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Political Science is not a single, homogenous field. Within the broad area of the study of politics, there are many possible routes one could choose to take in order to find an answer to the same question. This paper is an attempt to unite several approaches to the study of politics in the search for an understanding of one small aspect of political life. Rather than viewing different aspects of political science as distinct, separate schools of thought, the primary argument presented here is that many different approaches to one question can each give valuable insights which will lead to an understanding more complete than any one school could offer. While reading this paper, remember that it is inspired and built by an analysis and understanding of political theory. Although theory receives very little space on these pages, it is the analysis of theory which provides the insights into the empirical study of politics presented here. By applying the broadest range of ideas available to me to one very specific question, I hope to provide new insights, both into the use of research data, and into the relationship between theory and practice.

Within pluralist theory, there is room for the existence of a substantial group of citizens whose lack of interest in politics causes them to have very vague or even inconsistent political preferences. Within theories which describe the operation of democracy as a process of elite group competition for available power, the importance of a buffer
of relatively apathetic citizens is stressed. In fact, many theories of the rise of mass societies cite the destruction of such a buffer as essential to the rise of fascism. Part of the analysis presented here stems from an observation that some voting studies tend to disregard the significance of such a group.

Considerations of theories of political education and socialization also played an important role in the development of the analysis presented here. Knowing why different groups of citizens use different groups of criteria when evaluating presidential aspirants would be helpful to the continued development of theories of the role of education in shaping the future of a polity. Existing theories of political education already provide insights into the possible pitfalls of a society which stresses the blind acceptance of authority. While the existence of an apathetic group is seen as necessary, the ability of an elite to mobilize such a group could be very dangerous. If the mass media is capable of mobilizing apathetic, disenfranchised, and disinterested groups of citizens, it could be a powerful weapon in the hands of a potential fascist.

The possibility that a significant group of citizens choose presidential candidates on the basis of criteria other than interest group competition has profound impact on pluralist conceptions of the role of elections in U.S. democracy. What if people who are neither apathetic, misinformed, nor irrational, choose to vote for the candidate
Who they believe to be the most honest, experienced, intelligent leader? If such a group does exist, what impact is it having on the outcome of elections?

Considerations of theory provided insights into the empirical study of election behavior, and the empirical study of election behavior has the potential to provide insights into theory. Thus, the arguments presented here are specific and limited in scope; the reasons for presenting them are as numerous and diverse as are the fields of political science.

Ken J. Fairfax
April 16, 1981
more than any others, two theories of democratic behavior have shaped both our understanding of the role of presidential elections and the research that has been used to examine that role further. Those two theories are the pluralist conception of American democracy and Downs Economic Theory of Democracy (1957). [1]

The first section of this paper deals with the concept of the proximity index, which is a commonly used operationalization of the Downsian issue voting model.

The second section follows a path set by many previous researchers, arguing that if an individual chooses a candidate for any reason other than issue proximity, including party loyalty or even a simple emotional response, that individual could alter his/her responses to survey questions so as to exhibit a high degree of issue alignment.

[1] In one sense, Downs’ theory can be seen as a subset of pluralist thought, since the economic model assumes pluralist tendencies to exist in the electorate. If people believed that they would receive the maximum possible benefit by choosing the most experienced leader, the most sincere, honest candidate, or the most intelligent person, then there would be no reason to put issue stands and issue proximities into a utility maximization equation. Of all possible reasons for voting for or against a candidate, only the decision to vote in accordance with issue preferences fits into the Downsian model of voter behavior. Downs assumes that the U.S. does operate under a pluralist system, and thus voters seek to maximize their utility by voting for the candidate who most closely favors those issues they themselves favor.
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With the favored candidate. The second section also examines the impact of a lack of adequate measures of salience on election research.

The third section takes a large step by attempting to show that it is possible for individuals to agree with a candidate on issues because that individual has been influenced by other factors. If, for some reason other than the analysis of the content of the issue, an individual decides that some issue stand is good, or that some candidate is "right", the individual would exhibit a high degree of candidate issue alignment. It is important to note that such an individual would not meet the requirements of the Downsian model since the decision to agree with a certain candidate was not made on the basis of an understanding of the issues and of the candidates' stands on them. This paper argues that there are several factors not considered by the Downsian model of voter behavior which can influence the voting decision of the individual. In addition, these influences can lead people to respond to research questionnaires in such a manner as to cause the Downsian researcher to believe that the respondents are issue voters even if they make voting decisions on the basis of totally different criteria.

The fourth section of this paper is a simple argument, based on the arguments presented in the second and third sections, on why it is possible that the proximity index does not adequately operationalize issue voting. In addition,
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even complex schemes of factor analysis, which include all determinants of the vote, may lead to misleading conclusions if the assumption is made that anyone exhibiting a high degree of issue-vote alignment is voting on the basis of an understanding of the issues.

The fifth section of this paper presents two models of voting behavior which examine specific implications of the Downward model. The models and tests are designed to demonstrate that the assumption that correlations between a proximity index and the vote are measures of issue voting is inconsistent with the data.[2] The third model examines the impact of perceptions of the candidates' personal qualities on the voting decision.

[2] The data used in this paper were provided by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Science Research, as ICPSR 1361, and were originally collected by the Center for Policy Studies of the Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan under grants from the National Science Foundation and the National Institute for Mental Health. I am solely responsible for all of the analyses presented here and their interpretation.
Section I

I THE PROXIMITY INDEX

The proximity index is a widely used tool for answering one of the classic questions in the scientific study of presidential voting behavior: To what extent do voters make voting decisions in accordance with their policy preferences? [3]

In the 1950's, the test to determine the extent of issue voting did not actually use the relationship between an individual's issue stands and those of the candidates. Instead, a series of tests were used which were designed to separate the issue voters from other voters. To qualify as an issue voter, an individual must first be aware of the issues facing the nation and must have opinions on them. In addition, the individual must know the present government stand on the issues in question and see a difference between...

[3] The large amount of attention focused on the correlation between issues and the vote is understandable in light of the emphasis placed on the role of the "informed electorate" in American political theory. Although it is true that heavy emphasis was placed on education and an informed electorate by the founding fathers, it does not necessarily follow that a knowledge of all campaign issues is important. Arguments by Madison would suggest that the opposite is true. (Federalist, No. 10) Perhaps the level of information which they had in mind was of a more simple and personal nature - people need to know if they are happy or unhappy; in a rural society, they need to read in order to know if we are at peace or at war and in order to know what prices to expect for their crops in the market. Perhaps the model of voter behavior which Madison and Jefferson had in mind was very similar to Benjamin Page's "selection of a benevolent leader" (1978: Ch. 10), in which case it has taken political science 200 years to come back to where it started.
the two parties' stands on the issues (Campbell, et al., 1960: Ch. 6). By 1969, the correlation between individuals' issue stands and their vote became the measure of issue voting (Converse, et al., 1969).

Both of these methods of examining the extent of issue voting are inadequate when measured by the criteria of the Downs model of voter behavior (1957). Measuring the correlation between voters' issue stands and their votes does not adequately deal with the complexity of the concept being measured; what needs to be measured is the degree of agreement between the voter and the respective candidates on important issues. A more elaborate model of issue voting was developed in which the individual has a preferred course of action on an issue on which the candidates have taken stands. The voter then looks at the issue stands of the candidates, compares them to his/her own, and decides who is closer, and therefore whom to vote for in the coming election (Davis and Hinich, 1966; Davis, Hinich, and Ordeshook, 1970; Riker and Ordeshook, 1968). The proximity index is an attempted operationalization of this model. The proximity index used in this paper has been accepted and used by the Center for Political Studies beginning with their analysis of the 1972 National Election Study (Miller, 1976; Miller and Miller, 1975; Miller, Miller, Raine, and Brown, 1976).

Calculating the proximity index is rather simple.
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Respondents are asked to describe their stands on selected issues by placing themselves on seven point scales representing views ranging from one extreme to the other. They are then asked to place the presidential candidates on the same scales. By taking the absolute difference between the position of the respondents and the positions assigned to each of the candidates, we get two scales describing how close the respondents are to each of the candidates. By taking the difference of these two scales, an index is formed representing which candidate each individual perceives as being closer to him/herself.[4] The label "proximity index" represents the fact that the index describes the respondent's relative proximity to the two candidates on the basis of an issue.

In summary, the correlation between an issue proximity index and the vote can be seen as a measure of the degree to which people voted in accordance with their issue preferences, and thus the proximity index is a tool for determining the extent to which people choose candidates on

-----------------

[4] The mathematics of the operation is as follows:

Proximity Index = |SP - PC1| - |SP - PC2|

Where: SP - is the respondent's self-placement on an issue scale.
PC1 and PC2 - are the respondent's placement of the two candidates on the same issue scale.

Positive scores show greater proximity to (less distance from) candidate two negative score show greater proximity to candidate one.
Section I

the basis of issues. The basic argument for the use of the proximity index could be stated as follows: If a person chooses a presidential candidate on the basis of the perceived degree of agreement between him/herself and the candidate, then a proximity index, reflecting the relative closeness of the two candidates' perceived issue stands to the stand of the individual, will be a predictor of the vote. Therefore, the degree of correlation measured between the vote and the issue proximity indexes will be a measure of the degree to which voters make their candidate choices based on the issues being discussed during the election.
Projection and learning are labels assigned to the propensity for the individual to rationalize candidate choice and issue positions. Three opinion items are employed in measuring the correlation between an issue proximity index and the voter's voting decision, the respondent's own stated issue preferences, and the respondent's perceptions of the issue positions of the two candidates. In the Downsian model, the assumption is made that only one item, the voting decision, is a dependent variable. An alternative model of voter response may state that if an individual has already chosen a preferred candidate, then that person is likely to decide to alter his/her responses to the other two opinion items so as to display a high degree of issue alignment. In this model, the vote choice is independent and the respondent's stated perceptions of the issues and the candidates' stands on them is dependent.

If an individual decides to vote for a particular candidate on the basis of some non-issue [7], he/she is likely to feel pressured to appear to have made a rational

[7] What is meant here, and in the rest of this paper, by the term 'non-issue' is simply any determinant of the vote other than policy stands. Although an issue which is not discussed, or one which is decided without public awareness or debate, is often labeled a non-issue, that is not the use of the term employed by this paper.
Section II

decision on the basis of issues.[6] In order to appear as having made a sophisticated, rational choice, all the respondent needs to do is assign policy preferences very similar to the respondent's personal policy preferences to the preferred candidate. This process is usually called "projection." Another method would be for the respondent to alter the reporting of his/her own issue stands so as to align them with the perceived stands of the chosen candidate. This second process is called "learning."

The degree to which candidates utilize the possibility for projection to take place is demonstrated by the ambiguity of their issue stands. By being very unclear about exact issue stands, the candidate allows people to 'fill in the blank' in whatever manner will attract their votes (Page, 1978: Ch. 5). The extent to which issue ambiguity allows for great variety in the perception of candidate issue stands made it possible for voters in the 1972 election to assign every possible issue position to each of the two candidates (Bruner, 1978). Learning is most likely to occur in the case

Voter rationality has long been defined in terms of the extent to which people choose candidates on the basis of issues. The best proof of this point is the fact that when V.O. Key decided to prove that the electorate was indeed "responsible", he did it by showing that issue voting did take place. Cardew and Stimson have recently observed that "the common - indeed, universal - view has been that voting choices based on policy concerns are superior to decisions based on party loyalty or candidate image" (1980:79).
Section II

of the individual who either knows little or cares little about an issue, but does have an idea of where the preferred candidate stands.

The problem is compounded in recent CPS National Election Studies by the fact that interviewers ask questions in an order which greatly increases the potential for projection or learning to occur. After first asking for whom the respondent intends to vote, and then asking the respondent to place him/herself on a thermometer index to describe his/her feelings towards the two candidates, the interviewer then asks who the respondent agrees with on several issues. The question sequence for each of the issues is as follows. First the respondent is asked to place him/herself on an issue position scale, and then the respondent is asked to place each of the candidates on the same scale.

A hypothetical instance demonstrates the flaw inherent in posing questions in that order. Assuming that the individual currently being interviewed has previously decided to vote for one candidate for some reason other than an issue with which the respondent considers very important, the responses to the imaginary interview could proceed as follows. After saying that he/she loves one candidate and hates the other, it would be unlikely for a person to contradict him/herself by agreeing with the hated candidate on many issues. To avoid seeming inconsistent, the respondent could simply alter
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his/her responses to issue questions. The less the respondent knows or cares about the issues, the more likely the possibility of rationalization will occur. The strong implication that issue voting is "rational" which is implicit in the format of the National Election Study serves as a strong motivating device which could cause people to attempt to make themselves appear to have made "rational" vote choices.

Arguments stating that issue projection and learning do affect individuals' responses to survey questions are not new. From the time of the 1948 National Election Survey, at least some researchers have been bothered by the possibility for projection or learning to occur (Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee, 1954:233). The phenomenon which David Repass first described as "a strong tendency toward 'issue alignment' which apparently lends order and meaning to the political world" of the voter (1971:81), he later defines as the propensity for projection and learning to take place (1976:613). The first people to argue that projection and learning cause the proximity index to vote correlation to measure something else besides the degree of issue voting were David Brody and Benjamin Page. They described the tendency toward issue alignment perceived by Repass as being the rationalization of a voter's candidate selection and issue stands which interferes with the measurement of issue-vote correlations. They applied the words "projection"
and "persuasion" to describe the phenomenon (1972:457).

The lack of adequate salience measures for all issues results in a situation where it is nearly impossible to isolate the avenues which might allow for projection or learning to influence the correlations measured between issue proximity indexes and the vote. Issue salience should not be confused with the level of issue-vote correlation. In order to be a determinant of an individual’s vote, a factor must be salient to that individual and the individual must perceive a difference between the candidates on the basis of that factor. A high correlation between an issue proximity index and the vote does not necessarily imply that the issue in question had any significant impact on the outcome of the election. The proximity index and the vote could both be determined by some third factor group, making the measured issue-vote correlation spurious. This third factor group could include many different influences for different groups of people. Anything from party loyalty to agreement on another issue or group of issues, to evaluations of the personal attributes of the candidates, could be a determinant of both the proximity index and the vote. Measures of issue salience could allow researchers to determine if one factor is of such importance to a group of individuals as to suggest that the respondents in that group rationalized their other responses on the basis of that one factor.

If a respondent agrees totally with a candidate on an
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issue which is of vital personal importance to that respondent, he/she may either base his/her own issue positions on other issues on those of the candidate, or he/she may base his/her perception of the candidate's other issue positions on the respondent's own positions. In a similar manner, a respondent could alter all of his/her issue stands on all of the perceived issue stands of the candidates on the basis of a closeness to one candidate on some non-issue. If adequate measures of issue salience were available, it would be possible to check for the possibility of projection or learning caused by a strong issue agreement on an important issue by determining if one issue was of such importance as to suggest the likelihood of the biased reporting of all other issues. Since non-issues are not measured in the same manner as are issues, even the aid of a salience measure would be inadequate if the most important reason for a person to choose a particular candidate was a non-issue.

Other data which might be useful in operationalizing issue voting are difficult to use in their current form. Questions asked concerning what the respondent perceives as the most important issues facing the U.S., and the open-ended questions concerning what a respondent likes or dislikes about the candidates, are both potentially useful. The "most important issues" questions are a measure of issue salience and the open-ended questions allow for people to express
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reasons for voting other than issues.

Two problems prevent the most important issue questions from being as useful as they could be. First, there is not a high degree of correspondence between the issues presented to the respondent in that section of the survey and those issues on which the proximity indexes are based. In 1976, only three issues upon which proximity indexes can be calculated were included in some form in the list for the respondent to choose as the most important. [5] What is needed is for the same issues to be included in the list of the most important issues as are included in the list upon which all the necessary information to construct proximity indexes is collected.

The second problem with the "most important issues" questions is that only one non-issue, honesty, is included among the options. It would be necessary to measure the importance of an entire range of non-issue qualities which could affect the vote choice.

Although the open-ended questions where the respondent is asked what he/she likes and dislikes most about each of the candidates do allow people to express both the perceived difference between the two candidates on non-issue areas and the importance of these areas, the data is not in a form

[5] All variables used in this analysis will be introduced in Section 7, along with their ICPSR variable numbers.
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compatible for use with the issue proximity indexes.

The decision to measure some variables on uniform scales and on variables with limited response options while other variables are measured using open-ended questions rests on assumptions concerning how the data collected will be used. Measuring correlations which may exist between two scale variables, or between two variables with limited response options is statistically rather simple. However, measuring the relationship between a variable containing responses to an open-ended question and a scale variable is very difficult. The lack of similarity in the structure of the two variables presents large problems for the researcher. A group of variables measured using the same technique are interchangeable during analysis. This means that the same statistical routine used to measure the correlation between one issue proximity index and the vote could be used to measure the same relationship between all proximity indexes and the vote. That same statistical routine would be totally inappropriate for determining the relationship between the response to an open-ended question, such as what in particular the respondent likes about Carter, and the vote.

Variables which can be used easily with one another can be said to exhibit a high degree of correspondence, and variables which are very difficult to use together in the same analysis are said to exhibit low correspondence. Thus, although the open-ended question which asks the respondent
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what are the most important issues facing the nation could be
used to determine the salience of an issue proximity index to
the voter, the lack of correspondence between the two
variables makes it difficult, if not impossible, to use the
open-ended question for that purpose. The possible responses
to the open-ended question are too varied to allow themselves
to be grouped into simple categories to measure the salience
of a specific single issue.

In summary, there exists the possibility for projection
and learning to bias the data collected in the CPS National
Election Study. The order in which the questions are
presented to the respondent, the lack of uniform measures of
salience, and the lack of correspondence between various
types of data, all combine and result in a situation where it
is easy, and likely, for respondents to rationalize issue
responses to fit a voting choice, and where it is not
possible to control for that tendency. The format of the
study is such that it facilitates the tendency of the
respondent to actively alter response data in order to appear
"rational."
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III NON-DOWNSIAN INFLUENCES ON THE VOTING DECISION

Of the three opinion items involved in the proximity index (the respondent's voting decision, the respondent's personal issue preferences, and the respondent's perceptions of the issue stands of the respective candidates), only one, the voting decision, is considered to be a dependent variable by the Downsian model of voting behavior. This section takes a radical departure from many models of voting behavior by arguing that it is possible that respondents' personal issue stands and their perceptions of the candidates' issue stands are actually dependent variables.

Within the framework of the spatial model provided by *An Economic Theory of Democracy* (Downs, 1957), there is no room for the presidential election campaign to influence individuals' perceptions of the candidates' issue stands. However, the behavior of presidential aspirants in organizing huge and elaborate organizations designed to aid their ascent to the White House would tend to suggest that the campaign is the secret to success. Individual's assessments of the honesty and competence of the respective candidates also lie well outside of the narrow limits of the Downsian model, but it is hard to imagine anyone voting for a candidate who is perceived to be dishonest and incompetent, no matter what issue positions the candidate adopts. These two influences on the individual's perception of the
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candidates and the issues are very dissimilar, but they have in common the fact that neither will be considered in a strict Downsian analysis of an individual's vote choice. In addition, any researcher who chooses to examine the relationship between any issue, or all issues, and the vote without giving due consideration to other influences on the respondents' perceptions of the issues and the candidates' stands on them may be examining only a narrow slice of the entire voting picture, which could lead to very inaccurate conclusions. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate that political theory and practice both show that routes do exist by which non-issue considerations can influence the citizens' perceptions of the issues, the candidates, and the candidates' stands on those issues.

One of the founders of the modern study of presidential electoral behavior, Paul Lazarsfeld, concluded that the campaign did indeed influence the final voting decision of many people in the 1948 presidential election. "In the last analysis, more than anything else, people can move people.... The side which has the more enthusiastic supporters and which can mobilize grass-roots support in an expert way has great chances of success." (1948:158) Erie county, Ohio, clearly stood outside a world where spatial models of candidate competition based on issue stands describe the operation of voting in a democracy.
Section III

In more recent elections, researchers have been emphasizing the manner in which the campaign process, commonly called the election game, influences individuals' perceptions of the candidates. In *Choices and Echoes in Presidential Elections* (1978), Benjamin Page presents a very convincing analysis of electoral behavior in which the role of the media, the role of ambiguity in the statement of policy stands, the role of the news in presenting the entire election as if it were a giant horse race, and other varied influences, all play important roles in the eventual outcome of the election. He argues that neither economic nor party competition models of democracy adequately represent the process by which the nation's leader is actually chosen by the people, and propose an model called "selection of a benevolent leader" (1978: Ch. 10). In this conception of the role of elections in U.S. democracy, the concept of the "informed electorate" assumes a definition considerably different from that used by Downs. In Page's model, the informed individual is able to answer questions such as: "Am I better off or worse off than I was four years ago?" and "Does this candidate look in the same general political direction that I do?" rather than voting on the basis of the level of agreement between him/herself and the two candidates on the specific policy questions being discussed in the election, Page's voter choose a candidate on the basis of very personal experiences, general agreement on political
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ideology, and appraisals of which candidate is "best."

The effect of the electronic news media on individuals' perceptions of the candidates and on the election process as a whole has led some researchers to develop a conception of voter behavior in which the entire election is one giant race in which candidates are being evaluated on how well they play the game (Patterson and McClure, 1976; Patterson, 1980). The media image of the election game results in the voters placing emphasis on candidate images, perceptions of winners and losers, and events rather than issues (Patterson, 1980: Part IV).

The importance of playing the game correctly is dramatically emphasized by the rise of political consultants. The political consultant is the media wizard who orchestrates every move of the campaign so as to create and project a consistent image of the candidate which emphasizes to the public those points which may help to win the election while it down-plays those qualities of the candidate which may act to detract from the popularity of the candidate. Candidates' decisions to hire professional political media consultants to manage every aspect of their campaign, including when to speak on an issue and how to word the position to be expressed, does not prove that playing the game correctly will win an election, but it does demonstrate that the people most directly concerned with the outcome of the election, the candidates themselves, believe that they can influence the
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election's outcome by outplaying their opponents. If media did not influence the end result of the election, why would candidates hire people to run a political campaign whose sole political expertise is mass political communication through the national media? The rise of the importance and influence of the media in presidential elections has directly resulted in the rise of the political consultants (Agranoff, 1972; Paletz, 1978; Erikson, Luttbeg, and Tedin, 1980; Crotty and Jacobson, 1980; Patterson, 1980; Davis, 1980).

Perhaps the most convincing arguments in favor of recognizing the profound impact of the media on the outcomes of elections are the statements of the political consultants who earn their living by helping politicians to win elected office. The political consultant realizes that not only issues will affect the outcome of the election, but that how and when they are presented, how they are mixed with other qualities, how often the public is reminded of the candidate, and many other small but influential details will all have an effect on the voters' final perceptions of the candidates. In his book, The Election Game and How to Win It, long time political consultant Joseph Napolitan describes his job as that of a specialist in political communication (1972:2). In order to maximize the probability of a candidate being elected, the consultant will attempt to devise the scheme of distribution of available resources, such as time, money, image of the candidate, news media, etc., which will most
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perfectly fit the challenge presented by that particular election. Candidates are Napolitan because they realize that although he will not affect them as individuals and he will not change their issue stands, they are more likely to win an election with his help than without it.

The content of the issues at stake will decide the outcome of the election under an economic model of democratic elections; there is no room in that model for the package in which those issues are placed to have an effect on the vote. The fact is, a majority of information which people receive about the candidates through the news media, their number one source of information, deals with the election game and not substance or the content of the issues (Patterson, 1980: Part II). In addition, the information which the candidates give about themselves through their advertisements or speeches presents issues not as sheer content, but as part of a picture. The issue is presented briefly within the context of a message of political statesmanship (Page, 1978: Ch. 6). The complete political package offered to the public contains issue stands, political ideology, and pleas to party loyalty mixed with entertainment, sensationalism, and national pride. A speech on economic recovery which is broadcast during prime time from a section of the South Bronx which looks like it has been subjected to numerous air raids conveys more to the electorate than an isolated policy statement.

The net result of these influences is that the
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possibility exists for an individual's perception of the candidates' issue stands to be based on qualities other than their policy content. An individual may agree with a candidate's issue position because it was presented in a very emotionally appealing manner, or because it is a "winning" stand. Only the person who views all issues and all candidates' issue stands in terms of their pure policy content, and who is completely unaffected by the manner in which the information is presented, fits into the Downsian model.

Although Robert Dahl is probably correct that the current fashion seems to be to assume that any political theory written before the Second World War is rubbish (1956:123), fashions sometimes run counter to wisdom. The normative assessments of the candidates by the individual must and should influence the eventual voting decision.[8] Normative assessments of the candidates, including judgment

---

[d] Without resorting to theories based upon natural law or the natural aristocracy, it is still possible to see the importance of electing a person who will behave in a rational and honest manner once in office. Perceptions of personal qualities such as leadership may simply be media images to some people, but they could also represent very real and very carefully considered assessments of the qualities of the presidential candidates. Since the power of the President to affect the national mood lies not only in the issues which he/she may pursue but also in the character and direction of the leadership and administration which the President gives to the nation and the power structure surrounding the President, electing a "good" person to the job is essential. Although issues are important in the campaign, the character of the candidate and leadership qualities and honesty he/she
as to the candidates' honesty, cool-headedness, public spirit, and dedication, were stressed as valuable by authors from the founding period. In Thomas Jefferson's view, electing the person most likely to provide for the good of the entire nation is the purpose of an election.

Jefferson not only assumed that each individual, when given the proper political environment, would vote for the candidate who is most likely to benefit the entire nation, he also assumed that people should vote in such a manner. For Madison, it was not true that the best method for finding what is best for the whole is to add up the total of what is best for each specific group. As long as each group decided on its preferences on the basis of narrow self-interest, how could the net result of all group preferences be anything but a collection of narrow self-interests? Jefferson's conception of a natural aristocracy provided an alternative method for deciding upon the optimal action for the nation as a whole. Madison and Jefferson disagreed on many points, but both strongly agreed that by electing people to public office who are honest and truly sensitive to the needs of all Americans, the causea course for the United States could be plotted free from the harmful effects of small groups' self-
interest. While examining Jefferson's and Madison's conceptions of elections in the political order it is crucial to remember that they never tried to separate the normative and positive aspects of theory. People should vote for the natural aristocracy because that is what will ultimately lead to the greatest good for all. People do vote for the natural aristocracy because, given a set of choices, it is only logical to vote for the 'best' candidate. In 1831, in a letter to John Adams, Jefferson summed up his feelings on why he believed in the wisdom of the new Constitution.

The natural aristocracy I consider as the most precious gift of nature for the instruction, the trusts, and government of society.... day we not even say that the form of government is best which provides the most effectively for a pure selection of these natural aristocracies into the offices of government? (Dumbauld, 1955)

If citizens still behave as Jefferson believed they should, then it is possible that the causality assumed between issue stands and the vote is false. People may like a particular policy because the candidate who advocates it is a wise, honest person who advocates it because it is best for the nation.

A political order in which citizens can agree with candidates' issue stands without even knowing the content of those stands is neither Pluralist nor Downsian. Both theories assume that decisions to agree with candidates'
issue stands are based upon an informed analysis of only the content of those stands. There are ample reasons to suspect that for many people, neither interest group competition nor utility maximization are the sole determinants of the voting decision.
Section IV

IV THE PROXIMITY INDEX AS A COMPLEX MEASURE OF INTERDEPENDENT FACTORS

The fact that researchers do choose to analyze elections in terms of the impact of the media and the election game, the fact that political consultants play such an active role in political campaigns, and the fact that normative judgments of the candidates by the voter can influence the vote choice of all stand in sharp contrast to a model in which candidates win or lose on the basis of the issues they support. If these factors are influencing the decisions of the voters, how are they influencing the data collected in the CPS National Election Study? One route by which these factors could find expression is through either active or passive projection and learning as described in the previous sections. What this implies is that the issue proximity index may not be a pure measure of the relative closeness of the voter to the two candidates on the basis of some certain issue. Projection and learning transform the proximity index into a measure of the end result of a complex system of perception.

All of an individual's issue stands could be influenced by the context in which the issues were presented, as could all of the individual's perceptions of the candidate's issue stands. The campaign can influence personal issue stands by presenting issues in certain manners and with different
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amounts of emphasis. It can also influence individuals' perceptions of candidates and their issue stands. Similarly, beliefs as to the honesty, leadership ability, rationality, and competence of the candidates can influence the individual's perceptions of candidates' issue stands and the individual's own issue stands. All information must be filtered through the mind of the individual, where it will be influenced by all of the other information available on the subject, on its way to the data base of the researcher. Perceptions of candidates' issue stands include assessments of the candidates, influences of the campaign, and other factors. Issues are images.

Because the proximity index-vote correlation is a measure of the relationship between a complex system of interdependent determinants of the vote and the vote, Miller, Miller, Haine, and Brown were correct when they argued that there is no way, in a single survey, to determine the extent to which rationalization has affected issue-vote correlations (1976:705). However, just as it is impossible to determine what portion of the issue-vote correlation is due to projection and learning, it is impossible to determine what portion of the correlation is due to actual issue agreement.

Any researcher attempting to treat issues as independent of the many factors which interact to produce the respondent's final perceptions of the candidates' policy
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positions, the respondent's own positions, and the final vote choice, may not be measuring the extent of issue voting, but may instead be measuring the extent to which other factors have controlled the respondent's perceptions of the election. Even the researcher who tries to study all possible determinants of the vote is limited by the lack of measures of salience which could suggest which factors interact in which order to produce the final vote choice.

The problem is not that we know that projection and learning are affecting the measured correlation between the proximity index and the vote, for we do not know that for certain. The problem is not that we know that respondents' issue stands and their perceptions of candidates' issue stands are dependent and not independent variables, for we do not know that for certain. The problem is that we also do not know for certain that the assumptions of the Downsian model are true. We do not know what is true; all we know on the basis of arguments thus far presented is that the Downsian model is not necessarily true.
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V  EPIRICAL IMPLICATIONS

After identifying various models of voter decision making, we must now proceed to devise methods to determine which models, or combination of models, best describes the actual process. It seems most likely that many people do behave as Downsian individuals, but that others do not. The step to be taken is to determine to what extent various types of voting prevail. Although this step is crucial, it is also very difficult to adequately perform. The purpose of this section is therefore very limited. Rather than determining the extent to which various models of voting behavior describe the actual process, this section simply attempts to demonstrate that the American electorate is not a strictly Downsian body.

Although it has been correctly argued that it is impossible, in a single study, to determine the extent to which projection and learning have affected the measured issue-vote correlations, it is the purpose of this section to prove that it is possible to demonstrate that the issue proximity indexes do measure more than the differences between the issue stands of the respondent and those of the candidates. Three different models will be presented, along with three statistical routines and three sets of results. The first two models will test specific implications of the logic behind the use of proximity indexes as vote predictors.
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In each case, the test is designed to demonstrate that the observed relationship is inconsistent with the assumption that the proximity index operationalizes the Downsian model. It will be argued that the reason for this inconsistency is the influence of uncontrolled factors such as the campaign which caused projection and learning to take place. The third test is similar in design to the first two, with one important difference. Rather dealing with the correlation between issues and the vote, it deals with the correlation between non-issues and the vote. Thus, it is a test of a model which stresses the role of non-issues in the presidential election process.

The first test determines the effect of issue saliency on the correlation between proximity indexes and the vote.[9] This first test hypothesizes that some people tend to choose a candidate more on the basis of issue stands than on non-issue qualities, and that non-issues play the predominant role in candidate selection for other people. In other words, issues as a group are more salient to some people than

[9] The three proximity indexes used throughout this section are based upon the following issues: whether the government should insure employment and a good standard of living, whether the tax system should be progressive or uniform, and whether the government should help improve the social and economic conditions of minorities.

The ICPSR variables used to calculate each of the three indexes were, respectively, VAR3241 to VAR3243, VAR3779 to VAR3781, and VAR3264 to VAR3266.
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to others and issue-vote correlations should be higher for those people who place more importance on issues.

MODEL ONE: Issue-vote correlations exist because individuals vote for the candidate whom they perceive as being closer to them on issues. Therefore the magnitude of issue-vote correlations will be higher for those individuals who consider issues to be relatively more important than non-issues in their appraisals of the candidate, and it will be lower for those individuals who place less importance on issues when appraising presidential candidates.

Since the National Election Study provides no direct means of determining the relative salience of issues and non-issues as groups, the testing of the above model is rather difficult. Since respondents were asked by the interviewer "Is there anything in particular about (candidate X) that might make you want to vote for him?", the respondent was provided with an opportunity to evaluate the candidates on the basis of whatever criterion seemed most important. By making the assumption that the individual who places more importance on issues is more likely to describe what he/she likes or dislikes about a candidate in terms of issues, a measure of the salience of issues as a group can be formed from the responses to these questions. On the basis of the model it would be expected

[10] ICPSR variables VAR3112 to VAR3116 contain reasons for liking Carter, and variables VAR3118 to VAR3122 contain reasons for disliking Carter. Reasons for liking and disliking Ford are contained in variables VAR3124 to VAR3128 and VAR3130 to VAR3134, respectively.
that issue-vote correlations will be higher among those individuals who referred to issues while assessing the two candidates than they would be among those people who never mentioned issues when referring to a candidate. The three proximity indexes chosen for use throughout this paper were chosen because they are good predictors of the vote, they have relatively few missing cases, and sufficient information is contained in the data to use these same indexes in all three types of analysis used by this paper.

The results of this analysis do not allow for the acceptance of the model. The magnitude of the correlation between the Tax Rate proximity index and the vote is larger for the 372 people who never mentioned an issue in their appraisals of the candidates than it is for the 488 people who did mention issues. The Somers' D (symmetric) for the two groups are -.344 and -.242 respectively. The same result is true for the most powerful proximity index predictor of the vote, the stand on the government's role in employment. The proximity index to vote correlation for the 642 people who did not mention issues is -.435 while the correlation among the 548 who did mention issues is only -.364.[11] The third index, based on whether the government should give aid

[11] The varying number of valid cases for each of the three proximity indexes is due to the variation in the number of valid cases for the indexes themselves. Out of 2780 total cases, the tax rate proximity index had missing data on 1444 cases, the government role in employment index had missing
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to minorities, follows the exact same pattern. The 610 people who did not mention issues voted with a correlation of -.425 between the index and the vote, while the 539 people who did mention issues voted with a correlation of only -.371.

The fact that the issue-vote correlations decreased in all three cases would tend to support a model stating that the more vital a person considers issues to be in forming his/her opinion of a candidate, the less likely that person is to vote for the candidate who more closely agrees with his/her on individual issues. Unless one is inclined to accept such a contradictory model, it must be presumed that some type of interference in distorting the results. The impact of projection and learning on the correlation could account for the observed relationships. If those people who place little or no importance on issues and instead decide to choose a candidate on the basis of some other non-issue criterion either project their own issue stands onto their favorite candidate, or adopt the stands of their favorite candidate as their own, then the results of this first test are totally logical. The fact that issue-vote correlations were higher for those people who did not mention issues in

data on 969 cases, and the aid to minorities index contained 1049 cases with missing data. Only 1631 cases contain valid data for who the respondent voted for, since the other 1049 people did not vote. All respondents gave at least one reason for either liking or disliking one of the candidates. Of the 2870 cases in the survey, 1760 contained no issue responses, while 1110 cases did contain at least one issue reference.
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their appraisal of the candidates would suggest that they either learned or projected to a high degree. If a person really doesn't know anything about a given issue but feels pressured to appear rational and knowledgeable, then it seems logical that he/she would consistently place him/herself closer to his/her favorite than to the other candidate. Similarly, if an individual chose one candidate on the basis of some non-issue, perhaps that non-issue affected the individual's perceptions of the issues and the candidates' stands on them.

The second method of analysis is similar. This second test determines the effect of the saliency of a particular issue on the issue-vote correlation for that issue. Rather than attempting to determine the saliency of issues as a group, this method uses the respondent's ranking of particular issues to project the magnitude of the issue-vote correlation for individual issues.

**MODEL ONE: Issue-vote correlations exist because individuals vote for the candidate whom they perceive as being closer to them on issues. Therefore the magnitude of the issue-vote correlation for a particular issue will be higher for those persons who stated that that particular issue was of major importance to them than it will be for those people who did not mention the issue as important.**

As mentioned earlier, during a part of the interview the respondent is asked to rank the importance of a list of
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problems facing America.[12] The data from this section contains the ranking of an issue if it was ranked as one of the four most important problems, and otherwise lists the issue as unranked. For this test, an issue is considered salient to an individual if that individual ranked the issue as one of the four most important issues facing America. In all other cases, the issue was considered not salient. The questions which presented the respondent with a limited number of options from which to choose the most important problems were used here rather than the similar open-ended questions. This decision was made because of the need to use data which was relatively compatible with the proximity indexes. Grouping the multitude of responses to the open-ended questions into categories similar in content to the issues in question would have been very difficult, if not impossible.

For two of the proximity indexes this method of analysis leads to the rejection of model two. For the Tax Rate proximity index, the issue-vote correlation for the 699 people who ranked the issue as one of the four most important was .279, while it was .299 for the 361 persons who did not

[12] The responses to these questions are stored in ICPSR variables VAR3722 to VAR3735. The three variables used in this test are VAR3730, the importance of unemployment as a problem facing the nation, VAR3727, the importance of the high tax rate as a problem facing America, and VAR3732, the importance of racial issues. Although the concepts measured by these variables do not match those measured by the proximity indexes exactly, they are the closest matches existing in the data.
list taxes as one of the four most important issues. The correlation between the vote and the government role in employment proximity index is .348 for the 692 people who stated that unemployment was one of the four most important problems, but the correlation is .389 for the 498 people who do not consider unemployment a major issue. The proximity index based on the government's role in giving aid to minorities provides the only exception to the trend. For the only 159 people who ranked racial issues as one of the four most important issues facing America, the issue-vote correlation is .562. For the 991 people who did not consider racial issues important, the correlation was only .370.

For the two issues for which the issue-vote correlation is less for those people who consider the issue important than it is for those people who do not consider the issue important, model two cannot be accepted. We are left with a choice of either believing that people who care less about an issue are more likely to vote in accordance with their issue preferences than those people who consider the issue important, or assuming that data measure something else besides the level of issue voting for those people who do not consider the issue important. Once again, the argument suggests itself that if a person is not concerned with an issue that the person is much more likely to project his/her views onto his/her candidate, or to accept the candidate's
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perceived position as his/her own, than is the person who actually has a strong stand on the issue. If projection and learning are more common among people less concerned about an issue, then the results of this analysis are completely logical. The fact that the one issue for which model two cannot be accepted is characterized by a disproportionately small number of people considering the issue important leads to some observations. Perhaps some issues are of such overwhelming importance to a few persons who are very directly affected by them that the issue-vote correlation is very high for that group. In their analysis of the Wallace candidacy in 1968, Converse, et al., show how one issue or group of issues can differ dramatically from others for a certain group which perceives the issue as very important (Converse, Miller, Jusk, Wolfe, 1969). It could also be the case that minority aid is such an "easy" (emotional, non-substantative) issue for those who feel it is important that either racism, or a hatred of it, cause the observed relationship (Carmine and Stimson, 1980).

In one respect, the third method of analysis is very different from the other two. Rather than testing an implication of the Downsian model, it tests an implication of a model which recognizes the importance of non-issue determinants of the vote. In the same manner as the other two tests, this third method of analysis examines the effect of salience on the correlation between an influence on the
voting decision and the vote. The difference is that in this test, the influencing factor to be examined is a non-issue rather than an issue.

**MODEL THREE:** The correlation between non-issue perceptions of candidates by individuals and the vote exists because people vote for the candidate whom they perceive as better, on some basis other than issues. Therefore the magnitude of the non-issue-vote correlation will be greater for those people who consider non-issues important than it will be for those who do not consider non-issues important.

This third method of analysis is the most difficult to operationalize. As explained earlier, the National Election Survey does not treat non-issues in the same manner as issues. To maintain the similarity with the first two tests, it would be desirable to test this model by studying the effects of salience on a non-issue proximity index comparable to the issue proximity indexes used for the other methods of analysis. By using the responses to the open ended questions which ask what the respondent likes/dislikes about the two candidates, a pseudo-proximity index can be formed.\(^{[13]}\)

By adding one point to a scale for each favorable non-issue...
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reference made to a candidate, and subtracting one for each unfavorable reference, scale variables are formed representing how close the respondent feels to each of the two candidates. By subtracting the non-issue scale for one candidate from the non-issue scale for the other candidate, a proximity index identical in form to the issue proximity indexes can be formed. The correlation between this proximity index and the vote is -.462 with 967 valid cases. The only available measure for the salience of non-issues is located in the section of the survey which asks people to rank the importance of different issues. In agreement with the practice used in the last method of analysis, non-issues are labeled salient if the respondent ranked honesty, a non-issue, as one of four most important issues facing the U.S., and are labeled non-salient otherwise. Now the same test can be applied to non-issues and non-issue salience as was previously applied to issues and issue salience.

The results of this analysis stand in contrast to the results obtained by testing the effects of salience on issue-vote correlations. For the 619 people who ranked honesty as one of the four most important issues facing America, the non-issue to vote correlation is -.486, while it is only -.420 for the 348 people who did not consider honesty an important issue. The model appears to provide

---

[14] ICPSR Variable VAR3726 contains the respondent's ranking of the importance of honesty in government.
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correct predictions.

It is logical that this third model should be accepted for non-issues since projection and learning can not easily influence the non-issue proximity index. If the interviewer first asked which of the two candidates the respondent preferred and then proceeded to ask the respondent to place Carter and Ford on honesty scales, then it would have been much more likely for the respondent to have rationalized his/her responses.
VI CONCLUSIONS

The difficulty with the candidate proximity index measure is that respondents can either project their own issue positions onto their favorite candidate, or rationalize their issue responses by placing themselves close to their favored candidate. (RePass, 1976:814)

Although the results of the first two tests of the proximity index as a measure of issue-vote correlation only demonstrate that the proximity index actually measures something else besides the relative closeness of the two candidate's issue stands to the stands of the respondent, there is good reason to believe that the effects of projection and learning caused the observed relationships. If projection and learning do significantly affect the data collected, as the analysis presented by this paper would suggest, then one could argue that the index should be abandoned.

Although the proximity index has problems, it is a potentially very valuable tool in the analysis of presidential voting behavior. The problem with the index actually stems from its heritage as a tool in operationalizing a simple spatial model of electoral behavior which did not adequately consider the role of other important influencing factors in the final voting decision. By limiting the scope of influences on the vote to be examined using a proximity index to only issues and issue stands,
entire areas of possible influence are ignored.

If Thomas Jefferson had designed the National Election Study, then the respondent would most likely have been asked to evaluate each of the two candidates on the basis of important voting criteria, such as the honesty of the two candidates, or their ability to handle a huge problem which might unexpectedly confront the nation. By following each of those questions with another question asking how important the respondent considers the trait, Jefferson could have devised indexes representing the respondent's appraisal of the two candidates on an entire range of vote determinants with salience measures for each so that he could determine why a given candidate was elected. His indexes would contain a bias caused by the uncontrolled effects of the relative degree of issue agreement existing between the respondent and the candidates and by the influence of the campaign on the respondent's perception of the candidates.

If Joseph Napolitan had devised the National Election Study, he probably would have asked many of Jefferson's questions, plus he would have included questions asking the respondent to rank each of the candidates in terms of how often the respondent heard the candidates mentioned on TV, who the respondent saw as currently winning and losing, and who the newspapers and TV networks seemed to favor. In addition, he would ask questions suited to the individual
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election to see if the aspects of the candidate which he was trying to stress actually came across. In 1976, he probably would have wanted to know how close the respondent felt each of the candidates was to "ordinary people"; how much experience each candidate had; and how clear the issue stands of the candidates seemed to be. By following those questions with simple salience measures, he could have constructed indexes representing how effective the media campaigns of the two candidates had been, with salience measures to determine the relative importance of each. If that is all the information he collected, his data would have contained biases due to the impact of the relative closeness of the candidates' issue stands to those of the respondent.

As the situation exists, neither Jefferson nor Napolitan devised the 1976 National Election Study. The survey does include valuable issue proximity indexes, but it lacks both good salience measures and indexes measuring the respondents' perceptions of the candidates on other important influencing factors.

The issue proximity index, like any other index, is simply a measure of who the respondent prefers on the basis of one factor. While answering questions, all the respondent can be expected to do is to try to separate his/her perception of one aspect of the candidate from all of the other aspects which add up to yield a vote choice. To expect the respondent to be able to perfectly divorce his/her
perception of an issue stand from every other aspect of the presidential race in asking the impossible. Issues do not exist in a vacuum—they exist in a space defined not only by them, but by all of the other determinants of the final voting decision. That space is defined by the influencing factors and its shape is dependent upon all of its components. Issues, images, prejudices, and other factors all influence one another. Only by examining all of them, and the importance attached to each of them, can an accurate assessment of the true reason for the voting decision be made. Any one factor considered in isolation will still contain all of the influences of the other factors.

By placing the issue proximity index in the context of as many other influencing factors as possible, and having a salience measure associated with each, the nature of their interdependencies could be examined. Divorcing the issue proximity index from its heritage and placing it in a context not limited by a narrow conception of what factors should influence the vote could make it a very valuable tool. Although it is not now possible to determine, in a single survey, the extent to which rationalization affects the measured degree of issue-vote correlation, if the survey were altered so as to include much more complete information on all of the factors which influence the final voting decision, then not only could the impact of rationalization on issue-vote correlations be measured, but a model of voting
behavior based more on how individuals actually evaluate the candidates could be formulated.

When coupled with the analysis presented in this paper and the results of the first two tests, the results of the third method of analysis offer convincing evidence that the American electorate is neither strictly Downsian nor strictly pluralist in nature. A model based on all of the arguments and statistical analysis presented here would most likely be a hybrid of already existing models. Although definite Downsian and pluralist tendencies do exist in the electorate, they are not the only models which describe voting behavior. A model which perceives the role of issues midway between the role assigned to them by the Downsian model and the role assigned to them by Page's "selection of a benevolent leader" model (1973: Ch. 19). For a significant group of people, the content of the issues discussed in an election most likely does constitute the primary motivation behind a vote choice, but for another significant group, the analysis of issue content probably play only a very small role in the final voting decision.

The fact that the data available were collected under a design limited by the assumptions of both models makes it impossible to determine just how the electorate does behave. Analyses of voting behavior based on the assumption that the electorate does behave in a pluralist manner, in a Downsian manner, or in any set manner, will never lead to a complete
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understanding of the role of elections in American democracy. Only by carefully devising a data collection system with the aim of measuring all possible determinants of the vote as if all were equally valid reasons for making a voting decision will information be collected which could be used to develop a comprehensive understanding of voting behavior. Such a data base could then be used to test the specific implications of many theories of voting behavior in an attempt to find the theory which best describes the functioning of the presidential electoral process. Theories should not constrain the scope of empirical research, instead empirical research should be used to test the validity of the basic assumptions of theories, and the correctness of the predictions of those theories.
**Summary Tables**

**TABLE ONE**

The Effects of the Salience of Issues as a Group on the Correlation between Proximity Indexes and the Vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity Index</th>
<th>Zero Order</th>
<th>Issues Mentioned</th>
<th>Issues Not Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Rate</td>
<td>-.243</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government in Employment</td>
<td>-.404</td>
<td>-.364</td>
<td>-.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to Minorities</td>
<td>-.401</td>
<td>-.371</td>
<td>-.421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Correlations between Proximity Indexes and the Vote, Controlling for the Salience of the Issue. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity Index</th>
<th>Zero Order</th>
<th>Issue Important</th>
<th>Issue Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Rate</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>-.279</td>
<td>-.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Employment</td>
<td>-.404</td>
<td>-.348</td>
<td>-.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to Minorities</td>
<td>-.401</td>
<td>-.562</td>
<td>-.370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

All correlations are Somers' D Symmetric.

All correlations are significant at the .0001 level.

The numbers in parentheses are the number of valid cases.
### Summary Tables

#### TABLE THREE

The effects of Salience on a Non-Issue Proximity Index.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Condition</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero Order</td>
<td>-0.462 (967 valid cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty Important</td>
<td>-0.486 (649 valid cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty not Important</td>
<td>-0.420 (348 valid cases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Correlations are significant at the .0001 level.
References


Dvorsky, and Sideshaw, Peter. (1970) "An Expository Development of a Mathematical Model of the
References


Patterson, Thomas. (1976) The Mass Media Election. New York:
References

Praeger Publishers.


