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Abstract — The article deals with the statistical dependence of interval variables—estimates (attitudes to voting results, satisfaction with the work of state bodies, the respondents’ attitudes to political parties, political leaders and other parameters) on the nominal parameter “Basis for Choice of a Political Party”, which is represented by 9 nominal responses, characterized the respondent’s attitude to the political organization. There are also 13 dependent (interval) parameters, characterized respondents’ interest in politics, estimations of the work of political and state leaders, attitude to the various significant political events in Russia and others analyzed with a new version of the authorial method. The method applied to analyze cause and effect relation in parallel for any interval and nominal variables, and as a result, it became possible to speak about the dependence of an interval parameter on a multi-valued nominal variable, and to select the relation necessary in strength, based only on numerical values.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The article deals with the dependence of interval variables—estimates (attitudes to voting results, satisfaction with the work of state bodies, the respondents’ attitudes to political parties, political leaders and other parameters) on the nominal parameter “Basis for Choice of a Party”.

It is represented by nine nominal responses:

1. I like its leader.
2. It has a reliable team.
3. I like its program.
4. It knows best what to do.
5. It has clear goals.
6. No more worthy, no one else to vote for.
7. Is in opposition to the current government.
8. Just decided.
9. Did not vote.

We list the dependent (interval) parameters:

1. Interest in politics.
2. Attitude towards the LDPR party.
3. Attitudes to the Communist party.
4. Attitude towards the Yabloko party.
5. Attitude to V.V. Putin.
6. Attitude to D. A. Medvedev.
7. Attitude to V.V. Zhirinovsky.
8. Attitude to M.D. Prokhorov.
9. Attitude to S.M. Mironov.
10. Attitude to A.A. Navalny.
11. Dissatisfaction with the results of voting in the elections to the RF State Duma.
12. A satisfaction with the results of voting in the Russian Federation presidential elections.
13. Satisfied with the work of the Russian President V.V. Putin.
14. Subjective assessment of their financial situation.
A new version of authorial method applied to analyze cause and effect dependence in parallel for any interval and nominal variables, and “as a result, it became possible to speak about the dependence of an interval parameter on a multivalued nominal variable, and to select the relation necessary in strength, based only on numerical values” [3].

“When we combine any quantile partitions by interval parameters and groups by nominal responses into one multiple comparison problem, we obtain a result for nominal and interval parameters on a single scale of comparative weightiness. Then, they (triads or quarts) allow us to construct the strength of relation coefficients according to interval parameters, as before, and normalize them to a single analog correlation (dependency of interval parameter upon itself). The relation coefficients analogues must be similarly normalized for the groups according to nominal responses. Note that in the case of nominal variables, we can discuss the dependence only in one direction: like the interval parameters depend on the nominal parameters.” [3].

Thus, it became possible to talk about the dependence of the interval parameter on the multivalued nominal variable and to select the relation necessary in strength, based on numerical values only” [3].

“When constructing the strength of relation coefficients (after a general problem of multiple comparisons for all parameters) we suggest two strategies:

1. We should take two nominal responses corresponding to maximum and minimum values of the comparative weightiness of the interval parameter, whose dependence on the nominal parameter is determined.

2. We should take (a search of all variants) three (in the case of triads for interval parameters) or four (in the case of quarts) nominal responses each time. Then the relation coefficient analogues for three (four) nominal responses are determined, after which the relation coefficients become averaged over all permutations, since the nominal responses are equal to each other and the streamlining of operation is not implemented for them.” [3].

‘The first strategy is obviously the more stringent and determines a fewer number of relation as strong ones” [3].

We will consider the issue of how the second strategy has identified strong relation in the case where the cause is a nominal variable of “Basis for Choice of a Party”.

The independent (nominal) parameter “Basis for Choice of a Party” is a choice from nine responses proposed:

1. I like its leader (G18-01).
2. It has a reliable team (G18-02).
3. I like its program (G18-03).
4. It knows best what to do (G18-04).
5. It has clear goals (G18-05).
6. No more worthy, no one else to vote for (G18-06).
7. Is in opposition to the current government (G18-07).
8. Just decided (G18-08).
9. Did not vote (G18-09).

Let us consider the dependence of 14 interval (quantitative) variables on the nominal variable “Basis for Choice of a Party”, which takes 9 values.

TABLE I. DEPENDENCE OF THE INTERVAL PARAMETER (VARIABLE) “INTEREST IN POLITICS” (X05) FROM THE NOMINAL PARAMETER (VARIABLE) “BASIS FOR CHOICE OF A PARTY” (G18)

| Response group | Comparative weightiness | Nominal answer to the question-cause Strategy of identifying the “average permutations” |
|----------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| G18-01         | -247                   | I like its leader                                                 |
| G18-02         | +1882                  | It has a reliable team                                            |
| G18-05         | +1120                  | It has clear goals                                                |
| G18-08         | -1173                  | Just decided                                                     |

Factor of the connection strength (average of the 24 permutations) = 0.59

Factor of the connection strength (maximum value) = 0.84 (1243)

The interval parameter “Interest in politics” can be considered as a kind of indicator for the survey results reliability, since the greatest comparative weightiness are observed for nominal responses corresponding to the real understanding or misunderstanding of political processes: the party (which I choose) has a reliable team (comparative weightiness = +1882). The response: “Just decided” (-1173) testifies to a minimal interest in policy.

II. RESULTS

A sociological study of a “civil marriage” phenomenon and a problem of its image formation influenced by students’ political orientations was conducted as a part of sociological laboratory work plan (2014). 24 quantitative parameters were selected or constructed to examine the dependence (linear and nonlinear).
The respondents who choose a party based on its opposition to the current government had negative attitudes towards the party of Yabloko (-3407).

### Table V. Dependence of the Interval Parameter (Variable) “Attitude to V.V. Putin” (X12) from the Nominal Parameter (Variable) “Basis for choice of a party” (G18)

| Response group | Comparative weightiness | Nominal answer to the question-cause relation |
|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| G18-02        | +1122                   | It has a reliable team                          |
| G18-03        | -441                    | I like its program                              |
| G18-04        | +2157                   | It knows best what to do                        |
| G18-09        | -535                    | Did not vote                                    |

Factor of the connection strength (average of the 24 permutations) = 0.54

Factor of the connection strength (maximum value) = 0.78 (1432)

A positive attitude to V.V. Putin (+2157) is typical for a group of respondents, who choose a party based on their opinion that it knows better than others what to do.

### Table VI. Dependence of the Interval Parameter (Variable) “Attitude to D. A. Medvedev” (X13) from the Nominal Parameter (Variable) “Basis for choice of a party” (G18)

| Response group | Comparative weightiness | Nominal answer to the question-cause relation |
|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| G18-01        | +633                    | I like its leader                              |
| G18-04        | +2828                   | It knows best what to do                        |
| G18-07        | -263                    | Is in opposition to the current government     |
| G18-09        | -510                    | Did not vote                                    |

Factor of the connection strength (average of the 24 permutations) = 0.62

Factor of the connection strength (maximum value) = 0.86 (1423)

Similarly, a positive attitude to D. A. Medvedev (+2828) is typical for a group of respondents, who choose a party based on their opinion that it knows better than others what to do.

### Table IV. Dependence of the Interval Parameter (Variable) “Attitude to the Yabloko party” (X11) from the Nominal Parameter (Variable) “Basis for choice of a party” (G18)

| Response group | Comparative weightiness | Nominal answer to the question-cause relation |
|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| G18-03        | -551                    | I like its program                              |
| G18-04        | +1331                   | It knows best what to do                        |
| G18-07        | -3407                   | Is in opposition to the current government     |
| G18-08        | +516                    | Just decided                                   |

Factor of the connection strength (average of the 24 permutations) = 0.86

Factor of the connection strength (maximum value) = 1.19 (1234)

The respondents who choose a party based on its opposition to the current government had positive attitudes to the Communist party (+3666).

### Table III. Dependence of the Interval Parameter (Variable) “Attitudes to the Communist party” (X10) from the Nominal Parameter (Variable) “Basis for choice of a party” (G18)

| Response group | Comparative weightiness | Nominal answer to the question-cause relation |
|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| G18-01        | +3789                   | I like its leader                              |
| G18-04        | +3483                   | It knows best what to do                        |
| G18-08        | -233                    | Just decided                                   |
| G18-09        | -1095                   | Did not vote                                    |

Factor of the connection strength (average of the 24 permutations) = 1.04

Those respondents who explained the basis when choosing the party as “I like its leader” (+3789) or “It knows better than others what to do” (+3483) had positive attitudes towards LDPR is present in.
TABLE VII. DEPENDENCE OF THE INTERVAL PARAMETER (VARIABLE) “ATTITUDE TO V.V. ZHIRINOVSKY” (X14) FROM THE NOMINAL PARAMETER (VARIABLE) “BASIS FOR CHOICE OF A PARTY” (G18)

| Response group | Comparative weightiness | Nominal answer to the question-cause relation | Strategy of identifying the “average permutations” relation |
|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| G18-02        | -162                    | It has a reliable team                         |                                                          |
| G18-03        | +1839                   | I like its program                            |                                                          |
| G18-07        | +3937                   | Is in opposition to the current government     |                                                          |
| G18-09        | -1201                   | Did not vote                                  |                                                          |

Factor of the connection strength (average of the 24 permutations) = 0.98
Factor of the connection strength (maximum value) = 1.39 (1342)

The respondents who choose a party based on its opposition to the current government had apparently positive attitudes to V.V. Zhirinovsky (+3937).

TABLE VIII. DEPENDENCE OF THE INTERVAL PARAMETER (VARIABLE) “ATTITUDE TO M.D. PROKHOROV” (X16) FROM THE NOMINAL PARAMETER (VARIABLE) “BASIS FOR CHOICE OF A PARTY” (G18)

| Response group | Comparative weightiness | Nominal answer to the question-cause relation | Strategy of identifying the “average permutations” relation |
|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| G18-02        | -1163                   | It has a reliable team                         |                                                          |
| G18-06        | -514                    | No more worthy, no one else to vote for       |                                                          |
| G18-07        | +88                     | Is in opposition to the current government     |                                                          |
| G18-08        | +2418                   | Just decided                                  |                                                          |

Factor of the connection strength (average of the 24 permutations) = 0.64
Factor of the connection strength (maximum value) = 0.88 (2413)

The group of respondents whose basis for choosing a party is the following motto “Just decided” had positive attitudes (+2418) towards M.D. Prokhorov.

TABLE IX. DEPENDENCE OF THE INTERVAL PARAMETER (VARIABLE) “ATTITUDE TO S.M. MIRONOV” (X17) FROM THE NOMINAL PARAMETER (VARIABLE) “BASIS FOR CHOICE OF A PARTY” (G18)

| Response group | Comparative weightiness | Nominal answer to the question-cause relation | Strategy of identifying the “average permutations” relation |
|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| G18-02        | -2062                   | It has a reliable team                         |                                                          |
| G18-04        | -1665                   | It knows best what to do                      |                                                          |
| G18-08        | +684                    | Just decided                                  |                                                          |
| G18-09        | +159                    | Did not vote                                  |                                                          |

Factor of the connection strength (average of the 24 permutations) = 0.85
Factor of the connection strength (maximum value) = 1.21 (2314)

The group of respondents who choose a party because a party has a reliable team had negative attitudes (-2062) to S.M. Mironov.
The negative attitude to the voting results at the elections to the Russian Federation State Duma (-3291) is present in the respondents, who choose a party based on its opposition to the current government.

Similarly, the respondents who choose a party based on its opposition to the current government had negative attitudes to the voting results at the Russian Federation presidential elections (-3768).

The negative attitude toward the voting results at the elections to the Russian Federation presidential elections (VARIABLE “DISSATISFACTION WITH THE RESULTS OF VOTING IN THE ELECTIONS TO THE RF STATE DUMA” (X19) FROM THE NOMINAL PARAMETER (VARIABLE) “BASIS FOR CHOICE OF A PARTY” (G18))

| Response group | Comparative weightiness | Nominal answer to the question-cause Strategy of identifying the “average permutations” relation |
|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| G18-02         | +539                   | It has a reliable team                                                                        |
| G18-03         | -698                   | I like its program                                                                            |
| G18-04         | +876                   | It knows best what to do                                                                      |
| G18-07         | -3291                  | Is in opposition to the current government                                                     |

Factor of the connection strength (average of the 24 permutations) = 0.78
Factor of the connection strength (maximum value) = 1.08 (1432)

However, the satisfaction with the work of Russian President Vladimir Putin identified two opposing groups: a group with positive attitudes (+1288) who choose a party because it knows better than others do what to do; and a group with negative attitudes (-1602), who choose a party based on its opposition to the current government.

The subjective assessment of their financial situation is quite high (+2088) among the respondents, who choose a party because it knows better than others do what to do.

III. Conclusion

We demonstrated the new method for joint analysis of interval and multivalued nominal data on the specific study data in the context of political sociology. As a result, we obtain the new cause and effect information, as the interval variables depend on multivalued nominal variables.

This continues research in the context of nonlinear nature with regard to social sciences (human sciences):
1. Author’s method of multiple comparison.
2. Author’s method of studying statistical relations [1, 2].
3. Nonlinearity of psychological and social science [3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15].
4. Synergetic paradigms in the science [6, 9, 10, 11].
5. International and European Congresses of Psychology and Sociology: ICP, ISA, ECP, ESA (58 presentations).

It also staticizes acceptance synergetic paradigms in psychological and social science.

At the same time, the nonlinear nature of psychological and sociological data is not relevant for most researchers, although the nonlinearity of psychological and social has already been revealed in numerous studies with the help of the authorial method.
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