

CONCEPTS TO DATA:
THE PROBLEM OF POLITICAL PARTIES*

*
By Kenneth JANDA
Northwestern University

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the crucial concepts-to-data theoretical linkage in a large scale research project comparing political parties across the world. The project covered 158 parties operating during 1950 to 1962 in 53 countries representing all regions of the world. The data sources consisted of more than 60 000 pages of material on over 3 500 books, articles, newspapers, and other documents. The parties were scored on 111 basic variables subsumed under ten major concepts. The conceptual framework was created in 1969, before a single party was scored on a single variable. It took more than a decade just to complete the data collections. Because the data were generated to fit concepts in a newly-defined conceptual framework, they had to be "made" rather than "collected". This is common for those who seek to do empirical research under a new paradigm.

The dynamic interplay of theory and research is essential to the development of knowledge in all fields. This interplay has been sadly lacking in the study of political parties and their functions in political systems. A quarter century ago, Duverger spoke of the need to break out of the "vicious circle" which required that general theory be based on profound studies of parties but that studies could not be profound without general theory (1961: xiii). Duverger's answer was to sketch out a general theory to guide detailed studies, and his work sparked more than two decades of theoretically oriented inquiries into the formation, organization, and performance of political parties in political systems (Eckstein, 1968: 439).

Despite the outpouring of research, these inquiries have not yielded satisfactory results. Crotty observed, "The investigation of political parties within compatible theoretical frameworks and across cultural lines has not progressed far" (1970: 267), and Mayer deplored the "disparate nature of the questions raised, the lack of comparable units of analysis, the lack of agreement on an appropriate conceptual framework, and a disturbing dissensus on the objects of a study of parties" (1972: 212). More recently, Sartori recounted his frustrations in dealing with the "conceptual morass" which had defeated his attempts at cumulating theory and evidence in the study of parties (1976: x). Maisel and Cooper later wondered whether the concepts and findings "now available" were not too limited and ambiguous for the development of general theory (1978: 23).

Some would seek to break the vicious circle in parties' research by puncturing it with theory (Lawson, 1976: 237-238), but others would favor hammering it with more and harder data (Crotty, 1970: 290). While both theory and data are needed to improve our understanding of political parties, this paper argues that fruitful interplay between the two is currently retarded more by the lack of good data than by a shortage of intriguing theory. More properly, it is due to the lack of data collected to fit theoretical concepts.

* Prepared for delivery at the 1983 Annual Meeting of The American Political Science Association, Palmer House, Chicago, September 1-4.
(Panel of the IPSA. Committee on Conceptual and Terminological Analysis)

Making Data as a Theoretical Task

Writing on the critical and early role that data play in theoretical formulation, Singer (1982: 190) contends that "data are made, not born." Singer argues that readily "available" data are often inappropriate to test the theory for which they are used. We must instead "make" certain data that are dictated by our theories.-- Unfortunately, Singer says, "Of all the skills that go into the growth of social science knowledge, the least developed is that of data generation." (1982: 212)

Data generation often requires concentrated effort as well as intellectual skills. McClelland, who has generated his share of data in international relations, says that specific facts needed to test a theory must often be quarried "by hand out of hard rock" (1972: 36). Those who have labored in theoretically-oriented cross national research projects, especially those involving Third World countries, know the feeling. Typically, more time is spent in data collection than analysis. Deans and research sponsors may become impatient with the lack of substantive results (i.e., publications) when other scholars are creating impressive cross-national data banks with hundreds of variables in far less time. But many of these justifiably impressive data banks are composed of data culled easily from published sources with little attention given to their theoretical relevance.

In the absence of an explicit paradigm to guide data collection, Kuhn notes that all nonirrelevant facts seem equally relevant:

As a result, early fact-gathering is a far more nearly random activity than the one that subsequent scientific development makes familiar. Furthermore, in the absence of a reason for seeking some particular form of more recodite information, early fact-gathering is usually restricted to the wealth of data that lie ready to hand. (1970: 15)

Obtaining the proper data to operationalize and test a complex social theory is often more a matter of creating the data than finding them.

Creating Data for Comparing Political Parties

This paper describes the crucial concepts-to-data theoretical linkage in a large scale research project comparing political parties across the world. The International Comparative Political Parties Project was founded in 1967 with support from the National Science Foundation to conduct the first comprehensive, empirically-based analysis of political parties across the world. The ICPP Project studied 158 parties operating during 1950 to 1962 in 53 countries representing all regions of the world. The parties were scored on over 100 variables in a conceptual framework that was developed before any data were collected. The information to code the parties came from thousands of pages of library material stored in a microfilm and computer information retrieval system (Janda, 1982). It took more than a decade just to complete the data collection, validate the conceptual framework, and prepare the data file for deposit in the Inter-University Consortium (Janda, 1979). Truly, the project "made" more data on parties than it "found."

The scope and complexity of the ICPP Project make it difficult to summarize. It is described at length in the first 175 pages of Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey (Janda, 1980), a 1,000 page volume that reports the basic data. The discussion below tries only to convey an understanding of the research and resulting data base while skirting unnecessary detail.

The Sample

A "political party" was defined in the ICPP Project as "an organization that pursues a goal of placing its avowed representatives in government positions." This definition was designed to accommodate diversity among entities called "political parties" across political cultures. The term "placing" was interpreted broadly to mean "through the electoral process" (when a party competed with one or more others in pursuing its goal), or "by internal selection" (when a ruling party permitted no electoral competition) or "by forceful imposition" (when a party aimed at subverting the system and capturing the government).

To insure a broad selection of parties across the world, a stratified sampling procedure was used. First, all countries with functioning parties of some durability were identified and classified into one of ten cultural-geographic "regions" -- namely the "Anglo-American" area, West Central Europe, Scandinavia and the "Benelux" nations, South America, Central America, Asia and the Far East, Eastern Europe, Middle East and North Africa, West Africa, and Central and East Africa. From each of these ten areas, five countries were selected at random, producing a set of fifty countries representing all ten regions. Three countries which were not drawn by this random sampling procedure (U.S., U.K., and Canada) were added subsequently due to their special appeal.

The party situation in each of these 53 countries was surveyed from 1950 to 1962. All organizations that met the conceptual definition of a "political party" were required to meet certain minimum levels of strength and stability before inclusion in the study. "Legal" parties had to win at least 5 percent of the seats in the lower house of the national legislature in two elections during the period, while "illegal" parties required evidence of support by at least 10 percent of the population over five years. These criteria yielded a set of 158 parties which differed greatly in their characteristics and political roles. The numbers of parties by countries is given in Table 1. The parties are listed in Appendix 1.

TABLE 1: Coverage of the [CPP Project]: Parties by Area, Country, and Time Period

Cultural-Geographical Area	Country	Parties per country	Parties by area	Number of parties in		Number of parties in both periods
				1950-56	1957-62	
Anglo-American:	United States	2	22	22	22	22
	United Kingdom	2				
	Australia	3				
	Canada	4				
	New Zealand	2				
	Ireland	3				
	Rhodesia/Nyasaland Fed.	4				
India	2					
West Central Europe:	Austria	3	16	16	16	16
	France	5				
	West Germany	3				
	Greece	4				
	Portugal	1				
Scandinavia and Benelux:	Denmark	4	22	22	22	22
	Iceland	4				
	Sweden	4				
	The Netherlands	6				
	Luxembourg	4				
South America:	Ecuador	5	18	14	18	14
	Paraguay	3				
	Peru	5				
	Uruguay	2				
	Venezuela	3				
Central America:	Dominican Republic	1	17	12	12	7
	El Salvador	2				
	Guatemala	7				
	Nicaragua	3				
	Cuba	4				
Asia and the Far East:	Burma	4	16	13	14	11
	Cambodia	2				
	Indonesia	4				
	North Korea	1				
	Malays	5				
Eastern Europe:	Albania	1	10	10	10	10
	Bulgaria	2				
	East Germany	5				
	Hungary	1				
	USSR	1				
Middle East and North Africa:	Sudan	3	14	12	14	12
	Tunisia	1				
	Lebanon	4				
	Iran	4				
	Turkey	2				
West Africa:	Dahomey	3	13	10	9	6
	Chad	4				
	Guinea	1				
	Upper Volta	1				
	Togo	4				
Central and East Africa:	Central African Republic	1	10	4	10	4
	Chad	2				
	Congo-Brazzaville	2				
	Kenya	2				
	Uganda	3				
TOTALS			158	135	147	124

The Time Period

To capture some measure of changes in parties over the period from 1950 to 1962, each party was scored separately (whenever possible) for its characteristics in the first part of the period (1950 to 1956) and in the second part (1957-1962). Because not all parties existed in both parts and not all variables were scored separately, some complexities arise in the numbers of cases in the data base. Briefly, the cases distribute as follows: 158 parties met qualifications for study sometime during the overall time period, but only 135 parties existed in 1950-1956 and 147 were in 1957-1962. Because the parties were scored separately for the first and second parts of the period, they can be treated as a combined sample of 282 parties for assessing the success of the data collection (discussed below).

The Conceptual Framework

Because the sample is representative, it is heterogeneous. Not only do the parties range across ideologies and represent extremes in organizational characteristics, but they also differ dramatically in their orientations toward politics and in their cultural settings. One school of thought would argue that such a collection of disparate entities called "parties" is nothing more than a stew of apples and oranges and that little can be expected from any effort at "comparing" the German Social Democratic Party, for example, with the Kabaka Yekka of Uganda or the Paraguayan Liberals. To the contrary, the intellectual impetus behind the ICPP Project is that the enormous diversities among political parties throughout the world can be accommodated within a relatively few major concepts or dimensions of variation. Moreover, diversities within these dimensions conform to patterned relationships, specified in advance, which hold among political parties of all types and across cultural settings.

The conceptual framework of the ICPP Project was based on ten major concepts which subsumed 111 "basic variables" serving as indicators of the concepts. The ten major concepts can be divided into those that pertain to a party's external relations with society and those relating to its internal organization. They are listed below along with the numbers of indicators subsumed by each:

<u>External Relations</u>	<u>Basic Variables</u>
1. Institutionalization	7
2. Governmental Status	8
3. Social Support	18
4. Issue Orientation	13
5. Goal Orientation	33
6. Autonomy	5
 <u>Internal Organization</u>	
7. Degree of Organization	7
8. Centralization of Power	8
9. Coherence	6
10. Involvement	6

Space limitations do not allow discussion of the conceptual and operational definitions of these variables here, but see Appendix 2 for the discussion of the concept, "centralization of power." This concept was measured with eight indicators:

- 9.01 Nationalization of Structure
- 9.02 Selecting the National Leader
- 9.03 Selecting Parliamentary Candidates
- 9.04 Allocating Funds
- 9.05 Formulating Policy
- 9.06 Controlling Communications
- 9.07 Administering Discipline
- 9.08 Leadership Concentration

These eight basic variables formed a "Centralization of Power" scale with an alpha reliability coefficient of .83, which served to validate the operationalization (see discussion of validation below).

Data Collection

Parties were scored on the 111 basic variables after exhaustive library research involving newspapers, party documents, and government reports in addition to books and periodicals. More than three years were required just to complete the bibliographic searches, collect the textual material, and index the information for retrieval and research. Over 60,000 pages of material on party politics in our fifty countries were derived from more than 3,500 papers and publications. The collected material varied from a high of 4,582 pages on party politics in India to only 122 pages on the Central African Republic. (See Appendix 1 for coverage of the countries.) Such differences in quantity (and quality) of information in our files signaled differences in our ability to code the parties on the variables in the conceptual framework. A special microfilm and computer system was devised to manage the information collected while imposing quality control on the research conducted (Janda 1969 and 1982).

Bibliographic Procedures: The scholarly literature on political parties in the 1950s was poorly developed, and substantial resources had to be devoted to locating source material for each party system. Country researchers were provided with a checklist of bibliographic procedures for consulting all the standard sources -- e.g., International Bibliography of Political Science; Bulletin Analytique de Documentation Politique, Economique, et Sociale Contemporaine; A London Bibliography of the Social Sciences; and so on (Janda 1968). In addition, the project's

bibliographer provided citations from less conventional sources, like the U.S. State Department's External Research Reports, the Defense Documentation Center, the Smithsonian Institution's Scientific Information Exchange, and the foreign publications translated by the U.S. Joint Publications Translation Service. Moreover, the project collected specialized bodies of material on politics in all countries. For example, we obtained copies of the complete clipping files on our countries maintained in the libraries of the Christian Science Monitor in Boston and the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, and we acquired the country reports issued by the American Universities Field Staff. Compiling bibliographies was very time-consuming for all countries. For the more popular countries, the problem was selecting material from the many hundreds of citations encountered. For those studied less thoroughly, the problem was finding material that was at all informative. In the former instance, time was spent reading and deciding. In the latter, time was spent looking.

The MIRACODE System: The information in the pages on party politics in each country was tagged and stored for retrieval with microfilm technology, specifically Eastman Kodak's MIRACODE system (Janda 1967). MIRACODE (for Microfilm Information Retrieval Access Code) allowed for photographing large amounts of text while also providing browsing and searching capabilities by employing Boolean logic on machine-readable optical codes. Its basic components are a special microfilm camera and microfilm reader. The system can store and retrieve individual pages of original documents according to one or more three-digit code numbers assigned to the input material as in the Human Relations Area Files. At the microfilming stage, the MIRACODE camera transforms the code numbers into machine-readable binary codes recorded on film next to the page image. After the material on party politics in a given country was indexed, photographed, and loaded on a film magazine, the material was searched at a rate of 100 pages a second for combinations of indexing codes keyed to the conceptual framework. Researchers used the MIRACODE reader to retrieve the information needed to code their parties on the variables in the conceptual framework.

The RIQS System: After scoring the parties, the researchers prepared verbal explanations of their coding decisions. The codes and explanations together were then entered into a separate computer information system called RIQS (Remote Information Query System) which was used to manage the enormous amount of information generated from our research (Janda 1975 and 1982). In our RIQS application, each party was defined as record of seventy "items" of information as listed in Figure 1. The first item contains the English name of the party, its identifying code number, and the native language name (if the country is non-English speaking). Item two describes the amount of literature indexed for the party and included in our microfilm files. The last 68 items in the RIQS record definition pertain to basic variables underlying the major concepts in our conceptual framework. RIQS was used in various ways in the project to select and retrieve information for data quality control purposes, to fulfill outside requests for selected data, and to generate the "case studies" of parties published in Political Parties and illustrated in Figure 2.

Data Quality

Substantial effort was devoted to assessing data quality throughout the project. For example, each scoring judgment for every basic variable was accompanied by an "adequacy/confidence" code indicating the "adequacy" of the information in our file and our "confidence" in making the coding judgment with that information (Janda 1970a). These codes were assigned according to a nine-point scale with "1" meaning there was no information in the file to score the party on the variable and "9" meaning that at least three different sources supported the coding decision and there was no disagreement in the literature.

Slowed considerably by the quality control procedures, the coding took five years for completion after the conceptual framework was completed in 1969. As a further check on the quality of our codes, the records of the parties' codes and coding judgments were sent to more than 40 outside area and country experts who (over a period of two additional years) checked our facts and interpretations of events against their own knowledge and judgments. While by far most codes passed their scrutiny, our consultants made countless minor and numerous major corrections in our research, thus improving the quality of our data immeasurably. Despite three years of bibliographic work, five years of coding, and two years of outside review, the data were surely still not perfect when deposited with the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research in 1977--ten years after the Project was funded. Nevertheless, they represented a lengthy and careful attempt to meet the demands of the comprehensive set of variables in the conceptual framework.

1. PARTY NAME AND CODE NUMBER
2. INFORMATION BASE AND RESEARCHERS
3. 1.01 YEAR OF ORIGIN AND 1.02 NAME CHANGES
4. 1.03 ORGANIZATIONAL DISCONTINUITY
5. 1.04 LEADERSHIP COMPETITION
6. 1.05 / 2.05 LEGISLATIVE INSTABILITY AND STRENGTH
7. 1.06 / 2.06 ELECTORAL INSTABILITY AND STRENGTH
8. 2.01 GOVERNMENTAL DISCRIMINATION
9. 2.02 GOVERNMENTAL LEADERSHIP
10. 2.03 CABINET PARTICIPATION
11. 2.04 NATIONAL ORIENTATION
12. 2.07 OUTSIDE ORIGIN
13. 3.01 / 4.01 OCCUPATIONAL AGGREGATION / ARTICULATION
14. 3.02 / 4.02 RELIGIOUS AGGREGATION / ARTICULATION
15. 3.03 / 4.03 ETHNIC AGGREGATION / ARTICULATION
16. 3.04 / 4.04 REGIONAL AGGREGATION / ARTICULATION
17. 3.05 / 4.05 URBAN - RURAL AGGREGATION / ARTICULATION
18. 3.06 / 4.06 EDUCATIONAL AGGREGATION / ARTICULATION
19. 5.01 OWNERSHIP OF THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION
20. 5.02 ECONOMIC PLANNING
21. 5.03 DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH
22. 5.04 SOCIAL WELFARE
23. 5.05 SECULARIZATION
24. 5.06 SUPPORT OF ARMED FORCES
25. 5.07 EAST-WEST ALIGNMENT
26. 5.08 ANTI-COLONIALISM
27. 5.09 SUPRANATIONAL INTEGRATION
28. 5.10 NATIONAL INTEGRATION
29. 5.11 EXTENSION OF FRANCHISE
30. 5.12 PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS
31. 5.13 INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL LIBERTIES
32. 5.14 / 5.15 US / SOVIET EXPERTS LEFT-RIGHT RATINGS
33. 6.00 OPEN COMPETITION
34. 6.10 RESTRICTIVE COMPETITION
35. 6.20 SUBVERTING THE POLITICAL SYSTEM
36. 6.30 PROPAGANDIZING IDEAS AND PROGRAM
37. 6.40 ALLYING WITH OTHER PARTIES
38. 6.50 PROVIDING FOR SOCIAL WELFARE
39. 7.01 SOURCES OF FUNDS
40. 7.02 SOURCES OF MEMBERS
41. 7.03 SOURCES OF LEADERS
42. 7.04 RELATIONS WITH DOMESTIC PARTIES
43. 7.05 RELATIONS WITH FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS
44. 8.01 STRUCTURAL ARTICULATION
45. 8.02 INTENSIVENESS OF ORGANIZATION
46. 8.03 EXTENSIVENESS OF ORGANIZATION
47. 8.04 FREQUENCY OF LOCAL MEETINGS
48. 8.05 FREQUENCY OF NATIONAL MEETINGS
49. 8.06 MAINTAINING RECORDS
50. 8.07 Pervasiveness of Organization
51. 9.01 NATIONALIZATION OF STRUCTURE
52. 9.02 SELECTING THE NATIONAL LEADER
53. 9.03 SELECTING THE PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATES
54. 9.04 ALLOCATING FUNDS
55. 9.05 POLICY FORMATION
56. 9.06 CONTROLS COMMUNICATION
57. 9.07 ADMINISTERING DISCIPLINE
58. 9.08 LEADERSHIP CONCENTRATION
59. 10.01 LEGISLATIVE COMESION
60. 10.02 IDEOLOGICAL FRACTIONALISM
61. 10.03 ISSUE FRACTIONALISM
62. 10.04 LEADERSHIP FRACTIONALISM
63. 10.05 STRATEGIC OR TACTICAL FRACTIONALISM
64. 10.06 PARTY PURGES
65. 11.01 MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS
66. 11.02 MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION
67. 11.03 MATERIAL INCENTIVES
68. 11.04 PURPOSEIVE INCENTIVES
69. 11.05 DOCTRINISM
70. 11.06 PERSONALISM

Figure 1. RIQS record definition
for ICPP project data.

RECORD NUMBER 102

1. PARTY NAME AND CODE NUMBER
SUB-1..... AUSTRIAN SOCIALIST PARTY, 102
SUB-2..... SOZIALISTISCHE PARTI OSTERREICHS, SPO, 102
2. INFORMATION BASE AND RESEARCHERS
SUB-1..... INFORMATION ON THE SPO WAS CODED FROM 1746 PAGES OF LITERATURE AND 132 DOCUMENTS ON PARTY POLITICS IN AUSTRIA. 1136 PAGES, OR 65 PERCENT, DEAL WITH THE SPO. 9 OF THE DOCUMENTS, 6 PERCENT, ARE IN FRENCH, AND 21, 18 PERCENT, ARE IN GERMAN.
SUB-2..... RAYMOND DUWALL INDEXED THE LITERATURE FOR RETRIEVAL.
SUB-3..... RAYMOND DUWALL CODED THE FIRST TWO VARIABLE CLUSTERS. KENNETH JANDA CODED THE REMAINDER FROM NOTES LEFT BY DUWALL.
3. 1.01 YEAR OF ORIGIN AND 1.02 NAME CHANGES
SUB-1..... 1889, AC9
SUB-2..... 1, AC9
SUB-3..... ESSENTIALLY NO ONE DISAGREES WITH THE ASSERTION THAT THE SPO EMERGED IN 1945 AS THE RESULT OF A MERGER BETWEEN THE FIRST REPUBLIC'S REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS AND THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS. THE LATTER CLEARLY PREDOMINATED IN THE MERGER, SO THEIRS IS THE IMPORTANT DATE OF ORIGIN. MANY SOURCES CITE THE DECEMBER 30, 1888- JANUARY 1, 1889 CONFERENCE AT HAINFELD AS THE RELEVANT DATE, WITH NO REAL DISAGREEMENTS. THE 1945 MERGER WAS THE OCCASION OF A MINOR NAME CHANGE FROM SOCIAL DEMOCRATS TO SOCIALISTS. THE PARTY RETAINED A SUB-TITLE IDENTIFYING THE TWO COMPONENT PARTIES, BUT THIS WAS DROPPED LATER IN 1949, SINCE THAT TIME NO FURTHER NAME CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED.
4. 1.03 ORGANIZATIONAL DISCONTINUITY
SUB-1..... 9, AC6
SUB-2..... DOCUMENTATION OF TWO EVENTS IS GOOD-- 1945 MERGER OF SOCIAL DEMOCRATS WITH THE RELATIVELY INSIGNIFICANT REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS, RESULTING IN THE SPO, AND THE 1948-49 EXPULSION AND SPLIT OF ERWIN SCHARF AND HIS FOLLOWING (LEFT SOCIALISTS) WHO LATER COOPERATED WITH THE KPO. THE LDM AC IS DUE TO THE LATTER SPLIT, DOCUMENTED ONLY ONCE. ONE SOURCE MENTIONS THE 1959 EXPULSION OF TRUPPE, WHO FOUNDED THE LEAGUE OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS, WHICH RECEIVED 2,000 VOTES IN THE NEXT ELECTION.
5. 1.04 LEADERSHIP COMPETITION
SUB-1..... 11, AC8
SUB-2..... THE ONLY CHANGE IN LEADERSHIP (PARTY CHAIRMAN) THAT OCCURRED DURING OUR TIME PERIOD WAS IN 1957. AT THAT TIME, ARNOLD PITTFERMAN SUCCEEDED ADOLF SCHARF, WHO HAD HELD THE POSITION SINCE 1949. SCHARF BECAME FEDERAL PRESIDENT, FOLLOWING RENNER AND KOEGERER, BOTH SOCIALISTS. PITTFERMAN REMAINED CHAIRMAN BEYOND 1962. THE PARTY CHAIRMAN IS CHOSEN BY THE CENTRAL DIRECTORATE, CONSISTING OF 98 MEMBERS CHOSEN BY THE PARTY CONGRESS.
6. 1.05 / 2.05 LEGISLATIVE INSTABILITY AND STRENGTH
SUB-1..... INSTABILITY IS .05, AC8
SUB-2..... STRENGTH IS .42 FOR 1ST HALF, AC8 AND .46 FOR 2ND HALF, AC9
SUB-3..... THE SPO NEVER EXCEEDED THE REPRESENTATION OF THE OVP IN THE NATIONALRAT (PARLIAMENT). ITS PERCENTAGE OF SEATS LAGGED A FEW POINTS BEHIND, ALTHOUGH THE SPO TENDED TO PICK UP STRENGTH DURING OUR TIME PERIOD. IT HELD 48 PERCENT OF THE SEATS IN 1950 AND 46 PERCENT IN 1962.
7. 1.06 / 2.06 ELECTORAL INSTABILITY AND STRENGTH
SUB-1..... INSTABILITY IS .02, AC9
SUB-2..... STRENGTH IS .42 FOR 1ST HALF, AC9 AND .44 FOR 2ND HALF, AC9
SUB-3..... ELECTIONS WERE HELD IN 1953, 1956, 1959, AND 1962. THE SUPPORT GIVEN TO THE SPO VARIED FROM 42 TO 45 PERCENT.
8. 2.01 GOVERNMENTAL DISCRIMINATION
SUB-1..... 1, AC5
SUB-2..... THE SPO, TOGETHER WITH THE OVP, IS CLEARLY FAVORED BY THE GOVERNMENT IN THE ALLOTMENT OF FREE RADIO TIME TO POLITICAL PARTIES. BUT AN ELECTORAL PRACTICE OF HAVING PARTIES PASS OUT BALLOT PAPER (MAINTAINED UNTIL 1959) DISCRIMINATED AGAINST THE SPO IN RURAL AND ALPINE AREAS. TWO BITS OF INFORMATION WERE EXCLUDED FROM THE CODING DUE TO A LACK OF EVIDENCE OF DE FACTO OR INTENDED DISCRIMINATION OR DISCRIMINATORY EFFECT. THE FIRST WAS THE BANNING OF A CAMPAIGN POSTER BY SOVIET OCCUPATION AUTHORITIES IN THE 1953 ELECTION. THE SECOND WAS A SALE OF VOTING STOCK IN THE NATIONALIZED BANKS ONLY TO THE TWO COALITION PARTIES IN 1956.

Figure 2 Partial printout of RIQS record 102,
the Austrian Socialist Party.

Success in Coding the Parties

Just how well they met those demands can be judged by reference to the three columns of figures in Table 2, which names the variables subsumed under their concepts and reports on the empirical applicability of the conceptual framework. The first column in Table 2 states the total number of parties scored for each of the 111 variables. The second gives the percentages of the parties coded, and the third gives the mean adequacy/confidence codes assigned over all the parties that were coded on the variables. It can be seen that we were able to code 100 percent of the parties for only 9 of the 111 variables. Our rates of coding success varied widely over the other variables.

Empirical Applicability of the ICPP Conceptual Framework																											
Concepts and Basic Variables			No. of Parties Coded ¹	% of Parties Coded ²	Adequacy-Confidence in Codes Assigned ³	Concepts and Basic Variables			No. of Parties Coded	% of Parties Coded	Adequacy-Confidence in Codes Assigned	Concepts and Basic Variables			No. of Parties Coded	% of Parties Coded	Adequacy-Confidence in Codes Assigned										
EXTERNAL RELATIVES																											
1. Institutionalization						5.05 Secularization of Society			211	75	6.8	7. Autonomy															
1.01	Year of Origin		158	100%	7.8	5.06 Support of the Military	200	71	6.3	7.01	Source of Funds	197	70	5.9													
1.02	Name Changes		158	100	8.2	5.07 Alignment with East/West Blocs	256	91	7.3	7.02	Source of Members	229	81	8.8													
1.03	Organizational Discontinuity		157	99	7.4	5.08 Anticolonialism	250	89	7.1	7.03	Source of Leaders	238	84	8.1													
1.04	Leadership Competition		155	98	7.1	5.09 Supranational Integration	223	79	6.7	7.04	Relations with Domestic Parties	280	99	7.8													
1.05	Legislative Instability		150	95	7.4	5.10 National Integration	230	82	6.4	7.05	Relations with Foreign Organizations	271	96	6.1													
1.06	Electoral Instability		140	89	6.7	5.11 Electoral Participation	233	83	6.6		Mean	243	86%	6.5													
1.07	Number of Pages Indexed		145	92	—	5.12 Protection of Civil Rights	156	65	6.2																		
	Mean		152	96%	7.4	5.13	Interference with Civil Liberties	207	73	6.2	INTERNAL ORGANIZATION																
2. Governmental Status						6. Goal Orientation						8. Degree of Organization															
2.01	Governmental Discrimination		282	100	7.1	6.00	Open Competition	282	100	7.7	8.01	Structural Articulation	259	92	6.5												
2.02	Governmental Leadership		282	100	8.8	6.01	Advertising by mass media ⁴	74	26	7.0	8.02	Intensiveness of Organization	233	83	6.5												
2.03	Cabinet Participation		281	100	8.1	6.02	Advertising by signs, posters, etc. ⁵	55	20	7.4	8.03	Extensiveness of Organization	209	74	5.6												
2.04	National Orientation		281	100	7.2	6.03	Promoting candidates by direct contact ⁶	73	26	7.1	8.04	Frequency of Local Meetings	125	44	5.8												
2.05	Legislative Strength		280	99	7.6	6.04	Holding public meetings and rallies ⁷	78	28	7.6	8.05	Frequency of National Meetings	153	64	6.2												
2.06	Electoral Strength		209	74	7.6	6.05	Registering voters, transporting to polls ⁸	65	23	6.8	8.06	Maintenance of Records	240	85	5.7												
2.07	Outside Origin ¹		156	99	7.3	6.10	Restricting Competition	282	100	7.6	8.07	Pervasiveness of Organization	248	88	6.4												
2.08	Percentage of Pages Indexed ¹		145	92	—	6.11	Interfering with opposition advertising ⁹	76	27	5.8		Mean	210	74%	6.1												
	Mean ³		269	96%	7.7	6.12	Harassing opposition party workers ¹⁰	76	27	6.3	9. Centralization of Power																
3. Social Support: Attraction, Concentration, Reflection ¹						6.13	Harassing opposition candidates ¹¹	77	27	6.4	9.01	Nationalization of Structure	230	82	6.4												
3.01/4.01/12.01	Socioeconomic Status		247	88	5.2	6.14	Harassing opposition voters ¹²	80	28	6.0	9.02	Selecting the National Leader	239	85	7.0												
3.02/4.02/12.02	Religion		142	50	5.6	6.15	Falsifying vote reports ¹³	75	27	5.8	9.03	Selecting Parliamentary Candidates	192	68	6.5												
3.03/4.03/12.03	Ethnicity		85	30	4.5	6.16	Coopting political opponents ¹⁴	75	27	5.8	9.04	Allocating Funds	147	52	5.7												
3.04/4.04/12.04	Region		235	83	7.4	6.20	Subverting the System	282	100	7.7	9.05	Formulating Policy	234	83	6.4												
3.05/4.05/12.05	Urban-Rural		201	71	6.6	6.21	Boycotting elections, destroying ballots ¹⁵	79	28	6.8	9.06	Controlling Communications	221	78	6.3												
3.06/4.06/12.06	Education		135	48	6.9	6.22	Terrorizing the population ¹⁶	78	28	6.3	9.07	Administering Discipline	213	76	6.1												
	Mean		174	62%	6.0	6.23	Leading strikes and riots ¹⁷	79	28	6.7	9.08	Leadership Concentration	255	90	6.5												
5. Issue Orientation						6.24	Sabotaging government facilities ¹⁸	79	28	6.2		Mean	216	77%	6.4												
5.01	Government Ownership of Production		257	91	6.3	6.25	Attempting assassinations, coups ¹⁹	77	27	6.5	10. Coherence																
5.02	Government Role in Economic Planning		241	85	6.7	6.26	Conducting guerrilla warfare ²⁰	77	27	6.7	10.01	Legislative Coherence	176	62	4.9												
5.03	Redistribution of Wealth		228	81	6.5	6.31	Operating mass communications media	228	83	7.0	10.02	Ideological Factionalism	247	88	6.0												
5.04	Social Welfare		213	76	6.7	6.32	Operating party schools (political ed.)	182	65	6.0	10.03	Issue Factionalism	226	80	5.8												
6. Issue Orientation						6.33	Passing resolutions and platforms	208	74	6.7	10.04	Leadership Factionalism	262	93	6.3												
6.31	Publishing position papers		203	72	6.3	6.34	Engaging in electoral agreements ²¹	65	23	7.8	10.05	Strategic or Tactical Factionalism	217	77	5.9												
6.32	Engaging in legislative blocs ²²		65	23	7.2	6.42	Engaging in legislative blocs ²³	65	23	7.2	10.06	Party Purges	272	96	6.5												
6.33	Engaging in cabinet coalitions ²⁴		61	22	8.5	6.43	Engaging in cabinet coalitions ²⁴	61	22	8.5		Mean	233	83%	5.9												
6.34	Supporting other presidential candidates ²⁵		31	11	6.9	6.44	Supporting other presidential candidates ²⁵	31	11	6.9	11. Involvement																
6.51	Providing food, clothing, shelter		125	44	5.0	6.51	Providing food, clothing, shelter	125	44	5.0	11.01	Membership Requirements	219	78	6.4												
6.52	Running employment services		117	41	4.7	6.52	Running employment services	117	41	4.7	11.02	Membership Participation	179	63	5.4												
6.53	Interceding with government for members		131	46	5.2	6.53	Interceding with government for members	131	46	5.2	11.03	Material Incentives	213	76	4.0												
6.54	Providing basic education		113	40	5.2	6.54	Providing basic education	113	40	5.2	11.04	Purposive Incentives	240	85	3.8												
6.55	Providing recreational facilities		124	44	5.8		Mean	190	67%	6.6	11.05	Doctrinism	264	94	5.9												
	Mean		190	67%	6.6						11.06	Personalism	257	91	4.7												
												Mean	229	81%	5.0												

¹There were 158 distinct political parties in the study, but not all operated in both parts of the time period, 1950-1956 and 1957-1962. Those parties that did operate in both parts were coded separately for each part on most of the variables and their scores were pooled to form a maximum sample size of 282. This accounts for apparent discrepancies between the number of parties coded and the percentage coded, for in some cases the relevant *M* for computing percent is 158 and in other cases it is 282. In general, all the institutional variables were coded over the entire 1950-1962 time period, and the relevant *M* is 158 for all those basic variables. The only other two variables for which this is true are 2.07 and 2.08.

²See Table 2.1 for the scales used to assign adequacy confidence codes.

³See note 1. Because of the differences in the possible number of cases for these computations, variables 2.07 and 2.08 have been excluded from the calculations of the mean number of cases coded for the Governmental Status cluster of variables.

⁴The social attraction, concentration and reflection variable clusters were all based on the same data matrix, and different formulas were used in computing the scores. The numbers of parties coded and percentages of parties coded would be identical across each of the three concepts, so they were grouped together for presentation in the table. The adequacy confidence codes are identical for two of the three concepts and virtually identical for the other, so they were also grouped together for presentation.

⁵Coding on these variables stopped early in the research project as it became clear that the research funds would run out before coding was completed. This accounts for the generally low numbers and percentages of parties coded. These values are excluded from the computation of the means for numbers and percentages of parties coded at the base of the columns.

TABLE 2: Success in Coding ICPP Parties

One can see that we were least successful in scoring parties on a number of the "goal orientation" variables in cluster 6. The entries in Table 2 tagged with footnote 5 identify variables coded for less than 30 percent of the parties. This low rate of success was due to dwindling research funds, which forced us to stop coding on these variables about one-third of the way through the parties.

There are only two other places in the conceptual framework where we were unable to code more than half the parties in the study. One of these is elsewhere in the goal orientation cluster, variables 6.51 through 6.55. These variables pertain to a party's efforts in providing for the welfare of its members, activities which tend not to be discussed at length in the literature -- as witnessed by their relatively low adequacy/confidence (A/C) codes, averaging only 5.2. The other place is in the social support cluster, where we found it difficult to obtain information for coding the composition of party support for religious, ethnic, and educational groupings.

Excluding the variables already discussed, we found it possible to score most parties on each of the variables in the framework. In fact, more than two-thirds were scored on all but 6 of the remaining 82 variables. We were most successful in scoring parties on variables pertaining to their institutionalization and governmental status, while least successful for degree of organization -- along with the goal orientation and social support clusters already discussed. Note that the percent of parties coded is not an accurate guide to the quality of the data coded. The most striking case is the involvement cluster. Although an average of 81 percent of the parties were scored on these variables, the average A/C code attached to these scores was the lowest for any of the clusters. This was due to the problem of determining the motivational bases of party militants. There were few hard data relating to these variables, and the A/C codes reflected the heavy reliance on coder judgment and inference in the scoring.

Reliability: Coding reliabilities were assessed at the beginning stages of the project by having two coders independently score the same parties on common variables. A total of 557 such "blind pairs" were generated over virtually all the variables in the framework. The mean correlation among the coding pairs was .79. High reliabilities were also obtained for the concept scales produced from the basic variables as discussed below.

Conceptual Equivalence: One might suspect that the conceptual framework is biased toward "western" parties, which draw most of the methodologically and analytically impressive research literature. But for most of the variables, straight historical studies and descriptive reports (so typical of the non-western literature) proved more useful for scoring purposes than more theoretically oriented research. Moreover, the sheer quantity of available literature on many western parties is often less than that on party politics elsewhere. Our information files on Iceland, Ireland, and Luxembourg, for example, were much smaller than our files on Ghana, Ecuador, and North Korea. Nevertheless, it is true that the western parties were coded at a somewhat higher rate than the non-western, but the difference is not much.

This can be illustrated with reference to two variables in the involvement cluster. Variable 11.02, membership participation, was coded for only 63 percent of the parties overall, one of the lower rates in the study. A separate breakdown shows that 74 percent of the western parties were coded in comparison to 56 percent of the non-western parties outside Anglo-America, Western Europe, and the Scandinavian countries. The other variable, 11.04 purposive incentives, was scored for an impressive 85 percent of the parties, despite the lowest mean A/C code in the study of only 3.8. Again, more western parties were coded (92 percent), but a large majority of the non-western parties (80 percent) were also scored for reliance on purposive incentives. Moreover, the quality of our scoring judgments (as reflected by the A/C codes) was actually slightly less for the western parties, whose members were thought to have more complex mixtures of motivations and thus were harder to score. In short, the basic variables in the conceptual framework do tend to be more applicable to western rather than non-western parties, but the differences are minor, and substantial numbers of non-western parties were scored on most of the variables.

Validating the Conceptual Framework

An extensive attempt to "validate" the conceptual framework through evidence of convergence among indicators within the same concept cluster is discussed in Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey (Chapter 14). The results of that effort were inevitably complicated and Table 3 was prepared to summarize those complex results. The table cites each of the concepts in the framework and comments on the extent to which the data analysis supports the conceptual expectations. For example, Table 3 reports that seven variables were originally proposed as measures of "institutionalization," that one was quickly dropped for lack of face validity, and that four of the remaining six intercorrelated as expected. These four items yielded a scale of institutionalization with a reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of .79.

Summary of the Results from the Empirical Application of the Conceptual Framework				
No. of Original Variables	Concept and Comments	Name of Scale Produced	No. of Variables in Scale	Reliability
7	Institutionalization. One of the original variables (1.07) was dropped for conceptual reasons. Of the remaining six, four intercorrelated as expected: 1.01 Year of Origin 1.04 Leadership Competition 1.05 Legislative Instability 1.06 Electoral Instability	Institutionalization	4	.79
8	Governmental Status. Two of the original variables (2.07 and 2.08) were dropped for conceptual reasons. Of the remaining six, five intercorrelated as expected: 2.01 Government Discrimination 2.02 Governmental Leadership 2.03 Cabinet Participation 2.05 Legislative Strength 2.06 Electoral Strength	Governmental Status	5	.92
18	Social Support. Measures of social attraction, concentration, and reflection were devised to tap "diversity" of support along six dimensions. All three measures interrelated exactly as expected for four of the six dimensions, but not for socioeconomic status and education. The reliabilities for these scales were much lower, for the concentration measure did not relate as strongly as expected to attraction and especially reflection. (The concentration measure was included in the socioeconomic and educational diversity scales, but the inclusion is debatable.)	Socioeconomic Diversity	3	.71
		Religious Diversity	3	.86
		Ethnic Diversity	3	.83
		Regional Diversity	3	.96
13	Issue Orientation. A simple left-right unidimensionality in issue positions was not found, but only two dimensions accommodated eleven of the thirteen issues, with 5.09 and 5.10 unrelated to these two dimensions. The Marxist scale was composed of 5.01 Government Ownership of Means of Production 5.02 Government Role in Economic Planning 5.03 Redistribution of Wealth 5.04 Social Welfare 5.05 Secularization of Society 5.07 Alignment with East/West Blocs 5.08 Anticapitalism The liberalism scale was composed of 5.06 Support of the Military 5.11 Electoral Participation 5.12 Protection of Civil Rights 5.13 Interference with Civil Liberties A subcluster of variables in the Marxist scale dealt specifically with economic items. These have been formed into an economic leftism scale, involving items 5.01 through 5.04.	Urban-Rural Diversity	3	.86
		Educational Diversity	3	.69
6	The liberalism scale was composed of 5.06 Support of the Military 5.11 Electoral Participation 5.12 Protection of Civil Rights 5.13 Interference with Civil Liberties A subcluster of variables in the Marxist scale dealt specifically with economic items. These have been formed into an economic leftism scale, involving items 5.01 through 5.04.	Marxism	7	.90
		Liberalism	4	.81
6	The liberalism scale was composed of 5.06 Support of the Military 5.11 Electoral Participation 5.12 Protection of Civil Rights 5.13 Interference with Civil Liberties A subcluster of variables in the Marxist scale dealt specifically with economic items. These have been formed into an economic leftism scale, involving items 5.01 through 5.04.	Economic Leftism	4	.81
		Social Activities	4	.81
33	Goal Orientation. To economic research funds, coding was curtailed on 21 variables with less than 30 percent of the parties scored. No attempt was made to scale these variables according to predictions about party strategies and tactics. Remaining variables showed marginal support of other expectations. The "social activities" scale was formed a posteriori from these variables: 6.31 Operating mass communications media 6.32 Operating party schools 6.33 Providing food, clothing, shelter 6.34 Running employment services 6.35 Interacting with government for members 6.36 Providing basic education 6.37 Providing recreational facilities	Social Activities	7	.80
5	Autonomy. The five items proposed to measure autonomy failed to correlate as expected, leading to a rejection of the "alternative leadership" conceptual model and a reconceptualization as a "rational indicator"		0	

Summary of the Results from the Empirical Application of the Conceptual Framework				
No. of Original Variables	Concept and Comments	Name of Scale Produced	No. of Variables in Scale	Reliability
7	Diversity of Organization. Only one of the original variables did not perform to expectations. The items which scaled were 8.01 Structural Articulation 8.02 Intensiveness of Organization 8.03 Extensiveness of Organization 8.04 Frequency of Local Meetings 8.06 Maintaining Records 8.07 Pervasiveness of Organization	Degree of Organization	6	.83
8	Centralization of Power. All the variables interrelated as expected in an overall scale of power: 9.01 Nationalization of Structure 9.02 Selecting the National Leader 9.03 Selecting Parliamentary Candidates 9.04 Allocating Funds 9.05 Formulating Policy 9.06 Controlling Communications 9.07 Administering Discipline 9.08 Leadership Concentration But factor analysis disclosed two subclusters in the above set. One set of three variables formed a structural power scale: 9.01 Nationalization of Structure 9.06 Controlling Communications 9.07 Administering Discipline Again in a posteriori manner the other subcluster formed the personal power scale: 9.02 Selecting the National Leader 9.03 Formulating Policy 9.08 Leadership Concentration	Centralization of Power	8	.83
6	Coherence. One variable did not intercorrelate as expected. The other five did, but with the lowest reliability in the study: 10.01 Legislative Cohesion 10.02 Ideological Factionalism 10.03 Issue Factionalism 10.04 Leadership Factionalism 10.05 Strategic or Tactical Factionalism	Structural Power	3	.77
		Personal Power	3	.75
6	Involvement. One variable did not correlate as strongly with the others as expected. The other five formed the involvement scale: 11.01 Membership Requirements 11.02 Membership Participation 11.03 Material Incentives 11.04 Purposive Incentives 11.05 Dictatorship	Coherence	5	.72
6	Involvement. One variable did not correlate as strongly with the others as expected. The other five formed the involvement scale: 11.01 Membership Requirements 11.02 Membership Participation 11.03 Material Incentives 11.04 Purposive Incentives 11.05 Dictatorship	Involvement	5	.78

TABLE 3: Empirical Validation of the Conceptual Framework

The governmental status cluster is even more closely in accordance with expectations. Of the six variables that were retained on the grounds of face validity, five intercorrelated as expected, producing a governmental status scale with a reliability of .92. Four other concept clusters conformed to expectations as well or better than institutionalization and governmental status. These were degree of organization, centralization of power, coherence and involvement. Thus, the expectations of relationships among the variables subsumed under these concepts in the framework were strongly, but not completely, supported by data on political parties across the world.

Of the remaining four concept clusters, the variables in two performed "mostly" as expected. For diversity of social support, the scales of socioeconomic and educational diversity had reliabilities of only .70 compared to reliabilities above .80 for religious, ethnic, regional, and urban-rural cleavages. For issue orientation, two distinct clusterings of issues emerged instead of one general cluster. These two clusterings of left-right issues invited interpretation as two different "faces" of leftism -- "Marxism" and "Liberalism." The scales for these two dimensions had reliabilities above .80.

Of the last two concept clusters, "goal orientation" was not given a chance for validation due to the problem of missing data, and the expectations for "autonomy" were overwhelmingly disconfirmed by the data. At least this demonstrates that there was nothing in the data, the conceptualization, or the design that forced the variables to behave according to expectations.

Summary

Overall, six of the ten clusters of variables performed virtually as expected and two performed mostly as expected. One of the remaining clusters could not be properly validated, and the other simply did not bear out expectations. One might summarize the results in another way. In all, a total of eighteen scales and subscales were formed to tap the concepts in the original conceptual framework. The reliabilities of these scales ranged from .69 to .96 and averaged .82. Scholars who wish to utilize the existing data base prepared by the ICPP Project and deposited with the Consortium should find it helpful to know that the basic variables in the data base do tend to interrelate as originally conceptualized. These scales can be used to measure such concepts as party institutionalization, governmental status, social diversity, issue orientation, goal orientation, degree of organization, centralization of power, coherence, and involvement.

These concepts and supporting data have been used in a variety of theoretical studies. Most recently, the data have been used by Harmel (1981) to assess the effects of environment on party centralization; by Harmel and Janda (1982) to probe the limits to party reform imposed by the environment; and by Janda and Gillies (1983) to analyze parties by world regions. Of course, those who operate with alternative conceptual frameworks may use the basic variables in other ways according to their own theoretical expectations. This is true of the book by Katz (1980), who tested his theory about the effect of electoral systems on parties' issue positions, factionalism, and cohesion. However, the data cannot be removed far from their conceptual underpinnings without decreasing their utility for theoretical research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Crotty, William J. (1970) "A Perspective for the Comparative Analysis of Political Parties," Comparative Political Studies, 3 (October), 267-296.
- Duverger, Maurice. (1961) Political Parties. New York: Wiley. (Original edition in French, 1951).
- Eckstein, Harry. (1968) "Party Systems," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences Volume II. New York: Macmillan and the Free Press. Pp. 436-453.
- Harmel, Robert. (1981) "Environment and Party Decentralization: A Cross-National Analysis," Comparative Political Studies, 14 (April). 75-99.
- _____ and Kenneth Janda. (1982) Parties and Their Environment: Limits to Reform? New York: Longman.
- Janda, Kenneth. (1968) ICPP Information Codes and Indexing Manual. Northwestern University, First Edition, January.
- _____. (1967) "Political Research With Miracode: A 16mm. Microfilm Information Retrieval System," Social Science Information, 6 (April-June), 169-181.
- _____. (1969) "A Microfilm and Computer System for Analyzing Comparative Politics Literature," in George Gerbner, et al. (eds.) The Analysis of Communication Content. New York: Wiley. Pp. 407-435.
- _____. (1975) "A Worldwide Study of Political Parties," in Benjamin Mittman and Lorraine Borman (eds.), Personalized Data Base Systems. New York: John Wiley. Pp. 129-137.
- _____. (1979) Comparative Political Parties Data: 1950-1962. Ann Arbor: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- _____. (1980) Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey. New York: The Free Press.
- _____. (1982) "Managing Qualitative and Quantitative Information in the Study of Political Parties," Social Science Information Studies, 3, 113-129.
- _____ and Robin Gillies. (1983) "How Well Does 'Region' Explain Political Party Characteristics?" Political Geography Quarterly, 2 (July), in press.
- Katz, Richard S. (1980) A Theory of Parties and Electoral Systems. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas A. (1970) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Lawson, Kay. (1976) The Comparative Study of Political Parties. New York: St. Martin's.
- Maisel, Louis and Joseph Cooper (eds.) (1978) Political Parties: Development and Decay. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Mayer, Lawrence C. (1972) Comparative Political Inquiry. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.
- McClelland, Charles. (1972) "Theoretical Problems," in James N. Rosenau, Vincent Davis, and M. A. East (eds.), The Analysis of International Politics, New York: The Free Press.
- Sartori, Giovanni. (1976) Parties and Party Systems. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Singer, J. David. (1982) "Variables, Indicators, and Data: The Measurement Problem in Macropolitical Research," Social Science History, 6 (Spring), 181-217.

Statistics on the 158 Parties Studied in the ICPP Project			
ID Code	Party Name	No. of Pages in Party File	% of Pages in Country File ^a
001	American Democratic Party ^a	—	—
002	American Republican Party ^a	—	—
011	British Labour Party ^a	—	—
012	British Conservative Party ^a	—	—
021	Australian Conservative Party	1,353	45%
022	Australian Liberal Party	1,211	40
023	Australian Country Party	1,059	35
031	New Zealand National Party	809	52
032	New Zealand Labour Party	965	63
041	Canadian Conservative Party ^a	—	—
042	Canadian Liberal Party ^a	—	—
043	Canadian Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (New Democratic Party) ^a	—	—
044	Canadian Social Credit Party ^a	—	—
051	Irish Fianna Fail	254	31
052	Irish Fine Gael	157	19
053	Irish Labour Party	109	13
071	Rhodesian & Nyasaland United Federal Party	900	39
072	Rhodesian & Nyasaland Considerate/Dominion Party	366	17
073	Northern Rhodesian African National Congress	317	14
074	Malawi (Nyasaland) Congress Party	374	16
081	Indian National Congress	1,978	43
082	Indian Communist Party	1,302	28
101	Austrian People's Party	827	47
102	Austrian Socialist Party	1,136	65
103	Austrian Freedom or Liberal Party (League of Independence)	306	18
111	French Popular Republican Movement	612	22
112	French Radical Socialist Party	710	25
113	French Socialist Party	738	26
114	French Gaullist Party	681	24
115	French Communist Party	842	30
121	West German Christian Democratic Union	796	36
122	West German Social Democratic Party	850	40
123	West German Free Democrat Party	629	30
141	Greek Liberal Party	112	22
142	Greek National Progressive Union of Center	82	16
143	Greek Rally/National Radical Union	150	29
145	Greek United Democratic Left	98	19
171	Portuguese National Union	725	63
201	Danish Social Democratic Party	404	34
202	Danish Moderate Liberal Party (Venstre)	366	22
203	Danish Conservative Party	317	18
204	Danish Radical Liberal Party	174	15
221	Icelandic Independence Party (Conservative)	66	40
222	Icelandic Progressive Party	70	43
223	Icelandic People's Alliance (Communist)	71	43
224	Icelandic Social Democratic Party	76	46
241	Swedish Social Democratic Party	273	47
242	Swedish Center Party	192	33
243	Swedish People's Party (Liberal)	188	33
244	Swedish Right Party (Conservative)	187	33
261	Dutch Roman Catholic People's Party	697	48
262	Dutch Labor Party	757	40
263	Dutch Liberal Party	369	20
264	Dutch Anti-Revolutionary Party	435	23
265	Dutch Christian Historical Union	318	17
266	Dutch Communist Party	224	12
271	Luxembourgian Christian Social Party	82	41
272	Luxembourgian Socialist Party	102	50
273	Luxembourgian Democratic Party	90	45
274	Luxembourgian Communist Party	52	26
301	Ecuadorian National Velasquista Federation	131	14
352	Ecuadorian Conservative Party	221	24
353	Ecuadorian Liberal Party	162	19
354	Ecuadorian Socialist Party	134	14
355	Ecuadorian Concentration of Popular Forces	38	4
361	Paraguayen Faberista Party	280	36
362	Paraguayen Colorado Party	309	40
363	Paraguayen Liberal Party	133	17
371	Peruvian Movement of National Union (Odriistas)	149	15
372	Peruvian Christian Democratic Party	87	9
373	Peruvian Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana	556	57
374	Peruvian Popular Action Party	282	29
375	Peruvian Democratic Movement	282	29
381	Uruguayen Colorado Party	236	34
382	Uruguayen National Party (Blancos)	227	33
391	Venezuelan Republican Democratic Union	174	22
392	Venezuelan Christian Social Party	188	24
393	Venezuelan Democratic Action Party	438	55
411	Cuban Revolutionary Party	224	10
412	Cuban Liberal Party	49	2
413	Cuban Democratic Party	36	2
414	Cuban Popular Socialist Party	1,492	68
421	Dominican Party	1,219	34
431	Salvadoran Revolutionary Party of Democratic Reunification	163	57
432	Salvadoran Renovating Action Party	39	14
441	Guatemalan National Democratic Movement	139	8
442	Guatemalan Christian Democratic Party	64	4
443	Guatemalan Revolutionary Party	161	10

Statistics on the 158 Parties Studied in the ICPP Project			
ID Code	Party Name	No. of Pages in Party File	% of Pages in Country File ^a
444	Guatemalan National Democratic Reconciliation Party	166	10
445	Guatemalan National Renovation Party	57	3
446	Guatemalan Revolutionary Action Party	221	13
447	Guatemalan Labor Party	760	45
471	Nicaraguan Nationalist Liberal Party	256	64
472	Nicaraguan Conservative Party	41	10
473	Nicaraguan Traditional Conservative Party	155	39
501	Burmese Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League (AFFFL)	932	46
502	Burmese "Stable" AFFFL	266	13
503	Burmese "Clean" AFFFL, or Union Party	505	25
504	Burma Workers/National United Front	286	14
511	Cambodian Popular Socialist Community (Senkum)	622	64
512	Cambodian Democratic Party	197	15
531	Indonesian Nationalist Party	602	20
532	Indonesian Muslim Scholars Party	388	13
533	Indonesian Communist Party	1,104	36
534	Council of Indonesian Muslim Associations (Masumi)	828	27
561	Korean Workers' Party	649	85
581	United Malayan National Organization	984	42
582	Malayan Chinese Association	929	40
583	Malayan Indian Congress	580	23
584	Pan-Malayan Islamic Party	211	9
585	Malayan Communist Party	284	12
601	Albanian Workers' Party	228	80
611	Bulgarian Communist Party	856	72
612	Bulgarian Agrarian National Union	57	5
631	East German Socialist Unity Party	633	64
632	East German Christian Democratic Union	107	12
633	East German National Democratic Party	92	11
634	East German Liberal Democratic Party	98	11
635	East German Democratic Peasants' Party	62	7
641	Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party	962	79
671	U.S.S.R. Communist Party	2,898	87
741	Sudanese National Unionist Party	207	29
742	Sudanese Independence of Nation Party	294	40
743	Sudanese Southern Liberal Party	66	9
751	Tunisian Neo-Doustour Party	1,082	60
761	Lebanese Progressive Socialist Party	153	15
762	Lebanese Constitutionalist Union	80	8
764	Lebanese Phalanges (al-Kataeb)	131	13
765	Lebanese Nationalist Bloc	69	7
771	Iranian People's Party (Mardom)	107	12
772	Iranian National Party (Melliyun)	75	8
773	Iranian Communist (Tudeh) Party	175	19
774	Iranian National Front	65	7
781	Turkish Republican People's Party	246	23
782	Turkish Democratic Party	241	23
802	Dahomean Republican/Nationalist Party	83	19
803	Dahomean Democratic Union	125	29
804	Dahomean Northern Ethnic Group/Democratic Rally	27	6
811	Ghananian Convention People's Party	1,012	72
812	Ghananian United Party	134	9
813	Ghananian National Liberation Movement	341	24
814	Ghananian Northern People's Party	341	24
821	Democratic Party of Guinea	461	62
871	Volcanic Democratic Union	240	69
881	Committee of Togolese Unity	277	41
883	Democratic Union of the Togolese Populations	8	1
895	Togolese Progress Party	153	23
896	Togolese Union of Northern Chiefs and Populations	117	17
911	C.A.R. Movement for the Social Evolution of Black Africa	92	75
921	Chadian Progressive Party	236	50
922	Chadian Social Action Party	90	19
931	Congolese Democratic Union for the Defense of African Interests	168	35
932	Congolese African Socialist Movement	108	23
961	Kenyan African National Union	699	71
962	Kenyan African Democratic Union	470	48
981	Ugandan People's Congress	257	27
982	Ugandan Democratic Party	207	21
983	Ugandan Kabaka Yekka	109	11

^aThe percentage is obtained by dividing the number of pages indexed for a party by the total number of pages in the file for that country. When summed across all the parties in a given country, the percentages must total to more than 100 because more than one party can be discussed on the same page. As discussed in the text, the literature on parties in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada was not organized into files and indexed in the systematic fashion as the literature for parties in the other countries.

^bThe United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada were not drawn for the study and we did not build information files for these. Instead, their parties were coded by judges using more conventional library research methods.

APPENDIX 1:

List of 158 Parties in the ICPP Project