

B-

"Party identification is the attitude of considering oneself a Republican, Democrat, or whatever-party attachment-as opposed to being an official party member or even voting for the party's candidates." (Public Opinion, pg 255)

Party identification is declared if an individual feels strongly about the party's ideals, beliefs, attitudes and values. For example, in general, Democrats are, "usually thought of as favoring economically and socially liberal policies.

Republicans are generally considered social and economic conservatives." (Public Opinion, pg 230)

Independents have a harder time being recognized in the typical two-party system. Even though there is an "~~independent~~" party, the lack of support by the general public has not allowed ~~independents~~ to have their ideals, beliefs, attitudes and values heard on equal political ground to the Democrats or Republicans. Even with Election 2000, 'the Nader Factor' caused some fear among ~~independents~~ that their votes would not count.

Really there is no independent party

To identify with a party, a person needs to be informed, knowledgeable and constantly staying on top of issues associated with that party. If a person blindly enters a social contract with a political party, then that individual risks identifying and limiting themselves with ideals, beliefs, attitudes and values they do not believe in. It is safe to presume that those who identify with a party are

no party identification does not imply any thing about party membership

individuals who try to stay interested in news going on around them and within their political party.

not necessarily

It is due to party identification and the pressures to stay informed of various topics within that political party that I offer this hypothesis: Democrats and Republicans will have a greater interest in the presidential campaign than ~~will~~ Independents.

In the crosstabulation results of interest in the presidential campaign with party identification, there appeared to be no significant difference between Republicans and Democrats to Independents.

INTEREST IN PRES CAMP * PARTY IDENTIFICATION Crosstabulation

			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			Total
			DEM	REP	INDEPENDENT	
INTEREST IN PRES CAMP	GREAT DEAL	Count	23	35	6	64
		% within PARTY IDENTIFICATION	35.9%	36.1%	13.3%	31.1%
	SOMEWHAT	Count	27	44	28	99
		% within PARTY IDENTIFICATION	42.2%	45.4%	62.2%	48.1%

*Count is
flawed of total
Dem & Rep
are more interested
but only 13%
of independent.
That's a big
difference*

Looking at the results from those that indicated at least 'somewhat' of an interest in the campaign, the data illustrates there is no significant difference between Democrats (78.1%), Republicans (81.5%) and Independents (75.5%). These results can be explained by the candidates and the campaigns. Although the candidates for the typical two-party system belonged to different parties, both Gore and Bush were nearly identical in platforms and positions. Both tended to stay in the middle of public opinion so not to upset a majority of voters. This either confused or did not convince voters which candidate they should vote for.

*Where
do these
numbers
come
from*

The 'Nader factor' also 'threw a monkey wrench' into the campaigns. He spoke up against the two-party system and drew attention to what he felt was wrong with the country. When he spoke, a lot of people could identify with what he said. Because the election was so close, the votes he persuaded from the dominate parties, caused a narrower gap between parties.

But what does this have to do with the hyperclass you are mentioning

In the crosstabulation results of interest in the senatorial campaign with party identification, there also appeared to be no significant difference between Republicans and Democrats to Independents.

INTEREST IN SEN CAMP * PARTY IDENTIFICATION Crosstabulation

			PARTY IDENTIFICATION			Total
			DEM	REP	INDEPENDENT	
INTEREST IN SEN CAMP	GREAT DEAL	Count	20	25	6	51
		% within PARTY IDENTIFICATION	31.3%	25.8%	13.3%	24.8%
	SOMEWHAT	Count	23	42	18	83
		% within PARTY IDENTIFICATION	35.9%	43.3%	40.0%	40.3%

Looking at the results from those that indicated at least 'somewhat' of an interest in the campaign, the data illustrates there was a slight marginal difference between Democrats (67.2%), Republicans (69.1%) and Independents (53.1%).

Nebraska was conflicted which candidate to choose for the senate race. Nebraska does have a strong conservative democratic belief that as citizens we need to vote. This can then be applied backwards to the analysis above. If Nebraskans have a strong internalized sense of voting, then in order to make the right decision, they need to be informed. To be informed, voters must seek out information through media, friends and family. Through information, certain

*OK you added both together but look at the numbers you are comparing you are comparing Democrats and Republicans
This obscures differences even so a tall needle an interest +*

thoughts, beliefs, ideals and opinions are formed and identified. The voter can then identify with a particular party.

As an overall assessment, the crosstabulation, it is complicated to ask a few questions in a survey format to get to know if party identification has a direct relationship to interest in political campaigns. Also, to increase reliability, it would be recommended to have a larger sample of people from a larger demographic and geographic range. As stated above, Nebraskans are different. They're more conservative, more traditional and not as open to a great deal of change. They are not a good sample to apply to the rest of the nation.

Another way to think about the variables and expectations of this survey was that this election was very atypical. Perhaps a different election would show different results. Currently, there was an increased number of Independents from past years. This has taken some votes away from the dominate parties. Another example would be a Democrat (or Republican) winning an election by such a landslide, that the American people no longer pay attention to the news or other information sources. The other party would have to be trying to drum up support to salvage their party and not necessarily their candidate.

I offered this hypothesis: Democrats and Republicans will have a greater interest in the presidential campaign than will Independents. The data was inconclusive.

To become affiliated with a party, information sources need tapped. People do not blindly agree to become part of a political party. There is too much pressure from society to belong to a political party without knowing what beliefs, ideals,

But we are only interested in drawing conclusions about Nebraska while sample is small and we would like a larger one, even a large sample of Nebraskans would not allow me to draw conclusion about the nation

I would draw a different conclusion. I think your hypothesis was confirmed

and values they will be coupled with. However due to the uniqueness of Election 2000, it is hard to judge the validity and reliability of these survey results.