

Author(s): Niemi, Richard, Charles Hadley, and Harold Stanley
Title: National and State Party Identification
Date: September 25, 1987
Dataset(s): 1987 Pilot Study

Abstract

This report addresses split party voting in the context of the 1987 Pilot Study sample. The authors find that: (1) dual identifiers -- those who identify with one major party at the national level, but the other at the local level -- remain at about the same level estimated by other studies in the last 15 years and (2) dual identification is not limited to any one area, though specific patterns of such identification do vary by region. Niemi, Hadley, and Stanley also argue for including separate national and state party identification questions in the 1988 National Election Study in order to expand upon the limited sample of dual identifiers in the Pilot Study survey.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

Rochester, New York 14627

Department of Political Science
Bitnet Mail: PSC1 at UORVM

September 25, 1987

TO: NES Board of Overseers

FROM: Richard Niemi, Charles Hadley, and Harold Stanley

RE: National and State Party Identification

Our recommendation is that the Board seriously consider including the national and state party identification questions in the 1988 study in the format used in the Pilot Study (Questions A43-A44b). Assuming that the traditional party identification question is asked on the preelection interview, possible contamination effects and respondent confusion could be avoided by including these questions on the post-election interview.

In the Pilot Study the national-state questions show that dual identifiers remain at about the same level as in other studies conducted over the past 15 years. The attached table shows that, when calculated as elsewhere (i.e., using the responses to the initial question), 13.6 percent of the respondents claimed dual identifications. This contrasts, for example, with 14.3 percent in the 1970 National Election Study.

The Pilot Study also shows that although there is some interesting regional variation, the incidence of dual identification is not limited to the South or to any single area. The percentages of dual identifiers are 11.9, 14.3, 15.3, and 10.8, in the Northeast, Midwest, South, and West, respectively.

Nor is the set of dual identifications restricted to one kind, such as national Republicans and state Democrats. At the same time, there are some patterns that can be explored. Overall, for example, there are two percent more independents at the state than at the national level. In the South there is a greater weakening at the state level of national Republican identifiers than national Democratic identifiers. Outside the South, the pattern is reversed, with national Democratic identifiers tending to weaken at the state level.

We have only been able to begin the analysis of the relationship between dual identification and other variables. Indeed, the small number of cases in the Pilot Study precludes very much probing. In the end, we hope to have a normal-sized sample on which to test findings about attitudes generated for a southern elite sample in Hadley's Journal of Politics article and findings about participation and the "intransitivity" in the

party identification question found by Niemi, Wright, and Powell in a forthcoming JOP article.

A final point is that interest in the multiple identification problem continues to exist and, in fact, to grow. Ric Uslaner, for example, has expressed interest in the question in order to make comparisons with Canada, where multiple party identifications are a well-established phenomenon. Another indicator of this interest is that a panel on the topic has been organized for the upcoming Southern Political Science Association meeting. Among others, Mac Jewell will present data from a Kentucky survey and a national survey by the National Council of State Governments, as well as data from the Pilot Study that we will supply him.

V5287(NATIONAL PARTY ID)

V5291(STATE PARTY ID)

FREQUENCY PERCENT ROW PCT COL PCT	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
0	44 12.22 83.02	1 0.28 1.89	5 1.39 9.43	1 0.28 1.89	0 0.00 0.00	1 0.28 1.89	1 0.28 1.89	53 14.72
1	8 2.22 8.99 15.09	74 20.56 83.15 86.05	7 1.94 7.87 17.95	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	89 24.72
2	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	7 1.94 20.00 8.14	24 6.67 68.57 67.54	1 0.28 2.86 2.70	3 0.83 8.57 6.38	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	35 9.72
3	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	3 0.83 8.57 3.49	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	31 8.61 88.57 83.78	1 0.28 2.86 2.13	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	35 9.72
4	1 0.28 2.17 1.89	1 0.28 2.17 1.16	3 0.83 6.52 7.69	4 1.11 8.70 10.81	29 8.06 63.04 61.70	7 1.94 15.22 10.94	1 0.28 2.17 2.94	46 12.78
5	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	12 3.33 17.14 25.53	54 15.00 77.14 84.38	4 1.11 5.71 11.76	70 19.44
6	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.56 6.25 4.26	2 0.56 6.25 3.13	28 7.78 87.50 82.35	32 8.89
TOTAL	53 14.72	86 23.89	39 10.83	37 10.28	47 13.06	64 17.78	34 9.44	360 100.00

FREQUENCY MISSING = 97