The course topic

“Political Change in the Democracies of Europe and in the EU: Forms of government and party systems in the crisis years”
The topic

- The great economic and financial crisis of 2008-2016 (?) in the EU. And then the Immigration crisis and the Security crises
- An export product of the USA! When an elephant sneezes…
- The impact in a special environment – the EU, an integrated set of European democratic nation states
- Democratic states and their main features
- The special situation of democratic states in a supranationally integrated system of institutions, rules, etc.
- A challenging situation: a deep economic stress (recession, unemployment, bank crisis, sovereign debts tensions, etc.) challenges from the demand side actors and institutions of democracy.
- The (political) supply side:
  - government performances in front of the crisis (fall of governments…?)
  - Parties (persistence/decline of old parties, growth of new parties, sustainability of new parties ?)
  - The role of EU institutions. Opportunities and constraints for national actors
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Political science and the comparative method

In contemporary political science the comparative perspective has acquired a central role....

• ....but the tradition is old: from Aristotle's Politics to Montesquieu's Esprit des Lois....

• Other disciplines (for instance history) are less keen about comparing; why? More interested in the specificity of each experience than in generalizing ....

• ...In fact comparing is a very common activity in every day life ...we compare movies, cars, restaurants, people, professors, students...

• Comparing is a crucial activity in developing knowledge

• Comparing in the ordinary and in the scientific language:

  – the ordinary language compares spontaneously without much previous deliberation about procedures.

  – the scientific language reflects upon its procedures and defines them according to the goals to be achieved
The Comparative method 1

• To compare: what does it mean?
• Analyze differences and similarities of two (or more) objects
• If there are only differences it is normally not very interesting to compare them (the apples and potatoes example!)
• Why comparing?
  – To describe phenomena
  – To explain phenomena
  – To evaluate phenomena
The Comparative method 2

• The descriptive perspective:
  – Analyzing the properties of a phenomenon

• The explanatory perspective:
  – Finding the factors that cause a phenomenon

• The evaluation perspective.
  – Attributing a value (good/bad) to a phenomenon

• The “engineering” perspective
  – Devising the instruments for obtaining a specific goal
The descriptive perspective

Observing empirically reality: what does it entail?
To be able to distinguish different phenomena and to determine their specific peculiarities/properties. From the global view to a particularized view. From the panorama to the details.
A preliminary selection of the “area of reality” to be observed is required (specialization). A phenomenon (a set of phenomena) that seem relevant, important.
Developing the instruments for conducting empirical observation.
Concepts → variables (operationalization/indicators)
Units of analysis: Macro/micro
Cases: Many/Few
Properties: Many/few
Observing and describing the properties of the cases to be analyzed
Properties become more visible when comparing more than one case
The data matrix . Descriptive strategies (intensive/extensive)
The data matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Var 1</th>
<th>Var2</th>
<th>Var3</th>
<th>Var4</th>
<th>Var5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The explanatory perspective


• The problem: how to reduce the number of possible explanatory factors and find a limited set of (necessary and sufficient) factors?

• Developing hypotheses (conjectural propositions) is the first step (the higher the level of education the greater the probability that a voter will vote for the right…the greater the number of parties the greater the instability of governments…..with the presidential model the probability of democratic crises increases….

• How to test/validate them? How to choose among rival explanations?

• How to make sure that it is not another variable/s that explains the observed phenomenon
Case Study method

• The study of a single case is often a first step in research.
• What are its advantages:
  – intensive examination of a phenomenon even with scarce resources
  – The possibility of gaining an in depth knowledge of a case and of exploring all its peculiarities (the country expert)
  – Collection of information about a great number of variables
• And its disadvantages:
  – Limited ability to discriminate among contending explanations
  – Limited ability to produce propositions of general value
• Types of case studies (Lijphart):
  – Atheoretical (just descriptive)
  – Interpretive (analysis of a case guided by a theory)
  – Hypothesis generating (a first step towards comparative research)
  – Theory confirming/Theory infirming (put to a test an existing theory to delimit its validity)
  – Study of deviant case
The experimental method

• To manipulate the independent variables in a controlled situation
• To observe how the variations in the independent variable are reflected in the dependent one
• Its basis: the possibility to manipulate the independent variables and to control the environment of the phenomenon
• Its limited applicability in political science
• Quasi-experiments
The non experimental methods. Statistical method

• “Imitating/simulating the experimental method” in a different context: the real world as the laboratory of political scientists
• The search for variance through the comparison of different cases.
• Statistical analysis: many cases (the cases are not relevant) few variables. Statistical instruments for measuring the covariations between Dependent (DV) and Independent Variables (IV) (analysis of correlation, regression, etc.)
• Advantages: it provides fairly robust instruments for assessing rival explanations (examples: electoral behaviour studies)
• Disadvantages: difficulties in collecting informations for sufficient N of cases (examples: studies of regime changes)
• Peculiarities of the cases are missed unless explicitly specified in the model
The non experimental methods. The comparative method

• In depth analysis of a small number of cases (small N/many variables)
• How different is the logic from that of the statistical method?
• The selection of cases is used in both cases to produce variations in the dependent and independent variables.
• Cases are individually selected (vs randomly selected)
• Advantages: possibility of detailed examination of complex phenomena
• Disadvantages: With few cases and many variables it is difficult to reach a strong control of hypotheses.
• How to reduce its disadvantages:
  – increasing the number of cases
  – reducing the number of variables (discarding variables, combining variables: for instance using a combined index of development instead of many indicators)
The logic of comparison

A problem: the explanation of the fall of a democratic regime (example: Italy 1922-25)

How to explain it? The case study and/or historical approach: accumulation of evidences related to the phenomenon (and its antedents). Uncertainty on the necessary (without which..) and sufficient (the presence of which..) causes. Unverified explanations. Redundant explanations.

Case 1 D.V.: Breakdown I.Vs: fragmented party system, proportional electoral system, authoritarian culture, anti-democratic leader, extremeist parties ……..

Comparative approach: choosing other cases and checking the presence/absence of factors

Case 2 Breakdown fragmented party system, majoritarian electoral system………..

Case 3 No breakdown fragmented party system, no extremist parties…. 
## An example of the comparative logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative strategies

• Selection of cases as a crucial instrument in the comparative analysis

• Most similar cases (ex. Anglo-saxon democracies; Latin American countries):
  – Cases sharing many common features and few differences
  – Different results on the dependent variable
  – All the common features are variables “kept under control” and excluded from the explanatory process.
  – The few differences are the explanatory factor responsible for variations in the dependent variable

• Most dissimilar cases:
  – Cases sharing few common features and many differences
  – Same results on the dependent variable
  – The common features explain similarities in the dependent variable
Lijphart’s scheme

**Figure 1. Situating the Comparative Method as of 1971: Lijphart’s Scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Method</th>
<th>Comparative Method</th>
<th>Experimental Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit:</strong> Permits intensive examination of cases even with limited resources.</td>
<td><strong>Defined as:</strong> Systematic analysis of small number of cases (&quot;small-N&quot; analysis). <strong>Merit:</strong> “Given inevitable scarcity of time, energy, and financial resources, the intensive analysis of a few cases may be more promising than the superficial statistical analysis of many cases” (Lijphart, p. 685).</td>
<td><strong>Merit:</strong> Eliminates rival explanations through experimental control. <strong>Inherent Problem:</strong> Experimental control is impossible for many or most topics of relevance to field of comparative politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inherent Problem:</strong> Contributes less to building theory than studies with more cases.</td>
<td><strong>Inherent Problem:</strong> Weak capacity to sort out rival explanations, specifically, the problem of “many variables, few cases.” <strong>Potential Solutions:</strong> 1. Increase number of cases 2. Focus on comparable cases 3. Reduce number of variables a. Combine variables b. Employ more parsimonious theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Case Studies:</strong> 1. Atheoretical 2. Interpretive 3. Hypothesis-generating 4. Theory-confirming 5. Theory-infirming (i.e., case studies that weaken a theory marginally) 6. Deviant case studies</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Statistical Method</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Merit:</strong> Assesses rival explanations through statistical control. <strong>Inherent Problem:</strong> Difficult to collect adequate information in a sufficient number of cases, due to limited time and resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collier’s development
Further reflections

- The comparative method:
  - Its role for interpretative understanding (beyond causal analysis understanding the meaning of phenomena)
  - Research cycle: in depth comparison favours development/testing of old/new theories
  - A disciplined configurative approach of complex phenomena enables a better evaluation of alternative hypotheses
  - Possibility of increasing number of cases…..
  - ..but problems of conceptual stretching in large N studies (the importance of conceptual definitions)
  - Analysis of complex causal configurations
  - Debate about advantages and disadvantages of most similar and most dissimilar cases strategies (possible combination of the two strategies)
The study of regimes

- A very old theme in the study of politics. What is it about?
- Power: its foundations, allocation and reallocation, limits, accountability …. (who has what power, to whom s/he is responsible…)
- From traditional approaches (one/few/many rulers) to the more articulated contemporary approaches
- The lesson of the “elitists” (Mosca, Pareto, etc.): the analysis of the ruling class, its resources, organisation, renewal mechanisms.
- Who are the power holders (civilians/military; elected/coopted; unified elite/plural elite)
- Which are the institutions/procedures through which power is allocated and exercised
- Which principles, values (traditional/modern; democratic/ademocratic… ) provide legitimacy for the exercise of power
- What is the role of the members at large of the political community in political affairs (active/passive); what are they rights, freedoms, empowerment. (by which forces they are drive: fear, greed, rationality, sentiments…)
The regime concept

- **Regime concept**: it assumes that the architecture of power is reasonably defined and stable

- It does not assume that it is entirely static (changes occur continuously and any regime is undergoing more or less important transformations) (US and UK cases). It may also be partially contested.

- Situations that (partially) escape the regime concept: transitional, chaotic situations.

- **Transitional situations**: elements of a previous regime persist but there are also elements of a new one, and there is a dynamics of transformation.

- A transitional situation is by definition open ended: the final result is not guaranteed, the transition may stall or end up in a different direction

- **Chaotic situations**: a breakdown of a previous regime, and contending forces are competing for alternative models; situation without a clear directionality
Democracy as the predominant paradigm of contemporary political regimes?

- The predominance of democracy as an ideal, as an evaluation yardstick..
- … does not necessarily entail its predominance in practice
- But other regimes have to pay tribute to democratic ideals (democratic simulations in non-democratic regimes, «other democracies») even if they do not respect (fully) its practice. Or define themselves as temporary solutions.
- Recent developments and increasing diffusion of democracy.
- What is democracy? A contested concept. Disentangling the normative from the empirical dimension. Democracy and «good politics»: synonyms or…..
- An old concept and its transformations in contemporary times: from the small city-states polities of ancient Greece and Medieval Europe to the large territorial states of modern times. From direct D. to liberal representative D.
- A literal definition: «government of the people» «gov of, by, for the people» (Lincoln)
  - A set of ideals and values defining a normative model
  - A word used to provide a comprehensive empirical description of a broad set of institutions, procedures, actors producing a special type of political life/regime which approximates sufficiently an ideal (positively valued) model of running politics
Some classic definitions

• Defining the core meaning of D in an empirical perspective:
  - Schumpeter: competition among elites decided by the vote of electors
  - Tilly: democracy as a regime where relations between state and citizens are based upon a system of broad, equal, protected and mutually binding consultation
  - Schmitter and Karl: a system of governance in which rulers are held accountable for their actions in the public realm by citizens acting indirectly through the competition and cooperation of their elected officials.
Tilly’s distinction between democracy and state capacity
Democracy: a standard model or a plurality of models?

- Substantive (focused on the outcomes), procedural (focused on the mechanisms), process oriented definitions (focused on the quality of the processes)

- Minimal vs. enlarged definitions
Specifying its institutional elements

*From minimal procedural definitions ....*

- Electoral franchise of all adult citizens
- Plurality of parties
- Fair, free, recurrent elections for the selections of the rulers (lawmakers and chief executive)
- Rights to formulate and express political preferences formalised and protected by independent judiciary
- Plurality of sources of informations

*........to enlarged definitions*

- All relevant authorities accountable to democratic process
- Democratic government has effective power to govern
- No reserved domains of non democratic authorities (role of the military; other actors ....)
- Executive power limited by autonomous power of other institutions (horizontal accountability)
- Rule of law is well established
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BOX 1-1. Freedom House Checklist for Political Rights and Civil Liberties (Adapted from Karatnycky 2000: 583-585.)

Political Rights

1. Is the head of state and/or head of government or other chief authority elected through free and fair elections?
2. Are the legislative representatives elected through free and fair elections?
3. Are there fair electoral laws, equal campaigning opportunities, fair polling, and honest tabulations of ballots?
4. Are the voters able to endow their freely elected representatives with real power?
5. Do the people have the right to organize in different political parties or other competitive political groupings of their choice and is the system open to the rise and fall of these competing parties or groupings?
6. Is there a significant opposition vote, de facto opposition power, and a realistic possibility for the opposition to increase its support or gain power through elections?
7. Are the people free from domination by the military, foreign powers, totalitarian parties, religious hierarchies, economic oligarchies, or any other powerful group?
8. Do cultural, ethnic, religious, and other minority groups have reasonable self-determination, self-government, autonomy, or participation through informal consensus in the decision-making process?
9. (Discretionary) In traditional monarchies that have no parties or electoral process, does the system provide for consultation with the people, encourage discussion of policy, and allow the right to petition the ruler?
10. (Discretionary) Is the government or occupying power deliberately changing the ethnic composition of a country or territory so as to destroy a culture or tip the political balance in favor of another group?

Civil Liberties

1. Is there freedom of assembly, demonstration, and open public discussion?
2. Is there freedom of political or quasi-political organization, including political parties, civic organizations, ad hoc issue groups, and so on?
3. Are there free trade unions and peasant organizations or equivalents and is there effective collective bargaining? Are there free professional and business associations?
4. Is there respect for the rights of persons accused or convicted of crimes, including the right to due process of law, freedom from secret or illegal detention, habeas corpus, habeas corpus, protection against the arbitrary deprivation of property, right of access to court?
5. Does the rule of law prevail in civil and criminal matters? Is the population treated equally under the law? Are police under direct civilian control?
6. Is there protection from political terror, unjustified imprisonment or torture, whether by groups that support or oppose the system, freedom from war and insurgencies?
7. Is there freedom from extreme government indifference and coercion?
8. Is there open and free private discussion?
9. Is there personal autonomy? Does the state control travel, choice of residence, or choice of employment? Is there freedom from indoctrination and excessive dependency on the state?
10. Are property rights secure? Do citizens have the right to establish businesses? Is private business activity unduly influenced by government officials, the security forces, or organized crime?
11. Are there personal social freedoms, including gender equality, freedom of marriage partners, and size of family?
12. Is there equality of opportunity, including freedom from exploitation or dependency on landlords, employers, union leaders, bureaucrats, or other types of obstacles to a share of legitimate economic gain?

rights and a 5 (almost as low) on civil liberties. It called the country “not free.” Here is how the country report began:

Political parties loyal to President Nursultan Nazarbayev continued parliament following the September 2004 legislative elections, which criticized by international monitors for failing to meet basic democratic standards. Only one opposition deputy was elected, although he refused to take part in protest over the flawed nature of the polls. Meanwhile, the resignation of senior officials raised questions about internal power struggles and factionalism within Nazarbayev’s government. (Freedom House Kazakhstan 2005)

Although Kazakhstan’s involvement in the international economy and international politics kept Nazarbayev from the sort of blank slate of authoritarianism adopted by his Central Asian neighbors (Soviet-style), it did not keep him from ruthless manipulation of the government apparatus to his own advantage. In December 2005, Nazarbayev won a six-year presidential term with a fantastic 91 percent of the vote, not even we see presidential candidates winning election — and even if they do, they often do so through far less than honest ballot-box stuffing.

What Is Democracy?
Effective participation. Before a policy is adopted by the association, all the members must have equal and effective opportunities for making their views known to the other members as to what the policy should be.

Voting equality. When the moment arrives at which the decision about the policy will finally be made, every member must have an equal and effective opportunity to vote, and all votes must be counted as equal.

Enlightened understanding. Within reasonable limits as to time, each member must have equal and effective opportunities for learning about the relevant alternative policies and their likely consequences.

Control of the agenda. The members must have the exclusive opportunity to decide how and, if they choose, what matters are to be placed on the agenda. Thus the democratic process required by the three preceding criteria is never closed. The policies of the association are always open to change by the members, if they so choose.

Inclusion of adults. All, or at any rate most, adult permanent residents should have the full rights of citizens that are implied by the first four criteria. Before the twentieth century this criterion was unacceptable to most advocates of democracy. (Dahl 1998: 37–38)
Democracy with adjectives

• Collier’s discussion: what is the problem?
• The proliferation of terminology: from democracy to democracies..
• Analytic differentiation…and comparative validity
• A parenthesis on concept building and conceptual clarity. Its importance in comparative politics
• Sartori’s discussion of the ladder of abstraction:
• Extension and intension of concepts (meaning of concepts and empirical referents)
• Examples: Regime – Democracy – parliamentary democracy
• The problem of conceptual stretching (extending a concept to empirical referents which do not fit completely with the meaning)
• Examples: Chinese Democracy
• The problem of conceptual differentiation
• Where is the place of illiberal democracy? And of minimal/electoral democracy? Or of liberal democracy?
The ladder of abstraction 1

**Figure 1**
The Ladder of Generality: Increasing Differentiation versus Avoiding Conceptual Stretching
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Democracy and democracies

- How to deal with regimes sharing some elements of democracy? But not all?
- Moving up in the ladder of abstraction.
- Developing diminished subtypes (illiberal democracy)
- Missing attributes (from minimal definition)
  - Full suffrage
  - Full contestation
  - Civil liberties
- Missing elements (from expanded definition)
  - Effective and full power to govern
- Its relevance for our discussion:
  - “Partial democracies” share some elements of full democracies: Institutions, parties..
  - ..but limit some of their functionalities…
The ladder of abstraction 2

**Figure 2**
Inclusion and exclusion of cases: ladder of generality versus diminished subtypes
Diminished subtypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Diminished from Procedural Minimum Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1a) Missing Attribute:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Suffrage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oligarchical democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1b) Missing Attribute:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Contestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De facto one-party democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1c) Missing Attribute:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Liberties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiberal democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Diminished from Expanded Procedural Minimum Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing Attribute:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Effective Power to Govern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarded democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutelary democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3
Partial Democracies: Examples of Diminished Subtypes
Democratic definitions

• Precising the definition of democracy
  – From minimal..
  – …to expanded

• …or shifting the overarching concept?
  – Democratic situation
  – Democratic government
  – Democratic regime
  – Democratic state
Shifting the concept of democracy: from regime to situation, government, state
The changing world of (non democratic) regimes.

The transformations of the last twenty years

- Old Basic distinction (Democracy/Authoritarianism/Totalitarianism)
- Disappearance/transformation of totalitarian regimes
- Decline of party based authoritarian regimes (except for some persisting post communist regimes)
- Decline of mass mobilisational efforts (exceptions)
- Decline of military regimes
- The expansion of a gray area with a mixed repertory of traditional authoritarian tools (repression, clientelism, patronage, associational bonds, etc.) and of democratic instruments (elections)
The factors of change

• The failures/exhaustion of some of the classic ND regimes (communism/fascism...), of their ideologies and promises

• The transformations/adaptations of successful ND regimes to changing internal/external conditions

• An increasing international pressure for democratisation linked to increased number of democracies/international conditionalities/foreign interventions.....

• ... But also failed transitions to democracy. Transitional processes “captured” by new/old authoritarian leaders
The gray area between democracy and authoritarianism

• The gray area stretches between democracies with some serious deficits and authoritarian regimes with some democratic openings

• Where are the “cutting point/s” in this area?
A new classification of regimes

• Diamond’s classification of regimes
  – Liberal democracies (less than minimal def. extending beyond the electoral dimension)
  – Electoral Democracies (minimalist def. of democracy concentrating on freedom, fairness, competitiveness of elections)
  – Ambiguous regimes (grey at the highest level !)
  – Competitive Authoritarianism (multi- party elections with some competition but heavily manipulated/constrained)
  – Hegemonic Electoral Authoritarian (hegemony of one party/leader/clique clearly established) (electoral results are completely predictable: extremely limited space for opposition in elections, parliament, mass media)
  – Closed regimes (no space allowed to outsiders)
# Table 1—Regime Types and Frequencies, End 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regime Types</th>
<th>Countries Over One Million Population N (%)</th>
<th>Countries Under One Million Population N (%)</th>
<th>All Countries N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democracy (FH Score 1-2.0)</td>
<td>45 (30)</td>
<td>28 (66.7)</td>
<td>73 (38.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Democracy</td>
<td>29 (19.3)</td>
<td>2 (4.8)</td>
<td>31 (16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous Regimes</td>
<td>14 (9.3)</td>
<td>3 (7.1)</td>
<td>17 (8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Authoritarian</td>
<td>19 (12.7)</td>
<td>2 (4.8)</td>
<td>21 (10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegemonic Electoral Authoritarian</td>
<td>22 (14.7)</td>
<td>3 (7.1)</td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politically Closed Authoritarian</td>
<td>21 (14)</td>
<td>4 (9.5)</td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>150 (100)</td>
<td>42 (100)</td>
<td>192 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democracy FH 1-2.0</td>
<td>Electoral Democracy FH &gt;2.0</td>
<td>Ambiguous Regimes</td>
<td>Competitive Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WESTERN DEMOCRACIES</strong> (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 West European states</td>
<td>United States (1,1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (1,1)</td>
<td>Australia (1,1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand (1,1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSTCOMMUNIST</strong> (27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic (1,2)</td>
<td>Hungary (1,2)</td>
<td>Moldova (2.4)</td>
<td>Armenia (4,4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland (1,2)</td>
<td>Yugoslavia (3,3)</td>
<td>Georgia (4,4)</td>
<td>Russia (5,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia (1,2)</td>
<td>Slovenia (1,2)</td>
<td>Macedonia (4,4)</td>
<td>Belarus (6,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia (1,2)</td>
<td>Latvia (1,2)</td>
<td>Ukraine (4,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania (1,2)</td>
<td>Bulgaria (1,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (2,2)</td>
<td>Romania (2,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</strong> (33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Caribbean states¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>Argentina (2,3)</td>
<td>Venezuela (3,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay (1,1)</td>
<td>Costa Rica (1,2)</td>
<td>El Salvador (2,3)</td>
<td>Paraguay (4,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama (1,2)</td>
<td>Suriname (1,2)</td>
<td>Jamaica (2,3)</td>
<td>Colombia (4,4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia (1,3)</td>
<td>Peru (1,3)</td>
<td>Mexico (2,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile (2,2)</td>
<td>Dominican Republic (2,2)</td>
<td>Brazil (3,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana (2,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecuador (3,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras (3,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua (3,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trinidad &amp; Tobago (3,3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guatemala (3,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts & Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines.
2. Pakistan has not held elections since the October 1999 military coup. It is a transitional regime that is difficult to classify, since it is more open and pluralistic than closed authoritarian regimes.
4. Technically a no-party regime, but with competitive and partially free elections.
5. In transition to a more open and competitive political system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Liberal Democracy FH 1-2.0</th>
<th>Electoral Democracy FH &gt;2.0</th>
<th>Ambiguous Regimes</th>
<th>Competitive Authoritarian</th>
<th>Hegemonic Electoral Authoritarian</th>
<th>Politically Closed Authoritarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIA (E, SE, &amp; S)</strong> (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (1,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brunei (7,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan (1,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bhutan (7,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea (2,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>China (7,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (2,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia (3,4)</td>
<td>East Timor (5,3)*</td>
<td>Singapore (5,5)</td>
<td>Laos (7,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia (2,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malaysia (5,5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam (7,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (2,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Afghanistan (7,7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand (2,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burma (7,7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh (3,4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Korea (7,7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal (3,4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka (3,4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PACIFIC ISLANDS (12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Pacific island states³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiji (4,3)</td>
<td>Tonga (5,3)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea (2,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands (4,4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRICA (SUB-SAHARA)</strong> (48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde (1,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius (1,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Tomé &amp; Príncipe (1,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa (1,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana (2,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (2,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique (3,4)</td>
<td>Lesotho (4,4)</td>
<td>Burkina Faso (4,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali (2,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania (4,4)</td>
<td>Central African Rep. (4,5)</td>
<td>Congo, Brazzaville (5,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia (2,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria (4,5)</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau (4,5)</td>
<td>Comoros (6,4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin (3,2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Djibouti (4,5)</td>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire (5,4)</td>
<td>Mauritania (5,5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar (2,4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Leone (4,5)</td>
<td>Gabon (5,4)</td>
<td>Chad (6,5)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles (3,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zambian (5,4)</td>
<td>The Gambia (5,5)</td>
<td>Guinea (6,5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal (3,4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Togo (5,5)</td>
<td>Uganda (6,5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi (4,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia (5,6)</td>
<td>Angola (6,6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger (4,4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya (6,5)</td>
<td>Liberia (6,6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE EAST-NORTH AFRICA</strong> (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cameroon (6,6)</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea (6,7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel (1,3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey (4,5)</td>
<td>Lebanon (6,5)</td>
<td>Kuwait (4,5)**</td>
<td>Bahrain (6,5)**³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iran (6,6)</td>
<td>Jordan (5,5)**</td>
<td>Oman (6,5)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yemen (6,6)</td>
<td>Morocco (5,5)**</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates (6,5)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Algeria (5,6)</td>
<td>Qatar (6,6)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tunisia (6,5)</td>
<td>Iraq (7,7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt (6,6)</td>
<td>Libya (7,7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saudi Arabia (7,7)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria (7,7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*International Protectorate.*

**Traditional Monarchy. Tonga is a liberal aristocracy, with only partial elective authority.**
Comments on Diamond

• Comments:
  • attention concentrates predominantly on the electoral processes and their nature
  • other aspects not taken into account. The resources of the regime’s core leadership (so Saudi Arabia is in the same category with China etc.). Variations between personalistic and more impersonal regimes
  • liberal democracy and electoral democracy: concepts on a different level of abstraction?
  • How to discriminate in the intermediate areas? A diminished form of democracy or a diminished form of authoritarianism? Half empty/half full glass?
  • What is the criterion? Balance between govt. and opposition, game is not totally pre-decided, uncertainty of results (these elements must be stable to some extent) (extraordinary results can happen if the regime underestimates the opposition: Chile’s plebiscite of 1988); space of action for oppositions
From concepts to measures
Democracy: Definitions and beyond

Directions of research

• Improving our classificatory instruments
  – Exploring the gray (transitional) area between fully liberal democracy and non-democracy (partial democracies) (Collier & Levitsky 1997, Diamond 1999). How stable are these intermediate forms?

• Specifying variations within the democratic model:
  – Developing traditional institutional typologies (presidential vs. parliamentary D) (Shugart & Carey 1992, etc.)
  – Lijphart’s polar models of majoritarian/consensus D
  – Analysis of Quality of Democracy (Diamond & Morlino 2005)

• Links between Qod and gray area explorations
Forms of Government and party systems

• Studying the actual working of democracy and the changes it undergoes: critical aspects
• Forms of government (FoG) and party systems (PS) as two central elements in democratic systems
• FoG: Defines the institutional articulation of political authorities
• PS: The set of crucial actors of the competitive game and their interrelations
• Other elements: Democracy is affected also by other elements which contribute to its working (other institutions, contextual conditions, etc.).
Democratic executives and forms of government

- Forms of government (FoGs): different (formal/informal) systems of relationships between the representative institutions and the executive.
- FoGs in democratic systems…
- …and in hybrid regimes (does it make a difference?)
- Main questions for comparative analysis:
  - What are the possible variations in FoGs?
  - What explains the different solutions?
  - What about the interactions between FoGs and political actors (parties)?
  - What are the consequences of different choices, what kind of interactions between institutions (checks and balances, decision-making performances, dynamisms, etc) they produce?
  - And in the case of countries on a transition path to democracy what is their relevance in the democratisation process?
Elements and choices defining FoGs

- Head of State (HoS) - Government (G) - Parliament (P) as the main elements at play. Why these institutions?
- The defining choices:
- What are the mechanisms to ensure the democratic legitimation/accountability of G?
- Which functions (powers) for the HoS
- What relationship should there be between HoS and G
- What is the internal structure of G
- What is the role of P vis-à-vis G
- How are these 3 institutions related with the pluralism/partisanship typical of a competitive democratic regime
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The institutional components of the puzzle (a)

- The Head of state (an anthropomorphic concept) …
- Monarchical versus republican solutions
- and its (possible) functions
  - A governing or a non-governing role?
  - The (symbolic) function of representing internally/externally the (unity of the) country
  - The role of an umpire in a competitive system (checking that the rules are observed; taking the procedural initiative in the solution of governmental crises; moderating conflicts).
  - How to endow it with a non partisan authority? (special majorities in parliamentary election)
  - What powers it should have vis-à-vis the other institutions?
The institutional components of the puzzle (b).

• The government (head of government and ministers + …)

• Functions
  – The political guidance of the central state bureaucracy and of its internal articulations (ministries/departments)
  – The responsibility to face/solve the major problems of the community

• Problems
  – How to ensure democratic accountability
  – How to combine plurality of functions and unity of responsibility
  – How to combine stability and accountability
  – How to ensure its ability to act (….but also limits)
  – What role to be given to its leader and what to the Government as a collective body
  – What degree of autonomy and authority to the ministers
The institutional components of the puzzle (c).

- The representative assembly/ies (parliament/congress).
  - The main institution of pluralistic representation (how to solve the representation puzzle? Monocameral and bicameral solutions; electoral systems, etc.)
  - The law-making institution (how to allocate powers within this process)
  - The function of governmental oversight and its powers vis-à-vis the government

- Other institutions
  - The constitutional/supreme court. How to preserve constitutional justice combining technical competence and a modicum of democratic accountability
  - The central bank. How to guarantee a competent guide of the monetary police and a modicum of democratic accountability.
  - Other independent authorities. How to distance regulation from democratic/electoralistic/partisan pressures
Alternative solutions for the Head of State

• Establishing a democratic (democratically compatible) head of state
  – Maintaining a royal head of state and (progressively) depriving it of governing functions (possible conflicts)
  – Providing for a republican head of state
    • A parliamentary investiture (parliament as the locus of democratic legitimacy) (problem: how to build its authority and to isolate it form parliamentary and partisan skirmishes; solutions: duration of term; special majorities.....)
    • A separate investiture via a popular direct or indirect election (problem: how to avoid excessive personal power)
      – Its powers vis a vis the government (nomination, dismissal, veto of its initiatives, decree power.....or even fusion with the government)
      – ..... and the parliament (legislative veto, dissolution).
• Solutions and constraints
Democratic legitimation of G

- Central question in any democratic FoG is the legitimacy (and accountability) of G. In democratic systems legitimacy must derive from expressions of people’s voice.
- Alternative choices
- Legitimating the government through the parliament
  - Parliamentary confidence and its variable forms
  - Which chamber is involved
  - The government as a collective unit (or PM preeminence)
  - The government and its parliamentary basis
- Through a separate popular mandate
  - Direct or indirect.
  - The government as a monocratic unit with popular mandate
  - The ministers as the agents of the head of gov.
  - The parliament and the government as separate institutions (with independent life)
Forms of government, the main types

- Parliamentarism
- Presidentialism (or separation of institutions)
- Semi-presidential system (parliamentary system with separately elected head of state)
- The swiss system
- The elected premier system
Parliamentarism

• Basic features
  – Government based upon “political confidence” of the parliament (parl. majority or a minority tolerated)
  – Power of the parliament to dismiss the government
  – Variable duration of government’s term of office
  – (Possibility of an early dissolution of parliament)
  – HoS with either a traditional (weak) legitimation or a parliamentary one and mainly symbolic and regulatory powers
  – .....and what happens if you have the HoS elected by the people ?

• Variable features
  – Selection of the PM by the HoS or by the parliament’s speaker, or by a parliamentary vote
  – Explicit or implicit confidence vote. Constructive no confidence vote
  – Confidence vote for the PM or for the cabinet
  – Control over parliament’s dissolution (by the HoS or by the PM)
  – Powers of G to issue decrees
  – Powers over parliamentary agenda
  – HoS veto on legislation
  – HoS nomination powers
Presidential system

• Basic features
  – Fusion between Head of State and Head of Government
  – Popular election of head of state independent from parliament (direct or indirect)
  – Fixed term of office of the (head of the) executive
  – Ministers («secretaries») selected by the President

• Variable features
  – Possibility (or not) of reelection
  – Legislative powers of president (initiative, veto)
  – Decree power. Executive orders
  – Non legislative powers of the president (dissolution of parliament ?)
  – Powers of the parliament over the executive (presidential impeachment, confirmation of ministers, censure, etc.)
Semi-presidentialism

• Basic features
  – Government based upon “political confidence” of the parliament (p. majority)
  – Variable duration of government’s term of office
  – Power of the parliament to dismiss the government
  – Head of state based upon a non parliamentary (popular) investiture (direct or indirect election, or monarchy)
  – Head of state endowed with a series of “governmental powers”

• Variable features
  – Power of head of state to dismiss government
  – Power of head of state to dissolve parliament
  – Veto powers over legislation
  – Decree power
Other types

• The swiss system
  – Government elected by parliament
  – No power of dismissal of parliament
  – Rotating government leadership
  – Head of government combines function of head of state

• The system of directly elected PM (adopted for some time in Israel)
  – Head of state elected by Parliament
  – Head of government directly elected
  – Government subject to confidence vote of parliament. No fixed term
  – Combined dismissal of government and dissolution of parliament
The Form of Government of the EU after Lisbon

• Can we talk of a FoG for the EU?
• Yes because the main components of a FoG are there …
• … and some of the critical choices existing behind any FoG have been or have become relevant also for the EU
• Is there a “parliamentary like institution” in the EU? Yes: the European Parliament…. but also the Council have legislative powers and both are (directly or indirectly) representative bodies.
• Is there an executive? Is there a head of government? Yes, but in fact there is more than one executive as the Commission, the Council and the European Council all share in the functions of the executive.
• And what about the head of state? Who represents the EU symbolically (three Presidents?)? Who nominates the Head of the Executive?
Delegation and accountability according to Strom

I. Parliamentary Government

Voters → Parliament → Prime Minister → Minister A → Dept. A
              → Minister B → Dept. B

II. Presidential Government

Voters → Upper Chamber → President → Secretary A → Dept. A
              → Lower Chamber → Secretary B → Dept. B

*Figure 1.* Delegation and accountability under parliamentary and presidential government.
Figure 1. Regime categories.
HoS nominated by Parliament and Cabinet responsible to Parliament

Albania 1998–present
Austria 1920–1929
Austria 1929–1934
Bangladesh 1986–present
Czechoslovakia 1920–1935
Czechoslovakia 1935–1938
Czechoslovakia 1990–1992
Czech Republic 1992–2000
Czech Republic 2000–present
Dominica 1978–present
Estonia 1992–present
France 1875–1918
France 1918–1940
France 1944–1958
Germany 1949–present
Greece 1975–1986
Greece 1986–present
Hungary 1990–present
India 1950–present
Israel 1948–present
Italy 1948–present
Latvia 1922–1934
Latvia 1990–present
Lithuania 1920–1934
Malta 1964–present
Mauritius 1992–present
Moldova 2000–present
Nigeria 1963–1966
Pakistan 1985–1997
Pakistan 1997–1999
Poland 1921–1926
Portugal 1911–1919
Portugal 1919–1926
Slovakia 1992–1999
South Africa 1961–1983
Suriname 1975–1979
Trinidad and Tobago 1976–present
Turkey 1961–1971
Turkey 1973–1980
Turkey 1983–present
Vanuatu 1980–present
Elected President and Cabinet accountable to Parliament

Armenia 1995–present
Austria 1945–present
Belarus 1994–1996
Bulgaria 1991–present
Cape Verde 1992–present
Central African Republic 1995–present
Comoros 1992–1999
Croatia 1990–2000
Croatia 2000–present
Finland 1919–1956
Finland 1956–1994
Finland 1994–2000
Finland 2000–present
France 1958–present
Germany 1919–1933
Georgia 1994–present
Guinea-Bissau 1994–present
Iceland 1944–present
Ireland 1948–present
Lithuania 1992–present
Macedonia 1991–present
Madagascar 1992–present

Mali 1992–present
Moldova 1994–2000
Mongolia 1992–present
Mozambique 1994–present
Peru 1979–1992
Poland 1992–1997
Poland 1997–present
Portugal 1976–1982
Portugal 1982–present
Romania 1996–present
Russia 1993–present
São Tomé and Príncipe 1990–present
Slovakia 1999–present
Slovenia 1991–present
Spain 1931–1936
Taiwan 1994–present
Ukraine 1992–1996
Ukraine 1996–present
Uruguay 1919–1933
Elected President not accountable to Parl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1945–1953</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1990–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1925–1973</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1985–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1989–present</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>1993–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1960–1991</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1824–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1948–present</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1942–1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1994–present</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1985–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1996–present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1985–present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1980–present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1994–present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1994–present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>1990–present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presidential attributes and powers: 1. popular election; 2. contemporary election of President and Assembly; 3. discretionary appointment power; 4. chairing of cabinet meetings; 5. veto power; 6. decree power; 7. Foreign policy role; 8. central role in government formation; 9. ability to dissolve legislature

Table 2. Total powers of the president, category values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. dev. s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explaining different FoGs

• What kind of considerations enter in the choice of FoGs?
• Is the choice of FoGs a theoretically driven exercise in constitutional engineering or a process decided by more practical considerations and under the pressure of conditions at the time of the shaping of a new constitution?
• Who are the actors participating in the choice and what are their goals, needs and resources?
• The geographical and historical distribution of FoGs. Democratic parliamentarism predominant in Europe and in some former dominions/colonies of UK (Australia, Canada, Jamaica, India, New Zealand, Malaysia ….), in Japan (and in a non democratic form in other Monarchical states). Presidentialism or semi-presidentialism predominant in the Americas, Africa, former Soviet Union, Asia.
The historical paths to different FoGs

- *The birth of parliamentarism.* Evolution of monarchical regimes. Transformation/establishment of parliament with limiting and control powers over the government. Increasing detachment of the government from the Monarch. Reduction of the monarch to a non governing figure (or abolition). The role of developed parties in preventing presidential solutions.

- *The birth of presidentialism.* In newly independent countries without a monarchy a popularly elected president is often seen as a nation building device. Weakness of parties as a factor (and a consequence ?).

- *Semi-presidential solutions.* An attempt to balance the two models and a compromise between parties and emerging leaders or other actors (De Gaulle in F; military in Portugal)
FoGs and democracy/tisation

- Is the FoG relevant for the stability of democracy/the process of democratisation?
- Which FoG is more favourable for a process of stabilization consolidation of democracy?
- The disadvantages of presidentialism:
  - Fixed pres. term. Less flexibility in handling with government failures (no institutionalised instrument for displacing a government)/ but also limits to duration in power (when re-election ban)
  - Independent elections. Greater likelihood of executive/legislative deadlock
  - It encourages a majoritarian mentality (zero sum game)
  - Incentives for inter-institutional conflict when Presidents are faced with deadlock (to attack parliament as a nuisance) and in the extreme for Presidents to resort to extra-constitutional means
  - Greater chances for outsiders to enter the game
  - Is the combination of presidentialism and multipartism especially conducive to difficult situations?
  - Are there other external factors? As military predisposition to political intervention?
The party system and FoGs

• The constitutional format and its practical implementation
• The party system as a crucial intervening factor. The role of party in determining collective behavior of individual politicians
• Party systems and presidential systems.
• Party systems and parliamentary governments
• Party systems and semi-presidential governments
Parties and Democracy 1

- **Parties in the competitive setting of contemporary democracy**
  - A definition: organized political groups of similarly minded people competing for authoritative positions via the electoral process.
- What democratic parties are not: interest groups, social movements
- ..........but potential connections, grey areas and transformations
- **The role of parties in established democracies**
  - Recruiting and organizing politicians
  - Developing policy proposals
  - In the electoral process: structuring the vote, reducing and stabilizing the alternatives
  - In Parliament: reducing complexity, promoting the achievement of collective decisions
  - In Government: cementing the collective dimension, promoting policy programs
  - And in society at large (political socialization of the population)

- **Parties in the non competitive setting of authoritarian or hybrid regimes.**
  - Instruments for the mobilization of support
  - Power organizing mechanisms
Parties and Democracy 2

- **The role of parties in the building of new democracies**
  - Parties as mobilizers of the opposition of the old regime
  - Parties as players in the agreements/pacts deciding the rules/institutions of the new democracy
  - Parties as vehicles of the legitimation (delegitimation) of the new regime

- **The formation and consolidation of parties in a new democracy**
  - Problems related to changes between the transition to the post-transition phases
  - Problems related with resources
Parties and Democracy 3

• A democracy without (with very weak) parties?
  – Which actors would take their place?
  – With what effects on the working of democracy?

• A Leaders’ based democracy?
Parties and party systems

• How to analyze parties.

• The *party as the unit of analysis*. Focus on the individual properties and internal determinants.
  – Party identity and party history
  – Organizational models
  – The different internal components of parties
  – Electoral and membership strength

• The *party system as the unit of analysis*. Focus on competition and cooperation between party units
  – Elements defining the party system
  – Number of units and features of the competitive space

• What comes first? The party or the Party system?
  – In normal situations new parties have to enter into (and to adapt to) an existing party system (while at the same time challenging it)
  – At critical junctures the party system may be fundamentally (re-)shaped by emerging parties
### Table 1. The models of party and their characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Elite party</th>
<th>Mass party</th>
<th>Catch-all party</th>
<th>Cartel party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of social-political inclusion</td>
<td>Restricted suffrage</td>
<td>Enfranchisement and mass suffrage</td>
<td>Mass suffrage</td>
<td>Mass suffrage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of distribution of</td>
<td>Highly restricted</td>
<td>Relatively concentrated</td>
<td>Less concentrated</td>
<td>Relatively diffused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politically relevant resources</td>
<td>Distribution of privileges</td>
<td>Social reformation (or opposition to it)</td>
<td>Social amelioration</td>
<td>Politics as profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal goals of politics</td>
<td>Ascribed status</td>
<td>Representative capacity</td>
<td>Policy effectiveness</td>
<td>Managerial skills, efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of party competition</td>
<td>Managed</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Contained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern of electoral competition</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Labour intensive</td>
<td>Both labour intensive and capital intensive</td>
<td>Capital intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of party work and party</td>
<td>Personal contacts</td>
<td>Members' fees and contributions</td>
<td>Contributions from a wide variety of sources</td>
<td>State subventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campaigning</td>
<td>The elite are the 'ordinary' members</td>
<td>Bottom up (pace Michels); elite accountable to members</td>
<td>Top down; members are organized cheerleaders for elite membership open to all (heterogenous) and encouraged; rights emphasized but not obligations; membership marginal to individual's identity</td>
<td>Stratarchy; mutual autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal source of party’s resources</td>
<td>Small and elitist</td>
<td>Large and homogenous; actively recruited and encapsulated; membership a logical consequence of identity; emphasis on rights and obligations</td>
<td>Neither rights nor obligations important (distinction between member and non-members blurred); emphasis on members as individuals rather than as an organized body; members valued for contribution to legitimizing myth</td>
<td>Party gains privileged access to state-regulated channels of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between ordinary members and party elite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Party becomes part of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character of membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party channels of communication</td>
<td>Interpersonal networks</td>
<td>Party provides its own channels of communication</td>
<td>Party competes for access to non-party channels of communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of party between civil society and state</td>
<td>Unclear boundary between state and politically relevant civil society</td>
<td>Party belongs to civil society, initially as representative of the newly relevant segment of civil society</td>
<td>Parties as competing brokers between civil society and state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative style</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>Agent of state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyzing party systems: Sartori’s Typology

- What for? Finding the systemic features that define and shape the behavior of party units.
- With which instruments? Number of parties and political space
- Counting parties. Problems and instruments. Sartori’s criteria of relevance
- Criteria for a typology
  - Competition vs absence of competition
  - Fragmentation vs. concentration
  - Polarisation vs. depolarisation. How are they defined? The anti-system party concept
- Sartori’s typology
  - Single party } Non competitive
  - Hegemonic party } “
  - Predominant party } Competitive
  - Two parties system } “
  - Moderate multiparty system } “
  - Polarized multiparty system } “
  - Atomization } Still a party system?
Sartori's typology

• The features of polarized multipartism
  • High number of parties (> 5)
  • Polarized ideological space (presence of anti-system parties)
  • Bilateral oppositions
  • Governments of the centre
  • Lack of alternance in government
  • Irresponsible oppositions (politics of outbidding)
  • Centrifugal competition (and erosion of the centre)

• ........And of moderate multipartism

• From qualitative to quantitative measures of polarisation
• How to measure polarisation: experts’ evaluations; citizens’ evaluations; evaluations by politicians
The analysis of party systems: the number of parties

- Towards a more precise counting of parties (and party sizes)
- The “effective number of parties” (Laakso & Taagepera) and previous measures of fractionalization.
  - Herfindahl’s concentration index = $\Sigma^n$(squared firms' shares of the market)
  - Rae fragmentation index = $1 - \Sigma^n$(squared party parliamentary seats or votes shares) (or $1 - \text{Her}$)
  - L & T effective number of parties = $1/\Sigma^n$(squared party parliamentary seats or votes shares) (or $1/\text{Her}$)
- Another instrument:
  - Concentration index = Sum of the shares of the two biggest parties
Examples

• Three party systems (with parties A, B, C, D and their percentages):
  • I.  A: 40%; B: 40%; C: 10%; D: 10%
  • II. A: 30%; B: 25%; C: 25%; D: 20%
  • III. A: 60%; B: 40%

• Herfindahl index: I: 0.34; II: 0.255; III: ?
• Rae index: I: 0.66; II: 0.745; III: ?
• L&T: I: 2.94; II: 3.92; III: ?
• Concentration index: I: 80%; II: ?; III: ?

• Two levels of the indexes:
  • electoral level
  • parliamentary level
  • ?
Gallagher index of disproportionality

\[ G = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \sum (V_i - S_i)^2} \]
Measuring polarization (Dalton)

Figure 1
Citizen Placement of Parties on the Left–Right Scale
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An index of polarization (Dalton)

$$PI = \sqrt{\sum\left(party\ vote\ share_i\right)\times\left[\left(party\ L/R\ score_i - party\ system\ average\ L/R\ score\right)/5\right]^2},$$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>−.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>−.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>−.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>−.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>−.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea (S.)</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>−.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>−.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>−.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>−.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>−1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>−.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>−.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2
The Impact of Left–Right Attitudes on Vote Preferences as a Function of Party Polarization

Source: Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, Module II and the Polarization index in Table 1; available from www.cses.org.
Figure 3
The Impact of Left–Right Attitudes on Vote Preferences as a Function of Party Fragmentation Index

Explaining Party systems birth and evolutionary dynamics

- How do we explain identities and composition of the party systems
- How do we explain similarities and dissimilarities among European party systems? Chance or necessity?
- Rokkan’s cleavage theory (1970)
- The great transformations occurring in European societies
  - Nation- and State Building
  - Industrialization
- ........and their consequences
  - Centre-periphery
  - State-Church
  - Farming-Industry
  - Owners-Workers
- The political mobilisation of social cleavages through parties and its consequences for the party systems
- The freezing of the party systems hypothesis
Post-Rokkan: the unfreezing of party systems

The unfreezing of the old cleavages

– Decline of old parties
– Birth of new parties
– Increased electoral volatility

New cleavages?

– The post-materialist/materialist cleavage (green parties)
– A new centre/periphery cleavage (enthno-regionalist parties)
– The anti-immigration/globalist cleavage (xenophobic, neo-nationalist parties)
On measuring party system change

The concept of volatility and its measure:

• Def. The net change within the electoral party system resulting from individual vote transfers.

• How to measure it? The volatility index:

Total Volatility = (|PV1| + |PV2| + |PV3| + ...)/2

• And what about changes between political blocks?

Block Volatility = (|PV1+PV2| + |PV3+PV4|)/2

• Example:

Election 1 P1 30%; P2 20%; P3 30%; P4 20%

Election 2 P1 20%; P2 20%; P3 50%; P4 10%

TV = (10 + 0 + 20 + 10)/2 = 20

BV = (10 + 10)/2 = 10
Electoral volatility

\[ \text{Volatility} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |p_{it} - p_{i(t+1)}| \right)/2 \]
Changing party systems in W Europe (Laver & Benoit)

Dimensions of competition? One or more?
- economic policy (lower taxes/higher public services)
- social liberalism/conservatism
- environmental policy
- decentralization policy

Table 1: Three categories of parties analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Ranking of core policy dimensions 1989 and 2003, in terms of mean dimension importance for party, weighted by party size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Economic policy</th>
<th>Liberal vs conservative</th>
<th>Environmental protection</th>
<th>Decentralization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean rank</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.89</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1
Importance of Conflicts for Party Competition in 13 Central and East European Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Welfare State</th>
<th>Market Versus State</th>
<th>Democracy</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Nationalism</th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Social Rights</th>
<th>Communist Legacy</th>
<th>Regionalism</th>
<th>Urban-Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (all nations)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Entries are mean scores indicating the importance of a conflict dimension. The indicator ranges from 1 (most significant) to 5 (insignificant).
Changing salience of dimensions across surviving parties

Table 3: For pairs of parties competing in both 1989 and 2003, dimension importance 2003 minus dimension importance 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Economic policy</th>
<th>Liberal vs conservative</th>
<th>Environmental protection</th>
<th>Decentralization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>** -1.58</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>* -3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>** -1.55</td>
<td>** -0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>** 1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>** 2.38</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>* 2.25</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>* -0.92</td>
<td>** 2.56</td>
<td>** 3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>** 1.69</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>** 6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>** -3.66</td>
<td>** 2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* differences are statistically greater than zero at 0.10 level or better, using a two-tailed paired t-test (at the country level). ** indicates p<=.05
Figure 1: 1989 and 2003 policy positions of the set of western European parties present at both time points, by policy dimension.
Figure 2: Party policy positions in Germany, 1989 and 2003
Table 7: Policy eccentricity 2003, by dimension and new party status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party competed in 1989</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New party since 1989</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social policy*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party competed in 1989</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New party since 1989</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party competed in 1989</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New party since 1989</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party competed in 1989</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New party since 1989</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclidean socio-economic policy**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party competed in 1989</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New party since 1989</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One-tailed difference of group means test significant at better than 0.05
**One-tailed difference of group means test significant at better than 0.01
Table 1: Left/Right and GAL/TAN Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Observations (Parties)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.9772</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.9562</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.9181</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.8296</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.7891</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.7472</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.6835</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>0.6823</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.6572</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.6511</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0.6445</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.5995</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.5259</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.4444</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.4112</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.3119</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0.2402</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>0.0340</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>-0.4490</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>-0.5997</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>-0.8120</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>-0.8331</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>-0.8723</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>-0.9880</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The implementation of FoGs is significantly affected by the political actors operating them. The political actors can use to a different degree (more/less active; more/less compliant; more/less loyal) the opportunities offered by the different FoGs. Collective political actors can create “bridges” across institutions.
Parties and forms of government 2
Parliamentary Form of Government

- 1. The formation of governments
  - Single party or coalition governments
  - Which coalitions
  - Elections and parliamentary majorities
  - Who guides the process

- The role of the Prime Minister: primus inter pares or primus super pares?

- “Governing” the government. Centrifugal drives and centripetal drives.
Second Module

Goals:

analyze FoGs and Party Systems variations across countries and across time in European countries.

Questions:

how different are countries of the «new Europe» and countries of the «old Europe»? Are they becoming more similar?

are European party systems becoming more fragile?

in a period of economic crisis have governments become more unstable
Student papers

Each student should cover the form of government (FoG) and the party system of two countries

1. Form of Government:
   a. what the Constitution of the country says about the FoG
   b. the FoG in practice

2. Party System: cover the main aspects defining the party system

3. Period to be covered: the last four parliamentary elections

4. Paper format: a. Introduction; b. Substantive paragraphs; c. conclusion; d. tables/graphs; e. references

5. Preliminary version presented and discussed in class (January)

6. Deadline final version: 6 days before exam.
Sources
Constitutions
EJPR Political data yearbook
Wikipedia elections
France

NICK STARTIN
Department of Politics, Languages and International Studies (POLIS), University of Bath, UK

Table 1. Results of presidential election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>First round</th>
<th>Second round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>François Hollande</td>
<td>Socialist Party (PS)</td>
<td>10,272,705 (28.63%)</td>
<td>18,000,668 (51.64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Sarkozy</td>
<td>Union for a Popular Movement (UMP)</td>
<td>9,753,629 (27.18%)</td>
<td>16,860,685 (48.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Le Pen</td>
<td>Front National (FN)</td>
<td>6,421,426 (17.00%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Luc Mélenchon</td>
<td>Front de Gauche – United Left Front</td>
<td>3,984,822 (11.10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François Bayrou</td>
<td>Movement for Democracy (Modem)</td>
<td>3,275,122 (9.13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Joly</td>
<td>Valls (Greens)</td>
<td>828,345 (2.31%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Dupont-Aignan</td>
<td>Debout la République – For the Republic</td>
<td>643,907 (1.79%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe Poutou</td>
<td>New Anticapitalist Party (NPA)</td>
<td>411,160 (1.15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathalie Arthaud</td>
<td>Lutte Ouvrière – Workers’ Struggle</td>
<td>202,548 (0.56%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Cheminade</td>
<td>Progrès et Solidarité – Progress and Solidarity</td>
<td>89,545 (0.25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2012 presidential and legislative elections

According to the left-leaning French daily Libération, 2012 was a ‘year of shocks and contradictions’ (Giret 2012: 3). In political terms it was dominated by four rounds of voting in the presidential and legislative elections, whose results included the defeat of President Sarkozy’s pursuit of a second term and the election of François Hollande, following in the footsteps of François Mitterrand as only the second Socialist President in the history of the French Fifth Republic. A Socialist-led majority in the French National Assembly also ensued, giving the party unprecedented political power, as in recent years it had also become the dominant force in the French second chamber (the Senate), as well as in the
Student papers

Form of government
1. Head of state
   1. Selection
   2. Mandate
   3. Powers (→ government; → parliament)
2. Parliament
   1. Chamber/s
   2. Powers (→ government; → head of state)
3. Government
   1. Formation
   2. Dissolution
4. Summary: comprehensive evaluation of FoG
Student papers

Form of Government: from theory to practice

• Heads of state
  • Who? Duration
  • Party affiliation

• Governments
  • List and duration.
  • Partisan support

• Heads of State and Governments
  • Political congruence or not
Student papers

Party systems
1. Electoral results (4+ electoral rounds)
2. List/identities of important parties
3. Party system fragmentation
4. Electoral volatility
5. Old/new parties

6. Comprehensive evaluation of party system