1974

An Analysis of the Independent in the Electorate.

Benjamin Y. Cooper
College of William and Mary

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INDEPENDENT IN THE ELECTORATE

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Government

The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

---

by

Ben Cooper

1974

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfullment of

the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Author

Approved, May 1974

Jack Edwards

Roger W. Smith

Joseph A, Miri

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to suggest that the way in which political scientists have been treating the independent voter should be thoroughly re-examined in the light of current trends and changes in the party identification of the American people.

The paper presents an analysis of the major works in the study of the independent voter in an effort to indicate some of the weaknesses in the various treatments of this voter. Then an attempt is made to place this analysis in a current setting to offer suggestions regarding directions of re-evaluation.

To emphasize the trends in independent political behavior, a case study was implemented using information obtained through interviews conducted with 120 students of the College of William and Mary.

The results of this study indicate that many of the long held notions about independents do not apply to this one particular segment of the voting population. A suggestion is raised that the data obtained from this study may be an indication of similar findings in a broader segment of the American voting population.

THE INDEPENDENT VOTER

INTRODUCTION

In a rather oversimplified manner, the American electorate can be divided into the partisans and the non-partisans. Each of these groups is quite large and varied, but some basic labels can be applied to each of them. Partisans are primarily either Democrats or Republicans. The number of people who hold long term allegiance to any other party is quite small in comparison to these two large, influential parties. The other division of the electorate is not so easy to classify. The non-partisan label includes a number of Americans who are totally apathetic toward politics, those who hold brief allegiance to "one shot" parties, and those who participate politically but avoid party labels. These members of the electorate are usually placed in the category known as "independents".

Most of the research that has been done in voting behavior studies has been directed to the partisans and has usually concentrated on the two major parties. This concentration is understandable since, until recent years, about eighty per cent of the electorate has considered itself as aligned with one of the two major parties. Researchers have so probed into the characteristics of Republicans and Democrats that any researcher worthy of his trade can predict with a high degree of accuracy a voter's party by studying his income, race, and occupation. Although theories conflict, researchers have attempted to establish a basis for understanding the reasons Americans choose parties by study-

ing both adults and children. Some of the more ambitious studies have extended their research to other countries to discover how people from different cultures have certain features in common in their partisan behavior.

Although the study of voting behavior has yielded a great deal of information about the partisan, it is unfortunate that the same may not be said of the non-partisan. The independent does not quite fit into the two party political system, a fact which adds to the difficulty of studying him. He is a maverick who refuses to be a partisan when most of his fellow citizens in the electorate willingly fall in line behind one of the major parties. This refusal to join means that the independent differs in some respect from the partisan. However, despite efforts to study this independent, there exists much uncertainty as to exactly how he differs from the partisan.

Researchers have divergent opinions concerning the independent. Many researchers regard him as an apathetic and uninformed member of the electorate. Others have found the independent to be generally more informed and less apathetic than most partisans. Still others consider this voter to be much the same as partisans, neither more politically astute nor less so. Uncertainty about the independent even extends to questions as whether or not there has been a significant increase in their number.

The causes for this apparent uncertainty are quite numerous, but it seems that the source of the problem can be traced to a lack of adequate research and possibly to methodological difficulties. The lack of adequate research may be difficult to detect by a cursory examination of voting behavior literature since this could mislead the reader

into thinking that a great deal of work has been done on the independent. More careful study reveals that, while indeed a great deal has been written about the independents, much has been mere repetition. There has been little original research into the voting behavior of the independent.

The work regarded as the authority on the independent is The American Voter by Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes. This book has gained much recognition in the field of political science and has been quoted time and again since its publication in 1960. Unfortunately, this quoting has seldom been accompanied by adequate re-examination of the original study. Researchers often seem content to fall back on the analysis of the independent found in The American Voter. For this reason, there has not been a significant study of independents since 1960.

Methodological problems may have also hampered the study of the independent. William Flanigan has suggested that the usual methods of studying indpendents are too biased toward partisans to provide insight.[1] Many of the questions in interviews concern attitudes toward political parties. Information questions frequently require partisan knowledge. Involvement questions often are limited to finding out how involved the respondent is in party activity. Unfortunately, perfect methods of analysis have not yet been developed.

The basic problem is, of course, that the independent has rarely been studied directly. He is usually studied as part of a broad examination of partisans in which he is a side issue rather than the focal point. In light of the fact that independents in the United States have increased from one fifth to nearly one third of the electorate in

the last thirty years, it would seem that a study concentrating on the independent alone is long overdue.[2]

In the present study, the focus will be on the independent in an effort to provide a clearer picture of this rather ambiguous member of the electorate. The first step will be to determine what the status of the field is in the study of the independent. In approaching this initial goal, a discussion of some of the different theories that have been formulated regarding this voter will be provided. In addition, the paper will indicate the different ways in which independents have been defined as well as several methodological problems which have affected the outcome of some of these studies. The underlying purpose of this first section of the paper will be to suggest reasons for doubting certain broadly accepted hypotheses.

In the second chapter, tests of certain of these broadly accepted hypotheses will be given. The tests will be made on the basis of interviews conducted with over one hundred students at the College of William and Mary. Lack of both time and financial resources limits the survey to the college sample, but it is hoped that this sample will provide worthwhile information. At any rate, the purpose of these tests will not be to validate or invalidate any of the hypotheses in question; rather, the tests should provide a basis for support or additional reasons to doubt these theories.

The tests, the conversations with the respondents, and the survey of the literature on independents should provide a basis for approaching the third phase of the paper. The goal in this third phase will be to further analyse the independent by viewing him through something other than straight statistics. In this section, the different types

of independents will be discussed as well as some of the factors which may lead a voter to an independent stance. While this section is necessarily subjective, it will be based as far as possible on both observation and empirical data.

The final chapter of this paper will be speculative. In this section, there will be a discussion regarding the meaning of trends in independent behavior in terms of the findings of this paper.

It should be noted here that the purpose of this paper is not to attack The American Voter. Instead, it is the intention of this paper to emphasize that, since The American Voter was written over thirteen years ago, it must be re-examined in a more current setting. It is hoped that this paper will contribute in some way to the process of re-examination.

CHAPTER I

The independent voter represents a paradox in the study of American political behavior. No other group of voters in our system has been more praised and criticized, sought after and ignored. He has been regarded as both the ideal voter and as the symbol of apathy. The notion of an independent voter conjures up images of an intelligent person who carefully weighs the merits of each candidate and then makes his selection without influence of party pressure or interest groups. As much as people desire the existence of such a voter, it would appear, at least to a large portion of the writers on voting behavior, that this voter does not exist.

V. O. Key, Jr. in his last book The Responsible Electorate fairly summarized the opinion of the field regarding independents. Key said,

> On the average, its [the independents] level of information is low, its sense of political involvement is slight, its level of political participation is not high, its decision on how to vote is made quite late in the campaign, and its sense of political efficacy is quite low. Moreover, the independents manifest a striking electoral volatility and, insofar as they vote, tend to move in high degrees toward the prevailing side.[3]

Although this analysis represents the "accepted" school of thought on the independent, careful analysis of some of the major offerings in this area yield widely divergent opinions. One of the primary sources of divergence, however, has been a problem of definition. Some writers, most notably Walter De Vries and Lance Tarrance, Jr., prefer to think

of the true independent as one who reveals inconsistency in his adherence to party lines when he votes.[4] Others, such as Key and the Survey Research Center group, prefer to think of the independent in terms of self identification. Although one cannot ignore the findings in line with the former definition, the latter seems to have gained wider acceptance. Some of the weaknesses and strengths of the two methods of definition can be revealed in an examination of the history of research into independent behavior.

Part of the problem of definition was hindered by limitations on methods of research. Early studies of independent voting, such as A. Lawrence Lowell's "Oscillations in Politics"[5] and F. Stuart Chapin's "Variability of Popular Vote at Presidential Elections"[6], were limited to aggregate data and intuition. They thought of the independent as the intelligent voter who switched from one party to another. In the 1930's and 1940's when researchers such as George Gallup and the Survey Research Center began asking voters how they identified themselves, a new kind of independent was introduced. This new independent gained his status, not by virtue of the intellect or voting record, but by his attitude toward parties; he either chose to identify himself with a party or was an independent. While this latter type of definition is still the most prevalent, De Vries and Tarrance are suggesting reappraisal of the voting record method.

Implementation of the voting behavior method (ticket-splitting and party-switching) have been considerably kinder to the independent than the self indentification method. The first studies, notably those Lowell and Chapin, expressed the belief that the independent voter switched his vote from party to party due to discontent with the party

in power and in order to avoid the ridid political constraints of party tradition. Lowell's study, which was done in 1896, examined the votes for President in the U. S. from 1836 to 1896 and votes in the gubernatorial elections in various states from 1870 to 1896.[7] Although his tools did not enable him to isolate independents, Lowell was able to indicate tendencies toward inconsistent partisan behavior. The trends he mapped out suggested that, for the period studied, Americans were quite willing to switch from one party to another. The reasons for such switching, he perceived, were related to discontent with the party in office, but the implication in his paper was that groups of American voters were not willing to follow strict party lines.

Stuart Chapin used the same type of aggregate data found in Lowell's study to indicate an increase in this defiant voting.[8] Unlike Lowell, Chapin referred to these voters as independents. Chapin employed standard deviations to determine whether or not the fluctuations in voting in American elections indicated increasing numbers of independents. His hypothesis was that increasing variability in the vote in years where high voting turnout was recorded would indicate independence in voting. Repeated co-occurrence of these two variables would thus indicate increasing numbers of independent voters. Chapin, probably guided by common knowledge and intuition, offered a subtle definition of the independent. Variations in the vote were to Chapin an indication of the voter's willingness to escape rigid political traditions. Since rigid political traditions could present a barrier to advancement, those who avoided these traditions were considered more progressive and, therefore, more intelligent. From this, Chapin deduced that the intelligent voter and the independent voter were one

and the same. Indeed, he used the terms synonymously in his study.

It was not uncommon to think of the independent as the intelligent or even ideal voter. Since he could not be isolated for study, one could only guess his intentions. The independent was thought to be the swing vote between the rigid partisan camps. In1936, however, researchers began more in-depth analysis to determine what type of person the independent party-switcher was. Ogburn and Jaffe's "Independent Voting in Presidential Elections" was such an attempt.[9] Although still limited to aggregate data, Ogburn and Jaffe included demographic analysis to attempt to describe the independent.

Through the use of smaller units of analysis (counties), Ogburn and Jaffe attempted to discover common features of switch voters.[10] They determined which counties had the greatest fluctuation of vote between 1920 and 1932, and then found several common characteristics of these counties. The fluctuating counties were found to have the largest proportion of young voters, the largest proportion of males, the smallest percentage of native born parents, the greatest growth in population, the greatest degree of urbanism, the greatest increase in wages, and the greatest lessening of the share of manufactured product going to labor. Of all these characteristics, Ogburn and Jaffe found that youth and the economic factors were the most persistent in the fluctuation counties. It is interesting to note that all these factors are often associated with a lower adherence to political traditions, which provides some support to the Chapin study.

Examination of the characteristics of this party-switcher and praise of their worth as voters reached a high water mark with the

publication of Walter De Vries and Lance Tarrance, Jr.'s The Ticket Splitter. Using survey research data as well as aggregate data, these authors offer a convincing appraisal of the ticket-splitter and independent as a major force in politics. They note that the ticket-splitter now represents more than half the voters in most elections. This ticket-splitter does not necessarily differ from the party-switcher of earlier studies. Each group consists of voters who escape the rigidity of the straight partisan voter. But this ticket-splitter/party-switcher differs greatly from the independent described by Key. Unlike the apathetic independent found in The Responsible Electorate, the ticket-splitter is a young, well-educated, active force in politics.[11]

There are some weaknesses in identifying independents on the basis of their voting record. Foremost among these weaknesses is the methodological uncertainty. In order to determine a person's voting history, a researcher has no alternative but to depend on the word of the person being interviewed. Interviewers are faced with the possibility of a voter's failure to remember a particular election or his reluctance to confess a particular vote. In the time between the vote and the interview, attitudes could change regarding the propriety of a particular selection.

Regardless of the possibility of deceit, reluctance to provide correct answers, or a simple lapse of memory, the interviewer is forced to gather his data without controls. He can compile all the data available, but he can never be confident of its accuracy.

By using the party identification method, some of these problems

can be alleviated. The voter must only respond whether or not he is a party identifier. This method is obviously the lesser of two evils, although both methods have inadequacies. But the party identification method seems preferable from the standpoint that it requires less reliance on the veracity of the person being interviewed.

Another weakness in identifying independents by the way in which they vote is how to treat the influences that affect a voter when the ballot is before him. One of these influences is the party system itself. The party structure in the U. S. is frequently in a situation in which the state party organization is on the opposite end of the ideological scale from the national party. This leads to a situation in which a person would find great conflict in voting, for example, for a conservative senator and a liberal president in the same election, although both may be Democrats. One who splits his ticket in such a way may be a Democrat, and may never consider himself other than a Democrat, and yet he may find that the pressures of voting a straight ticket are too great.

Another less empirical justification for using the party identification method is found in attitudes. One might reason that independence implies a certain freedom of movement which identifying with a party does not allow. If a voter considers himself a partisan, he is predisposed to an acceptance of the party system. If he should occasionally or even frequently split his ticket or switch parties, he is no less partisan in his attitudes. Therefore, to refer to a party-switcher or a ticket-splitter as an independent may be misleading. According to Key, the genuine independent is one "who stubbornly insists

that he is an independent with no leanings in either partisan direction."[12] The ticket-splitter or party-switcher would not qualify as one of Key's independents.

Whether one considers methodological differences or the philosophical differences of independence, it seems quite evident that the "genuine" independent is easier to locate in the electorate. The "genuine" independent is one who can be found by asking the question, "Do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent, or what?"[13] This question has been one of the most frequently asked questions since the survey method was first used in political science. Because of the frequent use of this question, there is enough information on this group of voters to offer deeper analysis of the independent than through any other method. The information affords researchers the opportunity to isolate the independent and to compare him to the more partisan voters.

Many of the studies that achieved almost divine authority in the field of voting behavior have approached the study of the independent through the self identification method. The Voter Decides by Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller sets forth the definition of the independent using self identification to examine influences on voting choices.[14] Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes in The American Voter analyzed independents as well as partisans to approach in more detail the characteristics of and the extent of the relationship between strength of partisanship and numerous variables.[15] V. O. Key, Jr. gave his readers a brief but pointed analysis of the independent in The Responsible Electorate.[16]

Of all the works mentioned thus far, none have had more influence in the area of the independent voter than The American Voter. Using the data facilities of the Survey Research Center, Campbell and his associates provided the field with a clear definition of the independent. Published in 1960, The American Voter had the following to say of the independent:

> Far from being more attentive, interested, and informed, independents tend as a group to be somewhat less involved in politics. They have somewhat poorer knowledge of the issues, their image of the candidate is fainter, their interest in the campaign is less, their concern over the outcome is relatively slight, and their choice between competing candidates, although it is indeed made late in the campaign, seems much less to spring from discoverable evaluations of the elements of national politics.[17]

Other researchers have echoed the findings of Campbell and have even deepened the division between the independent and the partisan. In Politics and Voters, Bone and Ranney state, ". . . the least partisan people are the least interested, engage in the least political discussion, know the least about public affairs and have the lowest ratio of voters to non-voters."[18] And in The Degeneration of Our Presidential Elections, Jules Abels classifies the independent as "the least interested, the least knowledgeable, and the least intelligent."[19]

Besides the uniform condemnation of the independent found in these works, another common thread in these studies is noted; in each, the approach to the independent is peripheral to a general study of partisans. Unfortunately, there have been few studies devoted solely to the independent, and none are from the Survey Research Center. But it is interesting to note that, when a study has been directed particularly

to the independent, the results have not been quite as negative.

Only two studies using the self identification method have been devoted entirely to the independent and both of them were done in the early 1950's. The more thorough of the two, Robert Agger's "Independents and Party Identifiers"[20] gives a much different view of the independent from that found in The American Voter. Instead of finding the independents on the bottom of the political ladder, Agger found that independents are remarkably similar to party identifiers. On an index of participation, independents rated lower than Republicans but higher than Democrats. Agger found that on a scale of issue activation, independents scored high than partisans. He also found independents to be midway between Republicans and Democrats in interest in following the campaign. Demographically, Agger found the independents to closely resemble partisans. This is hardly the same picture as painted by the "accepted" hypothesis.

Samuel Eldersveld's article "The Independent Voter", which complained about the methods used to identify independents, indicated that political scientists simply did not know much about independents.[21] Applying both the self identification and the voting behavior methods, Eldersveld showed independents to be increasing and credited them with being the deciding factor in most elections. He identified the typical independent as a young, well-educated, non-union male with a relatively high income.[22] He also found that while some groups of independents participate by voting, talking politics, attending rallies less than do partisans, the group as a whole is about the same as partisans.

The central message in Eldersveld's article was an encouragement of further research into the nature of the independent, but, except for

the peripheral studies of the Survey Research Center and the work of De Vries and Tarrance, this encouragement has gone unanwered. In the face of this dirth of research, the SRC findings still prevail as the most solid evidence on the place of the independent in American politics. But apparently, all writers are not satisfied with those findings. In 1968, William Flanigan wrote,

> Independents appear to have the information and the perspective on political affairs necessary for an evaluation of issues and candidates as competent as could be expected of partisans. Independents are no wiser or more virtuous than partisans; nor are they less so. It is not clear whether their lack of involvement means that independents are not easily aroused by political problems demanding their attention, or whether their lack of involvement simply means that independents are less biased by partisan predisposition.[23]

Apparently, our knowledge of the independent voter is under some question again. Flanigan suggests that the tests administered to independents may have been only tests of their strength of partisanship, not of their political knowledge or interests.

In summary, it is difficult to determine which view of the independent is correct. One can be fairly certain that the independent is not the intelligent, ideal voter of the Chapin study, but it is difficult indeed to plunge then to acceptance of Key's unfavorable characterization. One can also state with some certainty that the independent is not as involved, interested, concerned, nor informed as some partisans, particularly the strong partisans, but there is considerable doubt that even as a group independents are lower on these scales than all partisans.

Any of the above analyses may be correct, or it is conceivable that

they are all correct to some extent. The information gathered in the 1950's may have yielded different results from information gathered in the 1960's. The 1950's have often been described as a somewhat quiescent period and thus may have produced a more apathetic political spirit, or at least more so than the 1960's. The problem with the available information then is age. Although the information may be accurate, there seems to exist a degree of doubt which warrants re-evaluation of the accepted hypotheses. Recent trends and contradictory data should be re-examined to determine what the present status of the independent is.

The most obvious place to begin an analysis of trends is to discern the pattern of change in party identification over a period of years. The importance of party identification has been demonstrated in many articles on voting behavior. Because of the consistency of these findings, the suggested effect of party identification has become a virtual truism, but certain aspects of party identification remain speculative. In Elections in America, Gerald Pomper says that party identification is quite firm and highly resistant to change.[24] Examination of Table I indicates that while partisanship for given periods may remain fairly constant, there is evidence of long term trends which indicate changes in partisan affiliation. Careful analysis of Table I reveals that, although the Democrats have remained fairly stable, the Republicans have shown a definite downward trend. More important, however, the independents have claimed almost steady increase since 1940. In terms of net change from 1940 to 1971, we find that the Democrats have shown an increase of three percentage points, the Republicans a decrease of thirteen percentage points, and the independents an increase of eleven

percentage points. This data includes the eighteen to twenty year olds in 1971, while in previous years only those twenty-one and older were included. However, removing the eighteen to twenty year olds does not greatly alter the percentages. Without the new group of voters, the Democrats show a four per cent increase, the Republicans an eleven per cent decrease, and the independents an eight per cent increase.

In Measures of Political Attitudes published by the Survey Research Center, the authors suggest that the large increase in independent identifiers is evidence of a true shift in voting alignments.[25] Until this large increase, the number of independent identifiers constituted about twenty per cent of the electorate. Currently, that number has risen to about thirty per cent of the electorate. Of course, the increase in the percentage of independents must be accompanied by a decrease in the percentage of partisan identifiers. No one can effectively speculate on the future of this trend away from political parties, but should this increase in independents continue, there could be a plurality of independent voters in the future. Should this trend continue, one must certainly pause to consider the implications regarding independents found in The American Voter and The Responsible Electorate. If we apply syllogistic reasoning to the situation, the implications are a cause for concern. If independents are generally considered apathetic and if they are increasing in the electorate, then one might logically deduce that the electorate is becoming more apathetic. Thus,we might assume that the trends indicated in Table I provide evidence that there might be a rise in apathy in the country rather than a rise in citizen involvement.

TABLE I

PARTY IDENTIFICATION, 1940 TO 1971[26]

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans	Don't Know	Totals
1940	41%	20%	38%	1%	100%
1944	41%	20%	39%	0%	100%
1947	46%	21%	27%	7%	101%
1952	47%	22%	27%	4%	100%
1956	44%	24%	29%	3%	100%
1958	47%	19%	29%	5%	100%
1960	46%	23%	27%	4%	100%
1962	47%	23%	27%	3%	100%
1964	51%	22%	24%	2%	99%
1966	45%	28%	25%	2%	100%
1968	45%	29%	24%	2%	100%
1971a	44%	31%	25%	0%	100%
1971b	45%	28%	27%	0%	100%
% change[c]	+3%	+11%	-13%		
% change[d]	+4%	+8%	-11%		

a includes 18-20 year old voters; b includes only those voters 21 and over; c represents net change 1940 to 1971 including 18-20 year old voters in 1971; d represents net change 1940 to 1971 excluding 18-20 year old voters in 1971

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF INDEPENDENTS AND PARTISANS IN THE SOUTH[27]

	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
Strong Democrats	24%	24%	22%	23%	24%
Weak Democrats	21%	25%	29%	26%	24%
Independents	8%	12%	13%	11%	25%
Weak Republicans	4%	6%	8%	7%	7%
Strong Republicans	5%	6%	11%	8%	4%
Never Voted	38%	26%	18%	15%	16%
Totals	100%	101%	101%	100%	100%

A more likely alternative to relegating the future of politics to mass apathy is to find the source of the increase in independents. From this point, some speculation can be offered to explain the increases in independence. One explanation can be offered by studying party identification in the South. Table II indicates the pattern of identification of the formerly solid Democratic South from 1952 to 1968. Although the partisan figures do not change much, it is readily apparent that independent identification jumped from eight to twenty-five per cent over the sixteen year period with fourteen points of that jump coming between 1964 and 1968.

Examination of the whole table shows that the most obvious source of new independent voters was from the group listed as "never voted". Over the same period this group dropped twenty-two percentage points. The "never voted" group was obviously overloaded with blacks who had been restricted in one way or another from voting. If the independents' increase was due to the "never voted" decrease, then one might assume that the independents after the shift would be largely comprised of blacks. Two other factors tend to negate the possibly high percentages of black independents in this particular case. One factor is that blacks in the South tend to identify with the Democratic party probably due to the fact that so much civil rights legislation came from the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Matthews and Prothro show that about seventy-five per cent of blacks identify with Democrats, while only twelve per cent are independent.[28] The other factor is that the 1968 jump came after the 1964 Goldwater presidential effort which saw several southern states voting Republican for the first time in

many years.

One possible source of the independent increase may be the southern white Democrat. The Goldwater victory in 1964 in five southern states may certainly be taken as an indication of a decrease in the Democratic hold over the "solid South". But despite the Goldwater vote, the percentage of party identifiers leaving the Democratic party was not reflected in Republican gains. According to the data in Table II, it is possible, however, that the Democratic losses were reflected in increases among independents. Then one can assume that the constancy of the percentage of those identifying themselves as Democrats can be explained by the large percentage of the "never voted" category which became Democratic.

Robert Agger speculated on the possibility of such a phenomenon. He said that an area in transition may find itself becoming independent before it truly switches to the other party.[29] Life-long southern Democrats who may feel quite uncomfortable as Republicans may choose the independent identification to ease the change. An example of one state which has found popularity in the independent slot is Virginia. A formerly "machine" controlled Democratic state, Virginia now has one Republican Senator, one independent Senator, and an independent as candidate for Governor. Alabama is another state that has not only elected its first Republican Senator in years, but supported the candidacy of its Governor George Wallace in the strongest third party movement in modern American history.

The increased independent identification in the South may be part of a transitional phase, or it may simply represent a discontent with

both major parties. Long term analysis will help to reveal which one is the stronger explanation, but the large independent increases in 1968 must surely represent more than an uninterested, apathetic populace. One point that the example of the South emphasizes is that, although the percentages of party identifiers may remain fairly constant, there is no certainty that the composition of these percentages remains constant.

Transitions from one party to another may explain part of the increase in independents, but there is a more likely explanation. Virtually every study since Ogburn and Jaffe constructed a rough demography of the independent[30] confirms the belief that independents are typically found among the young voters. Recent evidence certainly helps to verify this finding. De Vries and Tarrance report that forty-two per cent of the people between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-nine identify as independents, while college students on northern campuses are more than fifty per cent independent.[31] Among the newly enfranchised eighteen to twenty year olds, Gallup has found that fifty-one per cent are independents.[32] The fact that more young people would call themselves independent is no surprise; The American Voter explained this phenomenon. There is some doubt, however, whether Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes expected the percentages to climb to such a high figure.

Voting studies from the 1950's and early 1960's provided information to explain why young people are usually more independent than their elders. While most of the findings are rather speculative, they have gained wide acceptance. Gerald Pomper in Elections in America says of party identification, "Once established, this loyalty 'to a party is

highly resistant to change."[33] But The American Voter informs us that "in general, younger adults do not tend to identify strongly with a party."[34] These findings suggest that although party identification is a very important influence on voting behavior, it does not seem to become so important until one grows older.

Regarding the notion of age and party identification, The American Voter finds tenuous support for the claim that "older people will always feel stronger political bonds with a political party than will newer members of the electorate."[35] Campbell and his colleagues recognize the weaknesses in their findings in that they came from cross-sectional data. With cross-sectional analysis, there can not be true observation of change in party identification and age. It can only be said that at one particular time, one group of persons who are older have stronger party ties than a group which is younger. Cross-sectional data cannot say with certainty that as the younger group ages, this group will become more partisan.

If one feels optimistic about the party system, there is a source of support in the believed positive correlation of age and party identification. If one accepts the notion that independents are the politically unsophisticated, then there is less cause for concern that they will eventually inherit the political system. The independents, providing that they follow rules of statistical conformity, will lose their independence and pick up a party. However, the proof for such a claim is based on rather tenuous evidence. Recent research may alter these findings enough to worry party recruiters.

Norval D. Glenn and Ted Hefner's "Further Evidence on Aging and

Party Identification" offers findings which question the usual assumptions regarding age and party identification.[36] By conducting a cohort analysis using ten year cohorts which covered four year intervals from 1945 to 1969, Glenn and Hefner indicate that there is no apparent increase in party identification as a voter ages. Rather, it seems that party identification remains fairly constant throughout life. Glenn and Hefner took information regarding age and party identification from both Gallup surveys and the SRC and divided them into ten year groups ranging in age from twenty to eighty-five. The youngest group on the survey were those who were aged twenty to twenty-nine in 1965, and the oldest were those who were between sixty and sixty-nine in 1945.

With one exception the greatest change of any identification--Republican, Democrat, or independent--from the time the cohorts came into the study to 1965 was an increase of 6.8 per cent among independents who were thirty-four to forty-three years old in 1969. Most of the changes were lower; the average change was only slightly less than three per cent. The one exception, however, was a 13.8 per cent decrease in Democrats in the youngest group with a 6.4 per cent increase in independents and 4.1 per cent increase in the "other" category. The 4.1 per cent increase in the "other" category was attributed by the authors to the Wallace candidacy.

This exception may be of great significance if the findings of Glenn and Hefner are valid as they seem to be. The idea that one tends to align himself with a party as he grows older is one of the standard arguments to undermine the significance of the increase in young independents. If in fact one does not become more partisan with advancing years, we might expect to see even greater increases in independents in

the future. The belief expressed by Glenn and Hefner that people gain their partisan leanings based on some perceptions of the party structure at the time they came into the system would suggest that in recent years, the perceptions of parties has become more vague than, for example, during the New Deal era of Franklin Roosevelt. Of course, the work of Glenn and Hefner must be re-tested.

What has come from the body of research into the independent seems to be a large question mark. The few things that can be said with certainty are that there are more independents now than at any time in the recorded history of survey research and that young people are more independent than their elders. One cannot say with certainty that the independent is the political dullard described by The American Voter and The Responsible Electorate, nor can one elevate the independent to the status described by The Ticket Splitter. It is difficult to state with assurance that the independent is no different from any other voter. The problem is more noticeable when writers in political science take certain findings for granted. The American Voter is often quoted in the face of contradictory data.

The misuse of The American Voter's analysis of the independent has been a hindrance to further research. In works mentioned earlier by Bone and Ranney and Jules Abels, The American Voter was used as a source of information for their rather overstated descriptions of independents. Key, too, may have been overzealous in his appraisal of Survey Research data. Such misuse or misinterpretation tends to lessen the chances for constructive hypotheses. To fall back on a study from the late 1950's as supportive evidence is not likely to add significantly to the body

of knowledge in 1973. Researchers should instead constantly challenge these findings and subject them to new tests of validity.

If there are more independents now than in the past, and if these independents are generally younger, it would seem that the likely group with which to test the various hypotheses regarding independents is the young voter. Certainly, the most available group of young people is college students. While there is usually a higher socio-economic group found in colleges than in the population of young people as a whole, there is a fairly wide range of age, sex, race, religion, and, probably more than ever before, financial status. College students, by nature of their situation,are better educated than the general public, but in many ways, they are fairly representative of the population as a whole.

Regardless of the possible socio-economic differences which could appear in a college sample, one would still expect the differences found by Campbell and his associates to appear between independents and partisans. There is a perceptual problem in testing college students in that many observers perceive them to be more politically active (an opinion probably based on the student movements of the 1960's) and somewhat more ideological than the general population. Based on available evidence, this does appear to be a problem of belief rather than of supportive data.

In the following chapter, certain of the notions regarding independents will be tested with a college sample. Among the ideas to be tested are political involvement, political information, party image, and political cynicism.

CHAPTER II

In the opening chapter, various theories about independents were discussed to indicate the different directions which previous studies have taken in describing this voter. Although for the most part these theories differ only on minor points, some of them are obviously in direct conflict with each other. Of course, some of the differences can be traced to technical problems such as the use of different questionaires or varying methods of analysis. These discrepancies are most evident when older studies are compared to more recent studies. However, the conflicts evidenced in some of the theories are apparently the result of dissimilar findings derived from similar data.

For a variety of reasons including depth of analysis, reputation of the researcher, and the treatment of the findings, certain theories seem to gain more credence among the members of the political science field. In the study of the independent, it seems that this favorable nod has been given to The American Voter. The American Voter, probably the most frequently quoted study on independents, stands as the recognized authority. Certainly, the respect and recognition which this book has achieved make any challenges to the authors' findings very difficult. However, in political science, no study can remain permanently unchallenged since circumstances are constantly arising which have the potential of altering the electorate. At this writing, The American Voter

has been in print for more than a decade. During that decade, there have been some obvious changes in the electorate. One of these changes has been the enfranchisement of the eighteen to twenty year olds. Another has been the change in party identifications which resulted in a substantial increase in the percentage of independents. Therefore, it would seem that a re-examination of the conclusions and implications which were drawn in The American Voter is due.

In this study, such a challenge is posed. The area of challenge will be certain aspects of Campbell's treatment of the independent. The format of the test will be a case study conducted with a limited sample, students at the College of William and Mary. It is obvious that a sample drawn from such a small portion of the electorate does not afford as broad a base for generalizability as a national sample. Nevertheless, the contention made here is that the hypotheses, if valid, should withstand tests even within a broader universe. Such a sample could not possibly provide results which would alter the popular beliefs about independents. What the test of this sample will accomplish is either to provide additional strength to the theories of Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes or to introduce doubt into certain areas.

In The American Voter several characteristics were applied to the independents. Independents were said to be, or at least inferred to be, less involved in politics, less interested in campaigns, less concerned over the outcome of elections, and less informed about politics. In addition, the authors found that if independents voted in elections,

their decisions regarding for whom to vote were made late in the campaign and on the basis of something other than an evaluation of the issues. Of these various hypotheses, those dealing with involvement, interests, concern, information, and to a degree, the issues are to be tested in this chapter. The time at which an electoral decision is made and the reasons, whether issues or otherwise, the vote is cast a certain way will not be treated in this study.

As mentioned, these hypotheses evolved from a national survey, whereas this study deals only with college students at only one college. However, there is certainly justification for the use of such a sample. As was indicated in the first chapter, the percentage of independent identifiers is increasing. This increase is largely due to the fact that approximately forty per cent (estimates vary) of young people identify themselves as independents. Researchers have also found that,among these young voters, the college student is most likely to be an independent. The percentage of college student independents is usually found to be around fifty. The question of why these students are independents immediately comes to mind when one considers the theories of The American Voter. Are they generally apathetic or, at least, more apathetic than college partisans? Are they less involved, less interested, and less concerned about politics than other students? If we accept the theories of Campbell and his associates, then these questions must be answered in the affirmative.

Certainly, the current image of the college student does not resemble the apathetic citizen. The anti-war demonstrations of the late 1960's and early 1970's as well as activism in such areas as civil

rights and environmental protection led some people to speculate on the advent of a student movement. George McGovern's presidential bid seemed to rely heavily on such speculation. It would seem that such activity would not indicate the presence of a large apathetic group in the colleges. These expectations, whether accurate or not, do seem to add a measure of justification to a test of college students. If the theories found in The American Voter can withstand the test in an arena of activism, they will certainly gain in credibility. If they fail to stand, then perhaps there is reason to re-examine them on a broader scale.

Basically, the present research is a case study of voting behavior. The purpose is to view one select group to determine if they behave as researchers have suggested that they would behave. Each aspect of the analysis of the independent as found in The American Voter will be discussed separately. In addition, tests of political cynicism and the respondent's image of the major parties will be provided. It should be mentioned that The American Voter did not directly challenge the information level of independents, but the inference can be clearly drawn. Even if such an inference cannot be drawn, these questions should serve as a test of V. O. Key's hypothesis in The Responsible Electorate that independents' level of information is low. The cynicism questions were included for the purpose of determining to a greater extent the differences between partisans and independents and to probe into the cause of an independent indentification. More discussion of the cynicism test will be offered in the final chapter.

INVOLVEMENT

The involvement questions were designed to test the extent of the voter's active interest in campaign and election activity. In this survey, the students were asked whether or not they had voted; contributed money to a campaign, party or candidate; attended political meetings, rallies, dinners, or the like; worked for a candidate or party; talked to people to show them why they should vote for a particular candidate or party. The primary purpose of asking these questions was to be able to devise a scale of political involvement that could be used for comparative purposes. In this scale, voting was considered as the primary activity. If a person voted and responded in the affirmative to any of the other four types of activities listed, he was considered to be highly involved. If he voted but did not participate in the other activities, his involvement was labelled as medium. If he did not vote in 1972, he was considered to have low involvement, regardless of other activity.

In addition to the implementation of this scale, it was considered useful to provide other methods of treating the data for the purpose of cross-checking the scale. First of all, the questions were viewed individually to determine what types of activities appealed to independents. Secondly, a numerical mean response was computed based on yes = 1, no = 2 for the entire series. Finally, Republican and Democratic scores were combined in the above instances to provide a partisan - independent comparison. It was hoped that treating these questions in such a manner would help prevent misleading conclusions that could possibly be drawn from the scale. Although the cases would be rare, a person could be involved in every type of activity, but for

some reason was unable to vote. In the scale his level of involvement would be low, but his activity would be recorded in the cross-checks.

The results of the involvement test were somewhat surprising. Rather than scoring the lowest of the three groups, the independents scored in the second position above Republicans. (See Table III.) However, the Democrats outscored the independents. As indicated in the chart, the mean involvement score was 1.47 for Democrats, 1.60 for independents, and 1.69 for Republicans.

Some interesting data emerged from the individual treatment of the questions. The first question on the involvement scale asked whether or not the respondents had voted in the 1972 election. Turnout among these students was apparently high; 85.5% of the sample indicated that they had voted in 1972. The breakdown of the entire sample by parties indicated that independents did not vote less than partisans. (See Table IV) By a small margin, independents voted less than Democrats but more than Republicans. When the scores for the two parties were combined, it was found that actually a larger percentage of independents voted in 1972 than partisans, although the difference was quite small.

On the question involving contribution of money to campaigns and attending meetings, rallies, and dinners for candidates, the pattern was the same as the first question. Democrats scored highest, Republicans scored lowest, and independents scored in the middle. The pattern changed on the fourth question. When asked whether or not they had worked for a candidate in 1972, both independents and Republicans scored much lower than Democrats, but Republicans scored slightly higher than

TABLE III

SCALE OF INVOLVEMENT IN 1972 CAMPAIGNS AND MEAN INVOLVEMENT SCORE

	Democrat	Independent	Republican	All Partisans
High	62.5%	54.8%	50.0%	58.3%
Medium	28.1%	30.6%	31.3%	29.2%
Low	09.4%	14.5%	18.8%	12.5%
(Totals)	(100%)	(99%)	(101%)	(100%)
Mean Score	1.47	1.60	1.69	1.50

TABLE IV

PERCENT INVOLVED IN ASPECTS OF INVOLVEMENT SCALE AND MEAN RESPONSE SCORE

	Democrat	Independent	Republican	All Partisans
Voted in 1972	87.5%	85.5%	81.3%	85.4%
Contributed to a candidate or campaign in 1972	21.9%	16.1%	12.5%	18.7%
Attended meetings, rallies, dinners in 1972	40.6%	35.5%	25.0%	35.4%
Worked for a candidate in 1972	31.3%	11.3%	12.5%	25.5%
Talked about politics in 1972	53.1%	56.5%	56.3%	54.2%
Mean response score	1.53	1.62	1.62	1.56

independents.

The scores on the last question of this series were somewhat surprising. When asked if they had talked to people to show them why they should vote for a particular candidate or party, both independents and Republicans scored higher than Democrats. However, the percentages for all three groups were very close which suggests that there was not a great amount of difference in either group in this particular activity. The fact that the independents scored as high as the partisans is impressive. One would expect the partisans to "talk up" their candidate more willingly than the percentages indicate.

The results of the involvement test are fairly clear. In this sample, independents were not less involved than all partisans. In fact, the independents were in some instances more involved than all partisans. The worst that could be said for independents is that they are involved in politics to about the same degree as partisans as a whole.

One of the significant reasons for the comparatively high score of the independents was the low score of the Republican identifiers. It is obvious that the Democrats were involved in much larger percentages than were the Republicans. No attempt has been made to probe into an explanation of this phenomenon. However, a very likely explanation can be offered on the basis of observation. George McGovern was definitely an underdog in the 1972 election; no widely distributed polls predicted a McGovern victory. In the face of certain victory, it is quite possible that the Republican students were content to rest on that lead,while the Democrats fought an uphill struggle. This con-

fidence could have decreased the Republicans' desire to get involved. Unfortunately, no controls were introduced to account for this possibility.

CONCERN OVER THE OUTCOME OF THE ELECTION

In order to determine the degree to which the students in the sample were concerned over the outcome of the 1972 elections, they were asked the following question: "In terms of the outcome of the 1972 Presidential election, would you say that it mattered to you very much, pretty much, not very much, or not at all who won?" Responses of "very much" and "pretty much" were classified as concerned; responses of "not very much" and "not at all" were classified as unconcerned.

For comparative purposes, the percentages of answers to the questions were categorized into Republicans, Democrats, independents, and all partisans. As was predicted by The American Voter, independents indicated that they were less concerned than both Republicans and Democrats. The differences were slight, particularly between Democrats and independents, but they were in the order predicted. (See Table V)

INTEREST IN THE CAMPAIGN

As in the concern test, the students were asked only one question to determine their level of interest. The question asked was, "Would you say that you were very much, somewhat, or not very much interested in following the 1972 campaigns?" Responses were placed in three categories. The percentages of each group's response were computed as was

TABLE V

PERCENT CONCERNED OVER OUTCOME OF 1972 ELECTION

	Democrat	Independent	Republican	All Partisans
Concerned	81.5%	80.6%	87.5%	83.3%
Not concerned	18.8%	19.4%	12.5%	16.7%
Totals	101%	100%	100%	99%

a mean score of interest. (See Table VI)

Once again the findings were that independents scored lower than both Republicans and Democrats. The Democrats of the sample indicated far more interest in the 1972 campaigns than did the Republicans or the independents. (The low Republican score could again possibly be attributed to the certainty of victory.) In this test, as with the test of concern over the outcome of elections, the pattern followed that which was predicted by The American Voter.

KNOWLEDGE OF THE ISSUES

It is difficult to develop four issues in any test that will be significant to the sample one wishes to test. In the 1972 Presidential election, it was felt that in certain areas, the candidates' stand on the issues would be sufficiently separated so that some problems would be reduced. The four issues were revenue sharing, reduced defense department spending, redistribution of wealth among American citizens, and maintaining the present level of American troop strength in the NATO forces in Europe. The respondents were asked to identify the candidate most frequently associated with these issues, whether is support or non-support. Issues one and four were seen as mre frequently supported by Nixon, while issues two and three were seen as McGovern supported. The interviewer gave the respondents sufficient latitude to explain answers or to identify the issues in ways more in line with their conception of the issue. Each question was coded as correct or incorrect.

When the issue questions were viewed separately, independents

TABLE VI

LEVEL OF INTEREST IN FOLLOWING 1972 CAMPAIGNS AND MEAN INTEREST SCORES

	Democrat	Independent	Republican	All Partisans
Very much	65.6%	33.9%	31.3%	54.2%
Somewhat	21.9%	51.6%	62.5%	35.4%
Not much	12.5%	14.5%	06.3%	10.4%
(Totals)	(100%)	(100%)	(101%)	(100%0
Mean Interest scores	1.47	1.80	1.75	1.56

seemed to do fairly well. (See Table VII) On both issue A, "revenue sharing", and issue B, "reduced defense department spending", independents scored more correct responses than did Republicans. However, the scores on issue C,"redistribution of wealth", and issue D, "maintaining NATO troops", placed independents below both partisan groups. The Democratic respondents scored higher than all all groups on every issue except issue D.

When compared to all partisans, independents scored a higher percentage of correct responses only on issue B, and the difference in the scores on that issue was 0.23%. Therefore, as with other questions, the patterns suggested by The American Voter again seem to be accurate.

INFORMATION

Voting behavior researchers continually look for a more revealing test of political information. Many information questions are often too mature, too childish, too regional, or bound by cultured biases. Probably, no accurate test of political information will ever see the light of day. Any test of political information must then remain a crude measure at best. The questions used with this sample are subject to the same criticism. However imperfect the questions are, they are, of necessity, the only methods available to approach the question of how informed the voter is. The questions for this study were devised for this study in particular. They have not been subjected to tests of reliability. However, after a few interviews were conducted, it was apparent that these questions were fairly consistent in determining the extent of political information of the respondents.

TABLE VII

PERCENT CORRECT IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES BY CANDIDATE

	Democrat	Independent	Republican	All Partisans
Issue A	59.4%	43.5%	37.5%	52.1%
Issue B	93.8%	91.9%	87.5%	91.7%
Issue C	93.8%	87.1%	93.8%	93.8%
Issue D	84.4%	75.8%	93.8%	87.5%

Because the sample was all college educated, to some extent, the difficulty of the information series was necessarily increased. Questions that have been used on a national sample were generally considered to be too simplistic to be worthwhile. The respondents were asked to name the two United States Senators from the state in which they voted and to identify the party affiliation of those Senators. It was possible for the student to know the party of the Senator without being able to recall his name. Also, the respondents were asked to identify the speaker of the U. S. House of Representatives, the president of the U. S. Senate, and to identify the party which holds a majority in Congress. In addition to these questions, the index score on the issue questions was included to provide a total of six information questions. The index score was devised by considering three or four correct responses to the issue questions as correct, while two or less correct answers was considered incorrect. The maximum number of correct responses would be scored as six; the maximum number of incorrect responses would be scored as zero.

The information questions were coded both individually and as part of an information scale. The scale was simply based on determining the mean score of correct answers to the six questions issued. On this scale, independents scored a lower mean information score indicating fewer correct answers on these questions. (See Table IX) The highest score was made by Republican identifiers with 4.625. Democrats were second with 3.563, and independents scored a low 3.048. On each of the first five questions (all but the issue series), Republicans outscored both the Democrats and the independents.

TABLE VIII

PERCENT CORRECT RESPONSE TO IDENTIFICATION QUESTIONS (INFORMATION SERIES)

	Democrats	Independent	Republican	All Partisans
U.S.Senators identification	53.1%	40.3%	87.5%	64.6%
Senator's party identification	56.3%	45.2%	81.3%	64.6%
Majority party identification	78.1%	71.0%	100%	85.4%
Speaker of House identification	31.3%	29.0%	37.5%	33.3%
Senate President identification	53.1%	46.8%	75.0%	60.4%

TABLE IX

MEAN SCORES FOR INFORMATION SERIES

Democrat	3.563
Independent	3.048
Republican	4.625
All Partisans	3.918

(Scores include issue response.)

Independents scored the lowest percentage of correct responses on every question. (See Table VIII) The differences between their percentages and the Republican percentages were considerable. These differences were much larger than those that separated the group on any questionaire. The average difference was nearly thirty per cent. There would be little argument to an assertion that, on the basis of this data, the independent is somewhat less informed about politics than partisans.

To deviate briefly from the analysis of the independent, it is interesting, and somewhat surprising, to note the low score on certain of the information questions. For example, out of the entire sample, only 50.9% could correctly identify the two U. S. Senators from their home state, or voting state, if different. Only 30.9% could name the Speaker of the U. S. House of Representatives. Only 52.7% could identify the Vice-President as the President of the U. S. Senate. Of course, when separated from the independents' scores, the partisans do not look as bad. 64.6% of all partisans correctly identified their Senators. Only 40.3% of independents could do the same.

PARTY IMAGE

The party image series of questions was designed by Matthews and Prothro for Negroes and the New Southern Politics as an additional measure of party identification. The question will serve the same purpose in this study. The interviewers were asked to provide, if they could, their positive and negative feelings toward both the Democratic and Republican parties. Positive statements about the Democrats and

negative statements about the Republicans were each coded with +1. Negative statements about the Democrats and positive statements about the Republicans were each coded with -1. The maximum number of either positive or negative statements about each party was four. Thus, the scale ranged from +8 to -8. As one approached a score of +8, his image of the Democrats was considered more favorable; as one approached -8, his image of the Republicans was considered more favorable.

It would naturally be expected that all Democrats would have a positive mean score, that all Republicans would have a negative mean score, and that independents would be somewhere around the zero mark, neither pro Republican nor pro Democrat. This series was used in this study to determine to what extent there were latent partisan sentiments among the independents.

The results of this study followed the expected pattern to some extent. Republican identifiers had a more favorable Republican image, Democrats had a more favorable image of Democrats, and independents were between the two extremes. (See Table X) The deviation from the "perfectness" of the results was that there was a definite Democratic "slope" to the findings. In other words, each group tended to be more favorable Democrats. For example, although the Republican identifiers had a favorable image of the Republican party, the score indicated that these feelings were not very strong (-0.313), while the Democrats rather solidly favored the Democratic party (+2.15). In addition, the independents, while falling close to the center (+0.87) actually had a more favorable image of the Democratic party than the Republicans had of the Republican party.

TABLE X

PARTY IMAGE SCORES

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Like Democrats	+1.594	+0.758	+0.563
Dislike Democrats	-0.563	-0.500	-0.625
Like Republicans	-0.125	-0.355	-0.875
Dislike Republicans	+1.250	+0.984	+0.625
Party image scores	+2.125	+0.871	-0.313

(+ indicates direction in favor of Democrats; - indicates direction in favor of Republicans.)

One possible explanation for this slope is the fact that the Watergate issue was receiving wide coverage at the time of the interviews. This issue was frequently mentioned as a dislike of the Republican party so that Watergate could have caused the Democratic bias. More discussion regarding the meaning and leaning of the results of the party image series will follow in the last chapter.

CYNICISM

The final series of questions was introduced as an act of curiosity on the part of the researcher. This test for political cynicism should help in explaining the character of the independent as compared to partisans. Cynicism has been shown to be related to such factors as a low level of information and also with reduced partisanship. One would justifiably expect an independent who conforms to these other low levels to conform to the cynicism patterns also.

The students were asked to respond to six statements about politics and politicians. Their answers were coded on a six point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. All but the sixth question were "negative" toward politics and politicians. A "strongly agree" response to these first five questions would be the most cynical response, while a "strongly disagree" response would be the most cynical for the last question. The scores for the six statements were then combined to one scale which had as its boundaries six (least cynical) to thirty-six (most cynical).

The results of the cynicism scale did not provide the anticipated results. Despite the fact that independents indicated a more cynical

TABLE XI

TOTAL RESPONSE AND MEAN RESPONSE TO CYNICISM SERIES

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Total response	15.594	15.113	15.563
Mean response to questions	2.6	2.5	2.59

(Total response range: 6=most cynical to 36=least cynical)
(Mean response range: 1=most cynical to 6=least cynical)

response pattern, the differences were so slight that they are almost negligible. (See Table XI) Republicans scored 15.563 (a mean response of 2.59), Democrats scored 15.594 (a mean response of 2.6), and independents scored 15.113 (a mean response of 2.5). Further analysis of the cynicism scale will be provided in the final chapter.

It is regrettable that the sample was not of sufficient size or diversity to offer a complete examination of independents and partisans on a seven point scale. A seven point scale ranging from strong Republican to strong Democrat would reveal greater data concerning the leaning independents as well as the leaning partisans. Unfortunately, some of the cells (i.e. strong Republicans) were far too small to afford any real comparison. However, a brief discussion of the potential of such data shall be discussed later.

With the data that is available, it is quite apparent that the student independent does not live up to the expectations of some observers. One can read The American Voter with whatever doubts one feels, but as far as this sample is concerned, the findings of that book appear to have been quite accurate. With the exception of involvement, every factor tested revealed that the independent generally scored lower than the partisans. Even the deviation on the involvement scale can be reasonably explained.

In the last chapter, an attempt will be made to carry the analysis of the independent a step further than the raw data provided here or in The American Voter. The goal will be to present certain observations relating to the factors that could and the factors that do

affect independents. Although some of this data is supported to some extent by empirical data, most of it is drawn from the experience of this researcher in interviewing one hundred and ten students over a four week period. Much of the conversation from which some of the observations were made were virtually impossible to code.

CHAPTER III

It is obvious from the data thus far presented that the independents in this sample were somewhat less politically sophisticated than were the partisans. The results of the tests provided in the preceding chapter were somewhat surprising in the face of some of the popular notions regarding independents and college students. One might expect that independents in college would somehow be different from the independents that have been found by Campbell and Key. In the last decade, the image of college students has been that of the non-partisan, ideological crusader. They have attacked the programs of Democrats and Republicans alike. Some even pushed for a third party movement in 1968 behind Eugene McCarthy. Such behavior could lead to the conclusion that the independent and the activist are one and the same. If the present sample is any indication of college students in general, such conclusions have little basis in fact. In this sample, the partisans seemed to be activists, while independents seemed somewhat less active.

In most studies, this is the point at which the analysis ends for the independent. He is averaged, classified, and placed to one side to make room for the partisans. This is, of course, an inadequate procedure for studying a group that now comprises over thirty per cent of the electorate. In this study, an attempt will be made to go beyond that rather inadequate stage. In doing this, several goals will be approached.

First of all, the independent will be further classified by looking beyond the statistical averages. Then, theories will be offered concerning why there are independents and why independents are increasing.

These classifications, theories, and hypotheses are not based directly on statistical data. Rather, the following analysis is the product of observations of this college sample through a month of personal interviews. This analysis is not meant to be rigid, but to be suggestive. Perhaps, some of these suggestions will provide impetus for further research.

Independents are not a monolithic group. In fact, independents are politically quite diverse. They have no party convention to bring them together, no platform on which to stand, and no ticket to support. This diversity makes them difficult to classify. However, in this sample, three general types of independents seemed to reveal themselves with some consistency.

The first type of independents and, regrettably, the largest group, is the apathetic voter. Among the student respondents, these apathetics seemed particularly prevalent among sophomores, although the type emerged to some degree in all ages at all levels. The students who conformed to this pattern tended to be self professed apathetics who chose their position out of a lack of interest. Perhaps a "don't care" category would have been more appropriate for many of them. As would be expected, this group was poorly informed, generally unconcerned over the outcome of the election, and, as mentioned, uninterested in politics in general. When asked about their future as political citizens, most

espressed a lack of desire to be in any partisan mold or to participate in politics at all beyond voting.

Despite the overall lackluster spirit of these apathetic students, there were some encouraging signs. Some of these students expressed a desire to be more involved in politics, but for one reason or another, had not yet done so. One of the most frequently stated reasons for this delay in involvement was the lack of a leader or candidate to inspire them to action. For some of these, the 1972 campaign was too polarized between liberal and conservative which resulted in their being left in the confused center without a candidate to represent their views. Another frequently stated reason was that they were not in their home districts during the campaign and on voting day. Perhaps when they leave school, they will be involved to some degree. These students have probably been through only one election as eligible voters and have not developed the habit of political participation.

Another group of independents was what could be referred to as the latent partisans. The latent partisans were those independents who intended to "join" a political party at some time in the future. This group was generally composed of the youngest voters in the sample, predominantly the freshmen, who claimed that they did not have the experience or the training to affiliate themselves with a party. However, for the most part, this type of independent was very concerned over the election outcome, very interested in following the campaigns, and moderately well informed. In addition to these points, the latent partisans were often found to have worked for one of the candidates in 1972 in some capacity.

This group of independents tended to favor one party or the other more frequently than either of the other types of independents. Although there seemed to be more Democratic sympathizers among these students, the Republican-Democratic percentages were very close. Among most of these latent partisans, there was a measure of discontent with each party that prevented them from identifying themselves with either party. Those leaning toward the Democratic party disclosed a measure of discontent over the Eagleton affair in 1972; those leaning toward the Republican party had similar feelings about Watergate. Perhaps in the absence of such issues, these latent partisans will be able to choose a party.

The final type of independent to emerge in this study was the one often referred to in this study and the others as the "ideal" independent. Although the ideal evaluation may be in some doubt, it was evident that these students were more informed than were the others, more highly interested, and quite concerned over the outcome of the election. Generally speaking, however, their level of involvement did not correspond to these other high levels.

The "ideal" independent would make an interesting group for isolated study. Except for their high level of awareness about politics, they seemed to exhibit few common characteristics. Perhaps they were more individualistic than were others in the sample. They seemed to be more cynical than the latent partisan group of independents and a little less so than the apathetic group. Also, they seemed to be further away from the ideological center of politics than were the other groups. Judging by their impressions of the parties in the party image series, there seemed to be more "liberals" than conservatives, but the numbers

were not heavily weighted to either side. Among these students, there were McGovern supporters, Nixon supporters, and one supporter of John Schmitz of the American Independent Party.

As was stated earlier, these "types" are not rigid. There were numerous exceptions and contradictions, but these general divisions seemed apparent in the interviews. Another general observation that can be made of the entire group of independents is that among genuine independents as described by Key, both "ideal" and "apathetic" independents may be found. Among these two types, one might expect fewer casualties to the partisan camps while the leaners would not be expected to maintain their independence. Of course, in our two-party system, it is generally assumed that most college age independents, whether genuine or not, will eventually become Republicans or Democrats. However, this has not been as predictable in recent years. Perhaps, an examination of the factors which encourage the initial independent stance will serve as a partial explanation for the change that has taken place.

As has been suggested, independents are a diverse group. Naturally, there would be a diversity of influences which could cause them to refuse or to delay in acquiring a partisan position. In voting behavior studies, frequent mention is made of the idea that most voters take their political views from their parents, while others react to their scholastic environment, their peers, or other stimuli.

Parents are an obvious source of political socialization. Fred Greenstein and Herbert Hyman, among others, feel that the family is possibly the greatest of the socializing forces.[37] For the most part,

this appeared to generally true with this sample. Republican students were usually the products of Republican homes, Democratic students were usually the products of Democratic homes, but independents did not follow these general patterns. The terms "Democrat","Republican", or "independent" homes refer, in this case, to a home in which the parents were of the same identification, or were so identified by the student. A mixed home refers to one in which the student identified his parents as having different partisan affiliations.

Among these classifications of parental identification, some interesting patterns emerged. (See Table XII) First of all, independents were more frequently the products of Republican homes. Only twenty-five per cent stated that their parents were both independents. When the classifications of independents were examined in terms of parental identification, the results were even more interesting. The highly informed independents tended to come from homes in which the parents had different identifications, while the apathetic independents tended to come from homes in which the parents held the same identification. A mixed political home could indicate a more open political environment in the home which could encourage interest in politics and independence. It should be noted here that the apathetic students seemed to have more difficulty in identifying their parents' party affiliations. This uncertainty could indicate a lack of or limited political discussion in the home. More detailed study regarding parental influence could shed some light on this theory.

Obviously, some students echo their parents' political views, while others rebel against them. Although much can be explained by

TABLE XII

CROSSTABULATION OF STUDENT PARTY IDENTIFICATION

AND PARENTS OF STUDENTS PARTY IDENTIFICATION

	Student party I.D.		
	Democrat	Independent	Republican
Parent party I.D.			
Both Democrat	53.1%	16.1%	12.5%
Republican-Democrat	12.5%	6.5%	6.3%
Both Republican	15.6%	40.3%	68.8%
Democrat-Independent	3.1%	4.8%	0.0%
Republican-Independent	3.1%	6.5%	12.5%
Both Independent	12.5%	25.8%	0.0%
(Totals)	(99%)	(100%)	(101%)

this influence, there are other explanations which must account for those who are not influenced by their families. The environment of the college must be one of these factors. It is difficult to determine the effect of the school itself in terms of its attitude toward political activity, but it is possible to speculate on another aspect of the environment, the peer group.

In college, the peer group influence has a great opportunity to exert itself. Students live together and attend classes together in a sort of closed community. One of the prior notions of this study was that the influence of the peers in such a community would greatly affect the partisanship of the students. To test the peer group effect, the party image series was used. It was hoped that the party image series would reveal latent partisan sentiments among the respondents. For example, a student could respond as an independent to the party identification question and as a Democrat in the party image series. A student who responds in this way may be choosing his identification from convenience or style to create an image of his politics as being non-partisan.

The party image series did not reveal these stylish tendencies among independents. Although there was a trend in favor of the Democratic party in the responses, there was no widespread pattern of such latent partisanship except among those described earlier as latent partisans. Even among latent partisans, there was little strong favoritism for either party. The results of this test are far from conclusive, but it can be theorized from this data that stylish identification is not particularly effective with independents. Probably the effect of

peer pressure or other factors of the environment are no more significant among independents than among partisans. Other factors may have more effect on the selection of an independent identification.

One of the most frequently mentioned factors which encourages independence among young voters is the fact that they are young. Those who express this theory explain that as the voter ages, he begins to gather more reasons for being a partisan and loses his independent identification. Independence is then attributed to the inexperience of youth as are the low levels of involvement among young people.

It is true that there is a larger percentage of independents among young voters than among older voters. However, the belief in the conversion process from independent to partisan which accompanies age may not be so certain. Glen and Hefner have gathered data which indicates that this conversion process is not so great.[38] If these men are correct, the percentage of independents will not get less as the population ages. What is suggested by this data is that most people retain the party identification that they acquire initially. Thus, the influence of the political environment at the time the voter assumes a party may be more significant than the age of the voter. A voter during the New Deal might have been more likely to be a Democrat, while one might prefer independence during Watergate and Viet Nam. Each of these voters would retain their identification, according to this theory. The studies of Glen and Hefner will have to be repeated with improved methods and data.

A final factor which seemed particularly significant in the partisan identification of this sample was the effect of personalities. In the party image series, personalities were frequently cited as the rea-

son for favoring or not favoring a party. Independents seemed to give particular mention to this factor. It is interesting to note that few independents mentioned George McGovern or Richard Nixon in this series as a "like", but each received frequent mention as a "dislike". No student indicated that he liked Hubert Humphrey or Lyndon Johnson. Perhaps many of the independents have not been impressed by the candidates of either party in recent elections. Even if this is true, there is no way of knowing whether independence is a result of the lack of impressive leaders or if independent stance reduces the attraction of candidates of the major parties.

It is difficult to determine which, if any, of these factors has the most effect on a voter choosing an independent position. Most likely, each of them has some effect. Regardless of the cause of independence, it is certain that in 1972, a large number of voters did not vote according to their party identification at the presidential level. The increase in independents can be partially attributed to the large number of young independents, but without the eighteen to twenty year old voters, the percentages have still increased. Certainly, young voters cannot be blamed for party defections. Independence must mean something more than citizen apathy or youthful whims. In the concluding chapter, a discussion will be provided as to the significance of the trends in independent behavior in terms of this study and others.

CHAPTER IV

The picture of the independent may not be any clearer at this point than it was at the beginning of this study. It would appear on the surface that independents in the college community do not differ appreciably from independents in the national electorate. Each group of independents, when compared to groups of partisans with otherwise similar characteristics, appears to be somewhat less aware of the political world. However, this study has suggested that independents are too diverse to be placed in any sort of rigid mold.

Despite this obvious diversity, independents continue to be typecast by most voting behavior researchers. Events in 1972 make such typecasting a dangerous practice. In this year, the numbers of independents, party-switchers, and ticket-splitters have increased. Independents now represent nearly one third of the electorate; party-switchers provided Richard Nixon with one of the largest electoral landslides in American history, and ticket splitting was widespread enough to maintain the Democratic hold over Congress inspite of the Republican presidential victory. Perhaps the old evaluations of independents are no longer valid.

One of the major problems of studying independents is that there is not enough data to afford proper comparison. Studies have shown that independents are still less involved, interested, informed, and concerned than partisans, but there seems to be no way to determine whether

or not the gap is closing. If the gap between partisans and independents is widening, perhaps the increase in independence could be construed to mean an increase in apathy. If the gap is narrowing, independent increase has even more profound meaning.

There is no way to determine the direction in which independents are moving by studying the data gathered from this sample. However, the trends indicate that, regardless of the direction, more citizens will be independent in the future. In a recent article which appeared in The Washington Post (September 9, 1973), David Broder suggested that the parties have so divided themselves ideologically that an end to the two party system may be in the not too distant future.

The students in this sample did not seem overly pleased with the party system. There was no particular widespread dislike of the candidates, but frequently the students would mention that they did not favor political parties at all. On the party image series, there was little response to the question that asked them to express their "likes" for each party. Many of them said that there was nothing to like or admire about either Republicans or Democrats. The recent Watergate affair has certainly helped to emphasize the fact that many Americans no longer have faith in their leaders. In such an atmosphere of distrust of public officials and dislike of partisan politics, it is no wonder that many voters are refusing to be labelled with either party.

Broder suggests that the 1972 election was a highly ideological election between the liberal Democrats and the conservative Republicans. Conservative Democrats left the ranks of the liberals to join the Republicans in a landslide victory. According to Broder and the Michigan Center for Political Studies, this election may have been an indication

of elections in the future. If this prediction is accurate and if the analysis of the 1972 election as a particularly ideological campaign is correct, the old ways of describing the electorate may no longer be valid.

These old ways of analysis treat the independent lightly. However, independence may now warrant more thorough treatment. Independents have increased considerably in recent years to the point that there are more independent identifiers than there are Republican identifiers. In many colleges, there are more independents than there are Republicans and Democrats combined. But these increases would not be so significant if they were not accompanied by the changes that are occurring in the party system and in party loyalties.

The two most obvious results of the decline in party loyalties have been the strong appeal of George Wallace and the poor showing of majority party candidate George McGovern. The vote for these two candidates suggests that the voters may not be as bound by party loyalties as they have been in the past. Another such indication is found in a recent Gallup poll which reports that the Republicans have not realized an increase in their percentage of the electorate despite the huge Nixon victory. In the same poll, it was reported that the Democrats have lost some of their share of the electorate. The failure of the Republicans to gain and the Democratic losses have been reflected in independent increases.

Perhaps in the face of these changes in the electorate, voting behavior researchers will re-open the examination of the independent. They may discover that it is imprudent to permit "accepted" theories to

escape continuous re-examination.

APPENDIX A

The Research Design

The sample used in this study was selected from the student directory of the College of William and Mary. The initial sample was 120 of which there were ten casualties leaving a final sample of 110. The students were personally interviewed during the months of April and May of 1973 in sessions that were from ten to thirty minutes in duration.

The questions for the interviews were for the most part taken from other voting behavior studies. The involvement series was Angus Campbell's Index of Political Participation as used in The Voter Decides. The Party Image Series was taken from Negroes and the New Southern Politics, a study by Donald R. Matthews and James W. Prothro. The questions for the Cynicism Series were the same as those used by Agger, Goldstein, and Pearl in "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning".[39] The questions used to measure both concern over the outcome of the election and interest in the campaign were the same as those used by Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes in The American Voter. The information questions and the issue identification series were designed for this study and have been subjected to tests of reliability.

Where possible, the statistics used in the original application of the above tests were repeated in this study. However, in some cases, the statistics in the original were too complex for the purposes of this study. The statistical measures used in the Involvement Series,

the Party Image Series, and the concern and interest questions were the same as the original. The Cynicism Series was changed from a Guttman Scale analysis to statistical means analysis. The information and issue questions were analyzed through percentages, averages, and means. All of the statistical operations were computed through the programs of the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences using the data facilities of the College of William and Mary.

For various reasons, some of the results of the questions did not prove worthwhile. (See Appendix B for questionaire.) Some of the demographic factors were of very little significance to the study. For example, there were only four non-whites in the sample, a number too small to allow racial comparisons. The family income question revealed very little difference among the respondents. After about three-fourths of the interviews, this question was discontinued. The categories of home town size proved equally unusable for the sample. The cells other than "50,000 to 499,999" were too small to be of any value.

One of the real disappointments of the survey was the failure of the sample to yield enough diversity in partisan feelings to employ the seven point party identification scale (strong Republican to strong Democrat.) As with the town size responses, the cells were too small in some cases, particularly "strong Republican", to justify any conclusions from the scale. However, the results of this scale were used in some of the speculative remarks in the paper.

Some of the factors would have been interesting to analyze but were not considered to fall within the boundaries of this study.

Male-female comparisons were not used in this study although they were computed. The differences seemed to fall according to the theories that suggest that on most measures of political activity, males will score higher than females. Also unused in this study were the differences between residents of Virginia and non-residents. Since the current campaign for Governor of Virginia involves an independent candidate and another who has recently switched parties, one might expect more residents to identify as independents than in the past. Unfortunately, no controls could be introduced to account for this possibility. However, it can be reasoned that the effect of the gubernatorial campaign would not greatly alter the results of interviews taken eight months prior to the election.

One of the results of the interviews that was not fully intended at the outset of the study was the information gathered from conversations with the respondents which followed the interviews. In many cases, these conversations were encouraged by the interviewer. The students were asked questions such as why they chose to be independents and did they intend to remain independents. These questions frequently generated rather lengthy conversations which were often more informative than the interview questions. Due to the nature of these questions, it was difficult to classify the responses. However, these conversations did provide much of the information for the general observations in Chapter Three.

The ability to engage in such conversations was one of the advantages of conducting all the interviews personally. Another advantage

was the continuity of the style of the interview. The result of such interviewing allows interpretation of the data which could not come through viewing statistics only.

APPENDIX B

The Questionaire

1. Sex	Male___Female___
2. Race	White___Black___Other___
3. What is your age?	_____
4. What year of school are you in?	Freshman___Sophomore___ Junior___Senior___Grad____
5. What is your major?	_____
6. Where is your home town?	_____
7. Classify town as to population.	1,000,000 + __500,000 to 999,999__ 50,000 to 499,999__Below 50,000___
8. Would you look at this card and tell me the letter that most approximates your family income?	$4,999 and below___$5,000 to $9,999___$10,000 to $14,999___ Above $15,000___
9. Do you usually consider yourself a Republican, a Democrat, an independent, or what?	Republican___Democrat___ Independent___other____
10. Do you usually favor one party or the other? (If independent)	Strong Republican___Weak Republican___Independent Republican___
11. Do you consider yourself a strong Republican or Democrat?	Independent___Independent Democrat__ Weak Democrat___Strong Democrat___
12. How about your parents? Are they Republican, Democrat, independent or what?	Both Repub___Both Demo___Both Independent___Republican-Democrat___ Republican-independent___Democrat-independent___

13. Would you say of the 1972 campaign that you were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested at all? Very much___Somewhat___ Not much___

14. Did you vote in 1972? Yes___No___

15. Did you give any money, or buy tickets, or anything to help the campaign of one of the parties or candidates? Yes___No___

16. Did you go to any political meetings, rallies, dinners, or things like that for one of the campaigns? Yes___No___

17. Did you work for one of the candidates or parties? Yes___No___

18. Did you talk to any people to show them why they should vote for one of the candidates or parties? Yes___No___

19. Can you tell me anything in particular that you like about the Democratic party? + + + +____

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

21. Is there anything in particular that you like about the Republican party? - - - - ____

22. Is there anything in particular that you dislike about the Republican party? + + + + ____

Responses to the following six statements will be: strongly agree (1), somewhat agree (2), weakly agree (3), weakly disagree (4), somewhat agree (5), or strongly agree (6).

23. In order to get nominated, most candidates for public office have to make compromises and undesirable commitments. _____

24. Politicians spend most of their time getting re-elected or re-appointed. _____

25. Money is the most important factor influencing public policies. _____

26. A large number of city and county politicians are political hacks. _____

27. People are very frequently manipulated by politicians. _____

28. Politicians represent the general interest more frequently than they represent the special interest. _____

29. As far as you are concerned, would you say that you cared very much, pretty much, not very much or not at all about who won in 1972? very much/pretty much____ not very much/not at all_____

30. Who are the two Senators from _____now? correct___incorrect___

31. What are their political parties? correct___incorrect___

32. Do you know which party now holds a majority in Congress? correct___incorrect___

33. Do you know who the Speaker of the House is now? correct___incorrect___

34. Do you know who the President of the Senate is now? correct___incorrect___

Identify these issues as McGovern supported or Nixon supported.

35. Revenue sharing. correct___incorrect___

36. Reduced Defense Department spending. correct___incorrect___

37. Redistribution of wealth among American citizens. correct___incorrect___

38. Maintaining the present level of American troops in NATO. correct___incorrect___

39. Would you mind telling me whom you supported for President in 1972? McGovern___Nixon___Wallace___ Other___

NOTES

[1]William H. Flanigan, Political Behavior of the American Electorate (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972), p. 47.

[2]See Table I.

[3]V. O. Key, Jr., The Responsible Electorate (Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1966), p. 91.

[4]See Walter De Vries and Lance Tarrance, Jr., The Ticket Slitter (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972),

[5]See A. Lawrence Lowell, "Oscillations is Politics," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, XII (July, 1898), 69-97.

[6]See F. Stuart Chapin, "Variability of the Popular Vote at Presidential Elections," American Journal of Sociology, XVII, No.2 (September, 1912), 222-240.

[7]Lowell, p. 90.

[8]Chapin, p. 222.

[9]See W. F. Ogburn and Abe J. Jaffe, "Independent Voting in Presidential Elections," American Journal of Sociology, XVII (September, 1936), 186-201.

[10]Ibid., p. 189.

[11]De Vries and Tarrance, p. 60.

[12]Key, p, 91.

[13]Ibid., p. 91.

[14]See Angus Campbell, et al., The Voter Decides (Evanston: Row, Peterson, and Co.,1954).

[15]See Angus Campbell, et al., The American Voter (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960).

[16]Key, p. 91-92.

[17]Campbell, The American Voter, p. 143.

[18]Hugh A. Bone and Austin Ranney, Politics and Voters (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), p. 11.

[19]Jules Abels, The Degeneration of Our Presidential Elections (New York: McMillan, 1968), p. 69.

[20]Robert E. Agger, "Independents and Party Identifiers: Characteristics and Behavior in 1952," in American Voting Behavior, Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck, eds., (New York: The Free Press, 1959), pp. 315-318.

[21]Samuel Eldersveld, "The Independent Vote: Measurement, Characteristics, and Implications for Party Strategy," APSR, 46, No. 3 (September, 1952), 732-753.

[22]Ibid., p. 751.

[23]Flanigan, p. 47.

[24]Gerald M. Pomper, Elections in America (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1972), p. 71 and p. 73.

[25]John P. Robinson, et al., Measures of Political Attitudes (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1968), p. 495.

[26]Found in Flanigan, p. 33.

[27]Found in Donald R. Matthews and James W. Prothro, Negroes and the New Southern Politics (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., p. 373.

[28]Ibid.

[29]Agger, p. 316.

[30]See page 10 of this study.

[31]De Vries and Tarrance, p. 23.

[32]Gallup Political Index, No. 76, October, 1971, p. 11.

[33]Pomper, p. 73.

[34]Campbell, The American Voter, p. 329.

[35]Ibid., p. 161.

[36]Norval D. Glenn and Ted Hefner, "Further Evidence in Aging and Party Identification," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXVI, (Spring, 1972), 31-47.

[37]See Herbert Hyman, Political Socialization: A Study in the Psychology of Political Behavior (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959) and Fred I. Greenstein, Children and Politics (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965).

[38]Glenn and Hefner, 31-47.

[39]Robinson, p. 220.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abels, Jules. The Degeneration of Our Presidential System. New York: McMillan, 1968.

Bone, Hugh A. and Austin Ranney. Politics and Voters. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Burdick, Eugene and Arthur J. Brodbeck, eds. American Voting Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1959.

Campbell, Angus, et al. The American Voter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960.

_____, et al. Elections and the Political Order. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

_____, et al. The Voter Decides. Evanston: Row, Peterson, and Company, 1954.

Chapin, Stuart F. "Variability of the Popular Vote at Presidential Elections," American Journal of Sociology, XVIII, No. 2 (September, 1912), 222-240.

De Vries, Walter and Lance Tarrance, Jr. The Ticket Splitter. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972.

Eldersveld, Samuel. "The Independent Vote: Measurement, Characteristics, and Implications for Party Strategy," APSR, XLVI, No. 3 (September, 1952), 732-735.

Flanigan, William H. Political Behavior of the American Electorate. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.

Glenn, Norval D. and Ted M. Hefner. "Further Evidence on Aging and Party Identification," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXVI, No. 1 (Spring, 1972).

Greenstein, Fred I. Children and Politics. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

Hyman, Herbert. Political Socialization: A Study in the Psychology of Political Behavior. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959.

Key, V. O., Jr. The Responsible Electorate. Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1966.

Lowell, Lawerence A. "Oscillations in Politics," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, XII (July, 1898), 69-97.

Matthews, Donald R. and James W. Prothro. Negroes and the New Southern Politics. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1966.

Ogburn, W. F. and Abe J. Jaffe. "Independent Voting in Presidential Elections," American Journal of Sociology, XLII (September, 1936), 186-201.

Pomper, Gerald M. Elections in America. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1972.

Robinson, John P., et al. Measures of Political Attitudes. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1068.

VITA

Benjamin Y. Cooper, Jr.

Born in Nashville, Tennessee, April 13, 1948. Graduated from W. P. Davidson High School in Mobile, Alabama, June 1966. B.A., University of Alabama, 1970. Taught General Science at Huxford School, Huxford, Alabama, 1970 to 1972.

Entered the graduate program of the Government Department of the College of William and Mary in 1972.