Party Systems and Country Governance

Kenneth Janda, Northwestern University, with Jin-Young Kwak, Konkuk University

Our title, *Party Systems and Country Governance*, deserves some discussion. *VOX POP* readers understand “Party Systems,” of course, but they (and most others) may be unclear about the meaning of “Country Governance.” In Chapter 1, we define country governance as the extent to which a state delivers to its citizens the desired benefits of government at acceptable costs. We then address the question, “Does the nature of a country’s political party system affect the quality of its governance?”

A leading authority, on democratization and governance, thinks parties do have significant effects, although the governmental role they perform is far from clear. Thomas Carothers describes “the standard lament” about political parties as follows: they are corrupt, self-interested, do not stand for anything except winning elections, squabble with one another, and are ill-prepared for governing. In fact, he calls political parties the “weakest link” in establishing popular control of government in new or struggling democracies. Nevertheless, Carothers believes that parties “are necessary, even inevitable” for workable democratic pluralism.

International organizations and non-governmental organizations agree. They have poured millions of dollars into party development under the rubric of democratic assistance. These expensive party aid efforts have generated mixed results. According to one scholar, African leaders have “only grudgingly permitted multiparty politics under donor pressure” against “a current of underlying skepticism,” arguing that parties breed conflict, represent urban elites not the grassroots, and are themselves corrupt. Another scholar sees the same skepticism in Asia.

In truth, people across the world have a love-hate relationship with political parties. Parties are highly valued by most scholars for enabling popular control of government but are mistrusted by many leaders and citizens. Our book proposes and tests a theory of party system effects on country governance explicitly designed to pin down the contributions of political parties.

**Normative or Empirical Theory?**

Most western comparative scholars, U.N. officials, and others engaged in promoting democratic government in developing countries are guided by a normative theory: *It is good to have political parties competing to control government in open elections.* Normative theory that values political parties, however, also assumes the existence of an empirical relationship: *Countries with competitive party systems perform better than those without competitive party systems.* In practice, that assumption has been accepted as true without testing to see whether it is false. By and large, international efforts to promote party politics in developing countries have been guided by normative judgments relying on assumptions that have not been adequately tested through empirical research, if they are tested at all. They often go untested for three major reasons.

One stems from the value commitment to political parties in normative theory. Those who value political parties may think it *obvious* that countries are governed better when a reasonable number of stable political parties compete for votes in free elections—compared with countries that hold no elections, or countries that have elections but no parties, or those that have only one party. Why do the assumptions seem obvious?

Another reason flows from the difficulty in settling on research rules for acceptable answers. What evidence might show that democratic party systems “perform better” than non-democratic systems? What do you mean by performance? How can performance be measured? One might even ask: What do you mean by a competitive party system? How can one identify and measure the characteristics of political party systems?

Yet a third reason has prevented determining whether countries with competitive party systems perform better than those without competitive party systems. Even if scholars could settle on an acceptable research design, the research might be blocked because of difficulties in collecting the necessary data. One might find adequate party system data on about thirty established democracies and on a like number of developing countries, but what about the more than one hundred remaining countries whose party systems are rarely studied systematically? And where would one find the matching country data on government performance?

**The Theory to Be Tested**

This study converts the underlying empirical assumption about the performance of political parties into an empirical political theory of party system effects on country governance. The full theory, which consists of conditions assumed to be true and propositions to be tested, is formally presented in Chapter 6. From a set of seven assumptions, we deduce four broad empirical propositions about party system effects on country governance.

*Countries with popularly elected non-partisan parliaments score higher on governance than those with unelected parliaments without political parties.*

The more competitive the party system, the better the country governance.

The more aggregative the party system, the better the country governance.

The more stable the party system, the better the country governance.

That is the *theory*. It is an empirical theory with origins in normative theory. Whether or not the observable facts conform to the theory remains to be determined. That is the task of our book.

(Continued on page 2)
The Challenge of Country Governance

People generally recognize that country governments differ in their ability to deliver ordinary goods and services to their citizens. They see that some governments fare much better than others. Most people suspect that public rule is notoriously bad under dictators. Regardless of how nasty their autocratic rule, all dictators head governments that keep some degree of order and control over civil life. Some countries, like Somalia, have no dictator but little or no government either.

Somalia qualifies as a “failed state”—one whose central government had little practical control over much of its territory. In contrast to dictatorship and failed states, consider Costa Rica, which abandoned its standing army in 1948 and entered a sustained period of democratic elections. Or consider the tiny land-locked nation of Bhutan, tucked between India and China in the Himalayan mountains. Bhutan had been an absolute monarchy, where kings functioned as dictators, but in 2005, Bhutan’s king announced that he would transform his country into a democracy.

Or take the island nation of Iceland, small like Bhutan. Whereas Bhutan had been an absolute monarchy, Iceland claims the world’s oldest continuous parliament, a history of multiparty politics, and competent democratic government. Until 2008, Icelanders enjoyed one of the highest incomes per capita in the world and also one of the most egalitarian distributions of wealth. Iceland, however, suffered heavily in the 2008 global financial meltdown, and in 2009, Iceland’s voters ousted the free-market Independence Party that had governed the country for two decades and replaced it with a governing coalition of the Social Democratic Alliance and the Left-Green Movement.

Finally consider the enormous country of China. Under one-party dictatorial rule, the Chinese government depended on substantial annual growth in GNP to satisfy the material needs of over one billion citizens. Confronted with the 2008 collapse in the world economy, its government launched a huge stimulus program in early 2009. In contrast, the U.S. government operated under a vigorous two-party system and faced more constraints in devising its stimulus plan. After both programs had operated for six months in 2009, the U.S. economy remained flat with rising unemployment while the Chinese economy grew by nearly eight percent.

Clearly, governmental dictatorships differ from the failed government of Somalia—and both sets of countries differ from the democratic governments of Costa Rica and from the monarchical government of Bhutan. Although Iceland, China, and the United States all pursued economic growth, they did so under very different party systems. Iceland operated under a multiparty system that decisively punished economic failure. China’s one-party government could concentrate its resources on economic recovery without fear of losing power. The United States’ two-party system forced the government to balance competing interests while trying to craft its economic policy.

Is it possible to meaningfully compare such diverse nations concerning how well they deliver the benefits of government? We think so. This book uses country governance as a criterion for determining the effects of country party systems. Although we identify and explain the effects of two other major factors (country size and country wealth) on selected measures of governance, we do not claim to represent the complex relationships among all the variables that account for all the cross-country variance in governance. Our focus is on the independent effects of party systems (after controlling for country size and wealth) on country governance. In the language of research, party systems traits are our independent variables, and country governance is our dependent variable.

Overview of Research Design

Studies that compare politics in different countries usually employ either the “most similar systems” design, matching countries on shared characteristics. We follow the “most different systems” research design, comparing a large number of very different countries (ideally, every country) with maximally different party systems: competitive and noncompetitive, fragmented and aggregative, volatile and stable, and even countries without political parties. It focuses on a common set of dependent variables (measures of country governance) and independent variables (measures of party systems) and ignores most of the countless other variables on which the countries differ.

In keeping with this design, we analyze the data on six different indicators of country governance created by scholars at the World Bank for 212 countries in 2007. We determine whether party system traits have any statistically significant effects on country governance across all countries. Although we draw heavily on quantitative data, we present relatively few tables. Instead, we display data graphically in reporting our findings. Moreover, we explain in simple terms alternative methods for scoring data, the meaning of a correlation coefficient, how to interpret a regression equation, and the gist of statistical significance. We think that our presentation is digestible for undergraduate students, even those who never had a course in statistics.

We supplement our quantitative analysis by noting where five countries score in the distribution of a summary measure of country governance, from top to bottom:

- **Iceland**—the nation at the top of the 2007 World Bank mean governance scores.
- **United States**—a nation scoring high on governance but not at the top. (It is #23.)
- **Korea**—a nation scoring near the 25th percentile, toward the top (#50).
- **Russia**—a nation scoring near the 75th percentile, toward the bottom (#164).
- **Somalia**—the nation scoring at the bottom of the World Bank scores (#212).


Part II, “Environmental Effects on Country Governance,” begins by considering whether the quality of country governance is a cause or an effect of environmental conditions. It contends that country governance is clearly affected by country size, which is usually determined long before any particular government is in place. It also argues that country wealth is a cause of country governance, especially in the short term. To assess the relative effects of country size and wealth on country governance, we conduct elementary statistical analysis. To explain the analysis to readers unfamiliar with correlation and regression analysis, we proceed slowly, describing with few formulas (but numerous boxes and graphs) the meanings of essential terms: correlation, statistical significance, a regression coefficient, and explained variance. Understanding these terms is essential to understanding the data analysis, which shows strong and consistent effects of country size and wealth on country governance.

Part III, “Party System Effects on Country Governance,” addresses the main topic in a series of chapters. This section explains the normative and empirical theory underlying the study. It also describes the data collected to test the theory and various ways to measure party systems. Relying on the statistical knowledge conveyed in Part II, a set of chapters assesses the effects of party systems on country governance, beginning with the twenty-three countries that have no parties. For the other 189 countries, the chapters assess the effects of party system competitiveness, aggregation, and stability. The final chapter reviews the theory and research. It concludes that party systems have significant and mostly consistent effects on improving country governance. The findings should hearten those in international agencies who have spent millions of dollars to strengthen political parties in developing countries on the normative assumption that strong competitive, stable party systems promote countries’ ability to deliver to citizens the benefits of government.

END NOTES

The Weidenbaum Center of Washington University in St. Louis announces the creation of The American Panel Survey (TAPS)

TAPS is a panel survey in which a national probability sample of about 2,000 panelists will be reinterviewed online each month, beginning in the fall of 2011. Initial plans for TAPS extend surveys for five years. Among the many virtues of the TAPS survey is the accumulation of substantial amounts of information on each respondent, the ability to analyze individual-level change, the possibility of conducting randomized experiments within the survey, including using audio and video interventions – all within the context of a state-of-art, nationally representative sample. A wide variety of social science research – not just limited to law and politics – can be conducted using TAPS.

Scholars are welcome to propose questionnaire modules to be placed on TAPS, including survey experiments. Details on the panel, pricing, and application process are available at http://wc.wustl.edu/node/511. Inquiries are welcome at taps@wustl.edu. TAPS is co-directed by James L. Gibson and Steven S. Smith, both professors of political science at Washington University in St. Louis. Initial funding is provided by the Weidenbaum Center. TAPS is conducted in collaboration with Knowledge Networks, the leading online survey research firm.

Kay Lawson would like overseas readers of POP to know there is now a way to order the five volumes of Political Parties and Democracy (published by Praeger, which is now owned by ABC-CLIO) without paying high shipping costs. The website to use is http://www.abc-clio.com/aboutus/default.aspx?id=70447#UK.

At that site, buyers will find an email to write to depending on country or continent, for ordering either the full set ($214) or a copy of a single volume ($45). For U.S. buyers, the website is www.abc-clio.com/product.aspx?id=52943.

The books are also sold via Amazon and Barnes and Noble. The latter site gives all endorsements. Please also see the review in the April 2011 issue of Choice.
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Thursday, Sept. 1, 2:00 p.m.
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Title: Mama Grizzlies, The Tea Party, and the Process of Representation
Friday, Sept. 2, 2:00 p.m.
Co-sponsored by 31-15

Title: Women’s Movement Dynamics: Strategic and Institutional Underpinnings
Saturday, Sept. 3, 8:00 a.m.
Co-sponsored by 31-16

Title: Dynamics of Campaign Fundraising
Saturday, Sept. 3, 2:00 p.m.
Co-sponsored by Campaign Finance Research Group, Panel 1
Chair: Paul Allen Beck, Ohio State University (beck.9@osu.edu)
Papers: “Do Caps on Donations Work?” Eric McGhee, Public Policy Institute of California (mcghee@ppic.org)
“Where Does the Money Come From: The Timing and Geography of Campaign Contributions to Presidential Candidates in the 2000 and 2008 Primaries.” Andrew J. Dowdle, University of Arkansas (adowdle@uark.edu), Karen Sebold, University of Arkansas (ksebold@uark.edu), and Scott Limbocker, University of Arkansas (slimbock@uark.edu)
“Aft er Citizens United and SpeechNow.org: Considering the Consequences of New Campaign Finance Activities.” Diana Dwyre, California State University, Chico (ddwyre@csuchico.edu)
“National Political Conditions and the Intervening of Incumbent and Party Fundraising in the U.S. House.” Bruce A. Larson, Gettysburg College (blarson@gettysburg.edu) and Eric S. Heberlig, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (eheberl@uncw.edu)
“Understanding the Impact of the Internet and First-time Donors in the 2008 Election Cycle.” David B. Magleby, Brigham Young University (david_magleby@byu.edu), Jay Goodliffe, Brigham Young University (goodliffe@byu.edu) and Joseph A. Olsen, Brigham Young University (joseph Olsen@byu.edu)
Disc(s): Paul Allen Beck, Ohio State University (beck.9@osu.edu) and Robert G. Bootrighth, Clark University (robtrotright@clarku.edu)

Title: Party and Interest Group Responses to Campaign Finance Reform
Saturday, Sept. 3, 4:15 p.m.
Co-sponsored by Campaign Finance Research Group-2
Chair: Rick D. Farmer, Oklahoma Insurance Department (rick@rickfarmer.net)
Papers: “Citizens United, States Divided? The Interaction of Transparency and Spending in State Elections.” Douglas Spencer, University of California, Berkeley (dspencer@berkeley.edu) and Abby Wood, University of California, Berkeley (abbywood@gmail.com)
“The Value of Majority Party Status Reconsidered.” Jonathan Wand, Stanford University (wand@stanford.edu)
“The Politics of American Business.” Jonathan S. Krasno, SUNY, Binghamton (jkrasno@binghamton.edu) and Gregory Robinson, SUNY, Binghamton (grobino@binghamton.edu)
“Special Interest Partisanship: The Transformation of American Political Parties in Government.” Katherine Krimmel, Columbia University (kk2118@columbia.edu)
Disc(s): Allan J. Cigler, University of Kansas (acigler@ku.edu) and Timothy Werner, Grinnell College (werner@grinnell.edu)

Title: Religion and Political Group Activism
Thursday, Sept. 1, 8:00 a.m.
Co-sponsored by 33-11
Chair: Allen D. Hertzke, University of Oklahoma (ahertzke@ou.edu)
“Solidarity and Discord in Interest Group Memberships: How the Social Context of Religious Congregations Affects Interest Group Involvement.” Andrew R. Lewis, American University (andy.lewis@american.edu) and Paul A. Djupe, Denison University (djupe@denison.edu)

(Continued on page 4)
“Party Pressure on Religious and Moral Issues in Congress.” Lillian Hall Mason, SUNY, Stony Brook (lillianahall@gmail.com) and Naser Javaid, Roosevelt University

“Effectual Reasoning and the Decision to Become Politically Active: Moving Beyond Citizen Characteristics and ‘The Ask.’” Kimberly H. Conger, Colorado State University (KImberly.Conger@colostate.edu)

Disc: Allen D. Hertzke, University of Oklahoma (ahertzke@ou.edu)

Title: Party Change on Rights Issues
Thursday, Sept. 1, 10:15 a.m.
Co-sponsored by 7-24

Chair: Joseph Quin Monson, Brigham Young University (Quin.Monson@byu.edu)

Papers: “Party Position Change and the Politics of Gay Rights in the U.S. Congress.” David Karol, American University (karol@american.edu)

“To Two Roads Diverged: Abortion, Modernization and the GOP in the 1974 Election.” Burdett A. Loomis, University of Kansas (blooomis@ku.edu)

“In Search of American Populism: Alternative Dimensions of Public Opinion.” Byron E. Shafer, University of Wisconsin, Madison (bshafer@polisci.wisc.edu) and William J.M. Caggott, Florida State University (wjcaggott@fsu.edu)

“First to the Party: The Interest Group Origins of the Partisan Realignment on Civil Rights.” Christopher Baylor, University of California, Los Angeles (cbaylor@ucla.edu) and Erin Hartman, University of California, Berkeley (ehartman@berkeley.edu)

Disc(s): Clyde Wilcox, Georgetown University (clywilcox@georgetown.edu) and John J. Coleman, University of Wisconsin, Madison (coleman@polisci.wisc.edu)

Title: Party Distancing and Party Polarization in America
Saturday, Sept. 3, 10:15 a.m.
Co-sponsored by 36-7

Chair: William J. Crotty, Northeastern University (w.crotty@neu.edu)

Papers: “Structural Barriers to Political Consensus.” Gerald M. Pomper, Rutgers University, New Brunswick (gpomper@rci.rutgers.edu) and Marc D. Weiner, Rutgers University (mdw@eb.rutgers.edu)

“The Dynamics of Internal Party Coalition-Building.” Howard L. Reiter, University of Connecticut (howard.reiter@uconn.edu)

“Party, Ideology and Programmatic Commitment.” William J. Crotty, Northeastern University (w.crotty@neu.edu)

“Hispanics as an Emergent Force in Party Politics.” Rodolfo O. de la Garza, Columbia University (rd2001@columbia.edu)

Disc(s): John H. Aldrich, Duke University (aldrich@duke.edu) and Marc J. Hetherington, Vanderbilt University (hetherington@vanderbilt.edu)

Title: Panel to Honor the Scholarship of Gerald M. Pomper
Friday, Sept. 2, 8:00 a.m.

Chair: Kathleen A. Frankovic, CBS News (kfrankovic@yahoo.com)


“Party Activists, Ideological Extremism, and Party Polarization: Should We Be Generalizing about ‘Party Activists’?” Marjorie R. Hershey, Indiana University, Bloomington (hershey@indiana.edu) and Beth Easter, Indiana University, Bloomington (baeaster@indiana.edu)

“Party Realignment in New England.” Maureen Moakley, University of Rhode Island (moakley@uri.edu) and William G. Mayer, Northeastern University (wmayer@neu.edu)

Disc: John Hart, Australian National University (j.hart@anu.edu.au)

Title: Lobbying and Public Policy
Saturday, Sept. 3, 8:00 a.m.
Co-sponsored by 22-22

Chair: Thomas T. Holyoke, California State University, Fresno (tholyoke@csufresno.edu)

Papers: “Who Cares About the Lobbying Agenda?” David C. Kimball, University of Missouri, St. Louis (kimball@msstate.edu), Beth L. Leech, Rutgers University (leech@polisci.rutgers.edu), Marie Hojnacki, Pennsylvania State University (mhjojnak@psu.edu), Jeffrey M. Berry, Tufts University (jeffrey.berry@tufts.edu) and Frank R. Baumgartner, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (frankb@unc.edu)


“Who Does Not Lobby: Representation of Interests in Health Care Politics.” Amy Melissa McKay, Georgia State University (amckay@gsu.edu)

“Citizen and Lobbyist Access to Members of Congress: Who Gets It and Who Gives It?” Matthew T. Harrigan, University of Florida (mathewharrigan@ufl.edu)

Disc(s): Burdett A. Loomis, University of Kansas (blooomis@ku.edu) and Ruth S. Jones, Arizona State University (ruth.jones@asu.edu)

Title: Social Movements and Political Mobilization: New Approaches
Thursday, Sept. 1, 10:15 a.m.
Co-sponsored by 11-70

Chair: Dana Z. Strovitz, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities (dz@umn.edu)

Papers: “Meaning Making and Mobilization: Reconceptualizing the Role of Grievances in Social Movement Theory.” Erica Simmons, University of Chicago (ericas@uchicago.edu)

“An Identity-Based Theory of the Partisan Dimensions of Social Movements.” Michael T. Heaney, University of Michigan (mheaney@umich.edu)

“Plutocrats, Populists, and the Tea Party.” David S. Meyer, University of California, Irvine (dmeyer@uci.edu)

“Contagious Contention: A Network Approach to Collective Action on Climate Change.” Jennifer Hadden, Cornell University (jh242@cornell.edu)

Disc: Sidney Tarrow, Cornell University (sgt2@cornell.edu)

Title: Reciprocal Influences of Partisanship and Issue Attitudes: The U.S. and Europe
Friday, Sept. 2, 8:00 a.m.
Co-sponsored by 36-8

Chair: Thomas John Scotto, University of Essex (tscott@essex.ac.uk)

Papers: “Party Structuring of Policy Attitudes and Conflict Extension: An Experimental Assessment.” Thomas M. Carsey, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (carsey@unc.edu) and Geoffrey C. Layman, University of Notre Dame (glayman@nd.edu)

“Beyond Endogeneity? Removing Political Conditioning from Economic Perceptions.” Geoffrey Evans, Oxford University (geoffrey.evans@nuffield.ox.ac.uk) and Mark A. Pickup, University of Oxford (mark.pickup@gmail.com)

“Personal Values, Party Identification, and the Origins of Public Opinion.” Paul N. Goren, University of Minnesota (pgoren@umn.edu)

“The Reciprocal Influences of Dutch Voters’ Policy Beliefs and Party Evaluations.” James Adams, University of California, Davis (jadams@ucdavis.edu), Catherine E. De Vries, University of Amsterdam (c.e.devries@uva.nl) and Debra Lynn Leiter, University of California, Davis (dleiter@ucdavis.edu)

“The Development and Dynamics of Party Identification in New Democracies: A Comparative Cohort Analysis.” Anja Neunzendorf, University of Oxford (anja.neunzendorf@nuffield.ox.ac.uk)

Disc(s): Thomas John Scotto, University of Essex (tscott@essex.ac.uk) and Logan Dancy, University of Pittsburgh (lmd80@pitt.edu)

Title: Why People Contribute to Political Campaigns and Why Their Contributions Matter
Saturday, Sept. 3, 4:15 p.m.
Co-sponsored by 36-9

Chair: Hans Hassel, University of California, San Diego (hassel@ucsd.edu)

Papers: “Campaign Finance Reform and Polarization: Has the Individual-Donor Revolution Advantaged Ideologically Extreme Candidates?” Adam Bonica, New York University (abonica@princeton.edu)

“Social Campaign Giving.” Betsy Sinclair, University of Chicago (betsy@uchicago.edu) and Erin Hartman, University of Michigan (ehartman@umich.edu)

“The Effect of Redistricting on Individual Campaign Contributions.” Jenna Bednar, University of Michigan (jbednar@umich.edu) and Elisabeth R. Gerber, University of Michigan (egerber@umich.edu)

“Donating Money versus Time: Why People Donate Money to Some Candidates yet Donate Time to Others.” Adam Seth Levine, Vanderbilt University (adam.levine@vanderbilt.edu) and Cindy D. Kam, Vanderbilt University (cdkam@vanderbilt.edu)

“Caravans for Cash: The Effect on Campaign Contributions.” Andrea N. Gillespie, Emory University (andra.gillespie@emory.edu) and Joshua A. Berman, Emory University (jaberma@emory.edu)

Disc(s): Hans Hassel, University of California, San Diego (hassel@ucsd.edu) and Gary C. Jacobson, University of California, San Diego (gjacobs@ucsd.edu)
Title: Religion and Political Parties in Comparative Perspective

Sunday, Sept. 4, 10:15 a.m.

Co-sponsored by 33-12

Chair: David A. Dulio, Oakland University (ddulio@oakland.edu)

Papers:

“Leftist Candidates in Western Europe: The Intersection of Religion and Party Strategies.” Tatiana Kostadinova, Florida International University (tkostadinova@fiu.edu) and Petia A. Kostadinova, Nova Southeastern University (petia.k@nsu.edu)

“Religious Institutions in Western Europe: The Impact of Religion on Political Parties.” John R. McAndrews, University of British Columbia (jkmc@interchange.ubc.ca)

“Polarization over Time.” David B. Sparks, Duke University (d.sparks@duke.edu)

“Can Citizens Perceive of Federalism? A Partisan Explanation.” Srinivas Parinandi, University of Michigan (sparinan@umich.edu)

“Responsiveness and Women’s Substantive Representation within the Belgian Heads of Government.” Eline Mariska Severs, University of Antwerp (Eline.Sever5@ua.ac.be)

“Succeeding in Politics: Dynasties in Democracies.” Daniel Markham Smith, University of California, San Diego (daniel.smith@ucsd.edu)

“Ally or Perish? Party Financing as a Constraint on Party Behavior in Post-Communist Political Systems.” Maria Spirova, Leiden University (mspirova@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

“American Standards for American Children: A Century of Organizing for Child Well-Being.” Doug Imig, University of Memphis (Dimig@memphis.edu)

“Political Party Responses to European Parliamentary Election Results.” Zeynep Somer-Topcu, Vanderbilt University (z.t.somer-topcu@vanderbilt.edu)

“Keep ’Em In or Take ’Em Out: A Simulation Analysis of the Impacts of the Changes to the New Zealand Electoral System.” Alexander C. Tan, University of Canterbury (alex.tan@canterbury.ac.nz) and Stephanie Borthwick, University of Canterbury (sfb39@uclive.ac.nz) and Monique Eade, University of Canterbury (Monique.eade@gmail.com)

“Is There a Winner Effect in American Elections? Evidence from a Natural Experiment.” Michael Sances, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (mwsances@mit.edu)

“The Functions of Political Parties in New Democracies”

Chair: Kenneth W. Kollman, University of Michigan (kkollman@umich.edu)

Papers:

“Candidate Selection Procedures, Electoral Rules, and Legislative Party Cohesion in Mixed Electoral System Countries.” Jessica Robinson-Petchey, Brigham Young University (jrp68@ucla.edu)

“Competition Aversion and Candidate Entry.” Kristin L. Kanthak, University of Maryland (kgoss@duke.edu)

“Where You Vote Affects How You Vote.” Jennifer A. Steen, Arizona State University (jasteen@asu.edu)

“Candidate Characteristics and Voter Ambivalence.” Matthew Buttice, University of California, Davis (mbuttice@ucdavis.edu)

“Candidate Selection Procedures, Electoral Rules, and Legislative Party Cohesion in Mixed Electoral System Countries.” Jessica Robinson-Petchey, Brigham Young University (jrp68@ucla.edu)

“Political Party Responses to European Parliamentary Election Results.” Zeynep Somer-Topcu, Vanderbilt University (z.t.somer-topcu@vanderbilt.edu)

“Do Voters Understand Party Promises? Mandate Responsiveness in East European Politics.” Tatiana Kostadinova, Florida International University (tkostadinova@fiu.edu) and Petia A. Kostadinova, Nova Southeastern University (petia.k@nsu.edu)

“Rethinking Party Membership: Towards a Functional Measurement Strategy.” Susan Scarruw, University of Houston (sscarrow@uh.edu) and Aldo Fernando Ponce, University of Houston (afponce@mail.uh.edu)

Disc(s):

Kenneth W. Kollman, University of Michigan (kkollman@umich.edu) and Brandon C. Zicha, Free University of Amsterdam

The Functions of Political Parties in New Democracies

Saturday, Sept. 3, 2:00 p.m.

Co-sponsored by 44-14

POSTERS

Title: Poster Session: American Politics 2

Friday, Sept. 2, 2:00 p.m.

Posters:

“Measuring the Quality of Elections” Gary Bland, RTI International (gbland@rti.org), Davin Phoenix, University of Michigan (dphoenix@umich.edu) and Vincent L. Hutchings, University of Michigan (vincenth@umich.edu)

“Keep ’Em In or Take ’Em Out: A Simulation Analysis of the Impacts of the Changes to the New Zealand Electoral System.” Alexander C. Tan, University of Canterbury (alex.tan@canterbury.ac.nz), Stephanie Borthwick, University of Canterbury (sfb39@uclive.ac.nz) and Monique Eade, University of Canterbury (Monique.eade@gmail.com)

“Is There a Winner Effect in American Elections? Evidence from a Natural Experiment.” Michael Sances, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (mwsances@mit.edu)

“Responsiveness and Women’s Substantive Representation within the Belgian Heads of Government.” Eline Mariska Severs, University of Antwerp (Eline.Sever5@ua.ac.be)

“Succeeding in Politics: Dynasties in Democracies.” Daniel Markham Smith, University of California, San Diego (daniel.smith@ucsd.edu)

“Ally or Perish? Party Financing as a Constraint on Party Behavior in Post-Communist Political Systems.” Maria Spirova, Leiden University (mspirova@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

“American Standards for American Children: A Century of Organizing for Child Well-Being.” Doug Imig, University of Memphis (Dimig@memphis.edu)

“Political Party Responses to European Parliamentary Election Results.” Zeynep Somer-Topcu, Vanderbilt University (z.t.somer-topcu@vanderbilt.edu)

“Keep ’Em In or Take ’Em Out: A Simulation Analysis of the Impacts of the Changes to the New Zealand Electoral System.” Alexander C. Tan, University of Canterbury (alex.tan@canterbury.ac.nz) and Stephanie Borthwick, University of Canterbury (sfb39@uclive.ac.nz) and Monique Eade, University of Canterbury (Monique.eade@gmail.com)
“Local Age Distributions and Support for the Political Fringe in American Politics.” Brittany Houtz Bramlett, University of Maryland (bb Bramlett@gyv.umd.edu) and James G. Gimpel, University of Maryland, College Park (jgimpel@gyv.umd.edu)
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