

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Kenneth Janda

Source: *Computers and the Humanities*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Apr. - Jun. , 1979), pp. 131-132

Published by: Springer

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30207862>

Accessed: 01/04/2010 22:30

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=springer>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Springer is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Computers and the Humanities*.

Book Reviews

Party Identification and Beyond: Representations of Voting and Party Competition, ed. Budge, Ian; Ivor Crewe, and Dennis Farlie. London: John Wiley & Sons, 1976. Pp. 393, no index. \$34.50.

By Kenneth Janda

If you are concerned about the disjuncture between empirical studies of voting behavior and spatial theories of electoral choice, you should read this book. An outgrowth of a workshop sponsored by the European Consortium for Political Research at Strasbourg in 1974, it consists of seventeen original papers on the utility of the concept of party identification in explaining voting choice, on “dimensional analysis” as a policy-based alternative perspective, and on the utility of spatial theory for voting research. *Party Identification and Beyond* does more than package the papers for easy consumption; it proposes a synthesis of the party identification and rational choice approaches of electoral research.

With nearly 400 pages of small type and numerous tables and graphs, the book is not quick reading, but it is for the most part rewarding. Because it is well organized into three parts, its themes can be summarized by a selective description of the chapters in each part.

Part I, “Party Identification: Its Theoretical and Measurement Status,” begins with an essay by Warren Miller, one of the original Michigan gang of four who devised the famed seven-point scale for measuring party identification in the U.S. Defending the concept, Miller holds that cross-national variations in the role played by party identification should constitute new problems for research rather than arguments for its invalidity. Ivor Crewe counters by showing that British voters tend to change their party identification to match their party choice in a given election, which questions the “pre-dispositional” nature of party identification and suggests that more attention should be given to current politics rather than childhood “learning” as its cause. Jacques Thomassen presses the attack

Kenneth Janda is a professor of political science at Northwestern University.

with data for The Netherlands, where party identification is less stable than voting preference and does not appear to be causally prior to vote preference. Max Kaase’s research on Germany finds more of the same: analyses of party identification are highly dependent on operationalization, and the concept, however measured, does not seem to be causally prior to vote choice. Noting the need for a concept “like” party identification to measure long-term predispositions, Budge and Farlie nevertheless find that psychologically-based measures are nearly equivalent to voting choice in eight of nine countries studied—the U.S. excepted. They propose instead that long-term dispositions can be measured with socioeconomic characteristics, which are clearly prior to voting choice, through a technique called “Likelihood Ratio Space” abbreviated LiRaS. Like the old “index of political predisposition,” this technique yields a scalar value for the propensity of voting for a given party.

The research reported in Part II, “Dimensional Analysis,” represents parties as points in space, a method which is necessary for spatial theories of electoral choice. This is the least coherent of the three parts. Jerrold Rusk and Ole Borre measured voters’ preferences toward Danish parties on “feeling thermometers” and determined that the parties could be placed along a left-right dimension in 1971 but that by 1973 a second dimension was needed to accommodate changes in parties. Whereas Rusk and Borre created a “party-defined” space based on reliance on party preferences, Erik Damgaard and Jerrold Rusk constructed *policy-defined* space in their study of parliamentary votes of Danish parties from 1953 to 1973. The party-defined and policy-defined spaces were analogous, and there was some evidence that old and new parties shifted positions in response to changes in public opinion and election returns from 1972 to 1973. Constructing party-defined spaces from voter preferences in Belgium, Andre-Paul Frogner found that voters tended to shift to the “closer” party when they shifted voting choice. Gary Mauser and Jacqueline Freyssinet-Dominjon noted a convergence between party-defined and policy-defined spaces for French parties. However, Ronald Inglehart and Dusan Sidjanski learned that voters’ left-right placement of Swiss parties, while

corresponding rather well to respondent self-placement and party preferences for the "established" parties, did not relate well for Switzerland's newer "protest" parties. But more generally, Ronald Inglehart and Hans Klingemann, although they concluded that party identification was more a *cause* of left-right self-placement than a consequence of left-right political attitudes, observed nevertheless that the left-right scale had broad applicability in 1973 across nine European Community countries. This conclusion seems to emphasize the importance of party identification as a long-term predisposition in voting choice, and it fits the other findings in this part which place parties in party-defined space. Although the editors strive mightily to emphasize the distinction between spatial orderings defined by voter preferences and by policy positions, the inability to develop the distinction in the separate selections works against coherence.

Part III, "Rational Choice and Party Identification," starts with an excellent review and critique of the spatial theory of elections by Peter Ordeshook, who notes its limitations (e.g., to simple two-candidate plurality-rule elections without consideration of campaign tactics) but contends that its rational choice paradigm is sufficiently flexible to accommodate more richness, including long-term predispositions. Some elementary predictions from rational choice theory were confirmed by Michael Laver's chapter on voting in Northern Ireland under STV (Single Transferable Vote), and in the next two chapters William Irvine achieved mixed results in testing some rational calculus explanations of voting turnout and voting choice in Canada. The most forceful argument for a rational choice approach to voting research and against the party-identification approach comes from David Robertson, who holds that party identification at best offers *ex post facto* explanations of long-term and short-term forces on voting and that research should be guided by rational choice theory, which asks how a rational-choice voter ought to vote in specific circumstances. Farlie and Budge conclude the book by returning to their LiRaS as a measure of long-term predispositions.

Although nearly all these articles deserve reading for one reason or another, the hurried reader can learn the substance of the book's argument through selective reading. The editors' introductions to the three parts are careful analyses of the issues involved in the chapters and deserve to be read closely. Indeed, the chapters in "Dimensional Analysis" are difficult to relate to the book without having read the introduction. The argument in *Party Identification and Beyond* unfolds in the introductions and in a subset of articles. Miller's chapter on party identification allows an inventor to explain his invention. Budge and Farlie's chapter on LiRaS proposes an alternative to the "causally con-

fused" Michigan measure of party identification while retaining the concept, saying that in LiRaS "party identification rides again" (p. 125). Ordeshook's chapter on spatial theory is essential for relating concerns with long-term predispositions to the short-term character of existing spatial theory. Robertson's criticism of orthodox party identification theory as "metaphysical" (p. 380) is as blunt as any Michigan critic could want. Finally, Farlie and Budge reserve the opportunity to play peacemaker, noting that the Miller-Robertson debate is only a "theological dispute" (p. 390), that the faith requires maintaining a distinction between long-term and short-term election forces, and that LiRaS does it better than "the original measure based on direct questions" (p. 392).

Many of the other articles in this book, especially those on dimensional analysis, will be cited on their own merits. The book itself will come to be recognized as an important stepping-stone to the integration of theoretical and empirical concerns in electoral behavior research, moving us "beyond" party identification.

A Concordance to the Poems of Ben Jonson. Compiled by Steven L. Bates and Sidney Orr. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1978. Pp. xlvi, 882. \$40.00.

A Concordance to the Poems of Ben Jonson. Edited by Mario A. Di Cesare and Ephim Fogel. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1978. Pp. xxviii, 884. \$30.00.

By Mark E. Amsler

Several manually compiled concordances to Ben Jonson's nondramatic poetry have been started in the past, but none has been completed. Now two computer-assisted concordances of the poetry have appeared within a few months of each other. What are we to do with such riches? One concordance, compiled by Steven Bates and Sidney Orr (both from UCLA), is based on Vinton Dearing's concordance program and so takes its place beside George R. Guffey's concordances to the poetry of Andrew Marvell (1974) and Thomas Traherne (1974). According to the prefatory materials, Sidney Orr helped debug both of Guffey's concordances as well as the Jonson concordance. The other concordance, edited by Mario Di Cesare and Ephim Fogel, is the latest volume in the Cornell University Press series of computer-assisted concordances and complements Di Cesare's earlier *Concordance to the Complete Writings of George Herbert* (1977). The program used by Di Cesare

Mark E. Amsler, an assistant professor of English at the University of Delaware, is primarily interested in Medieval and Renaissance studies and modern literary theory.