

Workshop Proposal Outline form for prospective Workshop Directors for the ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops

Please complete this form, providing the requested additional information in order to support your Joint Sessions Workshop Proposal. Further information can be found on the [How to Propose a Workshop](#) and [Information for Workshop Directors](#) pages of the [ECPR website](#).

Title of proposed Workshop:	Rethinking intra-party cohesion in time of party transformation
Outline of topic:	<p>Intra-party cohesion is a crucial feature of parliamentary democracies. Indeed, government's stability and survival as well as legislative activity greatly depend on the capacity of political parties to work as unified entities. However, parties are not monolithic organizations: they aggregate more or less divergent views; include amateurs and professionals, followers and leaders; and are organized along a hierarchical or stratarchical structure. Intra-party divisions can be frequent between and within the faces of the party: party members' dissatisfaction with their local section (party on the ground - PoG); divisions at party congresses surrounding the elaboration of the party platform or leadership selection (party in central office - PCO); disunity of legislators voting behavior (party in public office - PPO). Given these dissensions, how do parties manage to work as cohesive blocks?</p> <p>This is the topic addressed by this workshop especially that it becomes even more relevant at a time when party organizations are in a continuous process of transformation through processes such as cartelization, intra-party democratization, dealignment and depillarization. These developments are likely to influence the degree of cohesion between and within the faces of the party. For example, we may expect greater dissensions between grassroots supporters and their elites as the latter are moving away from civil society and enhancing their position in the state; while intra-party democratization may increase grassroots' control of their leaders. Intra-party democratization might increase the heterogeneity of interests and ideas among party members, while cartelization might bring resources that leaders can use as 'carrots' to incentivize cohesion among public officials.</p> <p>This workshop aims to achieve four objectives: (1) To define cohesion (with different meaning in the literature); 2) To identify ways to measure cohesion (by broadening the scope of cohesion beyond legislative voting unity, operationalization within and between the faces of the party); (3) To identify determinants of cohesion and (4) To analyze how party transformations affect parties' capacity to appear and function as collective entities.</p>
Relation to existing research:	<p>Intra-party cohesion is inherently ambivalent. On the one hand, intra-party cohesion is a crucial feature of the daily life of parliaments. Cohesiveness directly impacts government's survival (Saalfeld 2009), coalition behavior and bargaining power of the party in public office (Bäck 2008; Giannetti & Benoit 2009; Pedersen 2010). Cohesion is thus highly valued, and is a critical element in parties' policy- and office-seeking strategies. On the other hand, political parties are not, and have never been, monolithic structures: dissensions and conflicts are frequent, and are even functional to the party organization. Intra-party dissensions play a great role in shaping political parties' ideological and policy stances (Harmel & Tan 2003), constitute essential 'engines of change' (DiSalvo 2012), and influence electoral performance (Tavits 2013; Gherghina 2014). Some scholars also discuss the</p>

role that dissent could play in re-invigorating the democratic debate within parties, and in improving parties' representativeness and accountability to their voters (Carey 2009; D. M. Farrell et al. 2015)

Apart from the normative discussion surrounding the functional role of intra-party cohesion, several questions transcend the literature. First, what is intra-party cohesion? The literature lacks a consensus. Research entrenched in structural approaches of party organizations examines intra-party cohesion through the concept of intra-party factionalism (Belloni & Beller 1978; Bettcher 2005; Sartori 1976), thus considering cohesion at a meso-level, and as a collective phenomenon. Another current of the literature considers cohesion at the level of party members, in terms of ideological coherence (May 1973; van Haute & Carty 2012) or 'exit, voice and loyalty' (Hirschman 1970) dynamics (Close 2011; Kato 1998; van Haute 2015). A third field of research is entrenched in legislative studies and has dominated the scene in the last decades. Within this field, the definition of cohesion is also discussed: is cohesion about unity in voting behavior, or is it about homogeneity of preferences before a vote? Should cohesion be distinguished from the concept of discipline? Should cohesion be defined as an outcome or a process? (Andeweg & Thomassen 2011; Bowler et al. 1999; Hazan 2003; Özbudun 1970). Conceptual confusions abound within and between these different fields of research. Besides, they have remained quite impermeable to each other.

Second, how can we measure cohesion? If the definition of intra-party cohesion is multifaceted, the methodological approaches and tools used to measure it are also various. Cohesion can be visible and directly measurable, e.g. legislative voting behavior, members exiting the party, factions recognized in party statutes, or invisible and informal, e.g. dispersed ideological preferences. Cohesion can be measured at the individual-level, or can describe a party-level characteristic –voting unity indexes (Rice 1925). Depending on these theoretical and methodological choices, scholars may rely on qualitative or quantitative approaches, and on static or dynamic tools. Newspapers scrutiny, party memoranda examination and interviews are better fitted for grasping long term processes of intra-party divisions and factionalization (Mershon 2001; DiSalvo 2012), and used in case study analyses or small N comparative studies. More suited for large N comparative studies, quantitative tools are of three main types. First, content analysis of motions adopted in party congresses (PCO) (Ceron 2015) or of legislative speeches (PPO) (Bäck et al. 2011; Proksch & Slapin 2010). Second, legislative voting data, often in the shape of roll-call voting data (Cox & McCubbins 1993; Hix et al. 2005; Sieberer 2006; Carey 2007; Depauw & Martin 2009; Boucek 2012). Third, attitudinal survey data, which help to grasp legislators' preferences or attitudes of loyalty independently from their voting behavior (Kam 2001; Andeweg & Thomassen 2011; van Vonno et al. 2014), and are useful to examine ideological coherence, dissatisfaction, voice and exit of party members (Close 2011; van Haute & Carty 2012). While all these tools have certain limitations, their combination can provide valuable insights on the different types of intra-party cohesion. New methods, such as network analysis, should also be explored.

A third question that transcends the literature deals with the determinants of party cohesion. How is cohesion produced? At the macro-level, scholars highlight the role of state structure, legislative rules and functioning, and electoral systems on legislative cohesion (Sieberer 2006; Carey 2007; Depauw & Martin 2009; Kam 2009; Andeweg & Thomassen 2011; Ceron 2015), factions or exit, voice and loyalty (Kohno 1992; Kato 1998; Cox et al. 1999; Boucek 2012). At the micro level, scholars examine the impact of individual resources, socio-demographic, psychological factors and socialization (Kam 2009; Tavits 2009; Gherghina & Chiru 2013; Russell 2014).

	<p>Party-level factors are also considered, such as candidate selection rules (Kohno 1992; Hazan & Rahat 2006; Shomer 2009; Cordero & Coller 2014), size of the party, government and opposition position –both often related to the size of the governing majority (Sieberer 2006; Carey 2007; Stecker 2013). Some factors remain barely tested, especially at the party level: we know little about how resources, organizational structure (Bolleyer 2011) and intraparty democracy (Hazan & Rahat 2015) would affect cohesion in the different faces of the party, neither we know whether party ideology has any influence (Close 2015). Yet, these organizational aspects, as well as the ideological identity of parties, have been and are still changing considerably. While some studies underline the potential impact of processes such as dealignment (André et al. 2011; Kam 2009) and depillarization (Andeweg & Thomassen 2011) on cohesion, we still do not know much about how party transformations, such as the cartelization trend, affect intra-party cohesion.</p>
--	---

<p>Likely participants:</p>	<p>Given the multifaceted definition of cohesion, applicants for the workshop are likely to come from scholars working on party organization, party membership, party changes and legislative dynamics. These are likely to include authors working in this field and cited in the previous section: Rudy Andeweg (Leiden University), Audrey Andre (Vrije Universiteit Brussels), Hanna Bäck (Lund University), Nicole Bolleyer (University of Exeter), Francoise Boucek (Queen Mary University London), Mihail Chiru (Central European University Budapest), Marc Debus (University of Mannheim), Sam Depauw (Vrije Universiteit Brussels), Reuven Hazan (Hebrew University), Shane Martin (University of Leicester), Gideon Rahat (Hebrew University), Thomas Saalfeld (University of Bamberg), Ulrich Sieberer (Konstanz University), Emilie van Haute (Université Libre de Bruxelles) and Cynthia van Vonno (Leiden University). In addition to these established scholars, our aim is to bring to the workshop emerging scholars and we are aware of a considerable number of researchers conducting their PhD or post-doctoral studies in these fields. Likely participants include members from the Standing Group on Political Parties and from the Standing Group on Parliaments, which we are members of, and collaborators on various comparative projects in which we are involved (e.g. the MAPP or PARTIREP project).</p>
------------------------------------	--

<p>Type of Papers required:</p>	<p>We encourage three types of papers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Theoretical papers that discuss the definition and conceptualization of intra-party cohesion. Such contributions should ideally bring a broad perspective of the concept, by examining it in several faces of the party, or between these faces. 2. Methodological papers addressing the issue of measuring cohesion. Contributions that bring innovative methods and data are particularly welcomed. 3. Empirical papers that seek to explain variation in intra-party cohesion, at the macro-, meso- and micro-levels. We encourage papers that focus specifically on variations between parties, and analyze the role of party-level characteristics – organization, ideology– – and party change. Both case studies of single parties and comparative (large and small N) are invited, although we have a preference for comparative studies. Longitudinal analyses are more than welcomed. We have no preference for qualitative or quantitative techniques of analysis. However, we expect papers presenting single case studies to aim at building, testing, or modifying theories instead of being centered on individual instances. The focus of the workshop is predominantly European (with a coverage of both Western and Eastern countries), but valuable contributions from other geographic areas are welcome.
--	---

Funding:	Most participants will be self-funded from their home institutions. Some funding is available to offset the travel costs of the workshop directors and to prepare the output from the workshop for publication. We will also seek additional funding to promote participation.
Biographical notes:	<p>Caroline Close is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, under a F.R.S.- FNRS grant. Her main research interests are party organization, intraparty politics, party ideology, democratic innovations and legislative studies. She is a member of the Centre d'étude de la vie politique, and she is involved in the international MAPP network (Members and Activists of Political Parties). Recent publications as author and co-author include: 'Assessing Party Research Decline: A View from the British Journal of Political Science', In R. Coman & J.-F. Morin (eds.) <i>Political Science in Motion</i>, Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 2016; 'Green Parties and Elections', in Van Haute (ed) <i>Green parties in Europe</i>, Ashgate, 2015; 'Party members in a pillarised partitocracy: An empirical overview of party membership figures and profiles in Belgium', <i>Acta politica</i>, 48(1), 2013, 68-91; 'At the root of parliamentary party cohesion: the role of intraparty heterogeneity and party ideology', <i>Brussels Working Papers</i> 2016, n°1.</p> <p>Sergiu Gherghina is Lecturer at the Department of Political Science, Goethe University Frankfurt. His research interests are party politics in new democracies (with an emphasis on party organization, recruitment, and mobilization), legislative and voting behavior, and democratization. His research combines qualitative and quantitative approaches. His authored and co-authored works were published in <i>American Journal of Political Science</i>, <i>Comparative European Politics</i>, <i>Democratization</i>, <i>East European Politics</i>, <i>European Political Science Review</i>, <i>European Political Science</i>, <i>European Union Politics</i>, <i>International Political Science Review</i>, <i>Journal of Legislative Studies</i>, <i>Party Politics</i>, and <i>Politics</i>. He has recently published a monograph (Routledge 2014) on party organization and electoral volatility in Central and Eastern Europe. He has successfully co-directed one ECPR workshop at the ECPR JS in Mainz (2013) that resulted in a special issue in <i>Acta Politica</i> (forthcoming 2016).</p>
References:	<p>Andeweg, R.B. & Thomassen, J., 2011. Pathways to party unity: Sanctions, loyalty, homogeneity and division of labour in the Dutch parliament. <i>Party Politics</i>, 17(5), p.655- 672.</p> <p>André, A., Depauw, S. & Deschouwer, K., 2011. Party Unity Norms and Electoral Dealignment. In <i>ECPR Standing Group on Parliaments Conference</i>. Leiden University Institute of Political Science.</p> <p>Bäck, H., 2008. Intra-Party Politics and Coalition Formation Evidence from Swedish Local Government. <i>Party Politics</i>, 14(1), p.71- 89.</p> <p>Bäck, H., Debus, M. & Müller, W.C., 2011. The Ideological Cohesion of Political Parties. In <i>Workshop « Cohesion, Dissent and Partisan Politics in European Legislatures »</i>, ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops. St Gallen.</p> <p>Belloni, F.P. & Beller, D.C. éd., 1978. <i>Faction politics : political parties and factionalism in comparative perspective</i>, Santa Barbara, Californie: ABC-Clio.</p> <p>Bettcher, K.E., 2005. Factions of Interest in Japan and Italy The Organizational and Motivational Dimensions of Factionalism. <i>Party Politics</i>, 11(3), p.339- 358.</p> <p>Bolleyer, N., 2011. New party organization in Western Europe: Of party hierarchies, stratarchies and federations. <i>Party Politics</i>, 18(3), p.315- 336.</p> <p>Boucek, F., 2012. <i>Factional Politics: How Dominant Parties Implode or</i></p>

- Stabilize*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bowler, S., Farrell, D. & Katz, R. éd., 1999. *Party Discipline and Parliamentary Government*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Carey, J.M., 2007. Competing Principals, Political Institutions, and Party Unity in Legislative Voting. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(1), p.92–107.
- Carey, J.M., 2009. *Legislative Voting and Accountability* 1^{re} éd., New-York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ceron, A., 2015. Brave rebels stay home. Assessing the effect of intra-party ideological heterogeneity and party whip on roll-call votes. *Party Politics*, 21(2), p.246- 258.
- Close, C., 2011. Le factionnalisme partisan : imbrication ou concurrence des loyautés ? In *ST11. Etre partisan. Loyauté, prise de parole et défection dans les partis politiques*. 4ème Congrès international des associations francophones de science politique. Bruxelles, Université libre de Bruxelles, p. 1- 30.
- Close, C., 2015. Party cohesion and party ideology: the missing link? In Journée d'étude « Sciences Po Quanti ». Paris, CEVIPOF.
- Cordero, G. & Collier, X., 2014. Cohesion and Candidate Selection in Parliamentary Groups. *Parliamentary Affairs*, p.1- 24.
- Cox, G.W. & McCubbins, M.D., 1993. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cox, G.W., Rosenbluth, F. & Thies, M.F., 1999. Electoral Reform and the Fate of Factions: The Case of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party. *British Journal of Political Science*, 29(01), p.33- 56.
- Depauw, S. & Martin, S., 2009. Legislative party discipline and cohesion in comparative perspective. In D. Giannetti & K. Benoit, éd. *Intra-Party Politics and Coalition Governments*. London & New York: Routledge, p. 103- 120.
- DiSalvo, D., 2012. *Engines of Change: Party Factions in American Politics, 1868-2010*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Farrell, D.M. et al., 2015. Courting but Not Always Serving: Perverted Burkeanism and the Puzzle of Irish Parliamentary Cohesion. In R. Johnston & C. Sharman, éd. *Parties and Party Systems. Structure and Context*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, p. 92- 107.
- Gherghina, S., 2014. *Party Organization and Electoral Volatility in Central and Eastern Europe: Enhancing Voter Loyalty*, London: Routledge.
- Gherghina, S. & Chiru, M., 2013. Determinants of legislative voting loyalty under different electoral systems: Evidence from Romania. *International Political Science Review*, p.0192512113501242 - .
- Giannetti, D. & Benoit, K. éd., 2009. *Intra-Party Politics and Coalition Governments*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Harmel, R. & Tan, A., 2003. Party actors and party change: Does factional dominance matter? *European Journal of Political Research*, 42(3), p.409–424.
- Van Haute, E., 2015. Joining isn't Everything: Exit, Voice, and Loyalty in Party Organizations. In R. Johnston & C. Sharman, éd. *Parties and Party Systems. Structure and Context*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, p. 184- 201.
- Van Haute, E. & Carty, R.K., 2012. Ideological misfits A distinctive class of party members. *Party Politics*, 18(6), p.885- 895.
- Hazan, R.Y., 2003. Does Cohesion Equal Discipline? Towards a Conceptual Delineation. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 9(4), p.1- 11.
- Hazan, R.Y. & Rahat, G., 2015. Parties, Politicians, and Parliaments: The Impact of Intra-Party Democracy on Party Unity. In R. Johnston & C. Sharman, éd. *Parties and Party Systems. Structure and Context*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, p. 108- 126.

- Hazan, R.Y. & Rahat, G., 2006. The influence of candidate selection methods on legislatures and legislators: Theoretical propositions, methodological suggestions and empirical evidence. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 12(3-4), p.366- 385.
- Hirschman, A.O., 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hix, S., Noury, A. & Roland, G., 2005. Power to the Parties: Cohesion and Competition in the European Parliament, 1979–2001. *British Journal of Political Science*, 35(02), p.209- 234.
- Kam, C.J., 2001. Do Ideological Preferences Explain Parliamentary Behaviour? Evidence from Great Britain and Canada. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 7(4), p.89- 126.
- Kam, C.J., 2009. *Party Discipline and Parliamentary Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kato, J., 1998. When the Party Breaks Up: Exit and Voice among Japanese Legislators. *The American Political Science Review*, 92(4), p.857- 870.
- Kohno, M., 1992. Rational Foundations for the Organization of the Liberal Democratic Party in Japan. *World Politics*, 44(03), p.369- 397.
- May, J.D., 1973. Opinion Structure of Political Parties: The Special Law of Curvilinear Disparity. *Political Studies*, 21(2), p.135- 151.
- Mershon, C., 2001. Party factions and coalition government: portfolio allocation in Italian Christian Democracy. *Electoral Studies*, 20(4), p.555- 580.
- Özbudun, E., 1970. *Party Cohesion in Western Democracies: A Causal Analysis*, Sage Publications.
- Pedersen, H.H., 2010. How intra-party power relations affect the coalition behaviour of political parties. *Party Politics*, 16(6), p.737- 754.
- Proksch, S.-O. & Slapin, J.B., 2010. Position Taking in European Parliament Speeches. *British Journal of Political Science*, 40(03), p.587- 611.
- Rice, S.A., 1925. The Behavior of Legislative Groups: A Method of Measurement. *Political Science Quarterly*, 40(1), p.60- 72.
- Russell, M., 2014. Parliamentary party cohesion: Some explanations from psychology. *Party Politics*, 20(5), p.712- 723.
- Saalfeld, T., 2009. Intra-party conflict and cabinet survival in 17 West European democracies, 1945-1999. In D. Giannetti & K. Benoit, éd. *Intra-Party Politics and Coalition Governments*. London & New York: Routledge, p. 169- 186.
- Sartori, G., 1976. *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shomer, Y., 2009. Candidate Selection Procedures, Seniority, and Vote-Seeking Behavior. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(7), p.945- 970.
- Sieberer, U., 2006. Party unity in parliamentary democracies: A comparative analysis. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 12(2), p.150- 178.
- Stecker, C., 2013. How effects on party unity vary across votes. *Party Politics*, (Online First), p.1- 12.
- Tavits, M., 2013. *Post-Communist Democracies and Party Organization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tavits, M., 2009. The Making of Mavericks. Local Loyalties and Party Defection. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(6), p.793- 815.
- Van Vonno, C.M.C. et al., 2014. Agreement, Loyalty and Discipline: A Sequential Approach to Party Unity. In K. Deschouwer & S. Depauw, éd. *Representing the people. A survey among members of statewide and substate parliaments*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 110- 136.