

Political Parties and the Democratic Mandate

Comparing Collective Mandate Fulfilment
in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands

Cover

Front (top): Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, -JvL-

<http://www.flickr.com/people/-jvl-/> (Creative Commons Attribution 2.0 Generic License)

Front (bottom): House of Commons (Author's collection)

Back: Dutch Election debate 22 March 1966, Nationaal Archief / Spaarnestad Photo / Anefo / Kroon, SFA001017874 (No copyright restrictions)

Typesetting

Typeset using the L^AT_EX Documentation System.

Print

Wöhrmann Print Service

ISBN

978-90-8570-750-9

© 2011 Tom Louwerse. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission in writing from the proprietor.

© 2011 Tom Louwerse. Alle rechten voorbehouden. Niets uit deze uitgave mag worden verveelvoudigd, opgeslagen in een geautomatiseerd gegevensbestand, of openbaar gemaakt, in enige vorm of op enige wijze, hetzij elektronisch, mechanisch, door fotokopieën, opnamen, of op enige andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de rechthebbende.

Political Parties and the Democratic Mandate

Comparing Collective Mandate Fulfilment
in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van

de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,

op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof.mr. P.F. van der Heijden,

volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties

te verdedigen op woensdag 22 juni 2011

klokke 16.15 uur

door

Thomas Pieter Louwvse
geboren te Vlissingen in 1983

Promotiecommissie:

Promotor:

Prof.dr. R.B. Andeweg

Co-promotor:

Dr. H. Pellikaan

Overige Leden:

Prof.dr. J.J.M. van Holsteyn, Universiteit Leiden

Prof.dr. R.A. Koole, Universiteit Leiden

Prof.dr. J.J.A. Thomassen, Universiteit Twente

Dr. W. Lowe, Universität Mannheim

Dr. R. Thomson, Trinity College Dublin

Acknowledgements

The Dutch word for doctoral dissertation is *proefschrift*: in it one has to prove ones competence as a researcher in order to be promoted to doctor. Luckily, there were many people to assist me with this test. I am very grateful to the supervision by my supervisor, prof.dr. Rudy Andeweg, and co-supervisor, dr. Huib Pellikaan. Not only did they initiate the research project which gave me the opportunity to work on this dissertation, they also provided excellent assistance when needed, they allowed me the freedom to make this project my own, and dragged me back to the right path when necessary.

It has been a pleasure to work at the Institute of Political Science in Leiden. This is not just because the people are friendly; they also showed a genuine interest in my research project. The PhD seminar and lunch seminars offered the chance to present my research in a friendly, but critical, environment. I am particularly indebted to Simon Otjes and Cynthia van Vonno, who have commented on many of my papers, and to Niels van Willigen, Floris Vletter, Benjamin Pohl, Marc Uriot and Sergui Gherghina, which whom I shared an office and who were always available to provide advice on a broad range of issues that a young researcher comes across.

The University of Nottingham has gracefully received me as an exchange PhD student in the autumn of 2008. Under the supervision of prof.dr. Steven Fielding and prof.dr. Cees van der Eijk I had the opportunity to improve my familiarity with British politics and the method of computer-assisted content analysis. The help of dr. Will Lowe in mastering these techniques has been invaluable. My stay has been supported financially from the Leiden University Fund (LUF) and the Netherlands Institute of Government (NIG). The latter also supported my participation in a number of conferences, for which I am grateful.

In 2007 I had the opportunity to visit the Debate on the Address in the United Kingdom parliament. It was not only a pleasure to see the parliament in action, rather than analysing Hansard with a computer algorithm. Also, it provided the opportunity to interview prof.dr. Philip Norton and two senior members of parliament, which helped me in reflecting on the British case and how to study it. I thank them for this.

I presented papers based on my research on a number of occasions: Politico-

logenetmaal, Conference Making Parliament Speak, ECPR Joint Sessions and a workshop of the European Network for the Analysis of Political Text (ENAPT). I thank the participants of those events – in particular the discussants – for their remarks, which have influenced this dissertation one way or another.

The support of family and friends is invaluable. For one, telling them about my research project at birthday parties and in the pub genuinely helped me to focus on the main research questions and prepare for critical reception. After all, ‘everybody already knows that parties do not do what they promise’ – at least that is what I was told over and over again by those from outside the discipline. This has always been a refreshing experience. Pursuing a doctorate is more than just a job – at the same time it should not consume you. The love and support from my parents and from Hadewych reminds me of this every day.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Research questions	2
1.2	Societal and scientific relevance	4
1.3	Outline of the book	5
2	Towards a spatial approach to the party mandate	7
2.1	Political representation: linking citizens and representatives	7
2.2	The party mandate model	9
2.3	Does the party mandate model work?	18
2.4	The spatial approach to the party mandate	27
2.5	Conclusion	30
3	Explaining mandate fulfilment: two models of democracy	33
3.1	Mandate fulfilment: how institutions make a difference	33
3.2	Government and opposition	42
3.3	The decline of the party mandate?	46
3.4	Issue saliency and policy extremism	54
3.5	Conclusion	56
4	Comparing electoral and parliamentary competition	59
4.1	Research design	59
4.2	Analysing parties' policy preferences	64
4.3	Data collection and the classification of text	79
4.4	Using Wordfish to compare elections and parliaments	83
4.5	Constructing spatial representations of party competition	86
5	The party mandate in majoritarian and consensus democracies	89
5.1	What parties talk about	89
5.2	What parties say	101
5.3	Discussion and conclusion	142

6	Government and opposition	145
6.1	What parties talk about: setting the parliamentary agenda	146
6.2	What parties say	152
6.3	Conclusion	161
7	The party mandate in historical perspective	163
7.1	The decline of political representation	163
7.2	What parties talked about	164
7.3	What parties said	172
7.4	Conclusion	178
8	Issue saliency and policy extremism	181
8.1	Saliency and issue saliency congruence	182
8.2	Issue saliency, policy extremism and the congruence of positions	185
8.3	Conclusion	189
9	Conclusion	191
9.1	Different systems, similar levels of congruence	191
9.2	Implications	197
9.3	Approach and method	199
9.4	Avenues for further research	202
	Appendices	204
A	Technical appendix	205
A.1	Text collection and pre-processing	205
A.2	Text classification	207
A.3	Using Wordfish to compare spaces of competition	210
A.4	Tables	226
B	Abbreviations of party names	233
	Bibliography	235
	Dutch Summary	249
	Curriculum Vitae	255

List of Figures

2.1	Research into the party mandate	20
3.1	The relationship between government agenda control and Lijp- hart's executive-parties dimension	39
4.1	Results of a comparison of manual and computerized classification	82
5.1	Issue saliency in the UK: Economic issues	91
5.2	Issue saliency in the UK: Environmental issues	92
5.3	Issue saliency in the UK: Other issues	93
5.4	Issue saliency in the Netherlands: Economic issues	94
5.5	Issue saliency in the Netherlands: Environmental issues	95
5.6	Issue saliency in the Netherlands: Other issues	96
5.7	Median standard deviations of issue saliency in parliament	98
5.8	Spaces of party competition in the United Kingdom, 1955-1959	106
5.9	Spaces of party competition in the United Kingdom, 1966-1970	108
5.10	Spaces of party competition in the United Kingdom, 1974-1979	110
5.11	Spaces of party competition in the United Kingdom, 1983-1987	112
5.12	Spaces of party competition in the United Kingdom, 1992-1997	114
5.13	Spaces of party competition in the United Kingdom, 2001-2005	116
5.14	Spaces of party competition in the Netherlands, 1952-1956	120
5.15	Spaces of party competition in the Netherlands, 1959-1963	123
5.16	Spaces of party competition in the Netherlands, 1972-1977	126
5.17	Spaces of party competition in the Netherlands, 1982-1986	129
5.18	Spaces of party competition in the Netherlands, 1994-1998	131
5.19	Spaces of party competition in the Netherlands, 2003-2006	133
5.20	Distances between electoral and parliamentary positions	139
6.1	The marginal effect of manifesto issue saliency on parliamentary issue saliency: government and opposition in the UK	148
6.2	The marginal effect of average manifesto issue saliency on parlia- mentary issue saliency: government and opposition in the UK	148

6.3	The marginal effect of manifesto issue saliency on parliamentary issue saliency: government and opposition in the Netherlands . . .	151
6.4	The marginal effect of average manifesto issue saliency on parliamentary issue saliency: government and opposition in the Netherlands	151
6.5	Party position changes between manifesto and parliament, United Kingdom	154
6.6	Party position changes between manifesto and parliament, the Netherlands	155
6.7	Distances between manifesto and parliamentary positions	157
6.8	Parties' movement towards the mean government parties' position, the Netherlands	159
7.1	Mean issue saliency in the United Kingdom	165
7.2	Mean issue saliency in the Netherlands	167
7.3	Mean issue saliency congruence score	168
7.4	Mean length of party manifestos over time	169
7.5	Marginal effect of manifesto saliency on parliamentary saliency for various manifesto lengths	169
7.6	Topic concentration in manifestos and parliamentary debates . .	171
7.7	The effect of manifesto issue saliency on parliamentary issue saliency in different time periods	173
7.8	Distances between electoral and parliamentary positions	176
7.9	The effect of manifesto issue positions on parliamentary issue positions in different time periods	177
8.1	Expected value of issue saliency distance for various levels of issue saliency	184
8.2	Expected value of issue saliency distance for various levels of relative issue saliency	185
8.3	Parties' overall policy position extremism	187
A.1	Analysis of 1992-1997 parliamentary positions on Foreign Affairs, without correction	213
A.2	Analysis of 1992-1997 parliamentary positions on Foreign Affairs, with correction	215
A.3	Analysis of 2001-2005 UK parliament without government correction	217
A.4	Analysis of 2001-2005 UK parliament with government correction	219
A.5	Party positions on Economy, Health Care and Education in the 1972-1977 elections and parliament (The Netherlands)	222
A.6	Uncertainty in the estimation of parties' positions: UK manifestos 1955	224

List of Tables

2.1	Modes of Political Representation	13
2.2	An example of the Ostrogorski paradox	14
2.3	An example of a voting cycle	16
2.4	Approaches to the party mandate	23
3.1	Overview of hypotheses	58
4.1	Comparison of the United Kingdom and The Netherlands on the main independent variable and controls	60
4.2	Case selection	62
4.3	Average government participation in the Netherlands 1950-2006 .	63
4.4	Comparison of strengths and weaknesses of several measurement approaches	71
4.5	Overview of cases: countries, time periods and issue categories .	85
5.1	Explaining parties' issue saliency in parliament	100
5.2	The importance of the second dimension of the spaces of compet- ition	136
5.3	Explaining parties' issue positions in parliament	140
8.1	Explaining the percentage difference between manifesto and par- liamentary issue saliency	183
8.2	Explaining the distance between the manifesto and parliamentary position	188
A.1	Confusion matrix classification Dutch manifestos 1994	209
A.2	Explaining parties' issue saliency in parliament: government par- ticipation	226
A.3	Explaining parties' issue saliency in parliament: history	227
A.4	Explaining parties' issue positions in parliament: history	228
A.5	Explaining parliamentary issue saliency: manifesto length	229
A.6	Significance of issue saliency changes over time, United Kingdom	230
A.7	Significance of issue saliency changes over time, Netherlands . .	231

B.1	Abbreviations of British party names	233
B.2	Abbreviations of Dutch party names	234