

Controlling Governments

Voters, Institutions, and
Accountability



EDITED BY
José María Maravall
Ignacio Sánchez-Cuenca

This page intentionally left blank

Controlling Governments

This book studies the extent to which citizens control government. The chapters discuss what guides voters at election time, why governments survive, and how institutions modify the power of the people over politicians. The questions addressed include whether ideology or ethnic identity undermine the capacity of voters to assess the performance of incumbent politicians; how much information voters must have to select a politician for office or to hold a government accountable; whether parties in power can help voters to control their governments; how different institutional arrangements influence voters' control; why politicians choose particular electoral systems; and what economic and social conditions may undermine not only governments but also democracy.

The book combines analytical rigor with comparative analysis. Arguments are backed by vast macro- and micro-empirical evidence. There are cross-country comparisons and survey analyses of many countries. In every case, there has been an attempt to integrate analytical arguments and empirical research. The goal is to shed new light on perplexing questions of positive democratic theory.

José María Maravall is the Director of the Center for Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences, Juan March Institute (Madrid). He is also a Professor of Sociology at the Universidad Complutense (Madrid), an Honorary Fellow of St. Antony's College (Oxford University), and a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy. He holds doctorates from the universities of Madrid and Oxford. He was a socialist member of parliament and Minister of Education and Science from 1982 to 1988. His previous publications include *Economic Reforms in New Democracies* (1993); *Regimes, Politics, and Markets* (1997); and (with A. Przeworski) *Democracy and the Rule of Law* (2003).

Ignacio Sánchez-Cuenca is Professor of Political Science at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences, Juan March Institute (Madrid). He is also Associate Professor of Sociology at the Universidad Complutense (Madrid). He has been the Rice Visiting Associate Professor at Yale University and a Visiting Scholar at New York University and has held positions at Universidad Pompeu Fabra (Barcelona) and University of Salamanca. He has published four books in Spanish; articles in journals such as *Government & Opposition*, *Party Politics*, *European Union Politics*, and the *European Journal of Sociology*; as well as articles in several Spanish journals. He has authored chapters in several edited volumes, including *Democracy and the Rule of Law* (2003), edited by J. M. Maravall and A. Przeworski.

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN THE THEORY OF DEMOCRACY

General Editor

ADAM PRZEWORSKI New York University

OTHER BOOKS IN THE SERIES

Jon Elster, ed., *Deliberative Democracy*

Adam Przeworski, Susan Stokes, and Bernard Manin, eds.,
Democracy, Accountability, and Representation

Adam Przeworski et al., *Democracy and Development:
Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950–1990*

Robert Barros, *Constitutionalism and Dictatorship:
Pinochet, the Junta, and the 1980 Constitution*

José María Maravall and Adam Przeworski, eds.,
Democracy and the Rule of Law

Melissa Schwartzberg, *Democracy and Legal Change*

Controlling Governments

Voters, Institutions, and Accountability

Edited by

José María Maravall

Juan March Institute

Ignacio Sánchez-Cuenca

Juan March Institute



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521884105

© Cambridge University Press 2008

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2007

ISBN-13 978-0-511-36795-3 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-10 0-511-36795-3 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-88410-5 hardback

ISBN-10 0-521-88410-1 hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-71110-4 paperback

ISBN-10 0-521-71110-X paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of urls for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>page ix</i>
<i>Contributors</i>	<i>xi</i>
Introduction	1
JOSÉ MARÍA MARAVALL AND IGNACIO SÁNCHEZ-CUENCA	
1 Explaining the Electoral Performance of Incumbents in Democracies	17
BELÉN BARREIRO	
2 How Can Governments Be Accountable If Voters Vote Ideologically?	45
IGNACIO SÁNCHEZ-CUENCA	
3 Enduring Ethnicity: The Political Survival of Incumbent Ethnic Parties in Western Democracies	82
SONIA ALONSO	
4 Performance or Representation? The Determinants of Voting in Complex Political Contexts	105
PALOMA AGUILAR AND IGNACIO SÁNCHEZ-CUENCA	
5 Political Knowledge and the Logic of Voting: A Comparative Study	131
MARTA FRAILE	
6 The Political Consequences of Internal Party Democracy	157
JOSÉ MARÍA MARAVALL	
7 Choosing Rules for Government: The Institutional Preferences of Early Socialist Parties	202
ALBERTO PENADÉS	

8	Constitutions and Democratic Breakdowns	247
	ALICIA ADSERÀ AND CARLES BOIX	
	<i>Author Index</i>	303
	<i>Subject Index</i>	309

Acknowledgments

This book is the product of a collective research project carried out within the Juan March Institute (JMI). Most of the authors are affiliated with this institution either as professors or as fellow doctors. The intellectual identity and the research facilities of the JMI help to explain this book. The academic community of the JMI, not a large one, shares similar backgrounds, research interests, and a commitment to theoretically oriented empirical analysis. Although there is significant variation in the research design of the chapters, they are all inspired by the necessity of combining good theory and detailed empirical analysis. The initial consensus and the intense interaction between the members of the project led to a collective book that was not intended to be a mere collection of chapters. Over three years, the authors discussed the original project, the construction of the data sets, and the successive drafts of the chapters. The interaction and cross-fertilization were strong. This should be reflected in the theoretical and methodological cohesiveness of the book as a whole.

The Scientific Council of the JMI supported the research project from the beginning. We thank the late Michael Wallerstein, as well as Gøsta Esping-Andersen, Yasemin Soysal, and Richard Breen. Adam Przeworski deserves our special gratitude for his help with the project and his comments to earlier drafts of most chapters. Finally, the two readers of Cambridge University Press provided stimulating and helpful observations.

Braulio Gómez provided competent research assistance and helped greatly in the construction of most of the data sets. Magdalena Nebreda edited the text and handled the administration of the project with great efficiency.

Contributors

ALICIA ADSERÀ, Visiting Associate Professor, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs (Princeton University).

PALOMA AGUILAR, Doctora Miembro of the Instituto Juan March and Associate Professor of Sociology, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia.

SONIA ALONSO, Doctora Miembro of the Instituto Juan March and Research Fellow, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.

BELÉN BARREIRO, Doctora Miembro of the Instituto Juan March and Advisor at the Cabinet of the Spanish Prime Minister.

CARLES BOIX, Professor of Political Science, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs (Princeton University).

MARTA FRAILE, Doctora Miembro of the Instituto Juan March and Research Fellow at the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC).

JOSÉ MARÍA MARAVALL, Professor of Sociology, Universidad Complutense de Madrid and Director, Centro de Estudios Avanzados en Ciencias Sociales (Instituto Juan March).

ALBERTO PENADÉS, Doctor Miembro of the Instituto Juan March and Associate Professor of Political Science, Universidad de Salamanca.

IGNACIO SÁNCHEZ-CUENCA, Doctor Miembro of the Instituto Juan March; Associate Professor of Sociology, Universidad Complutense de Madrid; and Professor of Political Science at the Centro de Estudios Avanzados en Ciencias Sociales (Instituto Juan March).

Controlling Governments

Introduction

José María Maravall and Ignacio Sánchez-Cuenca

We discuss in this book some core topics in the positive theory of democracy. We try to understand the relationship between citizens and politicians: what guides voters at election time, why governments survive and fall, and how institutions modify the power of the people over politicians. These are all relevant questions to determine the role of elections in democracy. Note, however, that elections can be analyzed from many other perspectives different from the representative dimension of democracy. Thus, elections can be also interpreted as an epistemic device to reach the right decision (Coleman 1989); as an exercise of self-government (Przeworski 2005); or as an opportunity for participation and deliberation (Elster 1998).

This book focuses on the representative side of democracy – how rule for the people and rule by the people are connected. Do elections (rule by the people) induce politicians to act in a representative way (rule for the people)? A common theme in all the contributions here included may sound commonsensical or even trivial: we need to combine some analytical rigor with empirical analysis. If we dare to say something so obvious, it is because the field is badly divided into formal analysis and empirical studies. We take seriously what we have learned from economic models of democracy, but we use these conclusions to organize the empirical research of cases that are far removed from the assumptions made in the formal literature.

The analytical approach to the study of representative government revolves around formal models on the control and selection of politicians through elections (for an introduction, see Persson and Tabellini 2000, ch. 4; Przeworski 2003, ch. 8). Control and selection respond to two logics. On one hand, control is associated with retrospective voting, and the main concern is how to induce politicians to behave in the interest of the

electorate. More technically, the problem is how voters can avoid rent-seeking behavior by politicians (moral hazard). On the other hand, selection is associated with prospective voting. The problem is how to avoid the selection of bad types (adverse selection).

Although formal modeling has reinvigorated the theory of democracy and defined the relevant questions in a sharp and rigorous way, we still have some reservations about its empirical relevance. A brief reference to accountability models will help make the point. In purely retrospective models, all that matters is the past record of the incumbent. Voters set a particular threshold on the evaluation of their welfare between two elections: if it is achieved, they reelect the incumbent; otherwise, they throw him out. Pure accountability models (Ferejohn 1986) require several conditions for retrospective control to be possible: (1) citizens disregard promises and just observe outcomes; (2) they ignore differences between candidates because no selection is involved; (3) they do not differ in their distributive preferences over welfare that could be manipulated by the incumbent (i.e., the political space is unidimensional); and (4) they are able to coordinate on the voting rule that establishes the welfare threshold in virtue of which people vote for or against the incumbent.

Each of these conditions is crucial if citizens are to control the incumbent. These are not merely simplifying assumptions. They highlight how restrictive the conditions for electoral accountability are. It is rather obvious that in actual democracies, these conditions do not hold: there are various types of politicians; it is unlikely that voters will be able to coordinate on a voting rule; voters hear different promises; and politics tends to be run in more than one dimension.

Of course, later models have relaxed these conditions in various ways: for instance, allowing deviations from electoral promises (and not just unsatisfactory outcomes) to explain voters' reactions (Austen-Smith and Banks 1989), considering that candidates differ and have incentives to reveal in the campaign their true intentions (Harrington 1993), and introducing multiple agents that may provide information to the principal (Persson, Roland, and Tabellini 1997). Models of accountability also make important informational requirements: voters must be able to assess whether the incumbent is responsible for past outcomes. These may have been due to the actions of the government or to conditions beyond its control. If voters cannot know the causes of such outcomes, to establish a reelection threshold, and to reward or punish for past performance, becomes arbitrary.

Despite their more realistic assumptions, these models generally assume that representation can only be guaranteed via accountability. Elections, from this point of view, are little more than a mechanism to create rotation in office. As Riker (1982: 244) put it, “all elections do or have to do is to permit people to get rid of rulers.” This view is echoed in Przeworski’s (1999) minimalist conception of democracy.

Mackie (2003) has extensively shown that there seems to be some deep and unwarranted distrust in these models toward any function of elections that goes beyond kicking politicians out of office. Yet if elections are, after all, a punishment mechanism, it seems a rather inefficient one. Citizens have only one instrument, the paper ballot, to punish or reward the incumbent for the many decisions made during his or her time in office. Further, elections do not provide many opportunities for voters to coordinate on their judgments about the incumbent. Besides, as Fearon (1999) has argued, there are some resilient facts about the functioning of democracy that are scarcely compatible with the idea of retrospective control: (1) voters tend to dislike office-oriented candidates, (2) voters tend to reject politicians who follow too closely the shifts in public mood or who are too sensitive to surveys, and (3) some democracies work under term limits that eliminate the reelection incentive of the theory of accountability.

We have to provide a more realistic description of how the control of the incumbent is part of a wider democratic process. This is where we depart from the formal literature. But we try to stay close to the results of this literature to structure the empirical analysis. We do not believe that the alternative to formal models is running regressions, as is so often the case in the inexhaustible literature on economic voting. We hope to convince the reader that there is some middle ground between formalism and empiricism.

The chapters of the book focus on four themes that reveal the sort of complexities that emerge in the relationship between politicians and citizens. First, government survival does not depend entirely on electoral results. We must also take into account nonelectoral, parliamentary accountability. The mismatch between these two forms of accountability may have large implications for the calculations and strategies of the incumbent.

Second, voters make up their minds by combining judgments about incumbent performance with many other elements: these are not only retrospective and prospective considerations; voters may also vote for reasons that are unrelated to past or future performance.

Third, the relationship between governments and citizens is mediated by political parties. In the real world, the accountability relationship is a triangular one: the government is responsible to its voters but also to the party or parties that support it.

Finally, the extent of citizen control over politicians depends on institutions, but these institutions are endogenous, for they are designed by parties themselves. Parties, therefore, have certain latitude to decide to what extent they want to be constrained by citizens (Ferejohn 1999).

Note how distant we are with regard to pure accountability models. We have governments that can be controlled in more than one way, voters with varying degrees of sensitivity to government performance, parties that mediate between politicians and citizens, and endogenous institutions that enhance or reduce citizens' capacity for control. In each case, we have new problems that so far have received little attention in the positive theory of democracy.

Let us start with the survival of governments. We know that disconnections between loss of votes and loss of office exist in democratic systems. Such disconnections are particularly important under proportional representation and coalition governments. Cheibub and Przeworski (1999: 231–5) have shown that of 310 peaceful changes in prime ministers between 1950 and 1990, 48 percent were due to decisions made by politicians, either from their own party or from the ruling coalition. If we examine incumbents with majoritarian support in parliament and compare single-party and coalition governments in 23 parliamentary democracies from the end of the Second World War to 2003, 92.8 percent of prime ministers in single-party governments lost office through elections. This was the case for only 56.7 percent of prime ministers in coalition governments; the rest of losses were due to political conspiracies.¹ According to Maravall (2007), the criteria used by voters and politicians to sack a prime minister are antagonistic. In 1,109 country/year observations for these democracies (which included 312 losses of office), when economic performance was bad, the probability of losing power at election time went up; when the performance was good, the probability of being thrown out of office by ambitious fellow politicians increased. This may explain why, on aggregate, the fate of prime ministers does not appear to depend on economic conditions.

¹ The countries are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.

If we focus only on elections and leave conspiracies aside, the bulk of the literature has concentrated on how the fate of governments depends on economic conditions, mainly because economic performance is an easy variable to assess. Yet the connection between economic performance and government survival is obscure. Many studies have indeed shown that past economic outcomes influence the support of governments (examples are Kramer 1971; Shaffer and Chressanthis 1991; Lanoue 1994; Monardi 1994; Svoboda 1995). This support also appears to depend on expectations about the future, however, not just on assessments about the past. Comparative evidence is also inconclusive: past economic performance seems to matter in some countries but not in others (Paldam 1991: 9). Further, economic conditions, even if they influence individual voting, do not seem to affect electoral outcomes and whether or not governments survive. Powell and Whitten (1993), after studying 102 elections in 19 countries between 1969 and 1988, conclude that economic growth, inflation, and unemployment have no consequences on the electoral support of governments. This is very much the conclusion of Cheibub and Przeworski (1999: 226–30): past economic conditions had no effect on the likelihood that prime ministers would survive in 99 democracies between 1950 and 1990, with 1,606 country/year observations.

Barreiro, in her contribution to this book, provides a more comprehensive picture. First, she takes into account other outcomes apart from the economic ones. Second, she contemplates the possibility that different governments are judged differently by voters. As she states in her chapter, “we know very little about how accountability works in different ideological and economic contexts.” It has sometimes been argued that governments are more vulnerable to poor performance in policies at which they are assumed to be competent – as, for instance, the Republican Party in the United States over public spending (Lowry, Alt, and Ferree 1998). Other studies have stated, on the contrary, that this vulnerability is greater over policies at which they are assumed to be less adept – conservative governments over employment (Carlsen 2000; see also Warwick 1992).

Barreiro examines which criteria are used to punish or reward incumbents at election time, and whether they vary when right- or left-wing parties are in power and when the government corresponds to a rich or poor country. She studies 83 democracies between 1950 and 2000, looking at electoral gains and losses by incumbents. Governments in general tend to lose votes from election to election, with a mean loss of 3.9 percent. This tendency to *desgaste* is confirmed in Alonso’s chapter, which

shows that in multiethnic countries, class-based parties lose, on average, 1.40 percent of their vote between two consecutive elections, whereas ethnic parties lose 0.01 percent. Elsewhere, Maravall (2007) has shown that in parliamentary democracies, coalition governments lost, on average, 1.40 percent of their vote between elections, whereas single-party governments lost 2.50 percent. These findings contradict the hypothesis of an “incumbency advantage” – that is, the idea that holding office increases the likelihood of winning the next election because of the capacity to mobilize privileged resources.

Comparing the relative vulnerability of governments, Barreiro reaches two empirical conclusions: the first is that the criteria with which voters judge governments of left and right, and in rich and poor countries, do vary; the second, that the accountability of governments depends on the extent to which they can be held responsible for outcomes. Thus, although annual variations in per capita real income improve the electoral performance of all kinds of government, they matter somewhat more for governments of the left and in rich countries. Increases in total government expenditures as a percentage of GDP are beneficial for the vote for leftist parties in power (and indifferent for conservative ones). Further, if we accept that voters attribute more responsibility for outcomes the greater the share of seats in parliament of the party in power, this effect is greater in rich countries (i.e., as such share goes up, the greater the losses if performance is bad, and the greater the electoral rewards if performance is good).

Note that Barreiro studies accountability examining losses or gains of votes between two consecutive elections. She argues that “when incumbents lose or win votes for their outcomes, citizens are being sensitive to government performance. It is this sensitivity that may trigger the retrospective mechanism of accountability.” Yet the loss of votes is not necessarily related to the loss of power. Electoral leaks may go on over a very long time before becoming a threat to survival; governments may react with fear or with phlegm. In Great Britain, Tony Blair lost 2.3 percent of Labour’s share of total votes between the 1997 and the 2001 elections and 13.8 percent between the 2001 and the 2005 elections, but he preserved a majority of seats and stayed in power. It is only when votes lead to the loss of office that Friedrich’s “law of anticipated reactions” (1963: 199–215) operates: that is, when politicians, fearing that voters at election time will throw them out, avoid shirking.

These arguments about democratic controls are retrospective: governments respond for their past actions. They abandon two crucial exigencies

of pure accountability models, however: first, that all politicians in power are alike, so that elections involve no selection; second, that the electorate is homogeneous, so that incumbents cannot manipulate voters' distributional differences. The various contributors to this volume share a similar view of accountability. Sánchez-Cuenca's chapter combines both retrospective accountability and ideological differences among incumbents and voters.

A vast literature, from Downs (1957) onward, considers that elections are about selecting the best candidate for office and that this selection can be reproduced in a spatial "least distance" model. The "best" candidate is the one whose policies are closest to the voter's ideal position. Minimizing ideological distance is what guides both voters and parties. This is, of course, a prospective view of elections: no accountability is involved. In a different conception, elections are about holding governments accountable for their past record in office, and voters ignore differences between politicians. Very few consistent bridges have existed between these two distinct views of elections: what empirical studies have often done is simply juxtapose them – this has tended to be the case with the oceanic research on economic voting.

Sánchez-Cuenca shows why ideological voting and accountability can be combined. At election time, voters can assess the "ideological reliability" of a party – which depends on both the consistency of its policies and its political capacity. This assessment has to do with the past: "a government's performance provides plenty of evidence about its consistency and capacity." The "retentive power" of a party is then defined as the percentage of individuals who, being ideologically closer to that party, vote for it. Such percentage goes down as voters critically assess the capacity and consistency of the party despite its ideological proximity. Sánchez-Cuenca shows that a third of voters who were closer to the British Conservative Party or the German Christlich Demokratische Union/Christlich Soziale Union (CDU/CSU) than to any of their rivals did not vote following ideological proximity. The loss of retentive power was particularly important for the Spanish Socialist Party (PSOE): in 2000, only 52.3 percent of those voters who were closer to the PSOE than to any other party voted for it. Using conditional logit models, Sánchez-Cuenca demonstrates that such loss was first due to voters' attributions of inconsistency between ideology and policies (in the elections of 1986 and 1989) and later to their critical assessments of the party's capacity, mostly due to internecine struggles (in the elections of 1993, 1996, and 2000). This analysis therefore departs

both from the simple logics of ideological proximity and of retrospective performance voting: it combines ideology and performance in an analysis of accountability where differences exist among parties and among voters.

Ideology can thus guide voters in several ways. It can contribute to assessments of the political reliability of a party; it can help to select the candidate closest to the voter's preferences; it can reduce information costs; it can also introduce biases in voters' judgments of performance. Maravall and Przeworski (2001) have shown that ideology influences voters' expectations about governments: when assessments of the past and expectations about the future are combined, voters can find intertemporal or exonerative arguments to rationalize their vote. Ideology can lead them to think that if the past was bad, it was a necessary pain for a brighter future; or that a bad past and a bleak future are caused by conditions beyond the control of the government. In both cases, voters go on supporting the incumbent. The reward–sanction mechanism of pure accountability models is thus thwarted.

We do not know to what extent nationalism operates as an extreme form of ideology. Strongly ideological voters may follow the dictum “my party, right or wrong” – they will consider no other alternative. In similar fashion, nationalist voters may only conceive voting for a party that responds to their conception of the demos. When a part of the electorate holds to a different national identity, how does this affect the democratic control of the government? Are nationalist governments electorally more immune to past performance? Is the nationalist vote less volatile and more subject to political blinkers? The chapters by Alonso and by Aguilar and Sánchez-Cuenca shed light on these largely unexplored questions.

As Alonso puts it, “if it is true that ethnic allegiances provide nationalist parties with a competitive electoral advantage over class-based parties, *ceteris paribus* (i.e., under similar institutional settings), ethnic parties should show lower fluctuation of votes, less electoral punishment, lengthier duration in office, and less political erosion with the passage of time than class-based parties.” She studies five countries with fourteen ethno-regions (where ethnic and nonethnic parties compete), and 329 country/year observations. The analysis consists of a Weibull duration model in which the risk of losing office is assumed to vary as a function of time. She finds that the connection between government performance and survival in office is very different in majoritarian and proportional representation systems, both for ethnic and nonethnic parties. Because proportional representation facilitates party fragmentation, it also generates competition

within the nationalist camp – that is, more shifts of votes within blocs than between the nationalist/nonnationalist blocs. On the contrary, in majoritarian systems, access to office requires parties to compete for votes beyond ethnicity barriers – thus, competition between blocs is greater.

Coalitions were the norm in ethnoregions: 85.5 percent of all observations against 73.0 percent in regions with no ethnic parties. Most of such coalitions were mixed – that is, they included nationalist and nonnationalist partners. Although the fluctuation of votes was greater in ethnoregions because of their more fragmented party systems, mixed coalitions had lower electoral losses than homogeneous coalitions. This was due to the greater stability of the vote of ethnic parties in systems of proportional representation. Here, ethnic parties could follow a conservative strategy: they could simply rely on their own nationalist constituency rather than compete for nonnationalist voters. So, in ethnoregions, nationalist parties did better in preserving their voters than class-based parties. Alonso concludes that “voters judge an ethnic party less severely when it shares office with other parties . . . than when it is in office alone. Governments made up of only one party are similarly judged by voters, irrespective of the type of party. An ethnic party in office alone will probably be judged not only by the defense of the ethnonationalist program, but also by its economic performance.”

An intriguing question remains, as Alonso points out. The presence of nationalist politicians in mixed coalitions and the support given by nationalist voters to the collaboration with nonnationalist forces suggest a political pragmatism and a programmatic flexibility that contradicts the alleged rigidity of nationalist identities. So we need to move from a comparative analysis based on aggregate data on parties and governments to survey data on individual voters.

This is what Aguilar and Sánchez-Cuenca do in their chapter. They study the reactions of voters to the performance of a government in a complex scenario where, on one hand, nationalist parties enhance identity rather than performance, and, on the other hand, political decentralization increases voters' difficulties in attributing responsibility for past outcomes. The Spanish case provides an *experimentum crucis* to test the reaction of voters in a politically decentralized system where (1) the same party could hold the national and a regional government – it would thus be easier for voters to attribute responsibilities (the case in the chapter is Andalusia); (2) one party could hold power at the national level and be part of a coalition with nationalists at the regional level (the Basque Country);

or (3) different parties could be in office at the national and the regional levels – the regional government could be either nationalist (Catalonia) or nonnationalist (Castilla-León). The empirical analysis uses individual data from a 1992 survey with large national and regional samples.

Aguilar and Sánchez-Cuenca assess the relative influence of nationalism and ideology on the vote. They estimate the spatial distances between voters and parties both in a nationalist and an ideological dimension. What they find about the effect of such distances on the vote is the following:

1. The influence of ideology is stronger in general than that of nationalism. Both dimensions have a similar effect on nationalist voters, however. For nonnationalists, ideology matters much more.
2. There is coattail voting with respect to the central government. This is so particularly in nonnationalist regions, where the performance of the central government influences vote intentions for the regional governments.
3. In regions where nationalism is strong, the performance of regional governments has a greater effect on voters. This is particularly so for nonnationalist voters, who respond very much to the performance of the regional incumbent.
4. Nationalist voters tend to exonerate nationalist regional governments when the performance is poor. This is more the case with Basque than with Catalan nationalists: the former are much less sensitive to performance when deciding their vote. Nationalist voters also assess the performance of the central government much more critically than nonnationalist voters.

Therefore, the conclusion, which is based on comparative aggregate data, that nationalist governments survive longer in office than their non-nationalist counterparts under systems of proportional representation is coherent with the results of individual-level data. Nationalist voters tend to exonerate nationalist governments, their vote is less sensitive to performance, and their assessment of the central government is much more critical. So nationalists vote with political blinkers, and nationalist governments are more immune to performance.

So far, we have examined several aspects of the democratic control of governments, ignoring issues of information. However, citizens can hardly exercise such control if they do not know what is happening – that is, if they ignore political facts, if they cannot monitor the actions of the incumbent, if they cannot assign responsibilities for outcomes. If voting either consists of selecting the best candidates, generally on the basis of ideological

proximity, or involves holding governments accountable for their past performance, voters need information on politicians and their actions. We do not know, however, whether information is more related to the logic of selection or the logic of accountability.

As Fraile points out in her chapter, arguments on this matter have been somewhat contradictory. Fearon (1999) defends that retrospective accountability requires more information than prospective selection. Zaller (1992, 2004), on the contrary, indicates that informed voters are more ideological (i.e., prospective). Fraile examines postelectoral survey data in Spain, Portugal, Hungary, and Poland – four multiparty systems in which she assumes that informational requirements will be comparatively more demanding. Her empirical conclusions appear to be consistent with Fearon's interpretation: "retrospective control depends more on citizens' political knowledge than if voters use ideology to select the incumbent." On the contrary, "low degrees of political knowledge lead voters to select politicians according to ideology." The logic of voting appears to follow clear criteria: when voters know more about the world of politics, they may better assess the performance of the government and vote accordingly; otherwise, ideology serves them as a compass in selecting the best candidate.

Voters may use all kinds of information to monitor and assess governments. Their information may typically come from the media, the opposition, or institutions of horizontal accountability. It may also be that the party in government serves voters, providing them with critical information – the internal accountability of incumbents (*vis-à-vis* party members) – would contribute to their external accountability. This is what Maravall discusses in his chapter. A strong argument for internal party democracy would exist if "discussion between party activists and leaders in public office might inform voters on the reasons for policy switches or on hidden actions of the government."

The government is conceived in this chapter as an agent with two principals – the party and the electorate. These are the interests of the three actors: (1) voters want a government that carries out policies close to their preferences but that is also capable of implementing them, (2) party members are interested in policies but also in holding office (differences in the relative relevance of these two interests distinguishes the *nomenklatura* of the party from rank-and-file members), and (3) the government wants the party to provide early warnings about electoral threats but also to persuade voters about its policies. So trade-offs might exist, both for the electorate

and for the government, between information and capacity regarding the party.

Why would incumbent party members monitor the government better than voters? For one, their preferences over policy are stronger; this is why they militate in a party and do not just vote. Further, the political horizon of the party goes beyond that of leaders. Thus, party members will care about the ideological betrayals and the electoral costs of political U-turns or shirking. Even if the policy preferences of voters and party members do not overlap, the electoral program of the government is important for both: for the former, it is a set of promises on which the incumbent was elected; for the latter, a compromise between ideology and electoralism. Thus, open discussions within the party can be informative about what the government does, about whether or not it is implementing its program.

Yet debates can be ambiguous and carry too much noise. They can also undermine the capacity of the party in power. Survey data for Spain and the United Kingdom show that voters in two very different institutional contexts see such debates as factionalist disputes that undermine capacity. Consequently, they punish divided parties. An event-history analysis of twenty-two parliamentary democracies between 1975 and 1995, with 448 country/year observations, shows that parties last longer in office and the survival of prime ministers becomes more predictable when closed lists exist. If politicians believe that voters punish internal divisions, they will introduce discipline within their parties. This convergence of preferences between leaders and voters will be to the cost of party members and to the detriment of internal party democracy.

The last part of the book turns to explain the choice of institutions by politicians and their influence on the democratic game. Penadés's chapter provides an agent-based account of the choice of electoral institutions. As he puts it, such institutions "influence the manner in which governments can be made accountable. . . . Parties preferring the same rules behaved more similarly, under different electoral systems, than parties with opposite preferences competing in similar institutional environments." Preferences are explained by the consequences of electoral rules for government formation and by concerns about internal schisms and loss of votes.

Proportional representation (PR) generates incentives for party centralization, for conservative electoral strategies, and for postelectoral parliamentary alliances. On the contrary, in majoritarian systems, parties tend to be more decentralized, strategies try to expand the electorate, and winning elections entails more clearly assuming office. Institutional preferences

will depend on the risk of losing former voters when trying to attract new ones, on the threat of divisions within the party, and on fears about governing. Penadés focuses on the preferences of socialist parties until the Second World War when, out of sixteen countries, fourteen turned to PR. Such preferences varied widely: this is why we cannot accept explanations according to which socialist parties should have systematically opposed PR (because it benefited their opponents) or, on the contrary, should have always supported it (because it led to greater income distribution). Neither did the preferences of socialists depend on the average size of their electorates: no significant differences existed between those who defended or opposed PR – before or after it was introduced.

Because internal schisms and loss of votes were the two main concerns of party leaders, they chose electoral institutions accordingly. The main explanation of the choice, according to Penadés, lies in the strength of the trade-union movement. His careful analysis of historical evidence leads to the conclusion that “the causal antecedent constraining the choice of strategy was set by the trade unions. At the time of institutional choice, it was union strength rather than party strength that could have predicted the preferences of socialist parties.” Unions limited the threats of internal splits and of desertions by working-class voters. So leaders of union-based parties could opt for majoritarian representation, an expansive electoral strategy, and governmental responsibilities. On the contrary, parties related to weak unions were more vulnerable to organizational and electoral costs. Their choice was PR, thus transferring coalition games to the parliamentary arena, where entry into government was a decision that could be more quickly reversed.

These socialist politicians, when choosing the rules of representation, were anticipating the costs within their parties and their electorates. Their supporters’ threat of exit was a democratic limit to institutional choices. The [following chapter](#) by Adserà and Boix studies nonelectoral constraints on politicians: these stem from the possibility of antidemocratic reactions. The chapter focuses in particular on the balance of forces between majorities and minorities, related to the level of available resources and their distribution. The control of material resources by a group sets limits on what governments can do in a democracy. When such assets are mobile, the threat of exit reduces the capacity of governments to tax or expropriate. When the assets are fixed, such threat of exit is not plausible: to avoid being taxed or expropriated, asset holders will turn to rejecting majority rule (and democracy).

Thus, either governments accept limits on their policies or democracy will be destabilized. The question is no longer what explains the survival of governments nor what influences voters' choices at election time; it is rather why would the losers in the democratic game accept the verdict of elections. What Adserà and Boix study in their chapter is the relative influence of institutional variables, compared with economic development and the distribution of wealth, on the incentives to comply with, or subvert, the rules of democracy. They assess the probability of democratic survival in all sovereign countries from the mid-nineteenth century to the end of the twentieth century.

Institutions have a comparatively minor influence on the stability of democracies. As Adserà and Boix point out, "within the strictures imposed by social and economic factors, constitutional structures play a relatively marginal role." Majoritarian systems produce greater instability but in underdeveloped countries. Federalism and parliamentarism lessen the stakes and thus the incentives to subvert. Adserà and Boix consider both to be the only institutional conditions that stabilize democracies: "the positive impact of federal parliamentarism is extremely powerful – to the point that it seems to be the only institutional mechanism that stabilizes democracy regardless of nonconstitutional conditions."

Democratic survival depends on the material conditions of electoral majorities and minorities. This is where the incentives to accept or reject the results of elections are rooted. Such a conclusion replicates previous results (Cheibub and Przeworski 1999; Przeworski et al. 2000; Boix 2003; Przeworski 2003). Adserà and Boix show that the likelihood of a democracy surviving for at least fifty years is under 10 percent if the country's per capita income is below \$1,000; that it grows to 80 percent if the level reaches \$8,000; and that democracies face no risk of collapsing if their economies reach \$15,000 (at 1996 purchasing-power parities). An egalitarian distribution of wealth also decreases the threat to democracy. Levels of economic development make potential subverters risk-averse; economic egalitarianism reduces the distance between the preferences of minorities and the decisions of majorities. When these material conditions exist, the agendas of governments will be less restricted by antidemocratic constraints; incumbents will increase their autonomy vis-à-vis minorities with the capacity to veto the political process.

This is the string of arguments that this book presents. Arguments are backed by vast comparative evidence, at both the macro and micro levels. There are cross-country comparisons and survey analyses. In every case,

there has been an attempt to integrate analytical arguments and empirical research. The goal was to shed new light on perplexing questions of positive democratic theory.

REFERENCES

- Austen-Smith, David, and Jeffrey S. Banks. 1989. "Electoral Accountability and Incumbency." In Peter Ordeshook (ed.), *Models of Strategic Choices in Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Boix, Carlos. 2003. *Democracy and Redistribution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Carlsen, Fredrik. 2000. "Unemployment, Inflation, and Government Popularity: Are There Partisan Effects?" *Electoral Studies* 19 (2/3): 141–50.
- Cheibub, José Antonio, and Adam Przeworski. 1999. "Democracy, Elections and Accountability for Economic Outcomes." In Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin (eds.), *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coleman, Jules. 1989. "Rationality and the Justification of Democracy." In Geoffrey Brennan and Loren E. Lomasky (eds.), *Politics and Process: New Essays in Democratic Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Elster, Jon (ed.). 1998. *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fearon, James. 1999. "Electoral Accountability and the Control of Politicians: Selecting Good Types versus Sanctioning Poor Performance." In Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin (eds.), *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferejohn, John. 1986. "Incumbent Performance and Electoral Control." *Public Choice* 50 (1/3): 5–25.
- Ferejohn, John. 1999. "Accountability and Authority: Toward a Theory of Political Accountability." In Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin (eds.), *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedrich, Carl J. 1963. *Man and His Government: An Empirical Theory of Politics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Harrington, Joseph. 1993. "The Impact of Reelection Pressures on the Fulfillment of Campaign Promises." *Games and Economic Behavior* 5 (1): 71–97.
- Kramer, Gerald. 1971. "Short-term Fluctuations in US Voting Behavior. 1896–1964." *American Political Science Review* 65 (1): 131–43.
- Lanoue, David. 1994. "Retrospective and Prospective Voting in Presidential-Year Elections." *Political Research Quarterly* 47 (1): 193–205.
- Lowry, Robert, James Alt, and Karen Ferree. 1998. "Fiscal Policy Outcomes and Electoral Accountability in American States." *American Political Science Review* 92 (4): 759–74.

- Mackie, Gerry. 2003. *Democracy Defended*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maravall, José María. 2007. "Accountability and the Survival of Governments." In Carles Boix and Susan Stokes (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maravall, José María, and Adam Przeworski. 2001. "Political Reactions to the Economy: The Spanish Experience." In Susan C. Stokes (ed.), *Public Support for Market Reforms in New Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Monardi, Fred. 1994. "Primary Voters as Retrospective Voters." *American Politics Quarterly* 22 (1): 88–103.
- Paldam, Martin. 1991. "How Robust is the Vote Function? A Study of Seventeen Nations over Four Decades." In Helmut Norpoth, Michael Lewis-Beck, and Jean-Dominique Laffay (eds.), *Economics and Politics: The Calculus of Support*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Persson, Torsten, Gérard Roland, and Guido Tabellini. 1997. "Separation of Powers and Accountability." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112 (4): 1163–202.
- Persson, Torsten, and Guido Tabellini. 2000. *Political Economics: Explaining Economic Policy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Powell, G. Bingham, and Guy Whitten. 1993. "A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context." *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (2): 391–414.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1999. "Minimalist Conception of Democracy: A Defense." In Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cordón (eds.), *Democracy's Value*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam. 2003. *States and Markets: A Primer in Political Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam. 2005. "The Possibility of Self-Government." Manuscript, New York University.
- Przeworski, Adam, Mike Álvarez, José Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi. 2000. *Democracy and Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Riker, William. 1982. *Liberalism against Populism*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
- Shaffer, Stephen, and George Chressanthis. 1991. "Accountability and U.S. Senate Elections: A Multivariate Analysis." *Western Political Quarterly* 44 (3): 625–39.
- Svoboda, Craig. 1995. "Retrospective Voting in Gubernatorial Elections: 1982–1986." *Political Research Quarterly* 48 (1): 135–50.
- Warwick, Paul. 1992. "Economic Trends and Government Survival in West European Parliamentary Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 86 (4): 875–87.
- Zaller, John. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaller, John. 2004. "Floating Voters in U.S. Presidential Elections: 1948–2000." In Willem Saris and Paul Sniderman (eds.), *Studies in Public Opinion: Attitudes, Nonattitudes, Measurement Error, and Change*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Explaining the Electoral Performance of Incumbents in Democracies

Belén Barreiro

Introduction

This chapter examines electoral performance for incumbents in democratic regimes. I explore whether parties in government lose and win votes for the outcomes produced under their mandates. In other words, the work investigates whether electoral support for incumbents depends on key economic, social, and political indicators. The study includes eighty-three democracies from the 1950s through 2000.

This chapter is structured as follows. I first discuss the state of the discipline, and I present the principal objectives of the research. Then I test three main hypotheses. First, electoral variations for ruling parties may not only depend on pure economic indicators, such as economic growth or inflation. Voters may also hold governments accountable for other policies. They may care about the role of the state in the economy, in particular the size of the state.¹ Second, right-wing governments may be judged differently from left-wing governments. Citizens may reward conservative parties for fostering economic freedom and left-wing parties for increasing the size of the state. Third, accountability may work differently in rich and poor democracies. Voters may be more demanding in rich democracies or they may not be.

Accountability and Electoral Performance

The analysis of electoral performance for parties in government contributes to our understanding of how accountability works. Rulers are

¹ The size of the state refers exclusively to central government expenditures, not to the state's regulation of economic activity or to the size of the public sector, which includes public enterprises.