

- 
- I. Political campaigns and the voter Pp. 261-67
- A. Major perspectives
1. *Class*-voting: political sociologists at Columbia University
    - a. The People's Choice (1944), Lazarsfeld, Berelson, Gaudet
    - b. Voting (1954), Berelson, Lazarsfeld, McPhee
  2. *Party*-voting: political psychologists at the University of Michigan
    - a. The American Voter (1960), Campbell, Converse, Miller, Stokes
    - b. Theory: the vote division is a function of the shifting balance between long- and short-term forces
      - (1) *Long-term* forces: relatively stable and produce the "normal" [or standing] vote division
        - (a) Party identification
        - (b) Other group identifications strongly related to party id.: especially class and race
      - (2) *Short-term* forces: less stable and produce deviations from the "normal" vote
        - (a) Candidate assessments
        - (b) Issue preferences
      - (3) *Floating voters* are those whose vote choice is determined by short-term forces rather than party identification.
      - (4) The *normal* vote:
        - (a) Definitions:
          - i) Theoretically, a *normal vote* is one in which at least 90 percent of Democratic and Republican party identifiers vote in line with their party identification and Independent voters split 50:50. Figure 9.2, p. 264
          - ii) Operationally, a *normal vote* is approximated by the national vote in U.S. House elections (short-term forces tend to be less and cancelled out across 435 contests). Figure 9.1, p. 263
            - a) Once approximated as 54:46
            - b) Since 1994, closer to 50:50
        - (b) Factors that account for deviations from the normal vote: (short-term forces)
          - i) Nature
            - a) Partisan differences in candidate- and issue-appeals
            - b) Partisan differences in turnout
          - ii) Impact:
            - a) Far greater in presidential than congressional elections
            - b) Often produce split-ticket voting
    - (5) Election classification
      - (a) Realigning elections: produce a new "normal-vote" division with one party dominant: 1824, 1860, 1896, 1932 (2004?)
      - (b) Maintaining elections: outcome reflects current "normal" vote division: 1936, '40, '44, '48
      - (c) Deviating elections: short-term forces cause outcome that deviates from the current normal vote but without changing that normal-vote division: 1952, '56
      - (d) Reinstating elections: return to a normal-vote outcome after a deviating election: 1960
      - (e) De-aligning elections: produce a new "normal-vote" division with neither party dominant: 1968-2008
- B. Short-term forces below the presidential level
1. State & local elections: normal vote reflects partisan balance at that level rather than the nation as a whole
  2. State & local outcomes can be influenced by both national and state/local short-term forces
  3. Short-term forces often result in split-ticket voting

- C. Who are the *floating* voters?
1. Definition: defectors & independents whose vote is not determined by party identification but rather the short-term forces (candidate & issue appeals) in that campaign
  2. Relationship to information flow [Table 9.1, p. 266](#)
    - a. Attentive: easier to reach and more likely to turnout, but more partisan
    - b. Inattentive: less partisan, but harder to reach and less likely to turnout

## II. Policy issues and voters

### A. Assessments

1. Changes in political parties and candidates
2. Changes in electorate
3. Two perspectives
  - a. Negative: [The American Voter](#) (1960), Campbell, Converse, Stokes, and Miller
  - b. Positive: depends on choices offered by the parties & candidates
    - (1) [The Responsible Electorate](#) (1963), V.O. Key, Jr
    - (2) More recent: depends on changes in the electorate as well
      - (a) [The Changing American Voter](#) (1976), Nie, Verba, & Petrocik
      - (b) [The New American Voter](#) (1996) Miller & Shanks
      - (c) [The American Voter Revisited](#) (2008) Lewis-Beck, Jacoby, Norpoth, & Weisberg

### B. Voter perceptions of candidate differences, 2008 [Table 9.2, p. 268](#)

### C. Policy issues, ideology, and votes, 2008 [Table 9.3, p. 270](#); [Table 9.4, p. 271](#); & [Table 9.5, p. 272](#)

### D. Information and ideological voting, 2008 [Figure 9.3, p. 273](#)

### E. Issue voting and candidate advantage [Table 9.6, p. 274](#)

### F. Easy vs. hard issues

1. Group-based voting – race/ethnicity, religion, age, gender, class, etc.
2. Nature-of-the-times voting
  - a. Peace
  - b. Prosperity

### G. Candidate evaluations

1. Trustworthiness
2. Competence

### H. Prediction and causation, 2008 [Table 9.7, p. 278](#)

1. Issue position  $\Rightarrow$  vote decision: necessary and sufficient conditions
2. Vote decision  $\Rightarrow$  issue position
  - a. *Projection*: reducing cognitive dissonance by attributing your own policy preferences to the candidate of your party
  - b. *Rationalization*: reducing cognitive dissonance by changing your own policy preference to match those of the candidate of your party

## III. Explaining election outcomes

### A. Changing retrospective evaluations

1. Party of peace
2. Party of prosperity [Figure 9.4, p. 282](#)

### B. Changing candidate evaluations [Figure 9.5, p. 283](#)

### C. Candidate issue positions: the Anthony Downs model

1. In theory [Figure 9.6, p. 285](#)
2. In practice

## IV. Conclusions