Southern Political Science Association

THE INDEX OF POLITICAL PREDISPOSITION
IN THE 1948 ELECTION[1]

MORRIS JANOWITZ AND WARREN E. MILLER
The University of Michigan

The following article compares some major aspects of two studies made of the behavior of voters in presidential elections. The comparison was made in order to determine whether or not some of the conclusions drawn from one of the studies, the 1940 Erie County, Ohio, study, could be verified in the second study, a 1948 Survey Research Center national study of the election. Such comparisons of similar studies are essential to the progress of social research in that they guard against unwitting selection or exclusion of crucial variables in the studies. Two of the more common sources of such inadvertent selection or exclusion of variables are found in 1) the choice of unique groups of people to study and 2) the carrying out of studies under unique conditions.

For example, the repeated demonstration that racial prejudice among college sophomores may be eliminated or reduced by "education" has too frequently led to the narrow observation that education is the solution for the problem on a national scale. Such a conclusion makes at least two major assumptions, namely 1) that college sophomores are representative of all American people so that what is true for this unique segment of the total population is also true for the remainder of the population, and, perhaps more importantly, 2) that the classroom situation in which education "succeeds" does not differ in any essentials from "more normal" social situations. The extent to which one can generalize from conclusions drawn from classroom studies of college undergraduates must, of course, be probed by studies of other segments of the population in other than classroom situations. In this and other areas of social research, failure to repeat studies may result in accidental control or elimination of those variables which differentiate population segments and may thereby obscure important parts of the total picture or even lead to completely erroneous conclusions.

In this article conclusions drawn from the study of voting be-

havior in Erie County in 1940 are tested by analyzing voting be-
havior in the United States in 1948. The major substantive findings
suggest that some of the conclusions drawn from Erie County in
1940 are, perhaps, somewhat unique to the time and circumstances
of that investigation. Of almost equally great interest is the fact that
new hypotheses are suggested by the peculiar nature of the discrep-
ancies between the 1940 and the 1948 findings. As is suggested at
greater length in the closing section of the article, the primary find-
ings and the pattern of discrepancies are congruent with the notion
that political behavior research must both incorporate more complete
treatment of those variables considered here, and continue the search
for ways and means to deal with the many additional variables long
prominent in the lore of political science.

A significant portion of the Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet
analysis of political behavior in Erie County, Ohio, during the 1940
presidential election hinged on the crucial rôle assigned to the "Index
of Political Predisposition" (IPP).[2] This index sought primarily to
account for the presidential vote in terms of three sociological vari-
ables: socio-economic level, rural-urban residence, and religious dif-
ferences in the adult population. The authors summarized their
analysis of voting correlates with the following observation:

> The greatest part of the predictive value of all these (social)
> factors derives from three factors — socio-economic level, re-
> ligion, and residence. Of all rich Protestant farmers almost
> 75% voted Republican, whereas 90% of the Catholic laborers
> living in Sandusky voted Democratic.

> In order to use these factors in a simple way we constructed
> an Index of Political Predisposition (IPP) so that the re-
> spondents could be classified on a scale ranging from those
> with strong Republican predispositions at one extreme to those
> with strong Democratic predispositions at the other. . . . And
> thus, a simple combination of three primary personal char-
> acteristics goes a long way in "explaining" political prefer-
> ences . . . a person thinks, politically, as he is, socially. Social
> characteristics determine political preference.[3]

In *The People's Choice,* moreover, the authors indicated that the
IPP applies not only to the 1940 Erie County vote, but also has
explanatory value for national political behavior. Specifically, in the

[2]Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Berelson, Bernard, and Gaudet, Hazel, *The People's Choice* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949).

[3]*Ibid.,* pp. 25, 26, 27.

preface of the second edition of *The People's Choice* they discussed the application of the IPP to a 1944 national sample. The limits of the generalization of the index are stated in the following terms:

> . . . an index of political predisposition is less valid when ap-
> plied to a nation-wide sample than when applied to the resi-
> dents of one county. And yet, despite these limitations the
> results of the second study (National Sample Survey 1944,
> NORC) are an almost *afortiori* corroboration of those in the
> first.[4]

The construction and application of the Index of Political Pre-disposition is typical of those social survey analysis procedures in which classification and prediction are dependent on indices constructed from separate personal characteristics or attitudes of respondents. Each of the personal characteristics or attitudes included has some explanatory value. Combination of the relevant correlates is undertaken, consequently, in order to increase the number of respondents whose behavior can be explained in terms of the selected characteristics. Theoretical considerations are not usually paramount in such a method of analysis, although the correlates selected for combination are usually both statistically related and logically plausible in broad theoretical terms.

The Index of Political Predisposition arises from a sociological orientation in which group membership is seen as the basis of political behavior. This index appears to be the focal point for a number of propositions about short-range changes in political attitudes and behavior. The major generalizations from the Erie County report which are relevant to our present discussions can be paraphrased as follows: a) stability of attitudes allows individuals "to avoid or to minimize conflicts and disagreements with the persons in their social environments who share these attitudes";[5] b) changes in attitude which occur during a political campaign tend to increase the political homogeneity of social groups;[6] c) cross pressures (created by conflicts and inconsistencies among the factors which influence a vote decision) act to delay the making of a vote decision;[7] and d) stress created by intense cross pressures may lead to problem avoidance, decrease in interest, and non-participation in voting.[8]

[4]*Ibid.*, p. xvi.
[5]*Ibid.*, p. xx.
[6]*Ibid.*, p. 139.
[7]*Ibid.*, pp. 56, 60.
[8]*Ibid.*, pp. 62, 64.

From these and similar generalizations comes the conclusion that "voting is essentially a group experience." People with similar Index of Political Predisposition ratings tend to form groups; these groups tend to be homogeneous in political outlook and behavior; and changes in individual attitudes during a campaign increase the political homogeneity of these groups.[9]

One research implication of the Index of Political Predisposition, as used in the Erie County study, is that it produces a means for *predicting* the electoral behavior of *all* the members of a given population. However, more recently Lazarsfeld has pointed out that the IPP can be seen as an index to the political behavior of only a portion of the total population. This formulation holds that those individuals who declare their intention to vote either Democratic or Republican are more likely to vote in line with their intentions *if* they have the appropriate Index of Political Predisposition than if their IPP fails to reinforce those intentions.[10] This more limited view of what the IPP might account for excludes from any pre-election analysis those individuals who fail to state a voting intention, usually almost half of the politically relevant national population. In these terms, the IPP is not seen as an index of prediction, but in the narrower frame as a measure reflecting the tendency of individuals who have voting intentions to follow their intentions.

This paper reports on the application of the Index of Political Predisposition to data on the 1948 election gathered by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center. It seeks primarily to test the limits of the IPP rather than to develop new composite group indices of electoral behavior or to elaborate new theoretical explanations. Such new theoretical explanations will of necessity encompass not only indices of the group characteristics of the population, but in addition, consideration of such items as the nature of the political campaign, the existence of partisan affiliation, ideological commitments of voters, the character of the candidates, and the organizational effectiveness of the political parties involved. These elements were not central to the analysis presented in *The People's Choice*, and consequently are absent in this replication.

---

[9]*Ibid.*, Ch. XV.
[10]Personal communication to the authors. Some of the theoretical implications of this view are stated in "Problems of Survey Analysis," by Patricia L. Kendall and Paul F. Lazarsfeld in *Continuities in Social Research*, (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1951).

The results of the replication indicate that the IPP, although it has explanatory value, requires considerable refinement in order to constitute a basis for building an index to electoral behavior which seeks to incorporate the group characteristics of populations. No doubt many political scientists have assumed that the IPP would not apply to the same degree in the United States as it did in Erie County. The evidence cited could be, minimally, the geographical variation in American voting behavior. Such reasoning, although probably fundamentally correct, is rather imprecise. It, as is true of almost all explanations of voting behavior, is based on available data, and the bulk of the existing data on voting behavior in the United States is based on aggregates of people. Only by the use of sample surveys, such as have been employed in this paper, and with ever increasing frequency since the pioneering Erie County study, can data necessary to test the applicability of the IPP or other theoretical constructs be collected on the characteristics of *individual* voters.

Some of the research procedures used in the SRC study differ from those employed in the Erie County study. However, IPP scores were assigned to panel members in Erie County and to respondents in the SRC national sample by similar procedures.[11] And, when the relevant data were analyzed to prepare an Index of Political Predisposition for the 1948 Survey Research national sample, the results indicated a distribution quite similar to that encountered in Erie County. Comparison of basic data distributions, for example Table No. 2 and Table No. 8, provides evidence that elements of the two studies are clearly comparable and that analyses of SRC data can produce a valid replication of crucial portions of the Erie County study.

I

AMOUNT OF PARTICIPATION

Voting and Non-voting: As the authors of *The People's Choice* emphasized, political behavior theory must encompass both partici-

[11]In constructing the Index of Political Predisposition for the SRC sample, certain translations and equivalencies were required. These translations, as well as the schematic description of the procedures for assigning IPP scores, are described in a concluding technical note. The findings of the November, 1948 SRC study are reported in *The People Elect a President*, by Angus Campbell and Robert Kahn, Univ. of Michigan Press, 1952.

TABLE NO. 1

Actual 1948 Presidential Vote
and Reported Vote in SRC Sample

Vote	National Vote (per cent)	SRC Sample (per cent)
Democratic	49.5	50.3
Republican	45.1	42.3
Other	5.4	2.6
Not Ascertained	——	4.8
Total	100.0	100.0

TABLE No 2

Distribution of Index Political
Predisposition Scores

IPP Scores		Erie County (per cent)	SRC National Sample (per cent)
Extreme Republican	1	9	2
Strong Republican	2	18	15
Mild Republican	3	28	28
Weak Democratic	4	19	22
Mild Democratic	5	17	22
Strong Democratic	6	6	9
Extreme Democratic	7	3	2
Total		100	100
No. of cases		(1650)	(528)

pation and partisanship. Explaining the "amount" of political participation, including voting and non-voting, is just as crucial to understanding political behavior as is explaining the "direction" of participation — Democratic or Republican. If the Index of Political Predisposition is to serve as an adequate basis for the development of political behavior theory, it must to some degree account for voting as compared to non-voting. Although data in *The People's Choice* do not relate directly to this problem, it seems reasonable to infer from the nature of the IPP scale that respondents falling on the extremes of the scale should include significantly fewer non-voters than would be included among the respondents clustering at the center of the continuum.

This is to be expected because the IPP scores reflect "cross pres-

sures" which were seen as reducing participation in an election. Socio-economic status level, religion, and residence, the variables included in the IPP, are those factors seen as influencing a voting decision. In turn, cross pressures are "the conflicts and inconsistencies among the factors which influence the vote decision." Extreme scores reflect the absence of these cross pressures; for example, score 1: rich, Protestant farmers; and score 7: poor, Catholic workers. Inconsistencies and conflicts are concentrated in IPP score 4, and to a lesser extent in scores 3 and 5.[12] "An upper-class Catholic, for example, may find that his religious affiliation pulls him in one direction, while his class position pulls him in the opposite direction."[13]

Despite the clearly expected relationship between the IPP and voting or non-voting, the application of the Index to the SRC data did, in fact, provide little basis for predicting whether a given individual voted or whether he was a non-voter in 1948. Of 528 individuals to whom IPP scores could be assigned, 218 or 41% did not vote, and the Index scores of these people were distributed in much the same fashion as were the scores of the voters. (See Table No. 3.)

TABLE No 3

Index of Political Predisposition and Non-voting

(SRC National Sample, 1948)

IPP Scores		Voters (per cent)	Non-voters (per cent)	Total (per cent)
Extreme Republican	1 & 2*	18	14	17
Mild Republican	3	28	27	28
Mild Democratic	4	18	31	22
Strong Democratic	5	24	18	22
Extreme Democratic	6 & 7*	12	10	11
Total		100	100	100
No. of cases		(310)	(218)	(528)

*The two extreme groups on each end of the IPP were combined to provide extreme categories containing sufficient cases to allow reliable analysis.

As Table No. 3 indicates, differences between voters and non-voters at the extremes of the IPP were slight. However, some support was found for the suggested relationship between voting partici-

[12]See IPP score assignment procedures in technical note.
[13]Lazarsfeld *et al, op. cit.,* p. xxi.

pation and the IPP in the fact that as the center of the IPP (score 4) a markedly higher concentration of non-voters was found.

II

ELEMENTS OF PARTISANSHIP

Party Choice: In predicting party choice, it was found that when the IPP was applied to the voters in the 1948 SRC national sample, a total of 61 per cent of the voters voted in line with their IPP scores. The votes of the remaining 39 per cent contradicted the IPP-based predictions. (A correct prediction of 50 per cent of the vote could be expected by chance.)   The details of the relationship between IPP scores and Democratic and Republican voting behavior are presented in Table No. 4.

TABLE No. 4
Index of Political Predisposition and Party Choice[14]

1948 Vote	Voters assigned a Democratic IPP score* (per cent)	Voters assigned a Republican IPP score** (per cent)	Total (per cent)
Democratic	36	25	31
Republican	20	37	28
Other	4	4	4
Non-voters	40	34	37
Total	100	100	100
No. of cases	(293)	(235)	(528)

*Includes IPP scores 4, 5, 6, and 7.
**Includes IPP scores 1, 2, and 3.

Although the IPP was predictive of a tendency to vote in the expected direction, party-wise, this tendency was of limited statistical significance. The only respondents who followed their IPP scores to

[14]The proportion of reported non-voters in the SRC sample is smaller than the proportion of non-voters in the national population. Five elements contribute to this discrepancy, namely: 1) the sample design, which excluded the institutional population; 2) the nature of the above distribution, which is a distribution of only those respondents to whom IPP scores could be assigned (see *Technical Note*); 3) the loss of 10 per cent of the drawn sample due to "not at home" and other non-response factors; 4) the observed tendency for non-voters to report having voted; 5) sampling errors.

a statistically significant degree were the respondents who actually voted Republican.[15]

1948 Vote	Differences for Voters Assigned Democratic IPP	Differences for Voters Assigned Republican IPP
Democratic	$D = 5$, (36-31) $\sigma = 2.8$, C.R. $= 1.8$	$D = 5$, (26-31) $\sigma = 2.9$, C.R. $= 1.7$
Republican	$D = 8$, (20-28) $\sigma = 2.3$, C.R. $= 3.5$ —	$D = 9$, (37-28) $\sigma = 3.1$, C.R. $= 2.9*$ —
Other	$D = 0$, (4-4) C.R.<1	$D = 0$, (4-4) C.R.<1
Non-voter	$D = 3$, (40-37) $\sigma = 2.9$, C.R. $= 1.0$	$D = 3$, (34-37) $\sigma = 3.1$, C.R. <1

*At this significance level we would predict that the chances were 996 out of 1000 that the proportion of all people with a given IPP score (the proportion of all those with a Democratic IPP or the proportion of all those with a Republican IPP) who exhibited a particular voting behavior (Democratic, Republican, Other, or Non-voting) was different from (larger or smaller) the proportion of the whole sample who exhibited the same behavior.

However, it should be pointed out that the deviation of the Republican voters when compared with the Democratic voters produced a significant relationship with expected IPP scores. It may be concluded that the data gave some additional evidence that the sociological variables (SES level, religion, residence) were related to voting vehavior, in that all deviations were in the expected direction.

However, even if the IPP is not seen as an index to the political behavior of the total sample, but in the narrow frame of a measure of sociological reinforcement for the tendency of individuals to follow their stated intentions, significant relationships still do not emerge. Of the individuals whose IPP's reinforced their voting intention, 120 voted as intended, 10 voted otherwise. Of the individuals whose IPP's conflicted with their intentions, 68 voted as intended, 11 voted in the direction of their IPP's. The variance is in the correct direction but not to a statistically significant degree.[16]

Even if statistically significant associations had been found, the underlying question would remain: "How much of the voting is

[15]Significant Differences of Democratic IPP and Republican IPP Distributions from Total Distribution of Voters.

[16]Chi square $= 2.1$.

explained by the sociological variables subsumed in the IPP?" A summary of the SRC data shows that, of those *voters* in the 1948 SRC national sample who had a Democratic IPP score, 64 per cent voted Democratic (and only 36 per cent of *all respondents* who had Democratic IPP score voted Democratic in 1948). Similarly, of those *voters* who had a Republican score, 61 per cent voted Republican (and only 37 per cent of *all respondents* who had Republican scores voted Republican in the 1948 election). Of course, the explanatory value of the IPP should be greatest at the extremes (highest and lowest scores) of the Index; and this, in fact, was found to be true. As shown in Table No. 5, about three-fourths of the voters in the extreme positions followed their expected voting patterns, 77 per cent, as opposed to 61 per cent of the total voting sample.[17]

TABLE No. 5

Index of Political Predisposition and Party Choice

1948 Vote	IPP Scores					
	1 & 2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	6 & 7 (%)	Total (%)
Democratic	15	32	23	42	47	31
Republican	50	28	21	22	15	28
Other	5	4	5	5	2	4
Non-voter	30	36	51	31	36	37
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
No. of cases	(90)	(147)	(119)	(117)	(55)	(528)

Individual Variables: The underlying relevance of the IPP for explaining electoral behavior in the 1948 election was perhaps best indicated by an examination of the extent to which the individual items in the Index were able to predict voting behavior. When all voting respondents who had incomes below $3,00 were predicted to be Democrats, and all over $3,000 to be Republicans, 61 per cent of the vote was accounted for. That is, 61 per cent of the voters did vote as we would have predicted on the basis of their incomes. Similarly, when all "blue collar" people (unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled, and farm labor) who were voting respondents were predicted

[17]Nevertheless, if the IPP has to predict voting and non-voting, as well as direction of vote for these extreme cases, the amount of behavior correctly predicted is again greatly reduced even for the respondents who fall at the ends of the Index. Only 50 per cent of the respondents with extreme Republican IPP scores actually voted Republican; 47 per cent of those with extreme Democratic scores actually voted for the Democratic Candidate.

to be Democrats, and all "white collar" people (all other occupational categories) to be Republicans, 67 per cent of the vote was accounted for. When all individuals with grade school or less education were predicted to be Democrats, and all college educated were predicted to be Republicans, and when we further predicted that high school educated would split 50-50, Democrat and Republican, 82 per cent of the actual vote was accounted for. The Index of Political Predisposition, it should be recalled, accounted for 61 per cent of the vote.[18]

III

THE DYNAMICS OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

Time of Decision: Much of the discussion of the failure of the 1948 election predictions has concentrated on the lack of attention given to the last-minute decisions of the "undecided" voters. This failure is a significant indication of the lack of precise knowledge about a fundamental aspect of electoral behavior, the dynamics of the voting decision. Although it was not explicitly reported in *The People's Choice,* the character of the IPP suggests that the Index should have relevance to the time of the voter's decision on the party or candidate for whom he will vote. As was discussed above, individuals with very high or very low IPP scores are not subject to cross pressures created by conflicts and inconsistencies among the crucial vote-determining variables included in the Index. Cross pressures *are* exerted, instead, on those individuals whose scores are in the middle range. These cross pressures were reported to have delayed the vote decision in Erie County.[19]

Consequently, the expected pattern among SRC voters would have been that individuals with extreme Index scores would be most likely to make their decisions at an early date; and relatively few early decisions would be made by people with middle scores. During the last moments of the campaign a small number of decisions would remain to be made by individuals with extreme scores, and a relatively large number by the middle-score people.

[18]It should be noted that the procedure suggested here for categorizing people on the basis of education is not individually predictive for those with high school education. Although we could predict 82 per cent of the total vote, we would be in error on about 50 per cent of those with high school education.

[19]Same as in footnote 13, pp. 58-61.

Only in the case of voters with the extreme "Republican" scores was there a tendency to behave as anticipated. Voters with extreme Democratic scores showed no propensity for making their decisions early rather than at the last moment, thus not conforming at all to the expected pattern of behavior; and the behavior of the voters in the middle score, 4, (those subjected to the greatest cross pressures created by the variables of the Index) directly contradicted the expected behavior pattern. (See Table No. 6.)

Instead of the predicted behavior, the following pattern was exhibited involving IPP scores and the three time-pediods of decision-making. (See Table No. 6.) The time-periods were: 1) pre-convention, 2) after convention, but prior to the last two weeks before the election, and 3) during the two weeks just before the election. In the first place, the pre-convention decisions revealed no readily explainable significant differences between groups with different IPP scores, and in the second place, comparison of the IPP scores in the second and third time-periods indicated that those who had Democratic IPP scores tended to make their decisions later than those with Republican IPP scores. More precisely, individuals with *any* given IPP score tended to make their decisions later than did individuals with lower ("more Republican") scores.

TABLE No. 6
Index of Political Predisposition and "Time of Decision"

Time of Decision	IPP Score				
	1 & 2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	6 & 7 (%)
Pre-convention	42	38	45	41	39
Post-convention to within two weeks of election	45	36	29	25	21
Two weeks of election to election day	14	26	26	34	39
Total	100	100	100	100	100
No. of cases	(90)	(147)	(119)	(117)	(55)

Political Change: During the course of the 1940 campaign, "party changers" in Erie County were observed to have changed in the direction predicted by their IPP scores. This movement of the "party changers" was interpreted as an indication that change tended to increase the political homogeneity of the sociological groups to which the changers belonged.

Among members of the SRC 1948 sample, the direction of change among a small majority of the "party changers" followed the expected pattern, but the data failed to present any marked statistical confirmation of the conclusions drawn from Erie County. In Erie County, the data indicated that 36 out of 54 "party changers" changed in the predicted direction. In the 1944 national study reported in *The People's Choice,* 22 out of 36 "party changers" changed as predicted. In the SRC sample there were 48 out of 84 "party changers" who changed in the predicted direction. The SRC finding was not statistically significant.[20]

IV

EMPIRICAL IMPLICATIONS

It is probably of central importance in evaluating the applicability of the IPP to the 1948 presidential election data, that 13 per cent of the Erie County panel in 1940 were found to be "changers" of all varieties. In the SRC 1948 national sample, "changers," defined in the same terms, totalled 42 per cent during the equivalent time-period. (Change included not only shifts from one party to the other, but also various shifts in intention from non-voting to voting, and vice versa, and from undecided to party preference or to non-voting, and vice versa.) Undoubtedly, the variables included in the IPP are more relevant in the more stable political context.

Numerous other measures reflect the marked difference in stability of political behavior between the two samples. In Erie County, "fully 77 per cent of the panel members said that their parents and grandparents had voted consistently for one or the other of the major parties, and they maintained these family traditions in the 1940 elections."[21] By contrast, in the SRC national sample, only 41 per cent of the final vote had been decided before the conventions.[22]

[20]*Ibid.,* p. xvi, for Erie County and 1944 national sample data. The "change" in Erie County was statistically significant above the one per cent level, C.R. = 2.66. For both national samples, 1944 NORC and 1948 SRC, the change was less pronounced, producing critical rations of 1.3 in both instances.

[21]*Ibid.,* p. xx.

[22]Data on change were obtained from the interview-reinterview procedure which for this data follows the Erie County panel technique. However, data on time of decision were supplied by respondent recall in November, and not by independent observation of decision making such as is possible through use of panel research design.

But, stability of political predisposition is not equally a Democratic and Republican phenomenon. In fact, comparison of the Republican and Democratic vote in the 1948 sample suggests the greater stability of the Republican vote. In 1948, only 59 per cent of the final Democratic vote had been decided by mid-October, but fully 78 per cent of the final Republican vote had been decided at that date. From some of the preceding tables cumulative evidence of the stability and persistence of the national Republican vote in 1948 emerges. The "extreme" Republicans were the only ones whose behavior supported the expected link between IPP score and time of decision. Moreover, Republican voters were the only ones whose voting behavior gave statistically significant support to the expected relation between the IPP and party preference; and, in addition, non-voting among Republicans conformed closest to the pattern suggested by the IPP.

The greater power of the IPP seems to be in predicting the Republican and thereby the "status quo" vote, rather than the protest or social change vote. One can assume that the Republican end of the IPP is a rather suggestive index to the patterns of group membership which support "status quo" politics. The combination of wealth, Protestantism, and rural residence produces a rather easily recognizable political type. But the "opposites" of these characteristics fail to combine the attributes of the groups which voted in support of continued socio-economic change in the elections of 1940 and 1948. This is an empirical verification that traditional politics in the United States is characterized by a diffuseness of political protest programs designed to effect a coalition between diverse social groups. The New Deal and Fair Deal were a political formula for compromise among many different types of "opposers" who had and have wide differences among their emerging needs and requirements.

In a sense, these observations may also help explain the different performance of the IPP in Erie County in 1940 as compared with its performance in the nation as a whole in 1948. Politically, Erie County, as mentioned above, was markedly stable and represented a rather clear-cut pattern of social stratification. By contrast, the individuals who entered into the political compromise that constituted the 1948 Democratic vote seemed to display less political stability and fewer homogeneous group characteristics. Sectional differences in the United States contributed substantially to this lower homogeneity.

Finally, the 1948 campaign brought new issues of domestic and foreign policy to the fore as well as new candidates.

Yet, despite its limitations, the IPP remains a significant point of departure for the empirical development of a theory of political behavior in the United States. The fact that almost all of the data followed the expected pattern gives promise that refinement of the variables in the IPP will increase the explanatory power of the Index. In part, the refinement of categories for the IPP would seem to involve the introduction of change-oriented variables, and the repetition of the Erie County study in Elmira, New York, appears to be oriented in this direction. Religious differences can be seen not as a mere static dichotomy, but as forces requiring indices reflecting the amounts of individual conviction and religious group cohesion. Rural-urban differences require refinement in terms of length of residence, patterns of migration and rate of urbanization. Socio-economic level as a dynamic dimension at least involves consideration of social mobility. Old and new variables which are to be considered must incorporate the highly important regional differences existing in the United States generally and highlighted in the Democratic party of the South. Moreover, as mentioned before, the nature of the campaign, the characteristics of the candidates and the effectiveness of the political parties still remain to be accounted for as variables in electoral behavior.

TECHNICAL NOTE

The table below presents the distribution of those basic personal characteristics of the national sample used to construct the Index of Political Predisposition for the analysis of the SRC data: socio-economic items, Protestant or Catholic religious preference, and rural-urban residence differences.

TABLE No. 7

National Sample, 1948
(per cent)

	Income
27	$0 - 2000
59	2 - 5000
13	5000 and over
1	N.A.
100	

Population Class

28	Metro
53	Urban
19	Rural
———	
100	

Education

44	Grades
40	High School
15	College
1	N.A.
———	
100	

Religion

70	Protestant
21	Catholic
9	Other (including **N.A.**)
———	
100	

Occupation

7	Professional
11	Business
12	White Collar
25	Skilled and semi-skilled
13	Unskilled, including farm labor and service
15	Farm operators
1	Protective service
4	Housewife
1	Student
6	Retired
4	Unemployed
1	N.A.
———	
100	

Appendix B of *The People's Choice* includes a description of the construction of the Index of Political Predisposition. In constructing the Index of Political Predisposition, scores were assigned to respondents on the basis of their *judged* socio-economic level, their rural or urban residence, and their religion. The Survey Research Center data were directly comparable for the last two items. The

Survey Research Center population class data were dichotomized by separating "open country" respondents from all others. Respondent's statement of religious preference was used to define the third variable.

To provide a measure of socio-economic level comparable to the interviewer ratings of respondents in Erie County, the following procedure was used. Three variables, education, occupation and income, were combined as illustrated below.

Schema for Rating Socio-Economic Level
from Personal-Social Data

Income	Education Grade School	Education High School	College
$0-2000	all occupations D	all occupations C—	all occupations C—
$2-500	all occupations C—	all occupations except unskilled labor, those respondents classified as C— C+	all occupations except white collar, skilled and unskilled labor, those respondents classified as C+ B
$5000 and over	all occupations except white collar, skilled and unskilled labor, those classified as C+ B	all occupations except white collar workers, skilled and unskilled labor, those respondents classified as C+ B	all occupations except white collar, skilled, unskilled labor, and farm operators, those respondents classified as B A

Whereas approximately 45% of the Erie County respondents were not assigned IPP scores, approximately 25% of the total SRC

October sample (134 cases) could not be classified by Index of Political Predisposition scores. Half of this shrinkage (loss of 65 cases) occurred because of our inability to rate four occupational categories, namely: unemployed, protective services, students and retired. These occupational categories were eliminated from this scheme as being too poorly defined in socio-economic terms to allow valid assessment.

Of the other individuals who did not receive an Index of Political Predisposition score, 57 were eliminated because the index accommodated only Protestants and Catholics. Twelve cases were lost because respondents' income or education were not ascertained. The table below presents a summary of our treatment of socio-economic measures.

TABLE No. 8

SES Categories used in *The People's Choice**

	A	B	C+	C—	D	Total Cases Classified by IPP	Unclassifiable
Erie County**							
1940	3%	14%	33%	30%	20%	100%	N = 1350
						N = 1650	(45% of Total N)
National SRC							
Sample, 1948	5%	10%	33%	32%	20%	100%	N = 134
						N = 528	(25% of Total N)

*The Erie County figures show the IPP distribution for their May panel. Total membership of this panel was 3000 (*The People's Choice*, p. 4) but only 1650 Erie County respondents were assigned scores. The factors to which this 45 per cent loss can be attributed are not reported. See p. 174.
**The People's Choice*, p. 19.

From the above table we can conclude that the variation in Index of Political Predisposition distribution of Survey Research Center respondents from the distribution of Erie County respondents (see Table No. 1) is probably a function of changes in urbanization or persistent differences in population class and religion between Erie County and the nation.