

**THE CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF CROSSOVER VOTING IN THE 1998
CALIFORNIA ELECTIONS**

John M. Sides

Jonathan Cohen

Jack Citrin

University of California, Berkeley

jsides@uclink4.berkeley.edu

Working Paper 99-3

Working Papers published by the Institute of Governmental Studies provide quick dissemination of draft reports and papers, preliminary analysis, and papers with a limited audience. The objective is to assist authors in refining their ideas by circulating results and to stimulate discussion about public policy. *Working Papers* are reproduced unedited directly from the author's page.

THE CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF CROSSOVER VOTING IN THE 1998 CALIFORNIA ELECTIONS

John M. Sides

Jonathan Cohen

Jack Citrin

University of California, Berkeley

jsides@uclink4.berkeley.edu

Abstract

We analyze the magnitude, direction, and motivation behind crossover voting in June 1998 California primary. We find that crossover voting is of notable magnitude, but generally parallels patterns of partisan voting. Thus, crossover voting does not appear to have changed the outcome of the gubernatorial or senatorial elections. Our multivariate models of crossover voting indicate that crossover voting is largely *sincere*, meaning that most crossover voters are simply voting for their most preferred candidate, not hedging or raiding. We also analyze the effect of the primary vote on the general election vote. By and large, crossover voters in the primary stick with the opposition party in the general election – a further indication of sincere voting.

WE APPRECIATE THE HELPFUL COMMENTS OF LIZ GERBER. A PREVIOUS VERSION OF THIS CHAPTER WAS DELIVERED AT THE 1999 ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WESTERN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, MARCH 25-27, 1999.

I. INTRODUCTION

Both proponents and opponents of the blanket primary believe that it could affect voting behavior, candidate attributes, campaign strategies, and, ultimately, the results of the elections. In this paper, we explore voting behavior, in particular the much-discussed, much-anticipated, and, in some quarters, much-maligned phenomenon of crossover voting – the act of voting for a candidate outside your party. Our data come from a series of pre- and post-primary surveys conducted by the Field Institute and from the *Los Angeles Times* primary election exit poll. We examine in particular California’s 1998 gubernatorial and U.S. Senate races.¹ Of course, with only one case so far, the full impact of the blanket primary is impossible to determine. However, our analysis of the 1998 elections suggests that, like Proposition 13, this electoral reform leads “neither to the millenium promised by its proponents nor the apocalypse predicted by its detractors” (Citrin and Green 1985: 16).

We first discuss crossover voting in relation to two manifestations of partisanship: party registration and party identification. Our analysis then addresses these empirical questions:

- 1) How much crossover voting occurred in the primary election?
- 2) Whom did crossover voters vote for, and did their votes affect the outcome of the election?
- 3) What motivates crossover voting?
- 4) What is the impact of the primary vote on the general election vote?

¹ We are exceedingly grateful to Mark DiCamillo of the Field Institute and Susan Pinkus of the *Los Angeles Times* for making these data available. Naturally, crossover voting occurs up and down the ballot, in well-publicized state-wide contests as well as local elections, such as those for the State Assembly and Senate. Cain (1997) has suggested that crossover voting may even be more prevalent in down-ballot races, and Cohen et al. (1999) find comparable levels of crossover voting in 1998 California legislative races and Washington State Senate elections under its blanket primary. Though the Field Poll included questions about lower offices, such as state Attorney General, in its pre-primary surveys it did so only intermittently. Furthermore, such questions typically produce a great deal of missing data, since many respondents have no opinion about smaller races, especially months before election day.

II. CONCEPTUALIZING CROSSOVER VOTING

Crossover voting is, on its face, a simple notion: voting for a candidate outside of your political party. However, this basic definition masks several more complicated issues (see Wekkin 1988 for another review). First, how do you define the political party to which a person belongs? One possibility is *party registration*, meaning formal membership in a political party. The blanket primary, in doing away with the party primary, makes party registration electorally superfluous. There is only one primary, and any registered voter can participate fully.² The virtue of defining crossover voting based on party registration is that we can estimate what would have happened were the primary rules different. That is, one can “remove” the winning candidate’s vote share from minor-party, non-partisan, and crossover voters, and then, given certain assumptions, gauge the chances of his or her winning in this simulated closed primary. Defining crossover by party registration provides useful counterfactual comparisons across electoral regimes.

Another alternative is to define crossover voting based on *party identification*. Whereas party registration is a legal formality, party identification is a psychological construct, indicating some kind of enduring tie between citizen and party. Party identification is far from deterministic and is therefore conceptually distinct from a party vote. Nevertheless, if party identification constitutes, in V.O. Key’s phrase, a “standing decision,” then to vote against one’s normal affiliation implies a weakening of loyalty, either temporary or permanent. Because party

For example, in the April 1998 Field Poll, 62.5% of respondents were undecided when asked their preference for attorney general, even after the names and party affiliations of the candidates were read twice.

² In the closed primary all voters could vote for propositions and non-partisan offices, but were not allowed to cast votes in partisan contests.

identification is a matter of degree, defining crossover voting with this as the reference point allows for a deeper analysis of its underlying psychology.

Defining crossover voting also necessitates consideration of political independence. In the case of party registration, “independents” include members of minor parties as well as those who do not register with any party (“non-partisans”).³ In the case of party identification, “independents” profess no attachment to any party. Strictly speaking, no matter whether defined by registration or identification, any independent who votes for a Democrat or Republican engages in crossover voting (Ranney 1972; Adamany 1976). Under California’s closed primary system, party primaries were restricted to voters registered in those parties, and minor-party members, non-partisans, and members of the opposing major party could not participate. The blanket primary effectively enfranchises these groups and thus creates a population of non-party members who can vote for a party’s potential nominees. Party officials are most concerned with potential mischief by the major opposition party, not the votes of minor-party members and non-partisans. So while it is useful to differentiate crossover voting by minor-party members and non-partisans from that by opposing party members, we will focus primarily on major-party members and not on independents. We include independents when we discuss the magnitude and direction of crossover voting. However, the analysis of the motivations behind crossover voting will center on Democrats and Republicans.

Below we consider crossover voting defined both by party registration and party identification. In California, these concepts are highly associated. Combining the respondents from four Field Polls conducted before the primary (N = 4,060), 91% of both *registered*

³ In California, the official designation is “Decline to State.”

Republicans and *registered* Democrats had a consonant party *identification*.⁴ The same high association emerged when we constructed measures of crossover voting.⁵ These variables are simply dichotomous, coded 1 if a respondent crossed over – i.e., a registered Republican or a Republican party identifier voted for a Democrat, and vice versa – and 0 if not. In the case of crossover voting for governor, the correlation between these two measures was .75 ($p < .001$). In the Senate race, the correlation was .71 ($p < .001$). When we cross-tabulated the two measures, a similar result obtained: 93% of party *identifiers* who intended to cross over in their vote for governor also intended to cross over vis-à-vis their party *registration* (91% in the Senate race).

III. MAGNITUDE OF CROSSOVER VOTING

An initial look at the extent of crossover voting in the 1998 primary election is provided in Tables 1 and 2, which present frequency distributions for each measure of crossover voting, calculated by registration and identification, with and without independents. Table 1 shows that, in the gubernatorial race, 15.5% of the combined sample of Field Poll respondents planned to cross over by the identification measure, compared to 16.6% by the registration measure.

Intended crossover voting for Senate, as shown in Table 2, was also similar across these two

⁴ The Field Poll measures party identification with an initial question and then a two-stage partisan probe. The first question asks: “Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?” The follow-up asks: “(If Republican or Democrat) Would you call yourself a strong (Rep/Dem) or a not very strong (Rep/Dem)? (If Independent, Other, or No Preference) Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic party?” One squabble in the literature on crossover voting centers on whether independence should include partisan “leaners” as well as pure independents. Hedlund and his colleagues (Hedlund et al. 1982; Hedlund and Watts 1986) argue that they should not. However, given the “myth of the independent voter” (Keith et al. 1992), Wekkin (1988) argues that they should. We agree and thus define party identifiers as strong, weak, or leaning partisans.

⁵ Obviously, since all of these polls occurred before the election, we are not measuring crossover voting but *intended* crossover voting. In discussing results from the Field Polls, we will occasionally remind the reader that this analysis concerns only vote intention. However, in the interest of brevity, we will more often refer to the dependent variable simply as “crossover voting.” Later we also analyze the *Los Angeles Times* exit poll conducted on the day of the primary, which enables us to examine actual reported voting behavior.

measures: 13.7% in the case of identification and 14.8% in the case of registration.⁶ When independents were counted as crossover voters, the magnitude of crossover voting increased (to the 20-30% range). There was also more of a discrepancy between the magnitude of crossover voting by identification and by registration when independents were included. For example, in the governor's race, the difference was roughly 7% (21.8% vs. 28.6%). However, since we focus primarily on the measures of crossover that exclude independents, this discrepancy is not presently significant.⁷

However measured, the extent of crossover voting is notable. In both the gubernatorial and senatorial races, about one in six voters said they would choose a candidate outside their own party. Whether the crossover vote changed electoral outcomes obviously depends on the circumstances of individual races. Nevertheless, the observed level of crossover voting can be put in some perspective by comparing it with the magnitude of crossover voting in past general elections. In some ways, the Open Primary Initiative changed the rules regulating primary election to mirror those that have always governed general elections – namely, all registered voters can vote for any candidate they wish for any office. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect primary elections to become more like general elections, since the structural constraints are now identical (even though the number of candidates still differs). This claim is born out in the aggregate. As DiCamillo (1998) points out, the numbers of Democrats and Republicans supporting candidates of the other party in the 1998 primary were quite similar to the numbers of Democrats and Republicans who traditionally supported candidates of the other party in general

⁶ There is some overlap between crossover voters in the Senate race and crossover voters in the gubernatorial race, but it is not necessarily large. For example, among Republican crossover voters in the governor's race, 23% crossed over in the Senate race and voted for Boxer. Among Democratic crossover voters in the Senate race, only 15.2% crossed over and voted for a Republican in the governor's race.

⁷ This larger discrepancy derives from the greater number of independents as defined by party registration (15.5% of the combined Field Poll sample) compared to the number of independents by party identification (11.2%).

elections. In the twelve presidential, gubernatorial, and senatorial races from 1984-1996, 20.8% of registered Democrats voted for Republican candidates and 14.3% of registered Republicans voted for Democratic candidates.⁸

The comparability of crossover voting in the blanket primary and past general elections provides initial insight into the motivation behind crossover voting. In general elections, there is no such thing as raiding or hedging.⁹ Most everyone sincerely votes for the candidates they want to win. Since a segment of each party's registered voters regularly prefers candidates of the other party the blanket primary, instead of opening the door for partisan mischief, may do nothing more than allow these voters to express their true preferences earlier in the election season.¹⁰

IV CROSSOVER VOTING IN THE PRIMARY CAMPAIGN

How did crossover voters cast their ballots in the 1998 California primary? Tables 3 and 4 present the distribution of vote for Governor and Senator, broken down by a three-point party identification scale.¹¹ To give a sense of the dynamics of voter preferences as the campaign unfolded, a separate distribution is presented for each of the four pre-primary Field Polls, beginning in February and ending in May.

⁸ We calculated percent voting for candidates of the other party using the last pre-election Field Poll in each election year 1984-1994. In all of these years the last pre-election Field Poll deviated no more than two percentage points from the actual election results, and the outcomes of all races were predicted perfectly.

⁹ In a general election, hedging as defined here cannot occur, since there is no future election in which the hedger can return to his or her own party. However, voters may not vote sincerely in general election if they vote for their second choice because their first choice is very likely to lose. In doing so, voters avoid "wasting" their vote.

¹⁰ The composition of primary and general election voters was also similar. Looking at likely voters in the last Field Poll before the primary and general elections, we found nearly identical distributions of liberals and conservatives, as well as Democrats and Republicans (data not shown). This complements the earlier finding that primary voters are not much different than primary non-voters (Ranney and Epstein 1966; Robeck 1984).

¹¹ This is a collapsed version of the standard seven-point party identification scale.

The Gubernatorial Nomination Campaign

One dynamic of the campaign, indeed most campaigns, is the winnowing away of potential candidates. The earlier Field Polls typically presented respondents a broader array of candidates than did the later polls, when the candidate pool had narrowed. A second dynamic is change in the electoral fortunes of the candidates over time, as presented in the “Total Within Party” column of Table 3. Here, the story was largely the come-from-behind victory of Gray Davis. In the March poll, he lagged significantly behind both Checchi and Harmon, but in the final pre-primary Field Poll, conducted in May 1998, Davis won with more than half (51.3%) of the votes for Democratic candidates.

Tables 3 and 4 also track the rate of crossover intentions over time and how it varied by party identification. Though the large majority of partisan voters typically preferred a candidate within their own party, notable crossover voting was evident, even in the earliest poll: in February 1998, 19.8% of Republicans and 7.6% of Democrats expressed a preference for a gubernatorial candidate of another party, an asymmetry that remained throughout the campaign. In the governor’s race, crossover voting was primarily a Republican phenomenon. Although California Republicans are generally thought of as the more cohesive party, this finding is not unexpected. One might anticipate more crossover voters where there is electoral “action,” that is, races with several serious candidates. In the gubernatorial election, the Democratic race was contested, while the Republican Dan Lungren ran essentially unopposed. This arguably created an incentive for Republicans to cross over since the outcome of the Republican primary was predetermined. Whether this incentive motivated raiding, hedging, or sincere crossover voting is explored below.

A final point about the magnitude of gubernatorial crossover is its stability. In the four months before the primary, the rate of crossover voting changed little, among both Republicans, where it hovered around 20%, and Democrats, where it stabilized at 5%. The combined crossover rate ranged from 9% to 11.5%. This stability suggests that crossover voting was not much affected by campaign events, by the shifting electoral fortunes of various candidates, or by the reduction in undecided voters over time. There seemed to be some fraction of voters in each party who were ready and willing to cross over, even as the likely winner in each race changed.

In comparing the vote choice of crossovers and non-crossovers, two findings emerge. First, and most importantly, similar trends affected vote intention within both groups. In the Democratic race, Davis gained support over time among Democrats, independents, and Republicans alike. By May 1998, he won pluralities among all three groups. Overall, though, both Republican crossovers and independents demonstrated a greater and more durable preference for Checchi than did Democrats. Nevertheless, the similarity of the trends across party suggests that most crossover voting was not mischievous, but rather an expression of sincere preference.

The Senatorial Nomination Campaign

As Table 4 shows, the Senate race mirrored the governor's race in that it featured one competitive and one uncompetitive primary. In this case, the Democratic nomination was a foregone conclusion: the incumbent Barbara Boxer was the only serious candidate. On the other hand, the Republican race was quite competitive and eventually evolved into a duel between State Treasurer Matt Fong and car alarm magnate Darrel Issa, which Fong ultimately won.¹²

¹² The results from the May 1998 Field Poll are a bit problematic because the poll did not include Frank Riggs, who won roughly 10% of the vote, among the Republican candidates. Fong's actual winning margin was 45% to 40%.

Just as in the gubernatorial race, one would expect this disparity in competition to produce asymmetric crossover voting. Specifically, we should see fewer Republicans crossing over than Democrats. However, that result did not emerge in a consistent fashion. In the March 1998 poll, the reverse was true: 10.3% of Republicans crossed over, compared to 8.8% of Democrats, perhaps an indication of Boxer's draw as the incumbent. However, these percentages gradually shifted in the expected direction. The May 1998 poll found that, among Republicans, the fraction of crossover voters had shrunk to 8.6%, but that 15.8% of Democrats said they would cross over.¹³ Despite these fluctuations across party, the overall rate of crossover was again fairly stable in the months before the primary, around 10%.

Trends in voting intention for Senator were comparable to those for the governor's race. At first, the vote choice of Republicans, independents, and Democrats was somewhat different, but as the campaign unfolded, Fong gradually became the preferred Republican among each party group.

In sum, the locus of crossover voting varies with the competitiveness of the contest both *within a party* and *between parties*, and, perhaps, with whether an incumbent is running. In addition, since the trends in the preferences of crossover voters and loyal, and presumably sincere, partisans were very similar, it seems likely that crossover voting was mainly sincere.

V. THE IMPACT OF CROSSOVER VOTING ON THE PRIMARY ELECTION'S OUTCOME

Several past studies of crossover voting (e.g., Hedlund, Watts, and Hedge 1982; Hedlund and Watts 1986) find that crossover voting rarely changes the outcome of a primary election.

¹³ Since the percent of Democrats and Republicans who either were undecided or prefer "Other" had shrunk, conceivably some portion of these changes derived from the preferences of these voters.

Others (Adamany 1976; Wekkin 1988) argue that since crossover voters' preferences usually differ significantly from same-party voters, they can have an indirect impact on electoral outcomes by influencing factors such as candidate momentum and fundraising. Here, we analyze only the election tally itself, drawing upon the *Los Angeles Times* primary election exit poll, to address the counterfactual questions of whether Gray Davis and Matt Fong would have won under a closed primary.

Governor's Race

Table 5 shows that Davis won among exit poll respondents with 57.4% of the votes for Democratic candidates, a result quite close to the final tabulation (57.6%). If the old closed primary rules had been in effect, Davis would have lost the votes of Republican crossovers, decline-to-states, and members of minor parties.¹⁴ Nevertheless, it appears that he would have won anyway, other things equal. First, looking only at Democratic voters, Davis beat out his opponents with 59.3% of the vote. Second, even if all of the Democrats who crossed over and voted for Dan Lungren had voted for either Checchi or Harmon, Davis still would have won. In the exit poll's sample of Democrats, Davis' margin of victory over Checchi, his nearest challenger, was 994 respondents. The number of Democratic crossovers in this sample was only 221. Even if every one of them had voted for Checchi rather than Lungren, Davis still would have won handily.

Another indication that the new rules did not affect the outcome is the fact that non-Democrats also preferred Davis to Checchi or Harmon. Davis won a majority or near-majority of the votes of Republican crossovers, decline-to-states, and minor-party members, so it seems

¹⁴ As we discussed earlier in the section on conceptualizing crossover voting, the relevant measure of partisanship in discussing these counterfactuals is party registration.

quite certain that these infiltrators did not help elect a different candidate than the one Democrats themselves preferred.

Senate Race

According to the *Los Angeles Times* poll presented in Table 6, Fong beat Issa in the Republican primary 47% to 40%, a result that overestimated Fong's actual margin of victory by about 2%. Nevertheless, it appears unlikely that Fong would have lost under California's previous primary regime. First, Fong won among Republicans, i.e. the electorate in the hypothetical closed primary. However, Fong's margin of victory among Republican voters (45% vs. 42% for Issa) was markedly less than among Democrats or decline-to-states. Indeed, Republican crossovers, had they been limited to voting in the Republican race, as in a closed primary, could have changed the outcome. In the exit poll sample, Fong beat Issa by only 156 votes among Republican voters. Republican crossovers numbered 219.

However, the interplay of two factors lessens the likelihood that these Republican crossovers would have changed the outcome. First, Republican crossovers were quite liberal (38% classified themselves as such). Second, Fong appeared more attractive to liberals. Among Fong voters, 17% classified themselves as liberals, 12% as conservatives, and the vast majority as moderates. The comparable percentages among Issa voters were 12% liberal and 40% conservative, within many fewer moderates. Taken together, these facts imply that Republicans who voted for Boxer would have been more likely to vote for Fong than Issa in a closed primary.

Similarly, the number of Democrats who voted for a Republican candidate (378) was big enough to have changed the outcome of the Republican primary if they had favored Issa over

Fong by a significant amount. However, Democrats, like Republicans, favored Fong, and by even larger margins than Republicans did.¹⁵

To conclude, while crossover voting was substantial, we believe it did not alter the outcome of either the gubernatorial or senatorial race in California in 1998. The distribution of candidate preferences among crossover voters in each primary was similar to the distribution of the vote overall. Moreover, because both Davis and Fong garnered the support of their respective party faithful, they probably would have won in a closed primary as well.

VI. THE MOTIVATIONS BEHIND CROSSOVER VOTING

A tripartite typology of crossover voting is a useful starting point for analyzing the motivational basis of crossover voting. One motivation is *sincere*, which means that voters simply vote for the candidate they like best. Alternatively, crossover voting could be viewed as *hedging*. In this case, crossover voters actually prefer a candidate in their own party, but cross over to select their favorite candidate in the other party, thereby hedging their bets in the general election. If their preferred candidate in each party wins, then no matter who wins the general election, hedgers will find the outcome acceptable. Third, crossover voting can be *raiding*, where mischievous voters cross over to the weakest candidate in the opposing party in hopes of guaranteeing an easy general election for their own party's candidate.

Evidence of hedging and raiding is lacking in American primary elections (Hedlund et al. 1982; Hedlund and Watts 1986; Abramowitz et al. 1981; Southwell 1991; Wekkin 1991). One hypothesized reason is that most voters lack the political sophistication to engage in the

¹⁵ The numbers of both decline-to-states and minor-party registrants who participated in the Republican primary were too modest to affect the outcome, even if they had all voted for Issa (data not shown).

calculations necessary to vote in this manner. Indeed, given the length and complexity of the ballot in most California districts, with myriad state ballot propositions (nine in June 1998) as well as various local initiatives, hedging and raiding would be beyond the interest or capacity of most citizens. If this is so, then crossover voting should be mostly sincere.

A *Los Angeles Times* poll conducted in October 1997 provides initial support for this conclusion. Among the respondents, 90% of registered Democrats and 82% of registered Republicans said the most likely reason that they might vote for a candidate of another party was simply that they favored him or her. Only 7% of Democrats and 5% of Republicans said they would be likely to raid, meaning vote for a weak member of the opposition party. Eighty-seven percent of the decline-to-state respondents also said they would choose their most preferred candidate.

Theoretical Expectations

Hypotheses about the factors that promote crossover voting rest on assumptions regarding the motivational foundations of this behavior. The analysis undertaken here assumes that most crossover voting is sincere. What then are the likely characteristics of crossover voters?

Strength of party identification should influence the likelihood of crossover voting. Strong partisans should be less likely to cross over than weak partisans. Similarly, crossover voting should be more likely among those whose *ideology* is out-of-step with their party's. Thus, conservative Democrats should cross over to the Republican Party at a higher rate than liberal Democrats. It is also conceivable that sincere crossover voting might have some specific issue content. For example, pro-choice Republicans might have some incentive to vote for a

Democratic candidate if the Republican candidates are explicitly pro-life (as Dan Lungren was in the gubernatorial primary). In fact, further evidence from *Los Angeles Times* Polls suggests the possibility of policy-driven crossover: when asked which party could do a better job handling issues ranging from the economy to education to immigration, between 7 and 27% of Democrats and Republicans felt that the other party would do a better job.

Specific demographic attributes might also drive voters to cross over, net of the effects of ideology, partisanship, and policy. For example, the role of *gender*, in particular the attractiveness of Democrats like Jane Harmon and Barbara Boxer to female Republicans, was much-discussed in the June 1998 primary. These effects may vary by contest depending on the presence or absence of female candidates. The presence of female candidates may “cue” gender considerations otherwise absent in an all-male race.¹⁶

The effects of gender might also vary across party. Consistent with most speculation and some analysis (DiCamillo 1998), we expect gender to have a positive effect among Republicans, as Republican women, perhaps attracted to Harmon and Boxer in particular, should be more likely to crossover than Republican men, but what of its effect among Democrats? This is an open question. Just because a variable “pushes” some Republicans to cross over does not mean it will exert a comparable “pull” on Democrat women and keep them within their party. However, gender issues might push Democratic men to defect.

Race and ethnicity could also have an impact. Blacks and, to a lesser extent, Latinos are largely Democratic constituencies. Black or Latino Democrats should be less likely to cross over, especially because the California Republican Party is often identified with conservative stances on affirmative action and immigration that could further alienate racial minorities. The

¹⁶ However, since both the gubernatorial and senatorial races featured female candidates, we do not have variation by contest. Analysis of more offices and of later elections should give us a richer understanding of this issue.

race of candidates might make race even more salient. However, in June 1998 both races featured mostly white candidates (Matt Fong, an Asian-American, was the only exception).

Similarly, given that high *income* is generally associated with a Republican vote, we might expect that rich Democrats will be more likely to cross over to the Republican Party, and rich Republicans less likely to cross over to the Democratic Party. *Religiosity* may also factor in as a boon to Republican candidates. *Union membership* could function the same way for Democrats.

Two variables, *age* and *education*, do not generate clear theoretical expectations. Age could, for instance, have a consistently negative impact on the propensity to cross over regardless of party, if one assumes that partisan loyalties, whether Democratic or Republican, ossify with age. However, to the extent that age is associated with an allegiance to one of the two parties, its impact on crossover voting could vary. Regarding education, we might hypothesize, on the one hand, that it will have a consistently negative impact on crossover voting, since more educated voters could be more dedicated partisans. On the other hand, educated voters are also more diligent consumers of political information, and are thus more likely to know more about candidates in the opposing party and perhaps be attracted to them. Furthermore, educated voters' greater cognitive capacities may provide the wherewithal to vote strategically. Education could also have a varying impact on crossover voting among Democrats and Republicans if it is generally associated with a loyalty to one party or another.

These propositions concerning the possible impact of demographic characteristics on crossover voting assume that strength of partisanship, ideology, and issue positions do not exhaust the reasons for sincere crossover voting. In methodological language, there are excluded variables in the model that these background attributes somehow capture.

Data and Measures

Below we estimate a multivariate model to predict crossover voting. To ensure an adequate number of cases for statistical analysis, we combine the four Field Polls into one dataset within a sample size of 4,060. The choice of dependent variable again depends on whether we define crossover voting as voting against one's party identification and party registration. Since an analysis of motivations is in essence an examination of the psychology of voters, we opt for the more psychological measure of crossover voting, that based on party identification (though we also replicate the analysis on the measure of crossover based on registration). Among our predictors, gender, ethnic identification as black, Latino, or Asian, and union membership are dichotomous variables. Religiosity is measured with two dummy variables, one for Protestants and one for Catholics. Age is the number of years, education a ten-point scale, and income a five-point scale (detailed descriptions of all variable codings are provided in the Appendix).

To measure ideology, we construct a standard seven-point scale from a series of three questions in the Field Poll. On this scale, 1 represents a strong conservative and 7 a strong liberal. Then, to measure the strength of partisanship, we create and then "fold" the standard seven-point party identification scale at the mid-point to create a four-category measure, where 1 comprises independents and 4 strong partisans. To measure issue content, we would ideally rely on questions about several salient issues, such as abortion, education, crime, government spending, and the like. However, all that is available are preferences on two highly contested ballot propositions on the June ballot, Propositions 226 and 227. Proposition 226 mandated that unions obtain the permission of all members before spending their dues for political purposes. Proposition 227 radically limited bilingual education programs in California public schools. 226

failed by a narrow margin. 227 passed easily. Although this interpretation is somewhat crude, we construe a vote for either of these propositions as conservative, and thus more congruent with a vote for a Republican candidate.¹⁷

Multivariate Results: The Governor's Race

The multivariate analysis is comprised of several logit models, where the dependent variable is coded 1 if the respondent intends to cross over (against his or her party identification), and 0 if not. These models were estimated for each party-contest combination, and we include four replications to test the robustness of the results. The first replication includes only the last three Field Polls in the sample, since the first poll, which mentioned potential candidates (e.g., Riordan and Wilson) who never ran, may have produced anomalous results. The next replication includes only the sample from the May 1998 Field Poll, conducted just before the election when vote preferences presumably had solidified. The third replication includes only those respondents who identified themselves as likely voters, since they might be somewhat different in their predisposition to or motivation for crossing over. The last replication employs a new dependent variable, the measure of crossover using respondent's party registration instead of party identification.

Table 7 presents the results for the Republican vote for Governor. Model 7.1 is the full model, and it confirms several of our expectations. For one, the coefficient for ideology is statistically significant and positive. As Republicans become more liberal, the probability of a crossover vote increases. Furthermore, the coefficient for strength of partisanship is negative and statistically significant, indicating that increased partisanship is associated with a declining probability of crossing over. Gender is also highly significant and positive in the full model;

¹⁷ Even though Lungren nominally opposed 227.

other things equal, Republican women are more likely to cross over in the gubernatorial race than are Republican men. By contrast, income is negatively associated with a crossover vote. The more wealthy the Republican, the less likely he or she is to vote for a Democrat in the primary. Both vote for 226 and 227 are insignificant: opinions about these two initiatives are not related with the probability of a crossover vote, net of the other variables in the model. The rest of the variables in the model are also insignificant at the .05 level, though the dummy variables for Protestantism and Catholicism are in the expected direction.

Table 11 presents a set of predicted probabilities for these analyses based on the results of the full model. The results for Republican crossover for governor show the power of partisanship and ideology. With all other variables held at their modal values, there is a .56 probability that a strong liberal Republican will cross over, compared to .17 among strong conservative Republicans. Comparable probabilities obtain for ideology. Income also has a strong effect: those in the lowest income group are predicted to have a .41 probability of crossing over, compared to .17 among the wealthiest. Gender and vote on 226 have weaker effects.

Model 7.2 is “trimmed” to include only these significant results, simply to show that the predictive power of the model decreases only minimally. To be sure, that predictive power is not overwhelming. Although the overall percent correctly predicted is 73.7%, that figure conceals vastly different results for “no crossover” votes and crossover votes. In particular, the percent correctly predicted of crossover votes is only 20.1% in Model 7.2. This demonstrates that these models capture only part of motivational basis of crossover voting. Excluded factors such as candidate traits or issues beliefs and random behavior may account for the rest.

For the most part, the replications confirm these results, although the effect of partisanship wanes in the first replication (March-May polls only). Interestingly, in the second

replication, which includes only the poll closest to the primary election, 227 Vote is a significant predictor of crossover. As expected, its effect is negative: a vote for the proposition, i.e., against bilingual education, is associated with a declining probability of crossover among Republicans.

Comparable models of Democratic crossover for Governor, presented in Table 8, produce somewhat similar results. While ideology has the hypothesized effect – the probability of crossing over declines with increasing liberalism – the strength of partisanship variable is insignificant in Model 8.1. However, the 226 vote is statistically significant. Support for 226, which is in essence an anti-union vote, is associated with a higher probability of crossover voting among Democrats.

That gender is not significant in these or any model of Democratic crossover demonstrates that the “pull” effect of gender, i.e., its ability to keep Democrats within the party, is not as strong as its “push” effect, i.e., its ability to drive Republicans to a Democratic candidate. In other words, Democratic men are less likely to defect than Republican women. Of the remaining sociodemographic variables in this model, income, education, and union member are significant. Income is in the expected direction: as income increases, propensity to cross over among Democrats increases, net of other variables in the model. Education has the opposite effect. As Democratic respondents become more educated, *ceteris paribus*, their propensity to cross over in the gubernatorial primary decreases. Curiously, union membership is in the opposite direction than expected: other things equal, being a union member (or having one in the family) is associated with a greater likelihood to cross over and vote for Lungren. However, as evidenced in Table 11, this unanticipated effect has only a weak impact on the predicted probability of crossing over. In fact, these variables do not have a strong impact in general.

Multivariate Results: The Senate Race

In Table 9, we present this same series of models for Republican crossover for Senator. By and large, the results are the same as those for Republican crossover for Governor, despite the differences in the size of the Democratic field (three candidates vs. only one, Barbara Boxer). As hypothesized, ideology and partisanship are significantly associated with the probability of crossing over. Greater liberalism is associated with an increased probability of crossover; greater partisanship is associated with a declining probability of crossover. Table 11 shows that the effect of liberalism is quite strong: the predicted probability of crossover among strongly liberal Republicans, all other variables held at their modes, is .90. Vote intention on Proposition 226 is also significant and in the expected direction: a pro-226 stance, which means a vote against unions, is also negatively associated with crossover voting. In general, Republicans are more likely to “stay home” when they are more conservative, more partisan, and antagonistic to a traditional Democratic constituency. Interestingly, gender is again significant, although not strongly so ($p < .10$). Even after controlling for “political” variables, women are more likely to cross over and vote for Boxer than men. The replications largely confirm these results.

Table 10 applies the basic model to Democratic crossover voting for Senator, with results that again confirm our theoretical expectations. Ideology and partisanship have significant negative effects. The coefficient for Vote on 226 is again significant again, and in the hypothesized direction: a vote for 226 (against unions) is associated with a greater likelihood of a Democratic crossover vote to Fong or Issa, other things equal. The results also suggest that gender has some “pull” effect, as Democratic women were less likely to cross over than men. Interestingly, Protestant status is significant and in the expected direction. *Ceteris paribus*, it is associated with an increase in the probability of a Democratic crossover vote. The coefficient for

education, as in the analysis of Democratic crossover for Governor, is significant and negative. More education is associated with a declining propensity to cross over and vote for a Republican. The predicted probabilities in Table 11 again show the power of ideology and partisanship, and to a lesser extent education.

Taken together, these results confirm that crossover voting tends to be sincere rather than strategic. Defecting in the primary resembles defecting in the general election. Relatively weak party ties, sympathy with the ideological orientation of the other party, and membership in groups generally linked to support for the opposition all boost the probability of crossing over.

VII. THE EFFECT OF A PRIMARY VOTE ON A GENERAL ELECTION VOTE: DO CROSSOVERS RETURN HOME?

The final part of this analysis concerns the impact of the primary vote on the general election vote. The central question is: do voters who cross over in the primary election “return home” to their own party’s candidate in the general election? Or do they continue to support the opposite party? If crossover voters persist in their disloyalty, then it once again appears as if their intentions are sincere. If crossover voters return home, then their primary voting behavior may have derived from a hedging or raiding strategy. Suppose a Republican crosses over to vote for Checchi in the gubernatorial primary but then casts a vote for Lungren in the general election. This could be an act of hedging, if Checchi were his most favored Democrat, or raiding, if Checchi were perceived as the easiest Democrat to beat in the general election. Of course, this Republican may have preferred Checchi above everyone else, but if Lungren was his second choice overall then it makes sense to have switched back in the general election. This points to the difficulty of distinguishing hedging from sincere crossover.

The data in this analysis come from the last Field Poll conducted before the November general election. This poll not only asked voters their intended vote in the general, but also their vote in the primary, if they stated that they had in fact voted in the primary. Naturally, such a recall measure is fraught with problems. People tend to overstate their degree of participation and may not accurately remember their primary vote (which occurred five months before). In this sample, more voters reported that they voted for the candidate who won the primary election than actually did so – evidence of the familiar “halo” or “bandwagon” effect. According to this poll, Davis should have won the primary with 76% of the vote, instead of the 51% he actually garnered. Similarly, Matt Fong’s margin increased to 74% of the Republican electorate, whereas he actually won 45%.¹⁸

But while both margins of victory were significantly inflated, there was a much more modest bias in respondents’ recollections of crossover voting. Sixteen percent of the gubernatorial voters recalled crossing over against their party registration, as did 14% of senatorial voters.¹⁹ These rates are similar to those from both the pre-primary Field Polls (see Tables 1 and 2) and the *Los Angeles Times* exit poll. For example, according to the exit poll, 17.5% of voters crossed over in the gubernatorial race, and 15% crossed over in the senate race. The recall questions can thus help identify the motivations behind crossover voting, though there is uncertainty about how the aggregate recall bias toward Davis and Fong, the winners, affects the individual results.

One way to gauge the motivation of crossover voters is to see to how closely movements in their opinions mirror those of loyal party voters. Previously, we discussed how similar trends

¹⁸ One reason for the observed recall bias is that the Field question only listed the major candidates. The senatorial recall question, for example, did not list Frank Riggs or “other Republican candidate” as one of the options. Riggs garnered 10% of the votes for Republican candidates.

emerged among crossover and loyal party voters in the primary campaign. There were also similar trends in recall bias, which suggest that the same factors motivate the memories of both types of voters. Seventy percent of Republicans who claimed to have voted for a Democratic candidate in the primary recalled voting for Davis, as did 76% of Democrats, and 90% of decline-to-states.²⁰ In the Senate race, the direction of bias, when it exists, was the same across voters regardless of their partisanship (or lack thereof).

If crossover voting was largely sincere, most Republican crossovers in the gubernatorial primary should have supported Davis in the general election, and Democratic crossovers in the senatorial race should have supported Fong in the general election. Tables 12 and 13 show just that. In Table 12, we see that 63% of Republican crossovers stuck with Davis in November. Table 13 presents a comparable result: 64% of Democratic crossovers stuck with Fong in November. This tendency again indicates the similarity between the blanket primary and the general election. In a sense, the blanket primary is a preview, or even a first stage, of the general election campaign.²¹

General election preferences among crossover voters depended somewhat on their primary vote choice. Table 12 shows that, while only 25.4% of Republicans who voted for Davis in the primary returned to their party, 46.7% of Harmon voters and 66.7% of Checchi voters did so. This pattern also points to sincere voting, or possibly hedging, in the primary. Since 55% of Republican crossovers who voted for Checchi in the primary were self-identified conservatives, it is logical that they would gravitate back to Lungren, the more conservative

¹⁹ We rely on party registration here because the November Field Poll included no questions about party identification in this poll.

²⁰ For both Republicans and Democrats, the magnitude of the bias is about 20% above the election-day tallies.

²¹ Overall, 92% of voters who voted for a Democrat or Republican in the gubernatorial primary voted for the same party's nominee in the general election. In the senatorial race, 95% voted for a candidate of the same party in both elections.

major-party candidate in the general election. Similarly, of the 70.5% of Democratic crossovers for Issa who supported Boxer in the general election, most (60%) were conservative or moderate Democrats who arguably shared Issa's views or liked him personally. This lessens the likelihood that these Democrats were raiding in the primary (though it does not explain why a conservative Democrat would support Boxer over Fong in the general election).

The pattern of general election behavior among primary voters suggests the importance of candidate appeal. Those who continued to cross over in the general election were merely sticking with their preferred candidate. Those who returned home tended to have a first preference in the opposition party, but a second preference in their own. For example, most Republicans who crossed over to Checchi returned to their own party to vote for Lungren in the general. Thus, disloyalty to the parties did not run very deep. Crossover voting in the 1998 blanket primary does not prefigure partisan realignment; rather, it is another manifestation of the fluidity in voting behavior that has a long history in California.

VIII. CONCLUSION

A broad array of evidence indicates that crossover voting in the June 1998 blanket primary was sincere. Party mischief was minimal, and crossover voting did not affect electoral outcomes. This election was no apocalypse for the parties, then. But neither was it an Eden for its proponents: it did not produce moderate, centrist candidates in the gubernatorial and senatorial races. We suggest that the blanket primary's most important impact is how it prefigures the general election. Doing well overall, not just among the registered voters of one's own party, thus can be critical. If this is so, an additional set of research questions emerges.

How do the results of the primary election affect voters' perceptions of the viability of the candidates who emerge? And, at an institutional level, how does the need to fuse partisan and more general appeals even before the primary shape the nature of campaigns and campaigning?

Table 1. Magnitude of Crossover Voting for Governor

	Party Identification		Party Registration	
	no inds	inds	no inds	inds
no crossover	84.5%	78.2%	83.4%	71.4%
crossover	15.5	21.8	16.6	28.6
N	2574	2574	2492	2492

Source: Field Polls of February-May 1998.

Table 2. Magnitude of Crossover Voting for Senator

	Party Identification		Party Registration	
	no inds	inds	no inds	inds
no crossover	86.3%	79.3%	85.2%	71.6%
crossover	13.7	20.7	14.8	28.4
N	2701	2701	2615	2615

Source: Field Polls of February-May 1998.

NOTE: These figures are expressed as a percentage of all voters with a preference for a candidate.

Table 3. Preference for Governor, by Party Identification

	February 1998				March 1998			
	Republican (N=318)	Independent (N=56)	Democrat (N=355)	TOTAL within party	Republican (N=496)	Independent (N=117)	Democrat (N=565)	TOTAL within party
Republican	57.9	19.6	7.6	100.0	47.4	7.7	4.6	100.0
Lungren	36.5	7.1	1.7	56.8	45.0	6.8	3.4	92.6
Riordan	21.4	12.5	5.9	43.2	–	–	–	
Peron	–	–	–		2.4	0.9	1.2	7.4
Democrat	19.8	32.2	65.6	100.0	20.1	28.1	65.0	100.0
Checchi	10.4	12.5	16.3	31.2	10.9	17.9	20.0	37.6
Davis	4.7	7.1	22.5	31.5	3.4	3.4	17.9	24.4
Harman	0.3	1.8	4.5	5.7	5.8	6.8	27.1	38.0
Panetta	3.8	5.4	18.6	25.8	–	–	–	
Vasconcellos	0.6	5.4	3.7	5.7	–	–	–	
Other	–	–	–		3.4	6.8	3.5	
Undecided	22.3	48.2	26.8		28.0	57.3	26.8	
	TOTAL CROSSOVER: 9.0%				TOTAL CROSSOVER: 8.9%			

	April 1998				May 1998			
	Republican (N=353)	Independent (N=99)	Democrat (N=478)	TOTAL within party	Republican (N=279)	Independent (N=62)	Democrat (N=373)	TOTAL within party
Republican	51.6	6.1	5.0	100.0	65.9	15.4	5.1	100.0
Lungren	51.6	6.1	5.0	100.0	65.9	15.4	5.1	100.0
Riordan	–	–	–		–	–	–	
Peron	–	–	–		–	–	–	
Democrat	21.5	48.4	68.7	100.0	22.6	48.4	80.1	100.0
Checchi	11.9	23.2	24.7	40.5	7.5	16.1	15.0	22.2
Davis	6.8	14.1	26.2	36.1	9.7	19.4	43.4	51.3
Harman	2.8	11.1	17.8	23.5	5.4	12.9	21.7	26.5
Panetta	–	–	–		–	–	–	
Vasconcellos	–	–	–		–	–	–	
Other	3.1	7.1	2.7		3.6	11.3	4.0	
Undecided	23.8	38.4	23.6		7.9	25.8	10.7	
	TOTAL CROSSOVER: 10.8%				TOTAL CROSSOVER: 11.5%			

Source: Field Poll. The Total Crossover rates differ from Tables 1 and 2 because here they are expressed as a percentage of all voters, including those without a preference (undecideds).

Table 4. Preference for Senator, by Party Identification

	February 1998				March 1998			
	Republican (N=318)	Independent (N=56)	Democrat (N=355)	TOTAL within party	Republican (N=496)	Independent (N=117)	Democrat (N=565)	TOTAL within party
Democrat	9.4	35.7	67.6	100.0	10.3	30.8	72.2	100.0
Boxer	9.4	35.7	67.6	100.0	10.3	30.8	72.2	100.0
Republican	73.8	32.1	17.4	100.0	51.7	14.5	8.8	100.0
Fong	11.6	7.1	3.7	17.1	19.2	3.4	4.2	38.1
Issa	13.8	7.1	2.8	18.4	25.8	9.4	3.4	48.9
Riggs	2.5	0.0	0.8	3.5	6.7	1.7	1.2	13.0
Wilson	45.9	17.9	10.1	61.0	–	–	–	–
Other	–	–	–	–	5.4	7.7	3.4	–
Undecided	16.7	32.1	14.9	–	32.7	47.0	15.6	–
	TOTAL CROSSOVER: 9.2%				TOTAL CROSSOVER: 7.2%			

	April 1998				May 1998			
	Republican (N=353)	Independent (N=99)	Democrat (N=478)	TOTAL within party	Republican (N=279)	Independent (N=62)	Democrat (N=373)	TOTAL within party
Democrat	11.6	30.3	69.7	100.0	8.6	38.7	73.7	100.0
Boxer	11.6	30.3	69.7	100.0	8.6	38.7	73.7	100.0
Republican	53.9	23.2	10.9	100.0	73.8	33.9	15.8	100.0
Fong	24.4	12.1	6.1	47.7	38.0	21.0	9.4	53.8
Issa	29.5	11.1	4.8	52.3	35.8	12.9	6.4	46.2
Riggs	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Wilson	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other	4.2	6.1	5.0	–	2.9	8.1	2.9	–
Undecided	30.3	40.4	14.4	–	14.7	19.4	7.5	–
	TOTAL CROSSOVER: 10.0%				TOTAL CROSSOVER: 11.6%			

Source: Field Poll. The Total Crossover rates differ from Tables 1 and 2 because here they are expressed as a percentage of all voters, including those without a preference (undecideds).

Table 5. Vote for Democratic Gubernatorial Candidates by Party Registration

Party Registration	Vote Choice				TOTAL
	Checchi	Davis	Harmon	Other Democrat	
Democrat	18.5	59.3	20.8	1.4	100%
Decline to State	18.0	59.3	21.7	1.1	100.1%
Republican	29.5	49.7	19.1	1.7	100%
Other Party	29.7	51.7	16.1	2.5	100.1%
Total	20.8	57.4	20.4	1.5	100.1%

Source: *Los Angeles Times Primary Election Exit Poll, June 1998.*

Table 6. Vote for Republican Senatorial Candidates by Party Registration

Party Registration	Vote Choice			TOTAL
	Fong	Issa	Other Republican	
Democrat	56.0	31.5	12.5	100%
Decline to State	59.8	35.1	5.2	100.1%
Republican	45.0	42.0	13.0	100%
Other Party	39.8	44.1	16.1	100%
Total	47.3	40.0	12.7	100%

Source: *Los Angeles Times Primary Election Exit Poll, June 1998.*

Table 7. Republican Crossover for Governor
(frequency of crossover: 27.8%)

	Model		Replications			
	7.1	7.2	March- May polls	May 98 poll only	Likely Voters	Crossover (party reg)
Ideology	.18* (.07)	.20** (.07)	.22* (.09)	.28# (.15)	.17* (.08)	.20* (.08)
Strength of Partisanship	-.63*** (.14)	-.63*** (.14)	-.28 (.18)	-.50# (.26)	-.67*** (.14)	-.70*** (.17)
226 Vote	-.32 (.22)	-.36# (.22)	-.17 (.27)	.44 (.41)	-.34 (.23)	-.40 (.25)
227 Vote	-.12 (.25)		-.31 (.32)	-1.02* (.48)	-.15 (.26)	-.19 (.28)
Gender	.44* (.19)	.41* (.19)	.37 (.24)	.76* (.36)	.29 (.20)	.39# (.22)
Protestant	-.19 (.23)		.02 (.28)	-.45 (.40)	-.20 (.24)	-.15 (.26)
Catholic	-.06 (.27)		-.13 (.34)	-.43 (.54)	-.11 (.28)	-.13 (.32)
Income	-.22** (.08)	-.23** (.07)	-.20* (.10)	-.47** (.15)	-.23** (.08)	-.27** (.09)
Age	-.005 (.006)		-.005 (.007)	-.008 (.01)	-.009 (.006)	-.002 (.007)
Education	-.04 (.05)		-.003 (.06)	-.07 (.08)	-.02 (.05)	-.05 (.05)
Constant	1.98** (.73)	1.34* (.58)	.42 (.93)	2.52# (1.40)	2.31** (.78)	2.32* (.90)
-2 * LL	664.3	666.6	440.4	197.9	616.6	531.1
% correctly predicted	74.6	73.7	75.1	77.3	74.5	76.7
no crossover	94.9	94.3	98.1	93.5	95.4	95.2
crossover	21.8	20.1	8.5	31.5	17.1	21.6
N	627	627	413	207	592	533

Table entries are logit coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is coded 1 for a crossover vote and 0 otherwise. N=647. ***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05; #p<.10. Data are from the Field Poll.

Table 8. Democratic Crossover for Governor
(frequency of crossover: 7.1%)

	Model 8.1	Model 8.2	Replications			Crossover (party reg)
			March- May polls	May 98 poll only	Likely Voters	
Ideology	-.27* (.14)	-.25* (.10)	-.22* (.13)	-.55* (.25)	-.27* (.11)	-.18 (.12)
Strength of Partisanship	-.14 (.20)		-.31# (.23)	.34 (.45)	-.03 (.22)	-.50* (.24)
226 Vote	1.03** (.34)	1.04** (.32)	.93** (.41)	1.19# (.71)	1.09** (.35)	1.13** (.37)
227 Vote	.14 (.34)		.07 (.41)	.03 (.70)	-.03 (.35)	.01 (.37)
Gender	-.34 (.31)		-.40 (.36)	-.27 (.65)	-.29 (.32)	-.25 (.34)
Protestant	-.44 (.38)		-.58# (.45)	-.88 (.82)	-.37 (.39)	-.49 (.44)
Catholic	-.24 (.39)		-.16 (.43)	-1.22 (.98)	-.18 (.41)	-.52 (.44)
Income	.23* (.12)	.28* (.12)	.23# (.14)	.27 (.25)	.30* (.13)	.27* (.13)
Age	.008 (.01)		.01 (.01)	-.01 (.02)	.008 (.01)	.005 (.01)
Education	-.16* (.08)	-.15* (.08)	-.17* (.09)	-.15 (.17)	-.17* (.08)	-.19* (.08)
Black	-.59 (.56)		-.02 (.59)	-8.26 (26.13)	-.57 (.56)	-.50 (.57)
Latino	-.79 (.54)		-.69 (.61)	-1.06 (1.18)	-.75 (.55)	-.70 (.62)
Union Member	.66* (.31)	.61* (.31)	.38 (.37)	1.56* (.71)	.67* (.32)	.60# (.35)
Constant	-1.55 (1.11)	-2.32*** (.60)	-1.13 (1.25)	-1.12 (2.59)	-2.09# (1.21)	.49 (1.28)
-2 * LL	339.6	348.5	248.4	81.1	677.9	278.0
% correctly predicted	92.9	92.9	91.7	95.8	92.9	92.9
no crossover	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
crossover	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0
N	743	743	483	260	690	616

Table entries are logit coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is coded 1 for a crossover vote and 0 otherwise. N=743. ***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05; #p<.10. Data are from the Field Poll.

Table 9. Republican Crossover for Senator
(frequency of crossover: 13.7%)

			Replications			
	Model 9.1	Model 9.2	March- May polls	May 98 poll only	Likely Voters	Crossover (party reg)
Ideology	.45*** (.10)	.45*** (.09)	.49*** (.12)	.60** (.22)	.48*** (.11)	.57*** (.12)
Strength of Partisanship	-.40* (.18)	-.41* (.18)	-.25 (.23)	-.26 (.38)	-.36# (.19)	-.49* (.22)
226 Vote	-.74** (.28)	-.74** (.27)	-.66* (.33)	-.57 (.56)	-.66* (.29)	-.75* (.32)
227 Vote	.13 (.33)		-.18 (.40)	-.51 (.61)	-.03 (.33)	.09 (.37)
Gender	.44# (.26)	.42# (.26)	.47 (.32)	.84 (.53)	.40 (.27)	.37 (.30)
Protestant	-.14 (.30)		-.09 (.36)	-.22 (.54)	-.20 (.31)	-.14 (.35)
Catholic	.08 (.35)		.02 (.44)	-1.40 (1.03)	-.18 (.38)	-.30 (.43)
Income	-.07 (.10)		-.13 (.13)	-.05 (.21)	-.08 (.11)	-.14 (.12)
Age	-.002 (.008)		-.004 (.01)	.001 (.02)	-.001 (.009)	.001 (.009)
Education	-.02 (.06)		.01 (.08)	-.03 (.12)	.04 (.07)	.05 (.07)
Asian	.55 (.52)		1.27# (.67)	2.05 (1.46)	.91# (.55)	.74 (.60)
Constant	-1.50 (.98)	-1.54* (.73)	-1.46 (1.21)	-2.13 (1.97)	-1.34 (1.03)	-1.48 (1.23)
-2 * LL	414.2	416.5	280.7	110.9	380.4	313.9
% correctly predicted	86.7	86.7	85.5	89.7	87.5	86.9
no crossover	99.4	99.6	98.8	99.4	99.6	98.4
crossover	6.1	4.9	11.9	17.4	9.3	10.8
N	600	600	386	195	562	497

Table entries are logit coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is coded 1 for a crossover vote and 0 otherwise. N=600. ***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05; #p<.10. Data are from the Field Poll.

Table 10. Democratic Crossover for Senator
(frequency of crossover: 17.6%)

	Model 10.1	Model 10.2	Replications			
			March- May polls	May 98 poll only	Likely Voters	Crossover (party reg)
Ideology	-.40*** (.08)	-.41*** (.07)	-.38*** (.09)	-.48*** (.14)	-.39*** (.08)	-.35*** (.08)
Strength of Partisanship	-.76*** (.14)	-.76*** (.14)	-.81*** (.17)	-1.18*** (.28)	-.76*** (.15)	-.81*** (.17)
226 Vote	.40# (.21)	.42* (.20)	.18 (.26)	.39 (.43)	.59** (.23)	.77** (.25)
227 Vote	.31 (.23)		.63* (.29)	.56 (.40)	.30 (.24)	.004 (.26)
Gender	-.33 (.21)	-.34# (.21)	-.11 (.26)	.35 (.40)	-.28 (.22)	-.29 (.24)
Protestant	.35 (.25)	.53* (.21)	.69* (.30)	.56 (.44)	.49# (.26)	.24 (.29)
Catholic	-.37 (.30)		-.28 (.38)	-1.81* (.75)	-.39 (.32)	-.37 (.36)
Income	-.04 (.09)		-.07 (.11)	-.02 (.16)	-.04 (.09)	-.03 (.10)
Age	.004 (.007)		-.004 (.008)	.002 (.01)	.009 (.007)	.02* (.008)
Education	-.16** (.05)	-.17*** (.05)	-.06 (.07)	-.08 (.10)	-.12* (.06)	-.12# (.06)
Black	-.18 (.32)		.29 (.37)	-.14 (.57)	-.28 (.34)	.22 (.34)
Latino	.07 (.32)		.12 (.40)	.80 (.70)	.18 (.34)	.19 (.39)
Union Member	.11 (.22)		.15 (.28)	.14 (.43)	.06 (.23)	-.09 (.26)
Constant	2.94*** (.77)	3.23*** (.62)	2.29* (.96)	3.90* (1.58)	2.37** (.82)	2.09* (.93)
-2 * LL	621.0	625.6	417.9	184.4	566.8	469.5
% correctly predicted	82.9	83.3	85.2	87.2	84.4	85.9
no crossover	98.0	98.6	98.9	99.6	98.7	99.1
crossover	12.2	11.5	13.5	26.7	15.1	13.1
N	791	791	555	266	736	644

Table entries are logit coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is coded 1 for a crossover vote and 0 otherwise. N=743. ***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05; #p<.10. Data are from the Field Poll.

Table 11. Predicted Probabilities from Logit Models of Crossover

Republican Crossover for Governor		Democratic Crossover for Governor		Republican Crossover for Senator		Democratic Crossover for Senator	
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Value</i>
	<i>Prob</i>		<i>Prob</i>		<i>Prob</i>		<i>Prob</i>
modes	0.165	modes	0.058	modes	0.061	modes	0.142
strong cons	0.165	strong cons	0.124	strong cons	0.061	strong cons	0.487
moderate	0.304	moderate	0.058	moderate	0.234	moderate	0.142
strong lib	0.558	strong lib	0.027	strong lib	0.899	strong lib	0.042
strong rep	0.165			strong rep	0.061	strong dem	0.142
weak rep	0.311			weak rep	0.092	weak dem	0.305
ind rep	0.585			leaning rep	0.140	leaning dem	0.654
no 226	0.238	no 226	0.058	no 226	0.129	no 226	0.142
yes 226	0.165	yes 226	0.164	yes 226	0.061	yes 226	0.216
men	0.165			men	0.061	men	0.200
women	0.248			women	0.093	women	0.142
< \$20,000	0.412	< \$20,000	0.044				
\$40-60,000	0.261	\$40-60,000	0.077				
> \$80,000	0.165	> \$80,000	0.136				
		< 8 th grade	0.108			< 8 th grade	0.278
		1-2 yrs college	0.058			1-2 yrs college	0.142
		> M.A.	0.027			> M.A.	0.061
		no union	0.058				
		union	0.106				
						not protestant	0.142
						protestant	0.242

Note: Predicted probabilities were produced by holding all other variables in model at their modal values and varying the variable in question. All coefficients come from Model 2 in Tables 7-10.

Table 12. General Election Preferences among Republican Crossovers for Governor

Primary Vote Choice	Percent of Crossovers Who	
	“Returned Home” in General Election	Also Crossed Over in General Election
Davis	25.4% (44)	74.6 (129)
Checchi	66.7% (40)	33.3 (20)
Harman	46.7% (7)	53.3 (8)
Total	36.7 (91)	63.3 (157)

Source: October 1998 Field Poll. Weighted Ns in parentheses.

Table 13. General Election Preferences among Democratic Crossovers for Senate

Primary Vote Choice	Percent of Crossovers Who	
	“Returned Home” in General Election	Also Crossed Over in General Election
Fong	22.5% (27)	77.5 (93)
Issa	70.5% (31)	29.5 (13)
Total	34.5% (58)	64.6 (106)

Source: October 1998 Field Poll. Weighted Ns in parentheses.

Appendix: Variable Codings

Dependent Variable

Crossover Voting Coded 1 if a respondent intends to vote for (or stated that they voted for) a the candidate of the opposing major party, as defined by the respondent's party identification (or registration), and 0 otherwise.

Independent Variables

Strength of Partisanship Coded 1 (independent) to 4 (strong partisan). This was constructed by "folding" the standard seven-point party identification scale.

Ideology Coded 1 (strong conservative) to 7 (strong liberal).

226 Vote Coded 1 (yes) and 0 (no). A yes vote indicates support for Proposition 226, which mandated that unions get the permission of members before spending their dues on political purposes, such as advertisements during campaigns.

227 Vote Coded 1 (yes) and 0 (no). A yes vote indicates support for Proposition 227, which was designed to restructure, and largely do away with, bilingual education in California public schools.

Gender Coded 1 (female) and 0 (male).

Protestant, Catholic, Latino, Black, Asian Coded 1 if R identifies as a member of religious/ethnic group and 0 otherwise.

Age Coded 1 (18-24), 2 (25-29), 3 (30-39), 4 (40-49), 5 (50-59), 6 (60 and older).

Education Coded 1 (8th grade or less), 2 (some high school), 3 (high school graduate), 4 (trade/vocational school), 5 (1-2 years of college), 6 (3-4 years of college, no degree), 7 (college graduate), 8 (5-6 years of college), 9 (master's degree), 10 (graduate work past master's).

Income Coded 1 (under \$20,000), 2 (\$20-40,000), 3 (\$40-60,000), 4 (\$60-80,000), and 5 (more than \$80,000).

Union Member Coded 1 if R or a member of R's family is a union member, and 0 otherwise.

Bibliography

Abramowitz, Alan, John McGlennon, and Ronald Rapoport. 1981. "A Note on Strategic Voting in a Primary Election." *Journal of Politics* 43: 899-904.

Adamany, David. 1976. "Crossover Voting and the Democratic Party's Reform Rules." *American Political Science Review* 70: 36-41.

Cain, Bruce E. 1997. "Report on Blanket and Open Primaries." Expert testimony in *California Democratic Party et al. v. Bill Jones* (1997).

Cohen, Jonathan, Thad Kousser, and John Sides. 1999. "Sincere Voting, Hedging, and Raiding: Testing a Formal Model of Crossover Voting in Blanket Primaries." Presented at the 1999 Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, GA.

DiCamillo, Mark. 1998. "Californians Vote in the State's First Blanket Primary." *Public Affairs Report* 39 (5): 1, 4-5.

Hedlund, Ronald, Meredith Watts, and David Hedge. 1982. "Voting in an Open Primary." *American Political Quarterly* 10: 197-218.

Hedlund, Ronald, and Meredith Watts. 1986. "The Wisconsin Open Primary, 1968 to 1984." *American Political Quarterly* 14: 55-73.

Keith, Bruce E. et al. 1992. *The Myth of the Independent Voter*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ranney, Austin and Leon Epstein. 1966. "The Two Electorates: Voters and Non-Voters in a Wisconsin Primary." *Journal of Politics* 66: 598-616.

Robeck, Bruce. 1984. "The Representativeness of Congressional Primary Voters." *Congress and the Presidency* 11: 59-67.

Southwell, Patricia. 1991. "Open versus Closed Primaries: The Effect on Strategic Voting and Candidate Fortunes." *Social Science Quarterly* 72: 789-796.

Wekkin, Gary. 1988. "The Conceptualization and Measurement of Crossover Voting." *Western Political Quarterly* 41: 105-14.

———. 1991. "Why Crossover Voters Are Not 'Mischievous Voters': The Segmented Partisanship Hypothesis." *American Politics Quarterly* 19: 229-47.