

Political Science in Denmark: Trends of Research 1960-1975 Some Footnotes to a Bibliography

PETER NANNESTAD
University of Aarhus

1. Introduction

An attempt at defining political science could naturally be expected in introducing a paper on Danish political research during the last 15 years. However, no special efforts will be made from the outset to arrive at a rigorous definition of what should be included in 'political' research and what should be left out.

The difficulties which would have to be encountered in trying to distinguish political and other social research according to a *substantive* standard are too well-known to need much elaboration here. Political research is a slippery concept to catch in a net of substantive criteria, and Danish political research not the least so due to its comparatively young age. The time-space of this overview coincides almost exactly with the total lifetime of political science as an organized and independent academic subject in Denmark. Hence it covers just the 'formative years' of Danish political research, the years in which the scope and identity of the new science of politics were established. Considering this period, stability with regard to what was viewed as proper topics for political research and what was to be left to neighbouring disciplines cannot be expected. Thus, to start this review with a definition of political science in substantive terms would be to put the cart before the horse.

Nor would an institutional definition of political research be sufficient. As a crude first approximation to the views espoused by Carl J. Friedrich¹ and Thomas S. Kuhn,² one could choose to define political research simply as the research conducted in the university institute of political science, where the academic responsibility for the new subject originally was placed. But, as has been shown elsewhere,³ the existing Danish institutes of political science are quite heterogeneous units, and have always been so. Their staffs include, for instance, economists, historians and sociologists. Some of the practitioners not trained as political scientists have switched fields and are engaged in what would be recognized as political research by almost any standard; others are definitely and deliberately not.⁴ Thus, not everything emanating from the institutes of political science could properly be labelled products of political research, and in some cases, this label might actually be quite unwelcome. On the other hand, some research done outside the established institutes of political science closely parallels work done within

Political Science in Denmark: Trends of Research 1960-1975 Some Footnotes to a Bibliography

PETER NANNESTAD
University of Aarhus

1. Introduction

An attempt at defining political science could naturally be expected in introducing a paper on Danish political research during the last 15 years. However, no special efforts will be made from the outset to arrive at a rigorous definition of what should be included in 'political' research and what should be left out.

The difficulties which would have to be encountered in trying to distinguish political and other social research according to a *substantive* standard are too well-known to need much elaboration here. Political research is a slippery concept to catch in a net of substantive criteria, and Danish political research not the least so due to its comparatively young age. The time-space of this overview coincides almost exactly with the total lifetime of political science as an organized and independent academic subject in Denmark. Hence it covers just the 'formative years' of Danish political research, the years in which the scope and identity of the new science of politics were established. Considering this period, stability with regard to what was viewed as proper topics for political research and what was to be left to neighbouring disciplines cannot be expected. Thus, to start this review with a definition of political science in substantive terms would be to put the cart before the horse.

Nor would an institutional definition of political research be sufficient. As a crude first approximation to the views espoused by Carl J. Friedrich¹ and Thomas S. Kuhn,² one could choose to define political research simply as the research conducted in the university institute of political science, where the academic responsibility for the new subject originally was placed. But, as has been shown elsewhere,³ the existing Danish institutes of political science are quite heterogeneous units, and have always been so. Their staffs include, for instance, economists, historians and sociologists. Some of the practitioners not trained as political scientists have switched fields and are engaged in what would be recognized as political research by almost any standard; others are definitely and deliberately not.⁴ Thus, not everything emanating from the institutes of political science could properly be labelled products of political research, and in some cases, this label might actually be quite unwelcome. On the other hand, some research done outside the established institutes of political science closely parallels work done within

them, or deals with topics normally associated with political science. This holds true, for example, of work which has been done in the Institute of Sociology at the University of Copenhagen on voting behaviour (Høgh, D 342, 1972). And — perhaps somewhat more surprising — it also holds true of some work recently done in disciplines normally thought of as quite distant from political science, such as Nordic Philology.⁵ With the growing application of sociological approaches to the subjects of the humanities, the blurring of the division of labour between humanities and social sciences, including political science, must be expected to increase. Thus the 'scientific community' of political science is not congruent with organizational divisions.

There is, then, no easy way around the problems of delineating the scope of this overview. For purely practical reason, the starting point and the main point of reference will be the institutes of political science in Denmark and the research conducted there. Applying a complementary substantive criterion, mainly based on the categories of the bibliography of this journal, some work done outside these institutes will be included, while some work done within them will be excluded.

Needless to say, in the very last resort the decision on how to approach the task of writing an overview of this kind must always be a personal one. It follows that the resulting picture cannot be purely descriptive but will also reflect a personal view of what is important — or just interesting — in the development of Danish political science during the last 15 years.

Another source of lack of rigor in this overview must be mentioned alongside the difficulties in pinning down the object under study. This overview deals with *what* has been done in Danish political research during the last 15 years and *how* it has been done, i.e., the topics and the conceptual tools which have been at the heart of Danish political research. Unfortunately, dependent as they are on personal interpretation, problems and frameworks make poor 'facts'. Moreover, the concepts at hand for characterizing the shifting states of the art — e.g., the term 'behavioralism' — lack precision to such a degree that they at times appear almost content-free. Together, foggy 'facts' and imprecise concepts make for easy simplifications and sweeping generalizations, but hardly for rigor.

2. The Infrastructure of Danish Political Research

By several standards, the university institutes of political science make up the core of the research organization of Danish political science. The bulk of political scientists engaged in research are placed in the institutes, the main part of political research reported emanates from there, and most of the money spent on political research in Denmark is allocated to and through the institutes (Danish Social Science Research Council, A1, 1972).

In 1975, there were three university institutes to which was assigned the formal academic responsibility for political science proper: The Institute of Political Science at the University of Aarhus, established in 1959, The Institute of Contem-

porary History and Political Science (since 1972 formally split into an Institute of Contemporary History and an Institute of Political Science) at the University of Copenhagen, established in 1958 and active in political science since 1964, and the Institute of History and Social Science at the University of Odense, active in political science since 1971. The staff of these three institutes together numbered some 90 persons.⁶

As a rule, Danish university institutes have both teaching and research duties, and typically all full-time staff members have been expected to engage in both kinds of activity. In 1972, a standard was formally established for the amount of time to be used on teaching, research, and administration, respectively, in the universities.⁷ This regulation also established formal equality between all full-time staff members – full professors and others alike – with regard to teaching and research duties.

Thus, the material research capacity of a university institute may be regarded as mostly a function of sheer size, as each additional position allocated adds a fixed amount of man-hours to its research capacity – at least in principle. During the period considered here, the dominant factor influencing the size of appropriations to the institutes – both for positions and working expenses – has been teaching capacities, or ultimately student enrollment numbers. Simplifying somewhat, we can say that the volume of student enrollments for political science has determined the amount of political research possible during this period.⁸ Although staff development has lagged behind the increasing enrollments for political science, because there is no automatic regulation of appropriations according to enrollment volume, the booming interest in this subject on the part of the students experienced during most of the 60's and early 70's has thus indirectly triggered a strong increase in the political research potential in Denmark.

The institutes not only provide the positions and salaries for most of those engaged in political research. The cost of research projects is also, at least in part, covered by the institutes' appropriations for working expenses. Typically, secretarial assistance is paid by the institutes, as are – to some extent at least – assistant research staff (often students), and computer usage. Thus, external funding is normally sought for larger and more expensive projects only.

Although institutes of political science do not exist at the new university centers of Roskilde and Aalborg, contributions to political science recently have begun to appear from these places. Among other university institutes of some importance to political research, the Institute of Sociology at the University of Copenhagen has already been mentioned for its contributions to electoral research. To this incomplete list of institutes we may further add the Institute of Press Research at the School of Journalism in Aarhus which has conducted relevant research in mass communication and news media.

Besides university and similar institutes, several institutions outside the academic sphere are engaged in advancing or conducting political research as part of their activities. Their formal status varies somewhat, but normally they are related in one way or another to ministries or agencies in the central administration. Here we shall only mention three.

The *Danish Institute of Foreign Policy* is an independent institution, but funded mainly through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Its main task is to stimulate Danish research in international politics by initiating, coordinating and supporting projects, by coordinating publications and collecting documentation and by advancing research through the organization of seminars and so on. Thus, the institute does not conduct research of its own. Its funds are rather limited, totaling about 500,000 Danish crowns a year.

The *Institute of Development Research* is placed under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Its main task is to study the social, economic and political problems of developing countries and areas, and to produce facts and analyses which may be used in planning and evaluating Danish aid projects. The institute also tries to advance and stimulate interest in development problems and development research by organizing seminars and supporting projects.

Although it rarely is engaged in political research in the narrow sense, the *National Institute of Social Research* must also be mentioned in this context. An independent administrative body under the Ministry of Social Affairs, it has conducted a long series of investigations of social conditions in Denmark, many of which are of particular interest to political research as well.⁹ Moreover, the institute runs a technical division for designing and conducting sample surveys which has been involved in several political science projects in collaboration with the university institutes.

The contributions to political research from *private organizations* have been limited through most of this period. Several institutes of opinion and marketing research have regularly engaged in data gathering on political questions. Of these, especially the various 'political barometers', published every month, and the EEC sponsored 'Eurobarometer' are of interest to political research.¹⁰

As mentioned above, the main part of Danish political research is financed through appropriations to the university institutes of political science. External funding is normally sought only as far as the cost of a particular project exceeds the financial capacity of an institute. The most important source of financial support for political research (outside the institutes) is now the *Danish Social Science Research Council*.

The Danish Social Science Research Council – which is paralleled by four other councils in the fields of science, medicine, agriculture and veterinary science, and humanities – was established by law in 1968. It replaced the Danish State Research Foundation and its five commissions for the sciences, social science, medicine, agriculture and veterinary science, and the humanities, and took over the grant-giving functions of that older body. The funds administered by the Social Science Research Council are not unsubstantial and have been rising steadily. The total budget, which for all research councils together totaled 24 million crowns in 1969/70 had more than doubled by 1973/74, and during the same period the Social Science Research Council's share went up from 3.9 % to 12.6 %.¹¹

The part of the Social Science Research Council's budget allocated to political research has been varying somewhat from year to year, obviously as a function of variations in the amount of money applied for rather than as a function of shifts

in the Council's priorities. It has fluctuated between 3 % and 14 %¹² of the total amount granted. Grants have been given to support all or some phases of the research process, from data collection to publication. The main single beneficiaries among political research projects – but by no means the only ones – have been the big election studies in the early 70's (see p. 12 below).

Besides the grant-giving function, the Social Science Research Council also has an initiating function, and over the years it has taken a series of initiatives of particular importance to political science. Thus, the council has taken steps to stimulate and coordinate research in mass communication, Danish local administration, and the development of central political institutions.¹³ Moreover, the council has established and financed the Danish Data Archive on an experimental basis and for a limited period of time to help solve the problem of storing and retrieving social data in a central site and in machine-readable, well-documented and easily accessible form.¹⁴

Danish political research has multiple organizational ties to international political science bodies. Quite early, a Danish Society of Political Science was founded. The society – the functions of which are professional, not unionist – has been affiliated with the International Political Science Association (IPSA) for a long time. All three university institutes are members of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), while the institute in Aarhus administers the national membership in the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR).

3. Conceptual Models and Frames of Reference

In trying to outline the conceptual development in Danish political research during the period in question, two facts must be kept in mind. In the first place, political science as an organized scientific undertaking was a novum to the Danish academic world when introduced in 1958. Secondly, until the middle of the 60's, Danish political science was concentrated in one place, which makes it a not too gross simplification to treat Danish political science during much of the 60's as an undifferentiated entity.

When political science was originally established at the University of Aarhus in 1958, the first task confronting the 'founding fathers' was somehow to define the scope of the new subject and to develop – or implant – a usable conceptual framework. To solve this task, no guidance could be expected from tradition: what might have existed as a tradition of a Danish science of politics obviously was judged inadequate as the foundation upon which a modern science of politics could be built.¹⁵ In this situation, foreign impulses became especially important. Influences from American political science fell on particularly fertile ground. Perhaps, the most important single lines of influence may be traced to the writings of Arnold Brecht¹⁶ and David Easton.¹⁷

Without pretending to explain why just these two scholars, in particular, came to exercise considerable influence in the early stages of concept formation in Danish political science, one may at least point out some factors which supposedly

did much to facilitate their reception. The meta-scientific writings of Brecht did fit with the prevailing philosophical mood and doctrines in the Danish universities and with the dominating view of scientific methodology which at that time was – and had been for some time already – Anglo-Saxon or neopositivist in orientation.¹⁸ Nor is it, in retrospect, difficult to understand the special attractiveness of the Eastonian definition of politics to a Danish political scientist of that time; it could at least be interpreted – that was before ‘Systems Analysis’¹⁹ appeared – as if it implied a delimitation of politics from non-politics without reference to formal institutions of the state. Due to the peculiarities of Danish political life, most obvious with regard to value allocations in the labor market, any attempt at defining politics in terms of ‘governmental authorities’ or with reference to them must from the outset have appeared unsatisfactory to a Danish political scientist. Hence, the Eastonian concept must have appeared made to order in this respect.

Quite early then, Danish political science may be said to have acquired its shibboleths:²⁰ The ‘authoritative allocation of values’ and the notion of the ‘political system’ as formulated by Easton, and the tenets of ‘value relativism’ as formulated by Brecht.

But did the Eastonian framework thus given considerable prominence ever function as more than a shibboleth? Given the nature of Easton’s work, it is hard to answer the question in any conclusive way. But it may be argued that the development of Danish political research does not differ radically from the development of political research elsewhere, where Eastonian viewpoints were not as dominating. Furthermore, although much of the political research actually done in Denmark may be placed in the categories of the Eastonian framework, very little of it, if any, can unequivocally be traced directly to this framework as the initiating force, and its usage as the explicit framework of analysis has been rather limited.²¹

One further point which may arouse suspicion as to the real importance of the Eastonian framework concerns the apparent ease with which it was accepted, and for quite a long time maintained, as the cornerstone of Danish political science. This could of course be attributed to a rather uncommon agreement within the evolving profession concerning the merits of the framework. But one could, on the other hand, suggest that the Eastonian concepts never really were felt sufficiently restrictive to set off a revolt against their predominance and that most Danish political scientists found themselves able to pursue their own particular research interests under this umbrella. (When a revolt finally came, it was not directed against Eastonian concepts per se). In this connection it may also be of significance that a certain ‘watering down’ of key notions in Easton’s framework accompanied its reception. For one, the ‘aspect’-view often disappeared from sight, making the concept of the ‘political system’ just a loose frame for the description and analysis of existing political institutions.²² Secondly, the ‘system-persistence’ orientation which became especially visible in ‘systems analysis’ was often not taken into account. Within a framework thus redefined, everybody could feel at ease.

But even if this view of the very limited role played by the writings of Easton in Danish political research as opposed to the 'official' adherence to them is valid, there is another side to the matter. We know that decisions *not* made also have an impact on relationships of influence. It may well be that the initial adoption of Easton – and the way this was done – did not by itself turn Danish political science in a particular direction. But then it must also be admitted that it did not lead into any cul de sac and that it did not preclude certain lines of approach, but, on the contrary, opened wide possibilities for operating with various middle-range theories in special areas of political research.

As political science spread as an academic subject to other universities, the conceptual frameworks applied became more diversified. Thus, the Eastonian framework never rose to the same height of prominence in the work of the Institute in Copenhagen as it did in Aarhus. Still, a systems approach prevailed also in the work done in Copenhagen although more importance was attached to the writings of, e.g., Karl Deutsch rather than Easton. But again the direct role of this framework in shaping the problems taken up in political research and the ways in which they were attacked cannot be demonstrated convincingly.

In short, the overarching general theories or frameworks cannot be said to have shaped Danish political research although they were given much attention up through the 60's. During the last years of the period considered here, the interest in these theories dwindled. Instead, middle-range theories were resorted to in increasing numbers.

Through the developments described above, Danish political science may be said to have evolved into *behavioralism*. Nevertheless, when the output from the research process is surveyed it will be seen that not all of the behavioral creed was put to work at once. This is true especially as far as the *focus* of study is concerned: If behavioralism is taken to imply a main focus on relevant individual or group behaviour,²³ parts of the early Danish political research in this period were not strictly behavioral in outlook. On the other hand it can also be seen that Danish political research has grown more behavioral with respect to focus up through this period.

Several factors may have contributed to this development. Influences from other disciplines, like law and history, may have had a retarding influence in the beginning. Further, the role of resources in the behavioral break-through in American political science has often been alluded to.²⁴ Something comparable in kind may have played a role in the development of Danish political research as well. Behavioral research requires special skills in research methodology and statistics and the early Danish political scientists were inadequately trained in that respect and had to acquire the necessary proficiency before indulging in behavioral research. Moreover, behavioral research often requires greater material resources as well, e.g. money for survey sampling and computer time for data processing. Computers were not generally available to Danish political scientists until the early 70's, and money was not easily obtainable before the establishment of the Social Science Research Council.

But even before Danish political research had turned wholeheartedly be-

havioral, rumors spread that American political science once again was about to move to a new era – this time named *post-behavioralism*.²⁵ As with behavioralism, it is not easy to define post-behavioralism exactly; it is in some ways easier to say what it *is not* rather than what it *is*, and this is true especially when compared to the development in Danish political research.

As in the United States, the ‘established’ orientation of political research in Denmark became the target of severe criticism in the late 60’s. These criticisms were mostly, but not exclusively, articulated by students. There was no organized movement at the beginning. No ‘Caucus for a New Political Science’ was established. (Later on, several student organizations provided some kind of organizational shelter for the critics). The issues raised were much the same as in the American setting: Value relativism was attacked as a hollow cover for conservatism and most of the research done was condemned as irrelevant to social problems. The tune of the critique might be labelled ‘radical’ in the special American sense of this term.

Thus, the start of the revolt which was intended to bring behavioralism toppling down looks in retrospect very much alike in American and Danish political science. But quite soon, developments in Denmark took a very different course. While it appears that in American political science much of the revolt was absorbed by established political science in terms of both organization²⁶ and concepts,²⁷ thus marking the transition from behavioralism to post-behavioralism, what had begun as a ‘radical’ critique in Denmark rapidly moved toward a firm entrenchment in Marxian positions. As a consequence, a line of demarcation was established between ‘behavioralists’ of all shadings on the one side and Marxists – likewise of different colors – on the other.

Why did the initial critique thus result in a schism in Danish political science rather than a dialogue or eventually integration through adaptation to the critique raised?

The posing of this question is not meant to imply that the existing political science has not been influenced in any way by the sudden upsurge of interest in Marxian thought. Several individual scholars not belonging to the Marxist camp have drawn inspiration from Marxian concepts in their field of study.²⁸ Nor is it to say that the two camps are hermetically cordoned off against each other. But anybody looking into Danish political science writings of recent years for traces of a debate or dialogue on metascientific or conceptual topics comparable to that accompanying the transition from behavioralism to post-behavioralism in American political science will search in vain. A split exists and not much has been done to bridge it.

There may be several reasons for this. For one, there is really very little common ground to stand on for ‘behavioralists’ and Marxists in Danish political science if questions of ontology and epistemology are to be taken seriously. In elucidating the current state of affairs, it may also be pointed out that much of the work done by Marxist scholars has not been, and still is not, concentrated on issues felt particularly relevant to non-Marxist political research, or on concrete issues altogether for that matter. Much of the effort has gone into lengthy ‘reconstructions’ of Marxist

thought and into the laborious erection of highly abstract logical constructions which may, but more often may not, provoke the interest of the non-Marxist political scientist. Very little 'real analysis' relevant to political research has been offered. Not even the sudden and quite disruptive changes in Danish political life from 1973 onwards have brought up much more than theoretical prolegomena to a Marxist analysis of what really happened.²⁹ This anti-empirical tendency may have been reinforced by the fact that until now the 'school' dominating Danish Marxist research has been the 'German' or 'capital logical school' which has seemed more prone to come up with highly abstract deductions cast in resounding germanisms than has the competing 'structural school'. Whatever the reason, in the field felt central to non-Marxist political science-empirical analysis – Marxist political science has not yet posed a real challenge.

One may also point to the existence of some kind of institutional segregation between Danish Marxist and non-Marxist political scientists. For several reasons, the former are mainly concentrated in the new universities of Roskilde and Aalborg, while the latter dominate the older institutions. This may contribute to a situation of splendid isolation rather than easy and fruitful exchanges of points of view.

Thus, serious contributions to a debate on Marxist and non-Marxist conceptual frameworks and theories in political science are easily counted. In this context, the work of *Curt Sørensen* deserves special attention (Sørensen, B 23, 1975). He has concentrated on the specific characteristics of Marxist theory formation, exemplified by the development of Marxist theory between the world wars. The main thesis forwarded is that Marxist theory may be characterized by the amalgamation of theoretical work and political practice. Of special interest here is Curt Sørensen's confrontation of Marxist and non-Marxist views both on questions of epistemology and on questions of the social order and social changes. This discussion represents a major achievement, whether or not one may agree with the results and whether or not one will consent to the view implicit in much of the discussion to the effect that Durkheim and the great classical elitists (Pareto, Mosca) are still fully representative of non-Marxist social science thinking.

Thus, the status of Danish political research at the end of the period under investigation is characterized by the existence of two conceptually sharply different orientations. On the one hand there are 'behavioralists' who by and large have been retreating from an occupation with general theories and overarching conceptual frameworks into the realms of middle-range theories and empirical research. On the other hand, there are Marxists who are working with one grand theory (to the exclusion of all others) without paying much attention to empirical work.

4. Projects and Reports

In the preceding sections, the emphasis has been on drawing up some broad lines in the organizational and conceptual structure of Danish political research. In the following, an attempt shall be made to present a more detailed view of where

the research has been moving and what problem areas have been covered. Selected pieces of relevant research in progress will be mentioned for purposes of illustration, which is to say that the following discussion does not pretend to represent a complete picture of the state of Danish political research nor to do justice to all contributions made over the years.

From the bird's-eye view, several marked tendencies can be discerned in the mounting output of political research. One has to do with the sheer quantity of research conducted and reported. Looking at the forerunners of this overview³⁰ it can be seen that almost no research was reported in 1960 and only very little in 1966. Since then, the development has accelerated. Moreover, the size of individual projects has obviously been growing. An increasing part of the research undertaken has been based on collaborative efforts of scholars from the same or from several institutions as opposed to individual work.

The conceptual development has been alluded to above. The shift of focus mentioned in this context is clearly brought out by the fact that research based on the characteristics and attitudes of individuals and groups has been conducted even in areas most often found resistant to the 'behavioral persuasion', such as public administration or foreign policy. The increased tendency towards the employment of middle-range theories and frameworks – likewise mentioned above – can be seen to have turned parts of political research into a more social-psychological direction, as many of the theories and frameworks in current use originated there. The interest in borrowing frameworks from other neighbouring disciplines, especially economics, has been minimal.

Another characteristic feature of the research done which deserves attention is the apparently low interest in genuine comparative research which is witnessed by the work of the last 15 years. This is not to say, of course, that the comparative viewpoint has been totally absent, or that international collaboration has not been sought. This has in fact been done, partly through the ECPR, in several fields, e.g. research in socialization and investigation into the EEC-referenda in Denmark and Norway. Nevertheless, as a whole, Danish political research in this period appears rather 'ethnocentric' in outlook.

It has also been postulated above – and the following will hopefully show it – that most of the research done can be organized into categories essentially belonging to an Eastonian framework.³¹ When this is attempted, still another feature of Danish political research emerges; in the period under scrutiny here, most of the research done has been on problems related to input, conversion and feedback structures and processes at different levels of the polity. Very little attention has been given to the allocation aspect, i.e. the policy content of the output. Interest has predominately been confined to elucidating *how* certain decisions were arrived at, largely neglecting the question of *what* decisions have been made. This fact has been pointed out and criticized chiefly by Erik Damgaard, who also has suggested a framework for policy analysis influenced by American examples (Damgaard, A1, 1972). In collaboration with Kjell A. Eliassen, he has started a project which promises to enhance our understanding of the 'outcomes' of the political process.³²

Mass Reactions and Electoral Behaviour

According to Rokkan, "the breakthrough towards a 'new science of politics' invariably occurred at the lowest level of the system, at the level of the 'unit citizen' defined in electoral law".³³ Although in this quotation Rokkan obviously refers to events in a more distant past, it is interesting to note that the same trend may be found in the not too distant past of Danish political research. In fact the first project ever undertaken and reported from the new Institute of Political Science in Aarhus was an investigation of voting participation by Poul Meyer and Jens Jeppesen (D 342, 1964) and electoral research has remained an important field of political research in Denmark ever since.

The tendency pointed out by Rokkan in the above quotation must of course be attributed to the fact that the electoral process normally generates data suitable and readily available for ecological analysis. Hence, the data problem is more easily solved than in other fields, at least if one is prepared to abstain from analyses at the individual level. This holds true for Denmark as well. Moreover, here electoral material is available right back to the first enfranchisement in 1849 of all men above the age of 30.

Nevertheless, the interest in research on electoral behaviour prior to 1960 has been surprisingly low. Erik Høgh has done a short ecological paper on the election of 1950.³⁴ A longitudinal ecological project reaching back to 1920 was planned by Stehouwer (D 342, 1967), but due to his untimely death nothing came of it. It is to be hoped that a project recently started by Søren Risbjerg Thomsen will do something to close the gap. The project aims at an analysis of general elections back to 1920 based on ecological data. A special feature of this project is an attempt to construct formal models – derived from the Rasch-model – which will allow inferences from ecological data to behaviour at a lower level of aggregation.³⁵

The first phase of the mobilization of the Danish citizens and the early development of cleavages in the electorate up to 1901 are covered in Erik Høgh's doctoral dissertation written for the doctoral degree in sociology, *Vælgeradfærd i Danmark 1849–1901. En politisk sociologisk analyse* (D 342, 1972). The analyses are based on records from the open general elections in the period 1849–1901 which have been preserved from several electoral districts. Thus, the investigation is not restricted to the ecological level, but could be based on what in several respects amounted to a multi-wave panel. A number of hypotheses concerning electoral behaviour are proposed and put to test. Unfortunately, not the least from a comparative viewpoint, problems of mobilization and cleavage-formation are not in the central focus of the study and are mainly handled in a purely descriptive way. The work has drawn both acclamation and severe criticism.³⁶

A thorough ecological analysis of the four general elections held in the 60's has been presented by the late Jan Stehouwer and Ole Borre (D 342, 1968, 1970). The reports published showed a close relationship between ecological and political factors and demonstrated their considerable stability during the period analyzed. However, due to the character of the data base, many questions could not be posed in this investigation and many problems remain untouched (Pedersen,

D 342, 1968). There is nothing in the reports to foreshadow the violent landslides of the elections in the 70's which followed.

As an offspring of this project, an ecological data archive has been established by K.-H. Bentzon, Ole Borre and Jørgen Elklit.³⁷ The archive covers the period from 1909 to 1968 and is open for use by other scholars.

Contrary to the elections in the 60's, the elections of 1971, 1973 and 1975 were covered by nationwide sample surveys (including a panel) conducted by a group of scholars from the universities of Copenhagen and Aarhus.³⁸ Thus, invaluable individual data were acquired for the analysis of the land-slide elections of 1973 and 1975 which turned the established political landscape upside down. The group of principal investigators has published two reports, one covering the elections of 1971 and 1973, and very recently an additional one covering all three elections.³⁹ In both, the presentation is organized according to much the same principles (which at the same time give the main views adopted): Electoral choice is related to, e.g., the social background of the electorate, attitudes and opinions, exposure to political communication, and the perceived ideological structure and dimensionality of the party system. The studies give a detailed account of what happened in the protest elections of 1973 and 1975. For example, the attitudinal aspect, i.e. the changes in the attitudes towards different levels of the polity, is covered thoroughly, following earlier work of Ole Borre and Daniel Katz on the same issue (D 20, 1973). But the authors appear very cautious in attempting to tell *why* things happened.

Understandably, the events of 1973 and 1975 have drawn attention from several political scientists besides those directly involved in the above-mentioned project, and several reports and analyses have appeared (Boelsgaard, D 342, 1974; Bohn, D 342, 1974). To mention only a few more specialized studies, Ole Borre and Karen Siune have analyzed what issues were raised by the politicians and what issues were felt important by the electorate during the electoral campaign of 1973, based on interview data and on content analysis of broadcasts in radio and TV.⁴⁰ In collaboration with Jerrold Rusk from the University of Arizona, Ole Borre has studied the voters' shifting perception of the Danish party space. The results closely parallel those obtained by Torben Worre.⁴¹

Another decisive political event in the 70's – the referendum on Denmark's membership in the EEC in 1972 – has likewise been made the object of intense political research based on a survey of a sample of the electorate, elite interviews, and content analyses of relevant political communication. A group of scholars from the University of Aarhus, including specialists in the fields of mass communication and international politics, and cooperating with a Norwegian team headed by Henry Valen from the University of Oslo, has issued a report on the event.⁴² A group of scholars from the University of Copenhagen headed by Willy Johansen has been studying patterns of opinion formation up to the referendum.

A somewhat more specialized project within the field of mass reactions is found in the study conducted in 1971 in Southern Jutland by Jørgen Elklit and Ole Tonsgaard from the Institute of Political Science in Aarhus and the historian Johan Peter Noack. This study – which only in part is a study of electoral behavior –

derives its special feature from the national question posed by the German-minded minority in this area. Several preliminary reports have appeared (Elkfit, Noack and Tonsgaard, D 191, 1972).

As can be seen from the remarks above, the study of *mass media* and *mass communication* has come to play a role both in the analysis of electoral behaviour⁴³ and as an independent field of interest. Besides the mass communication studies within the election and referendum projects, Karen Siune has content analyzed a week's news transmissions in the Danish radio, and, together with Marit Bakke, has compared the structure and content of news broadcasting in Denmark and Norway (Siune, D 332, 1973; Bakke and Siune, D 332, 1974).

An important work on the historical development and role of the press has been done by Niels Thomsen (D 332, 1968, 1972). Ejbye-Ernst and Erik Nordal Svendsen have concentrated upon the role played by one local newspaper in a near-monopolistic position.⁴⁴

Of relatively recent vintage – at least in a Danish setting – is the interest in how political attitudes and orientations are moulded during the general development of the individual. The study of *political socialization* of children, conducted mainly by Lise Tøgeby, Palle Svensson and Carsten Jarlov, attempts to shed light on this question. The analyses of interview data obtained from school children in the municipality of Nykøbing and Aarhus indicate as a main finding that political interest and party identification are developed rather late,⁴⁵ and particularly later than should be expected from relevant American results. Besides the study of those socialized, a study by Lise Tøgeby based on content analysis of one of the chief agents of political socialization – school books on civic subjects – has been under progress for some time.

Parties, Interest Organizations and Popular Movements

In some respects, this field of specialization overlaps with the one reviewed above and it overlaps in part with the one discussed in the following section as well. As soon as we investigate the mass basis of a party, we are moving on the borderline of electoral research; as soon as we focus on its behaviour in the parliament, we are moving into the study of the central institutions of government.

As a field of specialization, the study of parties, interest organizations and popular movements obviously has been lacking the comprehensive projects which characterize the study of electoral behaviour. Most of the research done has concentrated upon one particular party or organization and/or one particular situation.

As was the case with political mobilization of the electorate, the associated historical aspect of party formation in the Danish society has not been given much attention in Danish political research. The main work on this topic has been done in Vagn Dybdahl's doctoral dissertation *Partier og erhverv* (D 21, 1969), written for the doctoral degree in history. This work concentrates on the development of the party organizations, demonstrating the role of occupational groups during this process.

A more general and comparative perspective is employed in Kjell A. Eliassen's

work on the development of the political participation and affiliation of interest organizations in Western Europe (D 12, 1974), which is influenced by the 'threshold' ideas current in Norwegian political science. Together with Lars Svaasand, he has proposed a comprehensive framework for the study of the formation of mass political organizations, attempting to bring together elements from the theory of organizations with the theory of nation-building and political development (D 10, 1975).

The problem of the basis of mass political organizations has mainly been treated in connection with electoral research. A large and in part comparative data base on this question has been assembled by Ingemar Glans, who has worked especially on the class basis of the socialist people's parties in Norway and Denmark, utilizing concepts from both Marxist and non-Marxist sociology (D 20, 1975). Much of his work still awaits publication.

Projects on single parties and organizations as parapolitical systems have also been reported. Jacob Buksti has investigated the development of conflict and cooperation within and among various agricultural organizations (D 13, 1974) and Palle Svensson has made the social-democratic party in the 30's the object of a system-persistence analysis.⁴⁶ The classical 'iron law of oligarchy'-view has been guiding several theses written on interest organizations.⁴⁷

Studies dealing with the role and influence of mass political organizations in special political situations have been strongly influenced by the Swedish models of party strategy, e.g. H. Bregnsbo's analysis of the process leading to the new school legislation in 1958 (D 10, 1971). Recently, the more comprehensive concept of 'corporativism' has been proposed as a framework for the analysis of the role of political organizations in the political process (Dahlerup, Jarlov, Johansen and Kristensen, D 10, 1975). The 'sectoral approach' applied in the above-mentioned project of Damgaard and Eliassen represents still another way of analysis which may be expected to prove fruitful.

Central Institutions of Government

As far as the output units of the polity⁴⁸ are concerned, the study of the formal institutions of government – parliament (*Folketing*), cabinet, and central and local administration – has occupied a central place in Danish political research during the period surveyed.

The early work was predominantly oriented in a historical direction (Thorsen, C 311, 1967), and a characteristic feature of a part of political research in this field appears to have been a tendency to treat the institutions under scrutiny isolated from other – especially 'lower' – levels of the polity. Several attempts to employ cross-sectional viewpoints represent a rather recent achievement in this respect.

With regard to 'parliamentary studies', three main areas of research stand out: the legislative behaviour of parties, often seen in a longitudinal perspective; the rules and procedures of the *Folketing*; and the process of recruitment of legislators.

Several scholars have covered the field of legislative behaviour which in a Danish context may be equated to the study of parties and their behaviour in the parliamentary setting. Torben Worre has clearly demonstrated this overriding im-

portance of the parties for all aspects of parliamentary activities, from the election process to the determination of the individual members' vote cast on a particular bill (Worre, C 321, 1970).

The first study of conflict and consensus in the *Folketing* was presented by Mogens N. Pedersen, still leaving the problem of the nature of the cleavage lines untouched (C 321, 1967). This question was taken up later on, first in a somewhat belated attack by Mogens N. Pedersen et al (C 321, 1971) on the idea of the existence of a right-left dimension as the sole cleavage line between Danish parties, and since in a thorough investigation conducted by Erik Damgaard and J. Rusk from the University of Arizona into cleavage structures and representational linkages in legislative behaviour in Denmark since 1920.⁴⁹ In this important study, data on 'party closeness' as perceived by the electorate and as exhibited by the votes cast in parliament in relation to several policy issues are used to construct the party space. Thereby, two aspects often treated separately in dimensional analysis of party systems are brought together, and, in principle, inferences can be made on the relationship between elite and mass behaviour.⁵⁰

The work on the recruitment of the legislative elite has mainly been done by Mogens N. Pedersen and – as far as the comparative part of the work is concerned – Kjell A. Eliassen. Two orientations are mainly employed in these studies: in some, the recruitment process is viewed from a group- or class-perspective as a kind of substitution process by which one dominating group is replaced by a new, as was the case in the 19th century when conservative groups were ousted by (liberal) agrarians (Pedersen, D 32, 1974). In other studies, main emphasis is placed on the professionalization aspect of the recruitment to parliament and comparisons are made between the professionalization of the legislative elites in Norway and Denmark. As far as Denmark is concerned, the degree of professionalization is shown to be independent of the degree of mobilization of the electorate, but rather to be a function of the strength of the social democrats and the agrarians, i.e. the dominating parties in the urban and rural districts, respectively (Pedersen and Eliassen, C 320, 1975).

As part of the project on recruitment, an *Archive on Danish Politicians* has been established, containing information on members of the *Folketing* from 1849 to 1968, members of the *Landsting* (1849–1953), Cabinet ministers (1849–1968) and candidates running for election to the *Folketing* (1960–1971) (Pedersen, A 2, 1972). The work on the establishment of the archive has triggered off a series of interacting theses on the role played by the Danish electoral procedures for the process of legislative recruitment (Foverskov, D 342, 1974). Several other aspects of recruitment have been made the object of theses as well.⁵¹

As far as the procedures of the *Folketing* are concerned, practically all of the non-legalistic studies have been done by students, resulting in theses.⁵²

The process of cabinet formation and the parliamentary basis of shifting governments has been analyzed by several scholars. Poul Meyer has given an account of the techniques of cabinet formation which concentrates upon the formal and informal rules governing the process (Meyer, C 311, 1967). Erik Damgaard has studied the process of coalition formation which normally has been necessary

to bring about the parliamentary basis of a cabinet, showing that the result approximately conforms to what would have been predicted from Riker's 'size principle' (Damgaard, C 321, 1969). He has also done most of the work reported in empirical studies of the functions of the *Folketing* and the structural adjustments of this body to new challenges.⁵³

The field of *public administration* – both at the central and local levels – differs from other fields in Danish political research mainly in that it is both theory- and application-oriented. This feature naturally marks the studies conducted. Poul Meyer has given several comprehensive descriptions of the Danish administration, employing both legal and several system theoretical frameworks (Meyer, C 611, 1973), and scores of papers on concrete administrative problems have appeared.

An interesting attempt to transgress the boundaries of the macro-view dominating much of Danish research in public administration is given in two projects currently under progress. One is an investigation into the relationship between citizens and the local administration in the municipality of Langaa, based on a sample survey.⁵⁴ It may be interpreted as an attempt to link together the study of the characteristic traits of a particular local administration with a study of the 'customer' and feed-back unit of the system, the individual citizen. The other is an investigation into the backgrounds and the working-conditions of members of the local councils following the reform of the local administration in 1970. It is conducted by K.-H. Bentzon and Ole Nørgaard Madsen. This study, too, may be seen as representing an attempt to get to the micro-level of administration, e.g., the attitudinal aspects of administrators, as a supplement to descriptions at the system level.

International Politics and Organizations

As may be seen from most bibliographies on political research in Denmark, such as the one contained in this journal, the study of international politics – or, more precisely, the study of politics in the international system, foreign policy and international organizations – is by no means the least preferred by Danish political scientists. At the same time, it seems to be most diversified and kaleidoscopic of all fields surveyed, both with regard to what is studied and how it is done.

Among the numerous contributions to the study of *Danish foreign policy*, only a few shall be mentioned here. The works of Troels Fink (E 23, 1961) and Sjøqvist (E 23, 1966) are mostly historical in orientation. The relationship between Denmark and the USSR is analyzed by Mary Dau (E 23, 1969) and the security problems in Danish foreign policy are treated by Erling Bjøl et al. (E 23, 1968).

Attempts have been made to imbed the analysis of Danish foreign policy in the broader perspective of small state politics. Ole Karup Pedersen's doctoral dissertation *Udenrigsminister P. Munch's opfattelse af Danmarks stilling i international politik* (E 23, 1970) is written with this point in mind.⁵⁵ Another contribution to be mentioned in this connection is Hans Branner's analysis of the crucial Danish decision at the beginning of World War I to close the straits by laying mines

(E 23, 1972). Although both studies share the interest in the small state aspect in Danish foreign policy, they differ markedly in their frame of reference. While Branner uses concepts from decision-making theory, Ole Karup Pedersen relies on a sociological role concept. Both Erling Bjøl (E 20, 1968) and Peter Hansen (E 23, 1974) have given more general contributions to the problems of small state behaviour.

The main contribution to the study of foreign policy of other countries is represented by Erling Bjøl's doctoral dissertation *La France devant l'Europe* (E 23, 1966) which gives a thorough analysis of French policies toward European integration under the fourth Republic. The main orientation of the study is decision-theoretical, based on the categories *système de causalité* and *système de finalité* derived from the work of Duroselle.

Quite another aspect of foreign policy is taken up in the period surveyed here. The projects related to the EEC-referendum which include surveys on both elite and mass attitudes have been mentioned above. In many ways the forerunner of these surveys was an investigation into foreign policy attitudes conducted in 1969. The model was an American study, and among the aims of the study was to find out whether scales utilized in America could be applied in a Danish context as well.⁵⁶ No final report has appeared so far, but part of the data has gone into several papers.

A mainly historical description of the *international system and international politics* after 1945 is given by Erling Bjøl (E 22, 1972/1973). Ib Damgaard Pedersen has been working with general systems theory (E 20, 1973) and has applied a systems analysis concept to the analysis of the collapse of the international system (E 0, 1969).

On the borderline between the study of international politics and foreign policy we may find numerous studies of the politics of deterrence, defense and disarmament. Especially Bertel Heurlin and Nikolaj Petersen have worked with projects in this field (Heurlin, E 152, 1971).

The main work on *international organizations* has been done by Peter Hansen. His first broadly based book on the topic must be characterized as primarily descriptive and legalistic in orientation (E 1, 1968). A more recent book clearly shows a shift in emphasis. Here, international organizations are placed in the framework of structural functionalism (E 1, 1975). Several projects on recruitment of personnel to international organizations are under progress.

Some Concluding Remarks

In the preceding sections we have surveyed parts of Danish political research done during the last 15 years. An attempt has been made to organize the pieces at hand into a picture, realizing that this meant superimposing on the material a structure which cannot be independent of the spectator.

Some works, however, defy the structure of this paper. Clearly, Erik Rasmussen's books (C 22, 1969) do not fit into one single classification of the categories used. Still, they are almost as close as possible to being the classics of Danish political

science, even though they were written with the primary purpose of teaching in mind.

Another work which comes to mind here is H. H. Bruun's highly learned study on the value-problem in Max Weber's methodology (A 2, 1972), which gives a lucid account of much of the foundation of value-relativism still belonging to the scientific credo of the greater part of the political science profession.

Jan-Magnus Jansson, in a famous quotation, once drew an analogy between the state of political science in Finland in 1959 and the state of the exploration of Africa at the time of Livingstone and Stanley:⁵⁷ the coastline was by and large known, as was the situation on the map of certain mountain ridges. Without implying anything about backwardness, the same characteristic may well be applied to Danish political science after its first 15 years of independent existence. The question is where the exploration will proceed. For the time being, the expedition team seems to quarrel over the best way and over whether to concentrate on the rivers or the ridges.

NOTES

1. Carl J. Friedrich, *Man and his Government* (New York: 1963) pp. 6-7.
2. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: 1972), second edition.
3. Cf. the paper on the growth of the profession in Denmark in this volume.
4. Thus, studies on drinking and smoking habits of youths or on the patterns of shopping displayed by housewives in rural districts will not normally be considered central to political science. (These examples are from projects conducted in the Institute of Political Science at the University of Aarhus).
5. Cf. Frands Mortensen, *Kommunikationskritisk analyse af 22-radioavisen* (Grenå: 1972).
6. Cf. the paper on the growth of the profession in Denmark in this volume.
7. 'Cirkulæreskrivelse om stillingsstrukturen for det videnskabelige personale ved Københavns Universitet, Århus Universitet, Odense Universitet, Danmarks tekniske Højskole, Den Kgl. Veterinær- og Landbohøjskole, Danmarks Lærerhøjskole, Danmarks Farmaceutiske Højskole, Københavns Tandlægehøjskole, Århus Tandlægehøjskole og Roskilde Universitetscenter' af 31. maj 1972, incl. Protokollat II.
8. Cf. the paper on the growth of the profession in Denmark in this volume for the development of staff.
9. Of special interest may be the collection of social indicators which has recently appeared under the title *Levevilkår i Danmark*.
10. There is close collaboration between several opinion research institutes and certain newspapers. *Gallup's* 'political index' is published in 'Berlingske Tidende', the results of the *Observa* panel appear in 'Morgenavisen Jyllandsposten', while the results of *AIM* are published in the daily 'Børsen', to mention only a few.
11. Danish Social Science Research Council (ed.), *op.cit.*, p. 37 (A1).
12. *Op.cit.*, p. 42. Here the range given is from 1% to 19%, due to a somewhat different definition of political research.
13. *Op.cit.*, pp. 38-39.
14. *Op.cit.*, loc.cit.
15. A summary of the tradition is given in Sven Henningsen and Erik Rasmussen, 'Political Research in Scandinavia 1960-65: Denmark', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, Vol. I, 1966, pp. 254-257 (A1).
16. Arnold Brecht, *Political Theory* (Princeton, New Jersey: 1959).
17. David Easton, *The Political System* (New York: 1953).
18. The main exponent of positivism in Danish philosophy has undoubtedly been Jørgen

- Jørgensen, incumbent of the chair in philosophy at the University of Copenhagen from 1926 to 1964.
19. David Easton, *A Systems Analysis of Political Life* (New York: 1965). A certain disappointment with the view taken in this work is reflected in Erik Rasmussen, 'Some Comments on the Concept of the Political System', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, Vol. 5, 1970, pp. 11-19 (C20), and *Komparativ Politik I*, p. 113 and *Komparativ Politik II*, p. 108, pp. 144 ff. (C22).
 20. Book of Judges, 12:6.
 21. One example, however, is the analysis of the Danish Social Democratic party from a system persistence point of view contained in a thesis written by Palle Svensson.
 22. This may be taken as an example of the fallacy labelled 'misplaced concreteness'. G. Bateson, in a short introspective piece, gives a nice account of how this fallacy may arise (Gregory Bateson, 'Experiments in Thinking about Observed Ethnological Material', reprinted in *Steps to an Ecology of Mind* (Bungay, Suffolk: 1972), pp. 47-61. As he may be unknown to most political scientists, a short biographical note: Bateson is an anthropologist and has collaborated with Margaret Mead, his former wife).
 23. Cf. the points in David Easton, *A Framework for Political Analysis* (New York: 1965), pp. 5-6.
 24. Robert A. Dahl, 'The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest', *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 55, 1961, pp. 763-772.
 25. There is already a large literature dealing with this phenomenon. Of special interest in this context is George J. Graham and George W. Carey (eds.), *The Post-Behavioral Era: Perspectives on Political Science* (New York: 1972).
 26. Cf. Theodore J. Lowi, 'The Politics of Higher Education: Political Science as a Case Study', *op.cit.*, pp. 11-36.
 27. Cf. the second edition of David Easton, *The Political System* (New York: 1972).
 28. This view has been repeatedly professed by, e.g. Ole Karup Petersen of the University of Copenhagen.
 29. Very recently, a thesis has appeared which contains an attempt to apply the theories of Poulantzas to empirical data on the political development in Denmark after 1973. The empirical part of the analysis is a blunder, as it does not succeed in closing the gap between theory and data. [Johannes Andersen, *Det borgerlige parlament og de borgerlige politiske partier* (Århus: 1976)].
 30. Sven Henningsen and Erik Rasmussen, *op.cit.* (A1); Stein Rokkan and Henry Valen, 'Parties, Elections and Political Behavior in Northern Countries: A Review of Recent Research', in Otto Stammer (ed.), *Politische Forschung* (Köln: 1960), pp. 103-136; and Jan-Magnus Jansson, 'Der Staatsapparat als Gegenstand der Politischen Wissenschaft in den Nordischen Ländern', *ibid.*, pp. 137-151 (A1).
 31. A usable classification scheme based on Eastonian categories may be found in Stein Rokkan, 'Political Research in Scandinavia 1960-65: Norway' in *Scandinavian Political Studies*, Vol. I, 1966, p. 275 (A1).
 32. Erik Damgaard and Kjell A. Eliassen, *Lovgivningsprocesser og politisk segmentering*, Århus, 1975 (mimeo.).
 33. Stein Rokkan, 'Political Research in Scandinavia 1960-65: Norway', *op.cit.*, p. 270 (A1).
 34. Erik Høgh, 'En økologisk analyse af folketingsvalget 1950', *Sociologiske Meddelelser*, 4. serie, 1958.
 35. Søren Risbjerg Thomsen, *Beskæftigelse og partivalg*, Århus, 1976. (mimeo.).
 36. Cf. *Sociologiske Meddelelser*, 17. serie, 1973, which contains some of the critical remarks. An interesting critique may also be found in Jørgen Elklit, 'Om udforskningen af vælgeradfærd i Danmark i det 19. århundrede', in *Historie, Jyske Samlinger*, Ny Række X, No. 2, 1973, pp. 266-288 (D342).
 37. Karl-Henrik Bentzon, Ole Borre, Jørgen Elklit, *Kommunedata-arkivet, 1909-68* (Århus: 1972). (See also Bentzon, D341).
 38. Ole Borre (University of Aarhus), Hans Jørgen Nielsen, Steen Sauerberg, and Torben Worre (University of Copenhagen).
 39. Ole Borre, Hans Jørgen Nielsen, Steen Sauerberg, Torben Worre, *Vælgerskreddet 1971-73* (Copenhagen: 1976); Ole Borre, Hans Jørgen Nielsen, Steen Sauerberg, Torben Worre, *Vælgere i 70-erne* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1976).
 40. Karen Siune and Ole Borre, 'Who Determines Electoral Issues', Århus, 1973 (mimeo.).

41. Ole Borre and Jerrold G. Rusk, 'The Changing Party Space in Danish Voter Perceptions, 1971-73', Århus, 1974 (mimeo.).
42. Jørgen Elklit, Peter Hansen, Nikolaj Petersen, Karen Siune, Melvin Small, Ole Tonsgaard, 'The Danish EEC Referendum. Some Preliminary Results', Århus, 1974 (mimeo.).
43. This development appears very much in line with the development in the SRC election studies from the University of Michigan.
44. A. Ejbye-Ernst, Steen Lykke Pedersen, Erik Nordahl Svendsen, *Ålborg Stiftstidende i lokalsamfundet* (Århus: 1975).
45. Palle Svensson, 'Politisk socialisering og partipræferencer blandt danske skoleelever', Århus, 1975 (mimeo.). For a critique of the 'socialization approach' see Søren Villadsen, 'Politisk påvirkning af børn - en kritik af undersøgelser og teorier', *Økonomi og Politik*, 1, 1973, pp. 3-20 (D31).
46. See note 13.
47. E.g. Ilja Wechselmann, 'Bureautiets (forretningsudvalgets) rolle i den danske landsorganisation', Copenhagen, 1971 (mimeo.).
48. Cf. Stein Rokkan, *op.cit.*, p. 275 (A1).
49. Erik Damgaard and Jerrold G. Rusk, 'Cleavage Structure and Representational Linkages: A Longitudinal Analysis of Danish Legislative Behaviour', Århus, 1974 (stencil).
50. For a critique, see Ian Budge, Ivor Crewe, Dennis Farlie (eds.), *Party Identification and Beyond* (New York: 1976), pp. 133-134.
51. Topics which have been studied in this context include the role of 'political families' and the recruitment of those employed in the public sector into the legislature.
52. In particular, the question hour, the private bills and the motions of adjournment have been studied.
53. Cf. Erik Damgaard, 'Structural Adjustments of the Danish Parliament in the 20th Century', in H. J. Heaphey and A. Baaklini, *Comparative Legislative Reforms and Innovations* (in press).
54. *Borger og kommune, Langaa* (Århus: 1975).
55. For a critical evaluation, see Erling Bjøl, 'P. Munch, historisk og sociologisk set', *Historie, Jyske Samlinger, Ny Række IX*, 1, 1970, pp. 123-141.
56. Peter Hansen, Nikolaj Petersen, K. W. Redder, 'Foreign Policy Attitudes of the Danish Population', Aarhus, 1969 (mimeo.).
57. Quoted from Dag Anckar, *Finsk statskunskap 1960-1975*, Åbo, 1976.