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政黨認同測量的爭議：單一面向或是多層面向

摘要

自從1950年代以來，行為學派研究者嘗試運用各種不同的分析途徑與測量方式，對於「政治態度」（political attitudes）的概念與相關議題進行瞭解。實證研究發現，選民的政治態度與其本身的政治行為有著顯著的關係。在各類的政治態度面向之中，「政黨認同」（party identification）乃是一項重要的心理成分，它是個人整體的價值觀念與信仰系統中關鍵的一環。此外，就比較政治的觀點而言，在一個政治體系中，多數選民政黨認同的分佈及強度與該體系的穩定與否亦有著密切的關係。鑑於政黨認同研究具有重要的理論意涵，此「文獻評議」（review essay）嘗試回顧與評析過去數十年間美國政治學界研究政黨認同的重要參考文獻，特別着重於測量面向的議題。儘管政黨認同係屬單一面向或是多層面向的論辯，學界仍眾說紛紜、尚無定見。然而，本文以為，單一面向的測量方式顯然有其不足之處，反觀多層面向的測量雖較為複雜，但卻為理論建構提供更完整的資訊，尤其對於若干多黨體制的政治環境，無疑地，瞭解這些學術論辯，對於政黨認同的測量以及諸多研究領域的探究，例如「政黨重組」（party realignment）、「政黨解構」（party dealignment）、「分裂投票」（split-ticket voting）、「策略性投票」（strategic voting）等，將頗有助益。
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Introduction

Behavioral research on political attitudes has employed a variety of measures and found that political attitudes are significantly associated with a wide range of political behaviors (cf. Converse, 1964; Milbrath and Goel, 1977; Stone and Schaffner, 1988; Conway, 1991; Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993; Abramson, Aldrich, and Rohde, 1995; Miller and Shanks, 1996). In the attitude-to-behavior process, the concept of party identification—“the individual’s affective orientation to an important group-object in his environment” (Campbell et al., 1976: 121)—appears to be a primary political orientation and an important theoretical component in studies of individual attitude sets.

Although party ID is widely employed in models of political behavior, it remains somewhat contentious in terms of both its meaning and its measurement. One debate exists as to whether party ID is really a psychological attachment to a political party,¹ a retrospective evaluation of past experience with political parties (Fiorina, 1981, 1984; Gerber and Green, 1998), a reflection of current vote intention (Budge and Farlie, 1976; Thomassen, 1976), or some other variant of one of these conceptualizations (Box-Steffensmeier and Smith, 1996; Erickson, MacKuan, and Stimson, 1998). Another debate exists as to how the concept of party ID should be measured, and it is the topic of this work.

Specifically, this research largely focuses on whether or not party ID is a multidimensional concept, and, if so, whether or not the traditional seven-point scale

¹ As Converse and Pierce (1985: 143) noted, some research treated party ID as a psychological term (an attitude, a predisposition, or an abiding identification), while other studies considered it a sign of behavioral commitment, such as formal party membership or a pattern of support in the elections.
It may seem arguable for the topic of measurement of party ID to be presented as something separate from the topic of what party ID “really is.” However, as Fiorina (1984: 422-423) noted, the traditional measure of party ID may imply different explications. For example, the meaning of categorization as a “strong Republican” is different if one conceptualizes party ID as a psychological attachment as opposed to a retrospective evaluation, but the operationalization need not be altered. Furthermore, if party ID is purely a reflection of current vote intention, a separate measure of the concept would not be required. Previous research has shown that this is not the case in the American context (Shively, 1980; Erickson, MacKuan, and Stimson, 1998; Hetherington, 2001), and foregoing narrative has cast doubt on this interpretation in the European and Japanese contexts as well (Richardson, 1991; Katz, 1979; Green, Palmquist, and Schickler, 1998).

For these purposes, this study views party ID as a theoretical construct, and the “actual” meaning of the concept considered to some extent open. It should be noted that the utility of the construct lies in its representation of a long-tern disposition toward politics. To that extent, Converse and Pierce (1985: 145) asserted that measures of party ID, as opposed to other types of partisan feelings, should reflect

---

2 The traditional measure is used in the American National Election Studies (NES) conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan (Campbell et al., 1974: 122). The initial question is this: “Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?” Those who classify themselves as Republicans or Democrats are also asked, “Would you call yourself a strong (Republican, Democrat) or a not very strong (Republican, Democrat)?” Those who classify themselves as Independents are asked the following question: “Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican or Democratic Party?”

3 For example, party attachments can be disrupted in systems such as that in Canada, where new political parties emerge that pit linguistic, ethnic, and regional identities against preexisting party identities (Schickler and Green 1997), or in Italy, where party labels change (Converse and Pierce, 1985).
“an extended time horizon” which would be given credence in evaluating various operationalizations of the concept. Otherwise, the criteria for the evaluation rest on the ability of measures to “mirror the electorate’s perceptions of party stimuli” (Jacoby, 1982: 34). This should be one of the weaknesses of the traditional seven-point measurement.

Dimensionality Problem of Measuring Party ID

The Michigan researchers who developed the traditional party ID measure hypothesized that party ID would be associated not only with the direction of individual political attitudes, opinions, and electoral choices but with the extent of individual involvement in politics as well (e.g., Campbell et al., 1976: chap. 6; Milbrath and Goel, 1977; Conway, 1991; Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993; Miller and Shanks, 1996). In their view, independents tend to be less concerned about politics, have less political information, less interested in political activities, and tend to vote less. Partisans, in contrast, are more involved and informed, more likely to register and vote, to talk about politics, to evaluate the outcomes of elections, to discuss candidates’ campaign promises, to try to influence others, to engage in campaign activities, and so on. Partisans are also treated as the object of mobilization efforts by political parties, so partisans tend to participate more actively in the political process. In short, the strength of an individual’s attachment to a party is viewed to drive his/her level of political involvement.

Evidence has been found that level of political involvement does vary with strength of partisan attachment, however. This runs contrary to the widely accepted notion of partisans as active persons who evaluate political objects from partisan position. One of the first indications that something might be wrong with the
traditional measure is the “intransitivity” problem. Contrary to the above hypothesis, Petrocik (1974) demonstrated that independent “leaners” are more politically involved than “weak” partisans, who presumably have a stronger attachment to a party than the former group. Some research (Weisberg, 1980; Weiberg and Smith, 1991) also indicated a tendency for Republican/Democratic “leaners” to vote for candidates of their party in greater proportions than weak partisans do as well. In a later work, Keith and his associates (1992) employed NES data since the 1950s, finding that “independent leaners” vote like outright partisans and resemble partisans in many behaviors and attitudes. Only a few are “pure” independents; removing these “independent leaners” leaves only a small core of fewer than 10% of total voters who are pure independents.

Additional evidence began to mount that cast doubt on the utility of the traditional measure. The seven-point measure of party ID assumes that partisan preferences are arrayed along a single dimension ranging from strong Democrats at one end to strong Republicans at the other with independents located in the middle. To the extent, this representation accurately reflects perception of party stimuli, and one would expect that: 1) persons who most positively evaluate one party would evaluate the other party most negatively; 2) persons who positively evaluate one party would like independents better than they would opposition party identifiers; and, 3) when individual party IDs do change, persons should move to adjacent categories rather than moving to opposite ends of the spectrum. Empirical findings indicate that none of these expectations is necessarily true.

Evaluations of the opposition party have been found to be largely independent of one’s own party ID. For example, Weisberg (1980: 45-47) analyzed the 1964-1976 NES data, finding that the correlations between Democrat and Republican
feeling thermometers ranged from low to zero. Similarly, Magiotto and Piereson (1977) used six NES national election survey data set conducted from 1964 and 1974 (three presidential elections and three midterm elections), finding only a modest relationship between the traditional party ID measure and feeling toward the opposition. Their findings supported for a “hostility hypothesis” that suggests that the likelihood that a person will vote consistently with his party ID increases with the extent of his hostility to the opposition party. Note that evaluations of the opposition are independent, long-term variables that improve to explain and predict individual’s electoral behavior.

With regard to the second expectation, which concerns independents, Weisberg (1980: 39) found that 48% of respondents who expressed an affinity for either Democrats or Republicans expressed stronger affect for the opposite party than for independents. Likewise, Jacoby (1982: 40) administered a short questionnaire to 105 students in undergraduate political science courses at the University of North Carolina in 1979, finding that 35% (n = 35) of his sample expressed a partisan preference ordering inconsistent with the single dimension assumed by the traditional measure.

With respect to the third expectation, which concerns switching partisans, Katz (1979) found evidence that when strong partisans change their party preference, they tend to become strong partisans of the opposite party, rather than moving to a weaker position along the continuum. This, of course, is a movement of great distance.

\[\text{\footnotesize{As Katz (1979: 152) found, for the American data, those changing from strong Republicans to Democrats between 1956 and 1958 or between 1958 and 1960 were more likely to become strong Democrats and least likely to become independents leaning toward the Democratic party. The converse was true for those shifting from strong Democrats to Republicans between 1956 and 1958, while between 1958 and 1960 the model pattern from strong Democrats to Republicans was to become weak Republicans, ahead of both strong}}\]
along the traditional scale and is inconsistent with the conventional wisdom. According to Katz, this conclusion is amply supported by the results of the multidimensional scaling analysis.

Findings such as those briefly outlined here have led many researchers to question the dimensionality of the concept of party ID (Dennis, 1988a, 1988b; Valentine and Van Wingen, 1980; Kamieniecki, 1985; Richardson, 1991). Perhaps the most prominent proponent of the multidimensionality of party ID is developed by Weisberg (1980, 1983). Weisberg remarked that, though individuals tend to identify themselves with only one group in a given domain, it is certainly possible to have positive affect for more than one group within that domain. For example, individuals might be fans of more than one football team; people might consider themselves Catholic while not disliking Protestants, etc. He further noted that rejection of identity with established groups within a domain does not necessarily entail rejection of the basic ideas associated with that domain (e.g. non-denominational Christians), and that lack of identification with established groups might be a positive source of identification.

According to Weisberg, when we refer the above assumption to party ID, then individuals could not meaningfully be arrayed along the single dimension which is assumed by the traditional seven-point party ID measure. For example, those who consider themselves both independent and partisan might have strong affect for both Democrats and Republicans, etc. By using the 1980 NES new-formed party ID question survey data set, Weisberg performed a factor analysis and found the possible

Republicans and independents leaning toward the Republican party. In the British case between 1964 and 1970, the greatest number of very strong supporters who changed party became fairly strong supporters of their new parties.
existence of the four-dimensional structure. The factors generated were interpreted by Weisberg as representing “political independence,” “partisan strength,” “partisan direction,” and “orientation toward the party system.”

The first, and probably the most important, takes into consideration the possibility that strength of party ID and strength of independence from separate dimensions. “Political independence,” according to Weisberg (1980: 56), “appears to be a complex topic, with many different types of respondents being combined as independents in the standard scales. A more careful examination of independents is likely to show meaningful differences among these different types.” Of importance here is the idea that individuals may positively identify with the ideal of independence while maintaining strong affect for a political party. To the extent that such individuals exist, the traditional measure is clearly inadequate, as it gives no indication of the strength of party ID of individuals who consider themselves first as independents or vice versa (Valentine and Van Wigen, 1980: 167-168). Furthermore, as Miller and Wattenberg (1983) and Hetherington (2001) pointed out that the traditional measure could confuse respondents who may positively identify with

---

5 The 1980 NES survey asked respondents: “In you own mind, do you think of yourself as a supporter of one of the political parties, or not?” Those who answered yes were asked which party they supported and to indicate the strength of that support on a seven-point scale: “On this scale from 1 to 7 (where 1 means “not very strongly, and 7 means “very strongly”), please choose the number that describes how strongly you feel.” They were then asked to indicate their closeness to the Republican or Democratic Party on a seven-point scale with one party at either end. Respondents who answered that they were not supporters were asked: “Do you ever think of yourself as closer to one of the two major political parties, or not?” Respondents who said yes were presented with the seven-point scale on which they could designate the degree of their closeness to one or the other party. Next, all respondents were asked “Do you ever think of yourself as a political independent, or not?” Those who said yes were asked to indicate “how strongly independent in politics you feel” on a seven-point scale. Respondents not thinking of themselves as independents were assigned the value of zero on this scale. Additionally, the thermometer rating of “political parties, in general” in the survey gave a measure of anti-party system views (Weisberg, 1980: 50; Keith et al., 1992: 188-189).
independence with respondents who identify neither with independence nor a political party.

The second and third components of party ID are the dimensions of “partisan strength” and “direction.” As stated previously, because positive affect for one party does not necessarily entail negative affect for the other, Weisberg (1980: 42-44) proposed a three-dimensional model that posits separate attitudes toward Republicans, Democrats, and independents. He constructed a “party difference” scale by subtracting the feeling thermometer for Democrats from that of Republicans and used the traditional measure to break ties. This procedure yields a seven-point scale whose categories are labeled similarly to those of the traditional measure. The idea behind the scale is different since partisan strength is measured relative to one’s evaluation of the opposition party. In correlating this measure with the vote, the test is, in effect, an examination of Maggiotto and Piereson’s (1977) hostility hypothesis. Weisberg found that the party difference scale had a higher association with vote than the traditional measure, adding additional confirmation to the existence of separate party dimensions.

With respect to the fourth possible dimension of party ID, according to Weisberg, is proposed which would rank individuals in accordance with their overall evaluations of the party system. It should be noted that Kamieniecki (1985) replied the Weisberg analysis and produced the same four factors, but his attempt to provide construct validation for the party system factor failed. As far as I know, no other

\footnote{It should be emphasized that in a three-dimensional space strong Democrats might lie adjacent to strong Republicans, thus accounting for the strange pattern of movement noted by Katz (1979: 150, 152).}

\footnote{Note that Kamieniecki’s (1985) analysis produced similar results with regard to a number of variables, causing him to conclude that the party difference index is a superior measure of}
empirical studies have yet supported the existence of this fourth dimension.

The main pieces of evidence for the existence of separate Republican and Democratic dimensions are findings of low correlations between the party feeling thermometers and between the traditional measure and party thermometers, as well as the effectiveness of the party difference scale. Some researchers challenged the first two findings on the basis of their failure to take measurement error into consideration (Green, 1988; Schickler and Green, 1997). With error corrected, they found that positive evaluations of one party are strongly and negatively correlated with evaluations of the opposition.

An additional critique, which applies to the party difference scale as well, is that feeling thermometer questions could lack wording capable of establishing an “extended time horizon” and therefore could be seriously influenced by short-term electoral issues. Some party scholars analyzing panel data and supported this argument by demonstrating that the traditional measure predicts future vote better than thermometer based measures (Converse and Pierce, 1985; McDonald and Howell, 1982; Schickler and Green, 1997).

Given the above critiques and Weisberg’s conclusion that the traditional party ID measure appears to do fairly well in terms of tapping partisan direction, it would seem that insufficient evidence exists that the electorate perceives party stimuli in three-dimensional terms, and that no modification to the traditional measure is necessary in order to take into account separate party dimensions. Evidence for a two-dimensional model of party ID, which posits separate independence and party ID dimensions, is much stronger than for either of the alternative models presented thus
far. As discussed earlier, the major criticisms of the traditional measure are its failures to estimate partisan strength among independents or independence strength among partisans, as well as its problems in distinguishing true independents from persons with no partisan preference. These failures are of little consequence if the electorate perceives independence as simply the absence of party ID or does not express positive attachment to both parties and independence. However, as mentioned previously, there is evidence that this is not the case for significant portions of the American and European voters.

The 1980 and 1982 NES surveys contained an alternative measure of party ID that included a separate strength of independence measure.8 The alternative measure allows an assessment of the number of respondents who identify themselves as partisans and independents as well as those who identify themselves as neither. Asking whether or not a person considers himself a “supporter” of a party apparently created a more stringent test of party ID than that provided by the traditional measure, and generated a much higher proportion of independents. Otherwise, the new party support scale (not including the strength of independence component) behaved in a similar manner to the traditional scale in terms of predicting vote, and the two measures seemed to be tapping the same underlying concept (Dennis, 1988a, 1988b).

Of particular interest here are analysis conducted using the combined party support and strength of independence measures. 16.4% (n = 156) of the 1980 total sample (N = 1,008) considered themselves both independent and partisan, and 27.9% (n = 266) considered themselves neither with the remainder of the sample classified either as “ordinary” partisans or independents. The distribution provides empirical

8 The wordings for the alternative measure of party ID see Footnote 5.
evidence that separate orientations toward party ID and independence do exist, and that the absence of party ID is not necessarily perceived to be the same as independence. When the combined measure is crosstabulated with the folded traditional scale, it is clear that there is very little relationship between the two measures. Among those classified as weak partisans (N = 369) on the traditional scale, for example, about 31% (n = 114) considered themselves neither party supporters nor independents. Independents on the traditional scale were distributed equally across the “ordinary” independent (independent but not partisan) and “unattached” (neither partisan nor independent) categories, etc. It is also clear that considering oneself an independent does not preclude strong party ID. Among those classified as strong partisans (N = 280) on the traditional scale, 30% (n = 84) of respondents who considered themselves both independents and party supporters [All of the above findings are cited in Dennis (1988a: 85) and Weisberg (1980: 52)].

Separation of independence strength from partisan strength reveals that strong independence is associated with characteristics of the “classical” independent voter. Contrary to findings based on the traditional scale’s independence category, strong independents have been found to rank higher than non-independents on measures of political interest, attentiveness, and voting frequency. Furthermore, “leaners” on the traditional scale, a group largely comprised of “ordinary” independents on the new measures, are more active than weak partisans with regard to non-partisan forms of political activity (Kamieniecki, 1985). Perhaps most interesting is the finding that respondents who identify both as partisans and independents are more politically involved than either ordinary independents or partisans, who are about equally involved, with the “unattached” being least involved. Dennis (1998a) demonstrated that they are also, among other things, highest in terms of political cognition and
awareness and the most likely to identify themselves ideologically.

“Independence” itself may be a multidimensional phenomenon and may connote different things for different people. As an example, Dennis (1998b) explored the meaning of political independence and found four separate aspects: political autonomy (a positive view of independence in terms of such value of individualism), antipartyism (independence due to a negative view of political parties), partisan neutrality (independence due to neutrality between political parties), and partisan variability (a view of oneself as switching between political parties).

The existing literature evidently indicated that the traditional measure of party ID tends to lump respondents together in various categories of party ID who share very divergent perspectives on independence (Green, Palmquist, and Schickler, 1998). Partisan independents appear to be individuals as having a positive attachment to the ideal of independence while maintaining an affinity for the issue positions of a political party. Ordinary independents appear to exhibit the former attributes of independent partisans but not the latter, with the reverse being true for ordinary partisans. Persons, who express attachment neither to parties nor independence clearly are alienated, yet can be found on the traditional scale in the same category as those with positive attachments.

This “lumping” could have various consequences for the studies of political behavior. As indicated earlier, for example, the ranks of the weak partisans include a substantial number of persons who are categorized as “unattached” who, in turn, have been found to be the least involved politically. “Leaners” are comprised largely of the more involved ordinary independents. These problems together might produce difficulties to explain matters such as Petrocik’s “intransitivity” problem and
clearly must be given consideration in any research geared toward the explanation of political participation.

Despite the evidence presented, skepticism remains as to the utility of a multidimensional party ID model. McDonald and Howell (1982) rejected the model, though they did not directly address the Weisberg/Dennis findings. Instead, they focused their attack on Katz’s (1979) and Valentine and Van Wingen’s (1980) analyses. McDonald and Howell argued that since leaners are purported to have dual attachments and since such attachments are purported not to be well represented on the traditional measure, then the traditional measure must be a more ambiguous stimuli for such persons and their responses should be less reliable. In demonstrating that leaners’ responses to the party ID questions are no less reliable than those of others, McDonald and Howell found no support for the two-dimensional interpretation.

McDonald and Howell’s arguments in these instances are not compelling, however. Katz’s multidimensional scaling results are consistent across two panels and two countries and are, therefore, resistant to a “chance” interpretation. In addition, as Jacoby (1982: 35) and Erickson, MacKuan, and Stimson (1998: 901) pointed out, it is possible that both unidimensional and multidimensional perceptions of party ID exist in the electorate, and findings indicated above would strongly indicate that this is the case. Some persons apparently do perceive of party ID unidimensionally, a fact that weakens Katz’s empirical results, but not, necessarily, 9

9 Both Katz’s multidimensional scaling analysis (which supported a two-dimensional outcome in the American case) and his findings with regard to movement between strong partisan categories are dismissed as being largely the result of random fluctuation due to measurement error. Valentine and Van Wingen’s research is based on the idea that independent leaners on the traditional scale have dual attachments to independence and party ID.
the validity of his interpretation. As to the critique of Valentine and Van Wingen (1980), McDonald and Howell (1982), though arguing to the contrary, clearly confuse reliability with validity. In short, there is no reason why, when presented with a consistent stimulus, a leaner would have any reason to give less consistent responses than anyone else is. The problem, as indicated by the evidence presented above, is that the stimulus about independence actually means different things to different people, not that it is perceived as ambiguous.

Fiorina (1984: 423) questioned the “strange notion of affect toward ‘independence’” in expressing doubts about a multidimensional conceptualization of the party ID. However, independence is not a group to which one might express attachment, nor the outcome of a retrospective evaluation of the political parties. Rather, it could be a norm to which an individual exhibits more or less awareness and allegiance. Viewed in this light, the idea of a positive orientation, or affect, toward the norm of independence seems less “strange.”

It is clear that party ID includes a separate independence dimension. Nevertheless, the idea does not fit neatly with the major conceptualizations of party ID. The notion of political independence in the current context derives its meaning from the notion of political party, since the political party is the object from which the individual is or is not declaring independence. It seems reasonable that an orientation toward independence should be included within the domain of the party ID concept.

Closely related to the concept of multidimensional party ID are findings indicating that some respondents express different party IDs at different levels of government. Hadley (1985) and Gerber and Green (1998) emphasized that
multi-level IDs are consistent with a multidimensional model, and Niemi, Wright, and Powell (1987) demonstrated that some of the intransitivities in the traditional measure disappear when consideration is given to party ID at different levels. Of particular interest here are Jennings and Niemi’s (1966) finding that mixed identifiers, individuals who hold different party IDs at different levels of government (usually partisan at one level and independent at another), resemble the “independent citizen voter.” In this, they also appear to resemble politically involved independent partisans (Weisberg and Smith, 1991; Gerber and Green, 1998). At least, it appears that party ID as a multidimensional concept and multi-level party ID are tapping the same phenomenon.

**Conclusion**

The question addressed here was whether or not the traditional seven-point scale of party ID adequately reflects the electorate’s perceptions of party stimuli. With regard to the direction of party ID, the answer is positive. In general, persons who express affinity for the Republican party tend to evaluate Democrats negatively and vice versa, indicating that Democrats and Republicans do lie at opposite ends of a bipolar scale as represented on the traditional measure. Furthermore, alternative measures which sought to take into account separate orientations toward Democrats and Republicans were found to be relatively unreliable, and inadequate for capturing long-term political dispositions.

An additional problem with the traditional scale not addressed above is its assumption of equal intervals between partisan categories. Research indicated that this assumption is unwarranted, and that the measure systematically understates the distance between categories on the Republic side of the scale (Jacoby, 1982: 35-36).
Furthermore, the distance between categories has been shown to fluctuate somewhat over time (Fiorina, 1984: 411). One solution to this problem would be to create “I-scales” (in Jacoby’s terminology) by having respondents rank preference orders for the seven categories on the traditional scale and then “unfold” these scales to form a interval level measure. The idea of “I-scales” is heuristic, but the problem is that the procedure cannot be accomplished using available mass survey data. It would appear fruitful for future researchers to develop a measure that could be so used.

As previously indicated, the traditional measure seems to work about as well as available alternatives in models of partisan direction items, and, therefore, seems adequate for these purposes. However, the traditional measure has some serious disadvantages. Its underlying assumption that independence necessarily represents the absence of the party ID seems unrealistic for a substantial portion of the electorate, and its use has led to apparently false characterizations of persons who consider themselves independent. In addition, some persons do not place independents in the middle of a bipolar partisan continuum. A separate measure of strength of independence should be needed.

A problem here is that the measure described above in some detail is available only for the 1980 and 1982 NES surveys, which severely limits its utility. In any event, a multidimensional model of party ID is capable of accounting for all of the phenomena explained by the traditional unidimensional model, and for some phenomena that the traditional model cannot explain (e.g., the intransitivity problem). Viewed in this light, it may be time that the traditional model be replaced.

---

10 As Jacoby (1982: 36-37) pointed out, such a procedure has the additional advantage of not
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