

Author(s): Weisberg, Herb and Tom Boyd

Title: Report on Party Identification Questions in the Pilot Study

Date: August 7, 1979

Dataset(s): 1979 Pilot Study

Abstract

This paper examines the utility of traditional and experimental measures of partisanship. Weisberg and Boyd first assess the feeling thermometer measures used in the 1979 Pilot Study. The authors find that the new "political independents" and "political parties" feeling thermometers are useful because the questions relating to a respondent's degree of independence track a new dimension, separate from the traditional Democratic-Republican continuum. The authors also find that there are no systemic differences between the 1964-1976 partisan group thermometers (which asked questions concerning feelings about "Republicans and Democrats") and the 1978 party items (which surveyed reactions to the Republican and Democratic parties). Finally, the authors evaluate the new party identification questions. Weisberg and Boyd find that: (1) The measures of "strength of independence" correlate well with other meters of independence; (2) The new partisanship questions tend to bunch more respondents in the middle category than traditional questions; and (3) It is common for respondents to think of themselves as both partisan and Independent, indicating that the two categories are not mutually exclusive concepts. This last finding is supported by a factor analysis of the dimensions of partisanship which uncovers both pro/anti party and a pro/anti independent scales.

NOT FOR CITATION OR QUOTATION
WITHOUT DIRECT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR

REPORT ON PARTY IDENTIFICATION QUESTIONS IN PILOT STUDY

Herb Weisberg
with the assistance of Tom Boyd

August 7, 1979

Section I. Recommendations (listed in priority order)

1. Feeling thermometer items:

In 1980 use "Independents," "political parties" (to measure anti-partyism), "Republican Party," and "Democratic Party" (avoiding the ambiguous Republicans and Democrats items).

2. Independence question:

In 1980 after the traditional party identification series, ask everyone "On this scale from 1 to 7 (where 1 means 'not very strongly' and 7 means 'very strongly'), please choose the number that describes how strongly you think of yourself as a political Independent." This question should be asked without a preceding filter question.

3. Closeness question:

In 1980, after the traditional party identification series, ask everyone (except pure Independents): "Here is a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 means feeling much closer to the Republican Party and 7 means feeling much closer to the Democratic Party, where would you place yourself on this scale?"

4. Other party identification questions:

The other party identification (V263 and V266) are worth considering for 1980. They measure different concepts and are useful.

5. Party attitudes battery:

In 1980 retain some of these items (V169-V179). The items chosen should be selected on the basis of the factor analysis and Jack Dennis's recommendations.

Section 2. Feeling Thermometers

A. "Political Independents" and "Political Parties"

The pilot study tested out two entirely new thermometer items relating to the partisanship concept: "Political Independents" and "Political Parties". There was initial concern as to whether the items would have good distributional properties--everyone might like Independents and dislike parties, so they could have too little variance to be useful. In fact, these proved to be two excellent and very useful items.

Table 1 includes rating summaries for the "Independents" and "Party Items". They actually had greater variance than the other party objects. Nor is there a problem with everyone approving Independents and opposing parties. Instead parties were more popular on average than were Independents. Even the Republican Party and Democratic Party items were more popular than Independents. The Independents did attract more "Don't Know" responses than did the other party objects, but the item performed well in all further analysis. In short, the distributional properties of the two new items pose no difficulty; these measures are fully reasonable measures.

Several sets of researchers have recently argued that independence is a separate dimension from the Republican-Democratic continuum. The new "Independents" thermometer item permits the first test of this claim. In fact the correlation between this item and the rating of the Republican Party is $-.03$ while its correlation with the rating of the Democratic Party is $.17$, showing that it is indeed a separate dimension. As another test, preference orders over Republicans (or Republican Party for Form B), Independents, and Democrats (or Democratic Party for Form B) were examined. If these three objects are perceived in unidimensional terms, with Independents in the middle, only four preference orders should appear (listed in order of first, second, and third choices with all tied ratings dropped): DIR, IDR, IRD, and RID. Fifty-five percent of the respondents had one of these preference orders (See Table 2). However, many more respondents had preference orders compatible with the Democrats and Independents being at the opposite ends of the dimension (or for that matter, with Republicans and Independents at opposite ends). To state this in a simpler way, if Independents are in the middle of the dimension, then partisans should prefer Independents to the opposite party, but in fact both those who liked Democrats most and those who liked Republicans most tended to like the opposite party more than Independents (40% to 25%). This comparison should run overwhelmingly in the opposite direction if there were a single Republican-Independent-Democratic dimension. As a result, the evidence indicates that independence is a separate dimension.

The new "Political Parties" item is even more fascinating. One might anticipate that it would be negatively correlated with Independents--that people who like parties more would be less likely to like Independents. Instead, the correlation is an insignificant $.04$. Table 3 condenses the cross-tabulation of the Independents and "Parties" thermometers. There

are people who like parties but dislike Independents (14% of the sample) and people who like Independents but dislike parties (10%), but also many people who like both (19%) or dislike both (8%). What results is a fascinating typology of reactions to Independents and "Parties". Also, preference orders on Republicans, Democrats, Independents, and Political Parties do not fit 1 or 2 dimensions according to unfolding analysis.

It is interesting to see how the Independents and the "Parties" items relate differently to other variables. Specifically, consider the new battery of party attitude questions (V169-V179). Most of these items measure anti-party feelings, such as in the prototypical last item "The truth is we probably don't need political parties in America anymore". These anti-party items have much higher correlations with the "Parties" thermometer than with the Independents thermometer; for example, the item just quoted has a correlation of $-.41$ with the "Parties" thermometer versus $.11$ with the Independents. Putting aside a couple of questions with low correlations with both items (the items on whether legislators should follow party dictates and whether party conflicts hurt the country more than they help it), the only question with comparable correlations with both thermometers is the one which contrasts party support and independence--"It is better to be a firm party supporter than to be a political independent" (Correlation of $+.20$ with "Parties" and $-.26$ with Independents). Thus, it is possible to frame questions which make party support and independence opposites of one another, but respondents do not themselves view anti-party questions as pro-independence.

The initial evidence is that these two new thermometer items have good distributional properties, yield insights on theoretically important questions, and can lead to interesting new research topics. Their usefulness will be further demonstrated in the analysis of section 4 of this report.

B. "Republicans", "Republican Party", "Republican Party Leaders" and so on

The 1964 to 1976 CPS studies had respondents rate "Republicans" and "Democrats" on the feeling thermometer. Researchers have used these items, but have been criticized for doing so because of the unclear referents. Since an unambiguous referent to the parties would be more useful, the 1978 CPS study switched to having respondents rate "the Republican Party" and "the Democratic Party" on the feeling thermometer. The pilot study included both versions in order to study wording effects. No direct comparisons can be made since the items were asked on different forms, but marginals can still be compared. Additionally, all respondents were asked to rate "Republican Party Leaders" and "Democratic Party Leaders". The leader items can be used also as a standard for examining the differences between the party group ("Republicans") and party ("Republican Party") items. Note that all of these ratings were obtained in the wave I of the pilot study, using the new thermometer card. Comparisons will also be made with the 1978 CPS study which left the field just before the first wave of the pilot study, but it must be remembered that the old version

of the thermometer card was used in that study. A separate report on the thermometer indicates that the new card yields lower means, higher variances, and more fifty-degree responses.

Table 1 summarizes the ratings for the different thermometer items. Prior expectations were that the party leaders would have the least favorable ratings while the ambiguous partisan group items would get the most favorable ratings. These expectations were not satisfied. The differences in means are small and inconsistent. The items have relatively similar variances. There is a drastic increase in "Don't Know" responses for "Party Leaders", which suggests more problems with these items than with the partisan group and party items.

An important possibility is that these variables behave differently with respect to other variables. No vote variable could be included in an off-year study, so instead a dependent variable was constructed from whether the person preferred Ford to Carter on the thermometer (+1), Carter to Ford (-1), or the two equally (0). The use of relative thermometer ratings as a surrogate for vote is becoming prevalent in the literature, so this is a very reasonable dependent variable. It was correlated with three difference variables: how much more the person likes Republicans than Democrats, how much more the person likes the Republican Party than the Democratic Party, and how much more the person likes Republican Party leaders than Democratic Party leaders. The correlations are virtually identical: .365 for the partisan group difference, .373 for the party difference, and .366 for the party leader difference. From this perspective, the items are interchangeable.

However, a divergence appears when these difference variables are correlated with the traditional seven-point party identification scale. The correlations are .704 for the partisan group difference and .714 for the party difference versus only .587 for party leaders, suggesting that the leader items are less partisan than the others.

Also, an important difference emerges between the party leader items and the other items when one examines the correlation among several thermometer items (See Table 4). In the pilot study that correlation is -.26 and the correlation of Republicans and Democratic items is -.24. However, the correlation of the Republican Party leader and Democratic Party leader items is as positive as those are negative, +.24. The sample size is small, but each of these correlations would be significantly different from non-zero in a simple random sample. This suggests that the party leader ratings are affected by something which does not affect the other party ratings--presumably a general tendency to like or dislike all party leaders. Table 4 also reports a substantially higher correlation between the party leader items on the one hand and the new "Political Parties" items (.42 for both sets of party leaders) than between any of the other partisan thermometers and the new "Political Parties" item (Correlations of .16, .20, .28, and .34). The party leader items are more affected by generic feelings toward parties than are the other items.

There is no evidence of systematic differences between the partisan group items and the party items. The party leader items, however, are quite different from the others and should be used with caution.

Section 3. New Party Identification Questions

A. Strength of Independence

One new party identification question series asked of everyone in the pilot study deals with political independence: "Do you ever think of yourself as a political independent, or not?" (If Yes,) "On this scale from 1 to 7 (where 1 means 'not very strongly' and 7 means 'very strongly'), please choose the number that describes how strongly independent in politics you feel." Several recent research papers argue that a person can think of himself as both a partisan and as an Independent and that independence has a strength component just as partisanship does. These items were designed to explore these possibilities. On the whole they were quite successful.

For analysis purposes, the two questions were combined into a single strength of independence scale, from 7 meaning very strongly Independent to 1 for not very strongly Independent, and 0 for not at all Independent (No on the filter question). Table 5 shows the distribution of responses on the resulting scale. The bimodality is unfortunate. Most people who think of themselves as Independents choose categories 4 to 7 on the strength scale, leaving categories 1 to 3 all but vacant. It would appear that a better measurement strategy would be to ask the strength of independence question of everyone without a preceding filter question.

In any case, the strength of independence scale correlates well with other measures of independence. It has a .38 correlation with the "Political Independents" thermometer, and a .44 correlation with the question of whether it is better to be a party supporter than an Independent.

Table 6 shows that it is common for people to think of themselves as both partisans and Independents. If the two were mutually exclusive, the correlation between the dichotomous measures of whether a person is a party supporter and of whether a person is an Independent would be -1.0. Instead the correlation is -.20, showing that the two are far from mutually exclusive.

Table 7 shows how the categories of Table 6 relate to the usual party identification question. Those who are only party supporters tend to be strong identifiers, and are rarely Independents. Those who are both party supporters and Independents fall in all categories except pure Independents. Those who are neither party supporters nor Independents tend to be leaners, but are rarely strong partisans.

While the distributional properties of the independence strength scale are not ideal, this new question is fitting theoretical interests well and is a useful question.

B. Partisan Position, Partisan Strength, and Party Closeness

The pilot study also included several new partisanship measures. The "Partisan Position" item, asked in both waves of all respondents, has respondents place themselves on a 1 to 7 scale from strong Democrat to

to strong Republican. The "Partisan Strength" question asks people who are party supporters (in response to a new question "Do you think of yourself as a supporter of one of the political parties, or not?") to place themselves on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 indicates they do not very strongly support their party and 7 means they very strongly support it. For analytical purposes, this strength question has been recoded from +7 for very strongly support Democrats to -7 for very strongly support Republicans, with 0 for those who are not party supporters.

The "Party Closeness" question involves the most intricate sequencing. All party supporters (44% of the sample) are asked to position themselves on a 1 to 7 scale from "I feel very close to the Republican Party" to "I feel very close to the Democratic Party". Those who are not party supporters are asked if they ever think of themselves as closer to one of the two major parties, and those who do (52% of those who are not party supporters) are then asked to position themselves on that same 1 to 7 closeness scale. For analysis purposes, those non-party supporters who never think of themselves as closer to one party or the other are put at 4 on the scale.

Table 8 compares the marginal distributions on these measures with the marginal distribution on the traditional party identification question. All of the new measures suffer from a common problem--many more people in the middle category than is the case with the usual party identification scale.

Table 9 shows how respondents tend to more extreme positions on the party ID scales. The correlations among these items are all high (see Table 10), which is in large part due to the fact that they all do a good job of putting Republicans at one end of the scale and Democrats at the opposite end. How these variables differ in dealing with strength of partisanship and independence will be examined more in the analysis section below. The closeness item proves critical to understanding both strength of identification and independence as traditionally measured.

Section 4. Analysis

A. Sources of Strength of Identification

Much recent research on party identification examines what strength of identification really means. This topic can be investigated using the unusually rich selection of variables available in the pilot study. For this analysis, a variety of new variables were created from variables already described:

Maximum: How much the person likes the party he likes most was created from the thermometers (The absolute value of the difference in the thermometer score given to the party groups for Form A or the parties for Form B).

Support: How much the person supports his party (7 for very strong support to 1 for not very strong support and 0 for not being a party supporter), based on the new partisan strength question.

Closeness: Ranging from 0 for equally close to both parties to 3 for very close to one party, recoded from the party closeness question.

Dichotomous Strength: The question usually asked of party identifiers

as to whether they are strong or not very strong identifiers.
 Strength Scale: The traditional scale (4=strong partisan, 3=weak partisan, 2=leaning Independent, 1=pure Independent).
 Measures of independence have also been included.

The correlation matrix is shown in Table 11, with all variables coded consistently so that a high score indicates high strength of identification. The correlations are not as high as in Table 10, but they are still fairly high. Strength of identification as traditionally measured correlates better with the new partisanship measures than with the thermometer measures. The correlations of the traditional measures with strength and closeness (or, equivalently, thermometer maximum and difference measures) are equivalent, and are higher than the correlations of the traditional measures with measures of independence.

A multiple regression analysis was performed to examine the impact of support, closeness, independence, and anti-partyism on the traditional strength of partisanship scale. Together, these four variables account for 49% of the variance in the traditional partisanship strength scale. The beta-weights are .38 for closeness, .27 for support, -.19 for independence, and -.10 for anti-party feelings (V179). All of the coefficients are significant. Thus, strength of identification as conventionally measured taps all of the separate concepts simultaneously. It comes closest to measuring how much closer a respondent is to his own party, and least how strongly Independent or anti-party the person is.

B. Sources of Independence

If strength and independence are separate, what distinguishes independents from partisans?

What distinguishes those who respond "Independent" or "No Preference" on the traditional first party identification question and those who respond "Republican" or "Democrat?" A multiple regression analysis was run with this as the dependent variable and four independent variables: support, closeness, strength of independence, and whether parties are needed anymore (V179). Only two of these variables have significant coefficients: closeness (Beta=.44) and strength of independence (Beta=-.27). Together, these two variables account for only one-third of the variance in whether or not a person is an Independent on the traditional first party identification question.

Table 12 shows how independence relates to the Republican, Democrat, and Independent thermometers. Neutrality between the parties definitely increases independence on the traditional first party identification question, but so does liking Independents more than either Republicans and Democrats. The thermometer evidence fits well with the multiple regression reported above, that closeness and strength of independence have separate effects in producing independence.

C. Dimensions of Partisanship

Recent research has focused much attention on the dimensionality of partisanship. Unfolding analysis of the thermometers above has shown

already that reactions to Independents are not at the center of a Republican-Democrat dimension. A more general question is what dimensions underlie the entire set of variables. For purposes of this analysis, thermometer variables, new partisanship question variables, and the 11-item battery of party attitude items (V169-V179) were analyzed with the traditional measure of strength of identification. Altogether 19 variables were included in a factor analysis.

Two dominant factors resulted. Two secondary factors also can be seen, though they amount mainly to pulling apart one of the original two factors. Because of the greater ease of two-factor display, the two-factor solution will be shown first (see Figure 1). There are four main clusters of variables in the space:

The independence items (thermometer on Independents and strength of independence scale),

An anti-party set of items ("The parties do more to confuse the issues than to provide a clear choice on issues", "The political parties are only interested in people's votes but not their opinions", and "The truth is we probably don't need political parties in America anymore",

A pro-party set of items ("People who work for parties during political campaigns do our nation a great service", "Democracy works best where competition between parties is strong", and "The political parties help a great deal in making government pay attention to what the people think"),

and several strength of identification questions (the traditional strength question, the closeness scale, the support scale, the maximum thermometer, the absolute difference on the thermometers, and the strongly agree/strongly disagree item: "It is better to be a firm party supporter than to be a political independent").

Drawing one axis through the independence items and another between the pro-party and the anti-party items divides the space into four quadrants:

- I. Pro-party and anti-independence feelings (and this is where the strength of identification questions are located along with the party thermometer and a strongly agree/strongly disagree item: "Senators or Representatives should follow their party leaders even if they don't want to").
- II. Favorable views of parties and independence,
- III. Pro-independence and anti-party feelings (located here are two additional strongly agree/strongly disagree items: "The best rule in voting is to pick the person regardless of the party label", and "It would be better if, in all elections, we put no party labels on the ballot") and,

- IV. Unfavorable views of both (which contains another strongly agree/strongly disagree item: "The conflicts and controversies between the parties hurt the country more than they help it").

This solution emphasizes again the importance of seeing independence and parties as separate dimensions. And it demonstrates that anti-party feelings are distinct from political independence.

The four-dimensional solution introduces only a variant on this theme. The pro-party and anti-party items still define opposite ends of one factor, with the "Political Parties" thermometer item having its highest loading on this factor. The remaining items now split between three factors: the independence cluster on one factor, the strength cluster on another factor (without the strongly agree/strongly disagree item), and the remaining strongly agree/strongly disagree items on another factor. An oblique factor solution finds that the strength factor has correlations of .24 to .31 with the other factors (corresponding to 72 and 76 degree angles), while the remaining factors are virtually orthogonal to one another. This solution emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between strength of partisanship on the one hand and independence on the other hand. It also suggests that the party attitudes battery should be seen as at least two sets of items, with the first two items being measures of something quite different from the fourth item and the last four items.

The dimensionality of partisanship is higher than we have previously realized, so it is important for future election studies to measure all of the dimensions: attitudes toward each party separately, independence, anti-partyism, identification, relative closeness to the parties, partisan position, and support of one's own party.

Table 1. Summary of Ratings of Party Objects on Thermometers

	Mean	(N)	sd	Percent Don't Knows	%50
Political independents	51.5	(239)	30.4	15%	30%
Political parties	55.5	(253)	26.4	10%	36%
<u>Republicans</u>	57.2	(133)	22.8	4%	37%
Republican party, pilot study	53.3	(134)	25.4	5%	38%
Republican party, 1978 study	55.2	(2035)	20.1	7%	33%
Republican party leaders	51.8	(245)	21.3	13%	35%
<u>Democrats</u>	55.9	(133)	23.8	4%	34%
Democratic party, pilot study	55.9	(136)	25.1	4%	37%
Democratic party, 1978 study	62.5	(2039)	20.8	7%	28%
Democratic party leaders	54.2	(246)	21.7	12%	36%

Table 2. Frequencies of Preference Orders*

Preference Orders Compatible with Dem-Ind-Rep Order		Preference Orders Compatible with Dem-Rep-Ind Order	
DIR	12%	DRI	21%
IDR	14%	RDI	25%
IRD	12%	RID	17%
RID	17%	IRD	12%
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	55%		75%

*Preference orders are listed in first choice, second choice, third choice order. The total number of untied preference orders is 110.

Table 3. Ratings of Independents and Parties

Political Independents	Political Parties			Total
	Below 50°	50°	Above 50°	
Below 50°	8%	10%	14%	31%
50°	6%	15%	8%	29%
Above 50°	10%	11%	19%	40%
Total	23%	36%	41%	100% (229)

Table 5. Distribution on Strength of Independence

very strongly Independent	7	16%
	6	13
	5	12
	4	9
	3	1
	2	1
not very strongly Independent	1	2
not think of self as Independent	0	45
		(258)

Table 6. Party Support by Independence

Support Party	Ever Independent	
	Yes	No
Yes	19.3%	24.4%
No	36.2%	20.1%

Table 7. Partisan Strength by Party Support and Independence

	Partisan Strength				<u>Total</u>
	<u>Strong</u>	<u>Weak</u>	<u>Leaner</u>	<u>Pure Independent</u>	
Party Supporter	60%	34%	3%	3%	100%
Both Supporter and Independent	38%	33%	27%	2%	100%
Neither	12%	47%	16%	26%	101%
Only Independent	2%	27%	41%	29%	99%

Table 8. Distributions of Partisanship Measures

Traditional Party ID		Party Position		Partisan Strength		Party Closeness	
		Wave I	Wave II	SD	7%		
		V222	V263				
SD	15%	5%	SD 5%	6	9	D	8%
				5	4		
WE	20	10	2 9	4	4	6	10
				3	2		
ID	14	14	3 14	2	0	5	20
				1	1		
PI	17	50	4 47	0	56	4	40
				-1	0		
IR	10	11	5 14	-2	1	3	12
				-3	1		
WR	14	7	6 8	-4	3	2	6
				-5	4		
SR	11	4	SR 2	-6	5	R	5
				SR	2		
(N)	(250)	(270)	(230)		(257)		(241)

Table 9. Party Closeness by Party Identification

	Very Close to Republicans						Very Close to Democrats
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Strong Rep	4%	3%	4%				
Weak Rep	1	3	4	6	1		
Indep Rep			5	6			
Pure Indep			1	13	3		1
Indep Dem				8	6	1	1
Weak Dem				6	8	3	1
Strong Dem					2	6	6

Table 10. Correlations of Partisanship Measures

	Traditional Party ID	Party Position Wave I	Party Position Wave II	Partisan Strength	Party Closeness	Difference	Carter v Ford
Traditional Party ID	--	.73	.79	.74	.82	.78	.38
Party Position: Wave I		--	.72	.64	.75	.69	.36
Wave II			--	.75	.83	.69	.38
Partisan Strength				--	.76	.62	.30
Party Closeness					--	.74	.35
Difference						--	.37
Carter v Ford							--

Table 11. Correlations of Strength Measures

	Thermometer Measures				New Partisanship Measures			
	Max- imum	Differ- ence	Indep	Parties	Support	Closeness	Independ- ence	Anti- Parties
Thermometers:								
Maximum	---							
Difference	.71	---						
Independents	.01	.11	---					
Parties	.41	.27	-.04	---				
New Measures:								
Support	.41	.38	.18	.32	---			
Closeness	.51	.52	.22	.31	.66	---		
Independence	.28	.26	.38	.13	.21	.26	---	
Anti-Parties	.25	.16	.11	.41	.21	.17	.09	---
Traditional Measures:								
Strong v Weak	.26	.27	.07	.14	.59	.57	.15	.13
Strength Scale	.54	.45	.21	.34	.59	.63	.36	.24
Partisan v Independent	.50	.38	.24	.30	.44	.51	.38	.20

Table 12. Proportion Independent by Thermometer Ratings*

	Rate Republicans and Democrats Equally	Rate Republicans and Democrats Unequally
Like Independents more than both parties	91% (32)	54% (24)
Rate Independents and preferred party equally high	57% (28)	20% (10)
Like preferred party more than Independents	32% (19)	23% (100)

***Number of cases in cell shown in parenthesis.**

Table 13. Party Attitudes Questions Battery

		pro- party	2	3	4	5	6	anti- party	Total
v169	The best rule in voting is to pick the best person regardless of party label.	6%	2%	3%	5%	9%	14%	60%	99%
v170	It is better to be a firm party supporter than to be a political independent.*	7%	10%	9%	15%	7%	18%	34%	100%
v171	People who work for parties during political campaigns do our nation a great service.*	20%	18%	18%	26%	9%	4%	5%	100%
v172	The parties do more to confuse the issues than to provide a clear choice on issues.	7%	12%	10%	26%	18%	11%	16%	100%
v173	Democracy works best where competition between parties is strong.*	33%	25%	18%	14%	4%	3%	4%	101%
v174	The conflicts and controversies between the parties hurt our country more than they help it.	11%	19%	11%	17%	16%	13%	13%	100%
v175	Senators or representatives should follow their party leaders even if they don't want to.*	6%	7%	7%	6%	14%	23%	37%	100%
v176	It would be better if, in all elections, we put no party labels on the ballot.	16%	13%	8%	13%	12%	13%	25%	100%
v177	The political parties are only interested in people's votes but not their opinions.	4%	12%	9%	13%	16%	18%	28%	100%
v178	The political parties help a great deal in making government pay attention to what the people think.*	10%	12%	19%	22%	15%	10%	12%	100%
v179	The truth is we probably don't need political parties in America anymore.	39%	15%	11%	13%	7%	7%	8%	100%

*The 1 to 7 codes have been reversed on these strongly agree/strongly disagree questions, so that 1 is always the pro-party response and 7 anti-party.

Table 14. Reasons for Party Support/Independence

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Why strong?</u>	<u>Why weak?</u>	<u>Why lean?</u>	<u>Why independent?</u>
Am Rep/Dem	always: 52%	not important: 35%		
Parents	were R/D: 46%			were I: 5%
Party activities	involved: 20%	not involved: 17%		
Party stands	approve: 54%	not completely: 40%	Mostly support: 47%	neither ok 12%
Support party cand.	almost always: 54%	usually: 55%	most of time: 45%	support both: 31%
'76 R/D cand	liked: 22%	disliked: 11%	liked 40%	
Carter	R: 21% D: 16%	R: 6% D: 6%	R: 19% D: 6%	R: 4% PI: 13% D: 7%
Opposite party	dislike: 12%	dislike: 7%	dislike it worst: 20%	dislike both: 5%
Vote person, not party		72%		84%
Lived around R/D			27%	
Vote issues, not party				63%
Not interested in politics				20%
Parties not keep promises				24%
Not know enough to choose				15%
Like both parties same				12%
Other reasons given	8%	7%	13%	6%

