
PARL/XTRAPARL POWER

Principal Coder:

Rachel Gibson

Coding Scheme:

Robert Harmel

Principal investigators:

Robert Harmel
Kenneth Janda

Principal Consultants:

Lars Bille (Denmark)
Thomas Poguntke (Germany)

Final Data and Text Editors:

Sahar Shafqat
Rachel Gibson
Robert Harmel



NSF Sponsorship

This data collection was sponsored by National Science Foundation grants to Robert Harmel at Texas A&M University (SES9112491) and Kenneth Janda at Northwestern University (SES9112357).

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Coding Scheme.....	7
Denmark:	
Center Democratic Party.....	14
Christian People's Party.....	16
Conservative People's Party....	18
Left Socialist Party.....	21
Liberal Party.....	24
Progress Party.....	27
Social (Radical) Liberals.....	30
Social Democratic Party.....	32
Socialist People's Party.....	35
Germany:	
Christian Democratic Union.....	38
Free Democratic Party.....	41
Greens.....	44
Social Democratic Party.....	48
United Kingdom:	
Conservative Party.....	51
Labour Party.....	53
Liberal Party.....	56
Social Democratic Party.....	58
Social and Liberal Democrats...	61
United States:	
Democratic Party.....	63
Republican Party.....	68
Project Bibliography.....	72

Parliamentary vs. Extraparliamentary Party Power

Introduction¹

Robert Harmel and Rachel Gibson
Texas A&M University

As part of Harmel and Janda's NSF-supported Party Change Project, Harmel undertook in 1992 to develop methodology for measurement of the concept "parliamentary vs. extraparliamentary power" (or "parl/xtraparl"). Conceiving of the problem as developing a set of suitable indicators for "the extent to which the parliamentary group personnel and their actions may be controlled by the extraparliamentary party"² (Coding Scheme), Harmel began by surveying available secondary literature and reference works on political parties in European and Anglo-American democracies. Upon completing that review, he determined that there should be sufficient information to support judgmental coding for seven variables that are conceptually related to parl/xtraparl. In question form, those variables are:

- (1) To what extent is **parliamentary candidate selection** controlled by the extraparliamentary party? (CANDSEL)
- (2) To what extent is extraparliamentary party directly involved in the **selection of the official parliamentary group leader** of the party? (PARLLEAD)
- (3) Is there a requirement that the party's **MPs rotate out of office** after a particular period of time, and if so, is it taken seriously? (ROTATE)

¹This text is adapted from Harmel and Gibson, *Parliamentary vs. Extraparliamentary Party Power: A Concept in Search of Measurement*, Paper presented at the Workshop on Parliamentary Party Groups, European Consortium for Political Research, Oslo, Norway, March 29-April 3, 1996.

²It should be stressed that, following Michels (1962/1911), the grass-roots constituency of the extraparliamentary party is assumed to be the party members, while the primary constituency of the parliamentary representatives (and hence, of the parliamentary party) is the electorate (or "supporters"). Some may disagree with this assumption, and there is certainly evidence of parties whose extraparliamentary wings are dominated by a small elite rather than a rank-and-file membership. Nevertheless, users should be aware that the above assumption underlies the coding scheme and its application for the Party Change Project.

- (4) Who, if anyone, is responsible for **disciplining parliamentary representatives** who deviate from the extraparliamentary party's policy positions? (DISCIPLN)
- (5) To what extent is the parliamentary group required to **conform to the extraparliamentary organization's policy positions**? (CONFORM)
- (6) To what extent is the extraparliamentary party (as opposed to the parliamentary group) responsible for formulating the party's **public positions on policy**? (POLICY)
- (7) Who is the **primary leader of the party**, officially and in fact, the parliamentary or the extraparliamentary leader? (PRIMLEAD)

The first three clearly relate to controlling the parliamentary group personnel, including aspects of both selection (1&2) and maintenance of "amateur status" (3). The last two (including #7 since the party's "primary leader" is normally the party's primary policy spokesperson) clearly deal with the parliamentary group's role with regard to formulating and communicating party policy positions. Those in the middle (4&5) deal with the extent of the parliamentary personnel's independence from extraparliamentary direction on policy matters.

Next, adapting judgmental coding techniques developed for Kenneth Janda's ICPP Project in the 1960s, Harmel developed multi-value coding schemes for each of the seven variables.³ Finally, the coding instructions were implemented by Gibson for the nineteen parties in the Harmel/Janda project, including nine in Denmark, four in Germany, four in the United Kingdom, and two in the United States.⁴ As with all data in the Harmel/Janda project on party change, the parl/xtrparl data were coded for each year from 1950 through 1990, thereby allowing investigators to study either change over time within parties or static

³Throughout the process, the intent was to develop "abstractly interval" coding schemes. In other words, to the extent possible, Harmel developed coding categories with equidistant gaps between adjacent categories. Though these are not strictly interval measures, they may be considered approximations to interval scales. Researchers using the data must determine for themselves whether interval or ordinal statistics are appropriate.

⁴The coding procedure consisted of reading all available English-language literature on the relevant topic for the party being coded, writing a summary statement of paragraph-length, and choosing the appropriate value from the coding scheme for that variable. The parties included in the data set are: Denmark's Center Democrats, Christian People's Party, Conservative People's Party, Left Socialists, Liberals (Venstre), Progress, Social Liberals (a.k.a. Radical Liberals), Social Democrats, and Socialist People's Party; (West) Germany's Christian Democratic Union, Free Democrats, Greens, and Social Democrats; Britain's Conservatives, Labour Party, Liberals, and Social Democrats; and the United States' Democrats and Republicans.

cross-sections for any individual year.

For each of the seven basic variables, a coding scheme was developed which consists of numerical codes assigned to a number of coding categories, ordered from least amount of extraparliamentary control (lowest numerical value) to greatest amount of control by the extraparliamentary wing (highest numerical value). In keeping with the desire to produce roughly interval scales, efforts were made to equalize the "distance" between adjacent categories. (In other words, the difference between "1" and "2" should be roughly equivalent to the difference between "4" and "5.") In some instances, provision was made for coding differences of a technical and less substantial nature by using alphabetized sub-categories of a given numerical value (as in "1a" and "1b"). The seven basic variables are:

CANDSEL

CANDSEL captures the extent to which parliamentary candidate selection is controlled by the extraparliamentary party. The primary distinction here is between selection by the party's "voters" or "supporters" vs. selection by the party's extraparliamentary "organization" (including its *members*). The coding scheme consists of five numbered categories, two of which are further subdivided to reflect technical differences (see Coding Scheme).

PARLLEAD

This variable is designed to establish how extensive a role the extraparliamentary party organization plays in selecting the official leader of the parliamentary group. In all countries the "parliamentary leader" is operationalized as the leader of the lower legislative body. In the United States, for instance, the respective parliamentary leaders of the majority and minority parties are the Speaker of the House and the Minority Leader. The coding scheme consists of four numbered categories (see Coding Scheme).

ROTATE

Michels (1962; originally 1911), in particular, was concerned that professionalization of deputies would increase their influence within the party and make them more difficult for the extraparliamentary party to control. Some parties, such as the German Greens, have tried at times to prevent Michels' concerns from becoming reality by restricting the likelihood of professionalization. One method for doing so has been rotation requirements, designed to assure that representatives would remain "amateurs." A less harsh alternative is to limit the number of consecutive terms a deputy can hold before stepping aside. Of the two, requiring rotation is taken to imply even greater interest

in controlling the parliamentary group than would be the case with term limits. In addition to distinguishing which method, if either, the extraparliamentary organization uses to control parliamentary members' tenure, the coding scheme also distinguishes between controls that are and are not actually put into practice.

It is important to note that this variable is rendered irrelevant if public law provides for some type of tenure limitation. If the latter is the case, then a missing value code (98) would be assigned (see Coding Scheme).

DISCIPLIN

This variable indicates which party wing, if either, can sanction parliamentary representatives for deviating from the extraparliamentary party's policy positions. The coding scheme consists of three numbered categories, one of which has subcategories. If the parliamentary group itself is chiefly responsible for formulating the party's public policy positions (see POLICY), then the issue of adherence to an extraparliamentary party's positions is irrelevant and a code of 1b is assigned (see Coding Scheme).⁵

CONFORM

This indicator measures the extent to which the parliamentary group is required to conform to the extraparliamentary organization's policy positions. Thus, while POLICY measures the extent to which the extraparliamentary organization is formally charged with formulating the party's public policy positions, CONFORM indicates whether the parliamentary group must conform to positions of the extraparliamentary party. Thus, this variable is fully relevant only when the extraparliamentary organization is responsible for adopting the party's public positions. There are three numerical codes, with two of them subdivided (see Coding Scheme).

⁵The fact that "conformation to extraparliamentary party positions," whether applied to individual representatives (as in DISCIPLN) or to the whole parliamentary group (as in CONFORM, the next variable to be discussed), is irrelevant when all policy formulation is in the hands of the parliamentary group itself may lead some to treat "1b" as a missing value for both DISCIPLN and CONFORM. Indeed, we are somewhat inclined in that direction ourselves, and probably would do so for some purposes.

POLICY

This variable is designed to measure the degree of responsibility (and hence control) that the extraparliamentary organization has over the formulation of the party's public positions on policy (see Coding Scheme). For purposes of this variable, "public positions" is to be interpreted broadly and may include more than just the party's programs and election manifestoes.⁶

PRIMLEAD

This variable is designed to indicate whether the ultimate leadership of the party rests with the parliamentary group or the extraparliamentary organization, officially and effectively. In some instances, the official leader of the party may not be the effective, recognized leader. The coding scheme provides for the distinction, while giving the extreme codes to cases where one leadership position is both officially and effectively the ultimate position of leadership for the party (see Coding Scheme).

References

- Beyme, Klaus von (1985) Political Parties in Western Democracies. Hants, England: Gower Publishing Company Limited.
- Duverger, Maurice (1964) Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. (Originally published in 1951 by Armond Colin in Paris.)
- Jacobs, Francis (1989) Western European Political Parties: A Comprehensive Guide. Essex, U.K.: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Janda, Kenneth (1980) Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey. New York: Free Press.
- McHale, Vincent E. (1983) Political Parties of Europe, Vol. 1. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

⁶The operational codes for POLICY assume that policy is made by (a) the parliamentary group and/or by (b) the extraparliamentary party. No special allowance is made for a major role being played by party supporters (i.e., voters). Coders were instructed that if the latter proved to be the case in some instance, one of the standard codes should be used, but the role played by supporters was to be noted in the description accompanying the numeric code.

Michels, Robert (1962) Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy. New York: The Free Press. (Originally published in German in 1911.)

Revised (Harmel, original 9-13-92; revised 1-15-93, 2-23-93, 8-93, 9-94; note in intro paragraph revised 5-26-96)

CODING SCHEME: Measures of Parl/Xtraparl Power Distribution

These variables are actually measures of the extent to which the parliamentary group personnel and their actions may be controlled by the extraparliamentary organization; **higher scores mean more extraparliamentary control**. (Note: In keeping with Michels (1911), **voters are seen as attached to the parliamentary party, while members are seen as attached to the extraparliamentary party**. Some may disagree with this assumption, and there is certainly evidence of parties whose extraparliamentary wings are dominated by a small elite rather than a rank-and-file membership. Nevertheless, users should be aware that the above assumption underlies the coding scheme and its application for the Party Change Project.)

[References below to ICPP variables refer to overlapping content between Party Change Project parl/xtraparl variables and the decentralization of power variables in Janda's International Comparative Political Parties project.]

12.01 Candidate Selection (CANDSEL; related to ICPP 9.03)

To what extent is candidate selection controlled by the extraparliamentary party?

The primary distinction here is between selection by the party's "voters" or "supporters" vs. selection by the party's extraparliamentary "organization" (including its **members**).

Operational Definition

- 1 Party "supporters" (i.e. voters) are responsible for nominating the parliamentary candidates, who self-select initially as candidates for the nomination process, as in a primary election. There is no pre-selection or post-ratification by the party organization.
- 2a The whole party membership nominates the parliamentary candidates (e.g., by postal ballot) from a list prepared

by the local level constituency committees, where any inputs from the national level would be only in the form of comments and/or recommendations. Post-nomination ratification by the party organization is not required.

2b The whole party membership nominates the parliamentary candidates (e.g., by postal ballot) from a list prepared by the local level constituency committees, but where the list can be adjusted (i.e. names may be added and/or rejected) by the national level.

3a Party "supporters" (i.e. voters) are responsible for the initial nominations from candidates who are self-selected; decisions must then be ratified by some organ of the national extraparliamentary organization.

3b Party members are responsible for the initial nominations (e.g., by postal ballot), which then must be ratified by some organ of the national organization.

3c The constituency organizations select and nominate the parliamentary candidates.

4 The constituency party organization makes initial nomination of candidates; they must then be ratified by the national party organization.

5 The national party organization, through a committee and/or a congress/convention of party members, nominates the parliamentary candidates.

12.02 Parliamentary Leadership Selection (PARLLEAD; related to ICPP 9.02)

To what extent is the extraparliamentary party directly involved in the selection of the official leader of the party's parliamentary group?

Note: "Parliamentary leader" means leader of the party in the lower legislative body. In the U.S. this would be the Speaker of the House for the Majority Party and the Minority Leader for the Minority Party. (I.e., in neither case would it be the President of the United States or the presidential candidate.)

Operational Definition

1 Selection is by the parliamentary group alone.

- 2 Selection involves both the parliamentary group and the extraparliamentary organization, with the parliamentary group responsible for more than 50% of the decision.
- 3 Selection involves both the parliamentary group and the extraparliamentary organization, with the parliamentary group responsible for 50% or less of the decision.
- 4 Selection is completely, or very nearly so, by the extraparliamentary party.

12.03 Conformation to Extraparliamentary Positions (CONFORM; related to ICPP 9.05 and 9.07)

To what extent is the parliamentary group required to conform to the extraparliamentary organization's policy positions?

Note: This variable is fully relevant only when the extraparliamentary organization is responsible for adopting the party's public positions. (See 12.06.) Otherwise, use code **1b**.

Operational Definition

- 1a There is no requirement that the extraparliamentary party's positions be followed by the parliamentary group.
- 1b** Party rules provide that party policy positions are to be formulated by the parliamentary group itself.
- 2a There is a provision in party rules requiring the parliamentary group to conform to the extraparliamentary party's public positions, but it is generally thought to be largely or totally ignored.
 - 2b No provision exists in the rules, but there is a clear and strong expectation that, in practice, the parliamentary group will conform to the positions of the extraparliamentary organization.
- 3 There is a provision in party rules requiring the parliamentary group to conform to the extraparliamentary party's public positions, and it is generally thought to be effective.

12.04 Discipline of Parliamentary Representatives (DISCIPLN;
related to ICPP 9.07)

Who, if anyone, is responsible for disciplining parliamentary representatives who deviate **from the extraparliamentary party's policy positions**?

Note: If the parliamentary group itself is chiefly responsible for formulating the party's public policy positions, use code **1b**. (See 12.06.)

Operational Definition

- 1a The national parliamentary party group itself administers major disciplinary techniques.
- 1b** The parliamentary group itself formulates the party's public policy positions.
- 2 There are no discernible techniques in the party rules for disciplining parliamentary representatives.
- 3 The extraparliamentary organization administers major disciplinary techniques.

12.05 Rotation Requirement (ROTATE)

Is there a requirement that the party's MPs rotate out of office after a particular period of time? If so, is the rotation requirement taken seriously?

Note 1: This is relevant only to the **party's own rotation requirement**, not to such a requirement if it is included in public law which applies to all parties equally. If the latter is the case, use code **99**.

Note 2: Requiring rotation **during** a term (i.e. between elections) is taken to imply greater interest in controlling the parliamentary group than is a term limitation.

Addendum (5-26-96): The following coding scheme and the original Party Change Project data set include a value of 2 for parties requiring "reselection to take place between elections."

However, we have -- after further consideration -- come to doubt that reselection is as likely as rotation or tenure limitations to have been motivated by the party's desire to maintain the amateur status of its representatives. Since the latter is the primary concern of this variable, we alert users to the possibility of dropping the coding categories of 99 and 2, and then recoding all data for ROTATE accordingly. The latter was done, for instance, for Harmel and Gibson (1996).

Operational Definition*

- 1 There is no rotation requirement or term limitation at all.
- 98 Law provides a term limitation for the lower house.
- 99 Law requires that reselection take place between elections.
- 2 Party rules require reselection to take place between elections.
- 3 Party rules provide for a term limitation (but not for rotation **between** elections), but the rule is not closely followed.
- 4 Party rules provide for rotation between elections**, but this rotation rule is not closely followed.
- 5 Party rules provide for a term limitation, which is closely followed.
- 6 Party rules provide for rotation between elections*, which is closely followed.

*In the original coding for the Party Change Project, -0a was used in place of 98, and -0b in place of 99 for the missing value codes.

That is, rotation is to take place after a particular period of time, **even if that means replacing an MP before the next election.

12.06 Public Policy Positions (POLICY; related to ICPP 9.05)

To what extent is the extraparliamentary party (as opposed to

the parliamentary group) responsible for formulating the party's public positions on policy? (Note that "public positions" includes more than just the party's programs and election manifestoes.)

Note: The operational codes below assume that policy is made by (a) the parliamentary group and/or by (b) the extraparliamentary party. No allowance is made for a major role being played by **party supporters** (i.e. voters). If the latter proves to be the case in some instance, use one of the following codes, but **be sure to note the role played by supporters in the description you provide to accompany the code.**

Operational Definition

- 1 All responsibility for making party policy rests with the parliamentary group itself.
- 2 2/3 or more of responsibility for making "national" party policy rests with the parliamentary group. The rest belongs to the extraparliamentary organization in some form.
- 3 Between 1/3 and 2/3 of the responsibility rests with the parliamentary group.
- 4 Some, but 1/3 or less, of responsibility rests with the parliamentary group.
- 5 None of the responsibility for making national party policy rests with the parliamentary group.

12.07 Primary Leader of the Party (PRIMLEAD)

Who is the primary leader of the party, officially and in fact, the parliamentary or the extraparliamentary leader?

(Note: 3 was split, and 3b created, on 9-9-94.)

Operational Definition

- 1 The parliamentary leader is officially and in fact the primary leader of the party.
- 2 The parliamentary leader is not officially the leader of the party, but is in fact the primary party leader.

- 3a Power is evenly split between the parliamentary and the extraparliamentary leaders, officially and especially in fact.
- 3b The extraparliamentary chair is officially the leader. When the country's chief executive is from the party, he/she is the primary leader in fact; when the chief executive is not from the party, the extraparliamentary chair is leader in fact.
- 4 The extraparliamentary leader is not officially, but is in fact the primary party leader.
- 5 An extraparliamentary leader is recognized in the rules as leader of the party, and is so in fact.