



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Summaries in English

N.A.

### Citation

Summaries in English. (1980). Summaries in English. *Acta Politica*, 15: 1980(3), 429-430.  
Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3452141>

Version: Publisher's Version  
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)  
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3452141>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

- 10 „ „ : Speciale subgroepen (Mokken).  
 11 „ „ : Multipele graphen (Stokman).  
 12 „ „ : Stochastische graphen (Mokken).

De inleidingen worden 's morgens gegeven (9-12 uur). De middagen zijn gereserveerd voor de introductie in de standaardpakketten, praktische oefeningen op sociaal-wetenschappelijke data, bespreking van empirische resultaten en behandeling van enkele sociale onderwerpen (zoals gesigeneerde graphen met hun toepassing op kennisgraphen).

#### Bekend veronderstelde literatuur

Aan de deelnemers van de cursus wordt zo spoedig mogelijk een opgave gedaan van bekend veronderstelde en aanbevolen literatuur.

Nadere inlichtingen en opgave bij mw. G. Winkel, Vakgroep Statistiek en Meettheorie FSW, Oude Boteringstraat 23, 9712 GC Groningen.

#### Themadag Vakgroep Politieke Wetenschappen te Leiden

Op vrijdag 10 oktober 1980 organiseert de Vakgroep Politieke Wetenschappen van de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden een 'themadag' over 'Politiek in de post-industriële samenleving'.

Met deze themadag wordt het academisch jaar voor staf en studenten geopend. Daarmee heeft de dag overigens geen besloten karakter. Integendeel, deze mededeling beoogt potentiële belangstellenden van de themadag op de hoogte te stellen en tot deelname te stimuleren.

In de voormiddag (vanaf 10.00 uur, Hugo de Grootstraat 27, Leiden) zullen referaten gehouden worden door:

Prof. Dr. A. van Staden, Drs. R. B. Andeweg en Prof. Dr. H. R. van Gunsteren.

De namiddag is gereserveerd voor discussie. Voor nadere informatie en aanmelding wende men zich tot het secretariaat van de Vakgroep Politieke Wetenschappen, Hugo de Grootstraat 27 te Leiden (071-149641, tst. 324).

## Summaries

### Voters and issues: on the formation of party-preferences

by J. J. van Cuilenburg, J. Kleinnijhuis, G. P. Noordzij

In this article the authors confront a very modest hypothetico-deductive model of party-preference-formation with survey-data from the Dutch 1977 national-election-survey.

The model is based on the supposition that people exhibit consistent preference-formation-behaviour, in the sense that voters tend to express a preference for those parties with which – in terms of a particular set of issues – they are most consistent, or, to which they stand closest.

The model has been applied to the three main political parties in the Netherlands: PvdA (Labour), CDA (Christian-Democratic) and VVD (Conservative-Liberal).

It appeared to be possible, using multiple regression as the tool for data analysis, to explain about 40% of the differences between voters with respect to their preference-formation in terms of their stands on issues ( $R^2$  for PvdA-model = .45;  $R^2$  for CDA-model = .36;  $R^2$  for VVD-model = .40).

Furthermore it appears to be possible to predict expressed party-preference adequately in 69% of the cases on the basis of a comparison between resp. the voters- and the (perceived) party-stands on issues.

These results may be regarded, in the opinion of the authors, as evidence for the empirical validity of the central axiom at the basis of their research, viz. that people do not behave in a blind mechanistic way and that behaviour can be adequately understood as being based on a minimal degree of reflection, i.e. on stands that people and parties take (resp. are perceived to take) on – among many other things – political issues.

In an appendix the authors briefly discuss some methodological points that could be raised against the model they have used. They come to the conclusion that more sophisticated models, more often than not resting on less solid theoretical foundations, do not exhibit more explanatory or predictive potential and that, for that matter, relatively simple models, resting on relatively clear theoretical assumptions, should be preferred.

### Property Rights, Justice and the Welfare State

by Percy B. Lehning

In this article five different theories of justice are examined in relation to the question: how much government intervention in private property rights is allowed.

The suggestion is that these five theories (of Murray Rothbard, Robert Nozick, James M. Buchanan, John Rawls and C. B. Macpherson) which are typical examples of the different stands that are taken nowadays on intervention by the welfare state, can be placed on a continuum.

On this continuum the left side is defined as full government control, while the right is taken to mean a completely free economy.

By placing the five theories along this continuum their different views on property rights can be explained by their different theories of justice. The theories of justice stipulate what ought to be called a just distribution and also – at the same time – give an answer to the question how inviolable property rights are.

#### **The (non-)assertion of welfare rights: Hirschman's theory applied**

by Freek Bruinsma

The article tries to explain the underutilization of welfare rights in terms of Hirschman's theory in *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*. Whereas Hirschman presents 'voice' and 'exit' as two competing mechanisms, the author distinguishes four different types of reaction: (1) *fight*: the assertion of rights, part of Hirschman's concept of voice in fact; (2) *flight*: Hirschman's concept of exit, absent any assertion of rights; (3) *acquiescence*: neither voice – here understood as the assertion of rights – nor exit; and (4) *revenge*: exit first and voice afterwards.

The legal programme of the welfare state consists of a growing body of rights to which the weaker party in relations of dependency is entitled (employee's rights, patient's rights, tenant's rights, social security rights, consumer's rights, etc.). To a large extent these new rights remain law in books, since from the perspective of the individual non-assertion, whether flight or acquiescence, is quite often preferable and in fact preferred to the assertion of rights, especially fight, which is the assumption of the welfare state. The author uses mainly the Weberian method of interpretative sociology (*verstehende Soziologie*) for an understanding when and where the different courses of action will be chosen, corroborated by empirical data.

The last part of the article is devoted to the implications of the analysis for the administration of justice. Apart from certain proposals to influence the cost-benefit analysis of the individual in order to make the assertion of rights more attractive and thus to create a higher demand for justice, the author concludes by exploring the potential contribution of the exit-option to justice.

#### **Welfare Rights in the Welfare State**

by Norman Furniss

The extent to which prescribed welfare rights in the modern state are asserted *in fact* is important and relatively neglected. Inferential reasoning on this issue is pursued most effectively in relation to three factors: Whether the state undertakes ad hoc welfare provisions or advances the general policy of a guaranteed national minimum; whether affected individuals are organized collectively or have to assert rights in isolation; whether the type of welfare right involves the outcome of market relations or the provision of government 'largess'. I conclude that in states most often and accurately labelled 'welfare states' the problem of nonassertion of welfare rights would be greatly attenuated.

## **Medewerkers aan dit nummer**

*Dr. P. R. Baehr* was hoogleraar in de Leer der Internationale Betrekkingen aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam en is thans secretaris van de Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid.

*Drs. F. Bruinsma* studeerde politicologie en staatsrecht aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam en is thans als wetenschappelijk medewerker werkzaam in de vakgroep Rechtstheorie, sectie rechtssociologie van de Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht.

*Dr. J. J. van Cuilenburg* is als wetenschappelijk hoofdmedewerker werkzaam bij de vakgroepen communicatie wetenschap en politicologie van de Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam.

*Dr. W. Derksen* is als wetenschappelijk medewerker verbonden aan de Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.

*Norman Furniss* is Associate Professor of Political Science and West-European studies aan de Universiteit van Indiana. Tijdens het studiejaar 1979-1980 was hij gastdocent bij de vakgroep politieke wetenschappen van de Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.

*J. Kleinnijenhuis* studeert politicologie en is als student-assistent verbonden aan de vakgroep politicologie van de Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam.

*A. J. Lanting* studeert Ruslandkunde aan het Oost-Europa Instituut van de Universiteit van Amsterdam.

*Drs. Percy B. Lehning* is als wetenschappelijk hoofdmedewerker verbonden aan de Erasmus Universiteit te Rotterdam.

*Dr. G. P. Noordzij* is als wetenschappelijk hoofdmedewerker verbonden aan de vakgroep politicologie van de Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam.

*Drs. Th. Ruyter* studeerde politicologie aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam. Hij was van 1973-75 te Dar es Salaam correspondent voor een aantal kranten en omroepen en is sinds 1976 werkzaam bij de Voorlichtingsdienst Ontwikkelingssamenwerking van het Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken.

*Drs. J. P. Verhoog* is als wetenschappelijk medewerker verbonden aan de vakgroep politicologie van de Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam.

*Dr. W. H. Vermeulen* is als wetenschappelijk medewerker verbonden aan het Europa Instituut van de Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht.