

## *The Dimensions of Partisanship in Canada\**

Eric M. Uslaner, *University of Maryland*

Canadians are said to have weaker partisanship than Americans. Most particularly, many Canadians identify with different parties at the federal and provincial level. To what extent does this dual identification form part of a syndrome of weak partisanship, as institutionalist theories of Canadian partisanship would suggest? LISREL modeling of attitudes toward parties in the 1974-1979 panel of the Canadian National Election Studies finds little support for such an institutionalist view. Instead, Canadians have complex schemata for evaluating parties. Dual identification forms a distinct dimension. There are four other factors: temporal stability for both party identification and voting behavior, the strength of identification at both the federal and provincial levels, and separate dimensions for federal and provincial partisanship. These results provide support for a cultural/historical account, especially given the distinctiveness of schemata for Quebec and British Columbia.

The received wisdom of studies of electoral behavior, driven largely by work on American politics, is that party identification is the major force that drives the vote. Partisanship is *the* long-term factor in shaping vote choice. All else is, if not commentary, at least transitory (Campbell et al. 1960). Even as vote choice may diverge from party ties in particular elections, the underlying identifications are likely to remain sturdy.

This view of the American voter is no longer sacrosanct. Students of voting behavior in other countries long have questioned the portability of the American model of partisanship (Budge, Crewe, and Farlie 1976). In some countries the very question of identification in the American sense is a matter of fierce debate. In others, such as Canada, people may identify with parties but with less intensity or stability (LeDuc et al. 1984).

The new view of partisanship in the United States does not treat identification as fixed. Rather, it may change over time with economic conditions, presidential popularity, and other short-term forces such as issues (Fiorina 1981). Furthermore, partisanship is multidimensional (Weisberg 1980; Dennis 1988). Independence is not simply a mid-point in the traditional seven-point scale of partisanship. Strength of party ties also forms a separate dimension from the direction of identification (Valentine and Van Wingen 1980).

This is not simply a measurement exercise. Multidimensionality generally is traced to the dealignment of the American party system. Evidence of multiple dimensions in Canada could not be so interpreted. The Canadian party system is marked by "stable dealignment" (LeDuc 1984a). Historically ties between voters and parties have been weaker in Canada than in the United States. While few

Canadians profess political independence (or simple nonidentification) compared with Americans, their ties to parties are generally weaker, less stable over time, and vary between levels of government (LeDuc 1984a, 403).

Canadians seemingly don't follow the received view of partisanship as a long-term, stable attachment. They view parties with less fervor than Americans, change attachments more often, and often adopt different affiliations at the federal and provincial levels. They are more likely than Americans to change identifications over time and less likely to adopt the same partisanship as their parents, so that overall "party identification has a rather different impact in Canada than it does in the United States" (Jenson 1975, 549).

Canadians alone among citizens of the major Anglo-American democracies (the United States, Great Britain, and Australia) are not polarized in their thinking about parties. They are considerably less likely than their compatriots to view one party positively and another negatively (Wattenberg 1982).<sup>1</sup> Such weak party ties mean that Canadians who shift their vote from one election to the next are substantially more likely than Americans to change their identification, as well (LeDuc 1984b, 435). The fluidity of partisanship is reinforced by different identifications in federal and provincial politics for many Canadians. From 1974 and 1980 between 61 and 64 percent of Canadians chose the same party at both levels of government; the figures rise to 77-79 percent when we consider only people who identified with parties at both the federal and provincial levels (Clarke and Stewart 1987).

Does the lack of enduring and stable ties indicate a general syndrome of "weaker" partisanship in Canada than in the United States? How are orientations structured in such a polity? People organize their political worlds into reasonably compact sets of ideas so that they can respond more readily to external stimuli (Lodge and Hamill 1986; Miller et al. 1986). The traditional perspective on party identification presumes a simple world view in which partisanship can be encapsulated in the seven-point scale. Yet, the literature on Canadian electoral behavior seems to suggest a syndrome of weak partisanship. Do weak ties to parties, instability of identification over time, and inconsistency across levels hang together in a way that clearly differentiates Canadian from American politics? At the other extreme, does each aspect of weak partisanship follow its own course so that orientations toward the party system are essentially chaotic? Or is there some structure in a seemingly anarchic world that might make sense of Canadian partisanship? There are conflicting views as to what drives party ties. The dominant perspective, which I call "institutionalist" (Uslaner 1990), sees partisanship in Canada as essentially different from that in the United States.<sup>2</sup> This is the "syndrome" perspective. So stated, it is a caricature. At the least, its advocates maintain that weak party ties, instability over time, and inconsistency across levels of government all are intercorrelated and, indeed, are causally linked.<sup>3</sup> LeDuc et al. (1984, emphasis added) comment about split-level identification in federal and provincial politics:

...all voters are continually exposed to two distinct sets of party images associated with parties operating in recognizably different party systems. *These conditions enhance the likelihood of partisan change at both levels of the federal system.*

Similarly, Clarke and Stewart (1987) find that split-level identification is a powerful predictor of partisan instability.

The second perspective, which I call “historical/cultural,” denies that Canadian thinking about parties is fundamentally different, at least at a psychological level, from that of Americans.<sup>4</sup> Particularly important is the argument that split-level identification (consistency) is fundamentally different from other indicators of partisanship. The former reflects the centrality of federalism in Canadian politics, which itself is traceable to the weak sense of nationhood, while the latter, according to culturalists, are not really weaker in Canada than in the United States. As Elkins (1978, 427, emphasis in original; cf. Sniderman et al. 1974, 275) argued:

...the party identification reported by a respondent has the same general character in both the United States and Canada. Although the exact percentages may vary somewhat by country and by time, this *difference in incidence* does not mask the *identity of patterns* in the two nations.

The culturalist critique of institutionalism is three-fold. First, there is simple disagreement over whether partisan stability, parental transmission of partisanship, the extent to which party ties travel with the vote, and the strength of identification are weaker in Canada than in the United States (see Uslaner 1990). Second, culturalists dispute the hypothesis that partisan consistency should vary either with volatility over time or the strength of identification. Indeed, they present evidence that neither relationship holds (Blake et al. 1985, 167; Blake 1982, 710). Finally, and most centrally, they maintain that the traditional view gives short shrift to the importance of federalism in shaping party ties in Canada, especially with respect to split-level identification. Such inconsistency must be viewed as having two fully developed sets of identification in Canada’s “two political worlds” that often do not intersect (Blake et al. 1985).<sup>5</sup>

These two different perspectives, then, lead to varying expectations for Canadians’ cognitive map of partisanship. The institutionalist thesis would lead us to expect either a single syndrome of party ties or distinct dimensions for consistency, stability, previous identifications, and strength of identification.<sup>6</sup> Why such disparate predictions? Institutional accounts stress the weak basis of partisanship in Canada (see Jenson 1975; Martinez 1990; Bowler 1990). This suggests an unstructured pattern of party ties. Yet some versions of this thesis indicate that indicators of partisanship hang together in a “syndrome” of loose ties (Clarke and Stewart 1979; LeDuc 1984a). There may thus be a single dimension

of affiliations.

The historical/cultural framework would expect a structure that would emphasize separate federal and provincial dimensions. While voting for different parties at the national and subnational levels is reasonably common in many federal systems, identification with different parties is not. Canada is a distinctive exception in this regard (LeDuc et al. 1984, 420; Uslaner 1990). Split-level identification is a manifestation of the centrality of federalism in Canadian political life. The institutionalist account sees it as part of an overall syndrome of weak partisanship; the historical/cultural framework treats it as generically different from other aspects of partisanship, which otherwise look quite similar to what one would find in the United States. Consistency should be distinct from other indicators of partisanship. Recognizing that the party system varies from one province to another and that split identifications are prominent in only two provinces (British Columbia and Quebec), even culturalists would expect some degree of chaos. Their findings that stability and partisan strength are unrelated to consistency provide further support for an expectation of disorder.

### **Cognitive Mapping**

Examinations of the cognitive maps of Americans toward political parties have subjected a series of measures of attitudes towards parties to factor analyses. This technique has several advantages. It reveals the underlying dimensions of partisanship and always provides a solution. It is generally undemanding on the researcher. However, exploratory factor analysis has a distinct disadvantage: It is atheoretical. While one can hypothesize models of different dimensionality, one cannot examine models that require that certain variables fall on the same dimension.

An alternative technique, confirmatory factor analysis (Joreskog and Sorbom 1984), is designed to do just that. One starts with a cognitive map and determines, through Chi Square goodness of fit tests, how well the data fit the hypothesized structure. Like other maximum likelihood techniques, the confirmatory factor analysis procedure (or LISREL) begins with a data matrix and derives parameter estimates that best reproduce the original observations. With exploratory factor analysis, one can always obtain a satisfactory fit to the data by expanding the number of dimensions extracted. Under LISREL, however, the fit depends upon the underlying theoretical structure and the identifiability of the model.

We first must posit a set of underlying dimensions in the cognitive map. These unmeasured dimensions are linked to measured variables, measurement errors (residuals), and intercorrelations among the dimensions and residuals.<sup>7</sup> The principal concern is with the relationships between the underlying dimensions and the observed variables.

The data base is the 1974-79-80 panel study of the Canadian electorate, specifically from the first two waves of the sample.<sup>8</sup> The data base is rich in

questions on party ties, but one must take some care in determining which ones are best suited to derive a cognitive map of Canadian partisanship. The dimensional studies of American partisanship offer only limited guidance. These analyses *are* largely measurement exercises, particularly about the worthiness of the seven-point scale. They are not driven by the same theoretical concerns as this study. More critically, the questions posed in the Canadian and American studies vary widely. We cannot establish any equivalence between the cognitive maps of the two countries. However, we can get some clues as to the portability of the American model, based upon what we find in Canada.

I do not include in the measures to be analyzed the direction of party identification since my concern is the structure of partisan thinking, not the specific objects of affiliation. The cognitive map includes 16 measures, some of which were specifically asked of respondents, while others were constructed from party ties and voting behavior. They include: (1) party identification consistency (across levels of government) in 1979;<sup>9</sup> (2) vote consistency in 1974 across levels of government;<sup>10</sup> (3) vote consistency in 1979; (4) stability of federal party identification from 1974 to 1979;<sup>11</sup> (5) stability of provincial party identification from 1974 to 1979; (6) stability of federal vote choice from 1974 to 1979; (7) whether the respondent claimed in 1974 to have voted always for the same party in federal elections; (8) a similar measure for 1979; (9) whether the respondent claimed in 1974 to have had a different federal party identification at some point; (10) a similar measure for 1979; (11) whether the respondent in 1974 claimed to have had a different provincial party identification at some point; (12) a similar measure for 1979; (13) whether the respondent claimed in 1974 to have voted always for the same party in provincial elections; (14) a similar measure for 1979; (15) the strength of federal party identification in 1979; and (16) the strength of provincial party identification in 1979.

The variables represent a mixture of partisan attachments and voting behavior. Within each category are both constructions of past behavior (party identification and vote stability) and recall of past identifications and vote (whether the respondent previously identified with a different party or ever voted for a different party). This selection of variables has several advantages. The cognitive map does not depend mainly upon recall measures, which can be unreliable (Niemi et al. 1980). Vote and partisan stability assess short-term fluctuations in party loyalty and the strength measures gauge current intensity. The recall measures, especially since they are at best imperfect measures of prior beliefs and actions, tap longer-range attachments to the voter's favored party, perhaps reflecting the effects of socialization.

The 16 measures represent a number of key constructs in what we long have believed to constitute people's cognitive maps of partisanship together with a distinctive Canadian overlay -- the different roles of federal and provincial party systems. These underlying, unmeasured variables are level consistency in party identification and the vote, stability over time, longer-term attachments (as

indicated by the recall measures), and partisan strength. Each is analytically distinct. There are multiple indicators of each concept, as required by LISREL (Sullivan and Feldman 1979).

All variables except the two measuring party identification strength are dummy variables; the latter include four categories.<sup>12</sup> The models were estimated directly from the data rather than from correlation or covariance matrices. This reduced the number of cases to 536, as all observations with missing data had to be deleted.<sup>13</sup>

We evaluate the models by examining the (unstandardized) coefficients, much as in regression analysis, and their standard errors. Each model has an associated Chi Square value. Unlike contingency table analysis, this goodness-of-fit Chi Square indicates the best correspondence of the model to the data when the statistic is *minimized* relative to the number of degrees of freedom. Thus, we seek (in the spirit of maximum likelihood) a probability level as close to unity as attainable. Practically, probability values greater than .05 generally are considered acceptable. Finally, the Tucker-Lewis reliability coefficient -- a Chi Square-based measure -- provides a rough measure of association for the fit of the data to the model. Although the sampling distribution of the coefficient is unknown, values of above .9 appear to indicate acceptable fits (Zeller and Carmines 1980, 175).<sup>14</sup>

### Chaos or Order?

I begin with an examination of three relatively simple cognitive maps. The first posits a single dimension of partisanship and the others two-factor schemas, one focusing solely on the federal-provincial distinction and the other on a differentiation between party identification and the vote. The first model yields a very poor fit to the data: Chi Square is 642.83 with 59 degrees of freedom for a probability less than .001 and a Tucker-Lewis coefficient of .645. A two-dimensional model based entirely upon a federal-provincial separation, with the three consistency indicators loading on both factors, fares somewhat better. However, Chi Square is 220.21 with 54 degrees of freedom, for a probability still less than .001. Furthermore, the two dimensions correlate at .91, indicating that they are not very distinct.

The third initial cognitive map posits separate worlds for party identification and the vote. Such a schema goes against the conventional wisdom of Canadian politics, which holds that both partisanship and electoral support are fluid and generally track together (LeDuc et al. 1984). However, it is a test of the portability of the American model, at least prior to its reformulation. Once again the fit is not good. Although the Tucker-Lewis coefficient is an acceptable .911, Chi Square is 145.27 with 53 degrees of freedom with  $p < .001$ . The two unmeasured variables correlate at -.920. Even though the data do not correspond well to the traditional American model, they do fit this cognitive map better than one based entirely upon

a federal-provincial dimension.

A fourth model presumes that the four constructs identified above constitute the appropriate schema for Canadian partisanship. I posit separate dimensions for level consistency, temporal stability, strength of identification, and long-term attachments. This proposed map fares somewhat better, but still does not yield an acceptable fit. The Tucker-Lewis coefficient is .944, but Chi Square with 51 degrees of freedom is 88.15, for a probability level less than .001.

The four factor model is incomplete in that it does not give federalism its due. The only part of federalism that it captures is split-level identification and vote consistency in 1974 and 1979. While level consistency is a distinctive part of Canadian partisanship, it is hardly the only manifestation of strains in federalism. The Prairie provinces, in particular, rarely have voted for a provincial government of the same party that controlled the federal Commons (Smith 1981, 41-42). Federal and provincial party organizations, unlike national and state parties in the United States, generally do not work together and sometimes even see themselves as competitors (Smith 1975, 331-332; Whitaker 1985). Also in contrast to the United States (see Jacobson and Kernell 1981), federal and provincial parties maintain separate fund-raising efforts. Candidates for the federal Parliament generally neither have served in the provincial Legislative Assembly nor even sought election to it, even in Ontario, where the party systems most clearly overlap (Johnston 1985, 153; Williams 1985, 312). Ontario is a swing province in federal elections, providing the base of support for the federal Liberals when they have held power, as the party has for most of the post-War period. On the other hand, the Progressive Conservatives have dominated provincial politics for this same period, often holding the Liberals to barely a quarter of the seats in the Legislative Assembly.

Federalism thus permeates the Canadian party system. The historical/cultural approach insists that we take this into account in establishing a cognitive map of partisanship for Canadians. We have seen, however, that a simple federal-provincial model performs rather poorly. As noted above, volatility and strength are generally not correlated with consistency. Nor is there any reason to believe that either would be associated with any other manifestation of the federal-provincial distinction. The most appropriate distinction between the two levels of government would seem to be in the long-term attachments to parties at different levels: always voting for the same party and whether the voter has had a different identification in the past.

Canada is hardly unique in this sense. Other federal systems, including the United States, have different outcomes at the national and subnational levels. Canada is distinctive not only with respect to split-level identification, but also in its "stable dealignment." The growing differentiation between outcomes at the federal and state levels in the United States represents both the weakening of party ties and the rise of the incumbency advantage for members of Congress since the 1960s. The Canadian pattern goes back much farther in time.

I posit a five-dimensional model including factors for level consistency, temporal stability, strength of identification, and long-term attachments at the federal and provincial levels. This map produced the best fit of any estimated for these data.<sup>15</sup> Table 1 presents the results. Chi Square is now 66.76 with 50 degrees of freedom; the Tucker-Lewis coefficient is .956 and  $p < .06$ . There are clearly five separate dimensions of partisanship. Level consistency, representing split-level identification and voting behavior, is distinctive. There also are separate dimensions for temporal stability and strength of identification. Long-term attachments at the federal and provincial levels form two, not one, dimensions. There is a clear gain in goodness of fit from the four-factor to the five-factor model, in going from an analysis that posits a single long-term dimension to one that has separate factors for federal and provincial attachments.

The indicators listed in Table 1 (and the others that follow) have, except as noted, statistically significant loadings at least at  $p < .05$ . Level consistency is comprised of level consistency (split-level versus single identification) and voting consistency at the provincial and federal levels in 1974 and 1979. Temporal stability includes voting for the same federal party over time, identifying with the same party at both the federal and provincial levels in both 1974 and 1979, and voting consistently across levels in 1974. The federal dimension comprises always voting the same in federal elections (both 1974 and 1979), federal temporal voting stability, and past federal partisanship (both 1974 and 1979). The provincial dimension encompasses past provincial identifications (both 1974 and 1979) and always voting the same in provincial elections (both 1974 and 1979). The two indicators of party identification strength constitute the strength factor.

There is some degree of overlap in the dimensions. Vote stability at the federal level, which loads primarily on the temporal stability dimension, also plays a role on the long-term federal dimension. Neither shorter-term measure of party identification stability is important for the federal or provincial factors. These results largely correspond with our expectations that long and short term measures form separate dimensions; they also confirm the weak relationship between recall measures and items based upon actual behavior.

Split-level identification seems to be rather distinctive. While it is an important element on the level consistency latent variable, the other two measured indicators -- vote consistency in 1974 and 1979 -- also load on the temporal stability factor (albeit the latter with an insignificant coefficient). Since federal and provincial elections do not occur at the same time in Canada, there always is some temporal component to vote consistency measures. This clearly is evident in the results in Table 1.<sup>16</sup> Party identification consistency is the only measure on the level consistency dimension that does not load on some other factor, highlighting the unique role it plays in the cognitive map of Canadians.

The dimensions are reasonably distinct, as can be seen in the intercorrelations reported in Table 2. Level consistency has moderate correlations (.4 in absolute value) with each of the other dimensions. Such relationships do not point to



**Table 1. Five-Factor Solutions for Canadian Partisanship**

	Level Consistency	Temporal Stability	Federal	Provincial	Strength
<i>Party ID Consistency 1974</i>	.280 (.000)*				
<i>Vote Consistency 1974</i>	.238 (.027)	.195 (.027)			
<i>Vote Consistency 1979</i>	.364 (.032)	<u>-.014 (.032)</u>			
<i>Federal ID Stability</i>		.287 (.000)*			
<i>Provincial ID Stability</i>		.264 (.018)			
<i>Vote Stability</i>		.432 (.038)	.086 (.036)		
<i>Always Vote Same Federal 1974</i>			.240 (.031)		
<i>Always Vote Same Federal 1979</i>			.429 (.000)*		
<i>Past Federal ID 1974</i>			.204 (.029)		
<i>Past Federal ID 1979</i>			.226 (.027)		
<i>Past Provincial ID 1974</i>				.176 (.028)	
<i>Past Provincial ID 1979</i>				.337 (.000)*	
<i>Always Vote Same Provincial 1974</i>			.265 (.023)		
<i>Always Vote Same Provincial 1979</i>			.416 (.025)		
<i>Federal ID Strength 1979</i>					.547 (.000)*
<i>Provincial ID Strength 1979</i>					.367 (.033)

Chi Square = 66.76                      Degrees of Freedom = 50    p <.06

Tucker-Lewis coefficient: .962

Note: Entries are unstandardized coefficients; standard errors are in parentheses.

Asterisks indicate standard errors fixed at zero. Underlined entries are not significant at p >.05.

anything like a “syndrome” of weak partisanship. Indeed, since the level consistency factor crosses both federal and provincial partisanship, it would be surprising if there were not at least modest correlations between this dimension and these others. The other factors generally are moderately related. Only the federal construct has *any* sizable, if hardly overwhelming, correlations with others: -.62 with temporal stability and .65 with provincial long-term attachments. Neither association is surprising. The two measured variables for temporal stability with the highest loadings relate to federal politics. The marker items for the federal and provincial dimensions are identical except for reference to different levels of government, clearly inducing some commonality. Nevertheless, the two dimensions share less than 40 percent of their variance in common.

Table 2. Intercorrelations of Dimensions for Five-Factor Model

	Level Consistency	Temporal Stability	Federal	Provincial	Strength
<i>Level Consistency</i>	1.00				
<i>Temporal Stability</i>	.41	1.00			
<i>Federal</i>	-.45	-.62	1.00		
<i>Provincial</i>	-.42	-.35	.65	1.00	
<i>Strength</i>	-.39	-.35	.42	.27	1.00

All correlations significant at  $p < .001$ .

### Two Political Worlds?

Before we assess competing theoretical claims, we first must determine the applicability of the five-factor model to all of Canada. As I have argued elsewhere (Uslaner 1990), split-level identification is common in only two Canadian provinces. In British Columbia, 64.6 percent of this sample has such dual identification. In Quebec, 24.6 percent selects one party at the federal level and another in provincial politics. Outside these two provinces only 10.5 percent of Canadians have split attachments in this sample.<sup>17</sup> The variables that predict this element of level consistency in British Columbia and Quebec fare rather poorly throughout the rest of Canada. Voters in these two provinces are more likely to have split identifications simply because of the options available to them.

In Quebec, the Progressive Conservatives do not contest provincial elections. The opponents of the Liberals in recent years have been the *Union Nationale* and the *Parti Quebecois*. Neither of the two major federal parties currently is competitive in provincial politics in British Columbia. The battle there is between the right-populist Social Credit Party, which dominated provincial politics until 1991 even though it has disappeared from competition at either level in the rest of Canada, and the New Democrats, a mildly socialist party that has traditionally run a weak third in federal politics.<sup>18</sup> Nowhere else in Canada does a governing

**Table 3. Five-Factor Solutions for Canadian Partisanship in Eight Provinces**

	Level Consistency	Temporal Stability	Federal	Provincial	Strength
<i>Party ID Consistency 1974</i>	.188 (.000)*				
<i>Vote Consistency 1974</i>	.146 (.030)	.228 (.029)			
<i>Vote Consistency 1979</i>	.256 (.036)	<u>-.020</u> (.036)			
<i>Federal ID Stability</i>		.276 (.000)*			
<i>Provincial ID Stability</i>		.269 (.020)			
<i>Vote Stability</i>		.366 (.036)	<u>.021</u> (.034)		
<i>Always Vote Same Federal 1974</i>			.222 (.034)		
<i>Always Vote Same Federal 1979</i>			.366 (.000)*		
<i>Past Federal ID 1974</i>			.201 (.033)		
<i>Past Federal ID 1979</i>			.180 (.030)		
<i>Past Provincial ID 1974</i>				.149 (.035)	
<i>Past Provincial ID 1979</i>				.333 (.000)*	
<i>Always Vote Same Provincial 1974</i>				.248 (.027)	
<i>Always Vote Same Provincial 1979</i>				.425 (.031)	
<i>Federal ID Strength 1979</i>					.535 (.000)*
<i>Provincial ID Strength 1979</i>					.367 (.040)

Chi Square = 38.01

Degrees of Freedom = 49 p < .87

Tucker-Lewis coefficient: .962

Note: Entries are unstandardized coefficients; standard errors are in parentheses.

Asterisks indicate standard errors fixed at zero. Underlined entries are not significant at p > .05.

provincial party fail to exist in federal politics.

A straightforward question, then, is whether the rest of the cognitive map of these Canadians is similar to that of their compatriots in the other eight provinces. A direct test of this hypothesis is possible within LISREL. I construct two subsamples, one for eight provinces and the other for British Columbia and Quebec, and then estimate the same five-factor model with coefficients constrained to be equal for each subsample. The result does *not* support the hypothesis that the cognitive maps of the two groups of Canadians are similar. For the nested analysis, Chi Square with 186 degrees of freedom is 434.21 ( $p < .001$ ).

How, then, do the schemas differ? The model for eight provinces ( $N = 360$ ) is presented in Table 3. It is, with minor differences in the magnitudes of coefficients,<sup>19</sup> the same model reported in Table 1. The five-factor model represents the cognitive map of most Canadians very well. Chi Square is 38.01 with 49 degrees of freedom ( $p < .87$ ). The Tucker-Lewis coefficient is .962. The fit for these eight provinces is clearly much better than it is for all Canadians. The intercorrelations of the dimensions are reported in Table 4. The general pattern is quite similar to that in Table 2. There are modest correlations among the factors. Comparing measures across samples is at best risky since these standardized measures are heavily dependent upon sample size and the distribution of cases on the variables. With this caveat in mind, I call attention to the somewhat stronger relation between federal and provincial long-term attachments for this subsample ( $r = .72$ ) than for the entire country.

Table 4. Intercorrelations of Dimensions for Five-Factor Model:  
Eight Provinces

	Level Consistency	Temporal Stability	Federal	Provincial	Strength
<i>Level Consistency</i>	1.00				
<i>Temporal Stability</i>	.38	1.00			
<i>Federal</i>	-.50	-.60	1.00		
<i>Provincial</i>	-.39	-.32	.72	1.00	
<i>Strength</i>	-.47	-.32	.43	.27	1.00

All correlations significant at  $p < .001$ .

The results for British Columbia and Quebec ( $N = 166$ ) are found in Tables 5 and 6. The best-fitting model for these two provinces is not as strong as that for the other eight. Chi Square is 82.85 with 56 degrees of freedom ( $p < .01$ ) and the Tucker-Lewis coefficient is .876.<sup>20</sup> The five factors generally are similar to those for the other eight provinces. However, the level consistency and temporal stability dimensions do not share any variables in common, nor does vote stability load on the federal factor. However, the provincial dimension now is more comprehensive. Party identification strength and stability are part of the provincial

**Table 5. Five-Factor Solutions for Canadian Partisanship in British Columbia and Quebec**

	Level Consistency	Temporal Stability	Federal	Provincial	Strength
<i>Party ID Consistency 1974</i>	.390 (.000)*				
<i>Vote Consistency 1974</i>	.414 (.026)	.342 (.000)*			
<i>Vote Consistency 1979</i>	.495 (.024)	<u>0.59</u> (.036)		-.262 (.059)	
<i>Federal ID Stability</i>		.281 (.034)			
<i>Provincial ID Stability</i>			.213 (.039)		
<i>Vote Stability</i>			.414 (.000)*		
<i>Always Vote Same Federal 1974</i>			.242 (.038)		
<i>Always Vote Same Federal 1979</i>			.278 (.039)		
<i>Past Federal ID 1974</i>					
<i>Past Federal ID 1979</i>					
<i>Past Provincial ID 1974</i>				.257 (.052)	
<i>Past Provincial ID 1979</i>				.369 (.000)*	
<i>Always Vote Same Provincial 1974</i>				.294 (.040)	
<i>Always Vote Same Provincial 1979</i>				.398 (.042)	
<i>Federal ID Strength 1979</i>					.475 (.000)*
<i>Provincial ID Strength 1979</i>				.135 (.059)	.127 (.066)

Chi Square = 82.85

Degrees of Freedom = 56 p <.011

Tucker-Lewis coefficient: .876

Note: Entries are unstandardized coefficients; standard errors are in parentheses.

Asterisks indicate standard errors fixed at zero. Underlined entries are not significant at p >.05.

dimension, although their corresponding measures at the federal level do *not* load on the federal dimension.

There are two possible explanations for these latter results. First is the centrality of provincial symbols in British Columbia and especially Quebec. The culture of each province stresses isolation from the rest of Canada. Quebec as the sole majority Francophone province is most clearly distinctive and alienated. British Columbia is an industrial province far removed from the metropolises of Central Canada, indeed separated by the Prairies with rather different political cultures. While much of Quebec history has been shaped by battles over clericalism, a fight unknown to English Canada, British Columbia has seen many fierce labor battles in the struggle -- also not found throughout Canada -- for socialism. The provincial party system of each is divorced from federal politics because the issues central to daily life in these provinces do not correspond to those in federal politics.

Table 6. Intercorrelations of Dimensions for Five-Factor Model:  
British Columbia and Quebec

	Level Consistency	Temporal Stability	Federal	Provincial	Strength
<i>Level Consistency</i>	1.00				
<i>Temporal Stability</i>	.30	1.00			
<i>Federal</i>	-.37	-.47	1.00		
<i>Provincial</i>	-.43	-.23	.57	1.00	
<i>Strength</i>	-.42	-.47	.32	.35	1.00

All correlations significant at  $p < .001$ .

Second, provincial stability and strength may be more closely connected to long-term attachments in these two provinces because the context of politics was changing from 1974 to 1979. In Quebec, the Quiet Revolution was in full force and the *Union Nationale* was fading as a provincial party, to be replaced by the *Parti Quebecois*. In British Columbia the break was not quite so recent, but the two major parties previously had competed in provincial politics -- and, indeed, not too long ago the Liberals even had been dominant. As the external stimuli changed, then, so did all aspects of provincial politics -- except the rather distinctive level consistency, which appears to be an enduring feature of British Columbia and Quebec politics impervious to which party constitutes the opposition (or perhaps even government) at a particular time.

The intercorrelations among the dimensions for these provinces generally are smaller than those for the rest of Canada. With a smaller sample, we *a priori* even expect higher correlations, so these results are not purely an artifact of comparing the incomparable. The average correlation for the eight provinces is .44; for British Columbia and Quebec it is .39. There is a small difference in the average associations for temporal stability (.41 and .37) and a somewhat larger one

for level consistency (.44 and .38). The greatest difference is found for the federal dimension, where the average correlations are .56 and .43, respectively.<sup>21</sup> The provincial and federal dimensions are correlated at .72 for the eight provinces, but only at .57 for British Columbia and Quebec. Much of the difference can be attributed to the different items loading on the provincial dimension in the two-province sample, but this very pattern calls attention to the varying structure of political competition there.

### **The Schema of Things Partisan**

Clearly, the partisan cognitive map of Canadians is multidimensional. Yet we know that the same holds for Americans, especially with respect to the distinction between party support and strength of identification (Weisberg 1980; Dennis 1988). In Canada a separate temporal stability dimension is found, whereas Dennis (1988) reported that variability over time hangs together with more general orientations toward the two parties. There is more evidence of chaos in Canada, reflecting “stable dealignment,” than of anything like a syndrome of weak partisanship. The five dimensions at best are moderately intercorrelated with each other.

Yet, there is also evidence of considerable structure, especially with respect to level consistency and separate factors for long-term attachments for federal and provincial attachments. Most Canadians live in “two political worlds” with rather disjointed linkages between federal and provincial politics. Residents of British Columbia and Quebec, with rather different patterns of party competition at the two levels, are most distinctive in this regard. For them there is a clear break between federal and provincial politics, as highlighted by nonoverlapping loadings between level consistency and other dimensions. The latter factor also has generally lower correlations with other factors in British Columbia and Quebec, especially with federal politics (-.37 versus -.50) and strength (-.48 versus -.42), compared to the rest of Canada. Level consistency seems to operate in its own sphere, as culturalists argue. It does not seem part of a more general syndrome, as institutionalists argue. Nor does split-level identification seem to vary across a wide range of indicators of efficacy, political trust, or participation, as an institutionalist (but not a historical/cultural) account would suggest (Uslaner 1989).

The divergent cognitive maps for the two subsamples also provide support for the historical/cultural thesis. These maps differ largely with respect to federal-provincial linkages. The temporal stability and strength dimensions -- and, indeed, even the federal factor -- appear largely the same for both groups of Canadians. Level consistency and the provincial factor differed most between the two subsamples. There is no evidence that overall constraint is greater for either group, so that there is not even a localized syndrome.

Conclusions about the portability of the American model must be tentative at best. It does not seem that the underlying psychological processes diverge greatly. In both countries the partisan maps are multidimensional. There is some evidence of a greater role for volatility in Canada. The greatest differences between the two countries reflect longer historical conflicts over the proper role of the federal government in Canada, which essentially are battles over national identity (Schwartz 1967) rather than different ways of conceptualizing about politics. In this sense, the American model can never be completely transferable, because that would entail grafting over 200 years of history with it.

## NOTES

\*The support of the General Research Board of the Graduate School and of the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences of the University of Maryland at College Park and of the Embassy of Canada for Faculty Enrichment and Research Awards is greatly appreciated. The data analysis was conducted at the University of Maryland Computer Science Center with data provided by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research. The ICPSR bears no responsibility for any interpretations herein. The assistance of Mike Wagner, Douglas Smith, and most especially Harold D. Clarke in making sense of these data is greatly appreciated, as are the comments of Gary D. Wekkin and Donald E. Blake. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1989 Meeting of the Association of Canadian Studies in the United States, San Francisco, CA, November 17-20.

<sup>1</sup> Wekkin (1991) finds that multiple identifiers in the Second Congressional District of Arkansas in the state's 1988 primary were not strongly polarized. It is unclear whether these findings are generalizable to Americans, since Wekkin's study focused on cross-over voters in primaries.

<sup>2</sup> The perspective is institutionalist because it derives from the argument that institutional design (the structure of federalism together with parliamentary government and its attendant party cohesion) is responsible for the alienation of the West from Central Canada (see Cairns 1968). This alienation forms the basis of weak party ties.

<sup>3</sup> I use the term "stability" to refer to temporal relations and "consistency" for cross-level attachments.

<sup>4</sup> This perspective stresses not institutional design, but patterns of Canadian history (and geography) to account for Western alienation and the country's bifurcated party system. It places heavy emphasis on the weak sense of nationhood in Canada as the proximate cause of split-level identification (Uslaner 1990).

<sup>5</sup> Here is where the institutionalist view of a syndrome may be something of a caricature. Even the most prominent institutionalists (LeDuc et al. 1984, 472, 482) acknowledge the importance of federalism in shaping split-level identification and suggest that inconsistency may derive from this tension in Canadian politics. Nevertheless, they do hypothesize that split-level partisanship will be associated with other dimensions of weak partisanship, as noted above.

<sup>6</sup> I do not presume any literal meaning for "chaos," much less any correspondence with "chaos theory," except in the sense that I expect some order even within disorder.



<sup>7</sup>The pattern of intercorrelations determines the identification of the model as well as potential multicollinearity problems. In the analyses that follow, correlations among the residuals are *not* reported since they have no import other than improving the goodness of fit of the models. Permitting these residuals to be correlated dramatically improves fits. Assuming that the residuals are not correlated among themselves leads to nonsensical results, especially when there is more than one indicator of the same concept, when one has reason to presume that measurement of one concept at time 1 bears on the value of other variables at the same time, or when variables appear to have some elements in common even if they do not form the same general dimension. The non-zero correlations estimated may vary somewhat from one analysis to another, depending upon the collinearity problems that may result from specifications for different subsamples.

<sup>8</sup>The data were weighted by the 1974-79 panel weights. I did not employ the 1980 wave because of loss of cases due to missing values, a problem already too severe in the present analysis.

<sup>9</sup>This is a dummy variable set at 1 for those respondents who had consistent party identifications (regardless of strength) between levels of government in 1979, and at 0 for those with inconsistent identifications. Respondents with no identification at *either* level were excluded from the analysis.

<sup>10</sup>This variable (and the next) were constructed from questions in the National Election Study asking respondents how they voted in the 1974 (1979) federal election and the most recent provincial election.

<sup>11</sup>All stability variables were measured using reported identifications or voting behavior at each time point in the panel study. Retrospective measures were *not* employed.

<sup>12</sup>The Canadian National Election Studies, unlike the American analyses, contain three categories of identification (very strong, strong, not very strong). The fourth category is non-identification.

<sup>13</sup>Estimation of the covariance or correlation matrices would not have resolved this problem, since matrices based upon pairwise deletion of missing data would have produced highly unstable and unreliable estimates. Assigning missing values to the lowest (or zero) categories is highly questionable and probably would distort the results even more.

<sup>14</sup>The Tucker-Lewis coefficient has an intuitive appeal. It is based upon the correspondence of the Chi Square for the estimated model and that for a null model (assuming that each variable constitutes an independent dimension). If the two Chi Squares are equal, the coefficient is zero. The general formula is:

$$\text{Chi Square (null) - Chi Square (estimated) / Chi Square (null)}$$

<sup>15</sup>I estimated many more models than I report.

<sup>16</sup>In each of the analyses one variable per dimension must have its standard error fixed at zero to identify the model. Variables so fixed are identified by asterisks in the tables. The 1979 provincial elections generally were closer in time to the federal election than occurred in 1974. This is the most likely explanation for the insignificant coefficient for 1979 vote consistency.

<sup>17</sup>These figures differ, but only slightly, from the somewhat larger (N = 582) sample analyzed in Uslaner (1990).

<sup>18</sup>The Liberals had a promising, if mild, resurgence in the 1991 BC provincial elections.

<sup>19</sup>In one case, the loading of vote stability on the federal dimension, the significance level also differs.

<sup>20</sup>The fit for any of these models may be underestimated. LISREL, like regression analysis, presumes intervally measured variables with normally distributed error terms. Since 14 of the 16 variables are dummies and the other two are ordinal, clearly both of these assumptions are violated, thus biasing the results toward worse fits. Attempts to improve the model by permitting more pairs of residuals to be correlated were confounded by multicollinearity, while models with a sixth dimension led to identification problems.

<sup>21</sup>The provincial and strength dimensions have average correlations that are similar across the two subsamples (.43 versus .40 and .37 versus .39). In all cases the average intercorrelations for all of Canada and for the eight-province subsample were virtually identical. Three gaps were .02 and two were .01.

## REFERENCES

- Blake, Donald E. 1982. The Consistency of Inconsistency: Party Identification in Federal and Provincial Politics. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 15: 691-710.
- Blake, Donald E. with David J. Elkins and Richard Johnston. 1985. *Two Political Worlds: Parties and Voting in British Columbia*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Bowler, Shaun. 1990. Consistency and Inconsistency in Canadian Party Identifications: Towards an Institutional Approach. *Electoral Studies* 9: 133-145.
- Budge, Ian, Ivor Crewe, and Dennis Farlie, eds. 1976. *Party Identification and Beyond*. London: John Wiley.
- Cairns, Alan C. 1968. The Electoral System and the Party System in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 1: 55-80.
- Campbell, Angus, Phillip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley.
- Clarke, Harold D. and Marianne Stewart. 1987. Partisan Inconsistency and Partisan Change in Federal States: The Case of Canada. *American Journal of Political Science* 31: 383-407.
- Dennis, Jack. 1988. Political Independence in America, Part II: Towards a Theory. *British Journal of Political Science* 18: 197-219.
- Elkins, David J. 1978. Party Identification: A Conceptual Analysis. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 11:419-435.
- Fiorina, Morris P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jacobson, Gary C. and Samuel Kernell. 1981. *Strategy and Choice in Congressional Elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jenson, Jane. 1975. Party Loyalty in Canada: The Question of Identification. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 8: 543-553.
- Johnston, Richard. 1985. Federal and Provincial Voting: Contemporary Patterns and Historical Evolution. In David J. Elkins and Richard Simeon, eds., *Small Worlds: Provinces and Parties in Canadian Political Life*. Toronto: Methuen.
- Joreskog, Karl G. and Dag Sorbom. 1984. *LISREL VI: Analysis of Linear Structural Relationships by the Method of Maximum Likelihood*, third ed. Mooresville: Scientific Software.

- LeDuc, Lawrence. 1984a. Canada: The Politics of Stable Dealignment. In Russell J. Dalton, Scott C. Flanagan, and Paul Allen Beck, eds., *Electoral Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984b. The Dynamic Properties of Party Identification: A Four-Nation Comparison. In Richard G. Niemi and Herbert F. Weisberg, eds., *Controversies in Voting Behavior*. Washington: CQ Press.
- LeDuc, Lawrence, Harold D. Clarke, Jane Jenson, and Jon H. Pammett. 1984. Partisan Instability in Canada: Evidence from a New Panel Study. *American Political Science Review* 78: 470-484.
- Lodge, Milton G. and Ruth Hamill. 1986. A Partisan Scheme for Political Information Processing. *American Political Science Review* 80: 505-519.
- Martinez, Michael D. 1990. Partisan Reinforcement in Context and Cognition: Canadian Federal Partisanship, 1974-79. *American Journal of Political Science* 34: 822-845.
- Miller, Arthur H., Martin P. Wattenberg, and Oksana Malanchuk. 1986. Schematic Assessments of Presidential Candidates. *American Political Science Review* 80: 521-540.
- Niemi, Richard G., Richard S. Katz, and David Newman. 1980. Reconstructing Past Partisanship: The Failure of Party Identification Recall Questions. *American Journal of Political Science* 24: 633-651.
- Schwartz, Mildred. 1967. *Public Opinion and Canadian Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Smith, David E. 1975. *Prairie Liberalism: The Liberal Party in Saskatchewan*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. *The Regional Decline of a National Party: Liberals on the Prairies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sniderman, Paul M., H.D. Forbes, and Ian Melzer. 1974. Party Loyalty and Electoral Volatility: A Study of the Canadian Party System. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 7: 268-288.
- Sullivan, John L. and Stanley Feldman. 1979. *Multiple Indicators*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Uslaner, Eric M. 1989. Multiple Party Identifiers in Canada: Participation and Affect. *Journal of Politics* 51: 993-1003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. Splitting Image: Partisan Affiliations in Canada's Two Political Worlds. *American Journal of Political Science* 34: 961-981.
- Valentine, David C. and John R. Van Wingen. 1980. Partisanship, Independence, and the Partisan Identification Question. *American Politics Quarterly* 8: 165-186.
- Wattenberg, Martin P. 1982. Party Identification and Party Image: A Comparison of Britain, Canada, Australia, and the United States. *Comparative Politics* 15: 23-40.
- Wekkin, Gary D. 1991. Why Crossover Voters Are Not Mischievous Voters. *American Politics Quarterly* 19: 229-247.
- Whitaker, Reginald. 1985. Party and State in the Liberal Era. In Hugh G. Thorburn, ed., *Party Politics in Canada*, fifth ed. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall.
- Williams, Robert J. 1985. Ontario's Political Systems: Federal and Provincial. In Hugh G. Thorburn, ed., *Party Politics in Canada*, fifth ed. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall.
- Zeller, Richard A. and Edward G. Carmines. 1980. *Measurement in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.