Direction and Strength of Voter's Party Identification in Taiwan after 2000

Ching-Hsin Yu[*]

abstract

Based on the TEDS 2001 survey data, this article focuses on the characters and the concomitant impacts on voters' behavior of the direction and strength of voters' party identification in Taiwan. It firstly provides a general sketch of direction and strength of voters' party identification in Taiwan. Then it continues to examine the voting consistency of three major party supporters according to the strength of party identification. The results show that those who possess stronger party identification are more stable in their voting patterns and the DPP supporters have the most consistent voting behavior than those of the KMT and the PFP. An ordered logit analysis presents a significant association between voters' sense of

checks-and-balances, strength and direction of party identification and their consistency of party support. Lastly, this article indicates that the existence of dual or multiple party identification among those KMT and PFP supporters might effect the cooperation and competition between the two parties in elections and thus result in reshuffling of the party system in Taiwan.

I. Introduction

As a member of the third wave democratization, Taiwan has experienced dramatic changes in its party system similar to others found throughout the states of the world. Foremost among these changes is that voters have changed the political parties that they support. If voter's party identification remains strong and consistent then the formats of political parties will remain stable as well. As voters drift elsewhere, the relationship between parties and voters weakens. This is precisely what has happened in Taiwan over the past decade, as shown in Appendix 1, and has become especially pronounced since the 2000 presidential election. The once all-powerful Kuomintang (KMT) which, despite capturing over 54% of the vote in the 1996 presidential election, was relegated to the role of opposition after its defeat in the presidential election of 2000. In the same period the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) witnessed an increase in its voter base, while new parties such as the People's First Party (PFP) and the Taiwan Solidarity Union (TSU) came into being. The shift in voter's partisan support has been significant enough that it has resulted in a change of Taiwan's party system.

Conventional wisdoms have emphasized the importance of party identification in the study of voting behavior. The utility of this concept and its relevant applications have been fervently discussed in American academies and provided valuable references for researchers in other countries. Even though many studies have explored the associations between voters' party identification and their political behaviors in Taiwan, it has been comparatively insufficient in the discussions on the direction and strength of voter's party identification. The goal of this essay is to understand the changing voter-party relationship through an analysis of voters' party identification in Taiwan after the 2000 presidential election. In particular, the direction and strength of

voters' party identification and their associational impacts on voters' attitudes and behaviors will be addressed. These will be done through an analysis of survey data collected in the project of 2001 Taiwan's Election and Democratization Study (TEDS 2001).[1]

II. Party Identification Revisited

In the study of voting behaviour, the concept of partisanship, or the relationship that a voter has, or perceives to have with a given political party, is of significant importance. One central concept to this study is party identification. Through the concept of party identification one can hope to develop a better understanding of the voter-party relationship. In addition to party identification, researchers have also developed variables, such as party support, party preference, party thermometer, party image, and party closeness, in an attempt to further an understanding of the voter-party relationship.[2]

Previous discussions of voter-party relationships, led by Campbell and others, (Campbell et al., 1954, 1960) developed a system of voter identification that centered

2. For more information about these discussions may also refer to Converse and Pierce (1985), Franklin (1985), Miller (1991), and Weisberg (1993).

on the concept of group theory. According to these discussions, voters identify or support an important political group, or party, based on their personal feelings and preferences. Their connections to a given party will also act to frame the voters' political values as they interpret issues and concerns presented to them. It is, therefore, not only a psychological attachment to a given party but also a cue for voters' political attitudes and actions. Moreover, these preferences may possess strong or weak levels. Some voters may maintain strong feelings toward a given party while others may have only weak, even neutral feelings toward a given party. For example, if we were to apply the above concept to the American party system, we might identify voters as either "Democrat" or "Republican" and label their strength of identification within seven categories; Strong Democrat, Weak Democrat, Independent Democrat, Independent, Independent Republican, Weak Republican, or Strong Republican (Weisberg, 1993: 684).

As the concept of party identification has gained its popularity, however, critics have focused on problems related to the dimensionality of party identification and transitivity of identification levels, such as "strong," "weak," and "independent". In reference to the problem of dimensionality critics pointed to the use of 'Democrat' and 'Republican' labelling of voters' party identification. Their concerns centered on the use of the two parties as polar opposites in the political spectrum with independent voters located somewhere in between. Voters were only allowed to choose "Democrat", "Republican" or "Independent" no matter how strong their party identification was. The problem of unidimensionality was addressed by Converse (1966) who talked about party identification of those living in Southern American states. He found that a small percentage of voters, while declaring support for a particular party, actually possessed a weak level of party identification and voted for different parties depending on specific electoral circumstances. More specifically, as Jennings and Niemi (1966) indicated, some voters might identify with more than one party when two types of

elections were held at the same time. In the elections for state governors, for example, voters might favour the Democratic Party while identifying with the Republican Party in the elections for state representatives.

The development of the partisan balance in the southern United States at the beginning of 1980s also highlighted the existence of voters' dual party identification. Voters did not solely support the Democratic Party as they had in the past. As voters' were provided with more alternative candidates, Republicans were able to increase their support due to the tendency of people's latent dual party identification to come to the fore. Hadley's study (1985) pointed out that most voters had at least two types of party identification; with one type being based on state party identification while the other was rooted in national party identification. He further demonstrated that the percentage of Democratic supporters was higher in some states than their support nationally. By contrast, Republican support was roughly equivalent at both the state and national levels. In conclusion, it was found that the identification of Democratic Party supporters was more multi-party oriented than was Republican supporters.

Weisberg (1980) was also critical of the unidimensionality of party identification feeling that it could only accurately measure voter's feeling towards a particular party, and was not useful in comparing multiple parties across a spectrum. In practice voters might identify with two parties simultaneously. The Democratic and Republican parties were not at opposite extremes. Still, those labelled as 'Independents' were placed between the two parties within the political spectrum. They were classified as different from those who possessed some level of party identification when, but in fact, they might really have no identification with any political party or they might possess the same level of like or dislike to all parties. Voter's party identification should measure characteristics of partisanship or non-partisanship instead of assuming that the voter is either a Democrat or a Republican. Those labelled as 'Independents' were not necessarily apolitical and their relationships to political parties should be accurately

evaluated and not ignored. Weisberg's argument also pointed directly to the possibility that voter's multiple-party identification does exist. His hypothesis about differing party identification called for the development of more complex multi-faceted approaches to observing the relationship between voters and parties.

Doubt about the utility of party identification is also raised when conducting research outside the United States. Clarke's research of voter-party relationships in Canada found that Canadian voters' party identification was multi-party oriented that voters' party identification differed between national and provincial levels of government (Clarke et al., 1979). Clarke further categorized three types of voter's party identification. The first type was "consistent identifiers", or those who were clearly identified with a single party and were strong supporters of that party at both the national and local elections. The second type was "partial identifiers", or those who identified with a single party, but whose support was not as strong as those in the "consistent" category. The third type was 'split identifiers', or those who possessed multiple party identities that differed between the national and provincial levels. In Clarke's analysis, different levels of elections, either the national or local levels, provided voters with different sources of party identification. The direction and strength of voters' party identification in these elections were thus contingent on the locality of elections.

Furthermore, the studies of Uslaner (1990) and Stewart and Clarke (1998) also identified the structural factors behind Canadians' multi-party identification. These findings indicated that voters' multi-party identification did not only come from voters' social-psychological factors, but also from the electoral system and the cultural settings in which these elections took place. This was explained because different provinces within Canada have different party systems while national parties are often not as powerful or as popular as their provincial counterparts. Political parties at the provincial levels have developed stable power bases largely independent from their

national affiliates. Voters have thus developed multi-party support as a result of the mutually exclusive political spheres that have developed in Canada.

In regard to the problem of transitivity of identification levels, the established method of research postulated that different levels in the strength of identification would have different impacts on voter's political attitudes and behaviours. A common understanding is that voters will increase their political involvements as their strength of party identification increases. Hence, on the one hand, there would be difference among those strong partisan identifiers of two different parties in political views and activities. On the other hand, there would be also difference between strong partisan identifiers and weak partisan identifiers of the same party in political views and activities. So those classified as strong Democrats would be the most supportive to the ideology of the Democratic Party than those weak and independent Democrats. These strong identifiers also would be more attentive to Democratic Party activities than those weak and independents identifiers. Likewise, similar situation would be applied to the Republican identifiers.

However, these assertions of monotonicity in voters' strength of party identification were weakened by other studies. For example, Petrocik's (1974) findings put forth that those classified as independent identifiers would attend more political activities than those who were more strongly associated with a given party. Hadley's research (1985) also confirmed that even though the consistent identifiers were more likely to be involved in political activities than those partial and split identifiers, the later two types did not have significant differences in party support with each other.

Niemi's findings (et al., 1987) toned with Clarke's (1979) earlier research and challenged the traditional measurement of party identification. Niemi discovered that consistent identifiers usually identified strongly with one party, while some partial identifiers could be placed closer to the label of independent. The mixed identifiers, or Clarke's split identifiers, could not be completely classified as independents because of

their ability to display tendencies associated with consistent identifiers and support one party in either one or all levels of election. In the degree of political participation, even though consistent identifiers were found to be more active than partial or split identifiers but there were no significant differences between the multi-party identifiers and partial identifiers.

Part of Niemi's findings postulated that consistent identifiers would be more willing to attend political activities than partial identifiers. Uslaner's (1989) research on Canadian voters' party identification, however, had different findings. Uslaner found that the Canadian consistent identifiers did not attend political activities to the same degree than the split identifier group, and in fact found results to the opposite effect. This was especially true at the provincial level with split identifiers attending more political functions than the consistent identifiers. Besides attending political activities, the three groups of voters also showed little differences in their attitudes towards certain political values such as political efficacy and political trust.

Therefore, in terms of the direction of voter's party identification, it is reasonable for a voter to have a single, a dual, and even a multiple party identification at different levels of elections. Thus, consistent, partial, and split identifiers might be possibly seen during electoral surveys. Also, following Niemi and Uslaner's arguments, there are not clear-cut differences in participation among the strong, the weak, and the independent voters. In particular, they are not clearly delineated when weak partisan identifiers and independents are compared. The issue of multi-dimensionality of party identification has thus reminded researchers the practical limitations that exist and obstruct the study of party identification from having consistent findings.

Similar to the American studies, the concept of party identification is also a starting point and foundation to understand the voter-party relations in Taiwan. Many studies are either focused on describing the social bases of individual political party or trying to explore the significance of party identification in voters' vote decisions

(Chen, 1986, 1994; Chen, 2000; Liu, 1996, 1997; Chu, 1996). The concepts of party identification and ideas similar to it have often been used in research to help explain voting behaviour, participation in political activities, and political interests of a given group of voters. Unfortunately most studies usually take for granted and only utilize this concept in its models to explain voters' electoral behaviour. Only few studies have addressed to the issues of direction and strength of voter's party identification.

For example, Ho's essay (1990) introduced the contents of party identification and compared its use throughout the world. He suggested that researchers must adjust the concept to account for different cultures and political systems. The conclusion of his paper also discussed academic use of party identification in Taiwan, although he unfortunately did not make any specific references to help validate his argument. Ho and Wu (1996) further put the concept of party identification into their study of party competition in the mid-1990s. They compared the three parties' identifiers in terms of their party support, party preference, and party evaluation. In their research they asserted that the uni-dimensional measures traditionally applied to a two party system were no longer suitable for understanding Taiwan's multi-party democracy. The authors felt that newer approaches favoring a more comprehensive, value-oriented methodology that could accurately evaluate likes and dislikes as well as the strength of these feelings, might be better suited in helping researchers gain a better understanding of voters' party preference and identification.

Besides the methodological discussions of party identification, studies of Hsieh (1986; 1989) and Wang (1996) also pointed out the importance of electoral systems that help to shape voter's party support in Taiwan. Their studies focused on the voter's party support in different electoral systems, with special attention paid to the mechanical and psychological factors that effect the allocation of votes and the long-term effects on the development of party systems. More specifically, Hawang's (2001: 63-66) recent research proved that, in a single member plural system, voters

who had stronger party identification were more stable in voting, while voters who had weaker party identification were more likely to shift their votes from one party to another. However, in a multi-member district, voters who possessed stronger party identification were more likely to participate in strategic voting than those who possessed weaker identification.

Comparing to the studies of voter's voting decisions, the materials in the study of voter's partisan direction and strength have thus far proven to be insufficient in Taiwan. The TEDS project includes the direction and strength of voters' party identification provide researchers with a more complete picture of the relationship between political parties and the voters who support them. The next section of this paper will concentrate on attempting to provide the readers with a clearer understanding of the direction and strength of Taiwanese voters' party identification.[3]

III. Direction and Strength of Voter's Party Identification: A Basic Sketch

Table 1 depicts the distribution of direction and strength of voters' party identification in 2001. In analyzing the findings, one firstly discovers that those who have no particular party preference, or the party they prefer is statistically insignificant, stand at around 42% of respondents. Of those who possess a party preference, the governing party, the DPP, maintains a relative majority at around 31% of those sampled. Those who identified with the KMT and the PFP were roughly similar, in terms of the support they received, garnering between 12-13% of support from those interviewed. The support that smaller parties received was limited in nature. It is also

---

3. All the data used in this article are weighted. Relevant questionnaires and their measurements used in this article can be found in Appendix 2.

noteworthy to note that the percentage of those who strongly identified with a given party was not high. For example those who strongly identified with the DPP only registered 5.4% of the total sample, with the percentages of those who strongly identified with the KMT and the PFP were even lower. Most of those respondents possessed a moderate level of preference for the party chosen or declared themselves independent.

Table 1   Direction and Strength of Voters' Party Identification

Directions and Strengths	Frequency	Percent
KMT	274	13.6
Strongly Identify	48	2.4
Moderately Identify	226	11.2
DPP	625	30.8
Strongly Identify	110	5.4
Moderately Identify	515	25.4
NP	7	.3
Strongly Identify	1	.0
Moderately Identify	6	.3
TAIP	1	.0
Strongly Identify	0	.0
Moderately Identify	1	.0
PFP	242	12.0
Strongly Identify	36	1.8
Moderately Identify	206	10.2
TSU	17	.9
Strongly Identify	3	.2
Moderately Identify	14	.7
Party Neutral	857	42.4
n=2022		

Source: TEDS 2001.

This distribution reveals that majority of the Taiwanese voters are either party-neutral or having only a moderate partisan preference. It stands to reason that voters with different party preference and strength might also have other significant differences in social-demographic characteristics as well. Given the small portion of popular support of the NP, the TIP, and the TSU, the following analyses will focus on the social bases of the three major parties, the KMT, the DPP, and the PFP. When one looks at Table 2 it becomes apparent that voters' different characteristics associate with their party preference and the strength. In general, voters who were above the age of 60, less-educated, farmers or fishermen, low-income earners, living in the central areas of Taiwan, and having a provincial origin of Taiwanese Minnan were found to possess no particular party affiliation and were for the most part considered party-neutrals. These findings in Table 2 are similar to that of Chung's study of the social attributes of Taiwan's independent voters over the past decade (2000).

In addition to the general partisan distribution, one can view the different types of social characteristics that those preferring different parties possess and gain insight through the use of adjusted residuals, as done in Table 2. For example, males were found to possess stronger party identification than were females. In terms of age, younger voters were more likely to have moderate partisan preferences than those who were of older age. Also, one finds that the higher the education the more likely that voters would possess a moderate level of party identification and the percentage of those who consider themselves independent will correspondingly decline. Likewise, white-collar voters and Taoyuan/Hsinchu/Miaoli voters were more likely to have a moderate level of partisan preference. Interestingly those who were above 60 of age, living in the Taipei Metropolitan, and having a Mainlander origin were also possessed quite strong party preferences.

Table 2　Voter's Social Characteristics and Strength of Party Identification, %

	Strong	Moderate	Party Neutral	Total
Gender				n=2022
Male	11.3(2.3)	51.4(1.7)	37.3(-3.1)	df=2,
				p=.000
Female	8.2(-2.3)	47.7(-1.7)	44.0(3.1)	χ^2=12.035
Age				
20-29Years	6.6(-2.6)	58.3(4.3)	35.1(-2.8)	n=2022
30-39 Years	7.7(-1.7)	56.5(3.5)	35.8(-2.5)	df=8,
				p=.000
40-49 Years	11.9(1.8)	51.8(1.0)	36.3(-2.1)	χ^2=96.303
50-59 Years	10.2(.3)	46.3(-1.1)	43.5(1.0)	
60 Years +	13.5(2.6)	28.8(-8.7)	57.7(7.3)	
Education Level				
Elementary and Below	9.4(-.4)	36.3(-.85)	54.3(8.9)	n=2016
Junior High School	12.3(1.7)	47.6(-.8)	40.1(-.2)	df=8,
				p=.000
Senior High School	9.3(-.5)	56.8(3.9)	33.9(-3.7)	χ^2=100.247
College	9.6(-.1)	61.3(3.8)	29.2(-3.8)	
University and Above	8.8(-.5)	62.8(4.2)	28.3(-4.0)	
Occupation				
Upper/Middle White-collar	11.1(1.4)	57.3(5.0)	31.6(-5.9)	n=2022
Lower White-collar	10.8(.8)	53.5(1.8)	35.7(-2.4)	df=8,
				p=.000
Farmers/Fishermen	7.6(-1.1)	29.9(-5.8)	62.4(6.6)	χ^2=83.934
Blue-collar workers	9.0(-.8)	46.7(-1.6)	44.3(2.1)	
Others	5.9(-1.5)	37.0(-2.8)	57.1(3.8)	
Location				
Taipei Metropolitan	13.4(2.9)	52.3(1.3)	34.2(-3.1)	n=2022
Kaohsiung Metropolitan	8.3(-.7)	50.6(.3)	41.4(.1)	df=14,
Taipei/Keelung	8.8(-.4)	54.1(1.2)	37.1(-1.0)	p=.000

Taoyuan/Hsinchu/Miaoli	8.1(-1.0)	59.7(3.6)	32.2(-3.0)	χ^2=46.846
Taichung/Changhua/Nantou	10.4(.5)	42.3(-3.2)	47.3(2.9)	
Yunlin/Chiayi/Tainan	8.5(-.8)	41.5(-.31)	50.0(3.7)	
Kaohsiung/Pingtung/Penghu	6.1(-1.7)	52.5(.8)	41.3(.2)	
Ilan/Hualien/Taidong	10.3(.2)	48.5(-.2)	41.2(.1)	
Provincial Origins				
Taiwanese Hakka	7.8(-1.2)	55.5(1.9)	36.7(-1.2)	n=1971
Taiwanese Minan	9.3(-1.4)	48.0(-3.0)	42.7(3.9)	df=4,
				p=.000
Mainlander	16.3(3.3)	56.4(2.0)	27.2(-4.0)	χ^2=25.748

Source: TEDS 2001.

Note: Values in brackets are adjusted residuals.

IV. Voter's Political Attitudes, Actions and Strength of Party Identification

Another area of study that is worthwhile exploring in order to better understand Taiwanese politics is whether voters with different strength of party identification possess different attributes in terms of certain political beliefs and actions in elections. The degree of voters' interests and concerns in political affairs, for example, are frequently used in measuring voters' common political activities. Voters have strong concerns in political affairs and interests in political discussion may no directly mean to have more impact on their voting decision, but they do represent voters' basic forms of political participation.

Likewise, political value such as voters' sense of checks-and-balances is also important for political participation. It has been a traditional belief in America that the separation and checks-and-balances of power among the executive and legislative

branches will best safeguard individual liberties. The idea of voters' sense of checks-and-balances has been used in the explanations for the occurrence of split-ticket voting and thus the appearance of divided government, albeit its impact on voters voting decisions is not yet conclusive (Petrocik and Doherty, 1996). Therefore, there may exist an associational relationship between voters' strength of party identification and senses of checks-and-balances. Voters who have possessed a high sense of checks-and-balances will be less partisan-oriented while voters who have low sense of checks-and-balances will be more partisan-oriented.

Finally, voters' strengths of party identification are also correlated with voters' willingness to follow party's direction in elections. It is reasonable to expect that voters with stronger party identification will be more supportive to party actions in elections as opposed to those without strong party identification. The following section of this paper will investigate the relationships between voter's political interests, political attitudes and the strength of party identification.

As indicated in Table 3, voters who have strong party identification displayed a high amount of concern over media's coverage of political events on television. Those with weaker identification, by contrast, were less concerned and voters who possessed no party preference demonstrated the least amount of interest in television news content. In terms of discussing political or election related issues, voters who had stronger identification with a party or a moderate level of identification to a party were more likely to discuss these issues, as opposed to those who were not identified to any given party. In reference to the 2001 Legislative Yuan elections those who had strong party identification were more concerned about the electoral outcome than those who moderately identified with a party, while those who had no party identification at all showed the least amount of concern over the results.

Table 3　Political Interests and Strength of Party Identification

Political Interests	Gamma	Kendall's Tau-c
interests in election news	.368***	.219***
frequency of discussion of political and election related topics	.438***	.276***
level of concern over legislative election results	.458***	.271***

Source: TEDS 2001.

In addition to voter's political interests, Table 4 also shows that the strength of voters' party identification, sense of checks-and-balances, and their willingness to vote strategically are all correlated. Those who had neutral partisan preference were more likely to have a sense of checks-and-balances, while those who were strong partisan preference were less likely to have a sense of checks-and-balances and those possessing moderate strength partisan preference fell in between. In analyzing voters' political behaviour and the strength of party identification, there was a clear association between the strength of party identification and voters' willingness to follow party's direction in elections. When a political party sought to gain support for its candidates in an election by requesting voters to vote strategically, those with stronger party identification were more likely to respond. Those who did not possess strong partisan preference showed a distinctly lower interest in listening to political parties' requests for cooperation.

Table 4　Sense of Checks-and-Balances, the Willingness to Follow Party's Requests, and Strength of Party Identification, %

	Sense of Checks-and-Balances		Willingness to Follow Party's Requests	
	with	Without	Willing	Unwilling
Strength of Party Identification				
Strong	32.8（-2.9）	67.2（2.9）	40.6（9.5）	59.4（-9.5）
Moderate	42.0（-.6）	58.0（.6）	18.7（2.5）	81.3（-2.5）
Party Neutral	47.9（2.7）	52.1（-2.7）	8.3（-8.3）	91.7（8.3）
	n=1459, χ^2=12.574		n=2021, χ^2=115.523	
	df=2, p=.002		df=2, P=.000	

Source: TEDS 2001.

Note: Values in brackets are adjusted residuals.

In a nutshell, the relationship between voters' strength of party identification and their political interests were very direct. Voters who had strong party identification had high interest in political affairs, while those who were independent would generally remain politically inactive, leaving those who moderately identify with a party somewhere in between. Voters' sense of checks-and-balances, by contrast, and their strength of party identification had a strong negative correlation. Furthermore, one can see that strength of party identification had a strong positive correlation with receptiveness to party requests. As the strength of identification increased the willingness of voters to adhere to party wishes also increased.

In terms of the strength of voters' partisan identification and their party support, means comparisons in Table 5 show the degree of consistency of party support among voters' different strengths of party identification. In the 2000 presidential election, those voters who strongly identified with either the DPP or the PFP all voted for the

DPP and PFP presidential candidates respectively, which mean a highly consistent relationship between the strength of party identification and party support among these two group of voters. Likewise, both the DPP and PFP were able to secure over 90% of votes from voters who were having moderate strengths of party identification. Compared with these two parties the KMT did not fare as well, only securing votes from 69% of those who strongly identified with party, while it was not even able to gain over 50% of ballots from those who moderately identified the party. From the means comparison one is able to see that the support of KMT's identifiers, both strong and moderate, was weaker and less stable than those of the DPP and the PFP.

In the 2001 mayoral and county executive elections, voters who have strong DPP identification were more than 90% likely to vote for the DPP's candidates. Even 84% of those who moderately identified the DPP cast ballots in favor of the party. In the case of the KMT, only 78% of strong identifiers voted for the party's chosen candidates, while around 70% of moderate identifiers also supported the party's choice.[4] The result of 2001 election also showed that the DPP's support from those who identified with the party was greater than that received by the KMT. Even though the KMT received a higher percentage of its supporters than had occurred in the 2000 presidential election, overall the voters who declared a support for the KMT were less stable than those who declared theirs for the DPP.

---

4. It should be noted that the PFP did not file candidates in most cities during the 2001 mayoral elections and as such there is no data available with which to measure their performance. As such, focus will be paid to the results of the DPP and the KMT.

Table 5   Voting Consistency and Strength of Party Identification

Election Type	Means of Consistency	Standard Error
2000 Presidential Election		
KMT Strong Identifiers	.6876	.4686
KMT Moderate Identifiers	.4975	.5013
DPP Strong Identifiers	1.0000	.0000
DPP Moderate Identifiers	.9139	.2808
PFP Strong Identifiers	1.0000	.0000
PFP Moderate Identifiers	.8904	.3133
2001Mayoral and County Executive Elections		
KMT Strong Identifiers	.7843	.4178
KMT Moderate Identifiers	.7007	.4596
DPP Strong Identifiers	.9047	.2956
DPP Moderate Identifiers	.8416	.3657
PFP Strong Identifiers	0.057	.2381
PFP Moderate Identifiers	.1009	.3025
2001Legislative Yuan Election		
KMT Strong Identifiers	.6885	.4689
KMT Moderate Identifiers	.5752	.4957
DPP Strong Identifiers	.7879	.4109
DPP Moderate Identifiers	.7077	.4554
PFP Strong Identifiers	.5859	.5002
PFP Moderate Identifiers	.5576	.4983

Source: TEDS 2001.

In the 2001 legislative election voters who were strongly and moderately identified with the DPP voted for the party at levels of 79% and 71% respectively

which was higher than the KMT's support level of 69% and 58%, and the PFP's 59% and 56% support. Once again this shows that the support received from those who identified with the DPP was more stable than that received by both the KMT and PFP.

Besides the consistency of party support in the three elections, another crucial development found in Table 5 is the differences of voters' party support at different levels of elections. When compared to the mayoral and county executive elections, the voters who identified the DPP and KMT were more likely to support party candidates at the local level than at the national level, with the exception of the PFP. The average difference was around 10% higher at the elections for city mayors and county magistrates, as opposed to the Legislative election. Likewise, those who strongly identified with the DPP were more likely to vote for its candidates at the municipal or county level than in the national legislative elections. Those who moderately identified with the DPP displayed the same type of behaviour, and the same pattern could also be identified with supporters of the KMT as well. This shows that even in elections that occur simultaneously voters with party identification will vote differently in different level elections.

It was obvious that those did not have a particular party identification dispersed their votes in an unpredictable manner, while those who possessed stronger party identification were somewhat more stable in their voting patterns as opposed to those with no party identification. This was especially true for voters who identified with the DPP. These findings prove that the measurement of voters' party identification can be a reliable tool for determining which party they will support in elections. As well, these results show that voters with a given strength of party identification will vote according to the level of strength of their support, the higher their support the more likely they will vote for their party of choice. They might, however, vote for different parties in simultaneous but separate elections. Part of this tendency might be a result of the dramatic changes of party systems in the process of Taiwan's democratization.

Another part of this split voting tendency might be explained through the fact that voters might actually support multiple parties due to the differences in the strength of party identification, and thus vote differently in separate elections.

Given the existence of voters' multiple partisan support, Table 6 provides a simple method of classifying voters' choices of the three parties above, thus aiding in understanding different types of party support. The first category, named as single party support, identifies those that supported the same party in each of the three elections surveyed. This group represents the largest number of those polled within this table. The second category is dual party support that voters supported two different parties in three elections. The number of this category is fewer than that of the first category. The third category is labeled multiple party support, which means that those within this group voted for different parties in each election surveyed, totaled the least frequency within the survey.

From the behavioral perspective, single party supporters were morel likely to stick to one single party and would not cross over partisan boundaries in elections. By contrast, the voting decisions of those dual and multiple party supporters were changeable in elections. It might also be deduced that those who supported only one party were most likely to support the DPP, while the KMT and the PFP were less likely to receive such support. Conversely, dual party supporters and multiple party supporters were more likely to choose either the KMT or the PFP in three elections.

Table 6   Types of Party Support in Three Elections

Types of Party Support	Frequency	Percentage
Single party support	343	51.7
Dual party support	270	40.7
Multiple party support	51	7.6
n=663		

Source: TEDS 2001.

By taking the types of party support detailed above and relevant political variables into an ordered logit analysis, as in Table 7, it can be explored whether voters' sense of checks-and-balances, political knowledge, and direction of voters party identification, would affect if voters supported one party or more. In terms of voter's sense of checks-and-balances, the voters who were without a sense of checks-and-balances were more likely to have single party support. On the other hand, voters who were having a sense of checks-and-balances were more likely to have dual or multiple party supports. In terms of the strength of voters' party identification, the weaker voters identified with a party, the more chance that they might become two-party or multi-party supporters, and the less chance they might become single party supporters. In terms of direction of party identification, compared to the independent voters, those who identified with the DPP were more likely to be single party supporters. By contrast, voters who identified with the PFP were more likely to be two-party or multi-party supporters. Compared to the results above, the levels of voters' political knowledge did not have a clear association with any of the party support types analyzed above.

Table 7　Types of Voter's Party Support: An Ordered Logit Analysis

Independent Variables	Coefficient	Standard Deviation	Significance
Without a Sense of Checks-and-Balances	-.601	.235	.011 ＊
Level of Political Knowledge	-0.025	.087	.774
Strength of Party Identification	.590	.252	.019 ＊
Direction of Party Identification			
KMT	-0.005	.412	.990
DPP	-1.335	.364	.000 ＊＊＊
PFP	1.397	.416	.001 ＊＊＊
n=532,　$\chi 2$=184.363, df=6,　＊:p<.05,　＊＊:p<.01,　＊＊＊:p<0.001			

Source: TEDS 2001.

V. Concluding Remarks

It is not unusual to find studies that focused on the relationships between voters' party identification and their voting decisions in Taiwan. This article has moved one step further by using the strength and direction of voters' party identification as a starting point to develop a deeper understanding of these issues. From the analysis we find that most Taiwanese voters are still not closely associated with existing political parties. As well, the distribution of direction and strength of voters' party identification is reflected on the current electoral power bases of each party. This fact also reflects the recently variable transformation in Taiwan's party system.

Based on voters' strength of party identification, one finds that Taiwanese voters can be classified into those that have strong party identification, moderate party identification, and independent. The highest percentage of respondents fell in the moderate preference category type. Voters who were independent tended to be older in age, lower in education, and blue-collar workers. Those who strongly identified a party comprised the smallest group of respondents and were composed of those above 60, located in and around Taipei metropolitan area, and were considered Mainlanders. Research results highlight that these three types of voters also display different characteristics and attitudes towards politics and political issues. Voters who have stronger party identification will care about political issues, attend political functions, and be receptive to requests from political parties to a higher degree than other groups. Results also showed that voters who had higher strength of party identification did not necessarily maintain a sense of checks-and-balances.

As well, one finds that those who strongly preferred a party were more stable and predictable than voters who moderately identified a party or were independent in voting patterns. This was especially true for those who strongly support the DPP.

Moreover, if different election types are considered, no matter what direction and strength of party identification, each party's supporters were more stable in executive elections for the posts of president, mayor, or county magistrates, than legislative elections, such as the 2001 Legislative Yuan election. This type of distribution also expounds that voters who possessed the same direction of party identification, but in different strength, would vote for different parties at different level of elections. Voters who had lower strength of party identification were more likely to support two parties or more in different elections.

In this thesis it was found that voters who strongly identified with a party were more stable, in terms of their electoral support, than those who possessed weak or no identification and were more likely to shift their support from party to party. These results can help to explain the phenomenon that have seen shifts in voters' party support in recent elections, albeit partially. The newly incumbent DPP has replaced the once-dominated KMT as the largest party in Taiwan after the 2000 presidential election. This change of political power also shows parallel distribution in voters' party identification.

However, even though the DPP identifiers have demonstrated strong and stable party preference, the number of these identifiers does not guarantee the DPP's continuous dominance. Furthermore, one prominent feature at the present time is the existence of a dual, even multiple, party preference among those non-DPP voters. Both identifiers of the KMT and the PFP may support their own party's candidates respectively in one election, as showed in the 2001 legislative election, but may also have a jointed support in the other election, as showed in the 2002 mayoral elections for Taipei and Kaohsiung cities. The prevalence of a dual or a multiple party identification of the KMT and PFP supporters have thus conditioned the cooperation and competition between the two parties in elections. It would have resulted in reshuffling of voters' party identification and the distribution of political power in

Taiwan.

Appendix 1   Changes in Popular Support for Political Parties in Taiwan, 1991-2001

Election	KMT	DPP	NP	PFP	TSU	Others
1991 National Assembly	69.1	23.3				7.6
1992 Legislative Yuan	53.0	31.0				16.0
1993 County Magistrates/City Mayors	47.3	41.2	3.1			8.5
1994 Provincial Governor	51.2	39.4	7.7			0.8
1995 Legislative Yuan	46.1	33.2	12.9			7.8
1996 National Assembly	49.7	29.8	13.7			6.8
1996 Presidential	54.0	21.1	14.9			10.0
1997 County Magistrates/City Mayors	42.1	43.3	1.4			13.1
1998 Legislative Yuan	46.4	29.6	7.1			17.0
2000 Presidential	23.1	39.3	0.1			37.5
2001 County Magistrates/City Mayors	35.1	45.2	10.0	2.4		7.3
2001 Legislative Yuan	28.6	33.4	2.6	18.6	7.8	9.0

Source: Election Study Center, National Chengchi University.

Note：The PFP was established after the 2000 presidential election. So all votes for the PFP presidential candidate, James Soong, have been counted as votes for 'Others' within this table.

Appendix 2   Descriptions and Measurements of Selective Variables

Variable	Description and Measurements
Attention to TV Election News Coverage	Respondents are asked the following question: "During last year's legislative campaign, when you watched election campaign news report on TV, did you pay very close attention, pay moderately close attention, not pay attention, or not pay attention at all?" (very close attention, moderately close attention, not attention, not attention at all)

Discussion of Election	Respondents are asked the following question: "How often do you discuss politics or elections with other people (including friends and relatives)?" (often, sometime, seldom, never)
Concerns of Election Results	Respondents are asked the following question: "Were you concerned with the outcome of this Legislative Yuan Election?" (very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, not concerned at all)
Sense of Checks-and-Balances	Respondents are asked the following question: "Which of the following statements do you agree with more? 1) The opposition parties should have a majority seats in the legislature so that they can provide checks-and-balances on the government. 2) The president's party should have a majority of seats in the legislature so that it can implement its policies." Respondents will be classified as having sense of check-and-balances as they agree with the first statement and respondents will be classified as without a sense of checks-and-balances as they agree with the second statement. (with, without)
Party Support	Respondents are asked the following questions: "1) Which candidate did you vote for the 2000 presidential election? 2) Which party did you vote for the 2001 Legislative Yuan election? 3) Which party did you vote for the 2001 county magistrates and city mayors election?" (KMT, DPP, PFP, NP, TSU, TAIP, Others)
Following Party's Requests in Election	Respondents are asked the following question: "In this election, many voters hoped that their party could win more seats in their district, and so they were willing to vote according to the party's suggested voting rationing system. Did you did this?" Respondents will be classified as willing to follow party's requests if they did this and respondents will be classified as unwilling to follow party's requests if they did not. (willing, unwilling)

Strengths of Party Identification	Respondents are asked the following questions: "1) Do think yourself as close to any particular party? When respondents answer "yes", then they were asked 1a) Which party do you feel close to? and 1b) Do you feel very close to this party , somewhat close, or not very close?" (strong, moderate) When respondents answered "no" to question 1), then respondents were asked 2) Do you feel yourself a little close to one of the political parties than the others? if respondents answered "yes", then they were asked 1a) Which party do you feel close to?" if respondents answered "no", then they were coded as party neutral. (moderate, party neutral)
Provincial Origin	Based on the provincial background of respondent's father. (Taiwanese Hakka, Taiwanese Min-nan, Mainlander)
Ethnic Identity	Respondents are asked the following question: "In Taiwan, some people think they are Taiwanese. There are also some people who think they are Chinese. Do you think you are a Taiwanese, Chinese, or both Taiwanese and Chinese. (Taiwanese, both, Chinese)
Consistency of Voters' Party Support	Based on voters' voting decisions in three elections, they are classified into three types: 1) support one party, 2) support two parties, and 3) multiple party support.
Political Knowledge	Respondents are asked the following five questions: 1) who is the current vice president? 2) what was the president of the PRC? 3) who is the current president of the United States? 4) how many years is a legislator's term? 5) which body has the power to interpret the Constitution? Respondents are scored from 0 to 5 to represent their levels of political knowledge (0 to 5)

References

Campbell, Angus. et al. 1954. *The Voter Decides. Evanston*. IL: Row Peterson.

Campbell, Angus. et al. 1960. *The American Voter*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chen, Lu-huei. 2000. "Change and Continuity of Party Identification Among the Electorate in Taiwan." (in Chinese) *Journal of Electoral Studies* 7, 2: 109-141.

Chen, Yih-yan. 1986. "The Study of Voting Behavior in Taiwan: Reviews and Prospects." (in Chinese) *Thought and Words* 23, 6: 557-585.

Chen, Yih-yan. 1994. "Predicting Voter's Choice in the 1992 Legislator Election: A Cluster Analysis." (in Chinese) *Journal of Electoral Studies* 1, 1: 1-37.

Chu, Yun-han. 1996. "The Partisan Factor in Electoral Choice: A Case Analysis of the 1991 National Assembly election." (in Chinese) *Journal of Electoral Studies* 3, 1: 17-48.

Chung, Tien-lien. 2000. "Developments and Changes of Independent Voters in Taiwan." (in Chinese) M.A. Thesis, Department of Political Science, National Chengchi University.

Clarke, Harold D. et al. 1979. *Political Choice in Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Converse, Philip E. 1966. "On the Possibility of Major Political Realignment in the South." *Elections and Political Order*. In A. Campbell. et al (eds).　New York: Wilely.

Converse, Philip E., and Roy Pierce. 1985. "Measuring Partisanship." *Political Methodology* 11: 143-66.

Franklin, Charles H. 1985. "The Dynamics of Party Identification." *American Political Science Review* 77: 957-973.

Hawang, Shiow-Duan. 2001. "A Comparison of Voters' Strategic Voting in the Single Member and Multiple Member Districts Plurality System." (in Chinese) *Soochow Journal of Political Science* 13: 37-75.

Hadley, Charles D. 1985. "Dual Partisan Identification in the South." *Journal of Politics* 47: 254-69.

Ho, Szu-yin. 1990. "Comparative Study of Party Identification." (in Chinese) *Issues and Studies* 29, 13: 62-72.

Ho, Szu-yin and Jaushieh Joseph Wu. 1996. "Measuring Party Identification in Taiwan's Party System." (in Chinese) *Journal of Electoral Studies* 3, 1: 1-16.

Hsieh, John F. 1986. "Electoral Systems and the Number of Political Parties." (in Chinese) *The National Chengchi University Journal* 54: 151-63.

Hsieh, John F. 1989. "The Prospect of Party Politics in the Republic of China on Taiwan." (in Chinese) *Journal of Sunology: A Social Science Quarterly* 4, 3: 30-39.

Jennings, Kent M., and Richard G. Nieme, 1996. "Party Identification at Multiple Levels of Government." American Journal of Sociology 72, 1:86-101.

Liu, I-chou. 1996. "The Behavior of Taiwanese Voters in 1992: Consolidation of Partisan Ties." In *Taiwan's Electoral Politics and Democratic Transition: Riding the Third Wave,* ed. Hung-Mao Tien. Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Liu, I-chou. 1997. "Difficulties of Concept Measurement in Political Science: The Case of Party Identification." (in Chinese) Conference of Research Methods of Political Science. 31 May, 1997. Taipei: National Chengchi University.

Miller, Warren E. 1991. "Party Identification, Realignment, and Party Voting: Back to the Basics." *American Political Science Review* 85, 2: 557-568.

Niemi, Richard G. et al. 1987. "Multiple Party Identifiers and the Measurement of Party Identification." *Journal of Politics* 49, 4: 1093-1103.

Petrocik, John R. 1974. "An Analysis of Intransitivities in the Index of Party

Identification." *Political Methodology* 1: 31-47.

Petrocik, John R. and Joseph Doherty, 1996. "The Road to Divided Government: Paved without Intention." In *Divided Government: Change, Uncertainty, and the Constitutional Order*. Peter F. Galderisi, et al eds. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Stewart, Marianne C., and Harold Clarke, 1998. "Partisan Inconsistency and the Dynamics of Party Support in Federal Systems: The Canadian Case." American Journal of Political Science 41: 97-116.

Uslaner, Eric M., 1989. "Multiple Party Identificatiers in Canada: Participation and Affect." Journal of Politics 51: 993-1003.

Uslaner, Eric M. 1990. "Splitting Image: Partisan Affiliations in Canada's 'Two Political Worlds'". *American Journal of Political Science* 34, 4: 961-981.

Wang, Yeh-lih. 1996. "Plurality vs. Majority: A Comparative Study of Direct Presidential Elections." (in Chinese) *Journal of Electoral Studies* 3, 1: 49-67.

Weisberg, Herbert F. 1980. "A Multidimensional Conceptualization of Party Identification." *Political Behavior* 2, 1: 33-60.

Weisberg, Herbert F. 1993. "Political Partisanship." John P. Robinson, et al (eds). In *Measurement of Political Attitudes*. San Diego, CA.: Academic Press.

2000 年後台灣選民政黨認同的方向與強度

游　清　鑫*

摘　要

　　本文藉由「2001 年台灣選舉與民主化調查研究」（TEDS 2001）的資料探討台灣選民在政黨認同的方向與強度問題。文中首先描繪台灣選民政黨認同的方向與強度之基本圖像，並以選民在不同選舉的政黨投票對象為依據，探索選民對當前三個主要政黨支持的一致性程度，結果顯示具有較強程度政黨認同的選民有比較一致的投票對象，而且認同民進黨的選民之投票一致性程度高於認同親民黨與國民黨的選民。其次，透過統計模型的分析得出選民的制衡觀念、政黨認同的方向與政黨認同的強度等因素對其政黨支持一致性程度有顯著的關係。本文最後也指出國民黨認同者與親民黨認同者具有較高比例的雙重、甚至多重政黨支持，此種雙重或多重政黨支持的存在不僅影響未來兩黨之間的選舉合作與競爭，也進一步影響台灣政黨體系的發展。

關鍵字：政黨認同方向、政黨認同強度、投票一致性、單一政黨支持、雙重政黨支持、多重政黨支持