

NES REPORT
New Measures of Subjective Political Efficacy and Political Trust

by

Richard D. Shingles
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

(9/28/87)

The data used in this report were collected by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan and are made available by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.

NES REPORT

New Measures of Subjective Political Efficacy and Political Trust

"Sense of political efficacy" and the related concept, "political trust", are two of the oldest and most researched concepts in modern survey research. Questions designed to measure them have been asked in every National Election Study (NES) since the 1950's. Yet, from the start, there has been considerable confusion as to the nature of these very similar concepts and the distinction between them. The confusion is evident in many research reports which either disagree about what the NES questions measure or challenge their validity (see work by Abramson and Finifter, Muller et al., Iyengar, Jukam and Seligson, Hill, Feldman, Miller et al., Citrin, Balch, Mc Pherson et al., Craig and Maggioto, Acock et al., Finkel, and Shingles). With time, the meaning of the concepts has evolved and become more precise. NES questions have become increasingly inadequate as theoretical interests and research needs expand. In the Spring of 1987, the NES responded to these trends in a pilot survey of a nationally representative sample. The survey tests new measures of efficacy and trust.

The purpose of this paper is to clarify and develop the concepts and evaluate the findings of NES Pilot Survey. The paper: (1) begins with the now accepted distinction between "internal political efficacy" and "external political efficacy"; (2) examines the conceptual relationship between external political efficacy, political trust and a covering concept, "political support"; (3) distinguishes between two focal dimensions of each concept (regime and incumbents); (4) suggests the importance of the distinctions for political action; (5) reviews the criticism of older NES questions and (6) assesses the comparative validity of new measures. The survey questions are evaluated on the basis of question wording, construct validation and criterion validation.

THE DIMENSIONS OF SENSE OF POLITICAL EFFICACY AND POLITICAL TRUST

The attitude, sense of political efficacy, is the expectation that participation in politics will be successful. It is generally recognized that political efficacy is a multidimensional concept. Numerous authors, often working with different data have suggested the importance of distinguishing between the dimensions now commonly referred to as "internal political efficacy" and "external political efficacy" (Lane, 1959, p. 149; Gurin et al., 1969; Finifter, 1970; Muller 1970, Converse, 1972, p.334; Balch, 1974; House and Mason, 1975; Craig, 1979, 1981, 1982, 1984; Shingles, 1981, 1984, 1985; 1986a, 1986b). Internal political efficacy (IPE) is that part of one's political efficacy which is attributed to one's self (i.e., self-confidence or internal personal control). External political efficacy (EPE) is the part which is attributed to objects in one's environment (e.g., other individuals, interest groups, government) which either facilitate or impede successful political action.

Sense of external political efficacy, is highly related to "political trust". The concepts typically are so closely defined as to be indistinguishable. Both are forms of "political support" (positive affect for government). They indicate confidence in government: the expectation of policy satisfaction. Unfortunately, this conceptual ambiguity has been largely ignored in most re-

search The development of empirical indicators which can effectively distinguish between EPE and Political trust is impossible without a precise conceptual distinction.

Gamson (1968), Easton and Dennis (1965, pp. 171-219; 1969, pp. 57-68) are among the few who have tried to make the distinction. Gamson defines political trust as a belief in the basic integrity of government; it is the expectation that government will produce preferred outcomes whether or not citizens participate (1968, p.54). Political efficacy is the belief that citizen participation is effective. Easton's distinguishes between two foci of political support: (1) effectiveness of citizens' inputs (supports and demands) in policy making and implementation and (2) satisfaction with policy outputs (the quality, efficiency and equity of government's response). Whereas political trust focuses solely on outputs; EPE addresses both. As such, political trust is a component of EPE. EPE refers to whether one can condition policy outputs by making political inputs. Political trust does not require inputs. As Gamson states, EPE is the perceived ability to act effectively. Political trust addresses the need to act. Trusting citizens need not participate in politics (unless otherwise motivated). Cynical citizens must act to protect their own interests.

Ironically, political trust contributes to a higher sense of external political efficacy and political cynicism lowers it. Using alternatives to the traditional NES questions, Shingles (1981) and Craig (1984), have supported Gamson by demonstrating that political cynicism and high IPE encourage political action. Do political trust and EPE also make individual contributions to political participation? Can citizens be cynical and still think authorities are responsive? Does the combination of political cynicism and high EPE encourage political action? Such questions cannot be addressed with earlier NES surveys.

Further distinction between types of EPE and types of political trust help us to explore these questions. Most useful is Easton's discussion of the objects of political support. He identifies three objects: (1) the political community (a self-identified people or geographical area), (2) the regime (broad procedural rules and institutions for making and implementing public policy) and (3) authorities (the specific individuals and political parties in office who carry out these tasks). The regime and its incumbents constitute "government". The "political system" consists of the government and the political community. The 1987 Pilot survey contains questions designed to measure all three objects of political support. For incumbents and the regime, the questions attempt to further distinguish between the foci of support, trust and efficacy.

Figure 1 presents four kinds of government support defined in terms of objects and foci. The figure differentiates between the two foci of support, inputs and outputs, and the two objects of government support, incumbents and the regime. Together, objects and foci define two kinds of EPE - "incumbent-based efficacy" (IBE) and "regime-based efficacy" (RBE) - and two kinds of political trust - "incumbent-based trust" (IBT) and "regime-based trust" (RBT).

Incumbent-Based Efficacy is the belief that authorities will find it in their own interest to respond to citizen demands and that they are personally capable of doing so (the incumbents' internal political efficacy). It refers to both the incumbents' motivation (e.g., the desire to remain in office, policy orientations, partisanship, group loyalties and personal integrity) and personal ability (e.g., intelligence, knowledge, skills). Three questions in the 1987 Pilot survey provide distinct measures of IBE. They are: (1) "Candidates for

office are only interested in people's votes, not in their opinions", (2) "Politicians are supposed to be the servants of the people, but too many of them think they are our masters" and (3) "Generally speaking, those we elect to public office lose touch with the people pretty quickly".

Incumbent-Based Trust is unqualified faith that incumbents will protect the public interest. It taps the same perceptions of incumbent's competence as EPE, but focuses on a single motivation: personal integrity. Politically trusting individuals expect policy satisfaction whether they participate in politics or not. They assume that authorities know what is in the public interests and act out of a high sense of public regardness, not narrow partisan loyalties or self-interests. Political trust is thus one form of EPE. Three Pilot study questions provide unique measures the motivational basis of IBT: (1) "Most public officials can be trusted to do what is right without having to constantly check on them", (2) "You can generally trust the people who run our government" and (3) "When government leaders make statements to the American people on television or in the newspapers, they are usually telling the truth". A fourth, competency, question correlates very highly with these variables and is largely distinct from the other efficacy and trust dimension. It is: "Most of the people running our government are well-qualified to handle the problems that we are facing in this country".

Regime-Based Efficacy is the expectation that conventional rules and procedures for policy formation and implementation facilitate (rather than impede) citizen inputs. It comprises beliefs about: (1) open and fair access to incumbents and (2) the external political efficacy of incumbents. The latter refers to (a) the institutional-based power of incumbents to implement the interests of the observer and (b) the power of the observer to prevail over intransigent incumbents by dismissing them (elections, impeachment, recalls) or by seeking alternative, conventional modes of access (e.g., via separation and divisions of powers). RBE may be based on assessment of formal political institutions or broader cultural, social and economic forces which influence the ability of government to function as intended. Three questions provide unique measures of RBE: (1) "There are many legal ways for citizens to successfully influence what the government does", (2) "Under our form of government, the people have the final say about how the government is run, no matter who is in office" and (3) "How much attention do you feel having elections makes the government pay attention to what the people think - a good deal, some or not much?".

Regime-Based Trust is the belief in moral integrity (legitimacy) of the basic principles upon which the government is founded. A person may be critical of the effectiveness or fairness of existing political institutions and authorities while supporting the principles of government, claiming government actions violate those principles. Two questions uniquely measure RBT: (1) "What ever its faults may be, the American form of government is still the best for us" and (2) "I would rather live under our system of government than any other I can think of".

[place Figure 1 here]

Each of the four attitudes identified in Figure 1 may be based on either an assessment of specific attributes of authorities and political institutions

or diffuse, long term affect acquired earlier in life (Easton, 1965, pp.273). Specific support is conditioned by governmental performance. Diffuse support is not; it is a form of prejudice. For example, in the U.S., the nature of socialization usually guarantees that affect towards things "American" (e.g., American government) are positive. One must be careful not to confuse diffuse support with political trust. Although both refer to types of "unconditional support", they differ in that diffuse support refers to the origins of an attitude and political trust refers to its content.

Specific observations which affect IBE and IBT include assessments incumbents' personalities and policies. A diffuse orientation which colors both is party identification. RBE and RBT may be influenced by either a series of actual policies or by diffuse attachments to a variety of symbols representing the country (e.g., the flag), the office, (e.g., the Presidency), or vaguely understood regime principles (e.g., democracy). In contrast to IPE, which is likely to be based on stable personality traits, EPE and political trust may or may not be stable, depending upon whether they are diffuse or specific. Attitudes towards the regime are likely to be more stable than attitudes towards incumbents.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIMENSIONS

There are several advantages to distinguishing between the dimensions of subjective political efficacy and political trust. First, it helps to clarify the relationship between political support, external political efficacy and political trust. Second, it makes possible more refined estimates of long term trends in public opinion. Third, the distinctions help to resolve what appear to be conflicting data on political support among different groups. For example, it has been suggested that the reason a 1968 NES survey (Abramson, 1983, p.175n) finds whites to be higher on IPE than blacks, whereas a 1967 NORC survey (Shingles, 1981) finds the opposite, is because the traditional NES questions used to indicate IPE actually measure EPE (Shingles, 1984). Similarly, the reason why Gutterbock and London (1983) and Shingles (1981), using the same data set, find different levels of black support for government appears to be because the former uses questions which indicate IBE while the latter measures RBE.

Fourth and most promising is the possibility that knowledge of the dimensions will further our understanding of how people choose to participate in politics. Muller and Jukam (1977) demonstrate the significance of the distinction between incumbent-based support and regime-based support for variety of conventional and unconventional modes of political action. Shingles (1981) and Craig (1980) show EPE and IPE interact in influencing levels and types of political behavior. Craig (1984) explores the joint impact of IPE, regime support and incumbent support.

Figure 2 presents a model of likely relationships between the four dimensions of government support and various types of political activity. The activities are organized under two broad categories pertaining to the motives of the participants (Shingles, 1981): (1) allegiant/nonallegiant behavior (intended either to support or overthrow the regime) and (2) policy behavior (any attempt to effect the election or appointment of public officials or the actions of officials for the purpose of influencing policy-making or policy-implementation). In the extreme, these two categories become indistinguishable. Blind, diffuse, support confuses policy behavior with allegiant behavior. Among the very alienated, policy behavior is likely to become seditious. In between, a variety of participatory styles are possible depending upon the combination of

political trust and political efficacy. These styles are further classified in Figure 2 according to whether or not they are (3) legal or illegal, (4) conventional (customary) or unorthodox, and (5) violent or nonviolent.

Figure 2 is presented here to illustrate the potential significance of the dimensions of government support. Space does not permit detailed discussion of the model. Only a portion of it is relevant to the types of conventional activity measured in NES surveys. The figure summarizes key elements and propositions of a theory of political participation. Several important assumptions underlie the model. First, for the sake of parsimony, each dimension is dichotomized into "high" and "low" support. Second, the model is limited to incumbent support and regime support. The effects of other types of political efficacy are held constant: it is assumed that individuals have moderate to high levels of IPE and they think unconventional and illegal tactics are effective (though not necessarily desirable or necessary). Third, it is assumed that political support contributes to a sense of civic duty to perform allegiant acts. Fourth, for policy activity, it is assumed that individuals are motivated by one or more substantive policy issues which they think the government is addressing (however inadequately) or should address. Fifth, with Verba and Nie (1972), it is assumed that activists vary in their participatory styles (the strategies and tactics they favor); however, with Barnes, Kaase et al (1979), it is further assumed that the escalation of strategy is typically cumulative: people add increasingly more costly tactics to their political action repertoires until something works or they quit. Finally, with Muller and Jukam (1977), it is assumed that regime-support is much more important than incumbent support in the decision to use illegal, violent tactics. Clearly these assumptions are not correct for all people, particularly the first four. However, they are necessary to simplify the model. A long term research agenda is to develop and test the hypotheses and assumptions of the model.

The left hand side of Figure 2 addresses which combinations of attitudes are likely to contribute to conventional, legal, nonviolent policy activities (e.g., campaigning). RBT is least important. Individuals who think the regime is illegitimate will use any tactic (conventional or unconventional) to change it. Low IBT provides a need to act, but does not create the necessary confidence that action will be effective. For individuals who do not trust incumbents, a high sense of IPE is sufficient for moderate levels of conventional policy activity, but high levels require confidence in existing political institutions (high RBE). Those who are low on both IBE and IBT are most likely to campaign to remove officials from office. The 1987 Pilot survey permits a tests of these expectations. To the extent that the measures of IPE and the dimensions of political support differentiate between levels of campaigning, the data will testify to the utility of the dimensions; they will also indicate the validity of survey questions used to measure them.

[place Figure 2 here]

PROBLEMS OF MEASUREMENT

There are serious problems limiting any effort to empirically distinguish among the dimensions of subjective political efficacy and political support. It is difficult to design survey questions which solely refer to incumbents and not the regime, or to the regime and not incumbents, or to the individual's political skills and not to incumbents or the regime. It is far more difficult to

create questions with the exact shades of meaning to differentiate between EPE and political trust. Two problems frustrate efforts to empirically distinguish among the attitudes. First, it is possible that the average citizen does not make such distinctions. To do so requires some knowledge about regime principles, specific government institutions and the records of incumbents. Polls suggest that many Americans lack this information. This means that they are likely to assess government on the basis of more diffuse, emotionally laden prejudices toward the nation and its symbols which were acquired during early socialization. Loyalty to one's country may be indistinguishable from support for the regime or specific authorities. If this is the case, all attempts to measure separate dimensions will fail. One cannot measure that which does not exist.

Second, assuming the attitudes exist, it is difficult to empirically distinguish among them, even with valid measures. A common method of validating survey questions which are supposed to measure a single attitude is to demonstrate that they are more highly intercorrelated than they are correlated with questions measuring other attitudes. This procedure, factor analysis, assumes that the different attitudes themselves are not highly correlated. Where the attitudes are casually related the assumption is likely to be violated. Such is the case with IPE and the dimensions of government support. Individuals who believe that democratic institutions are legitimate and effective may logically conclude that incumbents are forced to be responsive. Satisfaction with specific incumbents is likely to lead to the conclusion that political institutions work and are the political system is legitimate. Successful efforts to influence government may boost one's own self-confidence (Finkel, 1985). Unsuccessful efforts may have the opposite effect (Shingles, 1973). All these reasons caution against expecting clear factor solutions for measures of IPE, RBE, RBT IBE and IBT.

METHODOLOGY

In the fall of 1986, a Working Group of Craig, Niemi and Shingles was invited by the NES Board of Overseers to design and test new measures of subjective political efficacy and political trust. Many of the questions they ultimately proposed are based on earlier pilots survey conducted separately by Craig and Shingles. Shingles pretested new questions in three surveys to which this report will occasionally refer. They are: (1) 185 students at VPI&SU during Winter, 1986; (2) 400 adults in the Roanoke Valley, Virginia the following Summer and (3) 137 adults in the New River Valley, Virginia the next Winter. Many of the questions in the NES Pilot study are similar and, in some cases identical to, those tested earlier. The New River Valley (NRV) and NES subjective political efficacy and political trust questions are in most cases the same.

The NES included all the recommendations of the Working Group (along with most of the traditional NES efficacy and trust questions and two addressing "government responsiveness") in its Pilot survey. Descriptions of these items, their variable names and the dimensions they are designed to measure are listed in Table 1. The traditional NES efficacy, trust and government responsiveness questions are indicated by the labels: "NESEFF", "NESTRUST" and "NESRESP".

The final set of fifteen questions which are recommended to be included in the 1988 NES survey are indicated by asterisks in Table 1. They include only one traditional question (NESRESP1), although two (IBE1 and IBE4) are nearly

identical to older questions. A fourth (IBT4) is different from NESTRUST2 in that it substitutes "people in government" for the more ambiguous reference "government". This report will address why certain questions were accepted and others were rejected. The criteria for acceptance are: (1) construct validity, (2) criterion validity and (3) face validity. The latter is less important at this stage since, with the exception of IBT, all questions included in the Pilot survey appear to measure the target concepts.

The working group could not agree on which questions, if any, best measure IBT. This is due in part to an absence of a common, conceptually distinct definition of IBT and in part to insufficient time for the group to coordinate its research before the September 25 deadline for submitting reports. Niemi and Craig submitted a separate report without the benefit of the findings presented here. I believe, had they seen them, the group might have reached greater consensus. The responsibility for their failure to do so is entirely my own.

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY

The 37 variables in Table 1 were subjected to several stages of factor analysis. The analyses were performed on the entire sample of 346 (with list-wise deletion) and a subsample of 157 respondents who scored above average on the Political Information index (described below). To be accepted in the final recommendation, each variable had to contribute to distinct factor solutions for both samples. Only the results for the entire sample are presented here. At each stage of the factor analyses, variables were eliminated which either loaded poorly on all factors (e.g., NESTRUST1 and RBT3) or loaded on more than one. Many of the variables, especially those intended to measure IBT, loaded on multiple factors.

The fifteen variables marked with an asterisks in Table 1 form five distinct factors. These results are displayed in Table 2. The left hand side of Table 2 lists the variables and indicates the attitude each was intended to measure. The top of the Table labels the derived factors. The correlation matrix from which the solution was derived is presented in the Appendix. The data indicate a very strong relationship between intentions and results. The factor solution explains 62% of the variance. Given the difficulty of many respondents to distinguish between objects and foci and the casual linkages between the attitudes, these results are truly remarkable. Each of the variables in Table 2 loads very highly on one factor and has low or negligible loadings on the other four factors. Weighted composite indices have constructed by multiplying each of the fifteen variables by their factor scores and summing. The correlations between the five indices are reported in Table 3. Only two of the ten relationships are statistically significant ($P < .01$) and these are small, negative correlations (-.15 and -.13). The data clearly demonstrates the ability of respondents and the survey questions to distinguish five distinct, attitudinal dimensions.

INCLUDED VARIABLES

The factors appear, on their face, to be strong indicators of IPE, IBE, IBT, RBE and RBT. Four proposed IPE questions (IPE1, IPE2, IPE4, IPE6) are very highly intercorrelated in both samples (>.40). Only one of these, "I am qualified" (IPE1) has consistently significant correlations with questions intended to indicate political support. Apparently "qualified" is interpreted by some to mean legal qualifications. In all four questions, the respondent is unambig-

uously the subject of the sentence. They measure a nice mix of general qualifications to participate (IPE1, IPE4) and cognitive skills (IPE2, IPE6).

A caveat is in order. One of IPE questions was not asked in the NES Pilot survey as intended. The Pilot question states "I am as well informed". The original question was: "I am better informed". The change may have been inadvertent or it could have been done to ensure greater variance in response (the Pilot version is easier to agree with). Yet 46% of the New River Valley sample passed the more difficult version. More important, the "better informed" version loads highest on the IPE factor in the NRV data, whereas it loads lowest in the NES data. The reason the easier version performs worse is because it is ambiguous. A respondent may disagree that he is as well informed as most people either because he feels less well informed or because he thinks he is better informed. The more difficult version should be included in the 1988 NES survey.

The three proposed IBE questions are also very highly intercorrelated (>.40). They have moderate correlations with variables intended to measure IBT. The subject of all three are people who rule or would rule: "candidates for office", "politicians" and "public officials". The questions address a single topic: whether incumbents are inclined to respond to popular opinion. The proposed IBT questions fared worse. There are two reasons. First, (as shall be demonstrated below) many questions intended to measure incumbent-based trust are ambiguous (they do not rule out institutional coercion). Second, IBT and IBE are very similar concepts. Only three questions measure personal integrity, which is the essence of "political trust", and also form a distinct factor (IBT3, IBT4 and IBT7). Collectively, they measure the conviction that most incumbents are sufficiently trustworthy and truthful that the average citizen need not monitor them.

As in past surveys, the average respondent had difficulty differentiating between regime and incumbents. Nevertheless, three proposed RBE questions formed a distinct factor (RBE1, RBE4, NESRESP1). One (NESRESP1) deals specifically with the effectiveness of elections. Another (RBE4) is carefully worded to distinguish between incumbents and regime and addresses the ultimate sovereignty of people. The third (RBE1) deals with popular access to the policy making process. All tap a single topic: the effectiveness of American democratic institutions. Two proposed RBT questions appear to measure that dimension (RBT1, RBT4). Although highly correlated with each other (.39), they are largely unrelated to other efficacy and trust variables. Each states a preference for the American system of government. They are more broadly worded than the RBE questions and appear to tap faith in the legitimacy of the overall regime.

The Question of Response Set. Face validity and construct validity alone do not prove the validity of the proposed indicators. They suggest that the questions are distinct measures of five separate attitudes (factors) which intuitively appear to be the target concepts. There is another, plausible explanation for the final factor solution: response set. Niemi's and Craig's concern with response set seems to have played an important part in their conclusion that distinct IBT and RBE factors are not possible. The third column of Table 1 indicates the direction of question wording, whether it is positive or negative in tone. All the questions can be classified except for NESTRUST3 which is fairly balanced. The problem is this: the variables which comprise each of the final factors share the same sign. The final IBE variables are all negatively worded. The final IPE, IBT, RBE and RBT variables are positively worded.

I do not believe response set is responsible for the factor solution. There are five reasons. First, negative and positive questions were deliberately alternated in the interview. Normally, under these conditions, individuals who were in a response set mode would contradict themselves and there would be very little correlation among their answers. This is clearly not the case. Second, response set is generally attributed to less well informed respondents who have a tendency to answer questions which they cannot understand in the affirmative. The factor solution reported in Table 2 has been successfully replicated for better informed citizens.

Third, if response set were the reason for the final factors, one would also expect the questions which have been rejected to be of the same sign. This is not always the case. All three rejected IPE and RBT variables share the same sign. Yet, two rejected IBE questions have positive signs and a third is negative; the eight rejected IBT questions are evenly divided between positive and negative wording, and three of the rejected RBE questions are negative while the fourth is positive.

Fourth, if direction of question wording were important, rejected variables of the same sign would be as highly intercorrelated as included variables. Measures of internal reliability (Alpha coefficients) have been calculated for every category where there are two or more variables of the same sign. Table 4 shows that for one of the categories, RBE, like-sign excluded variables are more consistent than the included variables. For IBT, the excluded and included variable sets have similar consistency. However, for IPE, IBE and RBT the included variables are more reliable. Only for two of the five sets (IBT and RBE) is there any support for the "response set" hypothesis. This brings us to the fifth reason: most of the excluded variables (including IBT and RBE) were not discarded because they loaded poorly on factors defined by variables of the opposite sign. They were dropped because they loaded on more than one factor. Many of these same variables are ambiguous on their face.

EXCLUDED VARIABLES

This point is documented in Table 5. Table 5 provides correlations between the excluded variables and five composite indices measuring each factor in Table 2. The three rejected IPE questions are highly correlated with accepted IPE questions. Yet, they also correlate with the IBE index (two of them significantly). In the case of the traditional NES question, this is understandable. NESEFF2 is really two questions in one: an affirmative answer could indicate that an individual feels personally incompetent or that he thinks politics really are complicated. The latter could indicate complex issues, complex institutional processes or evasive politicians. The other two questions differ from accepted IPE questions in that they appear, on their face, to measure social confidence or self-esteem. In the subsample of better informed respondents, they formed a separate factor. Lower self-esteem contributes to a tendency to defer to others, including public officials. This would explain why people who agree with these questions tend to think well of incumbents.

Many of the rejected incumbent support questions correlate with the RBE index. On their face, the problem appears lie with ambiguous wording of the incumbent questions. For example, affirmative answers to the three rejected IBE questions could indicate a belief that officials are genuinely interested, caring and attentive or they could communicate the opinion that officials are compelled to comply or face retaliation at the polls. The same reasoning applies to rejected IBT questions which correlate with RBE. Public officials' ef-

forts to keep their campaign promises (IBT9) or serve the public (IBT6) may be accredited to fear of electoral defeat. The traditional "trust government" question (NESTRUST2) may be taken as referring to officials or institutions; the object of the sentence is not explicit. Likewise the "few big interests" question (NESTRUST3) says something about the motivation of incumbents (they are selfish) and something about the distribution of power in the United States. Notice that many of the rejected IBT questions are significantly related to the IBE index. Three (IBT2, IBT5, IBT8) are more closely correlated with IBE than IBT. This reflects the extreme similarity of the concepts. The difference between these items and those which were accepted are two: (1) the accepted IBT questions have lower correlations with IBE variables and (2) their wording more explicitly measures a voluntary, personal integrity.

Three of the rejected RBE questions are significantly correlated with the IBE index. This too stems from ambiguous wording. In RBE2, it is not clear who or what denies "the rest of us" power. It could be ineffective institutions or powerful, but unresponsive officials. Similar reasoning applies to NESEFF1. RBE5 was designed to avoid this confusion. It performed well in the NRV survey, but not in the NES Pilot. Most respondents agreed with RBE2 ("voting is effective"). It appears to tap a broad faith in democratic institutions, even patriotism. It is one of the only variable to have a significant correlation with the RBT index. It is also the only rejected variable that is significantly correlated with the Patriotism index (described below). Finally, the two rejected RBT questions are more closely associated with IBE than the RBT index. Answers to both were could have been affected by the Iran-Contra scandal which occurred during the period surveyed. Some respondents may have interpreted the references to "government" in RBT1 ("proud") and RBT4 ("make some major changes") to refer to incumbents rather than institutions. In short, the direction of question wording had little to do with the rejection process. The data do not support the response set hypothesis.

CRITERION VALIDATION

Criterion validation provides an independent method of verifying the nature of the five factors in Table 2. Ideally, the criterion variable selected for any one attitude would be hypothesized to correlate with that attitude, but no other (Campbell and Fisk, 1959). A group of carefully selected criteria could discriminate among all the efficacy and trust dimensions. Only a few criterion variables are available in the 1987 NES Pilot Survey. Most do not meet this ideal. However, they offer strong additional evidence that the five factors measure the target concepts. Three types of criteria will be discussed: (1) attitudes, (2) objective attributes and (3) campaign activity. Data for the first two are found in table 6.

Other Attitudes.

An excellent criterion for Internal Political Efficacy is a composite index measuring respondents' perceived knowledge about prominent Republicans. The index contains twelve variables (V5194 to V5205) and has an alpha = .91. No attitudinal variables were identified which are expected to differentiate between political efficacy and political trust. However, two variables should distinguish between regime-based and incumbent-based support. The criterion variable for incumbent support, "Reagan Traits", indicates respondents' assessments of the most salient incumbent, the President. It is comprised of eight

variables and has an alpha = .87. The criterion for regime support is an eight item composite index measuring "Patriotism". It has an alpha = .86.

Hypothesis 1: Perceived Knowledge should have a strong correlation with Sense of Internal Political Efficacy. Two of the variables in the IPE index (IPE2, IPE6) refer to perceived intellectual competence. The other two tap more general personal competence. The data confirm these expectations. The correlation between the two indices = .42. Perceived Knowledge is unrelated to the other four factors.

Hypothesis 2: A positive evaluation of the most visible incumbent, the President, should be related to incumbent support generally. One's assessment of any one incumbent may be colored by more general attitudes towards "politicians", "Congressmen", "Presidents", etc. In turn, assessments of public officials generally are likely to be influenced by experiences with specific incumbents. Reagan is the most salient. As predicted, Reagan Traits has a significant correlation with IBT (.30). However, it is largely unrelated to IBE (.07). This may stem from the fact that Americans these days are more likely to believe in the personal integrity of Reagan than think he is responsive to popular opinion. Reagan traits is not significantly correlated with regime-based support or IPE.

Hypothesis 3: To the extent systemic support is diffuse, Patriotism (support for country) should predict Regime support and vice versa. Patriotic individuals are inclined to think their country and its institutions are the best possible. Beliefs that the regime is legitimate and political institutions are effective contribute to feelings of patriotism.

There are clear limits to this line of thinking. Two caveats are in order. First, Patriotism may also have a positive association with incumbent support. This is always likely when political support is diffuse. In the 1980's, it may occur with specific support. Immediately after WWII, patriotism appears to have had little to do with incumbent support. There was a bipartisan foreign policy. Flag waving, patriotic Americans felt comfortable with both major parties. However, in the 1980's, Reagan has successfully politicized the issue. The Pilot study data suggest patriotism is not so much a partisan issue as Reagan's issue. Strongly patriotic individuals generally support President Reagan (the correlation between Patriotism and Reagan Traits = .36). For this reason, we can expect Patriotism to have positive, low weaker correlations with IBT and IBE. Second, there are many who support the regime who nevertheless feel that ostentatious displays of loyalty and "blind patriotism" are in bad taste (even inappropriate for a democracy). Therefore, Patriotism is not an ideal criterion for regime support. A weak association between Patriotism and a RBE or RBT variable does not prove that the latter do not indicate regime support. A strong association may only indicate answers to the question are colored by patriotic feelings.

As predicted, only regime-based support is significantly correlated with Patriotism. The correlation is highest for RBT (.28). Patriotism has a weaker, positive association with IBT. It is negatively correlated with IPE.

Objective Attributes.

Four objective attributes are used to assess the validity of the dimensions of subjective political efficacy and political trust. The first two are objective measures of political sophistication: (1) Level of formal education ("School") and (2) a composite index indicating factual knowledge about politics ("Actual Knowledge") "School" is V1144. The Political Information index is comprised of ten variables (V635 to V642, V206 and V210) and has a alpha coefficient = .81. The other two criteria are demographic variables: (1) race and gender.

Hypothesis 4: All three types of subjective political efficacy should be positively associated with objective political sophistication. Actual personal competence should predict perceived personal competence (IPE). Because government is generally more responsive to higher status citizens, they should be more likely to have a high sense of IBE and RBE. Formal education is a common indicator of status; it is highly correlated with knowledge. The data generally conform to these expectations. The IPE and IBE indices have significant, positive correlations with School and Actual Knowledge. RBE does not.

Hypothesis 5: Women have traditionally rated themselves lower in ability and self-esteem than men (Turner and Turner, 1982, p.491). Traditionally, American culture has judged male attributes to be superior to those of women. Until recently, the same culture discouraged women from taking an active interest in politics (Orum et al., 1974). For this reason, men can be expected to have higher levels of IPE. There is little basis for expecting a gender gap for regime or incumbent support. As predicted, men score significantly higher on the IPE index (-.38). Gender is not related to the other four indices.

Hypothesis 6: The literature indicates blacks have similar or higher levels of self-esteem than whites of comparable socioeconomic status (Turner and Turner, 1982). They are far more politically cynical. Using 1967 NORC measures, Shingles (1981) found blacks to score significantly higher than whites on IPE and lower on EPE. In the 1980's, after a series of administration attacks on civil liberties and welfare, blacks have good reason to not to trust the Reagan administration. A history of racial discrimination has left many with less faith in the American political system than generally found for whites. As expected, blacks score significantly lower than whites on the IBE and RBT indices. However, they are only slightly lower on IBT. The zero order correlation between Race and the IPE index is .06. The partial correlation, controlling for education is .11, indicating blacks have a slightly higher sense of internal political efficacy than whites of similar status.

Campaign Activity.

The discussion of Figure 2, provided a number of hypotheses about the relationship between conventional policy activity and the dimensions of subjective political efficacy and political trust. They are: (1) RBT is least important. Individuals who think the regime is illegitimate will use any tactic that works (conventional or conventional) to change it; (2) low IBT provides a need to act, but does not create the necessary confidence that action will be effective; (3) for individuals who do not trust incumbents, a high sense of IPE is sufficient for moderate levels of conventional policy activity, but high levels require confidence in existing political institutions (high RBE); (4) Presuming

they think elections are effective, those who are low on both IBE and IBT are most likely to campaign to remove officials from office.

To test these hypotheses, a composite index, "Campaign", was created from five campaign activity questions (V109, V606, V607, V609, V610 and V612) and a composite index measuring efforts to follow campaign news (V103, V105, V107). Consistent with the predictions, only the RBT index is not significantly correlated with Campaign. Table 7 dichotomies RBE, IBE, IBT and IPE, and displays their joint association with Campaign. An Analysis of Variance is presented at the bottom of the table for all four variables. The top of the table breaks down average standardized Campaign scores for RBE, IBE and IBT for those respondents who are above average on IPE. IPE has the strongest association with Campaign. Individuals who are low on IPE have a mean Campaign score of $-.26$; those who are high on IPE average $.34$. The average respondent scored 0.0 on Campaign activity. These figures provide a frame of reference for evaluating Campaign scores in the top half of Table 7.

The results are truly remarkable. As expected, combinations of low IBT and high political efficacy are associated with higher levels of campaigning. High IPE and low IBT alone contribute to participation rates which are only slightly above those of the average respondent ($.17$), proving that some type of external political efficacy is essential for high levels of campaign activity. RBE is far more important than IBE. Self-confident, politically cynical individuals who are high on RBE, but low on IBE average $.77$ on Campaign. Those who are low on RBE and high on IBE only score $.30$ (which is below average for high IPE). Politically cynical respondents who score above average on all three types of subjective political efficacy are the most active. They score over a standard deviation above the population mean (1.06).

CONCLUSION

This analysis provides strong evidence for the existence of five independent dimensions of subjective political efficacy and political trust in the general public and indicates that they can be successfully measured with questions asked in the 1987 NES Pilot survey. Factor analysis identifies five strong, distinct factors for questions which were explicitly designed to measure the dimensions. Criterion validation demonstrates that a variety of variables have theoretically expected, distinct relationships with the five dimensions. The relationships differ in predicted ways for different indices. These findings demonstrate that the average citizen has much more complex beliefs than previously thought and that the beliefs can be measured. The inclusion of the fifteen variables recommended in this report in future surveys promises to make an exciting contribution to both theory and research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramson, Paul (1983). Political Attitudes in America. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman
- Acock, Alan, Harold D. Clarke and Marianne C. Stewart (1985). "A New Model for Old Measures: A Covariance Structure Analysis of Political Efficacy" Journal of Politics 47: 1062-1084.
- Asher, Herbert B. (1974). "The Reliability of the Political Efficacy Items." Political Methodology 1:45-72.
- Balch, George (1974). "Multiple Indicators in Survey Research: The Concept Sense of Political Efficacy." Political Methodology 1: 1-43.
- Campbell, D. T. and D. W. Fisk (1959). "Convergent-Discriminate Validation by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix." Psychological Bulletin 56: 81-105.
- Citrin, Jack (1974). "Comment: The Political Relevance of Trust in Government." American Political Science Review 68: 973-988.
- Converse, Philip E. (1972). "Change in the American Electorate." In Angus Campbell and Philip Converse (eds.), The Human Meaning of Social Change. New York: Russel Sage
- Craig, Stephen C. (1979). "Efficacy, Trust and Political Behavior: An Attempt to Resolve a Lingering Conceptual Dilemma." American Political Quarterly 7: 225-239.
- (1984). "Political Discontent and Participatory Styles: An Exploratory Study of College Youths". Youth and Society 15 469-493.
- (1985). "Measuring Political Efficacy: Surveys Versus Depth Inter views." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association in Chicago.
- and Michael A. Maggiotto (1981). "Political Discontent and Political Action." Journal of Politics 43:514-522.
- (1982). "Measures of Political Efficacy." Political Methodology 8: 85-109.
- Easton, David (1965). A Systems Analysis of Political Life. NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- and Jack Dennis (1969). Children in the Political System: Origins of Political Legitimacy. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Erber, Ralph and Richard R. Lau (1986). "Political Cynicism Revisited: The Role of Political Schemata in the Decline of Trust in Government." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association in Washington D.C..

- Feldman, Stanley (1983). "Measurement and Meaning of Trust in Government." Political Methodology 9: 341-354.
- Finifter, Ada W. (1970). "Dimensions of Political Alienation." American Political Science Review 64: 389-410.
- Finkel, Steven E. (1985). "Reciprocal Effects of Participation and Political Efficacy: A Panel Analysis." American Journal of Political Science 29: 891-913.
- Gamson, William A. (1968). Power and Discontent. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.
- Gurin, Patricia, Gerald Gurin and Leo M. Beattie (1969). "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negroes." Journal of Social Issues 25: 29-53.
- Gutterbock, Thomas M. and Bruce London (1983). "Political Alienation in America: An Empirical Test of Four Competing Theories." American Sociological Review 48: 439-453
- House, James S. and William M. Mason (1975). "Political Alienation in 1952 - 1966." American Sociological Review 40: 123-147.
- Iyengar, Shanto (1978). "Subjective Political Efficacy as a Measure of diffuse Support." Public Opinion Quarterly 44:249-256.
- Lane, Robert E. (1959). Political Life: Why and How People Get Involved in Politics. New York: The Free Press.
- McPherson, J. Miller, Susan Welch and Cal Clark (1977). "Stability and Reliability of Political Efficacy: Using Path Analysis to Test Alternative Models." American Political Science Review 71: 509-521.
- Miller, Arthur H. (1974). "Political Issues and Trust in Government: 1964-1970." American Political Science Review 68: 951-972
- (1974). "Rejoinder to 'Comment' by Jack Citrin: Political Discontent or Ritualism?" American Political Science Review 68: 989-1001.
- , Edie N. Goldberg and Lutz Erbring (1979). "Type-Set Politics: Impact of Newspapers on Public Confidence." American Political Science Review. 73:67-84.
- Miller, Warren E., Arthur H. Miller, and Edward J. Schneider (1980). American National Election Studies Data Sourcebook, 1952 - 1978. Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Muller, Edward (1970). "Cross-National Dimensions of Political Competence." American Political Science Review 64: 742-809.

- (1972). "A Test of a Partial Theory of Potential Political Violence." American Political Science Review 66: 928-959.
- and Thomas Jukam (1977). "On the Meaning of Political Support." American Political Science Review 71: 1149-1166.
- , Thomas Jukam and Mitchell A. Seligson (1982). "Diffuse Political Support and Antisystem Political Behavior: A Comparative Analysis." American Journal of Politics 26: 240-264
- Orum, Anthony M. et al. (1974). "Sex, Socialization and Politics" American Sociological Review 39: 197-209.
- Shingles, Richard D. (1973). "Organizational Membership and Attitude Change: A Quasi-Experimental Approach." In James Caporaso and Leslie Roose (eds.). Quasi-Experimental Approaches. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press., pp. 226-270.
- (1981). Black Consciousness and Political Participation: the Missing Link." American Political Science Review 75:76-91.
- (1984). "The Conceptualization and Measurement of Internal and External Political Efficacy." Paper Delivered at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association in Chicago.
- (1986a). "'Sense of Political Efficacy', 'Political Trust' and the Dimensions of Political Support: Conceptualization and Measurement." Paper prepared for the NES Board of Overseers.
- (1986b) "Dimensions of Political Efficacy: Tests of New and Old Measures." Paper prepared for the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association in Washington D.C..
- and Carol Swain (1985). "Race and Gender: Their Implications for the Dimensions of External Political Efficacy." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Midwest Political Science in Chicago.
- Turner, Castellano B. and Barbara F. Turner (1982). "Gender, Race, Social Class and Self-Evaluation among College Students." The Sociological Quarterly 23:491-507.
- Verba, Sidney and Norman Nie (1972). Participation in America. New York: Harper and Row.
- Wright, James D. (1976). The Dissent of the Governed: Alienation in America. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Figure 1. Types of Government Support

		OBJECT OF SUPPORT	
		INCUMBENTS	REGIME
FOCUS OF SUPPORT	INPUTS (CONDITIONAL OUTPUTS)	Incumbent-Based Efficacy	Regime-Based Efficacy
	UNCONDITIONAL OUTPUTS	Incumbent-Based Trust	Regime-Based Trust

Figure 2. A Model of likely relationships between dimensions of Political Support and types of Political Action.

		HIGH REGIME-BASED TRUST							
		HIGH REGIME-BASED EFFICACY				LOW REGIME-BASED EFFICACY			
		High Incumbent-Based Trust		Low Incumbent-Based Trust		High Incumbent-Based Trust		Low Incumbent-based Trust	
		High Incumbent-Based Efficacy	Low Incumbent-Based Efficacy	High Incumbent-Based Efficacy	Low Incumbent-Based Efficacy	High Incumbent-Based Efficacy	Low Incumbent-Based Efficacy	High Incumbent-based Efficacy	Low Incumbent-Based Efficacy
Allegiant/Non-Allegiant Behavior		Obey the law; attend patriotic rallies and verbally support the regime.				Avoid patriotic displays of regime loyalty.			
		Defer to incumbents' opinions. Volunteer for nations' military. Uniformed vote as symbolic display of regime loyalty.		Question incumbents' opinions. Serve in military if drafted.		Obey the Law. Serve if drafted.		Disobey some laws. Refuse military service.	
Policy Behavior		Usually inactive. Possibly vote and campaign, but only to support incumbent.		Conventional, legal, nonviolent acts to: Compel incumbents to address needs. Circumvent or remove incumbents from office. (Examples: pay attention to news, discuss politics with others, informed voting, campaign & communal activities, personal contacts with officials)		Primarily unconventional legal, nonviolent acts to help incumbents to reform political institutions. (Examples of added acts: petitions; boycotts; legal demonstrations)		Legal and illegal nonviolent acts to compel the incumbents to reform institutions. (Examples of added acts: Nonviolent civil disobedience)	
								Legal and illegal nonviolent and relatively moderate violent acts to reform institutions. (Examples of added acts: occupy buildings, blockade streets, arson, riot)	

		LOW REGIME-BASED TRUST							
		HIGH REGIME-BASED EFFICACY				LOW REGIME-BASED EFFICACY			
		High Incumbent-Based Trust		Low Incumbent-Based Trust		High Incumbent-Based Trust		Low Incumbent-Based Trust	
		High Incumbent-Based Efficacy	Low Incumbent-Based Efficacy	High Incumbent-Based Efficacy	Low Incumbent-Based Efficacy	High Incumbent-Based Efficacy	Low Incumbent-Based Efficacy	High Incumbent-Based Efficacy	Low Incumbent-Based Efficacy
Allegiant/Non-Allegiant Behavior		Decline to actively support the regime. Obey most laws on pragmatic grounds.				Support the overthrow of the regime.			
		Defer to incumbents' opinions. No symbolic voting to support regime. Serve in military if drafted.		Question incumbents' opinions. Refuse military service.					
Policy Behavior		Usually inactive. Possibly vote and campaign, but only to support incumbents.		Conventional, legal nonviolent acts to: Compel incumbents to address needs. Circumvent or remove incumbents from office.		Legal and illegal, nonviolent and violent acts to: Help incumbents to overthrow the regime. (Examples of added acts: coup d' etates, terrorism, guerilla war, revolution)		Overthrow the incumbents with the regime	

Table 1. Initial Variable List: questions intended to measure the dimensions of Subjective Political Efficacy and Political Trust

HYPOTHESIZED DIMENSIONS	DIRECTION	DESCRIPTION
<u>REGIME-BASED EFFICACY</u>		
RBE1 V5171	+	Many ways to influence govt*
RBE2 V5172	-	Few have all the power
RBE3 V5174	+	Voting is effective
RBE4 V5175	+	People have final say*
RBE5 V5330	-	No way to make officials listen
NESEFF1 V5169	-	Don't have say
NESRESP1 V5277	+	Elections make govt pay attention*
<u>REGIME-BASED TRUST</u>		
RBT1 V5315	+	American form of govt best*
RBT2 V5316	-	Not proud of our form of govt
RBT3 V5317	-	Change Form of govt
RBT4 V5318	+	Rather live under our system of govt*
<u>INCUMBENT-BASED EFFICACY</u>		
IBE1 V5219	+	Officials are truly interested
IBE2 V5220	-	Candidates are only interested in votes*
IBE3 V5221	-	Politicians think they are our masters*
IBE4 V5222	-	Those we elect lose touch*
NESEFF3 V5173	-	Officials do not care what people think
NESRESP2 V5278	+	Govt pays attention to what people think
<u>INCUMBENT-BASED TRUST</u>		
IBT1 V5216	+	People running govt are well qualified
IBT2 V5217	-	People running govt are not honest
IBT3 V5218	+	Officials can be trusted without checking*
IBT4 V5320	+	Trust people who run govt*
IBT5 V5321	-	Govt run by few big interests
IBT6 V5322	+	Officials try to serve
IBT7 V5323	+	Govt leaders tell truth*
IBT8 V5324	-	Unless watch, special interests
IBT9 V5325	+	Those we elect try to keep promises
NESTRUST1 V5273	-	People in govt waste money
NESTRUST2 V5274	+	Trust government to do what is right
NESTRUST3 V5275	0	Govt is run by interests/for people
NESTRUST4 V5276	-	People running govt are crooked
<u>INTERNAL POLITICAL EFFICACY</u>		
IPE1 V5267	+	I am qualified*
IPE2 V5268	+	I have a good understanding*
IPE3 V5269	-	Others have an easier time understanding
IPE4 V5270	+	I could do as good a job*
IPE5 V5271	-	I don't feel sure of myself
IPE6 V5272	+	I am as well informed*
NESEFF2 V5170	-	I can't Understand

* indicates variables included in final factor analysis

Table 2. Included Variables: Final factor solution for dimensions of Subjective Political Efficacy and Political Trust (Principal Components analysis with orthogonal rotation)

HYPOTHESIZED DIMENSIONS		DERIVED FACTORS				
		IPE F1	IBE F2	IBT F3	RBE F4	RBT F5
<u>INTERNAL POLITICAL EFFICACY</u>						
IPE1	Qualified	.79	.04	.01	.24	-.02
IPE2	Understand	.78	-.05	.16	.11	.11
IPE4	Could Do	.78	-.01	-.11	.04	-.13
IPE6	Informed	.74	.11	.04	-.07	.06
<u>INCUMBENT-BASED EFFICACY</u>						
IBE2	Only Votes	.04	.77	.04	.12	-.05
IBE3	Masters	.04	.80	.27	.03	-.05
IBE4	Lose Touch	.01	.76	.19	.18	.18
<u>INCUMBENT-BASED TRUST</u>						
IBT3	Without Check Trust	-.03	.05	.77	.12	-.10
IBT4	Trust	.06	.21	.70	.01	.16
IBT7	Tell Truth	.06	.19	.75	.15	.09
<u>REGIME-BASED EFFICACY</u>						
RBE1	Many Ways	.13	.02	.12		.10
RBE4	Final Say	.03	.07	.14	.74	-.01
NESRESP1	Elections	.07	.24	.00	.73	.12
					.60	
<u>REGIME-BASED TRUST</u>						
RBT1	Govt Best	.02	.10	.08	.01	.83
RBT4	Our System	-.01	-.05	.03	.20	.80
VARIANCE EXPLAINED (62.1%)		22.0%	15.1%	9.8%	7.8%	7.4%
EIGEN VALUE		3.31	2.27	1.47	1.17	1.11

BOLDFACE indicates hypothesized factor

N = 346

Source: 1987 NES Pilot Study

Table 3. Correlation matrix: composite indices measuring Subjective Political Efficacy and Political Trust

	IPE	IBE	IBT	RBE	RBT
IPE	1.00				
IBE	.02	1.00			
IBT	-.15*	-.01	1.00		
RBE	-.03	-.04	.01	1.00	
RBT	-.02	-.01	-.03	-.13*	1.00

N = 346

* $P < .01$

Source: 1987 NES Pilot Survey

Table 4. Internal Consistency: Included and Excluded variable sets (Alpha Coefficients)

STATUS	DIMENSIONS OF EFFICACY AND TRUST				
	IPE	IBE	IBT	RBE	RBT
INCLUDED VARIABLES	.78	.73	.65	.51	.61
EXCLUDED VARIABLES WITH POSITIVE WORDING	--	.43	.61	--	--
EXCLUDED VARIABLES WITH NEGATIVE WORDING	.66	--	.65	.68	.39

Source: 1987 NES Pilot Study

Table 5. Excluded Variables: Pearson correlations with indices measuring dimensions of Subjective Political Efficacy and Political Trust

EXCLUDED VARIABLES		COMPOSITE INDICES				
		IPE	IBE	IBT	RBE	RBT
<u>INTERNAL POLITICAL EFFICACY</u>						
IPE3	Others Easier	.32*	.22*	-.10	-.02	-.06
IPE5	Don't Feel	.46*	.16	-.11	-.01	.00
NESEFF2	Can't Under	.39*	.26*	-.10	.05	-.08
<u>INCUMBENT-BASED EFFICACY</u>						
IBE1	Interested	-.02	.27*	.46*	.21*	.07
NESEFF3	Care	.02	.45*	.15	.28*	-.03
NESRESP2	Pays Attention	.07	.27*	.13	.27*	.06
<u>INCUMBENT-BASED TRUST</u>						
IBT1	Qualified	-.02	.10	.42*	.07	.13
IBT2	Not Honest	-.08	.43*	.24*	.08	-.03
IBT5	Big Interests	.04	.44	.17	.10	-.06
IBT6	Serve	.02	.13	.32	.22*	.07
IBT8	Unless Watch	-.07	.47*	.29*	.12	-.10
IBT9	Keep Promises	.00	.24*	.40*	.14	.00
NESTRUST1	Waste Money	-.04	.20*	.23*	.00	-.13
NESTRUST2	Trust Govt.	.00	.32*	.37*	.15	.09
NESTRUST3	Big Interests	.00	.35*	.42*	.21*	.01
NESTRUST4	Crooked	.09	.24*	.25*	.13	.02
<u>REGIME-BASED EFFICACY</u>						
RBE2	Few Power	.08	.33*	.11	.21*	.12
RBE3	Voting	.08	.01	.09	.35*	.31*
RBE5	No Way	.11	.26*	-.03	.26*	.07
NESEFF1	No Say	.13	.31*	.01	.32*	.01
<u>REGIME-BASED TRUST</u>						
RBT1	Not Proud	-.01	.26*	.03	.07	.18
RBT4	Change	.16	.29*	-.01	.05	.09

BOLDFACE indicates hypothesized factor

* P < .01; N = 346

Source: 1987 NES Pilot Study

Table 6. Criterion Validation: Efficacy and Trust indices with selected subjective and objective variables (Pearson Correlations)

COMPOSITE VARIABLES MEASURING EFFICACY AND TRUST					
CRITERION	IBE	IBT	RBE	RBT	IPE
Race	-.19*	-.09	.08	-.20*	.06
Gender	.03	.06	-.07	-.01	-.38*
Patriotism	-.02	.14	.18*	.28*	-.12
Reagan Traits	.07	.30*	.10	.12	.00
School	.19*	-.11	.02	-.06	.27*
Actual Knowledge	.26*	-.06	.06	.11	.43*
Perceived Knowledge	.03	.01	.13	.06	.42*

* P > .01; N's range from 327 to 346
 Source: 1987 NES Pilot Study

Table 7. Criterion Validation: average standardized Campaign Activity scores by Incumbent-Based Trust and Dimensions of Subjective Political Efficacy

HIGH INTERNAL POLITICAL EFFICACY*				
	LOW REGIME-BASED EFFICACY		HIGH REGIME-BASED EFFICACY	
	LOW INCUMBENT- BASED EFFICACY	HIGH INCUMBENT- BASED EFFICACY	LOW INCUMBENT- BASED EFFICACY	HIGH INCUMBENT- BASED EFFICACY
INCUMBENT- BASED TRUST				
LOW	.17 (27)	.30 (31)	.77 (16)	1.06 (22)
HIGH	.05 (23)	-.06 (21)	-.02 (12)	.54 (15)

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

MAIN EFFECTS	SUM OF SQUARES	STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE
IBT	5.624	.014
RBE	6.716	.007
IBE	3.776	.044
IPE	26.060	.000
RBE AND IPE	3.570	.050
TOTAL VARIANCE	56.210	.000

* Low IPE = -.26; High IPE = .34
 Source: 1987 NES Pilot Study

APPENDIX
CORRELATION MATRIX FOR FINAL FACTORS

	IPE1	IPE2	IPE4	IPE6	IBE2	IBE3	IBE4	IBT3	IBT4	IBT7	RBE1	RBE4	NESR	RBT1	RBT4
IPE1	1.00														
IPE2	.56	1.00													
IPE4	.55	.43	1.00												
IPE6	.41	.48	.42	1.00											
IBE2	.10	.05	.00	.08	1.00										
IBE3	.06	.03	.02	.10	.45	1.00									
IBE4	.10	.06	-.04	.07	.42	.58	1.00								
IBT3	.04	.11	-.09	.01	.14	.29	.17	1.00							
IBT4	.08	.12	-.01	.05	.23	.26	.26	.31	1.00						
IBT7	.10	.13	.00	.10	.17	.30	.37	.39	.47	1.00					
RBE1	.26	.19	.10	.07	.12	.12	.20	.13	.14	.20	1.00				
RBE4	.13	.11	.06	.11	.12	.16	.21	.18	.10	.20	.34	1.00			
NESR1	.18	.14	.06	.05	.23	.13	.23	.09	.16	.18	.25	.24	1.00		
RBT1	-.01	.09	-.06	.07	.03	.11	.17	.04	.16	.11	.13	.09	.13	1.00	
RBT4	.06	.08	-.06	.00	.02	-.05	.16	.03	.10	.12	.17	.13	.14	.39	1.00

Source: 1987 NES Pilot Study (N =346)

ADDENDUM FOR SHINGLES NES REPORT
TOPIC: TABLE 4

Table 4 in the Shingles Report addresses the "response set" hypothesis. It compares Alpha coefficients for different sets of variables. Each set includes only variables which are worded in the same (positive or negative) direction. A new Table 4 is attached which adds Average Inter-Item Correlations (AIC). Unlike the Alphas, the AIC's are not biased by (they are insensitive to) the number of variables in the set. The AIC's are in the columns marked "B". Notice that for four of the five dimensions, the included variables (of like sign) are more highly intercorrelated than excluded variables of the same sign. The exception is RBE. Table 4 offers strong evidence that these four factors cannot be explained solely in terms of response set. Even RBE cannot be explained in terms of response set. Three of the rejected RBE variables are negatively worded, but the fourth is positively worded. The best proof that the final factors are not ^{due} to response set is their different (theoretically expected) associations with the criterion variables discussed in the report. Most convincing is the powerful role the RBE index plays in explaining campaign activity (see Table 7).

Table 4. Internal Consistency: Included and Excluded variable sets
(Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient and Average Inter-item
Correlations)

STATUS@	DIMENSIONS OF EFFICACY AND TRUST									
	IPE		IBE		IBT		RBE		RBT	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
INCLUDED VARIABLES	.78	.47	.73	.48	.65	.39	.51	.28	.61	.44
EXCLUDED VARIABLES: POSITIVE WORDING	--	--	.43	.33	.61	.30	--	--	--	--
EXCLUDED VARIABLES: NEGATIVE WORDING	.66	.39	--	--	.65	.27	.68	.42	.39	.25

A = Cronbach' Alpha

B = Mean Inter-item correlation

@ Two variables of the same type and same sign were required to form a set. The number of variables per set is:

First row: 4, 3, 3, 3, 2

Second row: 0, 2, 4, 0, 0

Third row: 3, 0, 5, 3, 2

Not set: 0, 1, 1, 1, 0

Source: 1987 NES Pilot Study

SUPPLEMENT # 1 TO SHINGLES' NES REPORT
TOPIC: REJECTED QUESTIONS
(10/4/87)

This is a supplement to the 1987 report, "New Measures of Subjective Political Efficacy and Political Trust. The report evaluates 37 survey questions and recommends 15 as distinct, valid measures of IPE, IBE, IBT, RBE and RBT. Given the shortness of time and space, the report concentrates on evidence demonstrating the validity of recommended variables. This supplement provides a more detailed analysis of the 25 questions which were not recommended, explaining why they were rejected. The discussion is based on face validity, factor analyses and criterion validation. It summarizes relevant findings of the Craig and Niemi 1987 Report, the Shingles 1987 Report and three earlier surveys conducted by Shingles: 185 students at VPI&SU (Winter, 1986), 400 adults in the Roanoke Valley (June, 1986) and 137 adults in the New River Valley (Winter, 1987). The closer in time the earlier surveys are to the Spring, 1987 NES survey, the greater is the similarity in wording. The New River Valley and NES survey are nearly identical. More information is provided for some questions than others because they were included in more surveys. For brevity, the surveys will be referred to as: VPISU, RV, NRV and NES. Correlations for the 37 variables with selected criterion variables are in Table 8 (attached).

AN ITEM ANALYSIS OF REJECTED QUESTIONS

I. REGIME-BASED EFFICACY

RBE2 (V5172) "In this country, a few people have all the political power and the rest of us are not given any say about how the government is run."

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: It is not clear who or what is not giving "the rest of us a say". The culprit may be: (1) unresponsive, partisan or self-seeking incumbents or (2) faulty institutions.
2. The data indicate that most respondents interpret the culprit be incumbents. (a) In both NRV and NES data, V5172 has significant correlations with variables designed to measure IBE and IBT (Shingles, Table 5; Craig and Niemi, p. 16)). (b) It is more highly correlated than other "RBE" designates with various criterion variables measuring incumbent support (e.g., Craig's and Niemi's incumbent performance. p.16).

RECOMMENDATION: The question should be dropped as a measure of RBE or it should be modified to make it explicit that faulty institutions leave people powerless.

RBE3 (V5175) "Voting is an effective way for people to have a say about what the government does."

PROBLEMS:

1. This is superior to the traditional NES "voting is the only way" questions because it avoids the problem of having to decide whether an affirmative response indicates efficacy or inefficacy. However, the question has little variance and it appears to tap RBT or even patriotism.
2. The data: (a) The marginal for V5175 are very positively skewed. They are similar to those of RBT and Patriotism questions; they are much more skewed than the other RBE designates. (b) V5175 has a relatively weak association with other designated RBE variables (Craig and Niemi, p. 12). (c) It has a strong, significant correlation with the RBT factor (Shingles, Table 5). (d) It has a much higher correlation with Patriotism (.25) than the other RBE designates (the next highest is .16).

RECOMMENDATION: V5175 does not distinguish between RBE and RBT. Drop it.

RBE5 (V5330) "If public officials are not interested in hearing what the people think, there is really no way to make them listen."

PROBLEM:

This question was designed to rule incumbents out of consideration with a conditional introductory phrase. In the NRV data, this seems to work: V5330 separates incumbents from regime. It loads highest on the RBE factor and best distinguished RBE from IBE. However, in the NES data, V5330 cannot differentiate; it has significant correlations with both IBE and RBE designated variables (Shingles, Table 5; Craig and Niemi, pp. 13, 16).

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

NESEFF1 (V5169) "People like me don't have any say about what the government does."

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: It is not clear why "people like the respondent" have no say. The culprit may be: (a) faulty institutions, (b) unresponsive incumbents or (c) deficiencies of people like the respondent. The phrase, "people like me" encourages the latter interpretation.
2. In the VPI&SU, RV and NES data, V5169 loads on all three efficacy dimensions. It correlates almost equally well with indicators of RBE and IBE.

RECOMMENDATION: For the sake of continuity with earlier surveys, keep it as a general measure of External Political Efficacy, but do not do so at the expense of the fifteen recommended items. Keep it if there is room.

II. REGIME-BASED TRUST

RBT2 (V5316) "There is not much about our form of government to be proud of."

PROBLEMS:

1. In both the NRV and NES data, V5316 correlates as well or better with measures of incumbent support than with measures of regime support (Shingles, Table 5; Craig and Niemi, p. 8). Many respondents seem to ignore the reference to "form" of government and interpret the question as an evaluation of incumbents. Remember, the question was asked during the Iran-Contra scandal.
2. One would expect RBT to have a significant correlation with the Patriotism index. V5316 only has a weak correlation of .17 (Also see Craig and Niemi, p. 9)

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

RBT3 (V5317) "It may be necessary to make some major changes in our form of government in order to solve the problems facing our country."

PROBLEMS:

1. Same problems as v5316, but worse. Respondents appear to ignore the adjective, "form", and interpret the question as a reference to incumbents.
2. In both NES and NRV data, respondents gave far more negative responses to V5317 than to other alleged measures of regime support which were highly skewed in a positive direction. V5317 marginals are more similar to those for the incumbent-based trust questions.
3. V5317 has significant correlations with IBE questions (Shingles, Table 5; Craig and Niemi, p.8).
4. V5317 has no association with the Patriotism index (0.0).

RECOMMENDATION: Either modify it to provide a specific reference to "the constitutions" or "laws of this country", or drop it.

III. INCUMBENT-BASED EFFICACY

IBE1 (V5219) "Most public officials are truly interested in what the people think."

PROBLEMS:

1. V5219 has a relatively low correlation with other variables designed to measure IBE (Niemi and Craig, p.18).
2. It does not distinguish between IBE, IBT and RBE (Shingles, Table 5). Some respondents seem to interpret it as a reference to the personal integrity of incumbents (V5219 correlates well with IBT and REAGAN TRAITS). Others may believe incumbents are only interested in what people think so they can be re-elected (i.e., a coercive element which taps RBE), but once they get elected they lose touch.

RECOMMENDATION: drop it.

NESEFF3 (V5173) "I don't think public officials care much what people like me think."

Problem:

This variable has a very high correlation with the recommended set of IBE variables. However, it also has strong correlations with RBE variables. These results are found for both the RV and NES surveys. The reason appears to be a coercive connotation: officials do not have to care because they are not held accountable to the public (election do not work). Proof: V5173 has a higher association (.30) than the other alleged IBE indicators with V5277 (election make government pay attention).

RECOMMENDATION: For the sake of continuity, you may wish to keep it as a general measure of External Political Efficacy, but do not do so at the expense of the fifteen recommended items. Keep it only if there is room.

NESGRES2 (V5278) "Over the years, how much attention do you feel the government pays to what the people think when it decides what to do - a great deal, some, or not much?"

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: The meaning of "government" is unclear. Paying attention is a human attribute, but respondents may attribute attentiveness to institutional checks like elections.
2. Empirically, V5278 does not distinguish between RBE and IBE factors. It loads equally well on both (Shingles, Table 5).

RECOMMENDATION: This is a very vague question. The only reason to keep it is continuity. If push comes to shove, drop it to make room for new questions.

IV. INCUMBENT-BASED TRUST

IBT1 (V5216) "Most of the people running our government are well-qualified to handle the problems that we are facing in this country."

MINOR PROBLEM:

In both the NRV and NES surveys, this variable does a good job distinguishing IBE from the other four dimensions (Shingles, Table 5). It loads highly on the IBE factor and not at all or low on the other factors. It was dropped because of a small positive association with RBT (Shingles, Table 5). Note that it is the only IBE question which refers explicitly to incumbent ability. The others refer to motivation.

RECOMMENDATION: If there is room, keep it as the only measure of perceived incumbent ability.

IBT2 (V5217) "Quite a few of the people running our government are not as honest as the voters have a right to expect."

PROBLEM:

This question was intended to measure integrity (trust). It distinguishes between IBT and IBE in the NRV survey, but not in the NES survey. In the NES data, it correlates with the final IBE factor better than the IBT factor (Shingles, Table 5). It also correlates relatively poorly with other IBT measures (Craig and Niemi, p. 19). However, it does isolate the broader concept of incumbent-based support.

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

IBT5 (V5321) "It often seems like our government is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, rather than being run for the benefit of all the people."

PROBLEMS:

1. Ambiguous: the question appears to address an incumbent trait (selfishness), but also the distribution of power in the United States (regime).
2. Ambiguous: the question mixes notions of personal integrity with those of responsiveness, thereby taping both IBE and IBT
3. V5321 has significant correlations with the final measures of IBE, and RBE, but a relatively low correlation with other measures of IBT (Craig and Niemi, p.19).
4. It is very similar to the existing NES question (v5276).

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

IBT6 (V5322) "Most government officials try to serve the public interests even if it goes against their personal interests."

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: the reason officials try to serve is not explicit. Some may attribute it to personal integrity (IBT); other may say it is because service is a requirement of reelection (RBE).
2. In neither the NRV or NES surveys can V5322 discriminate between factors. It has significant correlations with IBT, RBE and IBE. (Shingles Table 5).
3. It correlates relatively poorly with other measures of IBT and criterion variables for incumbent support (Craig and Niemi, pp .19, 21).

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

IBT8 (V5324) "Unless we keep a close watch on them, many of our elected leaders will look out for special interests rather than for all the people."

PROBLEM:

This variable was intended to capture Gamson's notion of trust as the absence of a need to act. It clearly distinguishes between incumbent support and regime support. In the NRV, it also distinguishes between IBE and IBT. However, in the NES data, it does not distinguish between IBE and IBT. In fact, it has a much higher association with IBE.

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

IBT9 (V5325) "Those we elect to public office usually try to keep the promises they have made during the election."

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: The reason officials keep their promises is not made explicit. It may be a matter of personal integrity (IBT) or it may be solely to get reelected (RBE).
2. V5325 has significant correlations with designed indicators of IBT, IBE and RBE (Shingles, Table 5).

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

NESTRUST1 (V5273) "Do you think that people in the government waste a lot of the money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?"

PROBLEMS:

1. This has a clear incumbent reference, but there is also a partisan or ideological connotation: an allusion to Democrats as the party of big spenders.
2. V5273 is sufficiently different from the other NES trust and new IBT questions as to form its own factor in the NES data (Craig and Niemi, p.19).

RECOMMENDATION: Keep it only to maintain continuity with previous surveys, but not at the expense of the fifteen recommended questions.

NESTRUST2 (V5274) "How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right - just about always, most of the time or only some of the time?"

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: Is not clear what "government" means. It could describe Washington bureaucrats, Congressmen or the current administration. Or the reference could be to federal institutions. The new question, V5320 ("You can trust the

- people who run our government to do what is right") has an explicit reference to incumbents.
2. Empirically, V5320 is far superior to V5274 in discriminating between IBT and RBE factors (Shingles, Table 2 and Table 5). V5230 also distinguishes between IBE and IBT; V5274 does not. Finally, V5320 has a much higher correlation with REAGAN TRAITS than V5274 (.30 vs. .19).

RECOMMENDATION: Replace V5274 with V5320, one of the fifteen recommended items.

NESTRUST3 (V5775) "Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all people?"

PROBLEMS:

1. Ambiguous: the question addresses an incumbent trait (selfishness), but also the distribution of power in the United States (a regime attribute).
2. Ambiguous: the question mixes notions of personal integrity with those of responsiveness, thereby tapping both IBE and IBT.
3. Empirically, V5775 does not discriminate. It has large, significant correlations with the final measures of three factors: IBE, IBT, and RBE (Shingles, Table 5).

RECOMMENDATION: Keep it for continuity with earlier surveys if there is room, but do not do so at the expense of the fifteen recommended items.

NESTRUST4 (V5276) "Do you think that quite a few of the people running the government are crooked, but not very many are, or do you think hardly any of them are crooked?"

PROBLEM:

1. Like V5217 (trust), V5216 (crooked) appears to be an explicit reference to the personal integrity of incumbents (IBT).
2. Yet, empirically, (like V5217) it does not discriminate between IBE and IBT factors. It loads equally well on both. Unlike V5217, it also has a smaller positive correlation with the RBE factor. Apparently, many respondents think corruption is a function of both weak institutions and an absence of personal ethics. V5276 is not a good measure of IBT, nor the broader concept, incumbent-based support.

RECOMMENDATION: Keep it only to maintain continuity, but not at the expense of the fifteen recommended items.

IV. INTERNAL POLITICAL EFFICACY

IPE3 (V5269) "Other people seem to have an easier time understanding complicated political issues than I do."

PROBLEM:

1. In NRV and NES data, this is the weakest of the six questions designed to measure IPE. It has relatively weak associations with (a) the other IPE questions (Craig and Niemi, p. 10) and (b) the criterion variable, "Perceived Knowledge" (.21 compared to .42 for the final IPE factor).
2. In a subsample of better informed respondents, V5269 and V5271 (below) form a separate factor. The two variables appear to measure social confidence or self-esteem.
3. In both the NRV and NES data, these same variables have significant correlations with measures of incumbent support. It appears that individuals with little social confidence are more deferential to, and supportive of, incumbents.

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

IPE5 (V5271) "I often don't feel sure of myself when talking with other people about politics and government."

PROBLEM:

This variable loads higher on the IPE factor than V5269 or V5170. It also has a higher correlation with Perceived Knowledge (.29). Yet, it does not do as well on these criteria as the four accepted IPE measures. Also it tends to correlate with IBE (Shingles, Table 5).

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

NESEFF2 (V5170) "Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on."

Problem:

1. Ambiguous: This is really two questions in one. the first part is either a reference to (1) complex institutions (RBE) or (2) evasive politicians (IBE). The second part suggests personal skills (IPE)
2. The data reflects this ambiguity. (a) In both the RV and NES data, V5170 has the highest correlation (of the designated IPE variables) with the IBE factor (Shingles, 1986b, Table 2; Shingles, 1987: Table, 5). (b) In both studies, V5170 has the next to lowest correlation with the IPE factor (Craig and Niemi, p.10); the lowest is V5269. (c) It has a much lower correlation with the criterion, Perceived Knowledge, than any of the designated PE questions (Its correlation is .18, whereas the correlations for the variables in the final IPE factor are: .31, .42, .24 and .36).

RECOMMENDATION: The new questions are far better measures of IPE. Drop V5170. Start fresh with a new and better time series.

SUPPLEMENT # 2 TO SHINGLES' REPORT
TOPIC: CRITERION VARIABLES FOR ALL EFFICACY AND TRUST QUESTIONS
(9/20/87)
(see Table 8)

HYPOTHESES:

1. IBT and IBE variables should correlate better with REAGAN TRAITS.
2. RBT and (to a lesser extent RBE) variables should correlate best with PATRIOTISM.
3. IPE variables should correlate best with SCHOOL (formal education), ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE and PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE.

IBT FINDINGS:

1. Only two of 13 designated IBT variables correlate significant with Patriotism. (IBT4, IBT6) and these associations are weak (.14).
2. * All 13 designated IBT variables have significant correlations with REAGAN. NESTRUST1 (waste), IBT2 (honest) IBT5 (big interests) and IBT6 (serve) have the weakest associations. Of the new variables, IBT4 (trust), IBT3 (without check), IBT7 (truth), IBT1 (qualified) and IBT9 (promises) have the strongest associations.
3. Designated IBT variables are not significantly related to measures of political sophistication. IBT7 (truth) has the highest correlations.

IBE FINDINGS:

1. Designated IBE variables are unrelated to Patriotism.
2. * All, six of the designated IBE variables have significant correlations with REAGAN. IBE2 (only votes) has the weakest association.
3. All, but IBE1 (truly interested), have significant correlations with SCHOOL and ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE; however, these correlations are lower than those for designated IPE variables.

RBT FINDINGS:

1. * Three of four designated RBT variables have significant correlations with PATRIOTISM. RBT1 (best govt.) and RBT4 (system) are by far the strongest. RBT3 (make changes) has no association.
2. Designated RBT variables have only modest correlations (in the teens) with REAGAN (compared to correlations in the .20's for designated IBT variables).
3. The designated IBT variables are largely unrelated to SCHOOL, ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE and PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE.

RBE FINDINGS:

1. * All, but one of the seven designated RBE variables, RBE2 (power), have significant correlations with PATRIOTISM. RBE3 (voting) has the highest association.
2. Three designated RBE variables have significant correlations with REAGAN. The correlations are lower than those for most IBT variables.
3. Three of the designated RBE variables have significant correlations with SCHOOL: RBE2 (power), RBE5 (no way) and NESEFF1 (no say). Most are significantly correlated with ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE and PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE, though the correlations are generally much lower than for IPE.

IPE FINDINGS:

1. * All seven designated IPE variables are significantly correlated with SCHOOL, ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE and PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE. NESEFF2 (can't understand) has the weakest association with PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE.
2. All are negatively correlated with PATRIOTISM.
3. None are significantly related to REAGAN.

Table 8. Association between Efficacy and Trust variables and selected
criteria variables (Pearson Correlations)

VARIABLE TYPE	VARIABLE DESCRIPTION	PARTRIO- TISM	REAGAN TRAITS	SCHOOL	ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE	PERCIEVED KNOWLEDGE
<u>REGIME:</u>						
RBE1	Many Ways	.15	.08	.03	.11	.15
RBE2	Few Power	.01	.10	.20	.22	.11
RBE3	Voting	.25	.06	.01	.11	.14
RBE4	Final Say	.16	.16	.06	.17	.18
RBE5	No Way	.09	.03	.14	.26	.25
NESEFF1	No Say	.13	.05	.19	.21	.11
NESRESP1	Elections	.10	.18	.02	.09	.12
RBT1	Govt Best	.29	.18	-.01	.21	.11
RBT2	Proud Govt.	.17	.15	.22	.26	.11
RBT3	Change Govt.	.00	.05	.23	.36	.16
RBT4	Our System	.26	.11	-.01	-.01	.03
<u>INCUMBENT:</u>						
IBE1	Interested	.11	.28	.06	.08	.09
IBE2	Only Votes	.05	.09	.13	.18	.06
IBE3	Masters	.02	.13	.19	.25	.09
IBE4	Lose Touch	.08	.15	.16	.26	.08
NESEFF3	Care	.02	.13	.21	.25	.13
NESRESP2	Pays Attention	.08	.23	.11	.22	.17
IBT1	Qualified	.12	.24	-.11	-.04	-.01
IBT2	Not Honest	.04	.16	.04	.13	.03
IBT3	Without Check	.12	.24	-.07	-.02	.00
IBT4	Trust People	.14	.30	-.06	.03	.04
IBT5	Big Interests	.07	.17	.10	.17	.05
IBT6	Serve	.14	.19	-.11	.00	.10
IBT7	Truth	.02	.21	.05	.16	.19
IBT8	Unless Watch	.01	.17	.06	.09	-.01
IBT9	Keep Promises	.09	.22	-.02	.03	.04
NESTRUST1	Waste Money	-.13	.15	-.05	-.06	-.10
NESTRUST2	Trust Govt.	.12	.19	.01	.14	.04
NESTRUST3	Big Interests	.12	.29	.03	.05	.06
NESTRUST4	Crooked	.12	.20	.11	.22	.14
<u>PERSONAL</u>						
IPE1	Qualified	-.07	.01	.23	.30	.31
IPE2	Understand	-.04	.02	.15	.34	.42
IPE3	Others Easier	-.11	-.06	.26	.38	.21
IPE4	Could Do	-.13	-.03	.24	.31	.24
IPE5	Don't Feel	-.09	.01	.25	.41	.29
IPE6	Informed	-.07	.05	.14	.37	.36
NESEFF2	Can't Under	-.17	-.05	.31	.36	.18

BOLD TYPE indicates statistical significance, $P < .05$

Source: 1987 NES Pilot Study

SUPPLEMENT #3 TO SHINGLES REPORT
FINAL EFFICACY AND TRUST QUESTIONS
AND ALTERNATE WORDING TO DISCOURAGE RESPONSE SET
(10/5/85)

A principal concern of Craig and Nimie is the possibility of response set in the efficacy and trust questions. In my NES report, supplements and addendum, I have argued that response set is not a serious problem in the Pilot data. Nevertheless, it could become a problem in future surveys. The fifteen questions which I recommend for each dimension of efficacy and trust are worded in the same direction. That is, the IPE, RBE, RBT and IBT questions have a negative tone; the IBE questions have a positive tone. If these fifteen questions are employed in the 1988 NES survey, they should be intermixed with additional questions using alternate wording to avoid response set. Below I suggest six questions. The mix has the added advantage of testing Craig's and Niemi's concerns.

I. REGIME-BASED EFFICACY

1. (+) RBE1 (V5171) "There are many legal ways for citizens to successfully influence what the government does."
2. (-) ALTERNATE WORDING: "The normal, legal ways for influencing government often don't make any difference."
3. (+) RBE4 (V5175) "Under our form of government, the people have the final say about how the government is run, no matter who is in office."
4. (+) GRESF1 (V5277) "How much do you feel that having elections makes the government pay attention to what the people think - a good deal, some, or not much?"

II. REGIME-BASED TRUST

1. (+) RBT1 (V5315) "Whatever its faults may be, the American form of government is still the best for us."
2. (-) ALTERNATE: "The American form of government, its laws and constitution are far from perfect."
3. (+) RBT4 (V5318) "I would rather live under our system of government than any other that I can think of."

III. INCUMBENT-BASED EFFICACY

1. (-) IBE2 (V5220) "Candidates for office are only interested in people's votes, not in their opinions."

2. (+) ALTERNATE WORDING: "Most public officials are interested in doing a good job and not just getting reelected."
3. (-) IBE3 (V5221) "Politicians are supposed to be the servants of the people, but too many of them think they are our masters."
4. (-) IBE4 (V5222) "Generally speaking, those we elect to public office lose touch with the people pretty quickly."

IV. INCUMBENT-BASED TRUST

1. (+) IBT3 (V5218) "Most public officials can be trusted to do what is right without our having to constantly check on them."
2. (+) IBT4 (V5320) "You can generally trust the people who run our government to do what is right."
3. (-) ALTERNATE WORDING: "A lot of the people in government cannot be trusted to do what is right."
4. (+) IBT7 (V5323) "When government leaders make statements to the American people on television or in the newspapers, they are usually telling the truth."

IV. INTERNAL POLITICAL EFFICACY

1. (+) IPE1 (V5267) "I consider myself well qualified to participate in politics."
2. (-) ALTERNATE WORDING: "I am not as qualified as I should be to participate in politics."
3. (+) IPE2 (V5268) "I feel that I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing our society."
4. (-) ALTERNATE WORDING: "I don't understand many political issues."
5. (+) IPE4 (V5270) "I feel that I could do as good a job in public office as most other people."
6. (+) IPE6 (V5272) "I think I am as well informed about politics and government than most people."

CORRECTED WORDING: "I think I am better informed about politics and government than most people."

ADDENDUM FOR SHINGLES NES REPORT
TOPIC: TABLE 4

Table 4 in the Shingles Report addresses the "response set" hypothesis. It compares Alpha coefficients for different sets of variables. Each set includes only variables which are worded in the same (positive or negative) direction. A new Table 4 is attached which adds Average Inter-Item Correlations (AIC). Unlike the Alphas, the AIC's are not biased by (they are insensitive to) the number of variables in the set. The AIC's are in the columns marked "B". Notice that for four of the five dimensions, the included variables (of like sign) are more highly intercorrelated than excluded variables of the same sign. The exception is RBE. Table 4 offers strong evidence that these four factors cannot be explained solely in terms of response set. Even RBE cannot be explained in terms of response set. Three of the rejected RBE variables are negatively worded, but the fourth is positively worded. The best proof that the final factors are not due to response set is their different (theoretically expected) associations with the criterion variables discussed in the report. Most convincing is the powerful role the RBE index plays in explaining campaign activity (see Table 7).

Table 4. Internal Consistency: Included and Excluded variable sets
(Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient and Average Inter-item
Correlations)

STATUS@	DIMENSIONS OF EFFICACY AND TRUST									
	IPE		IBE		IBT		RBE		RBT	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
INCLUDED VARIABLES	.78	.47	.73	.48	.65	.39	.51	.28	.61	.44
EXCLUDED VARIABLES: POSITIVE WORDING	--	--	.43	.33	.61	.30	--	--	--	--
EXCLUDED VARIABLES: NEGATIVE WORDING	.66	.39	--	--	.65	.27	.68	.42	.39	.25

A = Cronbach' Alpha

B = Mean Inter-item correlation

@ Two variables of the same type and same sign were required to form a set. The number of variables per set is:

First row: 4, 3, 3, 3, 2

Second row: 0, 2, 4, 0, 0

Third row: 3, 0, 5, 3, 2

Not set: 0, 1, 1, 1, 0

Source: 1987 NES Pilot Study

SUPPLEMENT # 1 TO SHINGLES' NES REPORT
TOPIC: REJECTED QUESTIONS
(10/4/87)

This is a supplement to the 1987 report, "New Measures of Subjective Political Efficacy and Political Trust. The report evaluates 37 survey questions and recommends 15 as distinct, valid measures of IPE, IBE, IBT, RBE and RBT. Given the shortness of time and space, the report concentrates on evidence demonstrating the validity of recommended variables. This supplement provides a more detailed analysis of the 25 questions which were not recommended, explaining why they were rejected. The discussion is based on face validity, factor analyses and criterion validation. It summarizes relevant findings of the Craig and Niemi 1987 Report, the Shingles 1987 Report and three earlier surveys conducted by Shingles: 185 students at VPI&SU (Winter, 1986), 400 adults in the Roanoke Valley (June, 1986) and 137 adults in the New River Valley (Winter, 1987). The closer in time the earlier surveys are to the Spring, 1987 NES survey, the greater is the similarity in wording. The New River Valley and NES survey are nearly identical. More information is provided for some questions than others because they were included in more surveys. For brevity, the surveys will be referred to as: VPISU, RV, NRV and NES. Correlations for the 37 variables with selected criterion variables are in Table 8 (attached).

AN ITEM ANALYSIS OF REJECTED QUESTIONS

I. REGIME-BASED EFFICACY

RBE2 (V5172) "In this country, a few people have all the political power and the rest of us are not given any say about how the government is run."

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: It is not clear who or what is not giving "the rest of us a say". The culprit may be: (1) unresponsive, partisan or self-seeking incumbents or (2) faulty institutions.
2. The data indicate that most respondents interpret the culprit be incumbents. (a) In both NRV and NES data, V5172 has significant correlations with variables designed to measure IBE and IBT (Shingles, Table 5; Craig and Niemi, p. 16)). (b) It is more highly correlated than other "RBE" designates with various criterion variables measuring incumbent support (e.g., Craig's and Niemi's incumbent performance. p.16).

RECOMMENDATION: The question should be dropped as a measure of RBE or it should be modified to make it explicit that faulty institutions leave people powerless.

RBE3 (V5175) "Voting is an effective way for people to have a say about what the government does."

PROBLEMS:

1. This is superior to the traditional NES "voting is the only way" questions because it avoids the problem of having to decide whether an affirmative response indicates efficacy or inefficacy. However, the question has little variance and it appears to tap RBT or even patriotism.
2. The data: (a) The marginal for V5175 are very positively skewed. They are similar to those of RBT and Patriotism questions; they are much more skewed than the other RBE designates. (b) V5175 has a relatively weak association with other designated RBE variables (Craig and Niemi, p. 12). (c) It has a strong, significant correlation with the RBT factor (Shingles, Table 5). (d) It has a much higher correlation with Patriotism (.25) than the other RBE designates (the next highest is .16).

RECOMMENDATION: V5175 does not distinguish between RBE and RBT. Drop it.

RBE5 (V5330) "If public officials are not interested in hearing what the people think, there is really no way to make them listen."

PROBLEM:

This question was designed to rule incumbents out of consideration with a conditional introductory phrase. In the NRV data, this seems to work: V5330 separates incumbents from regime. It loads highest on the RBE factor and best distinguished RBE from IBE. However, in the NES data, V5330 cannot differentiate; it has significant correlations with both IBE and RBE designated variables (Shingles, Table 5; Craig and Niemi, pp. 13, 16).

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

NESEFF1 (V5169) "People like me don't have any say about what the government does."

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: It is not clear why "people like the respondent" have no say. The culprit may be: (a) faulty institutions, (b) unresponsive incumbents or (c) deficiencies of people like the respondent. The phrase, "people like me" encourages the latter interpretation.
2. In the VPI&SU, RV and NES data, V5169 loads on all three efficacy dimensions. It correlates almost equally well with indicators of RBE and IBE.

RECOMMENDATION: For the sake of continuity with earlier surveys, keep it as a general measure of External Political Efficacy, but do not do so at the expense of the fifteen recommended items. Keep it if there is room.

SUPPLEMENT # 2 TO SHINGLES' REPORT
TOPIC: CRITERION VARIABLES FOR ALL EFFICACY AND TRUST QUESTIONS
(9/20/87)
(see Table 8)

HYPOTHESES:

1. IBT and IBE variables should correlate better with REAGAN TRAITS.
2. RBT and (to a lesser extent RBE) variables should correlate best with PATRIOTISM.
3. IPE variables should correlate best with SCHOOL (formal education), ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE and PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE.

IBT FINDINGS:

1. Only two of 13 designated IBT variables correlate significant with Patriotism. (IBT4, IBT6) and these associations are weak (.14).
2. * All 13 designated IBT variables have significant correlations with REAGAN. NESTRUST1 (waste), IBT2 (honest) IBT5 (big interests) and IBT6 (serve) have the weakest associations. Of the new variables, IBT4 (trust), IBT3 (without check), IBT7 (truth), IBT1 (qualified) and IBT9 (promises) have the strongest associations.
3. Designated IBT variables are not significantly related to measures of political sophistication. IBT7 (truth) has the highest correlations.

IBE FINDINGS:

1. Designated IBE variables are unrelated to Patriotism.
2. * All, six of the designated IBE variables have significant correlations with REAGAN. IBE2 (only votes) has the weakest association.
3. All, but IBE1 (truly interested), have significant correlations with SCHOOL and ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE; however, these correlations are lower than those for designated IPE variables.

RBT FINDINGS:

1. * Three of four designated RBT variables have significant correlations with PATRIOTISM. RBT1 (best govt.) and RBT4 (system) are by far the strongest. RBT3 (make changes) has no association.
2. Designated RBT variables have only modest correlations (in the teens) with REAGAN (compared to correlations in the .20's for designated IBT variables).
3. The designated IBT variables are largely unrelated to SCHOOL, ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE and PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE.

RBE FINDINGS:

1. * All, but one of the seven designated RBE variables, RBE2 (power), have significant correlations with PATRIOTISM. RBE3 (voting) has the highest association.
2. Three designated RBE variables have significant correlations with REAGAN. The correlations are lower than those for most IBT variables.
3. Three of the designated RBE variables have significant correlations with SCHOOL: RBE2 (power), RBE5 (no way) and NESEFF1 (no say). Most are significantly correlated with ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE and PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE, though the correlations are generally much lower than for IPE.

IPE FINDINGS:

1. * All seven designated IPE variables are significantly correlated with SCHOOL, ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE and PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE. NESEFF2 (can't understand) has the weakest association with PERCEIVED KNOWLEDGE.
2. All are negatively correlated with PATRIOTISM.
3. None are significantly related to REAGAN.

Table 8. Association between Efficacy and Trust variables and selected
criteria variables (Pearson Correlations)

VARIABLE TYPE	VARIABLE DESCRIPTION	PARTRIO- TISM	REAGAN TRAITS	SCHOOL	ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE	PERCIEVED KNOWLEDGE
<u>REGIME:</u>						
RBE1	Many Ways	.15	.08	.03	.11	.15
RBE2	Few Power	.01	.10	.20	.22	.11
RBE3	Voting	.25	.06	.01	.11	.14
RBE4	Final Say	.16	.16	.06	.17	.18
RBE5	No Way	.09	.03	.14	.26	.25
NESEFF1	No Say	.13	.05	.19	.21	.11
NESRESP1	Elections	.10	.18	.02	.09	.12
RBT1	Govt Best	.29	.18	-.01	.21	.11
RBT2	Proud Govt.	.17	.15	.22	.26	.11
RBT3	Change Govt.	.00	.05	.23	.36	.16
RBT4	Our System	.26	.11	-.01	-.01	.03
<u>INCUMBENT:</u>						
IBE1	Interested	.11	.28	.06	.08	.09
IBE2	Only Votes	.05	.09	.13	.18	.06
IBE3	Masters	.02	.13	.19	.25	.09
IBE4	Lose Touch	.08	.15	.16	.26	.08
NESEFF3	Care	.02	.13	.21	.25	.13
NESRESP2	Pays Attention	.08	.23	.11	.22	.17
IBT1	Qualified	.12	.24	-.11	-.04	-.01
IBT2	Not Honest	.04	.16	.04	.13	.03
IBT3	Without Check	.12	.24	-.07	-.02	.00
IBT4	Trust People	.14	.30	-.06	.03	.04
IBT5	Big Interests	.07	.17	.10	.17	.05
IBT6	Serve	.14	.19	-.11	.00	.10
IBT7	Truth	.02	.21	.05	.16	.19
IBT8	Unless Watch	.01	.17	.06	.09	-.01
IBT9	Keep Promises	.09	.22	-.02	.03	.04
NESTRUST1	Waste Money	-.13	.15	-.05	-.06	-.10
NESTRUST2	Trust Govt.	.12	.19	.01	.14	.04
NESTRUST3	Big Interests	.12	.29	.03	.05	.06
NESTRUST4	Crooked	.12	.20	.11	.22	.14
<u>PERSONAL</u>						
IPE1	Qualified	-.07	.01	.23	.30	.31
IPE2	Understand	-.04	.02	.15	.34	.42
IPE3	Others Easier	-.11	-.06	.26	.38	.21
IPE4	Could Do	-.13	-.03	.24	.31	.24
IPE5	Don't Feel	-.09	.01	.25	.41	.29
IPE6	Informed	-.07	.05	.14	.37	.36
NESEFF2	Can't Under	-.17	-.05	.31	.36	.18

BOLD TYPE indicates statistical significance, $P \leq .05$

Source: 1987 NES Pilot Study

SUPPLEMENT #3 TO SHINGLES REPORT
FINAL EFFICACY AND TRUST QUESTIONS
AND ALTERNATE WORDING TO DISCOURAGE RESPONSE SET
(10/5/85)

A principal concern of Craig and Nimie is the possibility of response set in the efficacy and trust questions. In my NES report, supplements and addendum, I have argued that response set is not a serious problem in the Pilot data. Nevertheless, it could become a problem in future surveys. The fifteen questions which I recommend for each dimension of efficacy and trust are worded in the same direction. That is, the IPE, RBE, RBT and IBT questions have a negative tone; the IBE questions have a positive tone. If these fifteen questions are employed in the 1988 NES survey, they should be intermixed with additional questions using alternate wording to avoid response set. Below I suggest six questions. The mix has the added advantage of testing Craig's and Niemi's concerns.

I. REGIME-BASED EFFICACY

1. (+) RBE1 (V5171) "There are many legal ways for citizens to successfully influence what the government does."
2. (-) ALTERNATE WORDING: "The normal, legal ways for influencing government often don't make any difference."
3. (+) RBE4 (V5175) "Under our form of government, the people have the final say about how the government is run, no matter who is in office."
4. (+) GRES P1 (V5277) "How much do you feel that having elections makes the government pay attention to what the people think - a good deal, some, or not much?"

II. REGIME-BASED TRUST

1. (+) RBT1 (V5315) "Whatever its faults may be, the American form of government is still the best for us."
2. (-) ALTERNATE: "The American form of government, its laws and constitution are far from perfect."
3. (+) RBT4 (V5318) "I would rather live under our system of government than any other that I can think of."

III. INCUMBENT-BASED EFFICACY

1. (-) IBE2 (V5220) "Candidates for office are only interested in people's votes, not in their opinions."

2. (+) ALTERNATE WORDING: "Most public officials are interested in doing a good job and not just getting reelected."
3. (-) IBE3 (V5221) "Politicians are supposed to be the servants of the people, but too many of them think they are our masters."
4. (-) IBE4 (V5222) "Generally speaking, those we elect to public office lose touch with the people pretty quickly."

IV. INCUMBENT-BASED TRUST

1. (+) IBT3 (V5218) "Most public officials can be trusted to do what is right without our having to constantly check on them."
2. (+) IBT4 (V5320) "You can generally trust the people who run our government to do what is right."
3. (-) ALTERNATE WORDING: "A lot of the people in government cannot be trusted to do what is right."
4. (+) IBT7 (V5323) "When government leaders make statements to the American people on television or in the newspapers, they are usually telling the truth."

IV. INTERNAL POLITICAL EFFICACY

1. (+) IPE1 (V5267) "I consider myself well qualified to participate in politics."
2. (-) ALTERNATE WORDING: "I am not as qualified as I should be to participate in politics."
3. (+) IPE2 (V5268) "I feel that I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing our society."
4. (-) ALTERNATE WORDING: "I don't understand many political issues."
5. (+) IPE4 (V5270) "I feel that I could do as good a job in public office as most other people."
6. (+) IPE6 (V5272) "I think I am as well informed about politics and government than most people."

CORRECTED WORDING: "I think I am better informed about politics and government than most people."

II. REGIME-BASED TRUST

RBT2 (V5316) "There is not much about our form of government to be proud of."

PROBLEMS:

1. In both the NRV and NES data, V5316 correlates as well or better with measures of incumbent support than with measures of regime support (Shingles, Table 5; Craig and Niemi, p. 8). Many respondents seem to ignore the reference to "form" of government and interpret the question as an evaluation of incumbents. Remember, the question was asked during the Iran-Contra scandal.
2. One would expect RBT to have a significant correlation with the Patriotism index. V5316 only has a weak correlation of .17 (Also see Craig and Niemi, p. 9)

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

RBT3 (V5317) "It may be necessary to make some major changes in our form of government in order to solve the problems facing our country."

PROBLEMS:

1. Same problems as v5316, but worse. Respondents appear to ignore the adjective, "form", and interpret the question as a reference to incumbents.
2. In both NES and NRV data, respondents gave far more negative responses to V5317 than to other alleged measures of regime support which were highly skewed in a positive direction. V5317 marginals are more similar to those for the incumbent-based trust questions.
3. V5317 has significant correlations with IBE questions (Shingles, Table 5; Craig and Niemi, p.8).
4. V5317 has no association with the Patriotism index (0.0).

RECOMMENDATION: Either modify it to provide a specific reference to "the constitutions" or "laws of this country", or drop it.

III. INCUMBENT-BASED EFFICACY

IBE1 (V5219) "Most public officials are truly interested in what the people think."

PROBLEMS:

1. V5219 has a relatively low correlation with other variables designed to measure IBE (Niemi and Craig, p.18).
2. It does not distinguish between IBE, IBT and RBE (Shingles, Table 5). Some respondents seem to interpret it as a reference to the personal integrity of incumbents (V5219 correlates well with IBT and REAGAN TRAITS). Others may believe incumbents are only interested in what people think so they can be re-elected (i.e., a coercive element which taps RBE), but once they get elected they lose touch.

RECOMMENDATION: drop it.

NESEFF3 (V5173)

"I don't think public officials care much what people like me think."

Problem:

This variable has a very high correlation with the recommended set of IBE variables. However, it also has strong correlations with RBE variables. These results are found for both the RV and NES surveys. The reason appears to be a coercive connotation: officials do not have to care because they are not held accountable to the public (election do not work). Proof: V5173 has a higher association (.30) than the other alleged IBE indicators with V5277 (election make government pay attention).

RECOMMENDATION: For the sake of continuity, you may wish to keep it as a general measure of External Political Efficacy, but do not do so at the expense of the fifteen recommended items. Keep it only if there is room.

NESGRES2 (V5278)

"Over the years, how much attention do you feel the government pays to what the people think when it decides what to do - a great deal, some, or not much?"

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: The meaning of "government" is unclear. Paying attention is a human attribute, but respondents may attribute attentiveness to institutional checks like elections.
2. Empirically, V5278 does not distinguish between RBE and IBE factors. It loads equally well on both (Shingles, Table 5).

RECOMMENDATION: This is a very vague question. The only reason to keep it is continuity. If push comes to shove, drop it to make room for new questions.

IV. INCUMBENT-BASED TRUST

IBT1 (V5216)

"Most of the people running our government are well-qualified to handle the problems that we are facing in this country."

MINOR PROBLEM:

In both the NRV and NES surveys, this variable does a good job distinguishing IBE from the other four dimensions (Shingles, Table 5). It loads highly on the IBE factor and not at all or low on the other factors. It was dropped because of a small positive association with RBT (Shingles, Table 5). Note that it is the only IBE question which refers explicitly to incumbent ability. The others refer to motivation.

RECOMMENDATION: If there is room, keep it as the only measure of perceived incumbent ability.

IBT2 (V5217) "Quite a few of the people running our government are not as honest as the voters have a right to expect."

PROBLEM:

This question was intended to measure integrity (trust). It distinguishes between IBT and IBE in the NRV survey, but not in the NES survey. In the NES data, it correlates with the final IBE factor better than the IBT factor (Shingles, Table 5). It also correlates relatively poorly with other IBT measures (Craig and Niemi, p. 19). However, it does isolate the broader concept of incumbent-based support.

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

IBT5 (V5321) "It often seems like our government is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, rather than being run for the benefit of all the people."

PROBLEMS:

1. Ambiguous: the question appears to address an incumbent trait (selfishness), but also the distribution of power in the United States (regime).
2. Ambiguous: the question mixes notions of personal integrity with those of responsiveness, thereby taping both IBE and IBT
3. V5321 has significant correlations with the final measures of IBE, and RBE, but a relatively low correlation with other measures of IBT (Craig and Niemi, p.19).
4. It is very similar to the existing NES question (v5276).

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

IBT6 (V5322) "Most government officials try to serve the public interests even if it goes against their personal interests."

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: the reason officials try to serve is not explicit. Some may attribute it to personal integrity (IBT); other may say it is because service is a requirement of reelection (RBE).
2. In neither the NRV or NES surveys can V5322 discriminate between factors. It has significant correlations with IBT, RBE and IBE. (Shingles Table 5).
3. It correlates relatively poorly with other measures of IBT and criterion variables for incumbent support (Craig and Niemi, pp .19, 21).

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

IBT8 (V5324) "Unless we keep a close watch on them, many of our elected leaders will look out for special interests rather than for all the people."

PROBLEM:

This variable was intended to capture Gamson's notion of trust as the absence of a need to act. It clearly distinguishes between incumbent support and regime support. In the NRV, it also distinguishes between IBE and IBT. However, in the NES data, it does not distinguish between IBE and IBT. In fact, it has a much higher association with IBE.

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

IBT9 (V5325) "Those we elect to public office usually try to keep the promises they have made during the election."

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: The reason officials keep their promises is not made explicit. It may be a matter of personal integrity (IBT) or it may be solely to get reelected (RBE).
2. V5325 has significant correlations with designed indicators of IBT, IBE and RBE (Shingles, Table 5).

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

NESTRUST1 (V5273) "Do you think that people in the government waste a lot of the money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?"

PROBLEMS:

1. This has a clear incumbent reference, but there is also a partisan or ideological connotation: an allusion to Democrats as the party of big spenders.
2. V5273 is sufficiently different from the other NES trust and new IBT questions as to form its own factor in the NES data (Craig and Niemi, p.19).

RECOMMENDATION: Keep it only to maintain continuity with previous surveys, but not at the expense of the fifteen recommended questions.

NESTRUST2 (V5274) "How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right - just about always, most of the time or only some of the time?"

PROBLEM:

1. Ambiguous: Is not clear what "government" means. It could describe Washington bureaucrats, Congressmen or the current administration. Or the reference could be to federal institutions. The new question, V5320 ("You can trust the

people who run our government to do what is right") has an explicit reference to incumbents.

2. Empirically, V5320 is far superior to V5274 in discriminating between IBT and RBE factors (Shingles, Table 2 and Table 5). V5230 also distinguishes between IBE and IBT; V5274 does not. Finally, V5320 has a much higher correlation with REAGAN TRAITS than V5274 (.30 vs. .19).

RECOMMENDATION: Replace V5274 with V5320, one of the fifteen recommended items.

NESTRUST3 (V5775) "Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all people?"

PROBLEMS:

1. Ambiguous: the question addresses an incumbent trait (selfishness), but also the distribution of power in the United States (a regime attribute).
2. Ambiguous: the question mixes notions of personal integrity with those of responsiveness, thereby tapping both IBE and IBT.
3. Empirically, V5775 does not discriminate. It has large, significant correlations with the final measures of three factors: IBE, IBT, and RBE (Shingles, Table 5).

RECOMMENDATION: Keep it for continuity with earlier surveys if there is room, but do not do so at the expense of the fifteen recommended items.

NESTRUST4 (V5276) "Do you think that quite a few of the people running the government are crooked, but not very many are, or do you think hardly any of them are crooked?"

PROBLEM:

1. Like V5217 (trust), V5216 (crooked) appears to be an explicit reference to the personal integrity of incumbents (IBT).
2. Yet, empirically, (like V5217) it does not discriminate between IBE and IBT factors. It loads equally well on both. Unlike V5217, it also has a smaller positive correlation with the RBE factor. Apparently, many respondents think corruption is a function of both weak institutions and an absence of personal ethics. V5276 is not a good measure of IBT, nor the broader concept, incumbent-based support.

RECOMMENDATION: Keep it only to maintain continuity, but not at the expense of the fifteen recommended items.

IV. INTERNAL POLITICAL EFFICACY

IPE3 (V5269) "Other people seem to have an easier time understanding complicated political issues than I do."

PROBLEM:

1. In NRV and NES data, this is the weakest of the six questions designed to measure IPE. It has relatively weak associations with (a) the other IPE questions (Craig and Niemi, p. 10) and (b) the criterion variable, "Perceived Knowledge" (.21 compared to .42 for the final IPE factor).
2. In a subsample of better informed respondents, V5269 and V5271 (below) form a separate factor. The two variables appear to measure social confidence or self-esteem.
3. In both the NRV and NES data, these same variables have significant correlations with measures of incumbent support. It appears that individuals with little social confidence are more deferential to, and supportive of, incumbents.

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

IPE5 (V5271) "I often don't feel sure of myself when talking with other people about politics and government."

PROBLEM:

This variable loads higher on the IPE factor than V5269 or V5170. It also has a higher correlation with Perceived Knowledge (.29). Yet, it does not do as well on these criteria as the four accepted IPE measures. Also it tends to correlate with IBE (Shingles, Table 5).

RECOMMENDATION: Drop it.

NESEFF2 (V5170) "Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on."

Problem:

1. Ambiguous: This is really two questions in one. the first part is either a reference to (1) complex institutions (RBE) or (2) evasive politicians (IBE). The second part suggests personal skills (IPE)
2. The data reflects this ambiguity. (a) In both the RV and NES data, V5170 has the highest correlation (of the designated IPE variables) with the IBE factor (Shingles, 1986b, Table 2; Shingles, 1987: Table, 5). (b) In both studies, V5170 has the next to lowest correlation with the IPE factor (Craig and Niemi, p.10); the lowest is V5269. (c) It has a much lower correlation with the criterion, Perceived Knowledge, than any of the designated PE questions (Its correlation is .18, whereas the correlations for the variables in the final IPE factor are: .31, .42, .24 and .36).

RECOMMENDATION: The new questions are far better measures of IPE. Drop V5170. Start fresh with a new and better time series.