

Where Has the Jesse Voter Gone?

Andrew Grossbach, Rusty Kath, Alicia Spencer, & Danielle Stuard

Introduction

Pundits were stunned and scholars were speechless when Jesse Ventura, a former professional wrestler, won the 1998 gubernatorial election in Minnesota. From the culmination of a number of factors, including a high midterm turnout (60.5%) with many of those ballots cast by first time voters, Ventura was able to win the governorship in 1998. In 2002, however, Ventura chose not to run for reelection. This paper asks the question, “Where did the Jesse voter go?” In an effort to resolve this puzzle, we must first figure out what drew voters to Ventura in 1998. The first section of our paper examines previous research and several possible hypotheses of Ventura’s success in 1998, including a move away from party identification, institutional factors such as Minnesota’s lenient registration laws, a high voter turnout, as well as aid from his well-known name and personality. The second part of the paper then evaluates these hypotheses in light of exit poll surveys done in November 2002. This paper concludes with a discussion of the implications of these findings.

Research on why people vote for a third party candidate¹ suggests that this choice is typically based on their personal reaction to the individual candidate, not a personal identification with a third party. As Reiter and Walsh concluded in their study of three successful third-party campaigns, “Careful study of the electoral coalitions supporting (non-major-party candidates)...shows that they are not the product of an ‘alternative

¹ For the purpose of this study, we define a third party as any party other than the Democratic or Republican Party.

culture' of voters who consistently support non-major-party-candidates, but are assembled by each candidate on the basis of ideology and the level of political expertise” (Reiter and Walsh, 1995, p. 651). There is some support for this in Ventura’s election. Poll data indicates Ventura’s issues were less important to his voters than his personality as seen in a 1998 St. Cloud State University (SCSU) survey, in which 94% of those who said they would vote for Ventura were doing so because he was not a typical candidate (Frank & Wagner, 1999). Ventura’s voters preferred his persona to both Humphrey and Coleman (Frank & Wagner, 1999). This is in like fashion to the success of Ross Perot’s candidate-centered campaign in 1992. Downey attributes Perot’s success to his ability to appeal to voter’s emotions. “When Perot opened his mouth, the world listened. He spoke with common sense, decency, and a shrewd assessment of what was happening to the average American in the hands of a double-talking, greedy, bought-and-paid-for U.S. government that was uninterested in, and unapproachable to, the average American” (Downey, 1993, p. 185). Perot mobilized a portion of the voting pool in the 1992 election that would not have otherwise voted. “It appears that Perot’s candidacy boosted turnout by two to three percentage points” (Lacy and Burden, 1999, p. 252). In the previously mentioned 1998 SCSU survey 12% of voters said that they would not have voted if their only choices had been Coleman and Humphrey, showing that Ventura too increased voter turnout (Frank & Wagner, 1999).

Likewise, Jesse Ventura was not a run of the mill third party candidate. There is little doubt that Ventura’s name recognition as a former wrestler, and also as a movie star, aided his political success. Ventura was an entertainer. Thus he was able to approach the campaign as an entertainer, while Humphrey and Coleman played a

traditional game of politics (Frank and Wagner, 1999). Ventura's celebrity status gave him the needed resources to start a political career later in life. As Canon notes: "celebrity status plays the same function as the base office for a career politician: a resource for gaining higher office and a stake that is not casually risked" (Canon, 1990, p. 89). Jesse Ventura's high name recognition thus put him on the same political level as seasoned politicians. In a Minnesota Poll of the election season in February 1998, Ventura had a 64% name recognition—the highest of any third party candidate, putting him within the ranks of well-known contenders such as Norm Coleman, Skip Humphrey, and Ted Mondale (Daves, 1999). Thus, we hypothesize Ventura's status as an entertainer greatly aided his bid for governor.

Other research suggests, however, that third party votes are not simply based on the candidate's qualities. Rosentsone, Behr, & Lazarus present another possible explanation for choosing to vote for a third party candidate. They assert that voting third party is not due to party identification with a third party, but rather a temporary movement from the major political parties. When citizens feel a sufficient amount of distance between themselves and the major party nominees, they begin to contemplate a third party vote (Rosenstone, Behr, & Lazarus, 127). Wattenberg presents similar findings that the public may find the major parties as obsolete and thus cast their ballot for a third party (Wattenberg, 1993). These findings contrast Reiter & Walsh's assertion that Ventura's candidacy was a special circumstance that brought people out to the polls, instead arguing that those who voted for Ventura voted regularly, and in this specific case voted for Ventura as a vote against the major parties.

Similarly, Stone and Rapoport use a “push-pull” model to explain support for third party candidates, “ because support can be explained in part by attraction (or pull) to the candidate based on the issue positions he took and the priorities he set, and in part because of the ‘push’ away from the major parties based on dissatisfaction with their issue positions and priorities” (Stone and Rapoport, 2001, p. 51). After a third party candidate has a strong showing in an election, such as Ross Perot had in the 1992 presidential election, one of the two major parties will adjust their issue positions to align with those of the successful third party candidate.²

Another view on Independent voters is given by Jack Dennis who hypothesizes four different meanings of Independent, “(1) negative feelings about major political parties and partisanship, (2) positive identification with ideals of independence, especially individualistic autonomy, (3) neutrality or indifference because of no detectable party differences of significance, (4) a self-perceived pattern of variability in partisan behavior” (Dennis, 1988, p. 197). By dividing the Independent voters into these four categories (anti-partyism, political autonomy, partisan neutrality, partisan variability) Dennis shows that Independents cannot be evaluated as a whole because the different types of Independent voters have different reasons for their voting behavior. While some types of Independents may be more inclined to vote for a third party candidate, such as the anti-party Independents, others, like the partisan variability

² Following the strong showing by Perot in 1992, the Republican Party offered the Contract with America in the 1994-midterm elections. “The Contract emphasized the Perot issues of a balanced federal budget, reform, and limiting American commitment to internationalism. Just as notably, the Contract omitted reference to Republican priorities such as stopping abortions and promoting free trade that united the base of the Republican Party but were strongly opposed by supporters of Ross Perot” (Stone and Rapoport, 2001, p. 52).

Independents, may be no more inclined to vote for third party candidates than partisans would be (Dennis, 1988, p 219.)

Another possible related explanation of the Ventura vote may be attributed to structural and institutional factors in the election system. Niemi and Weisberg suggest that, “The single factor most often cited as responsible for low turnout in the U.S. is yet another legal consideration—voter registration” (Niemi and Weisberg, 2001, p. 31). However, Minnesota is one of the few states to allow citizens to register on Election Day. Voter turnout in Minnesota’s 1998 election was one of the highest ever recorded in a midterm, with many voters casting ballots for the first time, mostly due to Minnesota’s registration laws (Lacy and Monson, 2002). This factor likely contributed to Ventura’s success since those voters make up such an important part of his votes. According to Jacob Lentz, an estimated seventy percent of those who registered on Election Day cast ballots for Ventura. Many of these votes came from Minnesota’s youth population. “A vote for Ventura was most likely from a 25-year-old male...” (Lacy and Monson, 2002, p. 420).

Ventura’s election in 1998 then offers some possible explanations of who the Ventura voter was and how they would show up in the 2002 elections. If Ventura was elected due to a move from the two-party system to membership in a new third party, then those who voted Jesse in 1998 could be expected to vote for the Reform³ candidate in the 2002 election. However, if Ventura was elected due to institutional factors, for example the Minnesota same day voter registration laws, then we suggest that a third

³ On February 11, 2000, Ventura announced that he was leaving the Reform Party. He urged the party to sever ties with the national party and revert back to its original name, the Independence Party (Baden & deFlebre, 2000). It is our feeling that the Reform Party and the Independence Party have very close ties,

party candidate could not win the subsequent gubernatorial election. Since Ventura's campaign appealed to unlikely voters, who in turn registered and voted for him, this decreases the effectiveness of a similar campaign strategy, because prior research indicates that previously registered voters are more likely to vote. Likewise, if the victory was based on Ventura's personal name recognition, then it is also unlikely that a third party candidate could be expected to become Minnesota's next governor. This explanation fits most closely to our hypothesis: Ventura was a special case scenario. Those who voted for him in 1998 did so based on Ventura as an individual and a candidate, not due to his membership in the Reform Party. Thus, we hypothesize that those who cast ballots for Ventura in 1998 will vote in subsequent elections, but their votes will be dispersed evenly among the Democratic, Republican, and Independence party candidates in 2002, rather than going solely to Tim Penny.

Methods

Our results come from exit poll data from the 2002-midterm elections in Morris, Minnesota. Morris is a city of approximately 5,000 located in west-central Minnesota. Two thousand of these residents are students at the University of Minnesota Morris. Voters were asked to fill out a survey (Appendix 1) after exiting their respected voting station on Election Day, November 5th, 2002. Students from the political science division at the University of Minnesota Morris administered surveys at five of the city's six polling locations⁴. These surveys were handed out at three specified times throughout the day (7:00am-8:30am, 12:00pm-2:00pm, and 5:00pm-7:00pm) in effort to ensure that

and thus a Reform Party affiliation in 1998 would likely transfer to an Independence Party affiliation in subsequent elections.

a representative cross-section of the population would be sampled. We chose these specific times in an attempt to survey a wide array of different demographic groups, including the elderly, who typically vote in the early morning, and the working class, who typically vote either during their lunch hour or after work. The survey consisted of 25 questions, mostly multiple choice, asking for a wide array of information including vote choice in the 2002 statewide elections. Also included in the survey were four National Election Studies (NES) questions. Three hundred thirty-seven completed surveys were collected.

The data collected from the exit polls were entered into SPSS, a computer statistics program. We used cross-tabulations to examine the gathered information. Our results in this paper include only those who were able to vote in the 1998 gubernatorial election, thus reducing the possibility of a bias from university students.

Results

Our first task was to find out who voted in the 1998 election. We narrowed our data field to incorporate solely those individuals who had the potential to vote for Jesse Ventura. Of the 337 respondents to our 2002 election exit polling, 147 were eligible to vote in the 1998 election.⁵ We recorded data and split it into two groups: “Voted for Ventura” and “Did not vote for Ventura” to highlight the differences between the two. Our results indicate that, in concurrence with previous literature, Ventura’s voters tended to be young and male. As table 1 indicates, men accounted for 65% of Ventura’s support. Another breakdown of Ventura voters can be seen with age. Forty-five percent

⁴ The sixth voting district was not polled due to lack of survey administrators.

of Jesse voters were under the age of 30, 77% under the age of 45. Ventura's primary support came from individuals middle-aged or younger. Also, Ventura's voter tended to have, at minimum, some college education. Over 80% of the Jesse voters in our sample had either graduated from or attended college. Noteworthy is Ventura's lack of support from individuals having some graduate level education. Of the 14 respondents who claimed to have some graduate school experience, none cast their ballot for Ventura in 1998. Income level was the final area of demographic information we studied. Ventura supporters' incomes varied widely. The highest concentration of supporters, roughly half of the respondents, had individual incomes in the \$20,000-\$50,000 range.

Analyzing our data reveals mostly demographic similarities between the former Ventura and non-Ventura voters in 2002, although a few key differences are noteworthy. Over half of the ballots cast for the two major parties, 51.7%, were done so by women, whereas Ventura received only 35% support by women. Also, individuals with graduate school experience accounted for 10% of the major party vote. Ventura, as stated earlier, did not have any support from graduate educated individuals. Moreover, voters with an annual income exceeding \$50,000 were more apt to vote for Humphrey or Coleman. Almost 30% of the major party votes came from those in the highest income bracket, whereas Ventura received only 16% of their support. Also noteworthy were the votes cast by people over the age of 45; they supported major party candidates 81.6% of the time, whereas Ventura received only 18.4% of the vote.

⁵Three respondents who stated they voted in the 1998 election were ineligible to vote due to their age, thus leaving us with a 2% margin of error.

Table 1: Demographics of participants

		Voted for Ventura	Did not vote for Ventura
Gender			
	Male	26	71
	Female	14	76
	Total	40	147
Age*			
	18-29	18	40
	30-44	13	64
	45-59	3	24
	60 & over	6	16
	Total	40	144
Education			
	Grade	1	0
	Some High	0	4
	High Grad	6	20
	Some College	15	46
	College Grad	17	62
	Graduate	0	14
	Total	39	146
Income			
	Under \$10,000	9	23
	10-20,000	2	7
	20-35,000	11	32
	35-50,000	10	37
	Over 50,000	6	42
	Total	38	141

*Age of the voters at the time of the 1998 election

We next looked to see whether 1998 Ventura voters fit a distinctive partisan profile. It should be noted that the responses given were self-identifications given by respondents four years after the 1998 gubernatorial elections and are thus likely under-reported. Ventura drew support from voters of varied political affiliation. In accordance with Reiter and Walsh’s findings, it does not appear Ventura voters voted for third parties on a regular basis. Rather, Ventura was able to pull votes from Democrats and

Republicans, as well as Independents. As seen in table 2, the vast majority of votes in the 1998 gubernatorial election for Norm Coleman, the Republican candidate, came from those who considered themselves Republican. Unsurprisingly, the vote makeup for Skip Humphrey, the Democratic candidate, came mainly from party affiliated Democrats. Jesse Ventura also received votes from those affiliating with major parties, which totaled 62.5% of his total support. Only 37.5% of Ventura’s support came from individuals claiming to be “Independent” or “Other”. Thus, 23% of people who claim party affiliation to a major party voted for an independent candidate. Moreover, as seen in table 3, in 1998 a vote from those who do not affiliate with either of the two major parties did not ensure a vote for Ventura. Of those polled in table 3 (respondents who answered “Independent” or “Other” from table 2), only 39.5% of the independents voted for Ventura. However, Humphrey picked up an equal number of independent votes. Thus, Ventura wasn’t the only candidate gaining support from the independents. Because Ventura received a large percent of the general vote, which didn’t come solely from independents, we argue that this reinforces the notion that Ventura appealed not only to a single political ideology, but rather, to a large spectrum.

Table 2: Comparison of party affiliation and 1998 Gubernatorial vote choice

	Coleman (R)	Humphrey (D)	Ventura (Ref)	Other	Total
Republican	28	1	8	5	42
Democrat	2	46	17	1	66
Independent	4	3	9	3	19
Other	0	3	6	2	11
Total	34	53	40	11	138

Table 3: Comparison of political spectrum and 1998 Gubernatorial vote choice

	Coleman (R)	Humphrey (D)	Ventura (Ref)	Other	Total
Right	3	6	0	2	11
Left	1	9	7	1	18
Neither	2	4	12	1	19
Total	6	19	19	4	48

The next question to examine is how Ventura's supporters voted in subsequent elections. Over 75% of 1998 Ventura voters in our survey cast their ballots for a major party candidate in the 2000 presidential election, again favoring the Democratic candidate, Al Gore. Only 20% of 1998 Ventura voters cast ballots for a third party presidential candidate in 2000. However, this number is still significantly higher than previous Humphrey and Coleman supporters. Only 3.8% of individuals that had voted for Humphrey and 5.7% that had voted for Coleman voted for a third party presidential candidate in 2000.

Table 4: Comparison of vote choices in 1998 MN Gubernatorial and 2000 Presidential Elections

	Coleman (R)	Humphrey (D)	Ventura (Ref)	Other	Total
Bush (R)	28	7	13	6	54
Gore (D)	5	44	18	1	68
Nader (G)	2	2	6	2	12
Other	0	0	2	1	3
Total	35	53	39	10	137

We next examine how the Jesse Ventura voter cast their ballots in the 2002 gubernatorial election. There were four major candidates that ran in the 2002 Governor's race: Tim Pawlenty (R), Roger Moe (D), Ken Pentel (Green), and Tim Penny (Independence). Table 4 shows the results of a cross tabulation of voters in 1998 and their vote choice in 2002. Of the 40 voters who cast their ballot for Ventura in 1998, 27 voted for a major party candidate in 2002, with almost half (18) of those going to Moe,

the Democratic candidate. Also, only 15% of those who voted for the Reform Party candidate, Ventura, in the 1998 election, subsequently voted for Tim Penny, the 2002 Independence Party candidate. Essentially, those who voted for Ventura in 1998 dispersed their votes throughout the electorate, allying predominantly with major parties.⁶

Table 5: Comparison of vote choices in 1998 and 2002 MN Gubernatorial Elections

	Coleman (R)	Humphrey (D)	Ventura (Ref)	Other	Total
Moe (D)	3	44	18	1	66
Pawlenty (R)	24	6	9	5	44
Pentel (G)	2	0	7	2	11
Penny (Ind)	4	3	6	2	15
Total	33	53	40	10	136

Jesse voters dispersed to the major party candidates even more so in the 2002 United States Senate election. Of the 40 Ventura voters who cast ballots in 1998, 38 voted for a major party candidate in the 2002 U.S. Senate race (see table 6). Not a single Ventura supporter voted for Jim Moore, the Senate Independence Party candidate, and only one Ventura voter cast a ballot for a third party candidate.

Table 6—Comparison of vote choices in 1998 MN Gubernatorial and 2002 MN Senatorial Elections

	Coleman (R)	Humphrey (D)	Ventura (Ref)	Other	Total
Mondale (D)	2	48	23	3	76
Coleman (R)	30	4	15	7	56
Tricomo (G)	0	0	1	0	1
Moore (Ind)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	32	52	39	10	133

⁶ Noteworthy in our examination of the elections are the results acquired from the Stevens County Auditor’s Office with the actual voting records in both the 1998 and 2002 gubernatorial elections. Though the state as a whole elected Ventura in 1998, he was not victorious in Morris. Results from the auditor’s office show Humphrey victorious with 37.4% of the vote, Coleman second with 34.5%, and Ventura third with 28% (County Auditor). Morris, in the 2002 election, had strong support for Democratic candidates Roger Moe, the gubernatorial candidate, and Walter Mondale, the U.S. Senate candidate, who both won the city. Thus, it is not surprising that a good deal of Ventura voters cast their ballots for Democrats in subsequent elections.

We have seen that Jesse Ventura’s candidacy for governor increased voter turnout in the 1998 elections, but what effect did Jesse have on the 2002 elections? Looking at our data (see Table 7), it appears that Ventura’s election had a positive effect on voting, most likely by increasing voters’ incentive to vote in the 2002 elections. The increased incentive to vote can be seen not only in Ventura voters, but also by those who voted for Coleman, Humphrey, and other candidates. Forty percent of Humphrey voters had an increased incentive to vote in 2002, followed by 32% of Ventura voters, and 26% of Coleman voters. Overall, 38% of people polled in our survey who voted in 1998 had an increased incentive to vote in 2002 as a result of Ventura’s election in 1998.

Table 7: Ventura candidacy’s effect on likelihood of voting

	Coleman (R)	Humphrey (D)	Ventura (Ref)	Other	Total
Increased	9	22	17	5	53
Decreased	1	0	0	1	2
No Effect	25	33	21	5	84
Total	35	55	38	11	139

Although Ventura’s election increased the incentive to vote somewhat, it appears to have decreased the likelihood to vote for a third party candidate (see table 8). Overall 29% of people polled said they were now less likely to vote for a third party, while only 16% claimed to be more likely. Of Ventura voters, however, 32% were more likely to vote for a third party candidate following Ventura’s election, while only 13% said they were less likely to vote for a third party.

Table 8: Ventura candidacy’s effect on likelihood of voting third party

	Coleman (R)	Humphrey (D)	Ventura (Ref)	Other	Total
Increased	3	4	12	3	22
Decreased	12	20	5	3	40
No Effect	20	31	21	5	77
Total	35	55	38	11	139

Our data indicates that Ventura’s success in the 1998 election is due, in large part, to dissatisfaction with the major party candidates. Approximately half of Ventura’s voters polled cited dissatisfaction with the major party candidates as their main reason for voting for a third party candidate. Nearly one quarter of Ventura’s supporters claimed that their reason for casting their ballot for a third party candidate was because they felt their personal beliefs would be better represented. Other reasons for voting for a third party candidate, such as protesting the two party system, an effort to help the party maintain major party status, and a belief that a third party vote would not be wasted, were not the likely reasons that individuals polled voted for a third party candidate.

Table 9: Reasons for voting third party

	Col (R)	Hum (D)	Ven (Ref)	Other	Total
I was dissatisfied with major party candidates	3	3	19	2	27
I felt my personal beliefs were better represented by the 3 rd party	4	2	9	1	16
I was protesting the 2 party system	0	2	5	1	8
So the party could maintain major party status	0	1	0	0	1
Believed a 3 rd party vote would not be wasted	2	1	1	1	5
Other	0	2	2	1	5

Discussion

We acknowledge that this study had a number of potential flaws. There is a small amount of literature pertaining to modern third parties in the United States, and there is even less on Jesse Ventura’s election. The lack of literature makes it difficult to correlate our findings with past research and hypotheses. Also, our results do not reflect average Minnesota, but rather, a sample from one small rural Minnesota town. According to our results, in 1998 Ventura finished third in Morris elections, behind both Humphrey and

Coleman, while in reality, Ventura was elected into office. Also, the University of Minnesota, Morris, which is located in the town, most likely has a significant impact on our results. First, a large number of the votes Ventura received most likely came from the University. The majority of university students that voted in the 1998 election are no longer attending the University or residing in the city, which most likely contributes to the lack of Ventura voters to analyze. This study, however, still offers insight into third parties and candidate centered campaigns. Lastly, this research presents insight into the future of third party politics in Minnesota, especially the status of the Independence Party.

Some special circumstances of the 2002 Senate race give a possible insight into the final outcome. Less than two weeks before Election Day, incumbent Senator Paul Wellstone who was running for reelection, died tragically in a plane crash while traveling in northern Minnesota. Former Vice President Walter Mondale took the place of Wellstone as the Democratic candidate. The unique circumstances of this political race most likely affected how people voted, by possibly leading to realignment with the major party Senate candidates. Another possible explanation for the outcome of the 2002 Senate race is that, if Senator Wellstone had lived, Ventura voters, who supported the populist Jesse Ventura, would have also supported Wellstone and his populist ideals.

Past research has shown that the elderly have stronger party identification than the youth. If this proved to be true, older individuals would be less likely to vote for a non-major party candidate, unless such parties are well established (unlike the young Independence party) or the older voters had previously aligned with a third party rather than a major party. Since the youth tend to have a weaker party identification, they

would be more likely to vote for a third party candidate. Our research shows that the largest age group of Jesse voters was from 18-29, which concurs with previous research. Moreover, supporters of major party candidates running against Ventura were those ages 45 and over. Thus, the older the voters get, the less likely they will opt to vote for a third party candidate, and may instead develop identification with one of the two major parties.

Another interesting tendency for 1998 Ventura voters was their support of a third party candidate in the 2000 presidential election. A few different explanations may offer insight to this occurrence. For one, it is possible that Ventura appealed to those affiliated with the Green party, and thus Jesse voters voted for Green party candidate Ralph Nader in the 2000 presidential election. Also possible, is that the third party presidential vote was due to a general dissatisfaction with the major party candidates, which shows similarities to the 1998 Minnesota gubernatorial election. In future research, we recommend the examination of this phenomenon, and consider a potential relationship between populism and the Green and Independence parties.

Another interesting occurrence was Ventura's effect on Minnesota voting. Ventura was a popular candidate that increased voter turnout. However, our research indicates that though there was a greater likelihood to vote because of Ventura, people were less likely to vote for a third party candidate in subsequent elections. This may be due in part to Ventura's lack of public support during his Governorship. Both the media and the citizens tended to have conflicts with the governor's tactics and policies. A vote for a major party candidate in elections following 1998 may have been a protest to Ventura.

So we now ask if there in fact is a “Jesse Voter?” We argue no. Ventura appealed to a number of different demographic groups. Granted, though there was support from the youth, particularly males, Ventura could not have won the 1998 gubernatorial election with just their votes. Our evidence indicates that those who voted for Ventura in 1998 did not vote as a group in subsequent elections. Rather, their votes were dispersed among the electorate. Thus we conclude that there is not a true “Jesse Voter,” but rather a once existing Jesse fan club that spans across a number of different groups.

We hope that this research aids and encourages the future study of both third parties and candidate-centered campaigns. For future study, we recommend exit polling in the 2006 Minnesota gubernatorial race, which would be beneficial in determining the strength of the Independence Party as time progresses. This, and other future research, could benefit the public by allowing greater insight into the understanding of contemporary third party politics.

Conclusion

After studying Jesse Ventura’s successful 1998 governor’s race, we conclude that his election had little to do with people’s third party political identification. Jesse Ventura was a competitive candidate in Minnesota due to his name recognition, not the public’s realignment with third party ideals. His ultimate success, however, was not only dependent upon his name, but also his personal demeanor, which proved a stark contrast to other politicians. Other factors, like strategic campaigning and Minnesota’s same-day-voter registration laws, also contributed largely to Ventura’s success. As Reiter and

Walsh's research found when studying three other successful third party races, we feel the election of Jesse Ventura to the governor's seat in Minnesota was not the result of movement towards third parties, but rather a special scenario mainly based on a candidate centered campaign. We thus conclude that despite Minnesota's election of Jesse Ventura to the governorship in 1998, it isn't surprising that voters cast their ballots in the 2002 elections for major party candidates rather than the Independence and other third parties.

References

Baden, P.L., deFlebre, C. (2000, February 12). Ventura Splits From Reform. Star Tribune, p. A1.

Daves, R.P. (1999, May) What the hell is going on in Minnesota? What We Learned about Poll Accuracy and Likely Voter Measurement from the Election of Jesse (the Governor) Ventura. Paper presented at the Public Opinion Research's 54th annual conference, St. Petersburg.

Dennis, J. (1988). Political Independence in America, Part II: Towards a Theory. British Journal of Political Science, 18, 197-219.

Downey, P. (1993) The Perot Campaign from the Field. American Behavioral Scientist, 37, 185-187.

Frank, S.I. & Wagner, S.C. (1999). We Shocked the World: A Case Study of Jesse Ventura's Election as Governor of Minnesota. Orlando: Harcourt College Publishers.

Lacy, D. & Burden, B.C. (1999). The Vote-stealing and Turnout Effects of Ross Perot in the 1992 U.S. Presidential Election. American Journal of Political Science, 43, 233-255.

Lacy, D. & Monson, Q. (2002). The Origin and Impacts of Votes for Third Party Candidates: A Case Study of the 1998 Minnesota Gubernatorial Election. Political Research Quarterly, 55, 409-437.

Lentz, Jacob. (2002). Electing Jesse Ventura: A Third-Party Success Story. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Niemi, R.G., & Weisberg, H.F. (Eds). (2001). Controversies in Voting Behavior (4th ed.). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Rapoport, R.B. & Stone, W.J. (2001). It's Perot stupid! The legacy of the 1992 Perot movement in the major-party system, 1994-2000. PS: Political Science & Politics, 34, 49-59.

Reiter, H.L. & Walsh J.M. (1995). Who Votes for Non-Major-Party Candidates? The Cases of Longley, Sanders, and Weicker. Polity, 27, 651-663.

Rosenstone S.J., Behr, R.L., & Lazarus, E.H. (1984). Third Parties in America: Citizen Response to Major Party Failure. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Wattenberg, Martin P. 1993. "Partisan Dealignment in 1992: Ross Perot and the Independent Voter." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Appendix I

Political Opinions Survey

Thank you for your help in our study. Please read each question and circle your answer on the sheet.

1. Do you feel that government policies affect your household?
 - a. a lot.
 - b. some
 - c. a little
 - d. none

2. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me finds it difficult to really understand what's going on."
 - a. I agree
 - b. I disagree

3. Over the years, how much attention do you feel that the government pays to what people think when it decides what to do?
 - a. a lot
 - b. some
 - c. a little
 - d. none

4. Are you involved in any campus or community organizations (such as your church, Eagles club, etc)?
 - a. yes
 - b. no

If you answered no to question 4, skip to question 6

5. Approximately, how many hours a week on average do you spend engaged in activities related to these campus or community organizations?
 - a. Less than 1 hour
 - b. 1-3 hours
 - c. 3-5 hours
 - d. 5-10 hours
 - e. more than 10 hours a week

6. Did Jesse Ventura's election as governor 4 years ago increase, decrease, or have no effect on your incentive to vote in this year's election?
 - a. Jesse Ventura's election increased my incentive to vote.
 - b. Jesse Ventura's election decreased my incentive to vote.
 - c. Jesse Ventura's election had no effect on my incentive to vote.

7. Did Jesse Ventura's election as governor four years ago increase, decrease, or have no effect on your likelihood to vote for a third party candidate?

- a. Jesse Ventura's election increased my incentive to vote for a third party candidate.
- b. Jesse Ventura's election decreased my incentive to vote for a third party candidate.
- c. Jesse Ventura's election had no effect on my incentive to vote for a third party candidate.

8. Generally speaking do you think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent, or other?
- a. Republican
 - b. Democrat
 - c. Independent
 - d. Other (please specify)_____

If you answered a or b, please skip to question 10.

9. If you answered C or D to question 8, generally speaking in questions of politics which direction do you lean toward?
- e. left
 - f. right
 - g. neither

10. Did you vote today?
- a. yes
 - b. no

If you answered "b" to question 10. Please skip to question 20.

11. If you voted in the past elections, have you always voted for the parties you now identify with?
- a. yes
 - b. no
12. If you voted in today's election who did you vote for Senate?
- a. Walter Mondale
 - b. Norm Coleman
 - c. Ray Tricomo
 - d. Jim Moore
 - e. Other

13. If you did not vote for Mondale, would you have voted for Wellstone?
- a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. undecided
14. Does the passing of Senator Wellstone increase, decrease, or have no impact on your incentive to vote in this election?
- a. Senator Wellstone's passing increased my incentive to vote.
 - b. Senator Wellstone's passing decreases my incentive to vote.
 - c. Senator Wellstone's passing had no effect on my incentive to vote.

15. Did Senator Wellstone's death make you more or less likely to vote for the DFL Senate candidate?
- a. more likely
 - b. less likely

- c. no effect
16. If you voted for governor today, who did you vote for?
- a. Roger Moe
 - b. Tim Pawlenty
 - c. Ken Pentel
 - d. Tim Penny
17. If you voted in 1998 election for Minnesota Governor, who did you vote for?
- a. Norm Coleman
 - b. Skip Humphrey
 - c. Jesse Ventura
 - d. Other
18. If you voted in the 2000 presidential election, who did you vote for?
- a. George Bush
 - b. Al Gore
 - c. Ralph Nader
 - d. Other
19. If you voted for one or more of the following third party candidates (Jesse Ventura, Tim Penny, Ralph Nader) in the last four years, which of the following best represents your primary reason for doing so?
- a. I was dissatisfied with the major party candidates.
 - b. I felt my personal beliefs were better represented by the third party candidate.
 - c. I was protesting the two party system.
 - d. So the party could maintain major party status.
 - e. Believed a third party vote would not be wasted.
 - f. Other_____
20. What year were you born? 19__
21. Please indicate your highest level of education.
- a. grade school
 - b. some high school
 - c. high school graduate
 - d. some college
 - e. college graduate
 - f. graduate or professional school
22. What is your gender?
- a. male
 - b. female
23. My income is:
- a. below 10,000
 - b. more than 10,000 and less than 20,000
 - c. more than 20,000 and less than 35,000
 - d. more than 35,000 and less than 50,000
 - e. more than 50,000