

STRATEGIES FOR COMPARATIVE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR RESEARCH

Bradley Richardson
The Ohio State University

September 1977

STRATEGIES FOR COMPARATIVE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR RESEARCH

Comparative political behavior research takes three forms: multi-national coordinated studies, bi-national coordinated analyses and single nation studies conducted in a comparative frame of reference. There are relatively few multi-national and bi-national efforts. Examples of multi-national research are well known and include the early Rokkan European teachers study, the Almond and Verba five nation study, the Inkeles comparative participation project, the Verba and Nie comparative participation studies, the Dennis led comparative socialization research, the Inglehart and Rabier EEC studies and the Barnes multi-national coordinated study of value change and political protest. Bi-national efforts, some of them marriages of single nation research, include work by Converse and Dupeux, Campbell and Valen and Rokkan and Campbell. Single nation studies where comparison involves use of concepts and questions originated in research in other countries are the most common format found in comparative political behavior research.

The problems to be addressed in a discussion of comparative methodology are somewhat different, or differ in emphasis, where the different kinds of studies are concerned. Indicator equivalence, for example, is certainly a different kind of

issue with regard to the single nation studies than in the context of coordinated cross national research efforts. There are also problems which have greater relevance for all of the study categories than others. Development of useful constructs for comparative analysis is a case in point. This paper uses examples from party identification and political participation research to suggest how current theoretical controversies or gaps in conceptualization might be used constructively in comparative political behavior study.

PARTY IDENTIFICATION AS A COMPARATIVE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR CONCEPT

Recent controversy over the status of party identification as a useful cross-national construct illustrates some central problems of comparative political behavior research. From the beginning, the properties of party identification were based on psychological concepts and observations of party support in the United States. Party identification was consequently believed to have a number of core attributes, such as cross-time stability, transferability between generations and independence from the voting act. Despite some recent disagreement about the dynamic properties of party identification (Converse, 1976; Abramson, 1976), the basic model and related concepts still occupy a central position in American political behavior theory. Through application of the party identification construct abroad has come both confirming evidence and critical evaluation of this concept. The resulting confusion indicates a need for better conceptualizing the nature and sources of party loyalties in comparative research.

Generations in Comparative Party Identification Research.

For a decade or so the American party identification model was applied overseas with apparent success. Following the initial work by Campbell and Valen (1966), levels of party identification reasonably comparable to those in the United States were

found in a number of political systems despite major differences between institutional settings and party systems. Also, indications of party identification transfer between generations was found in other countries (Converse and Dupeux, 1966; Ward and Kubota, 1970; Butler and Stokes, 1969), while other comparative research showed party identification to have a strong relationship with voting choice (Butler and Stokes, 1969; Jennings, 1972; Borre and Katz, 1973), to be more intense among older partisans (Butler and Stokes, 1969; Jennings, 1972, Borre and Katz, 1973). Despite some cross-national differences, e.g. the low visibility of French parental partisanship and the very high consistency between partisanship and issue opinions and party loyalties and the vote in some European countries, these and other first generation comparative studies demonstrated a nominal fit across a number of countries between the assumed properties of party identification and observed patterns in party support.

A second generation of party identification research which has appeared in recent years has emphasized areas of lack of fit between the American model and foreign findings. Two of the assumed properties of party identification, stability across time and independence from the voting act, have come under special attack. The adequacy of the model to explain patterns of depoliticization and voting change is also questioned.

The stability question and the problem of the relationship

between party loyalties and voting choice behavior involve core assumptions of the party identification approach. Lower levels of stable party identifications were observed in Britain in the 1960s in comparison with trends in partisan attitudes from a presumably comparable period in the United States, although the differences were not enormous (Butler and Stokes, 1969). More critically, party vote records were more stable across time in the Netherlands than party identification (Thomassen, 1976), party loyalties tended to follow voting choices or show tandem patterns of change in the Netherlands (Thomassen, 1976), Britain (Butler and Stokes, 1969), and Denmark (Borre and Katz, 1973) and party identification appears to be unstable in Germany (Kaase, 1976). What these findings imply, according to the interpretations of the various investigators, is dependence between party identification and the vote rather than independence and/or simply unacceptable levels of cross-time stability to permit viewing party loyalties as a long-term, stable attitude.

A different critical thrust is found in recent British scholarship (Crewe, 1976), where it is argued that the party identification approach as traditionally expressed does not easily account for trends (also found in the United States and elsewhere) of partisan dealignment. Taken together the various concerns for the general question of the fit and validity of the party identification concepts have inaugurated a new phase in comparative political behavior research and theory.

The Need for a Comparative Concept of Party Support.

Given the presence of both confirming and disconfirming findings on the performance of party identification in different countries, development of better ideas on how party loyalties behave should be given high priority in comparative political behavior research. The problem has several dimensions:

(a) The possibility that party identification's performance may vary as the result of differences in the internal meaning of party support attitudes should be explored;

(b) The systemic conditions under which party identification performs differently should be examined in more detail;

(c) The normative properties of party identification across known political systems should be used as a basis for assessments of convergence and deviation rather than unspecified and unclear assumptions about what the American model implied.

Toward a Multi-Dimensional Understanding of Party Loyalties.

The present "Michigan" model of party identification has always assumed that party loyalties are essentially a single-dimensional affective tie. There are good arguments in favor of this concept (Budge, 1976) which cite its simplicity and related ease of measurement. On the other hand, a multi-dimensional concept of party identification might produce interesting insights in comparative research such as those developed by Nie and others in comparative political participation analysis (Nie, Verba and Kim, 1971).

In his critique of the party identification approach, Crewe (1976) suggested that several types of partisanship could exist without their detection by the normal operations of contemporary political behavior analysis. By examining different combinations of plausible dimensions of party ties, e.g. affect, duration of attachment, response to other parties and level and complexity of issue response, Crewe suggested a five-fold typology of party identification. The types of party loyalties suggested by Crewe might in turn be associated with different kinds of consequences than those anticipated by contemporary party identification models. For example, habitual partisans -- for Crewe people whose identifications were low in intensity but who still consistently voted for the same party -- might be less prone to deviate from their party loyalties than negative partisans or single issue partisans whose attitudes were of higher intensity but of lower potential stability. (Indeed, the presence of habitual partisans might help explain Kaase's (1976) finding that weak SPD supporters voted for their party in 1969 at the same rate as strong supporters!)

Other interesting examples of combining different dimensions of party identification into new measures or of multi-dimensional insights into the underpinnings of party attitudes can be cited. Jane Jensen (1975) combined cross-level and cross-time measures of partisanship in Canada to develop a

party identification index which had better predictive power in the complex environment of Canadian politics than the ordinary party identification indicator. In this case, sensitivity to complexity was shown mainly in the area of measurement. Elsewhere, Borre and Katz (1973) experimented with questions which tapped supposed variations in the ideological, symbolic and pragmatic sides of party identification in Denmark with some success, in that the different dimensions were differentially linked in some cases to turnout and voting choice.

The possibilities for defining different types of party identification are certainly not limited to the examples provided by Crewe, Jensen or the Danish research group. Among others, it is easy to imagine the existence of mobilized partisans whose attitudes and behavior are highly dependent upon organizational ties and manipulation by political activists and group representatives. If this category is added to Crewe's five-fold classification of habitual, negative, single issue, temporary and loyalist partisans, Jensen's combination of cross-level and cross-time support and the Danish tri-dimensional conceptualization, an inventory of potentially meaningful party identification types results. The utility of exploring the analytic possibilities of a multi-dimensional conceptualization of partisanship should be clear. Through examining the properties of partisanship in greater complexity,

troubling questions of equivalence might be broached with greater success. In addition, sensitivity to party identification's multi-dimensional possibilities might produce new theoretic insights similar to those developed in party participation research by Verba and Nie (1971; 1972). A multi-dimensional approach to partisanship might also help unravel the question of the primacy of social group ties vs. party loyalties by demonstrating more clearly the actual substance of party identification. Finally, and most importantly for the discussion here, sensitivity to differences between different kinds of partisanship could be productive in determining why the results of party identification research confirm the simpler American model in some cases and deviate elsewhere.

External Parameters of Party Identification. Comparative scholars have not exactly neglected the meaning of system differences for party identification. Several scholars (Converse, 1969; Zohlnhöfer, 1969, Richardson, 1975) have looked systematically at the effects of variations in system continuity on party identification. More recently American scholarship has begun somewhat analogously to view party identification differently during a hypothesized steady state period in contrast with the more recent period of partisan dealignment (Converse, 1976). In a very limited sense the effects of plausible system differences in party salience have also been explored indirectly (Converse and Dupeux, 1966; Richardson, 1975).

Some areas where system differences might affect party loyalties haven't been explored as yet, even though most scholars show a rich sensitivity to the possibilities of such influences in discussions of background factors that may affect their analyses. At the same time, the link between some system properties and party identification could be established by careful analysis even in the face of well-known difficulties in tracing the effects of political system variations at the individual level. For example, there are intriguing differences across political cultures in the patterns of affective responses to political objects which could be intimately related with the character of party identification attitudes or which might affect how party identification is linked with voting choices. Many Americans are positive in their answers thermometer to questions about both the Democratic and Republican parties, while Europeans show a stronger tendency to like their own party while rejecting other parties (although there are also variations within systems where different parties are objects). Japanese, in contrast, tend much more to affective neutrality in their response to political parties and other national political objects. It is easy to imagine that the patterns in affect across cultures may be linked with such intriguing phenomena as the prevalence of weak partisanship in Japan or the lower consistency between party identification and the vote in American elections compared with European behavior.

People in different countries also vary in the degree to which they are cosmopolitan or parochial in their political orientations, as is clearly shown in answers to political interest "focus" questions. The strong current of political parochialism observable in some cases, e.g. Japan, could be an inhibiting factor in the development of cognitive awareness and affective feelings toward political parties where the parties are mainly objects of national political affairs. (The possibilities for sub-system variation in party loyalties between cosmopolitan and parochial sub-cultures in Mediterranean, Latin American and Asian societies is equally present.)

Still a further axis of variance between systems, which could influence the quality of party loyalties, lies in the differences visible in contemporary or recent patterns of political cynicism and trust across nations. For example, cynicism is widespread in Japanese political culture at the same time that Japanese patterns of party identification indicate weak intensities and party image questions reveal an important number of instances of negative feelings toward one's own party. A link between these two kinds of attitudes can be inferred also in some countries where parallel trends exist in patterns across time of both political cynicism and partisan dealignment. Linkages between trends in partisan attitude formation and those for political cynicism can also be seen in socialization research results at some points. Studies on

learning among Japanese youths (Massey, 1976) show massive increases of distrust at the same time that party loyalties themselves are internalized, so that a connection between the pattern of evaluative attitudes and the qualities of party loyalties seems reasonable.

In addition to the patterns of politicization differences already mentioned, there may be important differences in direct political mobilization between countries which could affect the quality of party loyalties. Many European political parties still reputedly mobilize through batteries of auxiliary organizations or through other organized groups on a much more elaborate scale than is found in the United States. In addition to these differences in the scope of political mobilization, the nature of the mobilizing agents also varies substantially cross-nationally. Party elites and organizations probably dominate political mobilization efforts in Northern Europe and America, while candidates and their networks of personal supporters play a larger role in France, southern Italy and Japan (Tarrow, 1972; Curtis, 1969; Richardson, 1967).

Differences in mobilization, which are tapped only in a fragmentary way in current survey research, could be determined and may be associated with different levels and types of party loyalties and related attitudes. Differences in the visibility and affective "pull" of national party leaders apparently exist between political systems as well and may be an additional

factor giving partisanship a different color such as by providing different levels of intensity to the contest between parties. Finally, differences in the "depth" and ideologization of traditional socio-political cleavages, measurable with thermometer and issue opinion items, may themselves be associated with different kinds of patterns in party loyalties.

It is difficult to say at this state how far the link between potentially relevant system variables and patterns in party identification can be established precisely. The difficulties of isolating the effects of system differences cannot be underestimated. Still, efforts to specify how differences between political cultures and political systems affect the performance of party identification should be undertaken even in the face of the apparent problems if for no other reason, analysis of system effects should be pursued, simply because one of the greatest potentials of cross-national research lies in its capability to explore the systemic parameters which may affect the relationships between variables predicted by extant behavioral models.

The Need for Clear Norms of Party Identification Performance.

Contemporary party identification research of the second generational variety has one obvious defect in most instances. There is a strong tendency to reject the applicability of the party identification construct on the basis of the deviation

of some people's behavior from either American findings or an idealized version of the American models. What is lacking is a sense of what the normative properties of party identification across nations might be and in what units comparative findings might be assessed. There is no precision in concepts like stability and independence, and little sense of how far findings can deviate from expected patterns and still be seen as confirming evidence or at what point deviating findings exist. This is a general problem of social science investigation, but a particularly acute one for comparative research. Consequently, in addition to looking at some important areas of potential variation in the meaning of party identification and the impact of system variables across nations, future comparative research on party loyalties should use systematic observation of the properties of partisanship across several nations as a yardstick for making evaluations of new findings. In so doing, party identification research would be departing from the current pattern of simple assumptions, while simultaneously facilitating the task of precisely evaluating findings across nations.

Problems in Comparative Participation Research. The current issues in comparative political participation studies are somewhat different from those of comparative party identification research. There are paradigms of political participation which on the surface seem appropriate for comparative

analysis of behaviors ranging from participation motivated by internalized attitudes of political competence and involvement to activism motivated more by responses to one's social environment or direct efforts to solicit participation from outside groups. However, while comparative political participation as a field of inquiry research has been relatively advanced conceptually, measurement of some plausibly important variables has lagged behind. Political involvement and competence and some other political dimensions have been explored thoroughly in many studies. But indicators for such potentially fruitful concepts as social role, social integration-isolation and socio-political mobilization (Lipset, 1960) have not been developed. Rather simple social variables, e.g. social status, age, sex and urban-rural residence, which may capture complex and even potentially cross-cutting motivational dimensions are used far too frequently.

Examples of the problems of using simple variables and in sociological research on political participation are comparatively easy to find. Many studies have shown the importance of social status to political activity across nations (Tingsten, 1937; Lipset, 1960; Nie, Powell and Prewitt, 1969; Verba, Nie and Kim, 1971; Nie and Verba, 1975). Persons of higher social status simply participate more in politics than people in lower strata in a variety of situations, according to the converging findings of many studies. Still, there are examples of sharp differences in the correlations between

status and participation across nations (Nie and Verba, 1975) and evidence which shows political participation may sometimes be relatively insensitive to social status differences (Rokkan, 1970). In our own participation research (Richardson, Asher and Weisberg, forthcoming), it has been clear that some kinds of political participation are responsive to social status differences much more consistently than others. On one hand, higher status people in the eight nations included in our comparative workbook project generally discussed politics more often than lower status persons. Higher status persons also engaged in other information-gathering activities, particularly newspaper reading, more than persons of lower status. Elsewhere, the links between social status and political activity were far less systematic. Voting is less affected by social status than information-gathering activities. Only in the United States, according to our findings, is there a simple, monotonic relationship between social status and turnout. Moreover, other kinds of political activism, especially participation in election campaigns and attending political meetings, are linked with social status in the anticipated ways in some countries but not so in others. Presumably higher status persons in some countries engage less in certain kinds of political activities or lower status persons are mobilized to participate in equal proportions to higher status participants. Whatever the case, the problem of

conflicting patterns in the correlations between participation and simple social status variables exists.

Sex differences in political participation are another case where complex patterns prevail. Men are generally more activist than women according to the findings of almost any study of political participation where sex is a variable. In our own analysis, men also participated more in politics across a range of activities, regardless of country. Although very small sex differences in turnout were found in European countries, all of the findings were consistent in their indication of male dominance in political participation. However, when we explored hypotheses from earlier research (e.g. Rokkan, 1970) which postulated decreasing sex differences among such categories as persons with higher education or urban residents, we found very complicated relationships. The hypotheses were successful in some instances and failed elsewhere! Importantly, there are no good clues to the meaning of the distinctive patterns.

While the complexity in the participation patterns of people in different social strata and sexes across nations are probably not widely known, urban-rural differences have long been seen as a problem for comparative political participation research. Early studies indicated the presence of contradictory trends in urban-rural political activity in different countries (Tingsten, 1937). Subsequent research has shown repeatedly

that participation is complexly related to patterns of population distribution and density (Nie, Powell and Prewitt, 1969; Tarrow, 1972; Richardson, 1973). For some kinds of political activity and some countries, urban residents participate more than rural people. Elsewhere the pattern is reversed. Also, in some instances urban-rural residence has no impact on political participation. Finally, controls for social status and organizational activity -- social attributes which sometimes correlate highly with place of residence -- indicate that rural residence often leads to higher participation once the confounding influence of these variables is removed (Verba and Nie, 1972; Richardson, 1973; Richardson, 1974).

Two issues seem to emerge from the confrontation of political participation patterns with simple sociological variables such as social status, sex or urban-rural residence. First, we typically assume that the sociological variables are surrogates for fairly simple and internally consistent "packages" of motivations and attitudes, when in fact this may not be the case. Secondly, cross-national equivalence of sociological categories is often assumed in the absence of confirming knowledge that this is the case. We compare such social categories as educational and occupational status across cultures with highly divergent and not necessarily converging cultural and political traditions, without knowing the actual motivational and experiential content which these variables represent. For

example, is it probable that graduates of the highly selective European university systems are inherently similar to the graduates of the highly decentralized and more broadly oriented American universities? Perhaps there is a general equivalence in some areas of political cognition and information-seeking activities. But there may be less equivalence in the areas of motivation and experience which favor campaign participation. Obviously, speculation is easy, and the cross-national differences game has almost infinite possibilities. Yet, there are still divergent findings to be explained, and overly simplified assumptions about variable meaning and equivalence can be a central contributing factor.

Or, can it be assumed that college educated women in the organizationally penetrated and self-consciously "liberated" American middle class are similar to educated, middle-class women in cultures such as Japan, where the middle class has long been the sector in society where sex roles were most clearly differentiated on so called "traditional" grounds? And, can the seemingly isolative social setting of the American or Canadian prairie be compared meaningfully with the more socially integrative French or Japanese rural community?

Certainly many other examples exist of instances where important concepts appear to vary in meaning cross-nationally. The point here is simply that effective comparative research requires better concepts and indicators than we have readily available to us in the form of the commonly used sociological

categories such as status, place of residence and sex. Consequently, a strategy for improving knowledge of the underlying meanings for particular sociological variables and developing insight into potentially critical social processes is suggested below.

Exploring the "Internal" Motivations for Political Participation. Comparative political participation research at present should include systematic exploration of the dimensions which apparently complexly underly the relations involving conventional social variables. Borrowing and elaborating from Lipset and from Nie and Verba, a number of conceptual and measurement strategies can be suggested which could help unravel complicated findings such as those outlined above. Recent comparative political participation research (Nie, Powell and Prewitt, 1969; Verba, Nie and Kim, 1971; Nie and Verba, 1975) has gone far in conceptualization and measurement of linkages between attitudes like political competence-efficacy, cognitive competence and general political involvement and political activism. Still, the troubling complexity of certain linkages between simple social categories and some kinds of political activity remains, along with such intriguing puzzles as those where sex differences under control situations show unexpected and unexplainable tendencies.

Two lacuniae seem to exist in current political participation research where specifically social and political attitudes

are concerned. The potential for conceptualization and measurement of social role concepts relating to political activity is not fully explored and the possibility that complex relationships may exist between participation and kinds of political efficacy, personal competence (Converse, 1974) on the one hand, and political responsiveness dimensions of efficacy and/or political cynicism on the other hand, is neglected.

The absence of concepts and indicators for people's perceptions of socially desirable participation roles is particularly lamentable. We have measures of citizen duty in a number of studies where the focus of the questions is on the voting act. However, we lack a sense of the appropriateness and social desirability of other forms of political participation, even though such attitudes could be important. Moreover, social role concepts could be at variance with other attitudes supposedly conducive to participation. Thus, findings from a Japanese question which tapped the appropriateness of political activism beyond the voting act indicated patterns which at times contradicted those of political efficacy, particularly where the object of the efficacy question was national politics (Richardson, 1974). Young Japanese were high in efficacy relative to middle aged and older persons (more so on the textbook or personal competence dimensions than the political responsiveness dimensions),

while middle aged persons were typically those most prone to support the concept of political participation as a mechanism for solving community political problems. Middle aged persons also tended to participate more in politics across a broad range of behaviors. Unfortunately, these findings are from research reports which only reported results for different groups, so that individual patterns in the different attitudes and their effects on participation could not be observed. However, the example does serve to indicate that attitudes about the social desirability of political participation might be explored profitably.

Some Japanese data also suggest the presence of high levels of personal competence efficacy among well educated persons and people of high social status accompanied by low levels of political trust and "responsiveness" efficacy. The findings do not show, unfortunately, just how these attitude patterns are linked with the lower levels of active participation found among high status Japanese relative to persons at some other status levels. But the possibility that political cynicism and low "responsiveness" efficacy may play a role in political apathy is present.

Actually, our comparative participation workbook research suggests that political cynicism plays a very inconsistent role related to political participation. Using campaign participation and meeting attendance as dependent variables,

political cynicism (measured with the standard American questions) had no effect on participation in the United States and Canada. However, in Norway and the Netherlands, variables based on questions reasonably similar to the American ones were linked strongly with campaign activism in the predicted directions. The change in item content raises obvious questions, as does also the inevitable problem of causal directions or the question of whether any causal linkage is really inferrable. Yet the presence of cynicism-trust as a variable linked with participation of certain kinds in some countries is still intriguing, and suggests the desirability of including relevant questions in future participation research. Other possible causes aside (see below) some of the seemingly anomolous linkages between social status and campaign activism might be an artifact of attitude patterns such as those indicated for high status Japanese.

Probing the Social Context of Political Participation.

With the exception of recent analyses of the organizational roots of political participation (Nie, Powell and Prewitt, 1969; Verba and Nie, 1972), few of the Lipset (1960) hypotheses about the effects of social integration, socio-political mobilization and social reinforcement on participation have been explored. On the surface, at least, these social factors would seem to be an extremely fertile area for investigation, especially given scattered findings indicating that organizational and community influences may counteract or cancel those

expected from social status (Rokkan, 1970), or otherwise explain intriguing patterns in urban-rural differences in participation (Richardson, 1973; Richardson, 1974). (The same can be said for the role of these social factors as causes of interesting urban-rural patterns in political partisanship (Miller and Stouthard, 1975; Flanagan and Richardson, 1977).)

Social integration is an elusive concept in some ways, given possibilities for great variation and subtlety in its possible psychic consequences and dimensions. But at a much simpler level, it is easy to imagine that persons in greater social contact with others in their community or at work have opportunities for political information gathering and for participating in collective action that persons in more isolative circumstances do not. Thus, fairly simple measures of interaction with others might yield interesting insights into otherwise unmeasured aspects of variation between persons in different residential situations, different status groups and so forth. The extent to which people interact with others also seems (again taking things at their face value) as the first link in the chain of "development" of socially oriented attitudes and behaviors which Lipset and some others feel are relevant to political participation patterns. In other words, levels of social interaction may be critical to reference group behavior and responses to efforts by organized groups and political activists to mobilize participation (and support).

Developing better understanding of social reinforcement processes is an obvious second step for better conceptualization and measurement of relevant sociological variables in comparative political participation research. The belief that participation norms are socially derived and enforced is a commonplace in political participation research. Yet there has been to my knowledge no empirical exploration of the extent to which people participate in politics in some way in response to the perception that particular reference group members are active participants. Nor do we find out if participation is a norm of a particular group and its members are expected to participate, or that active participation is expected of good group members and the like. While the emphasis in much American organized group communications seems to imply the sanctity of participation and especially volunteer activism, we ignore these and other normative dimensions in our research. The modes of measuring these and other dimensions of social reinforcement and reference group behavior seem obvious; fairly direct questions could be used including items similar to those employed to tap length and intensity of labor union affiliations and other aspects of unions' reference group properties in American political behavior research (Campbell, 1960).

If Rokkan (1970) is correct, as well as some scholars more concerned with social cleavage development and reinforcement than participation (Sartori, 1968), direct political

mobilization may make a big difference in patterns of political behavior. The workings of mobilization would seem extremely simple in the case of the voting act, in contrast with the more complex trains of events which may intervene where organizations, parties or candidates seek campaign help or otherwise solicit some other kind of political participation. However, the critical point is that we simply don't ask people if they were asked to vote or participate. Rather, voluntaristic models prevail and we only come close to the possibility of mobilization effects via measurement of the impact of organizational membership (which could actually represent any of the social context processes we have been discussing). Yet it is precisely the possibility that people are directly "pressured" to participate that could explain the seemingly anomalous consequences of social status in some instances, i.e. where upper status persons don't campaign or attend meetings disproportionately to lower status persons.

The potential for identification of new dimensions of the social antecedents of political participation suggests interesting parallels between participation research and the study of partisanship. Political sociology has traditionally depended on fairly simple measures of social cleavages in efforts to trace the social roots of partisanship. However, some recent sociological studies on the sources of partisanship have shown clearly that direct organizational ties with

labor unions and churches or intimate contact with persons from relevant social groups can be more important than mere "membership" in some broad social grouping such as the working class or a particular religion (Goldthorpe, 1968; Liepelt, 1971; Sani, 1975). The results of these studies suggest the value of further pursuing the chain of causality between simple social attributes and the complex social processes they may in reality represent.

POSSIBILITIES FOR COMPARATIVE POLITICAL BEHAVIOR RESEARCH

Two kinds of emphases are reflected in this paper. The intellectual development of party identification research is seen as progressing from an early emphasis on American models toward a European reaction which is not yet sufficiently comparative in its concerns. For party identification research to profit most from the possibilities of cross-national research, development of concepts sensitive to the normative properties of party support across nations is suggested. Investigation of possible multi-dimensional properties for party identification is also urged as a way to grasp the meanings of partisanship across nations and to better tap reasons for inter-system variations in party identification performance. Finally, more attention conceptualization and measurement of system properties which plausibly may affect party identification is proposed.

Comparative political participation research has had a rich intellectual development. At the same time, several potentially key concepts to understanding of complex comparative findings have yet to be explored systematically in participation research. Consequently, survey attention to precise conceptualization and measurement of such dimensions as participation roles, social reinforcement, social integration and socio-political mobilization is urged.

The strategies endorsed here deal mainly with concept development and theory and appropriate measurement strategies. The problem of cross-system measurement equivalence addressed in many essays on comparative research should not be ignored. (However, identification of multiple dimensions of party identification and unexplored causal antecedents of party identification and political participation might provide a better understanding of where measurement equivalence problems actually exist.) Also, cooperative development of a knowledge base for understanding political conditions prevailing when surveys are conducted and profiling system differences in political education, issue salience, communications treatment of politics, politician visibility and other important environmental parameters should be explored.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABRAMSON, P. (1976), "Generational Change and the Decline of Party Identification in America: 1952-1974," American Political Science Review 70, pp. 469-478.
- BORRE, O. AND D. KATZ (1973), "Party Identification and its Motivational Base in a Multi-Party System: A Study of the Danish General Election of 1971," Scandinavian Political Studies 8, pp. 69-111.
- BUDGE, I. (1976), "Introduction: Party Identification and Beyond," in I. Budge, I. Crewe and D. Farlie, Party Identification and Beyond, (New York: Wiley), pp. 3-17.
- BUTLER, D. AND D. STOKES (1969), Political Change in Britain, (New York: St. Martin).
- CAMPBELL, A. et al (1960), The American Voter (New York: Wiley).
- CAMPBELL, A. AND H. VALEN (1966), "Party Identification in Norway and the United States," in A. Campbell et al, Elections and the Political Order, (New York: Wiley), pp. 245-68.
- CONVERSE P. AND DUPEUX (1966), "Politicization of the Electorate in France and the United States," in A. Campbell, Elections and the Political Order, pp. 169-91.
- CONVERSE P. (1969), "Of Time and Partisan Stability," Comparative Political Studies 2, pp. 139-71.
- _____ (1975), "Public Opinion and Voting Behavior," in F. Greenstein and N. Polsby, The Handbook of Political Science, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, Vol. 4, pp. 75-150.
- _____ (1976), "The Dynamics of Party Support," Sage Library of Social Research No. 35.
- CREWE, I. (1976), "Party Identification Theory and Political Change in Britain," in I. Budge, Party Identification and Beyond, pp. 33-62.
- CURTIS, G. (1971), Election Campaigning Japanese Style, (New York: Columbia University Press).

- FLANAGAN, S. AND B. RICHARDSON (1977), "Japanese Electoral Behavior: Social Cleavages, Social Networks and Partisanship," Sage Papers in Comparative Political Sociology, No. 06-024.
- GOLDTHORPE, J. (1968), The Affluent Worker: Political Attitudes and Behavior (Cambridge University Press).
- JENNINGS, M.K. (1972), "Partisan Commitment and Electoral Behavior in the Netherlands," Acta Politica 7, pp. 445-70.
- JENSEN, J. (1975), "Patterns of Partisanship in Canada: Split Identification and Cross-Time Variation," APSA convention paper.
- KAASE, M. (1976), "Party Identification and Voting Behavior in the West German Election of 1969," in I. Budge, Party Identification and Beyond, pp. 81-102.
- KUBOTA, A. AND R. WARD (1970), "Family Influence and Political Socialization in Japan," Comparative Political Studies 3, pp. 140-75.
- LIEPELT, K. (1971), "The Infra-Structure of Party Support in Germany and Austria," in Dogan and Rose, European Politics, (Boston: Little Brown), pp. 183-202.
- LIPSET, S. (1960), Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics (Garden City, New York: Doubleday).
- MASSEY, J. (1976), Youth and Politics in Japan (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath).
- MILLER, W. AND P. STOUTHARD (1975), "Confessional Attachment and Electoral Behavior in the Netherlands," European Journal of Political Research 3 (September), pp. 219-258.
- MILLER, W. (1976), "The Cross-National Use of Party Identification as a Stimulus to Political Inquiry," in Budge, Party Identification and Beyond, pp. 21-31.
- NIE, N. AND S. VERBA (1975), "Political Participation," in Greenstein and Polsby, Handbook of Political Science, Vol. 4, pp. 1-68.
- NIE, N. G. POWELL AND K. PREWITT (1969), "Social Structure and Political Participation: Development Relationships," American Political Science Review 65, pp. 361-78 and 808-32.

- RICHARDSON, B., H. ASHER AND H. WEISBERG (forthcoming), "Comparative Political Participation Workbook," ISSC Workbook Series.
- RICHARDSON, B. (1967), "Japanese Local Politics: Support Mobilization and Leadership Styles," Asian Survey 7, pp. 860-72.
- _____ (1973), "Urbanization and Political Participation: The Case of Japan," American Political Science Review 67, pp. 433-52.
- _____ (1974), The Political Culture of Japan (Berkeley: University of California).
- _____ (1975), "Party Loyalties and Party Saliency in Japan," Comparative Political Studies 8, pp. 32-57.
- ROKKAN, S. (1970), "Citizen Participation in Political Life: A Comparison of Data for Norway and the United States," in S. Rokkan, Citizens, Elections, Parties (New York: David McKay), pp. 362-96.
- SANI, G. (1974), "Determinants of Party Preference in Italy: Toward the Integration of Complementary Models," American Journal of Political Science, pp. 315-29.
- SARTORI, G. (1968), "The Sociology of Parties: A Critical View," in Otto Stammer, Party Systems, Party Organizations and the Politics of the New Masses, (Berlin: Institut für politische Wissenschaft an der Freien Universität Berlin), pp. 271-290.
- TARROW, S. (1971), "The Urban-Rural Cleavage in Involvement: The Case of France," American Political Science Review 65 (June), pp. 341-57.
- THOMASSEN, J. (1976), "Party Identification as a Cross-National Concept: Its Meaning in the Netherlands," in I. Budge, Party Identification and Beyond, pp. 63-80.
- TINGSTEN, H. (1937), Political Behavior: Studies in Election Statistics (London: P.S. King).
- VERBA, S., N. NIE AND J. KIM (1971), "The Modes of Democratic Participation: A Cross National Analysis," Sage Professional Papers in Comparative Politics, No. 01-013.

VERBA, S. AND N. NIE (1972), Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality (New York: Harper and Row).

W. ZOHLNHÖFER, "Party Identification in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States," in K. Shell, The Democratic Political Process (Waltham, MA: Blaisdell), pp. 148-58.