KELLOGG INSTITUTE
THE HELEN KELLOGG INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

**THE NATIONALIZATION OF PARTIES
AND PARTY SYSTEMS: AN EMPIRICAL
MEASURE AND AN APPLICATION TO THE AMERICAS**

Mark P. Jones and Scott Mainwaring

Working Paper #304 - February 2003

THE NATIONALIZATION OF PARTIES
AND PARTY SYSTEMS: AN EMPIRICAL
MEASURE AND AN APPLICATION TO THE AMERICAS

Mark P. Jones and Scott Mainwaring

Working Paper #304 - February 2003

Mark P. Jones is associate professor in the Department of Political Science at Michigan State University. His research focuses on the manner in which electoral laws and other institutions influence elite and mass political behavior and representation. His recent publications have appeared in the *American Journal of Political Science, Comparative Political Studies, and the Journal of Development Economics*. He is currently conducting an NSF funded study of split-ticket voting in presidential democracies.

Scott Mainwaring is a Eugene Conley Professor of Government at the University of Notre Dame and the former director of the Kellogg Institute for International Studies. His latest books are *Rethinking Party Systems in the Third Wave of Democratization: The Case of Brazil,* Stanford University Press, 1999; *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America,* Cambridge University Press, coedited, 1997; and *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*, Stanford University Press, coedited, 1995.

ABSTRACT

Political parties and party systems exhibit widely varying degrees of nationalization, that is the extent to which a party receives similar levels of electoral support throughout the country. The level of party nationalization has a prominent effect on such important factors as the survival of democracy, the types of issues that dominate political competition, legislative behavior, and public policy. In spite of its importance, party nationalization has been neglected in the comparative politics literature. Our paper makes two contributions. First, it provides a measure of party and party system nationalization, based on the Gini coefficient, that is superior for comparative analysis to those employed to date. Second, it utilizes these measures to analyze nationalization in 17 democracies in the Americas, the first time nationalization has been examined empirically outside of the advanced industrial democracies. The measure underscores the widely varying degrees in nationalization across party systems, within party systems over time, across parties within countries, and within parties over time.

Key Words: Political Parties, Nationalization, Latin America.

RESUMEN

Los partidos políticos y los sistemas de partidos exhiben amplias variaciones en sus grados de nacionalización; esto es, la medida en que un partido recibe niveles similares de apoyo electoral a lo largo del país. El grado de nacionalización de los partidos tiene un efecto destacado sobre factores tan importantes como la supervivencia de la democracia, los tipos de cuestiones que dominan la competencia política, el comportamiento legislativo y la política pública. A pesar de su importancia, la nacionalización de los partidos políticos ha sido ignorada por la literatura de política comparada. Nuestro artículo hace dos contribuciones. Primero, provee una medida de la nacionalización de los partidos y de los sistemas de partidos, basada en el coeficiente de Gini, que es superior para el análisis comparado que las que se han empleado hasta el momento. En segundo lugar, nuestro artículo utiliza estas medidas para analizar la nacionalización en 17 democracias en las Américas. Es la primera vez que la nacionalización ha sido analizada fuera de las democracias industriales avanzadas. Esta medición destaca la amplia variación en los grados de nacionalización entre sistemas de partidos a lo largo del tiempo, entre los partidos en un mismo país y en cada partido a lo largo del tiempo.

Palabras clave: partidos políticos, nacionalización, América Latina

**THE NATIONALIZATION OF PARTIES
AND PARTY SYSTEMS: AN EMPIRICAL
MEASURE AND AN APPLICATION TO THE AMERICAS**

MARK P. JONES AND SCOTT MAINWARING

WORKING PAPER #304 - FEBRUARY 2003

THE NATIONALIZATION OF PARTIES
AND PARTY SYSTEMS: AN EMPIRICAL
MEASURE AND AN APPLICATION TO THE AMERICAS

Mark P. Jones and Scott Mainwaring

Working Paper #304 - February 2003

Mark P. Jones is associate professor in the Department of Political Science at Michigan State University. His research focuses on the manner in which electoral laws and other institutions influence elite and mass political behavior and representation. His recent publications have appeared in the *American Journal of Political Science, Comparative Political Studies, and the Journal of Development Economics*. He is currently conducting an NSF funded study of split-ticket voting in presidential democracies.

Scott Mainwaring is a Eugene Conley Professor of Government at the University of Notre Dame and the former director of the Kellogg Institute for International Studies. His latest books are *Rethinking Party Systems in the Third Wave of Democratization: The Case of Brazil,* Stanford University Press, 1999; *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America,* Cambridge University Press, coedited, 1997; and *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*, Stanford University Press, coedited, 1995.

ABSTRACT

Political parties and party systems exhibit widely varying degrees of nationalization, that is the extent to which a party receives similar levels of electoral support throughout the country. The level of party nationalization has a prominent effect on such important factors as the survival of democracy, the types of issues that dominate political competition, legislative behavior, and public policy. In spite of its importance, party nationalization has been neglected in the

comparative politics literature. Our paper makes two contributions. First, it provides a measure of party and party system nationalization, based on the Gini coefficient, that is superior for comparative analysis to those employed to date. Second, it utilizes these measures to analyze nationalization in 17 democracies in the Americas, the first time nationalization has been examined empirically outside of the advanced industrial democracies. The measure underscores the widely varying degrees in nationalization across party systems, within party systems over time, across parties within countries, and within parties over time.

Key Words: Political Parties, Nationalization, Latin America.

RESUMEN

Los partidos políticos y los sistemas de partidos exhiben amplias variaciones en sus grados de nacionalización; esto es, la medida en que un partido recibe niveles similares de apoyo electoral a lo largo del país. El grado de nacionalización de los partidos tiene un efecto destacado sobre factores tan importantes como la supervivencia de la democracia, los tipos de cuestiones que dominan la competencia política, el comportamiento legislativo y la política pública. A pesar de su importancia, la nacionalización de los partidos políticos ha sido ignorada por la literatura de política comparada. Nuestro artículo hace dos contribuciones. Primero, provee una medida de la nacionalización de los partidos y de los sistemas de partidos, basada en el coeficiente de Gini, que es superior para el análisis comparado que las que se han empleado hasta el momento. En segundo lugar, nuestro artículo utiliza estas medidas para analizar la nacionalización en 17 democracias en las Américas. Es la primera vez que la nacionalización ha sido analizada fuera de las democracias industriales avanzadas. Esta medición destaca la amplia variación en los grados de nacionalización entre sistemas de partidos a lo largo del tiempo, entre los partidos en un mismo país y en cada partido a lo largo del tiempo.

Palabras clave: partidos políticos, nacionalización, América Latina

INTRODUCTION

This paper addresses an under-analyzed issue in the comparative study of parties and party systems: their degree of nationalization. In the massive literature on party systems, considerable attention has been paid to the extent of polarization (Sartori 1976; Sani and Sartori 1983; Knutsen 1998), the number of parties (Sartori 1976; Taagepera and Shugart 1989; Lijphart 1994), and the level of institutionalization (Janda 1980; Harmel and Sväsand 1993; Mainwaring and Scully 1995). With the exception of some work on the United States, very little has been written on the degree of nationalization.

It is time to address this lacuna. Parties and party systems vary significantly in the degree to which they are nationalized. By a highly nationalized party system, we mean one in which the major parties' respective vote shares do not differ much from one province to the next. In a weakly nationalized party system, the major parties' vote shares vary widely across provinces. The same logic applies to parties: highly nationalized parties have a relatively even share of the vote across different geographic units, whereas weakly nationalized parties have widely varying shares across geographic units.

Party-system nationalization reflects an important component of the dynamics of party competition. Two systems may be similar in the number of parties and the degree of polarization, the two dimensions Sartori (1976) used to classify party systems in his classic work. Yet if the level of nationalization diverges sharply between these two systems, the competitive dynamics are quite different. In a case of high nationalization, electoral competition follows a roughly similar pattern across the country's subnational units. In a case of low nationalization, the parties that fare well in some subnational units are minor electoral competitors elsewhere. Our indicator of party-system nationalization allows for precise measurement of such differences across countries.

Moreover, two parties (either within the same system or not) may have the same share of the national vote, but their political and electoral strategies will likely differ if one party wins a roughly similar share of the vote in all states while the other is dominant in a few states and a secondary force in the others. Our measure of party nationalization captures such differences.

In this paper we make three contributions. First and foremost, we propose a new way to measure *party-system* nationalization and *party* nationalization. For measuring party

nationalization we advocate inverting the Gini coefficient, a measurement of inequality across different units widely used in other contexts. Most previous measures of nationalization have significant shortcomings for comparative research. When clear and careful measurement of concepts is possible, as it is in this case, it forms a fundamental building block of good social science. Our measures allow for a precise means of assessing nationalization and of comparing across parties and party systems and across time. In addition, they reveal interesting information about change over time within a given political system. If a country moves markedly toward a more nationalized system, or conversely toward greater inter-state differences, these phenomena deserve careful attention (Stokes 1967; Claggett, Flanigan, and Zingale 1984; Brady 1985; Kawato 1987). Our measure of party nationalization allows us to compare parties over time, to see if parties' electoral increases and declines occur relatively evenly throughout the country or are geographically concentrated, and to examine whether most parties in the same country follow a similar pattern or diverge markedly in terms of nationalization.

Our second contribution is to provide data on the nationalization of party systems and parties in 15 Latin American countries, Canada, and the United States. Although this analysis is limited to 17 countries, our measures travel across the great majority of countries without difficulty. For the first time, in this paper the empirical data allow careful and systematic comparisons of party-system nationalization across countries outside Western Europe and the United States.

The third contribution in this paper is to call attention to an important phenomenon that has been badly neglected in the comparative literature on party-systems. One of our principal findings is that party-system nationalization varies greatly across cases, with potentially important consequences for how democratic systems function. Yet notwithstanding great variance in party-system nationalization, the comparative literature on party systems has virtually neglected this issue. Although variance in party nationalization is an important issue, except for the United States, there have been few attempts to compare across countries or time.[1]

We are aware of only two previous efforts to compare party or party-system nationalization across different countries (Rose and Urwin 1975; Caramani 2000).[2] Ironically, both previous efforts to compare party nationalization across different countries focused on the advanced industrial democracies, where (except for Canada, which is often not incorporated into comparative analyses of the advanced industrial democracies) variance across party systems has

been considerably less pronounced than outside this select group of countries. Our work indicates that scholars of parties and party systems elsewhere neglect the topic of party and party-system nationalization at their peril. In short, this paper furthers attempts to expand the frontiers of the comparative understanding of party systems so that scholars start to pay more systematic attention to differences in party-system nationalization and their consequences.

Conceptual Issues and Measurement

A first essential step is clarifying what we mean by "nationalization of parties and party systems." In the literature on the United States, the concept of "nationalization" has been used in two different ways. Schattschneider (1960) and Sundquist (1973) utilized it to assess the extent to which subnational units approximate national vote patterns; in this case, the *absolute* level of support for different parties across subnational units is the relevant measure. In contrast, Stokes (1965, 1967), Brady (1985), and Bawn et al. (1999) examined how closely the direction of electoral change in subnational units approximated the national pattern of electoral change (i.e., the swing from one party to others).[3] In their work, the vote shift from one election to the next rather than the absolute level was relevant. Claggett, Flanigan, and Zingale (1984) and Kawato (1987) used both meanings of "nationalization" and clearly distinguished between them.

Both conceptions of nationalization are meaningful, but the term "nationalization" of parties or the party system should be reserved for the former concept. Stokes and Brady did not measure the nationalization of the party system, but calculated the nationalization of electoral trends (or swings). The nationalization of electoral swings might bear an empirical relationship to the nationalization of the party system (or stated differently, to the absolute levels of electoral support parties win across subnational units). Logically, however, the concept of party-system nationalization should refer to the structure of the party system, not to whether electoral swings are similar across districts.

To measure the nationalization of *parties*, we subtract the Gini coefficient from 1. The Gini coefficient is a widely-used measure of inequalities across units (Shryock et. al 1976; Creedy 1998) It is, for example, the most commonly-used measure of income inequality. It ranges from 0 in cases of perfect equality across all units to 1 in cases of perfect inequality. As used here, the Gini coefficient assesses the extent to which a party wins equal vote shares across all the subnational units. A Gini coefficient of 0 signifies that a party received the same share of the vote in every subnational unit. A Gini coefficient of 1 means that it received 100% of its vote

in one subnational unit and 0% in all the rest.[4] We subtract the Gini coefficient from 1 so that a high score indicates a high level of nationalization. We call this inverted Gini coefficient the Party Nationalization Score (PNS).[5]

The PNS has two primary purposes. First, it can trace changes in a party's level of nationalization over time. Of particular interest is verifying the relationship between electoral ascension or decline, on one hand, and the PNS, on the other. Second, the PNS can be used to compare parties within the same system or across systems. Two parties can have the same share of the vote but diverging levels of nationalization, reflecting very different competitive situations. These differences are likely to affect the parties' electoral and congressional strategies.

In addition to being widely known and used, the Gini coefficient is technically superior to most existing alternatives. Like any measure of nationalization that merits serious consideration for cross-national analysis, it is not country specific—a Gini coefficient of .15 in one country is comparable to a Gini coefficient of .15 in another.[6]

Our measure of party nationalization is based on variance across states, provinces, departments, administrative regions, or parishes in parties' *electoral* performance. Let us be clear about what this concept does *not* measure. A party might have pronounced cross-state differences in programmatic character and social base and yet win the same share of the vote in all the states. On our measure, this party would be perfectly nationalized, notwithstanding the internal differences across states. Thus our concept of a nationalized party does not imply one that is programmatically homogenous across subnational units. Nor does it imply a party that is highly cohesive or disciplined at the national level. A nationalized party as defined here could be a loosely knit organization of individual political entrepreneurs who are part of the same national organization.

Building on the nationalization score for individual parties, we also develop a measure of the nationalization of *party systems*. To create this measure we multiplied the nationalization score (PNS) for every party by its share of the national valid vote, and then summed this product for all the parties. We call this weighted PNS the Party System Nationalization Score (PSNS).[7] The contribution of every party to the PSNS is thus proportionate to its share of the vote. It is useful to have such a summary expression of the level of nationalization of the party system for the same reason that it is useful to have a summary expression such as the effective number of

parties: it enables scholars to trace changes over time within the same system and to compare across countries.

Some Uses of the Measures

The PNS and PSNS allow researchers to measure nationalization precisely, to undertake more informed comparisons across countries and over time, and to locate cases on an important dimension of party systems. Our measures could also be useful for several other purposes in comparative political inquiry. For example, the degree of party-system nationalization is relevant for the most widely used measure of legislative electoral rules (average district magnitude or alternatives such as effective magnitude and effective threshold) and of the national party system (the effective number of electoral parties). When a party system is highly nationalized, the use of these measures is perhaps appropriate. In contrast, when a party system has an intermediate or low level of nationalization, national-level measures such as the average district magnitude and the effective number of electoral parties very likely suffer from validity problems.[8] The effective number of parties is still a meaningful indicator for cross-national comparisons and for understanding some aspects of national-level dynamics. The national-level data, however, can mask major intra country differences. In a weakly nationalized system, a portrait at the national level may be meaningless in understanding subnational dynamics, which are important in most weakly nationalized party systems.

In the remainder of this section, we note four hypotheses that political scientists have proposed about the effects of different levels of party-system or party nationalization that could be more effectively tested by using of the PNS or PSNS. First, Schattschneider (1960) linked the nationalization of the party system to voters' orientations. He argued that in highly nationalized party systems, national factors may be more important to forging bonds between voters and parties. Conversely, in less nationalized party systems, subnational factors may be more salient in creating these bonds. These hypotheses are not true by fiat—the nationalization of parties, as defined here, is analytically distinct from voters' response to national issues. The measures of party nationalization in the United States have also been important to understanding partisan realignment (Brady 1985; Kawato 1987) and the PNS could serve a similar function in comparative politics.

Second, the degree of nationalization reflects, and may have consequences, for legislative careers and for executive-legislative relations. In highly nationalized party systems, national issues are likely to be central in legislators' careers. Executives might have greater ability to forge legislative coalitions on the basis of national issues and negotiate with a few key national party leaders. In a "patchwork" or weakly nationalized party system, subnational issues are likely to be more important in legislative careers. Brazil illustrates this point as Ames (2001) and Samuels (forthcoming) have convincingly argued. Under conditions of weak party nationalization, the central party leadership may be less able to speak for the entire party and deliver its legislative support. This hypothesis also is not true by fiat and it merits more systematic research. A good measure of nationalization could help stimulate new research on such subjects and is essential for its empirical testing.

Third, differences in nationalization are likely to have public policy consequences. Decisions related to national transfers to subnational units, administrative reform, and subsidies may be strongly influenced by the degree of party-system nationalization (Gibson and Calvo 2000; Stepan 2001; Samuels forthcoming). Where a party's base of support is relatively constant across geographic units, it may be more likely to treat all units equally.[9] In contrast, where its support varies widely across geographic units, we would expect it to base its decisions in part on the degree of support it receives in specific geographic units. These public policy consequences seem particularly likely if a weakly nationalized vote pattern falls along regional lines, that is, if a governing party fares markedly better in some regions than others.

In the fourth hypothesis, Diamond (1988), Reynolds (1999), and Stepan (2001) argue that in new democracies where pronounced ethnic, national, or religious cleavages coincide with territory, the nationalization of some major parties may be a key factor in preserving democracy. In such contexts, it may be salutary that some parties with sufficient electoral appeal to help form a national government articulate programmatic countrywide concerns. In a weakly nationalized party system in a new democracy with profound ethnic, national, or religious cleavages, parties will likely orient their electoral messages toward specific ethnic, national, or religious groups. Stepan (2001) contends this pattern may drive a wedge between national and ethnic politics rather than to effect the "politics of accommodation," to use Lijphart's (1977) term.[10] He argues (p. 331) that "if the goal is the consolidation of democracy in a multicultural or multinational polity, a strong case can be made that the existence of statewide parties is useful." The PSNS

could help assess hypotheses about the relationship between party-system or party nationalization and democratic stability in multiethnic societies.

The utility of our measures does not rest on whether these four hypotheses are correct. Rather, the measures are useful because they allow for systematic comparison, show differences in patterns of electoral competition, and pave the way for testing these and other hypotheses.

Case Selection: Countries, Geographic Units, and Elections

Although our measure has broad applicability, this paper empirically is limited to the United States, Canada, and 15 Latin American countries. Within the Americas, our selection criteria were fourfold. First, we included only countries that held at least three consecutive democratic lower house elections. Second, we included only democratic lower house elections held since 1979—that is since the beginning of the third wave of democratization in the region (Huntington 1991). Third, we included only medium to large countries (i.e., those with populations greater than 2,000,000). Fourth, a handful of countries or elections were excluded due to our inability to gather the necessary electoral data (Dominican Republic 1978-90) or to problems associated with the way the available data are reported (Colombia, Ecuador 1998, Venezuela 2000).

TABLE 1

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS IN SEVENTEEN COUNTRIES
(as of the most recent election)

Country	Federal or Unitary	Name of Unit of Analysis	Number of Units	# of Members in the Lower House	Elections Included	Electoral System
Argentina	Federal	Province	24	257	1983–2001	Multi-Member PR
Bolivia	Unitary	Department	9	130	1985–1997	Mixed-Member PR-C (Natl. Threshold)
Brazil	Federal	State	27	513	1986–1998	Multi-Member PR
Canada	Federal	Province/Territory	13	301	1980–2000	Single-Member Plurality Districts
Chile	Unitary	Region	13	120	1989–2001	Binomial PR
Costa Rica	Unitary	Province	7	57	1982–1998	Multi-Member PR
Ecuador	Unitary	Department	21	82	1979–1996	Multi-Member PR (Natl. Tier)
El Salvador	Unitary	Department	14	84	1994–2000	Multi-Member PR (Natl. Tier)
Guatemala	Unitary	Department	23	113	1990–1999	Multi-Member PR (Natl. Tier)
Honduras	Unitary	Department	18	128	1981–2001	Multi-Member PR
Jamaica	Unitary	Parish	14	60	1980–1997	Single-Member Plurality Districts
Mexico	Federal	State	32	500	1994–2000	Mixed-Member PR-NC (Natl. Threshold)
Nicaragua	Unitary	Department	17	90	1990–2001	Multi-Member PR (Natl. Tier)
Peru	Unitary	Department	26	180	1980–1990	Multi-Member PR
United States	Federal	State	50	435	1980–2000	Single-Member Plurality Districts
Uruguay	Unitary	Department	19	99	1984–1999	Multi-Member PR (Natl. Allocation)
Venezuela	Federal	State/Territory	24	207	1983–1998	Mixed-Member PR-C (Natl. Tier)

Note: The federal district in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and Venezuela is included since residents of these districts elect voting members of the lower house (unlike their counterparts in the United States). One U.S. state employs Single-Member Majority Runoff Districts. In Ecuador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua respectively 12 (every four years), 22, and 20 additional members are elected using a separate ballot from a national district. Abbreviations: PR (Proportional Representation), C (Compensatory), NC (Non-Compensatory).

Although it would be possible to examine presidential and senate elections, lower house elections form the best starting point. In terms of party nationalization, presidential elections in multiparty systems have an idiosyncratic logic because of the importance of individual candidacies, because of party coalitions, and because there are greater, yet widely varying, incentives for strategic voting. A party could be quite nationalized in presidential elections because of the drawing power of a particular candidate and/or because of interparty coalitions, yet be weakly nationalized in lower house elections—the Brazilian Partido da Social Democracia Brasileira (PSDB) was an example in 1994 and 1998. We use lower house rather than senate elections because several countries have a unicameral legislature or a senate that is not popularly elected. Furthermore, many senates are renewed via partial renovation and some districts do not vote in every senate election year.

Table 1 provides summary information about the political institutions in these 17 countries. The information reflects the current state of affairs as of the most recent lower house election included in our study, although with few exceptions there was little change in these institutions during the time period under analysis.

We used geographic units of roughly comparable political status. For the six federal republics, we utilized the state (Brazil, Mexico, the United States, Venezuela) or province (Argentina, Canada) as the geographic unit.[11] For Bolivia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, and Uruguay the departments are our unit of analysis; for Chile, Costa Rica, and Jamaica we employed the administrative regions, provinces, and parishes respectively.

Because of the strategic behavior by elites and voters that takes place in single-member plurality districts, use of these districts (for Canada, Jamaica, and the United States) as our unit of analysis would provide less valid and reliable measures of party support than use of the larger territorial units. Furthermore, employment of these single-member districts would result in a much wider variance in the number of units per country in the analysis, which given the nature of the Gini coefficient, is not desirable.

Although the Gini coefficient is superior to the alternatives, it might not work well for comparisons of countries with a wide range in the number of geographic units. Fortunately, the sensitivity to the number of units is modest given the relatively limited range in the number of units we use in this analysis, from a low of seven (Costa Rica) to a high of 50 (United States),

with a median of 19. Combined with reporting party nationalization scores at two decimal places, the effect on our interpretation caused by these differences in the number of units is modest. The use of these administrative units is less arbitrary and suffers from less measurement error than the use of alternative measures such as deciles or quintiles of the rank-ordered subnational administrative units.

In the tables on *party* nationalization (Tables 4, 6, and 7), because of spatial constraints, we limit the presentation to parties that received a minimum of 5% of the national vote in the respective election. In contrast, the data on *party-system* nationalization are based on all the parties as well as independent candidates.

The Nationalization of Party Systems

The bottom row of Table 2 provides the average PSNS for the 17 countries. The level of nationalization varies markedly across party systems. The systems of Argentina, Canada, Peru, and especially Brazil and Ecuador, are much less nationalized than those of the six most nationalized countries. The data thus confirm previous scholarly work that emphasized the importance of provincial-level politics in Argentina, Brazil, Canada, and Venezuela, and of regional-level politics in Ecuador. Guatemala and Bolivia also have weakly nationalized party systems.

TABLE 2

Table 2

Party System Nationionalization in Seventeen Countries, 1979–2001
PSNS, Year of Democratic Election, and Period Average (in bold in the bottom row)

Ecuador	Brazil	Peru	Argentina	Cananda	Guatemala	Venezuela	Bolivia	Mexico	United States	El Salvador	Nicaragua	Chile	Uruguay	Costa Rica	Honduras	Jamaica
.62 (1979)	.65 (1986)	.70 (1980)	.79 (1983)	.78 (1980)	.74 (1990)	.86 (1983)	.80 (1985)	.84 (1994)	.82 (1980)	.87 (1994)	.86 (1990)	.80 (1989)	.88 (1984)	.90 (1982)	.91 (1981)	.94 (1980)
.54 (1984)	.51 (1990)	.79 (1985)	.81 (1985)	.83 (1984)	.74 (1995)	.85 (1988)	.77 (1989)	.79 (1997)	.85 (1982)	.83 (1997)	.85 (1996)	.92 (1993)	.86 (1989)	.92 (1986)	.93 (1985)	.94 (1989)
.47 (1986)	.51 (1994)	.62 (1990)	.74 (1987)	.78 (1988)	.80 (1999)	.72 (1993)	.78 (1993)	.83 (2000)	.83 (1984)	.85 (2000)	.88 (2001)	.86 (1997)	.86 (1994)	.91 (1990)	.95 (1989)	.93 (1993)
.63 (1988)	.61 (1998)		.76 (1989)	.62 (1993)		.61 (1998)	.72 (1997)		.83 (1986)			.90 (2001)	.88 (1999)	.89 (1994)	.92 (1993)	.93 (1997)
.55 (1990)			.62 (1991)	.67 (1997)					.85 (1988)					.86 (1998)	.92 (1997)	
.59 (1992)			.68 (1993)	.63 (2000)					.85 (1990)						.91 (2001)	
.58 (1994)			.79 (1995)						.87 (1992)							
.60 (1996)			.72 (1997)						.87 (1994)							
			.73 (1999)						.86 (1996)							
			.59 (2001)						.80 (1998)							
									.82 (2000)							
.57	**.58**	**.70**	**.72**	**.72**	**.76**	**.76**	**.77**	**.82**	**.84**	**.85**	**.86**	**.87**	**.87**	**.90**	**.92**	**.93**

Mexico, the United States, and El Salvador are intermediate cases with PSNSs far higher than those of Ecuador and Brazil but lower than those of most unitary Latin American countries. Although the literature on the nationalization of the US party system has emphasized its federalized nature, according to our measure, during this period it ranked as an intermediate (not low) case of nationalization among our 17 cases.

The party systems of Chile, Costa Rica, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, and Uruguay are quite nationalized. All six countries have unitary systems, in which other relevant elements being equal, offer stronger incentives to organize parties across departmental lines.

TABLE 3

MEASURES OF STABILITY IN PARTY SYSTEM NATIONALIZATION

Country	Mean Inter-Election PSNS Change	Greatest Inter-Election PSNS Change	Highest-Lowest PSNS
Jamaica	.00	.01	.01
Uruguay	.01	.02	.02
Honduras	.01	.03	.04
Nicaragua	.02	.03	.03
Costa Rica	.02	.03	.06
United States	.02	.06	.07
El Salvador	.03	.04	.04
Guatemala	.03	.06	.06
Bolivia	.03	.06	.08
Mexico	.05	.05	.05
Chile	.06	.12	.12
Argentina	.07	.14	.22
Ecuador	.07	.16	.18
Canada	.07	.16	.21
Venezuela	.08	.13	.25
Brazil	.08	.14	.14
Peru	.13	.17	.17

The PSNS also enables us to trace change and stability within a given country. Table 3 provides information on change and stability in nationalization by country over time. The second column measures mean change from one election to the next; the third measures the greatest change from one election to the next; and the fourth column measures aggregate change. Nine of the 17 countries experienced considerable stability (a mean interelection PSNS change of .00 to .03) in their level of party-system nationalization.

Argentina (1983–2001), Ecuador (1984-1996), and the United States (1980–2000) are the only countries that employ a mixed electoral cycle (i.e., every other lower house election is

concurrent/nonconcurrent with the presidential contest). In the United States there is no relationship between the electoral cycle and party system nationalization (perhaps due to the country's decentralized two-party-system). In contrast, in Argentina and Ecuador the level of nationalization has been higher in years of concurrent presidential/congressional elections. In Argentina, with the exception of the 1985 election, the PSNS dropped following every presidential contest (1983, 1989, 1995, 1999) and rose (vis-à-vis the previous nonconcurrent house election) in the presidential election year. In Ecuador, the nonconcurrent elections of 1986, 1990, and, to a lesser extent, 1994, represent clear valleys with respect to the peaks provided by the presidential years (1984, 1988, 1992, 1996). This finding indicates the nationalizing effect that presidential elections can have on congressional elections.

Although we have not systematically collected data for other regions, the norm in Western Europe is a high degree of nationalization (Rose and Urwin 1975; Caramani 2000). The Rose and Urwin indicator we consider reliable (see below) indicated the United States had a less nationalized party system than any Western European country. In our population, by contrast, the US party system is more nationalized than that of a majority of the other countries. Furthermore, some elections in developing countries such as India and Malawi have yielded less nationalized party systems than have elections in any country in our population.

TABLE 4

PARTY NATIONALIZATION (PNS) IN THE LOW NATIONALIZATION COUNTRIES

Ecuador

	CFP	PSC	ID	PLRE	OTHER1[a]	OTHER2[b]	DP	MPD	PRE
1979	.82	.48	.61	.55	.53	.48			
1984	.46	.59	.77	.34	.47	.57/.46	.63	.64	.32
1986	.58	.65	.71	.61	.46	.37	.45	.62	.31
1988	.60	.68	.83				.73	.61	.58
1990		.53	.79		.43		.59	.62	.67
1992		.74	.67		.38	.59	.57		.66
1994		.77	.69		.49	.34	.61	.50	.61
1996		.79	.50				.65		.67

Brazil

	PMDB	PFL	PT	PSDB	PPB[c]	PTB	PRN	PDT
1986	.84	.71	.60		.41			.49
1990	.63	.59	.64	.53	.47	.37	.56	.51
1994	.69	.55	.67	.55	.52/.50	.40		.54
1998	.74	.68	.69	.70	.64	.53		.54

Peru

	APRA	AP[d]	IU	CD	C90	IS
1980	.71	.82				
1985	.86	.76	.82	.73		
1990	.75	.69	.61		.45	.69

Canada

	LP	PC	NDP	BQ	RP
1980	.82	.84	.72		
1984	.82	.92	.70		
1988	.75	.91	.67		
1993	.81	.81	.52	.08	.52
1997	.86	.72	.73	.08	.54
2000	.82	.62	.68	.08	.55

Argentina

	PJ	UCR	OTHER[e]	ALIANZA
1983	.89	.88		
1985	.87	.91	.51	
1987	.87	.88	.37	
1989	.88	.86	.52	
1991	.88	.75	.24	
1993	.88	.81	.36	
1995	.84	.77	.69	
1997	.82			.82
1999	.81		.37	.87
2001	.83		.46	.76

Guatemala

	PAN	FRG[f]	DCG[g]	UCN	MAS	OTHER[h]
1990	.77	.72	.80	.88	.73	.51
1995	.86	.86	.76			.62
1999	.88	.91				.68

Venezuela

	AD	COPEI	MAS	LCR	CONVERG	MVR	PRVZL
1983	.86	.90	.80				
1988	.85	.92	.66				
1993	.72	.83	.60	.64	.74		
1998	.76	.62	.58			.70	.57

Bolivia

	ADN	MNR	MIR[i]	OTHER[j]	CONDEPA	UCS
1985	.88	.84	.72	.77		
1989	.88	.86	.88	.69	.33	
1993	.80	.93		.66	.42	.83
1997	.82	.82	.77		.45	.82

[a] 1979: PCE, 1984: FADI, 1986: FADI, 1990: PSE, 1992: PCE, 1994: PCE, 1996: MUPP-NP.

[b] 1979: CID, 1984: FRA/PD, 1986: FRA, 1992: PUR, 1994: APRE.

[c] PDS in 1986 and 1990, PP/PPR in 1994.

[d] 1985: PI, 1987: UCEDE, 1989: ADC, 1991: UCEDE, 1993: MODIN, 1995: FREPASO, 1999: AR, 2001: ARI.

[e] FREDEMO alliance in 1990.

[f] Presented in alliance with the PID and FUN in 1990.

[g] The DCG, UCN, and PSD presented in alliance in 1995.

[h] 1990: MLN, 1995: FDNG, 1999: DIA-URNG.

[i] Presented in alliance with the ADN in 1993.

[j] 1985: MNRI, 1989: IU, 1993: MBL.

TABLE 5

RANKING OF THE ELEVEN MOST NATIONALIZED

<div style="text-align:center">AND LEAST NATIONALIZED MAJOR PARTIES</div>

RANKING	PARTY	AVERAGE PNS	AVERAGE VOTE SHARE (%)	COUNTRY
Top Eleven	PUSC	.96	40	Costa Rica
	PLN	.95	45	Costa Rica
	ARENA	.95	39	El Salvador
	CONCERTACION	.94	53	Chile
	PLH	.94	48	Honduras
	PNH	.93	45	Honduras
	PNP	.93	54	Jamaica
	JLP	.93	45	Jamaica
	PC	.93	34	Uruguay
	ALIANZA	.92	37	Chile
	PRI	.92	42	Mexico
Bottom Eleven	ID	.70	14	Ecuador
	PRD	.69	20	Mexico
	NDP	.67	14	Canada
	PSC	.65	18	Ecuador
	PT	.65	11	Brazil
	PFL	.63	15	Brazil
	PSDB	.59	14	Brazil
	PRE	.55	14	Ecuador
	RP	.54	21	Canada
	CONDEPA	.40	14	Bolivia
	BQ	.08	12	Canada

Note: Includes only parties (45 total) that averaged 10% or more of the vote and competed in at least three elections during the analysis period. For additional information see Tables 4, 6, and 7.

Low Nationalization Countries[12]

We now shift from party systems to parties as the unit of analysis. Table 4 presents data on party nationalization in Ecuador, Brazil, Peru, Argentina, Canada, Guatemala, Venezuela, and Bolivia. Ecuador's major parties possess low average PNSs, with three among the 11 least nationalized major parties (45 total) in our population (Table 5). Ecuador's smaller parties are even less nationalized, with several among the least nationalized of our entire party population. These smaller parties account for a substantial portion of the vote; in none of the eight elections did the parties winning 20% or more of the vote account for more than half of the national vote.

Brazil is another outlier; the national party system is a pastiche of state party systems. State-level politics is very important and regional and state differences in the party system have long been salient. With the partial exception of the PMDB (Partido do Movimento Democrático Brasileiro) in 1986, Brazil's parties have won widely diverging vote shares across the 27 units of the federation. Three of the 11 least nationalized major parties are Brazilian (Table 5).

Peru provides the largest inter-election PSNS change, from .79 in 1985 to .62 in 1990, as the traditional Peruvian party system disintegrated. Peru's nascent democratic experience ended shortly thereafter when President Alberto Fujimori staged a coup in 1992. In 1990 all parties possessed relatively low PNSs, with Fujimori's C90 (Cambio 90) registering an extremely low .45 (especially for a governing party).

Argentina is another case of low nationalization, but its pattern of party federalization diverges from that of Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, and Peru. For much of this period, two main parties, the PJ (Partido Justicialista) and UCR/ALIANZA (Unión Cívica Radical/Alianza), had intermediate to high PNSs, yet coexisted with several powerful provincial parties, which normally compete in only one province and hence have extremely low PNSs. Although each provincial party accounts for limited weight in the PSNSs presented in Table 2, generally averaging between 0.5% and 1.5% of the national vote, cumulatively, these parties have won a meaningful share (between 5% and 8%) of the national vote in most elections.

In the 1980s, the Canadian party system had a level of nationalization only slightly lower than that of the United States. Since 1993, however, Canada has approximated Brazil's PSNSs. In the 1990s, two new forces emerged at the national level and dramatically lowered Canada's PSNS. The BQ (Bloc Quebecois) (PNS .08), which competes only in Quebec, is the sole single-province party in the 17 countries analyzed here that obtained 5% or more of the national vote. The Reform Party (RP), which first contested national elections in 1988 (garnering a meager 2% of the vote), also has a very low PNS, reflecting its concentration in the west. The RP drew many of its votes from the historic base of the Progressive Conservatives (PC), which saw its support dissipate in the west, but remained competitive in the Maritime provinces.

The remarkable changes in the Canadian party system in 1993 were associated with the second largest single interelection PSNS change (tied with Ecuador) in the 68 interelectoral periods covered in this study, from .78 in 1988 to .62 in 1993. In contrast to the 1980s, when two of the country's three major parties RP, PC, and Liberal Party (LP) were relatively nationalized, in the 1990s, of the five major parties, only the LP remotely approached a significant nationwide presence.

Guatemala's two largest parties during this period, the Partido de Avanzada Nacional (PAN) and Frente Repúblicano Guatamalteco (FRG), became increasingly nationalized over

time. This was especially the case for the FRG with a PNS of .91 in 1999 (up from .72 in 1990). With one minor exception, the other Guatemalan parties had low levels of nationalization.

Until 1993 the Venezuelan party system ranked in the high nationalization category. In the 1990s, however, Venezuela was pushed into the low nationalization category by the decline of the two parties Acción Democrática (AD) and Comité de Organización Política Electoral Independiente (COPEI), that had dominated Venezuelan politics for the previous quarter century, and constitutional reforms that decentralized power to the states resulted in a massive PSNS decrease (the largest aggregate shift, .25, in our population).

Most of Bolivia's major parties possess intermediate levels of nationalization. In contrast, Conciencia de Patria (CONDEPA) is a weakly nationalized party whose support is heavily concentrated in the Department of La Paz. This party helps drag the country's party system from the intermediate to low classification. After Canada's BQ, CONDEPA has the lowest PNS of the major parties in our analysis (Table 5).

Intermediate Nationalization Countries

Despite formal federalism, Mexico's political system was highly centralized until the 1990s. It is not surprising that Mexico has a more nationalized party system than Argentina, Brazil, and Canada. In contrast to the situation in the latter countries, Mexican state governments are comparatively bereft of resources.

Mexico is the country with the sharpest differences in nationalization from one major party to the next. The most nationalized party, the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI), is tied as the tenth most nationalized of our major parties (Table 5). In contrast, the Partido de la Revolución Democrática (PRD) is the tenth least nationalized. Mexico's PSNS thus conceals important cross-party differences (Table 6).

Although substantial literature has correctly emphasized the federalized character of the US party system (Kawato 1987; Mayhew 1986), the US party system is more nationalized than nearly half of the systems in this population. But if we compare the PNSs of the Democratic Party (DP) and Republican Party (RP) with those of the major parties in Costa Rica, Honduras, and Jamaica, the US parties are indeed quite federalized.

The Salvadoran party system underwent a striking transformation during this period. The largest party in the 1980s, the Partido Demócrata Cristiano (PDC), suffered an electoral hemorrhage. By 1997 the Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional (FMLN), a revolutionary group in the 1980s, had become El Salvador's second largest party, merely 2% behind Alianza Republicana Nacionalista (ARENA). The PDC collapse occurred very unevenly across the country: the party moved from a relatively high PNS to a low one between 1994 and 1997. The FMLN's growth was more even—its PNS rose only slightly, from .84 in 1994 to .88 in 2000.

TABLE 6

**PARTY NATIONALIZATION (PNS) IN THE
INTERMEDIATE NATIONALIZATION COUNTRIES**

COUNTRY	ELECTION YEAR	POLITICAL PARTIES				
Mexico		PRI	PAN	PRD		
	1994	.94	.79	.67		
	1997	.91	.74	.71		
	2000	.91	.84	.69		
United States		DP	RP			
	1980	.82	.83			
	1982	.86	.84			
	1984	.84	.83			
	1986	.84	.83			
	1988	.87	.85			
	1990	.87	.86			
	1992	.90	.90			
	1994	.87	.91			
	1996	.88	.90			
	1998	.83	.84			
	2000	.83	.85			
El Salvador		ARENA	FMLN	PDC	PCN	CD/CDU[a]
	1994	.96	.84	.87	.78	.47
	1997	.96	.85	.75	.75	
	2000	.94	.88	.71	.72	.68

[a] CD in 1994 and CDU in 2000.

High Nationalization Countries

The two parties that have dominated Nicaraguan politics since 1990, the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (FSLN) and Partido Liberal Constitucionalista (PLC), have relatively high PNSs. As is the case in the other Central American countries, however, the Nicaraguan minor parties are much less national than the dominant parties

In response to the two-member district legislative electoral system employed in Chile, the major Chilean parties formed two large and relatively stable national coalitions. The Concertación (CONCERT) includes four center and center-left parties.

TABLE 7

**PARTY NATIONALIZATION (PNS) IN THE
HIGH NATIONALIZATION COUNTRIES**

Country	Election Year	Political Parties			
Nicaragua		**FSLN**	PLC[a]		
	1990	.88	.87		
	1996	.87	.87		
	2001	.89	.89		
Chile		CONCERT	ALIANZA	PAIS	PC
	1989	.93	.96	.47	
	1993	.94	.94		.68
	1997	.94	.86		.76
	2001	.94	.92		.67
Uruguay		PC	PN	FA	NE[b]
	1984	.94	.92	.72	
	1989	.91	.92	.71	.75
	1994	.92	.90	.79	.72
	1999	.94	.87	.85	.83
Costa Rica		PLN	PUSC	PU	FD
	1982	.96	.95	.73	
	1986	.95	.97		
	1990	.94	.97		
	1994	.96	.97		.63
	1998	.94	.94		.81
Honduras		PLH	PNH		
	1981	.93	.91		
	1985	.94	.93		
	1989	.95	.96		
	1993	.93	.92		
	1997	.95	.93		
	2001	.94	.95		
Jamaica		PNP	JLP		
	1980	.93	.95		
	1989	.95	.94		
	1993	.94	.92		
	1997	.96	.93		

[a] UNO alliance in 1990.
[b] PGP in 1989.

The Alianza por Chile (ALIANZA), as it is currently named, includes two center-right parties along with a substantial number of independents. We therefore used coalition (rather than party) results. With the partial exception of the ALIANZA in 1997, these two major coalitions have consistently had very high PNSs.

Uruguay's two traditional parties, the Partido Colorado (PC) and Partido Nacional (PN), have consistently had relatively even vote patterns across the country's 19 departments. In contrast, the leftist Frente Amplio (FA) had a markedly less nationalized pattern until 1994. It fared much better in Montevideo than in the interior. The FA's ability to win more votes across a broader range of departments was a key factor in its electoral growth from 21% of the national vote in both 1984 and 1989 to 31% in 1994 and 40% in 1999. In contrast to what has occurred in most cases, the PN's electoral decline after 1989 (39%), to 31% of the vote in 1994 and 22% in 1999, has yet to produce sharply lower PNSs.

Costa Rica, Honduras, and Jamaica have the most nationalized party systems. The respective two dominant parties in these countries are highly nationalized, garnering relatively equal shares of the vote in all districts. They represent six of our nine most nationalized parties (Table 5).

Previous Measures of Nationalization

Claggett, Flanigan, and Zingale (1984), Schattschneider (1960), Sundquist (1973), and Kawato (1987) devised good measures of party nationalization for the United States, but they are appropriate only for two-party systems. Claggett, Flanigan, and Zingale (1984) measured the standard deviation (SD) of the Democratic Party (DP) share of the vote at the county level. SDs are poor measures for comparing parties that win very different mean shares of the vote because they are not comparable across parties with different vote shares. They tend to attribute higher values to large parties and lower values to small ones because there is likely to be less variance in absolute terms with a lower share of the vote. Because most democracies (those with two-party systems are rare exceptions) have relevant parties that win widely different vote shares, the SD is a poor option for comparative research.

Schattschneider (1960: 78–96) measured the DP's deviation from 50%, expressed as an absolute value, in every state and summed this value for all states. It is possible to follow this procedure for other countries by taking the deviation (as an absolute value) from a given party's mean share of the vote in all states or provinces—this is one of the measures that Rose and Urwin (1975) used. But in a multiparty system this measure greatly overstates the nationalization of small parties compared to large ones.[13] Sundquist (1973: 332–37) and Kawato (1987) devised

measures of nationalization based on the DP vote share, but focusing on one party is suitable only in two-party systems.

Although the measures of nationalization used for the United States do not work for most other countries, the debate about nationalization in the United States was useful to highlight the importance of the subject. Curiously, in comparative politics little has been written on this subject; the works by Rose and Urwin (1975) and Caramani (2000) are the main contributions. They both devised three different measures of nationalization. Both used the SD, which as noted is a poor measurement for comparing parties of unequal sizes. Rose and Urwin also used an Index of Variation (IV), which reproduces the modification of Schattschneider discussed in the previous paragraph. As noted, it has serious shortcomings for comparative research. Rose and Urwin's Index of Cumulative Regional Inequality (ICRI) (also used by Caramani) is their only solid indicator. It is constructed by calculating the percentage of a party's national vote won in a given territorial unit, subtracting that territorial unit share of the national vote, taking the absolute value, summing these absolute values for all units, and dividing by two. This measure performs well but has the disadvantage of being less well known and used than the Gini coefficient. Their three measures perform very differently—the United States ranks as the least nationalized party system among 20 countries on two of them, but as the most nationalized on the third. Such profound discrepancies reflect the serious problems with the SD and IV as measures of party nationalization. In addition to the SD and ICRI, Caramani employed the CV, where shortcomings were discussed earlier.

CONCLUSION

The extent of party and party-system nationalization is an important topic that has been neglected by the scholarly literature except for the United States. This is in part because the mainstream theoretical literature on parties and party systems has focused on the advanced industrial democracies, which, with a few exceptions, have quite nationalized party systems. But when we turn our attention to Africa, Asia, and Latin America, a much greater proportion of the party systems are weakly nationalized. Hence, the importance of analyzing variance in nationalization is greater for these regions than for the advanced industrial democracies. It is impossible to understand many party systems in the world, including those of such large and

important countries as Argentina, Brazil, Canada, India, and Russia without paying attention to the widely divergent vote shares that parties win in different states or provinces.

We have proposed a means of measuring nationalization that travels well across parties, countries, and time. This article is the first to provide empirical information about party-system nationalization outside the advanced industrial democracies. Our work makes clear that party-system nationalization varies markedly across countries.

Issues of measurement provide a key underpinning for examining important substantive issues in the social sciences. It is worth constructing new measures if the following conditions exist: a) the subject of measurement is important enough to merit sustained substantive discussion; b) it is measurable; and c) social scientists gain a useful tool by being able to precisely measure the phenomenon.

We believe that all three conditions obtain. Our measures enable us to compare across party systems; measure stability and change in nationalization within a given party system; compare across parties in one or more countries; analyze the relationship between electoral growth or demise and party nationalization; and assess the relationship between realignment or dealignment and nationalization. They should be useful for scholars studying various aspects of the party system and its relationship to factors such as voters' orientations, legislative careers, executive-legislative relations, public policy, and democratic stability in multi-ethnic societies.

Our measures could also be useful for tracking and comparing different political processes. Consider, the transitions from hegemonic party systems to democratic politics in Brazil (1974–85) and Mexico (1988–2000). These transitions were exceptional in the degree to which elections dictated the transition's pace. In both countries the pro-regime parties held remarkably similar positions: each had barely lost its majority in the lower house but retained a solid majority in the senate. But beyond this important similarity, the nationalization data reflect a difference. In Brazil, the wealthiest states tilted strongly to the opposition by 1974 and became overwhelmingly dominated by it in 1982, with the PNS of the governing party, the Partido Democrático Social (PDS), falling to .41 in 1986. In Mexico, in sharp contrast, the PRI remained competitive in all 32 states. The PRI's PNS remained high (.91) even in 2000. The PNS calls attention to these differences between otherwise similar cases and captures their magnitude.

Jones and Mainwaring   23

Although for reasons of space a statistical analysis of the sources of variance in party system nationalization must be left to a future study, three potential explanatory factors leap out in this set of countries.

First, the federal countries tend to have lower nationalization scores, reflecting greater variance in parties' electoral performances across the subnational units. The correlation between a binary federal-unitary variable and the PSNS is -.36. Federalism gives incentives for parties to organize and compete at the state level and tends to foster more differences than unitary systems in inter-state patterns of electoral competition.

Second, the more fragmented party systems tend to be the least nationalized. The correlation between the PSNS and the effective number of electoral parties is a remarkable -.87, notwithstanding the fact that the two issues are obviously conceptually and operationally discrete.[14] In this universe of countries, the larger parties tend to be more nationalized and the smaller parties less nationalized. In fragmented party systems, small parties win most of the vote, hence the powerful tendency towards low PSNSs. The legislatures in the low nationalization countries are not only generally fragmented along partisan lines. In addition, these different partisan forces tend to have distinct geographic constituencies, adding one more potential complication to coordination efforts in these assemblies.

Third, there is a noteworthy inverse relationship between electoral volatility and party nationalization. However, the driving force behind this relationship is most likely the previously noted correlation between fragmentation and nationalization.

Party nationalization varies even more dramatically than party-system nationalization. Individual parties range from almost perfectly nationalized the Costa Rican Partido Unidad Social Cristiano (PUSC) three times registered a nationalization score of .97 to perfectly provincialized (the Canadian BQ has won 100% of its votes in Quebec). A low level of nationalization does not necessarily result from a deliberate effort of parties to cast state or regional appeals. In these countries, a deliberate focus on state or regional appeals characterizes very few parties.

One finding stands out in the variance across individual parties: small parties tend to have substantially lower nationalization scores. Large parties (those that win over 30% of the vote) almost always compete in and have a chance to win seats in virtually all of the subnational administrative units. It would be unusual for a party to win 30% or more of the vote if it were a

minor party in a substantial number of provinces. Conversely, most small parties in our population won wildly divergent shares of the vote in different provinces.

It is likely that this difference stems in part from the distinct incentives for nationalization facing large and small parties in presidential democracies. Large parties can realistically compete for the country's most important electoral prize—the presidency. Because the president is elected by a national vote, the party must have a presence in any administrative unit and, thus, invests resources in the development and maintenance of a nation-wide party structure. This party structure, in turn, presents candidates in the legislative elections—especially when the presidential and legislative elections are concurrent—regardless of their chances of success. In contrast, small parties have a less realistic chance of winning the presidency and, thus, have a weaker incentive to develop and maintain a party structure, present candidates, and provide these candidates with campaign resources in districts where they have little chance of success.

A related pattern that emerged consistently is the relationship between party growth or decline and nationalization. Almost invariably, significant electoral growth was accompanied by a PNS increase and significant decline by a decrease.

More remains to be done on these issues, but we believe that our measures—the PNS and the PSNS—and our empirical information on 17 countries, pave the way for future research.

APPENDIX: Using the Gini Coefficient to Measure Party Nationalization

The following explanation of the Gini coefficient is based on Shryock et al. 1976: 98-100. The Gini coefficient, as used in this paper, measures the inequality in a party's vote share across different states, provinces, or departments. It is based on the Lorenz curve, which in this case, plots the cumulative proportion of states that the ith state represents of the total number of states (Column 5 in the below example) against the cumulative percentage of vote *shares* (not of votes) won by Party X in the ith state relative to the sum of percentages won by Party X in all states (Column 6 in the below example).

$$Gi = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i Y_{i+1}) - (\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{i+1} Y_i),$$ where Xi is the cumulative proportion represented

by the percentage of the valid vote won by Party X in the ith state divided by the sum of percentages won by Party X in all states; Y_i is the cumulative proportion that the ith the state represents of the total number of states or other political sub units.

In the hypothetical example below, Party X wins 0%, 10%, 30%, and 40% of the vote in the four states in a given country. The rows should be arranged by the ascending or descending vote shares that Party X won in the different states, not in random order. (The example shown below uses an ascending order, from the state where Party X won the smallest share of the vote to the state where it won the largest.) The sum of these vote shares is 80% (Column 2). In Column 4, for each state, we divided Party X vote share in that state by 80% to determine that the state's contribution to the party's unweighted (by population) aggregated vote percentages. Column 6 gives the cumulative totals for Column 4.

State	Party's share of vote in State	State represents the share of all states (i.e., 1 divided by # of states)	Column 2 divided by sum of column 2 in all states	Cumulative share of states Yi	Cumulative share for column 4 Xi	Xi*Yi+1	Xi+1*Y1
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
A	0	.25	0	.25	0	0	.0313
B	.10	.25	.125	.50	.125	.0938	.2500
C	.30	.25	.375	.75	.50	.5000	.7500
D	.40	.25	.50	1.00	1.00	–	–
	sum = .80					.5938	1.0313

Column 7 Row A represents the product of Xi (Row A in Column 6) times Yi+1 (Row B in Column 5), i.e., 0 * .50. Column 7 Row B represents the product of Row B in Column 6 times Row C in Column 5, and so forth. The final row in Column 7 is the sum of all row entries for Column 7. Column 8 Row A is the product of Xi+1 (Row B in Column 6) times Y1 (Row A in Column 5), i.e., .25 *.125, and so on. The final row in Column 8 is the sum of all row entries for the column. The Gini coefficient is obtained by subtracting the sum of Column 7 from the sum of Column 8.[15] In this case, which represents an example of uneven electoral performance across states, the Gini coefficient is therefore 1.0313-.5938, or .4375. The PNS = 1 -Gini; i.e., .5625.

Using the Gini coefficient to calculate nationalization scores entails weighting every state, province, or department equally—a choice that we would vigorously defend. The same method is used for determining the level of income inequality across states and many other purposes. We calculated the Gini Coefficient for each party using the STATA command "ineqdec0" (Jenkins 2001).

ENDNOTES

[1] Schattschneider (1960), Stokes (1965, 1967), Sundquist (1973), Claggett, Flanigan, and Zingale (1984), Brady (1985), and Kawato (1987) measured the nationalization of parties or electoral trends in the United States. Their contributions are valuable, but their measures do not work well except in two-party systems.

[2] Although scant comparative work exists on party-system nationalization, some scholars have addressed related issues. Observing that electoral systems create incentives not at the national level, but rather at the district level, Cox (1997) analyzed the ways in which district-level political competition leads to varying party-system patterns at the national level (see also Chhibber and Kollman 1998). Our endeavor is related. Although we do not attempt to explain *how* district-level competition is linked to the national party system, differences in nationalization reflect how closely results from one district mirror those of others.

[3] Bawn et al. (1999) used the term "electoral cohesiveness" rather than "nationalization." They defined electoral cohesiveness as "the extent to which the electoral fates of incumbent candidates of the same party are tied together" (p. 300). Because their measure is based partly on an incumbent's previous margin of victory, it works only in democracies with personal voting.

[4] This is the asymptotic result. In those analyses where the Gini Coefficient is most commonly employed (i.e., small sample analyses) the limiting result is not obtained. In our analysis this small sample property is most notable when a party wins 100% of its vote in a single electoral district.

[5] For additional information on calculating the Gini Coefficient see the Appendix.

[6] As a diagnostic, we calculated two alternative measures of nationalization: a ratio measure (RM) and the Coefficient of Variation (CV). The RM compares the percentage of the vote won by a party in the top quartile of states to that won in the bottom quartile. While this measure is easier to interpret, it is technically inferior because it arbitrarily selects two data points and ignores the rest. The RM provided results similar to the Gini coefficient, but it did so in a less consistent manner. The CV weights the standard deviation through the mean. It provided results substantively indistinct from those obtained using the Gini coefficient. But the Gini coefficient has two advantages over the CV. It is better known and equally good, and it ranges from 0 to 1. The CV has the disadvantage of being less easily interpretable than the Gini coefficient because its values have no intrinsic meaning (i.e., no upper limit). For example, whereas the Gini coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, the mean CV for 17 Western European countries from 1918 1990s ranged from 0.52 - 3.11 (Caramani 2000).

[7] $PSNS = \sum_{i=1}^{n}(PNS_i * V_i)$ where V_i is the vote share of the ith party.

[8] This is a particular problem for econometric analysis that employs the effective number of parties as a dependent variable and average district magnitude as an explanatory variable and pools countries/elections with varying levels of party nationalization.

[9] Also relevant here are factors such as the percentage of a party's national-level vote accounted for by a province and the percentage of a party's legislators who come from a province.

[10] In the 1960s, Nigeria exemplified the perils of a party system with highly regionalized parties that simultaneously arose from and reinforced ethnic and religious identities. Rather than trying to build bridges across ethnic, territorial, and religious lines, as would have been necessary for parties that aspired to have a nationalized electoral base, party leaders cultivated their own ethnic and territorial bases to the exclusion of others; they inflamed ethnic tensions rather than seeking accommodation. The resulting conflicts contributed to the breakdown of democracy in Nigeria in 1966 (Diamond 1988) and to a lesser degree in 1983.

[11] National territories where citizens vote in national legislative elections are referred to as provinces/states.

[12] In Tables 4, 6, and 7 we group the 17 countries into cases of low, intermediate, and high nationalization based on the PSNSs. These groupings are purely inductive. With a different set of cases, some regrouping would result.

[13] Assume a country has 20 states. If Party A (PA) wins a mean vote share of 50%, the highest possible deviation would be 50% x 20 = 1000%. This would result if PA won 0% of the vote in some states and 100% in the others. If Party B (PB) wins a mean share of 5% of the vote, the highest possible deviation would be (95% x 1) + (5% x 19) = 190%. This would result if PB won 100% in one state and 0% in 19. PA would have the same nationalization score as PB's theoretical maximum (based on winning 100% of

the vote in one state and 0% in 19) if PA won 40.5% of the vote in ten states and 59.5% in the other ten. Yet PA would be obviously and profoundly more nationalized than PB. In fact, it would be impossible for PB to be less nationalized, a fact that is captured by the Gini coefficient.

[14] This correlation would be most likely lower in Western Europe, where despite considerable variance in the effective number of parties, variance in nationalization is lower than in the Americas.

[15] If the descending vote shares are used, then the   Gini coeffcient is the absolute value of this process of subtraction.

REFERENCES

Ames, Barry. 2001. *The Deadlock of Democracy in Brazil*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bawn, Kathleen, Gary W. Cox, and Frances Rosenbluth. 1999. "Measuring the Ties that Bind: Electoral Cohesiveness in Four Democracies." In Bernard Grofman et al., eds., *Elections in Japan under the Single Non Transferable Vote*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Brady, David W. 1985. "A Reevaluation of Realignments in American Politics: Evidence from the House of Representatives." *American Political Science Review* 79: 28–49.

Caramani, Daniele. 2000. *Elections in Western Europe Since 1815: Electoral Results by Constituencies*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Chhibber, Pradeep, and Ken W. Kollman. 1998. "Party Aggregation and the Number of Parties in India and the United States." *American Political Science Review* 92: 329–42.

Claggett, William, William Flanigan, and Nancy Zingale. 1984. "Nationalization of the American Electorate." *American Political Science Review* 78: 77–91.

Cox, Gary W. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creedy, John. 1998. *The Dynamics of Inequality and Poverty: Comparing Income Distributions*. Northhampton, MA: E. Elgar.

Diamond, Larry. 1988. *Class, Ethnicity, and Democracy in Nigeria: The Failure of the First Republic*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Gibson, Edward L., and Ernesto Calvo. 2000. "Federalism and Low-Maintenance Constituencies: Territorial Dimensions of Economic Reform in Argentina." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 35 (3): 32–55.

Harmel, Robert, and Lars Sväsand. 1993. "Party Leadership and Party Institutionalisation: Three Phases of Development." *West European Politics* 16 (2): 67–88.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Janda, Kenneth. 1980. *Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey*. New York: Free Press.

Jenkins, Stephen P. 2001. "ineqdec0.ado." STATA Command. University of Essex.

Kawato, Sadafumi. 1987. "Nationalization and Partisan Realignment in Congressional Elections." *American Political Science Review* 81: 1235–50.

Knutsen, Oddbjørn. 1998. "The Strength of the Partisan Component of Left-Right-Identity: A Comparative Longitudinal Study of Left-Right Party Polarization in Eight West European Countries." *Party Politics* 4: 5–31.

Lijphart, Arend. 1994. *Electoral Systems and Party Systems: A Study of Twenty-Seven Democracies, 1945–1990*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lijphart, Arend. 1977. *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mainwaring, Scott P. 1999. *Rethinking Party Systems in the Third Wave of Democratization: The Case of Brazil*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Mainwaring, Scott, and Timothy R. Scully. 1995. "Introduction: Party Systems in Latin America." In Scott Mainwaring and Timothy R. Scully, eds., *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Mayhew, David R. 1986. *Placing Parties in American Politics: Organization, Electoral Settings, and Government Activity in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Reynolds, Andrew. 1999. *Electoral Systems and Democratization in Southern Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rose, Richard, and Derek W. Urwin. 1975. "Regional Differentiation and Political Unity in Western Nations." Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE. Sage Series Number 06–007.

Samuels, David J. Forthcoming. *Careerism and its Consequences: Federalism, Elections, and Policy Making in Brazil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sani, Giacomo, and Giovanni Sartori. 1983. "Polarization, Fragmentation, and Competition in Western Democracies." In Hans Daalder and Peter Mair, eds., *Western European Party Systems*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1976. *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Shryock, Henry S., Jacob S. Siegel, and Associates. 1976. *The Methods and Materials of Demography*. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Stepan, Alfred C. 2001. "Toward a New Comparative Politics of Federalism, (Multi)Nationalism, and Democracy: Beyond Rikerian Federalism." In Alfred Stepan, *Arguing Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stokes, Donald E. 1965. "A Variance Components Model of Political Effects." In John M. Claunch, ed., *Mathematical Applications in Political Science*. Dallas: Arnold Foundation.

Stokes, Donald E. 1967. "Parties and the Nationalization of Electoral Forces." In William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham, eds., *The American Party Systems: Stages of Political Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sundquist, James L. 1973. *Dynamics of the Party System: Alignment and Realignment of Political Parties in the United States*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Taagepera, Rein, and Matthew Soberg Shugart. 1989. *Seats and Votes: The Effects and Determinants of Electoral Systems*. New Haven: Yale University Press.