

Melvin J. Hinich
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, VA 24061

For the last four years I have been working on the problem of testing the spatial model of voting using feeling thermometer scores on candidates and issues from the 1968 and 1972 election surveys. The 1968 results are given in a working paper (with Cahoon and Ordeshook) entitled "A Multidimensional Statistical Procedure for Spatial Analysis." The 1972 results support the positive findings of our first study, but the results have not been written up. I have also analysed spatial non-voting models using the 1968 data. In order to test spatial models, we have developed a new multidimensional scaling procedure. This methodology is based upon the parametric spatial model which Davis and I introduced in our 1965 paper.

There is, however, an important difference in the way the present work treats issue voting. The dimensions of the space of candidates and voters were described in previous expositions as salient political issues. It is more consistent with empirical studies of voter attitudes to conceive of the dimensions as heuristic factors which are used by a voter to forecast a candidate's behavior with respect to economic and social policy once elected to office. An issue oriented rational voter who is faced with a choice among candidates for an executive office or a legislative seat must try to forecast how the candidates will function in office. It is rational for a voter to consider personality factors when choosing a representative. In a referendum election, on the other hand, voters only have to understand the issue and imagine the future consequences of the competing positions involved in the election. Elections

for representatives require a greater cognitive effort and information investment from rational voters.

It is rational for a voter to simplify the evaluation process by reducing the complexity of the issue space. Since the choice is over representatives and not issues per se, a rational voter must forecast how a candidate will behave in office. It is reasonable to use past performance and past associations as a guide to a candidate's future behavior. Moreover most voters do not have much incentive to invest in information, given the small impact of a single vote and the infrequency of elections. Thus a simple rule of thumb based on inexpensive but noisy information is the best evaluation and choice strategy for most voters and even modest contributors.

I have several ideas how to go about connecting political issues with the underlying dimensions we see in our empirical work. These ideas involve subtle changes in the set of questions which have been asked in previous SRC surveys. In addition, thought should be given to selecting a set of political figures which can be used over several surveys to obtain a consistent time series of spatial analyses.