Donald E. Stokes

Survey Research Center The University of Michigan

Modern governments keep records of voting on so grand a scale that no other electoral data are likely to rival the official returns. The public tally of votes will continue to be the primary material of electoral analysis. and the inferences to be made from variations across electoral units and over time can be very revealing of influences on mass political behavior. As a means of seeing into the electorate's mind, however, the analysis of election returns suffers two related disabilities, which are none the less severe for being so obvious. On the one hand, we cannot penetrate many aspects of electoral behavior without data on individual voters, whereas the official returns are tallied by precincts, wards, counties and other aggregate units. On the other hand, we cannot probe some influences on voting without measuring a much richer set of explanatory variables than could ever be gotten from official sources, even when the voting returns are augmented by census and other data aggregated by election units.

It was therefore natural that the interview survey should be applied to the study of elections, and as survey methods have developed over the past thirty years they have indeed played an increasingly important role in this type of political analysis. The first newspaper polls, in addition to showing their skills in forecasting, supplied a much surer description of the social composition of the vote. And the first academic studies, although they were confined to limited geographic areas. brilliantly displayed the versatility of the survey interview in terms of the range of information which might be collected and used. In some respects, however, survey studies began to provide basic time series on American national elections with the advent of the studies undertaken by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan in the years after the Second World War.

SOME CHRONOLOGY AND DESIGN

For anyone who values the chance development in research the entry of the Survey Research Center into election studies must be a gratifying story. The Center indeed became involved in voting research largely by accident in the year of Mr. Truman's surprise victory. Some weeks before the 1948 presidential election one of the Center's economic surveys asked a sample of Americans a pair of very simple questions about their voting intention. When Mr. Truman confounded the forecasters, as well as the Republicans, these data were lent a quite unexpected interest in two respects: first, this small but carefully designed probability sample by no means gave Mr. Dewey a long pre-election lead--in fact those who had formed a clear view gave Dewey no lead at all; <u>second</u>, and more important to the Center's growing involvement, the sample's design permitted a reinterview on the same individuals after the election. Such a follow-up survey was promptly undertaken as part of the Social Science Research Council's inquest into the difficulties in which the polling agencies had found themselves.¹

From this modest start a very considerable program of research has in fact emerged. In the Eisenhower-Stevenson election of 1952 the Center undertook a more ambitious study, one which exploited with a nationwide sample for the first time the real possibilities of an intensive survey of voting.² The 1952 study took a first round of interviews in September and October and a second round with the same sample in the six weeks following the election. Such an interview-reinterview design has become a standard element of subsequent studies, and the Center has now interviewed a national sample before and after each of the last five presidential elections.³

This program of research has encompassed the mid-term congressional elections as well. A moderate-sized sample was interviewed before the 1954 election, somewhat larger samples after the elections of 1958 and 1962. Plans are now in hand for such a study following the congressional election this year. With this additional work, a sample of Americans will have been interviewed in every national election from 1948 to 1966, excepting only the congressional election of 1950.

¹Elements of the Center's findings are incorporated in the volume issuing from the S.S.R.C.'s enquiry. See Frederick Mosteller et al, <u>The Pre-Election Polls of 1948</u> (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1949). The Center's 1948 study is reported more fully in Angus Campbell and Robert L. Kahn, <u>The People Elect a President</u> (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1952).

²The findings of the 1952 study are reported in Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller, <u>The Voter Decides</u> (Evanston Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1954).

[&]quot;This brief sketch of research owes a good deal to the friendly stimulus of participants in the 1966 summer program of the Interuniversity Consortium for Political Research.

³The findings of the 1956 study, with reanalysis of the 1952 data, are reported in Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes, <u>The American Voter</u> (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960). Selected findings from the subsequent studies are given in Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes, <u>Elections and the</u> Political Order (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966).

The samples interviewed in these nine elections have been independently drawn, with one main exception. The sample interviewed twice in 1956 was transformed into a longer-term panel and as many of its members as possible were interviewed a third time after the congressional election of 1958 and a fourth and fifth, time before and after the presidential election of 1960. The resulting individual-level data on political change during the full four years of a presidential election cycle have been an invaluable complement to the time series which can be formed from the independent samples interviewed during this lengthening span of contemporary electoral history.

TIME DATA AND EXPLANATORY MODELS

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance to this work of its extension through time. The dividends of this extension are partly those accruing to any research which takes the investigator more than once over the same ground: the refinement of concepts and measures, the extension of theoretical focus, greater efficiency in the reduction of data--all of these came naturally enough as the research extended to additional elections. In some respects, however, repeated measurements of the same population, and even of the same individuals, have been indispensable in solving several main analytic problems of the research itself. Let me give a very few examples of how the longitudinal character of these studies has shaped the development of correct analytic or explanatory models.

Party identification and electoral choice. Only a very undiscerning student of American politics could miss altogether the importance of party loyalties in our elections. The stability of the American party system over the past century has allowed partisan identifications to become deeply ingrained in the traditions of families and other social groupings, providing those who are socialized into these groups a partisan standard that is entirely capable of guiding the voter's thought and action through an entire lifetime. Prior survey studies of voting had not missed the importance of party identification; indeed, evidence of the extraordinary persistence of these "brand loyalties" had forced a basic revision of the pioneering study by Lazarsfeld and his associates in Erie County, Ohio, in the presidential election of 1940.4

In many respects, however, the understanding of party identification could move beyond the common wisdom only if it were explicitly measured and brought under close empirical analysis. Accordingly, the Center's earliest

⁴Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet, <u>The People's Choice</u> (New York: Duell Sloan and Pierce, 1944). The change of focus which the stability of party choice obliged these investigators to make is discussed in Peter H. Rossi, "Four Landmarks of Voting Research," Chapter 1 in <u>American Voting Behavior</u>, Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck, eds. (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959) pp. 5-54.

studies sought to assess these enduring orientations to party. The first efforts to do so made clear that reports of party identification were by no means identical with current party choices for President. Not only did the 1952 sample include many self-described "independents" who nevertheless had party choices at the moment; the sample included too an element representing millions of traditional Democratic identifiers who were prepared to vote for General Eisenhower. In other words, there was here a kind of discriminant validation: party identification was strongly associated with voting choice across the sample as a whole, but the association was sufficiently imperfect to sustain the belief that the conceptual distinction between enduring identifications and immediate behavioral choices was preserved in the empirical measures.

Nevertheless, survey responses which were confined to a single election could not dispose of the possibility that some people link themselves to a party in a purely nominal fashion, without these verbal responses having real motivational significance for current or future behavior. It seemed possible, for example, that large numbers of people might ordinarily call themselves Democrats because Franklin Roosevelt had accustomed them to doing so during the New Deal, but would as easily come to call themselves Republicans after several years' experience with an attractive Republican president in the White House.

The first contribution of longitudinal studies to resolving this sort of issue was to demonstrate how stable the distribution of party loyalties is. As reports of party identification began to be gathered from successive independent samples of the electorate, the proportions describing themselves as Republicans, Democrats, and Independents in fact differed so little from study to study that it was quite impossible to discern any genuine change from sampling fluctuation. This stability of party identification was the more noteworthy in view of the fluctuation of the vote from year to year. Indeed, the congressional vote, having swung strongly to the Republicans at the beginning of the Eisenhower period, in three successive elections m oved steadily back toward a division more in line with the distribution of party identification.

What successive samples implied as to the stability of party identification was confirmed by the individual panel data gathered from 1956 to 1960. Of course the small net change of party identification from year to year was bound to conceal some compensating streams of gross change; no large panel study has many turnover cells in which the frequencies vanish altogether. Nevertheless, by comparison with the rates of change of a variety of other individual-level measures of political attitude and behavior, the stability of party identification was most impressive, and this evidence strongly supported the view that our measure tapped a psychological orientation of great durability.

Clarifying the relationship between party loyalty and current voting choice, however,

required more than a demonstration of the stability of party identification. In three successive presidential elections--1952,1956, and 1960--the Republican candidate did better than could be expected on the basis of the distribution of party identification alone. In view of this it might still be claimed that millions of people who called themselves Democrats for reasons of family history or local tradition, especially in the South, were developing habitual Republican ties at the presidential level. A critical test of this hypothesis was made possible by the panel study from 1956 to 1960. If our measure of party identification were failing to detect an emerging group of presidential Republicans, the relationship between the set of Democrats supporting Eisenhower in 1956 and the set of Democrats supporting Nixon in 1960 ought to be a nesting one; that is, the group of traditional Democrats who voted Republican in at least one of these years ought to consist very largely of the presidential Republicans who voted against their nominal party both years, along with an additional element which voted Republican in the first of these elections, when the political tides were running a little more strongly to the Republican party. If the hypothesis as to the emergence of presidential Republicans were wrong, however, the forces producing deviation in the two elections would be independent, and the set of traditional Democrats voting for Eisenhower would overlap the set of Democrats voting for Nixon no more than we would expect if these two defections were statistically independent events.

In fact the truth lay much closer to the second of these models, and the two sets of defecting Democrats were found to be markedly nonoverlapping. The inference to be drawn from this as to the motivational force of party identification was clear enough: despite the fact that in 1960 there would again be extensive Democrat defections, much the best prediction of what an Eisenhower Democrat would do in 1960 was one assigning him to his historic party. The best forecast of what an Eisenhower Democrat would do the next time around was to say that he would return to his traditional party loyalty, although another set of Democrats, especially Protestants who were obsessed by Kennedy's Catholicism, would vote Republican.

As repeated observations disposed of these issues of validity, the measure of party identification could be entered with increasing confidence into analytic models of the electorate's behavior. The "unbiassed" character of reported party loyalties has played a critical role in the effort to extract from the distribution of party identification a "normal" or "expected" division of the vote for the electorate as a whole, or for a given population grouping.⁵ In fact, the "normal" division was found to depend on more than party identification alone: since the Republican Party has a disproportionate share of supporters who are better-educated, better-informed, and emotionally committed voters, Republicans ceteris paribus are less likely to be drawn away from their party by transient negative influences; hence, if the political issues and personalities of the moment favor both parties equally, we would nevertheless expect the Republicans to keep the support of a larger part of their identifiers at the polls (although they would lose the election owing to the Democratic preponderance of party identifiers).

Knowing how the vote would divide if it expressed only relatively enduring political orientations permits a surer description of transient political influences, and the capacity to separate long-term from short-term influences has in fact been a chief result of this work. The analysis of short-run forces on turnout and the party vote has provided a key to other aggregate properties of the electorate's behavior. For example, observing (1) that the support which a winning presidential candidate attracts from beyond his party is most likely to come from independents and persons of weak attachment to the other party, (2) that the presidential coattails will transfer some of this support to the congressional candidates of the same party, and (3) that independents and weak partisans are much more likely to drop out of the electorate at a mid-term congressional election gives a simple explanation of why it is that the president's party so often loses seats at an off-year election, an explanation which has nothing to do with increasing hostility to an administration's policies.6

Attitudinal components of the presidential vote. The immediate forces on the electorate's behavior are notoriously multivariate in character. At the very least, each presidential contest confronts the electorate with four principal actors--the two parties and their presidential candidates -- which are objects of positive and negative popular feeling in varying degree. What is more, the grounds of favorable and unfavorable response involve a multiplicity of foreign and domestic issues, advantage or disadvantage of various social groups, the personal attributes of the presidential nominees, and so on. To assess the cognitive and affective content of these responses, the Center has begun each of its pre-election interviews with a very extended sequence of free-answer questions about the parties and candidates. Although the full qualitative variety of answers to these questions is carefully preserved in coding, the analytic use of this material makes some kind of data reduction mandatory. Accordingly, the partisan direction and frequency of responses have been used to place each sample respondent on several scales of attitude toward the actors of presidential politics. The simplest analysis has used four such scales, corresponding to the two

⁶This explanation is developed by Angus Campbell in "Surge and Decline: A Study of Electoral Change," <u>Public Opinion Quarterly, 24</u> (1960), pp. 397-418, and Chapter 3 of Campbell <u>et al., Elections and the Political Order</u> (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966), pp. 40-62.

⁵This effort is discussed most fully by Philip Converse in "The Concept of a Normal Vote" Chapter 1 of Angus Campbell <u>et al, Elections and</u> <u>the Political Order</u> (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966), pp. 9 - 39.

parties and two candidates, but it is at times useful to reorganize the material so as to form a somewhat larger number of scales, corresponding to the different grounds of evaluation of the parties and candidates.

Despite the exceeding variety of the attitudes which are involved in presidential voting, the elector must come in the end to a single preference. To resolve these final preferencesand the electorate's ultimate choice--into a set of attitudinal components we have combined the several dimensions according to a linear probability model whose weights could be estimated as the coefficients of a multiple regression equation. Multiplied by the displacement of the sample mean from the theoretical neutral point of a given dimension, the partial regression coefficient associated with the same dimension provided an estimate of how much the dimension had on average increased or lessened the likelihood of individual electors voting in this way. Alternatively, these quantities estimated the extent to which a given dimension had increased or lessened the winning party's majority./

⁷If a respondent's eventual behavior is scored 0 or 1 according to whether he votes Democratic or Republican, and the respondent's position on each of a set of I attitude dimensions is expressed in terms of sample standard deviations about a theoretical origin, the model expresses the probability of the respondent's voting Republican as the linear combination

$$P(R) = b_1 X_1 + ... + b_T X_T$$
.

Therefore, across the whole sample the average extent to which positive or negative attitude on the ith dimension may be said to have increased or lessened the probability of voting Republican depends on two quantities: (1) the coefficient b_i and (2) the displacement, $\overline{X}_i - \overline{X}_i^0$, of the sample mean from the neutral point, \overline{X}_i^0 , of the dimension--that is, from the point where the sample mean would lie if attitude on the ith dimension were not more favorable to one party than the other. Hence the product

$$b_i (\overline{X}_i - X_i^0)$$

is an estimate of the contribution of the ith dimension to the winning majority, a contribution which would be nil either if b, were to vanish or if \overline{X}_i and X_i^o were to coincide. The difference

$$P_{R} - .5 = \sum_{i} b_{i} (\bar{x}_{i} - x_{i}^{o})$$

is the model's estimate of the direction and extent to which the proportion P_R of the two-party vote cast for the Republican candidate will depart from fifty percent or, equivalently, of the direction and magnitude of the winning majority. Applications of the model to the Eisenhower elections are reported in Donald E. Stokes, Angus Campbell, and Warren E. Miller, "Components of Electoral Decision," <u>American Political</u> <u>Science Review</u>, 52, (1958), pp. 367-387; to electoral change over the past four presidential

A model of this kind inevitably involves assumptions, and the extension of this research through time has allowed a more adequate test of these. Especially important was the test of the model's assumption that the individual's placement along the several dimensions of attitude is a sufficient explanation of his voting predisposition, in an immediate psychological sense, and that additional factors, including errors of measurement, have not biassed the probability estimates toward one party or the other Formally speaking, this assumption implies that the estimating multiple regression equation will exhibit a constant term of 0.5. This was true in the Eisenhower elections, but the constant might have been 0.5 as a result of compensating errors. Hence, a good test of this assumption awaited elections in which the tides of politics would flow strongly in the Democratic direction. The test was not long in coming: from the second Eisenhower-Stevenson election to the Johnson-Goldwater contest the two-party division of the vote swung a remarkable 18 percentage points toward the Democrats. In none of the elections of this period did the model's estimate depart from the actual majority by more than two percent; indeed, the correlation of the estimated and actual figures exceeded .98.

The reality of issue beliefs. From the beginnings of survey studies of opinion, investigators have been aware of how frail are the means by which they seek to measure attitude formation in the mass public. Evidence of these frailties is distressingly plain in the changes of opinion that can be induced by subtle changes of question wording, and perhaps even more in the willingness of a portion of a sample to offer opinions on mythical or nonsense issues. Yet the measurement of issue attitudes is essential to the purposes of opinion research. Only if survey studies have a degree of success at it can they help answer some of the largest questions as to the place of the broad public in the political order. Certainly this is true of the questions of popular influence in government. The intercourse of public and political leaders on issues of public policy is a good deal what democratic theory is about.

The need to separate real from unreal opinions has strongly influenced the construction of the Center's political questionnaires. This need helped prompt the use of the free-answer questions to which I have alluded, questions which allow the respondent to talk about the parties and candidates in terms of his own choosing. In the design of more structured issue items these questionnaires went to unusual lengths to allow a respondent to reveal that he had no opinion on the subject rather than choose one or another response among a set of alternatives. This kind of permissiveness, however, did not remove the suspicion that the frequency of nominal responses was more than trifling. Several types of evidence, especially the exceedingly low interrelationship of issue items

contests, in Donald E. Stokes, "Some Dynamic Elements of Contests for the Presidency," <u>American Political Science Review</u>, <u>60</u> (1966) pp. 19-28.

An invaluable opportunity to examine these matters was presented by the panel study from 1956 to 1960. Pains were taken to ask many of the same issue questions in each of the three elections studied. The replies to certain of these questions confirmed the suspicion that nominal or random responses had frequently been given. The telltale indicator that this was true was the remarkable fact that on some issues the opinions held by our sample at the third period of time (in 1960) could be predicted as well from opinion held at the outset of the study (1956) as from opinions held midway (1958). This fact is exceedingly hostile to the view that the turnover of opinion in the sample reflected a change of genuine attitudes: if it had, the fit of 1958's opinions with those of 1960, or of 1956's opinions with those of 1958, would almost certainly have been closer than the fit of opinions held four years apart. In fact, the only plausible model of change which could account for the findings was one in which a part of the sample could be said to have real and stable opinions, the rest to have made a random selection among the opinion alternatives offered by the interviewer. What is more, the size of the sub-sample having authentic opinions in some cases was astonishingly small. For example, government provision of electricity and housing, questions which have attracted political debate at least since the time of the Roosevelt New Deal, apparently were matters of genuine attitude formation for something like one respondent in six, whereas almost five in six had volunteered an opinion in the initial interview. What my colleague, Philip Converse, has called "non-attitudes" proved to be a most obtrusive element of these data.

THE CHANGING FOCUS OF RESEARCH

The longitudinal character of these studies has had a pervasive influence on the focus of research as well. Beyond the specific contribution to the development of explanatory models which I have tried to illustrate by several main examples, the extension of this work through time has had a number of critical side-effects. None of these is tightly determined by the lengthening time interval of the research, but in each case the extension through time has been a natural prelude to a new emphasis of these studies.

First of all, the fact that a series of elections has been encompassed within a single program of research inevitably has shifted attention from the individual voter to the electorate as a whole. The thought and action of the molecular citizen have not been lost sight of; the social and political variation afforded by a series of elections in fact has aided the refinement of models used to explain individual

The findings which I have touched, and the methods by which they are derived, are very fully discussed in Philip E. Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics," in <u>Ideology and Discontent</u>, David E. Apter, ed. (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964),pp.206-61 voting behavior. Rather, the extension of research over a number of elections has encouraged the development of related models which utilize what is known of individual behavior to deal with election outcomes as whole events. This is specifically true of the models of long- and short-term influences on the electorate to which I have referred.

Second, the extension of research to a number of elections has strengthened the sense of obligation to describe contemporary electoral history. This descriptive purpose in no sense conflicts with the theoretical purpose of developing explanatory models. On the contrary, the use of a correct model to explain an election outcome can be regarded as a form of description. In the giving of this sort of historical account, as so much else, nothing is so practical as a good theory.

Third, the interplay of theoretical and descriptive purpose in the historical present has deepened our interest in the past. This interest is partly a matter of looking for additional events to which current explanatory models apply. For example, the model of differential drop-out from the presidential electorate which will produce a loss of strength for the president's party in the following mid-term election can be used to account for an aspect of national party competition which has been present with remarkable consistency during the hundred-year life of our modern party system. Yet the interest in the past is also a matter of wanting to be clearer about the aspects of the present which need explaining; if, for example, the competition of parties since the Civil War gives unmistakable evidence of the presence of forces restoring the strength of the "weaker" party, we can pursue more diligently a search of contemporary data for clues as to the nature of these forces.⁹ The interest in the past is a matter too of wanting to know the limits of the empirical domain to which contemporary models apply. Although the background of electoral behavior is much more varied over a twenty-year span of politics than it would be in a single or a very few elections, one era in one country will exhibit only limited differences in respect to things which are of great importance to voting. Having recourse to the past is a way of escaping these bonds, however difficult it may be to recapture historical materials equivalent to the data of contemporary research.

Fourth, the desire to analyze electoral behavior under broad changes of background factors, a desire strongly encouraged by the extension of research through time, has led naturally to a quest for comparative material. The politics of a single nation, even if traced over several historical periods, can hardly yield up more than

⁹ This sort of intercourse of survey and historical data in fact led me to review with Gudmund Iversen the evidence that powerful equilibrating forces must have operated in the American party system. See Donald E. Stokes and Gudmund R. Iversen, "On the Existence of Forces Restoring Party Competition," <u>Public Opinion</u> Quarterly, 26 (1962), pp. 159-171.

a limited variety in the political institutions and social structure which have such pervasive effects in electoral behavior. The yield can be increased by comparative analysis of electoral politics in nations whose social and institutional structure differs from our own. Accordingly, over a period of years the Survey Research Center has sought to carry forward analyses of this kind, and members of our group have collaborated with foreign scholars in projects for which the research site has variously been France, Norway, Great Britain, Canada and other nations.¹⁰

Finally, several of these developments have given new prominence to questions about the place of the electorate in the political system as a whole. The shift from micro- to macro-analvsis and the search for social and institutional variation across time and national boundaries have enhanced our interest in the electorate's role within a wider political order. The party system has been a natural focus of this interest, and attention has been given the pervasive influence of the party milieu on voting, as well as the effects that voting behavior may have on the party system itself. Attention has also been given to institutional relationships that may link the electorate to other actors in the political system, especially the relationship of legislative representatives to their mass constituencies. This work has itself had a comparative aspect, and some of the design of a study of representation in the American Congress, undertaken in the 1950's, has been incorporated into a study of representation in the British Parliament.¹¹ Plans have been drawn to extend this comparative institutional analysis to other nations as well.

PATTERNS OF USE

The developments which I have touched characterize the work of the political research group at the Survey Research Center. I ought not to close, however, without mentioning the extent to which the Center's data have become a common resource of a much larger group of political scientists and scholars in related disciplines. As the Center's electoral series extended to more and more elections, an increasing number of requests were received for access to the data, requests which the Center sought to honor in a variety of ways.¹²

¹²For example, two summer institutes for interested political scientists were held at the Center during the 1950's under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council.

By the end of the 1950's a number of important publications had reported secondary analyses by scholars outside the Center's staff.13 In time, however, the volume of requests, as well as the requests for training in data analysis, became so great that some new basis for sharing these data was needed. Accordingly, the Center joined with a number of other universities in forming an Inter-university Consortium for Political Research which would organize the archiving and use of data and training in their analysis. Over the three years of its life, the Consortiums membership has increased rapidly, and seventy-six North American and European institutions now are associated with the Survey Research Center in this way. Once the Consortium's archive had been created, it was expanded to include data collections other than the Center's electoral studies. 14 This archival work has been generously supported by the National Science Foundation, and a committee of the American Historical Association has helped guide a vast extension into antique American election returns, reported by county, back to the early years of the last century. The frequency of requests for data from member institutions has reached a very high level indeed: in the year from July 1965 to June 1966 several hundred distinct requests were processed by the staff.

The emergence of the Consortium as a datasharing device clearly has widened the use of the Center's voting data as a resource for the study of American elections. Indeed, our desire to share these materials widely has led us to distribute to member universities the data gathered from each new election as soon as they are in machine-readable form, rather than reserving them until a primary analysis has been completed in Ann Arbor. This practice was followed in 1962 and again in 1964. It will be followed in the 1966 study now being prepared. Increasingly a whole profession has joined in the design and analysis of the Center's electoral studies.

¹³A partial list might include Morris Janowitz and Dwaine Marvick, <u>Competitive Pressure</u> and <u>Democratic Consent</u> (Ann Arbor: Institute of Public Administration, 1956); Heinz Eulau, <u>Class and Party in the Eisenhower Years</u> (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962); Robert E. Lane, "Political Personality and Electoral Choice," <u>American Political Science Review, 49</u> (1955) pp. 173-90; and Robert Agger, "Independents and Party Identifiers: Characteristics and Behavior in 1952," in <u>American Voting Behavior</u>, Eugene Burdick and Arthur J. Brodbeck, editors (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959), pp. 308-329.

¹⁴The list of additional studies would include the data from Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, <u>The Civic Culture</u>; Robert A. Dahl, <u>Who</u> <u>Governs</u>; Arthur S. Banks and Robert B. Textor, <u>A Cross-Polity Survey</u>; Bruce M. Russett <u>et al</u>., <u>World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators</u>; John C. Wahlke, Heinz Eulau, William Buchanan, and Leroy C. Ferguson, <u>The Legislative System</u>; Samuel A. Stouffer, <u>Communism</u>, <u>Conformity</u>, and <u>Civil Liberties</u>; U. S. Bureau of Census, <u>County</u> and <u>City Data Books</u>, <u>1952</u>, 1956, <u>1962</u>.

¹⁰Several of the papers which have issued from these collaborations are collected in Angus Campbell <u>et al.</u>, <u>Elections and the Poli-</u> <u>tical Order</u>. Op. cit.

¹¹Selected findings of the American representation study appear in Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes, "Constituency Influence in Congress," <u>American Political Science Review</u>, <u>57</u> (1963), pp. 45-56.