A DICHOTOMY IN US POLITICS: PARTY LOYALTY AND VALUES

by

Allie Strehle

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for Departmental Honors in

the Department of Political Science

Texas Christian University

Fort Worth, Texas

5/06/19

A DICHOTOMY IN US POLITICS: PARTY LOYALTY AND VALUES

Project Approved:

Supervising Professor: Vanessa Bouche, Ph.D

Department of Political Science

Adam Schiffer, Ph.D.

Department of Political Science

Kara Vuic, Ph.D.

Department of History

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the implications that values have on political party composition and loyalty. I examine this relationship by first establishing the connection of sets of values with each political party. Then, I design an experimental survey in which Democrats and Republicans are randomly assigned a mock news article about a political candidate that violates these party values through the lens of their stance on immigration. Finally, I ask questions about perceived candidate values and the subject's anticipated voting patterns. I find that each party does have their own dichotomous values, and that voters hope to see these values in the candidates for their party. Subsequently, it is because of these values and the value alignment that Democrats are more likely to deviate from their party. The results suggest Republicans will stay loyal to their party when voting, as seen in the 2016 election, while Democrats will be less tolerant of perceived diversions in the values of those they elect, causing them to be more loyal to their own individual values.

An individual that is loyal to their self-identified political party can be characterized by consistent voting patterns and stable support to the party throughout a long period of time. Party loyalty is highly sought after by party leaders as it constructs predictable voting patterns and clearly supportive coalitions that leads the party to success. Often, this party loyalty is derived from an individuals' party identification, which originates from social and familial contexts early on in life. This party identification persists through an individual's life and is indicative of their overall voting behaviors (Campbell, Converse, Miller, Stokes 1960). However, despite one individual's stagnant party identification, I argue that party affiliation is also based on values. Each political party is comprised of individuals that hold disparate values, and thus the party as a conglomerate values different principles, concluding that the two major political parties are inherently different. The study of the composition of these two political parties is integral to understanding voting patterns in the twenty-first century.

The idea behind this study came from a research agenda that began in the fall of 2016. In the fall, I created a survey experiment to answer the question: what causes voters to stray from their identified party to vote for a third party? In order to do this, I created two conditions by presenting articles depicting a candidate in the subject's party that was involved in either a tax scandal or a sexual assault scandal. The goal behind this previous research was to measure what impact scandals had on voter loyalty for each party. The results were clear that overall Republicans were more loyal to their party than Democrats, even when presented with candidates that were involved in a scandal. The research done through that project prompted me to continue to ask myself why are Democrats more likely to deviate from their party than Republicans.

In this study, I hope to answer the research questions, what impacts party loyalty, and what is the impact of party loyalty on voting behavior? To answer these questions, I explore party composition based on each party's defining values. Additionally, evaluate value connection between the respondent and a proposed candidate. Finally, I test party loyalty through voting patterns based on the voter's behavior to uphold or deviate from party values. I will test this through an experimental survey; first by surveying to prove a connection between different values with each party, then by providing an experiment to test the subjects' loyalty to their party.

This research will add to the discussion of party psychology and party composition, as well as create a definitive connection between values and individuals' party loyalty. This is important to interpret voting behaviors today. This will notably add to the discussion around party composition and party loyalty by proving a connection between values and voting patterns. By defining the values of each party and the subsequent voting behaviors based on these values, each party and party leaders can better identify with their party members.

In the following analysis, I will first discuss the previous literature pertaining to party loyalty, party composition and voting behaviors. Then, I will assert my values-based theory that defines both parties based on their core values. Following will be a discussion of the research design, in which I implemented a survey experiment to connect values to parties as well as party loyalty. Finally, I will examine the results of the experiment with a discussion on the study's implications as well as future studies to be performed.

Literature Review

Party identification is a personal identity that is developed at a young age, and is an identity that research has shown is held at a visceral, psychological level, akin to many other

social identities (Greene 2004). It is often socialization at a young age that develops this identity, with one's family being the main contributor **(**Berelson, Lazarsfeld, Mcphee 19554). Party ID has been proven to be more stable than principles such as equal opportunity, limited government, traditional family and moral tolerance (Goren 2005). These studies, as well as others, prove that party identification is an essential aspect of a voters' identity. It is a classification that persists and only changes slowly over time, should any change occur at all **(**Green, Palmquist, Schickler 2002).

However, other studies have observed the possibility for change and development over time. Shively stated there are five variables that impact one's decision on identifying with a party. These five variables are the strength of feeling that one must participate in politics, the cost of the information pertinent to voting, the resources available to party for these costs, concern for the quality of the decision, and finally, availability of other more efficient, decisional costs (Shively 1979, 1040). Other scholars have looked at the development and subsequent persistence of political ideology. Jennings and Niemi state that the political life cycle is evident and changes in this cycle can also indicate changes in political ideology (Jennings and Niemi 1978). While some theories hypothesize that the longer an individual is alive, the longer they are identified to their party and thus their identification is increased, others, such as Glenn and Hefner have disproved this theory through their study on the correlation between age and ties to the Republican Party. (Glenn and Hefner 1972). Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes connect the acquiescence of one's party to voting patterns through their funnel analogy. They argue that party socialization determines party identification, which determines a voter's attitudes, which then determines their vote (Campbell, Converse, Miller, Stokes 1960). These Columbia Studies make an important stipulation by including voter's attitudes as a voting determinant. These

attitudes and values define the two parties – as well as individuals within the parties - as distinct bodies with contrasting values.

The two major political parties are distinctly opposite in many cultural, structural and platform-based aspects. The cultural distinction is proven by Jo Freeman in "The Political Culture of the Democratic and Republican Parties". This article argues that the major difference in the parties lie in their political culture. It designates two ways the parties specifically differ, one of which is the structural differences. More important to this study, is the attitudinal differences. This article argues that Democrats see themselves as outsiders, regardless of their position in the party, and Republicans consistently see themselves as insiders in the party (Freeman 1986). Additionally, party composition is different based on the interests of the voters. Grossmann and Hopkins argue that Republicans are united via ideology, whereas Democrats are united through issue-based voting that is rooted in different voting blocs (Grossman and Hopkins 2016, 23). This creates a different mentality in the two political parties. Republicans are more interested in broad conservative stances throughout government, whereas Democrats are typically more interested in certain topics and require immediate discrete action. These two different approaches that lead to party unification cause major differences in voting patterns and behaviors.

As stated previously, voting patterns are typically based on party identification. "The American Voter" clearly correlates the two, stating that very few forces can overcome one's party identity to cause an individual to defect from the voter's identified party. However, newer studies such as "A New Partisan Voter" also assert that voting patterns have become more ideological and issue based in recent years (Bafumi and Shapiro 2009). Additionally, there are circumstances in which individuals would defect from their identified party in any given

election. One such example of this would be the involvement of a party candidate in a major scandal. These discrepancies between party ID and voting patterns imply that there are other factors involved when determining party loyalty and party identification. What I hope to determine is the values that each individual party identifies with and whether or not this can account for these discrepancies and further explain party identification and voting patterns.

Overall, previous literature has stressed the importance of socialization in the acquisition of a voter's party identification. This party identification is extremely stable and can be a good predictor of party loyalty and voting patterns, although it is not the only factor. Each party is inherently different, with different voters that compose the coalition of identified voters for that party. These party differences and extraneous factors that impact voting behavior can be accounted for by values and are central to my study in connecting party identification, party loyalty and subsequent voting patterns.

Values-Based Theory

My values-based theory asserts that individuals and parties hold specific values, which are vastly different between the two parties. It is these values that differentiate the composition of each party and thus guide and determine a voter's party loyalty and voting behavior. The values I connect with each party are drawn from studies done by Shalom Schwartz and Ronald Inglehart. First, I combine a few of the values they found in societies around the world, then I connect them with the political party that I find the most connection with. Finally, I show that these values are inherent in the parties and prove they impact voting patterns and behavior.

The first set of defining values was discovered by Inglehart who states a characterizing value of society is the polarization between traditional versus secular-rational values. He asserts that traditional values emphasize views that align with the statements: God is very important in

respondent's life, abortion is never justifiable, respondent has a strong sense of national pride, and it is more important for a child to learn obedience and religious faith than independence and determination (Inglehart 2000, 24). Individuals with this value also believe that work is very important, and respect authority. I connect this traditional value with the Republican party due to their relationship with the Christian Coalition, and typically traditional, conservative views . Inglehart contrasts this with the value of secular-rational. This secular-rational value is characterized by a disagreement with the previous statements, as well as an interest in politics, responsibility, abortion being okay, and determination (Inglehart 1997, 82). I associate this secular value with that of the Democratic party. These two values are polarized on a scale and associate well with their distinctive parties. These are the first values that characterize each party and explain party composition.

The next value is also described by Inglehart in his various studies. He asserts the contrasting values of survival versus self-expression that are integral in societies. Individuals that value survival empathize with statements such as: priority should be given to economic and physical security over quality of life, homosexuality is never justifiable, and you have to be careful about trusting people (Inglehart, 2000, 24). It is also characterized by prioritizing technology, money, hard work, and respect. This value of survival is another value I associate with the Republican party. Conversely, the value of self-expression opposes the characteristics stated above. Rather, they prioritize imagination, trust, tolerance, leisure and imagination. This value of self-expression is another one that I identify with the Democratic party.

The third value comes from another prominent values scholar, Shalom H. Schwartz. The first value category is self-transcendence, which is contrasted to self-enhancement. Self-enhancement combines achievement and power, with the hopes of promoting their own personal

interests (Dobewall, Strack 2014, 2). This value is added to the values of traditional and survival to create a trio of values that individualize identify with in the Republican party. The value of self-transcendence emphasizes universalism and benevolence to help promote welfare of others before themselves (Dobewall, Strack 2014, 2). This is added to the values of secular and self-expression for three major values that individuals in the Democratic party hold.

Finally, I use another one of Schwartz's values to describe the last contrasting value between the Republican and Democratic parties. The Republican party most closely identifies with his value of conservation. The value of conservation promotes ideals of tradition, conformity and security (Dobewall, Strack 2014, 2). This value emphasizes the overall sentiment of the Republican party and this value will dictate the loyalty of individuals to the party, as well as their voting behavior. The Democratic party most closely aligns with his value openness to change. This value prioritizes self-direction and stimulation (Dobewall, Strack 2014, 2). I believe that this is another indicator of the Democratic party. This, combined with the three prior values create my proposed composition of the Democratic and Republican parties and influence their voters' loyalty and voting patterns.

This value based theory leads to my first hypothesis. I believe that Republicans demonstrate the values of traditional, survival, self-enhancement, and conservation. Conversely, I believe that Democrats demonstrate the values of secular, self-expression, self-transcendence, and openness to change. This hypothesis can be broken down into four sub-hypotheses as follows:

- The more an individual holds traditional (secular) values, the more likely he/she is to affiliate with the Republican (Democratic) party.

- The more an individual holds survival (self-expression) values, the more likely he/she is to affiliate with the Republican (Democratic) party.

- The more an individual holds self-enhancement (self-transcendence) values, the more likely he/she is to affiliate with the Republican (Democratic) party.

- The more an individual holds conservation (openness to change) values, the more likely he/she is to affiliate with the Republican (Democratic) party.

These values differentiate the two parties by having a core set of beliefs that members of the party identify with. Thus, a voter's party affiliation is based on these described party values.

These four values previously stated combine to create two vastly different profiles for each political party. For my second hypothesis, I look at the connection these values have with those that voters see in candidates within their party. Thus, my second hypothesis is Republicans and Democrats will value candidates that display similar value to those they hold. This hypothesis extrapolates values beyond the individuals in each party to the candidates and party as a whole. This is rooted in the literature that states that political parties are inherently different. By establishing the differences at an individual level in my first hypothesis, I can subsequently hypothesize that these will apply to the party as a whole.

My third hypothesis states that because of the disparate values and connection between the individual and party values, Republicans are going to be less likely to deviate from their party, especially when presented with a candidate that violates one of their core values. Because of my previous to hypotheses, I hope to expand on my previous literature that Republicans are more loyal by proving it is because of values. Democrats are less likely to be loyal to their party because they are more loyal to their specific group interests. This is further proven by the idea that the Democratic party is generally made up of voting blocs and is much more of an issue-

based party. Thus, if the political candidate violates one of their core values, Democrats will be less likely to stay loyal to their party, and are more open to change. Due to the self-interest motivation the Republicans have, they will often partake in pocketbook voting. They will be less likely to change their vote, as long as their party stays overall ideologically conservative. Conversely, Democrats are sociotropic voters that will demonstrate less party loyalty due to their group interest. Overall, based on values and strength of party identification, Republicans will be more loyal to their party in voting than Democrats will, because of the disparate values held.

Research Design

In order to test my three hypotheses, I implemented a survey experiment. I designed the experiment through Qualtrics and distributed it through Amazon Mechanical Turk. I was able to use funding to compensate individuals that took my survey. I did this with hopes of getting many quality and diverse answers to represent the voting population as closely as possible. Overall, I obtained 456 subjects.

The survey experiment first asked a variety of pre-test questions. These included demographic information as well as the very important question about their self-identified party. In order to do this, I used a self-evaluated political ideology 5-point scale as well as a 5-point scale to self-identify with a political party. Additionally, while an Independent option was provided initially, I subsequently asked them which party they most closely align with. I felt confident doing this because research has shown that generally, people that identify as Independents still have a consistent voting pattern that aligns them with one party or another (Keith, Magelby, Nelson, Orr, Westyle, and Wolfinger). This party identification allowed me to

filter them into a survey experiment that was individualized for their party, as well as determine

their strength of party identification to use when testing my hypotheses.

After my preliminary questions, I sought to create questions that were targeted to my first

hypothesis: Republicans will demonstrate their values of traditional, survival, self-enhancement,

and conservatism, while Democrats will demonstrate their values of secular, self-expression,

self-transcendence, and openness to change. To do this, I asked subjects to read a variety of

statements and determine how much they agreed with the statements on a scale of 1-10. These

statements were derived from the initial research done by Schwartz and Inglehart, while

modernizing them when needed. Each proposed value had two statements rooted in evaluating

how closely they hold any given value. Overall, there were 16 statements.

After determining the subject's self-identified values as outlined in my theory, I tailored

the study to investigate my second and third hypothesis. In order to test value alignment and

political party loyalty, I designed conditions that would both align with party values, and violate

the values that I connected to each party. By violating the values that I hypothesize they hold so

closely, I was able to identify the validity of the party-value connection and their loyalty to their

party.

The condition created was an online news article depicting a candidate running for office.

The articles presented were all created as similarly as possible, with only the political stance

taken, and party changed. The scenario I used was the prevalent issue of immigration along the

southern border of the United States, with conditions created favoring either side of the issue.

For example, one Republican subject might have received an article discussing a Republican

candidate whose platform included open immigration and opposed the construction of a wall.

Not only does this go against their conservation value, it also goes against their general party

platforms. Thus, I was able to measure the values connection and whether this breach in their typical party platform was enough to impact their loyalty through their potential voting behavior. Conversely, I presented a Republican subject with a Republican candidate that favored immigration reform and favored the implementation of a wall. I presented the same two conditions to Democrat subjects with a Democratic candidate running on a platform of favoring/opposing immigration reform. By having four different conditions, I was able to gather results on strength of party identification and party loyalty for both party.

After receiving the condition, they were asked a series of questions to operationalize the dependent variable. First, I asked what values the subject thought the candidate displayed in the article they read. This took the form of corollary values created to reflect the values tested for in the first hypothesis, however this time I chose to focus on just the values of conservation and openness to change. These two values were chosen as they are often connected to each party in their platform, candidates, and overall ideals. Additionally, the scenario presented regarding immigration in the articles put these values very clearly to the test. Subjects were asked to what extent they felt the candidate held the corollary values on a scale of 1-10. This was essential in connecting their self-identified values from hypothesis one to the candidate values in hopes of proving value alignment.

Finally, I asked questions rooted in testing party loyalty. These included feeling, thinking, and action questions intended to test the subject's level of support and party loyalty. Specifically, I was looking for voting behavior, so I asked about their probability to vote for their candidate, a candidate from the opposing major party, and a third party candidate. All of these questions were measured on a five-point Likert scale. Each question was phrased in a different direction to avoid "gaming" the experiment. For a full view of my experiment, please view Appendix A.

By using a survey experiment, I am able to claim strong internal validity. It used a between-subjects design in which each subject only receives one condition. Because of this, I am able to state causation between the conditions and the results. This is done by using the Rubin-Causal model by randomly assigning participants to the pro-wall and anti-wall treatments, essentially creating two identical people between the two conditions. While I was unable to randomize the party ID factor due to the dependent nature of the design, by separating them, I was able to analyze each party independently and thus make comparisons between the two. Additionally, by keeping the conditions as similar as possible while only manipulating the intent of the condition, I hoped to eliminate as many outside influences as possible.

Results and Findings

After distributing my experimental survey, I downloaded the results to analyze the data and evaluate my posed hypotheses. In order to do this, I first needed to clean up the data, eliminating any results that showed attrition and converting the data for analysis in SPSS. The first test run identified the frequencies displayed through different demographics in my survey. Through this I found that I had 259 females and 195 males. Additionally, based on the initial question asked about party ID, I had the following breakdown of political party identification on a five point scale. Additionally, the breakdown of self-identified Independents is important, as they were then asked to self-identify with one of the two major parties, creating my final groups of Democrats and Republicans used for the experiment. After this analysis, I ended up with 285 Democrats and 170 Republicans.

After cleaning up my data and finding my descriptive statistics, I sought to test my first hypothesis that Republicans and Democrats will hold dichotomous values at the individual level. In order to do this, I created a new variables that coded the Democratic respondents as 1 and

Republican respondents as 0. By doing this, I could run bivariate correlations for the respondents in each party to each value statement created to test my first hypothesis. The following chart displays statement, value tested, significance level, and Pearson's Correlation when each statement was tested with my new "democratic" variable. This test was highly successful, proving positive correlations with the values I identified with the Democratic party, and negative correlations with values I identified with the Republican party. The only outlier in correlation direction was the statement "I determine my own self direction", though it was also not statistically significant. The other statement that was not statistically significant was that "Being wealthy is important to me". This leads me to think that either these statements don't connect well with the value I was trying to test, or they are statements that both parties hold similarly. However, despite these results, all of the other statements were correlated in the direction hypothesized and most were very highly significant. Despite two outliers, I feel confident that these results prove my first hypothesis by establishing these values with each party.

Statement	Value:	Pearson Correlation	Significance Level
I am very interested in politics.	Secularism	.088	.067
Abortion is warranted in certain circumstances.	Secularism	.356	.000
Religion is a very important part of my life.	Traditional	-.267	.000
I am very proud to be an American.	Traditional	-.327	.000
I am supportive of combatting global warming.	Well-being	.486	.000
Homosexuality is not a choice.	Well-being	.269	.000
A child needs a home with both a mother and a father to grow up happily.	Survival	-.375	.000
I would not be happy if my neighbor was an undocumented immigrant.	Survival	-.416	.000
I am passionate about social justice.	Self-transcendence	.333	.000
You should always show compassion toward others.	Self-transcendence	.185	.000
Being wealthy is important to me.	Self-enhancement	-.040	.411
Power is something to be desired.	Self-enhancement	-.176	.000
I appreciate variety in my daily life.	Openness to change	.140	.004
I determine my own self-direction.	Openness to change	-.041	.401
I like to stick to the status quo.	Conservation	-.280	.000
I believe there is a social order to society.	Conservation	-.268	.000

After finding significant results for my first hypothesis, I set out to test my second hypothesis that Republicans and Democrats will value candidates that hold similar values to those they hold. In order to do this, I created new variables to test the difference in the individually held values and the perceived candidate values. In order to do this, I averaged the

two conservation value statements and the two openness to change value statements from the respondents to create the average individual level of conservation and the average individual level of openness to change. Subsequently, I averaged the responses of the three statements that pertained to conservation of the candidate, and the same for openness to change. Finally, I subtracted the individual conservation average value from the candidate conservation average value and took the absolute value to create a new value called 'conservationdifference'. I similarly subtracted the individual and candidate averages for openness to change to create a variable called 'opennessdifference'. Additionally, I created two other variables called 'Rep Conditions' and 'Dem Conditions' that compared those who got the condition and those who didn't within each party. These variables were created to see how different the individual values were from the perceived candidate values were. In order to test this, I ran many bivariate correlations. First, I compared DemConditions and conservation difference, which had a -.022 Pearson Correlation and a .713 significance level. However, when I compared DemConditions with opennessdifference, the Pearson Correlation was .393 and the significance level was .000. What this relationship shows is that Democrats that got a condition that opposes their standard party platform were significantly more likely to have a larger difference in their individual values and the values they viewed in the candidate they viewed, however only in the openness to change value. Additionally, when comparing RepConditions and opennessdifference, the Pearson Correlation was .098 and the significance level was .217. However, when looking at RepConditions and conservation difference, the Pearson Correlation was .306 and it was highly significant at the .000 level. This relationship shows is that Republicans that got a condition that opposes their standard party platform were significantly more likely to have a larger difference in their individual values and the values they viewed in the candidate they viewed, however only in

the conservation value. This not only emphasizes the previously established values with each individual, but also that voters want to see those values in their party candidate as well. This was an important result because it allows me to extrapolate those values from an individual level to a party level with high confidence.

Finally, after proving my second hypothesis, I sought to prove my third hypothesis that Republicans will be more likely to deviate from their political party because of the core values of each party. In order to do this, I looked specifically at the survey question "I would consider voting for a third party candidate". Initially, I looked at comparisons between the RepConditions and DemConditions with this statement. Democrats that got the pro-wall candidate were significantly more likely to consider voting for a third party candidate with the Pearson Correlation being .425 at a significance level of .000. Conversely, this effect was not seen as much with Republicans. Republicans that got an anti-wall condition had a correlation of .173 with a significance level of .029 when compared to Republicans that got the pro-wall condition. While this proved again that Republicans were less likely to deviate from their party, it was the connection to values that I was still looking to prove. To prove the connection between party values and party loyalty, I ran two more bivariate correlations. I compared the statement "I would consider voting for a third party candidate" with the conservationdifference variable first, then the same statement with the opennessdifference. While the conservationdifference variable had results of a .021 correlation and a significance level of .656, the opennessdifference proved to be highly connected with a correlation of .304 and a significance level of .000. This relationship states that while Republicans want similar values as their candidate (as proved in hypothesis 2), when the difference is large between the individual and candidate values, they still will not consider voting for a third party candidate. Conversely, when Democrats see a wide

difference in their individual values and the candidate values, the probability that they will consider voting for a third party candidate increases significantly. This analysis proves not only the disparate loyalty between the two parties, but that it is rooted in the party values established at the beginning of my research.

In sum, the theories tested with this data proved my hypotheses in almost every facet with high levels of significance all around. I was able to prove first, that Democrats and Republicans have different values on the individual level. Then, I proved that voters want their values to align with the candidates in their party. Finally, I proved that perceived value alignment with candidates influence willingness to deviate from their own party for Democrats but not for Republicans. These three hypotheses combine to answer my initial question of why are Republicans less likely to deviate from their party than Democrats? Based on the quantitative analysis here, I feel confident in saying the values of conservation and openness to change play a large role. However, I do believe that more broadly, it is values that have major impacts on political party loyalty.

Discussion

While my previous research centered around the 2016 election and the implications that a variety of scandals had on elections, this current research turns to look more broadly at political party loyalty. This research helps explain what happened in the 2016 election, when a political outsider that no one predicted to win somehow won the largest office in the world. While many were shocked and confused about the election of Donald J. Trump, it is this loyalty of voters who are willing to turn a blind eye to scandals and disparate values that led him to victory. With his

tumultuous presidency and looming reelection campaign, it will be tested how far this blind loyalty will extend.

While some may look at this research and think predictions look grim for the Democratic party, I think this research also says a lot about Democratic voters. While they are not as loyal to their party, they are more loyal to their individual values, and that is still key information for the Democratic party to note in the upcoming 2020 election. In order to turn the tide, I believe the Democratic candidates will need to zone in on those issues and values that Democratic voters hold deeply. By finding that in their voter block and consistently emphasizing it throughout the campaign period, they could build a strong coalition and give the Republican party a run for their money. It is clear that they can't just campaign on the Democratic party name, rather need to differentiate themselves by standing up for those core values that will build a strong connection with these voters.

The concept of testing values associated with a party is an interesting one, though a continually changing one. Given the extreme party realignments that have occurred throughout history, it is clear that parties and the individuals in each party develop and change over time. It is important to keep up this research of values to see the overall evolution of parties, particularly in response to current events and a dichotomizing public. Future research should be done to study the evolution of each party and their values up until now, and continuing on in the future.

This research found many interesting results with clear implications in the current Presidential race. However, more research would be beneficial to better predict the impact of party values on voting patterns prior to the 2020 election. One of the biggest improvements could be the scope and diversity of my study. While this improved from my first study that I did,

getting a more representative sample from across the country with more racial, socioeconomic, and other diversity would better test my hypotheses to more accurately test the impact.

Additionally, this is difficult to test in the real world. Given that I presented a survey experiment, respondents were in a controlled setting, potentially aware of the experiment ahead of them. This could've resulted in gaming the experiment, or implicit bias by knowing they are not in the real world. This type of experiment worked well for me to prove causality, but I think there is also a great opportunity to expand this research with voters and the 2020 election.

Regardless of potential errors and pitfalls of this experiment, this study provides interesting, significant results that further adds to my research agenda. It begs the questions of how else individuals in each party are inherently different. Additionally, what is the implication of all the political party identification literature that has been done in the past? In future research I hope to look at how party alignment, identification, and loyalty develops over individual's lives and how specific elections impact party loyalty and defection. Overall, I think the 2020 Presidential election will be very telling in this research, and am looking forward to testing further implications of that election.

Appendix A (experiment mock up)

Pre-test questions

1. What gender do you most closely identify with?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Prefer not to answer

2. What is your age?
   a. Under 20
   b. 20-19
   c. 30-39
   d. 40-49
   e. 50-59
   f. 60-69
   g. 70+

3. What is your highest level of education?
   a. Some high school
   b. High school graduate
   c. Some college
   d. 2 year degree
   e. 4 year degree
   f. Professional degree
   g. Doctoral degree

4. With what race do you identify?
   a. Caucasian
   b. Hispanic
   c. African American
   d. American Indian
   e. Other
   f. Prefer not to answer

5. On a scale ranging from very liberal to very conservative, how would you classify your political ideology?
   a. Very liberal
   b. Liberal
   c. Moderate
   d. Conservative
   e. Very conservative

6. What is your party identification?
   a. Strong Republican
   b. Republican leaning

      c.   Independent/third party
      d.   Democratic leaning
      e.   Strong Democrat

7. Most independents/moderates find themselves relating to one party more than another. If you had to choose, which party do you identify with more?
   a. Republican party
   b. Democratic party

You will now read an article regarding a mayoral election. Please read the article closely and answer the following questions.

POLITICS

Immigration Becoming Key Issue in Mayoral Race

Democratic Mayoral candidate, Tim Shugart reveals pro-immigration stance, emphasizing Democratic party leaders

By Paul Johnson | February 17, 2019 – 9:22am

Shugart presents his platform as he announces his candidacy for mayor.

Democratic mayoral candidate Tim Shugart publicly announced his candidacy for Mayor.

In his 20 minute speech, he revealed key issue stances, and strongly emphasized his views on immigration. He emphasized Democratic party stances on open immigration and increased funding for DACA. "The wall should not be funded! Support for immigrants and undocumented citizens in their application process should be a focus of politics today". Democratic party leaders expressed their support with his stance across the country.

TOP STORIES

Iowans have first say in 2020 presidential race

College basketball player drops 55 points

India's fastest train breaks down day after launch

NBA to start African league with 12 teams across the continent

10 best hidden gems to travel to in Europe

POLITICS

Shocking Stance on Immigration Presented by Mayoral Candidate

Democratic Mayoral candidate, Tim Shugart reveals anti-immigration stance, going against Democratic party leaders

By Paul Johnson | February 17, 2019 – 9:22am

Shugart presents his platform as he announces his candidacy for mayor.

Democratic mayoral candidate Tim Shugart publicly announced his candidacy for Mayor.

In his 20 minute speech, he revealed key issue stances, but most notably his views on immigration. Despite party elders emphasizing open immigration and increased funding for the DACA program, Shugart takes a very different stance. "The wall would be beneficial to solve the current immigration problem. Let's build this wall at the southern border!" Democratic party leaders expressed their discontent with his stance across the country.

TOP STORIES

Iowans have first say in 2020 presidential race

College basketball player drops 55 points

India's fastest train breaks down day after launch

NBA to start African league with 12 teams across the continent

10 best hidden gems to travel to in Europe

POLITICS

Shocking Stance on Immigration Presented by Mayoral Candidate

Republican Mayoral candidate, Tim Shugart reveals pro-immigration stance, going against Republican party leaders

By Paul Johnson | February 17, 2019 – 9:22am

Shugart presents his platform as he announces his candidacy for mayor.

Republican mayoral candidate Tim Shugart publicly announced his candidacy for Mayor.

In his 20 minute speech, he revealed key issue stances, but most notably his views on immigration. Despite party elders emphasizing immigration restrictions and notably calling for a wall along the southern border of the United States, Shugart takes a very different stance. "The wall should not be funded! Support for immigrants and undocumented citizens in their application process should be a focus of politics today". Republican party leaders expressed their discontent with his stance across the country.

TOP STORIES

Iowans have first say in 2020 presidential race

College basketball player drops 55 points

India's fastest train breaks down day after launch

NBA to start African league with 12 teams across the continent

10 best hidden gems to travel to in Europe

POLITICS

Immigration Becoming Key Issue in Mayoral Race

Republican Mayoral candidate, Tim Shugart reveals anti-immigration stance, emphasizing Republican party leaders

By Paul Johnson | February 17, 2019 – 9:22am

Shugart presents his platform as he announces his candidacy for mayor.

Republican mayoral candidate Tim Shugart publicly announced his candidacy for Mayor.

In his 20 minute speech, he revealed key issue stances, and strongly emphasized his views on immigration. He emphasized Republican party stances on immigration restrictions and defunding the DACA program. "The wall would be beneficial to solve the current immigration problem. Let's build this wall at the southern border!". Republican party leaders expressed their support with his stance across the country.

TOP STORIES

Iowans have first say in 2020 presidential race

College basketball player drops 55 points

India's fastest train breaks down day after launch

NBA to start African league with 12 teams across the continent

10 best hidden gems to travel to in Europe

Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I feel that this candidate is leading the party well.	○	○	○	○	○
I would consider voting for the other major party candidate.	○	○	○	○	○
I don't think this candidate should win the election.	○	○	○	○	○
I feel this candidate reflects the values of his party well.	○	○	○	○	○
I would be very likely to vote for this candidate.	○	○	○	○	○
I do not agree with this candidate's stance on immigration.	○	○	○	○	○
I would consider voting for a third party candidate.	○	○	○	○	○

To what extent do you think the candidate in the article holds the following values?

	(1) Not at all	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10) This is an extremely closely held value
Traditionalism	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Conformity to political party	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Adherence to social norms	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Self-direction	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Creativity	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Openness to new ideas	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements.

	(1) Totally Disagree	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5) Neither Agree nor Disagree	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10) Totally Agree
A child needs a home with both a mother and a father to grow up happily.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I would not be happy if my neighbor was an undocumented immigrant.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am supportive of combatting global warming.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Homosexuality is not a choice.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am very interested in politics.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Abortion is warranted in certain circumstances.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Religion is a very important part of my life.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am very proud to be an American.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I am passionate about social justice.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
You should always show compassion toward others.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Being wealthy is important to me.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Power is something to be desired.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I like to stick to the status quo.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I believe there is a social order to society.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I appreciate variety in my daily life.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I determine my own self-direction.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix B (Regression Analyses)

What gender do you identify with?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	259	56.7
	Female	195	42.7
	Prefer not to answer	2	.4
	Total	456	99.8

What is your age?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Under 20	1	.2
	20-29	90	19.7
	30-39	187	40.9
	40-49	92	20.1
	50-59	60	13.1
	60-69	22	4.8
	70+	4	.9
	Total	456	99.8

What is your highest level of education?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Less than High School	2	.4
	High school graduate	55	12.0
	Some college	80	17.5
	2 year degree	50	10.9
	4 year degree	202	44.2
	Professional degree	59	12.9
	Doctorate	8	1.8
	Total	456	99.8

What race do you identify with?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Caucasian	295	64.6
	Hispanic	22	4.8
	African American	28	6.1

		Frequency	Percent
	American Indian	27	5.9
	Other	78	17.1
	Prefer not to answer	6	1.3
	Total	456	99.8
Missing	System	1	.2
Total		457	100.0

On a scale ranging from very liberal to very conservative, how would you classify your political ideology?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Very Liberal	70	15.3
	Liberal	144	31.5
	Moderate	135	29.5
	Conservative	84	18.4
	Very Conservative	21	4.6
	Total	454	99.3
Missing	System	3	.7
Total		457	100.0

How would you classify your political party affiliation?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Strong Democrat	109	23.9
	Democratic Leaning	127	27.8
	Independent/Third Party	107	23.4
	Republican Leaning	72	15.8
	Strong Republican	40	8.8
	Total	455	99.6

Most independents/third party identifiers find themselves relating to one party more than another. If you had to choose, which party do you identify with more?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Republican Party	58	12.7
	Democratic Party	49	10.7
	Total	107	23.4

Correlations

		DemConditions	Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I feel that this candidate is leading the party well.
DemConditions	Pearson Correlation	1	-.659**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	285	272
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I feel that this candidate is leading the party well.	Pearson Correlation	-.659**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	272	432

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I feel that this candidate is leading the party well.	RepConditions
Please respond to the following questions	Pearson Correlation	1	-.463**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000

regarding the candidate in the article. - I feel that this candidate is leading the party well.	N	432	160
RepConditions	Pearson Correlation	-.463**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	160	170

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		DemConditions	Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for the other major party candidate.
DemConditions	Pearson Correlation	1	.134*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.027
	N	285	272
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for the other major party candidate.	Pearson Correlation	.134*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027	
	N	272	432

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for the other major party candidate.	RepConditions
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for the other major party candidate.	Pearson Correlation	1	-.021
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.793
	N	432	160
RepConditions	Pearson Correlation	-.021	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.793	
	N	160	170

Correlations

		DemConditions	Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I don't think this candidate should win the election.
DemConditions	Pearson Correlation	1	.582**

			.000
	N	285	272
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I don't think this candidate should win the election.	Pearson Correlation	.582**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	272	432

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I don't think this candidate should win the election.	RepConditions
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I don't think this candidate should win the election.	Pearson Correlation	1	.446**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	432	160
RepConditions	Pearson Correlation	.446**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	160	170

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		DemConditions	Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I feel this candidate reflects the values of his party well.
DemConditions	Pearson Correlation	1	-.731**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	285	272
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I feel this candidate reflects the values of his party well.	Pearson Correlation	-.731**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	272	432

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I feel this candidate reflects the values of his party well.	RepConditions
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I feel this candidate reflects the values of his party well.	Pearson Correlation	1	-.621**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	432	160

RepConditions	Pearson Correlation	-.621**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	160	170

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		DemConditions	Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would be very likely to vote for this candidate.
DemConditions	Pearson Correlation	1	-.564**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	285	272
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would be very likely to vote for this candidate.	Pearson Correlation	-.564**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	272	432

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would be very likely to vote for this candidate.	RepConditions

Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would be very likely to vote for this candidate.	Pearson Correlation	1	-.427**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	432	160
RepConditions	Pearson Correlation	-.427**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	160	170

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I do not agree with this candidate's stance on immigration.	DemConditions
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I do not agree with this candidate's stance on immigration.	Pearson Correlation	1	.687**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	432	272
DemConditions	Pearson Correlation	.687**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	272	285

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I do not agree with this candidate's stance on immigration.	RepConditions
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I do not agree with this candidate's stance on immigration.	Pearson Correlation	1	.431**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	432	160
RepConditions	Pearson Correlation	.431**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	160	170

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		DemConditions	Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for a third party candidate.
DemConditions	Pearson Correlation	1	.425**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	285	272
Please respond to the following questions	Pearson Correlation	.425**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for a third party candidate.	N	272	432

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for a third party candidate.	RepConditions
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for a third party candidate.	Pearson Correlation	1	.173*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.029
	N	432	160
RepConditions	Pearson Correlation	.173*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.029	
	N	160	170

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		DemConditions	conservationdifference
DemConditions	Pearson Correlation	1	-.022
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.713
	N	285	272
conservationdifference	Pearson Correlation	-.022	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.713	
	N	272	432

Correlations

		conservationdifference	RepConditions
conservationdifference	Pearson Correlation	1	.306[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	432	160
RepConditions	Pearson Correlation	.306[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	160	170

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		DemConditions	opennessdifference
DemConditions	Pearson Correlation	1	.393[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	285	272
opennessdifference	Pearson Correlation	.393[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	272	432

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations

		opennessdifference	RepConditions
opennessdifference	Pearson Correlation	1	.098
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.217
	N	432	160
RepConditions	Pearson Correlation	.098	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.217	
	N	160	170

Correlations

		Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for a third party candidate.	conservationdifference
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for a third party candidate.	Pearson Correlation	1	.021
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.656
	N	432	432
conservationdifference	Pearson Correlation	.021	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.656	
	N	432	432

		Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for a third party candidate.	opennessdifference
Please respond to the following questions regarding the candidate in the article. - I would consider voting for a third party candidate.	Pearson Correlation	1	.304**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	432	432
opennessdifference	Pearson Correlation	.304**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	432	432

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Appendix C

References

Bafumi, Joseph, and Shapiro, Robert Y. 2009. "A New Partisan Voter." *The Journal of Politics.*

    71 (January): 1-24.

Baker, Wayne E., Inglehart, Ronald. 2000. "Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence

    of Traditional Values." *American Sociological Review.* 65 (February): 19-51.

Berelson, Bernard R., Lazarsfeld, Paul F., McPhee, William N. 1954. *Voting.* Chicago:

    University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, Angus; Converse, Philip E., Miller, Warren E., Stokes, Donald E. 1960. *The*

    American Voter. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dobewall, Henrik, Strack, Micha. 2014. "Relationship of Inglehart's and Schwartz's Value

    Dimensions Revisited." *International Journal of Psychology.* 49(4):240-248.

Freeman, Job. 1986. "The Political Culture of the Democratic and Republican Parties. *Political*

    Science Quarterly. 101(3): 327-356.

Goren, Paul. 2005. "Party Identification and Core Political Values." *American Journal of*

    Political Science. 49 (October): 881-896.

Green, Donald; Palmquist, Bradley; Schickler, Eric. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds.* Yale

    University Press.

Greene, Steven. 2004. "Social Identity Theory and Party Identification." *Social Science*

    Quarterly. 85 (1): 136-153.

Grossmann, Matt, and Hopkins, David A. 2016. *Asymmetric Politics: Ideological Republicans*

    and Group Interest Democrats. New York City: Oxford University Press.

Hood, Cory, and Strehle, Allie. N.D. "Uneven Partisan Defection: Are Democrats Less Loyal

than Republicans?" *Pi Sigma Alpha Undergraduate Journal.* Forthcoming.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Keith, Bruce E., Bagelby, David B., Neson, Candice J., Orr, Elizabeth, Westlye, Mark C., Wolfinger, Raymond E. "The Partisan Affinities of Independent 'Leaners'." *British Journal of Political Science*. 16(2): 155-185).