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PART I: DESCRIBING AND COMPARING THE COMPONENTS

Chapter 1: Dimensions of Party Nationalization: Static and Dynamic

U.S. House Speaker Tip O’Neil famously proclaimed that “all politics is local.” But politics is more local in some countries than others, and at some times than at others. Why? When, where, and how do local issues influence national elections or legislative politics more generally? How do we define and measure the degree of local influences in a manner that allows analysis across a broad range of countries? These are the questions that motivate this book.

To address these questions, I operationalize "local politics" as the inverse of party nationalization, which I measure across two dimensions, termed static and dynamic, using analyses of district-level data from legislative elections. A central thesis is that together the two dimensions provide a window into the relative importance to voters of local versus national concerns, and thus explain much about representation, legislative elections, party strategy and organization, and parliamentary politics. To explore this and subordinate theories, the book uses the data to detail the levels of localism across the world, explores sources of the variation, and evaluates the impacts on electoral accountability and collaboration among legislators.

Academic and press accounts of elections, frequently and sometimes explicitly, discuss the inverse relation of "local politics" and the "nationalization" of parties or elections. In the United States, for example, a recent theme has been whether changes to campaign finance laws have heightened the role of national politics in individual districts. Some evidence also points to the increasing partisan "waves" and a decreasing role of local factors in congressional elections. The growing importance of national advertising campaigns is also a part of the debate. The parties themselves apparently think in these terms; the Democratic Party, for example, reportedly discussed the risks involved of using the Tea Party movement to "nationalize" the 2010 midterm elections (Calmes and Shear, NYT 9/19/2010). Then in 2016 as the Republicans were worrying about the effect on sub-national electoral contests of their party’s leading presidential candidate, Donald Trump, the Washington Post cited a top aid to Senate Majority leader saying: “If there are crosscurrents that are potentially harmful, the most important thing you can do is aggressively localize the race — the things that matter back home, the problems you’re solving,” (Gold and Kane, 3/23/16).

The terms are also common in popular and academic discussions of elections in other countries. In Argentina, a candidate for governor in the province of Catamarca exclaimed that "luckily and by the grace of God the [gubernatorial] election has not been nationalized" (my translation; Infobae 3/13/11). Two years later, the Argentine president worked precisely in the opposite way, centralizing the candidate selection process to name candidates who supported the "national project" (Poggi 2013). In India, news reports focus on the dominance of local issues in national elections (Sengupta, 4/16/2009), and the Carnegie Endowment debated whether the 2009 election implied more of a "re-nationalization ....[or] regionalization of Indian politics (Jaffrelot and Grare, 11/8/2012). In Japan Reed, Scheiner, and Thies (2012 p. 364) note that "Koizumi managed to nationalize the election around a single idea (reform) and to convince voters that a vote for the LDP nominee in their district was a vote for reform." Further examples come from other corners of the globe, as highlighted in the following titles: "Electoral Nationalisation, Dealignment and Realignment: Australia and the US, 1900-88" (Leithner 1997), "Elections and Nationalization of the Vote in Post-Communist Russian Politics: A Comparative Perspective," (Ishiyama 2002) and "A 'Nationalization 'Process? Federal Politics and State Elections in West Germany" (Pridham 1973).

Analysts, parties, and voters raise these issues because the local-national balance dramatically changes the emphasis in campaigns and the political process. When campaigns are local, sub-national politicians (e.g. legislators or governors) can ignore mandates from their (national) political parties. Budgeting in such a scenario would emphasize district demands rather
than national priorities. That production of the B-1 bomber has ties to over 400 of the 435 US Congressional districts is a clear example of how localism overshadows concerns with efficiency (Haggard and Webb, p. X). On the other hand, where politics are nationalized, funds are likely to be centralized and parties can develop policies and campaigns without concern that politicians tied to a particular area will distort the broader message or block reform efforts. Large restructuring programs and other policies that yield regional shifts in economic advantages—as most do—are thus more feasible when there are low levels of local politics.

Because I am interested in the comparative study of local politics, I require precise definitions and statistically valid measures of local politics. I use a close study of electoral data for these purposes. Such data can reveal at least two particular patterns that indicate when and where politics revolve around local rather than national affairs. First, electoral data can show whether a party is equally popular around the country, or wins most support from particular regions. With a bit more coding, the data can also show whether parties have more success in a particular type of constituency, such as in urban areas. Second, they can also show whether (or the degree to which) voters in all localities respond in similar ways to national issues and debates. Where they do not, I will argue, local politics must come into the voters’ calculus.

Descriptions for these two party characteristics have come under many names. Some of these names, such as the personal vote or incumbency advantage, have stressed the local aspect. Alternatively, those that have measured and described "national forces" or the "party vote" have emphasized the issue from the opposite angle. The most general term applied to these concepts is "nationalization," but sometimes this term has been incautiously applied to both concepts. In this book I borrow this common word, but add adjectives that grow from the statistical operationalization of the concepts that I describe in Chapter <3>. I use “static nationalization” (SN) to imply the degree of homogeneity in a party’s vote across a country at a particular point in time. “Dynamic nationalization” (DN) captures the consistency in the change in a party’s vote in each district across time. Throughout the book, then, I am careful to use these adjectives, including them in square brackets when referring to other authors who omit the qualifying word.

The terms static and dynamic have statistical bases, and they highlight the independence of the concepts. Not only are these concepts (almost) theoretically independent, the empirical tests I provide in Chapter <4> show very weak empirical relations. For example, while neither the U.S. nor the U.K. parties are statically nationalized, the change in the vote for most British MP’s (i.e. the level of DN) is much more consistent than for U.S. members of Congress.

The US-UK comparison give a first hint at why considering just one dimension of party nationalization provides a misleading view of political geography, localism, and the nature of politics. When static but not dynamic nationalization is low, the winds of change affect a party in all corners of a country in a similar manner, regardless of the relative strength of the party in those corners. But where DN is also low, improvements in one region would not foretell a national surge. For the United States, because of the high relevance of incumbency, a legislator’s retirement can sometimes causes sharp changes in the vote in a district that are inconsistent with national trends. Some districts will also respond in unique ways due to their particular sociodemographics, economic engines, employment bases, or the quality of their candidates. To provide a second example, both Spain’s People’s Party (PP) and the Germany’s Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union (CDU/CSU) alliance have important variance in their regional support (low SN), but when there is a change in support, the two parties experience that change in sharply different manners as the different levels of DN attest. As a result, when Spain’s Socialists were thrown out of office in 2011 due to the county’s financial debacle, the PP was unable to take full advantage because some regions chose alternative parties. By contrast, when Germany’s ruling alliance, the CDU/CSU, grew by an average of six points in 2013, it reaped benefits in all but six of the 243 electoral districts where there had been no boundary changes, and in only two of those districts did it lose more than one percent. These types of contrasts are sometimes apparent within countries. Spain’s Socialists had higher static and dynamic
nationalization than the PP, and thus the 2011 collapse affected the party everywhere. Moving to Latin America, the three major parties in Uruguay have high DN, but regional differences are much sharper for the Broad Front than the Reds, with the National Party (Whites) fitting between the two poles. Clearly, both types of nationalization affect how the parties view politics, and thus both are essential to political analyses.

While the two nationalization concepts are independent, each has been associated with similar causes, effects, and measurements. For example, studies tie institutional variables, such as whether a system employs a presidential or parliamentary system, different aspects of the electoral system, and federalism, to both types of nationalization. Other factors that affect party systems, such as ethnic heterogeneity and parties' roots in society, are also potential explanatory variables for one or both dimensions of nationalization. Chapters <5 and 6> delve into this conundrum of using similar factors to explain independent outcomes.

The book also studies these two phenomena together because measurements of both derive from electoral data. While other operationalizations are possible, comparative analysis prescribes measuring SN as the distribution of a party's vote across a country, and DN as the change in the district-level vote. Again, while the distribution and its change are independent of one another, because both concepts are measured as derivatives of district-level electoral data, studies of one naturally belong with the other.

Armed with these more precise definitions and a methodology to measure the concepts, the book embarks on a comparative analysis that covers scores of parties in democracies from diverse corners of the world. The descriptive analysis is useful in and of itself, since while there have been multi-country statistical studies of volatility and what I term static nationalization, the dynamic dimension of nationalization—which is perhaps the more novel and intriguing of the concepts—has generally avoided cross-national analysis. The book moves past description, however, in several ways. First, the project emphasizes the importance of and means to incorporate geography or nationalization into conceptualizations of parties. Second, the book uses empirical data help to corroborate the theoretic claim about the limited relation between the two aspects of nationalization. Third, the data generate criteria from which to classify parties, which, in turn, facilitate tests that can explain the source of variation. Finally, the book considers some of the consequences of the varying levels of both dimensions of nationalization. Together these analyses provide ways to answer whether (or to what degree) party politics follow national trends rather than local issues, events, and personalities.

**Why Study Party Nationalization?**

Nationalization is central to the representative process, since it shows the geographic basis of a party’s electoral support. As I illustrate below in graphical form, it does so in two ways: a) as the consistency in a party’s support across a nation and b) as the degree to which changes in that support are consistent in different regions. A party is nationalized, then, if support is similar everywhere and when changes in support in one region are reflected across the country. Nationalization is a relevant description of the first dimension, since it indicates the degree to which a nation’s different regions are integrated. Strong variance on this dimension, by contrast, would indicate that local factors, perhaps heightened regional identities or economic interests, drive political loyalties. The second dimension also indicates an aspect of nationalization, because when a party’s support in all geographic units changes by a similar magnitude, national events must have a similar effect on all parts of a country.¹ The reverse is even clearer: if the changes (swings) are inconsistent across regions, then local factors must play a role in elections.

¹ Below I reference and discuss Katz (1973), who argues that national events can have dissimilar effects across regions.
The geographic basis of a party’s support—nationalization—influences party politics and representation by determining a party’s orientation towards distribution of public resources, support for region-specific interests, and the degree of unity or perhaps the sense of purpose with which a party addresses these and other policies. When policies affect voters from distinct regions in different ways, then the legislators who represent each region might be uncomfortable teammates. Will, for example, Democrats from the US South collaborate from those in the Northeast, given that gun policy, social issues, and views on trade and welfare have very different electoral consequences in the two regions? How do Canadian Conservatives from Quebec discuss the redistribution of tax resources among provinces with their colleagues from other parts of the country? Or how do Spanish People’s Party legislators elected in Catalonia or the Basque Country view regional autonomy in comparison with those hailing from Madrid? In some cases the coach (party leader) may have tools or enough influence to keep the team together, but in others it will be difficult for all the players to get behind a common strategy. In political terms, this might mean the difference between coherent policy proposals that the party can actively promote, and fragmented policy proposals with a lack of consensus that yields a bias towards minimal change or stagnation. Roberts (2014) concurs, explaining that internal divisions in a party “render[] the party’s programmatic stance incoherent” (p. 55). Those interested in representation can then analyze whether stagnation is Pareto optimal, providing the greatest good without some players being hurt.

In spite of its clear relevance to politics and representation, political geography generally, or nationalization specifically, is mostly absent in theoretical descriptions of parties and party systems. It is not apt here to review in detail all of the conceptions of these institutions, but it is necessary to place nationalization within the context of other traits that define them. In this telling, even though the ideas are sometimes only implicit or lacking, I emphasize the role of geography in six classic analytical frameworks. In loose chronological order, these divide parties and party systems based on: class, the number of parties, whether they serve national rather than parochial interests, how they represent ethnic cleavages, organizational structures, and institutionalization. In this discussion I follow many other studies and move between discussions of parties and party systems. This is sometimes problematic, since some systems are composed of different types of parties. In the following section I use this reasoning to emphasize the importance of a focus on parties but here I focus on the importance of nationalization in conceptualizing parties and the systems to which they belong.

The earliest classifications (e.g. Michels, 1915) divided parties according to adjectives such as “oligarchical,” “mass,” and “catch all” and these terms are still prominent (e.g. Roberts 2014). These studies were concerned with the inauguration of representative democracy, and class was a more prominent concern than regionalism. The degree to which parties institutionalize (Panebianco, 1988) or “integrate” potential factions (Duverger, 1954) is another way theorists have classified parties, but even these well-known studies spend little time evaluating the size, shape, or influence of parties’ regional bases.

The next prominent variable for classifying party systems, with clear implications for representation, is the number of parties. At one end of the scale, single party systems delineate the breach between democracy and autocracy. Beyond one, the number of parties speaks to the issues of representation through its implications for ideological diversity. The landmark studies of Duverger (1954) and Downs (1957) established the idea that two party systems should tend to produce centrist politics, while more parties would produce a broader range of options see also Cox 1990). Geography can enter into this discussion in several ways. First, wider ideological representation would facilitate the development of parties with a regional base. The concern, then, is with the relation among regions and their supporters. As Cox (1997) and Chhibber and Kollman (2004) ask, why and when is a single party able to gain support across regions in some countries, while in others separate parties form to represent different regions? This literature, in sum, ties
representation to the number of parties, and at least the more recent versions do have an explicit tie
to political geography.

Different from those studies concerned with regional representation per se, another strand
of literature divides parties or party systems according to whether they serve national or parochial
interests. In these studies, parties and party systems divide based on the degree of personalism
and clientelism—politics that takes a local focus— on one end of the scale and on the other, the
degree to which parties provide “clarity of responsibility” (Powell 2000) or "programmatic
structuration" (Kitschelt et al., 2010). The large body of work on political parties in the United
States centers on this debate. It is marked at one extreme by Mayhew's (1974) work that
highlighted legislators' independence from parties and personal ties to their constituencies. While
not discounting legislators' interests in pursuing policies and organizational structures that would
help them with their geographically bounded constituencies, the work on both U.S. and other
world legislatures spawned by Cox and McCubbins (1993) on parties as "cartels" marks a different
pole in this debate, since it provides a rationale for parties to build a structure within the
legislature that would help them to pursue national as well as parochial goals.

The fourth branch of literature about types of political parties and party systems does have
an explicit concern with geography, as it focuses on prescriptions for dealing with ethnic and
regional divisions. Lijphart's (1977) "consociational" prescription, for example, calls for
empowering ethnic or regional parties and fostering inter-party cooperation that would necessarily
cross geographic lines. Horowitz (1985) takes the opposing view, arguing that electoral systems
and other rules should encourage coalitions that cross ethnic (which are frequently regional)
divisions. Reilly's (2002) call for the alternative vote (in which voters provide preference rankings
for their choices) fits into this camp, as well. These issues are of interest, since they explicitly
consider regional parties and the ability of parties to gain support in different regions. They
provide useful case studies to show how different countries have succeeded or failed due to
different arrangements. What they have not done, however, is to provide a general framework to
compare, contrast, and measure the role of regional support for parties.

Work on the organizational structure of parties has moved away from a focus on
geo-graphy. For Panebianco (1988), among the factors that define a party's organizational structure
whether the party was built from national elites "penetrating" different territories, or regional
elites banding together ("diffusion"). Geography is evident in this discussion, but the extensive
literature on "institutionalization" which builds from organizational theory largely ignores this
topic. Mainwaring and Scully’s (1995), landmark study, for example, defines institutionalization
of parties or systems based on electoral volatility, roots in society, democratic legitimacy, and the
stability of party rules and structures, but not (explicitly) geography.\(^2\)

While the literature on party institutionalization largely omits discussions of geography, it
does hint at the subject in discussing the importance of parties in organizing groups or in the word
of Filipov et al. (2004) "integration." These authors rationalize federalism from both economic and
political perspectives. Within the political dimension, federalism allows representation of
minorities, decentralization of conflicts, a means (perhaps a 'payment' in exchange for autonomy)
to maintain disparate regional groups within the national aegis, and to contain or resolve regional
conflicts. They argue that parties play a central role in these processes—which can be positive or
negative. Parties are motivated, they argue, by electoral systems and geography. Focusing on the
latter, they continue that an ideal party in a federal system must integrate national and local elites
and structures. Among other criteria for assessing integration they query whether the party has an
organizational structure at the national, local, and regional level; whether there is a coattails effect
between local and national elections, and; how well the party's national platform is acceptable to

\(^2\) Their study focuses on party systems, but the organizational focus applies to individual parties. See discussion
below, citing Randall and Svasand (2002), who separate measures of institutionalization for parties and party systems.
the different regions. In a study of Argentina, Feierherd (2012) adds that "denationalization has weakened party integration" (my translation).

Traditional variables have facilitated categorization and advanced our understanding of the parties and party systems that are the basis of representative democracy. But while geography and nationalization are definitional for the representative role of political parties, these traits are only implicit, if not ignored, in most theoretical discussions of party organization. The two dimensions of nationalization capture the geographic aspects of politics, and thus can add nuance to other means for categorizing parties. Studying these concepts, however, requires more precision. What is nationalization? How does it affect political parties and thereby relate to representation? A crucial first step in exploring these questions is justifying the analytical focus on parties rather than party systems.

**A Focus on Parties before Party Systems**

In the preceding discussion I moved back and forth between discussions of parties and party systems. This analytical laxity is sometimes problematic, because as the extensive study of rational choice and collective action has shown, components of a group do not always represent the group itself. Translating to this book, it is problematic to study party systems because there may be significant differences among the parties that comprise them. A party system, for example, can mix old and new, hierarchical and disaggregated, radical and moderate, big and small. It can also mix parties with a national focus with others whose support is regional. Critics of the institutionalization literature have taken note of this problem, leading Randall and Svasand (2002), for example, to create a model to separately measure institutionalization of parties and that of the party system. In sum, understanding parties, and the politicians that comprise them, therefore, is a necessary precedent for discussing party systems. As a result, this book focuses on nationalization of parties, only discussing party systems as the interaction of the component parties.

In many countries the most prominent parties do follow similar trends, and thus country-level institutional variables are appropriate and statements about the party system are reasonable. Further, and regardless of their differences, the parties, of course, do interact, and thus it would also be incorrect to hermetically separate them. In Chapter <7> I thus explicitly discuss the interaction of nationally competitive parties with those that are only prominent in a particular region. But, for the countries where parties vary in terms of nationalization, system-level labels—unless they acknowledge the variance—will be misleading. For example, are systems such as those in Canada, the UK, or Spain nationalized or regionalized, given that some parties in these countries compete only in particular regions while others compete everywhere? Studying trends in these types of systems would necessarily have to focus on the individual parties. Further, understanding the forces that led to this particular form of a system, or the effects that that system has on the political process, would require attention to the individual parties. This idea implies that while hypotheses regarding the causes or effects of system nationalization would have implications for parties, the reverse may not be true. For example, some parties may form due to national movements while others form, perhaps at different times, as the result of rising regional demands. In short, discussing a nationalized system suggests that all parties are similar, but in many cases this is inappropriate. An analytical focus at the party level, then, increases the precision of the analysis and encourages a discussion of the interaction among parties, while system-level analysis too often ignores the intricacies of the components that make up the system.

Focusing at the party rather than the system level has other advantages. First, the statistical approach I develop provides distinct measures for parties. These values quantify the variance in a party’s support across time and across space, and I show that some countries house a variety of party types. Because of this variance, I argue with empirical examples in Chapter <3> that a
weighted average of the party results can yield a party system score, but such summary statistics can be misleading. Several configurations of national and local parties, for example, can yield (weighted) averages that place the “system” near the center of the range. In sum, an average (even if weighted) of parties would not necessarily provide a good view of the system. Therefore, while there are theoretical and practical interests in the party system, the book explicitly focuses at the party level to avoid improper generalizations.

**Defining and Depicting the Dimensions of Party Nationalization**

Since the term first appeared in a 1959 book review of Schattschneider’s work, "nationalization" has become a common word in studies of parties and party systems. Its usage, however, has not been consistent. Building on Schattschneider (1960), Stokes (1965, 1967) used the term to discuss the impact of national events on elections, and thus termed an election nationalized if his "district effect" (defined in Chapter <3>) was small. He also discussed a “national effect,” which he measured as the size of the average change in party support, something close to the common notion of volatility.

Part of the definitional conflict is whether “nationalization” should apply to distributions of parties or of voters. Lago and Montero (2013) build on Caramani (2000, 2004) and Bochsler (2010) while considering both possibilities in their discussions. For the first, the level of nationalization is dependent on the extent to which a party competes or has affiliates in all districts. These and other authors measure, in a variety of ways that I detail in Chapter <3>, the second aspect based on the degree to which support for the party is homogeneous across the country, which is the most common use of the concept (e.g. Rokkan 1970; Caramani 2000, 2004; Jones and Mainwaring 2003).

Part of the problem in those studies is that using “nationalization” without a modifier to describe the distribution of the vote disallows the possibility that the term has other conceptions. Some studies have followed Stokes’s early conceptions, and used more careful terminology to separately describe the distribution of the vote and the consistency in over-time movements. Claggett, Flanigan, and Zingale (1984), for example, discuss “convergence” and “uniform response” as the two aspects of nationalization (see also, Kawato, 1987). While using separate terminology for the two concepts is a step forward, given that both refer to the local-national balance of a party’s support I prefer to maintain the base term “nationalization.” My solution to the dual meanings is to add the adjectives “static” and “dynamic” to signify, respectively, the consistency in regional distributional of a party’s support and the consistency in change across geographic units.

I conjure the term *static nationalization* because it describes the distribution of a party's support at a particular moment in time. In contrast to a party with strengths and weaknesses in particular regions, a statically nationalized party would have similar levels of support throughout a country. While the term “static” is apt for evaluating an event at a particular point in time, is imperfect, since the distribution of support can change over time. An alternative term might be cross-district nationalization, but I prefer the term "static" to establish the contrast from the second concept, "dynamic."

An election for a party is dynamically nationalized when the change in that party's support across elections is consistent throughout the country. When a party with high DN gains support in one district or defined geographic unit, then, it would have a similar experience elsewhere. The

---

3 While the notions of both types of nationalization have been bandied about since at least 1950, the term “party nationalization” has its first JSTOR appearance in 1959, in a review discussing Schattschneider's work (Goldman, 1959), though Schattschneider himself first used the term “nationalization of party alignments” in a 1954 book review.
alternative here, where support goes up in some areas and down in others, would be an election where local factors are important. For this reason, low DN implies a high "local vote."

Low DN would be consistent with by at least two broad types of national politics. At one extreme the districts could all move independently. At the other, there could be subsets of districts, perhaps from a single region or with a particular profile (e.g. urban, ethnic minorities, wealthy), that move together. While each type would produce low DN, the localism would have different impacts on representation and party organization. In the former, legislators would be independent and sui generis factors would drive voting patterns. In the latter, there might be clear factions in the party, organized around the issues that bind subsets of districts. Chapter <9> considers the latter idea, looking at whether legislators from districts that move together are more likely to cooperate in the legislature.

Figure <1.1> follows the technique employed by Mustillo and Mustillo (2012) to demonstrate these two dimensions of party nationalization, using electoral districts as the geographic unit of interest graphs for other parties and countries are in Appendix 1 at the end of this book and my Cambridge University Press and personal websites (http://www.polisci.pitt.edu/person/scott-morgenstern). For a single party in each of three countries, the figure depicts the district-level legislative electoral results across several elections. Each line in the graph represents a different district, so each shows the trajectory for one party in that district from one election to the next. For example, the Social Democrats (PPD/PSD) in Portugal had support ranging from about 30 to 65 percent in 1991 across the country's 20 districts, a level of inconsistency that suggests a low or moderate level of static nationalization. At the same time, however, a very similar percentage of voters in each district moves towards or away from the party in each election. The remarkable similarity in the change of support in each district, as indicated by high degree of parallelism among the lines, suggests that the voters who are willing to shift their alliances must be responding to national rather than local stimuli. This is the embodiment of high DN.

-- Figure 1.1: Party Nationalization in Three Countries --

Other parties show very distinctive patterns. The second graph represents the support of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) in the proportional representation (PR) tier of the three elections between 2003 and 2009. Japan has a two-tier electoral system, with 180 Diet members chosen through this tier, and the other 300 chosen in single member districts. Here I focus on the PR tier, though later I show that the other tier produces a distinct pattern. The party's support in the PR tier fits within a narrow range (standard deviation of 4.7) across the 47 prefectures, suggesting a much higher level of SN than for the Portuguese PPD/PSD. The LDP lost about 10 points in the average district between 2005 and 2009, but this hit was felt with similar force in all the provinces. This consistent change, captured through the parallel lines in the figure, reflects high DN.

Finally, the graph for legislative election for Chile’s Concertación coalition shows a situation with low levels of both static and dynamic nationalization. The party wins an average of about 50% each year, but it is much stronger in some districts than others. SN is therefore low. Note that this party's support is qualitatively different from a party whose low SN is based on having little or no support in some districts but high support in others. Because DN is also low for the Concertacion (as indicated by the lack of parallelism among the lines) there are not particular areas where the party is always strong or weak. A regional party might also have low SN, but there would be consistency in the overtime patterns, as in the graph of Portugal’s PPD/PSD. That

---

4 Mustillo and Mustillo also discuss other dimensions, namely the idea of "fanning in" or "fanning out." I discuss this further in Chapter <3>.

5 The ideal types will become clear in the discussions of Caramani (2000, 2004) and Jones and Mainwaring (2003) that I begin to discuss later in this chapter. As noted, they use the term "nationalization" without qualifiers, and I thus add square brackets to add the necessary adjectives.
party is much weaker in the south, and thus the lines in the graph that represent southern provinces are consistently below the others. Local politics plays a vital but different role in the two countries. In Portugal it explains why the PPD/PSD has consistently lower support in some regions, but in Chile the sharp changes in the vote both over time and among districts must indicate that localism is both highly relevant and variable. The lack of a nationally coherent pattern that is captured by the low DN could be the result of different districts reacting in dissimilar ways to national campaigns or policies, but the localism could also be the result of changing candidates who are able to focus on different local issues and whose personal qualities also vary.6

These pictures highlight the challenges for measurement and theoretical discussions of nationalization. Not only are there two aspects of nationalization (and other components of variance) in the party’s support, outliers will bias estimates, and comparisons among differently sized parties can yield misleading results. Chapter <3> delves more deeply into the measurement challenges, and focuses on a particular hierarchical model that simultaneously analyzes the two types of variance evident in the graphs. That model, based on Stokes’s original components of variance analysis, provides statistically valid measurements for SN and DN, allowing comparisons cross time and among parties. The next chapter then uses the wealth of empirical data to explore both the theoretical and empirical combinations of the two types of nationalization. Although both aspects of nationalization are measured from electoral data, they are theoretically distinct phenomena and the data confirm that the two dimensions are empirically independent. But, what are the implications for democracy when parties score high on one, the other, both, or neither dimension? What factors lead to these different combinations? Those are subjects for this book.

To move towards that discussion, the next section explores some questions that the two dimensions of nationalization can help to address.

Why Focus on Two Dimensions of Party Nationalization

Armed with more precise definitions of party nationalization, this section moves beyond the general discussion of the importance of geography to party definitions to consider ways that the two dimensions, separately and perhaps in tandem, affect party organization and representation. The discussion begins with DN, with a focus on questions about the relation between parties and their legislators. Many of these questions stem from studies of the personal vote, but here I develop the idea of “local vote.” The section on SN, then, discusses the importance of regionalism to parties. Together, the sections explore representation from the perspective of the linkages between a national party and those who represent different regions.

Why Study Dynamic Nationalization?
Beyond contributing to debates about nationalization generally, DN is of particular interest because it provides a direct measure of the degree to which legislators are electorally independent from their parties. This theme has roots in Schattschneider’s (1950) concerns about weak parties and local-oriented politics in the United States, and it is also tied to more recent literature on party organization and the personal vote. As head of the American Political Science Association, Schattschneider and colleagues argued that U.S. parties should develop more centralized structures, in part because he saw a “shift [towards] national politics.” Party structures, meanwhile, lagged behind, because state and local branches had too much sway over candidate choice, committee membership, and the presidential election. In his 1960 opus, Schattschneider

6 For an explanation of the high DN in Chile, see Morgenstern, Polga, and Siavelis (2013). We argue, in general, that the electoral institutions promote personal vote-seeking activities by the candidates, as well as many changing candidacies, including independents.
continues this discussion, arguing about the importance of uniformity in political opinions across the polity, which he believed would help end regional conflicts and create a national majority. Parties rooted in different regions, he argued, hampered accountability because such a system implies limited competition. To be clear, he does not expect homogeneous opinions of individuals, but nationalization implies that the parties had a relatively even number of supporters in all regions.

The degree to which legislators are independent from their parties has been a major theme in studies of U.S. and comparative politics. Studies of the personal vote, for example, question whether more independent-minded legislators will develop coherent policy proposals, pursue constituency service, or break from their parties. As such, the party-legislator relation also influences voting patterns. If, in an effort to sway voters, legislators can rely on their personal qualities instead of just national partisan politics, then they will have incentives to provide constituency service or push for pork and particularistic politics to serve their districts (Mayhew 1974; Cain, Ferejohn, and Fiorina 1984, 1987; Carey and Shugart 1995). Mayhew predicted that such legislators would pursue credit claiming, position taking, and advertising—means for building their district-level support, perhaps pursuing personal (reelection) goals rather than national or partisan priorities. Legislators’ focus on personal over national interests could have negative “implications for party cohesion in the legislature, party support for the executive, and ultimately, the ability to enforce national electoral accountability in the system” (Cain et al. 1984, p. 111).

Overall, the level of the personal vote puts into contrast the poor quality of political representation in pork-ridden systems such as Italy, Colombia, and Brazil with more nationally centered party systems such as Britain (Mainwaring 1999; Geddes 1991; Shugart and Carey 1992; Haggard and Kaufman 1995).

The idea behind DN is closely tied to these concerns, but the culprit of weakened partisan responsibility becomes the distinct characteristics and varying interests of different electoral districts rather than the characteristics and qualities of individual candidates. Every party in every country fields a multiplicity of legislative candidates each with distinct personalities, qualifications, and campaigning prowess. In some cases these characteristics influence the voters, but in others party platforms, national events, and the economy determine voters’ preferences.

The idea of a personal vote is meant to capture the degree to which these differences are manifested in voting. But as Katz (1973) and others have argued, the personal vote literature has ignored the possibility that national level shocks have variable effects across localities. For example, a national policy to reduce farm subsidies would not affect Democrats in New York with the same force as it would in Kansas. The differential movement in the vote in these two states, then, should not be solely attributable to the personal qualities of the candidates, but also to the ethnic, social, and economic makeup of the district. As a result, Swindle and I (2005) argued that while the “personal vote” was a poor moniker for the concept that Stokes had tried to measure, it was useful to measure and study the combined impact of local and/or candidate factors on the vote. We thus apply the term “local vote” to capture the idea that voters are impacted by both candidate qualities and district characteristics. The concept of the local vote, in sum, is meant to make explicit that variances in a party's district level votes can result from candidate qualities, district characteristics, or both.

There is one other important distinction between the local and personal vote: the focus on parties in the former and individuals in the latter. Since its focus is on individuals, students of the personal vote have studied systems where parties put forth a single candidate (e.g. the United States) or voters are able to choose amongst a party’s multiple candidates (e.g. Colombia, Brazil, pre-1993 Japan, or Uruguay). This focus, however, leaves aside the large group of countries where voters choose among party lists. This is an important oversight, since these lists have differentiable personalities that may have strong effects on voting patterns. The local vote, then,
focuses on a party’s total vote in a given district, whether that vote is targeted towards an individual candidate, applied to a party list, or distributed among multiple party candidates.⁷

In sum, where the local vote is strong—that is where candidate qualities or district characteristics matter for voter choices—the candidates’ campaign styles, popularity and/or the variability in the local socioeconomic structure will affect how voters feel or interpret the impact of national policies and other stimuli. For example, national decisions that address issues such as agriculture, gun regulation, trade patterns, abortion rights, or civil rights might be advantageous to a party in one district and deleterious (or less advantageous) in others. This should be true even when first accounting for a party’s underlying support levels in the different districts.⁸

Furthermore, where there is a significant local vote, more able candidates (as individuals or as a team) will have greater success in spinning the issues to the party’s advantage or attracting the undecided voter.

Of course the standing of the party nationally and the swings in national mood are also important to legislators, as well described by Cox and McCubbins (1993). They argue that U.S. legislators win by a combination of personal and party reputation. This helps explain why, in addition to pursuing the personal vote, legislators also delegate significant powers to their party leaders to shore up the party’s reputation.

Testing these types of theories requires operationalization of the personal or local vote. The statistical analysis of DN resolves this concern by providing a direct measure of behavior that it is comparable across countries and time periods. The main alternative, proxying the personal vote by coding electoral systems, is problematic, because the measures are only indirect. Studies in this vein frequently use a coding based on Carey and Shugart's (1995) model that is carefully titled "Incentives to cultivate the personal vote" (my italics).⁹ Among the many examples that work along these lines are two well-known studies of corruption (Kunicová and Rose-Ackerman, 2005; Persson, Tabellini, and Trebbi, 2003) those that focus on trade policy (Nielson 2003), and another that focuses on budget discipline. (Hallerberg and Mariar 2004). Focusing on East Europe, Bagashka (2012) finds that the electoral systems that promote the personal vote harm economic reform. My early work argued that personal vote electoral incentives would harm parties' voting discipline, because legislators would owe less loyalty to their party leaders (Morgenstern 2001; 2004). Incentives, however, are not the same as behavior. Legislators in most parliamentary systems, for example, are much more loyal to their parties than are those in presidential systems. Electoral incentives, this implies, must contend with other variables in explaining legislators' behavior. As Vazquez d'Elia and I (2007) explain, similar to the outside walls of a house leaving much room for variance in the interior design, electoral systems constrain but do not determine behavior. To test these theories, therefore, requires a means for operationalizing the strength of the ties among a party’s legislators. DN resolves this issue by quantifying the degree to which legislators are electorally tied. In sum, the measure of DN, which is more fully developed in Chapter <3>, allows tests of hypotheses about the local vote based on a direct measure of voter behavior rather than an indirect measure of incentive structures.

Second, the DN is comparable across time and space. Coding electoral systems meets this criterion, but as noted it fails as a direct measure of behavior. Some studies of the personal vote have found proxies that are useful for a particular country or a particular time. Brady et al. (2000) measure the concept by using midterm elections to evaluate the difference between presidential
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⁷ A focus on parties means that the local vote is most closely related to the personal vote for countries that use either single member districts (e.g. Britain) or closed-list PR (as in most of Europe), since there is no differentiation between a candidate’s and a party’s votes. In systems that allow intra-party competition (e.g. Brazil, Chile, Ireland, pre-1994 Japan, etc.) there is a clearer distinction between the personal vote and the local vote.

⁸ The statistical model I discuss in Chapter 2 also accounts for (or holds constant) the underlying support.

⁹ Others have updated or expanded this study. See, for example, Electoral Systems and the Personal Vote Data Set (Johnson & Wallack, 2012).
and legislative voting. Taking a different tack, Crisp et al. (2013) study targeted government spending by looking at the similarity of districts—a measure perhaps related to the local vote—which they measure with surveys. More heterogeneity among the districts, they find increases targeted spending. Finally, Cox Mccubbins (1993) use the consistency of legislators’ vote swings in their study, an idea closely related to the DN. The important caveat is that it is a one-dimensional measurement. As I show in Chapter <3>, measuring one aspect of nationalization at a time introduces bias into the estimates.

Why Study Static Nationalization?
The study of SN focuses attention on fundamental questions about politics and representation, such as state building and the integration of a country’s regions, distribution of government resources, and separatist movements. Historical studies of Europe (e.g. E. Weber 1976; Rokkan 1970; Caramani, 2004) considered how European feudal or estate-based empires, many constituting multiple ethnic groups, developed modern parliamentary systems with regionally based representation. For example, as Caramani documents, countries across Europe nationalized (in a static sense) during the 1900s, which he claims was concomitant to the shift from regional towards ideological divides. While his statistical models focus on what I term SN, the implications that he draws for party and legislators’ behavior are related to DN and the personal or local vote. Specifically he argues that as [static] nationalization increases, “local candidates…lose their character of representing the local community. Rather they become the representatives of the national centre of the political organization” (p. 68). This, he continues, leads the voters to shift their attention from local to national issues.

These concerns are also pertinent to U.S. politics. Schattschneider (1960) was concerned that if parties separated on regional issues, they would fail to develop nationally oriented electorates and thus be unable to generate support for—or be accountable for—resolving national issues. Similarly, Sundquist (1973), discusses "convergence" of the party system across states, away from one-party dominant districts and regions, and Key (1959) discussion "secular realignments" of the vote was based on the concern that the change in the degree to which the partisan vote was divided between rural and urban districts. Interestingly, his finding of a greater salience of geography to the vote in the United States contrasts with Caramani's (2000) study of Europe, which shows a convergence in the vote among rural and urban regions.

The opposite of convergence implies pressures for separatism, and this justifies other interest in SN-like concepts (e.g. Rose and Urwin, 1975). Almost by definition, parties supporting regional autonomy or irredentist movements will have regionally concentrated voters. The reverse is not necessarily true, but it would be surprising to find non-nationalized parties opposing greater regional power or autonomy. Part of the concern with regional parties is that they have little electoral incentive to serve the interests of the country as a whole. Presumably nationalized parties, by contrast, have an incentive to serve all regions in order to build their electoral support. This suggests that encouraging parties to build national support is a way to unify the nation and reduce pressures for separatism.

Jones and Mainwaring (2003) provide additional hypotheses about the implications of [static] nationalization. Most importantly, as a consequence of its effects on policy and the political process, they argue that [static] nationalization has favorable implications for the survival
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10 Weber's study, for example, focuses on how schools helped to integrate rural populations. He notes that discussions about the time period that he discusses, 1870-1914, revolve around "civilizing" different populations (p. 5). He then goes on to discuss the move from politics that were "local and personal" towards a "concern with issues on a national and international plane" (p. 241).

11 As I note in Chapter <3> their most important contribution was methodological (suggesting the Gini coefficient as a measure of the consistency in the distribution of a party's national support), but the hypotheses are also an important contribution.
of democracy. This is based on several ideas. First, high [static] nationalization is indicative of strong party alignments and supportive linkages between voters and parties. Second, [statically] nationalized parties should be more unified and thus affect many aspects of legislative politics. And finally, the degree of [static] nationalization should affect public policy in terms of how parties target public funds.

Finally, SN and similar concepts are tied to specific policy or economic outcomes. For example, Lago-Peñas and Lago-Peñas (2009) find that less [statically] nationalized party systems (i.e. ones that maintain important regional parties) are bound by more rigid budgeting negotiations, thus affecting the magnitude of government transfers. Castañeda-Angarita (2013) focuses on the interplay among business groups and the local and national governments. He finds that low levels of [static] nationalization hamper inter-governmental cooperation, thus hindering attempts at budgetary reform. Crisp et al. (2013), who I cited above in discussing DN, also use the distribution of the vote (aka SN) to study how governments target spending. They associate higher levels of [static] nationalization of the governing coalition with reduced targeted spending. As a final example, Hicken, Kollman, & Simmons (2010) look at health policy, and using a broad large-n design, argue that a lack of party system nationalization "hinders states’ convergence towards international health standards."

In sum, SN is tied to many central political questions. While some of these issues are also pertinent to DN, distinct processes are at work with different implications for the representative and political process. But as with DN, valid testing of these issues requires careful operationalization of the variables. As I empirically demonstrate in Chapter <4>, the concepts do not co-vary, and thus tests should not conflate them. A high level of SN, for example, will not have the same impact on democracy or regime stability in all cases, because the level of DN would be an undefined (or left-out) variable. As an example, both dimensions are necessary to show the importance of economics to an election in a particular district. The static dimension may imply differences in terms of relative importance of the poverty, class, ethnicity, and nationalism in the vote, while the dynamic dimension shows the relative weight of changing economic conditions to the vote and whether all districts react to the change in a similar way.

Data Issues
In order to fully interpret the two dimensions of nationalization, this book pays special attention to comparative methodology, data usage, and measurement techniques. To allow the broadest possible range of cases, the book focuses mostly, but not exclusively, on legislative elections. This allows comparisons across parliamentary and presidential systems. At times it is appropriate to consider the nationalization of parties as evidenced through the support for presidential candidates, but since all democratic systems have legislative elections, most of the book focuses on elections at that level. While I therefore provide some statistics for nationalization based on presidential elections, and I also consider the impact of presidentialism on party nationalization, generally the book refers to nationalization of parties in legislative elections.

The book focuses on electoral districts as the unit of analysis, because this is the level at which parties and legislators compete for seats and votes. It would be feasible and perhaps interesting to test and compare results at higher or lower level geographical units (e.g. states or polling places), but these are less relevant if the goal is to understand the representation which is based on electoral consistencies. For those elected, the district formally defines their representative responsibilities and the results at that level determine their fate. Parties, meanwhile, must aggregate the legislators who represent these distinct electoral constituencies. In sum, district-level electoral results drive legislators’ fates and thus must condition their policy preferences and relationship with others in their party.

12 One study that does consider both dimensions is Crisp et al. (2013).
In a multiyear effort to apply tests to as broad a geographic base as possible, the empirical database constructed for this book, which is available at my websites (cited earlier), covers about 200 parties in more than 40 countries from Europe, Asia, the Pacific Basin, Africa, and the Americas. That appendix also includes graphical representation of party nationalization for most included parties (similar to Figure 1.1). As explained in Chapter 3, not all of these data were usable for multivariate comparisons, but the resulting comparative database is still large. I began building the dataset with Caramani’s publicly available dataset, and augmented that dataset with information on the single-member districts for Germany and France. During the course of my work, two other datasets became available, The Constituency-Level Electoral Archive (CLEA) and the Global Election Database (formerly Constituency-Level Elections Dataset). I have complemented these datasets with information I collected for Latin America, the United States, Canada, Japan, and Australia and other countries, often relying on experts (such as Mark Jones and Andy Tow for Argentina, and Ethan Scheiner for Japan) to fill in holes or interpret party names and coalitions. Within these broad guidelines, I only required that the party competition and district boundaries were consistent enough to allow cross-temporal and cross-district tests. This requirement eliminated, for example, New Zealand, where district boundaries have changed very frequently.

As detailed in Chapter 4, using the district-level data requires several other decisions. First, in many cases two or more parties join together in electoral coalitions. In some cases, such as the CDU/CSU alliance in Germany, the alliance is durable and joining the parties over time is not problematic. In other cases, however, parties join temporarily, and the analysis is less straightforward. Since the analysis would be distorted by changing alliance membership, in some cases the tests are conducted under the assumption that the alliance was in place for the whole period under analysis. Details of these types of decisions and other data issues are also explained in the on-line appendices cited above.

The issue of uncontested races, especially in countries that employ single-member districts creates another analytic problem. Stokes and others simply ran their analyses on races where at the two major parties won at least a minimal amount of the vote in all years. Eliminating uncontested races, however, underestimates the district heterogeneity, if not the other effects as well. While non-competition can signal a lack of geographic coverage for a party, it does not necessarily imply that the party could not win some support in that district. In single member districts, for example, the party may concentrate its resources on winnable districts and forego others. How should the measure of nationalization account for this issue? My approach has been to consider and compare results with and without “zero districts.”

Case selection was critical to the analysis, and is not without problems. My general rule was to collect data on all available countries that had at least five million people and were continuously democratic (based on Freedom House scores) during the entire period under investigation. I did make exceptions to the population rule for Uruguay and several countries in Central America. Second, with the exception of some of the regional parties of particular interest, inclusion required that parties competed in enough districts such that their overall share of the vote was above ten percent. They also could not be so volatile as to have lost all their support in any

---

13 That count includes multiple observations for a few parties, such as across different time periods or for different electoral tiers.
14 The Canadian data have two sources: the Canadian parliamentary website (http://www.parl.gc.ca) and the official reports of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada. Data for Australia are available from that country’s electoral commission, at www.aec.gov.au. Ethan Scheiner provided the data for Japan.
15 Thanks are owed to Octavio Amorim-Neto Brian Crisp, Maria Escobar-Lemmon, Mark Jones, Peter Siavelis, and Andy Tow for supplying parts of the Latin American data.
16 Empirically this is not much of an issue for countries that employ proportional representation.
These case selection rules do bias the results towards stability, but the rise or fall of parties not included in the analysis will be reflected in the statistics for the included parties. What the statistics will reflect is how the changing availability of votes that results from the birth or death of a party is captured by the other parties. Further, the methodology I apply accounts for volatility (see Chapter 3) and the two dimensions of nationalization account for regional parties by measuring the degree to which support levels and change are consistent across districts.

There are other methodological concerns. The first of these is how to clean the data in the measurement of one type of nationalization in estimating the other. Many analyses use district-level electoral data to study one or the other aspect of nationalization, but that data is “contaminated” by different types of variance. The solution I develop for solving this problem (though it too is imperfect) is to use a cross sectional time series (or more simply an analysis of variance) model to account for the different sources of variance simultaneously.

Second, measures must consider how to handle districts of different sizes or populations. There are reasonable arguments for weighting and equally strong reasons for ignoring this issue. In this book I generally work with unweighted results, but I discuss the issue in Chapter <3>.

Other issues are also important to the concepts of nationalization, but challenging to measurement. While there are techniques to evaluate the degree to which parties' support is concentrated spatially (e.g. Moran's I), most tests considering party nationalization opt for measures that do not consider the consistency in vote distribution. I have shown a few maps to highlight these issues, but continue with the regular practices. Next, when parties join electoral alliances, should we use the alliance support in the analysis, or drop the party from the analysis? These cases I have decided based on reading contextual analyses and discussing the cases with country experts. Where I analyze coalitions, the data notes clarify the choices. A final problem is that when countries modify their districts boundaries, it is not possible to evaluate the consistency in over-time changes.

No one data selection mechanism or procedure can resolve all of these issues, and thus my inclination is to be as transparent as possible about limitations and potential biases. In Chapter <3> I argue about the virtues of a hierarchical model to measure the two nationalization dimension—which include production of independent estimates of the two dimensions, clarity of interpretation of the statistics, and ease of use of a statistical model—I also show that it too can produce non-intuitive results under certain conditions. Overall, then, I argue for a multi-technique approach.

Previewing the findings

This book has methodological, theoretical, and empirical/descriptive pretensions. Here I foreshadow the main hypotheses and issues the subsequent chapters develop in detail.

Description of national/local politics around the world:

All politics are not local. In Chapter <2> I use the inverse of both dimensions of dynamic party nationalization to measure the degree of localism, and then use the measurements to categorize parties into four boxes: locally focused, nationalized, unbalanced, and in-flux. The first of these requires high party nationalization on both dimensions and the second the lack thereof. Unbalanced parties are high on the dynamic dimension, but score low in terms of static nationalization. In-flux parties, finally, should be rare, because they imply high static but not dynamic nationalization.

In some cases it was necessary to conduct the analysis on alliances rather than parties. If the alliance was short-lived, we ran the model as if the two (or more) parties were in alliance for our complete time series. For some countries (such as Ireland), however, the frequent changing of parties and/or districts was too great to overcome. Details by country are in Appendix <3>.
The data confirm wide variance of party nationalization around the world, among, and within countries. A regional focus underscores some trends but many exceptions. First, while there is preponderance of nationalized parties, on both dimensions, in Western Europe (e.g. those in the Czech Republic, Germany, Finland, and, Portugal), there are many other types of parties there, too. A number of that region’s parties, for example, are nationalized on the dynamic but not the static dimension. This would include Labour and the Conservatives in the UK, the French Socialists, Spain’s People’s Party, the Finnish Centre Party, as well as parties in Belgium and Portugal. In most of these countries regional divisions and local parties hamper static nationalization, but interestingly DN stays at a relatively high level. These divisions often affect the parties that compete nationally in different ways. For this reason while the Spanish Socialists and People’s parties are both dynamically nationalized, the Socialists maintain a higher (but not high) level of SN. Finally, the Swiss FDP and SVP fall into the localized category, while the scores for some other Western European parties, such as those in France, land between the clearly identified labels.

For Eastern Europe, the Polish parties are close to the unbalanced category, the Greater Romania party is nationalized, and data for Hungarian Civic Alliance fits that description, too.

In Asia, my data covers India, Japan, and Taiwan; it excludes Korean parties due to problems with changing district names. Parties in all but Taiwan are localized, but the proportional representation tier in Japanese elections produces nationalized parties. For Taiwan, the parties have middling levels of both types of nationalization.

Across the Americas, there is more variance. Parties in the United States are not as nationalized on either dimension as the typical Western European party, but DN is moderately high and much higher than it was in previous decades. Analysis of the US (and some other countries) requires special attention, since at times the parties do not compete in all districts. If the analysis includes all districts, then there has been improvement in the static nationalization since the 1950s, because there are fewer “zero” districts. At the same time, DN was much stronger at that time. Excluding districts where only one party competes, then SN looks worse over time, as does DN. This would indicate that even where the parties both compete (a figure that has gone up), the there is a greater separation of support than in times gone by.

In Canada, I formally code the Conservatives and Liberals in the ambiguous zone, but they are close to the unbalanced category. Even excluding Quebec, the parties have highly disparate levels of support in different districts, but change is felt in a surprisingly consistent manner. Support the fore NDP is less diverse, but change in fortunes is also less consistent. That party therefore earns a locally focused label.

In Latin America, at least one party in Argentina, Bolivia, and Mexico has a local focus, and none in those countries is nationalized or unbalanced. There are, however, nationalized parties in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, and Uruguay. Other parties (and coalitions), notably most in Chile, Brazil, and Peru fall into ambiguous categories.

Methodology & operationalization

The book uses the two dimensions of party nationalization to empirically identify the degree to which local factors drive elections (Chapter 4). Previous studies provide indirect proxies based only on the incentives for local behavior, or they lack a method for cross-country comparisons. Party nationalization, by contrast, is a direct measure of the degree to which elections across the country follow national trends or, by contrast, the qualities of legislative candidates and district characteristics are determinative.

Based on this idea, the book (Chapter <3>) develops a procedure for measuring static and dynamic nationalization simultaneously, based on district-level electoral data. Measuring the two dimensions together avoid statistical and theoretical bias.

Combining nationalization scores for parties into a system-level score generates another source of bias. Weighting systems can lessen the concerns, but they introduce other problems.
Further, many countries include widely disparate party types, and thus a (weighted) average of these parties tells little about how the party system works. The book, therefore, emphasizes the nationalization of parties, not of party-systems.

Theory
The book has three theoretical goals, and tests multiple hypotheses. The overarching emphasis is that party nationalization has two dimensions, each of which provides a distinct view of the role of localism in elections. The static dimension shows whether parties’ electoral bases are widespread, and the dynamic dimension shows whether the national political/economic debate and environment plus the party’s campaigns and policy proposals have differential impacts in the various regions. Moreover, the two dimensions are independent (except that when the dynamic dimensions is low, the static dimension is likely to be low, too).

Second, since there are two independent types of party nationalization (qua localism), there are also two sets of factors that explain them (Chapters 5 and 6). A key distinction that I identify is that parliamentary systems increase DN while the number of electoral districts has an inverse relation with SN. Federalism and ethnic heterogeneity (taking into account the degree to which groups are geographically segregated) are also important explanatory variables. My tests for explaining intra-country variance—which consider party (rather than democracy) age, ideological extremism, and governing experience— are less successful.

Third, the degree of localism in elections influences all aspects of politics, as documented in Chapters <7-9>. Where localism is more important, candidates may deemphasize their parties’ (national) campaign issues in favor of district-level concerns. At an extreme, this issue speaks to whether parties will support regional autonomy or separatist movements. As another example, localism influences whether co-partisan legislators have incentives to compete or collaborate. As others have explained, it also influences the parties’ leadership structures. Finally, even if voters everywhere blame incumbents for problematic performance, localism speaks to whether voters will coordinate on an alternative—or whether no party will be able to gain advantages because each locality will favor a different alternative.

Roadmap
This book is driven by questions regarding the cause and effect of the two dimensions of nationalization, which, in turn, are indicators of the degree to which politics focus on local or national issues. The concerns are motivated by former U.S. House Speaker, Tip O’Neil’s contention that “All Politics is Local.” As O’Neil explains in his book by the same name, local and national politics interact. He explains, in particular, that once a legislator earns respect for his or her stand and support for local issues, then they can become “‘national’ Congressman and vote for things that are good for the country but may not have a direct impact on [their] district (p. xvi).” The anecdotes that he provides about U.S. politics yield interesting questions for a comparative study. Why are politics more local in some places than others? What are the effects of differing degrees of localism? The concept of party nationalization allows me to quantify the degree of localism in elections, and study the issue from a cross-national comparative perspective.

Beyond the introduction and conclusion, the book has three sections that a) describe, measure, and compare two nationalization dimensions b) explain party nationalization, and c) use nationalization as an explanatory variable. To begin exploring the empirical data and theoretical questions, Chapter <2> develops the aforementioned typology of party types, based on the degree to which a party is statically and dynamically nationalized. The particular goal is to further develop the behavioral and organizational expectations for different types of parties. The next stage is to empirically classify parties from around the world. Chapter <3> deals with the methodological issues, explaining in detail the statistical model that I then employ to measure the
two types of nationalization. The ensuing chapter (<4>) then provides initial results from the analysis and uses those results in comparison with results generated by traditional methods in order to explain how extant methods are biased or misleading. It also fills in the classification of parties and party systems based on the two dimensions, and supports the contention that the dimensions are relatively independent aspects of electoral competition.

The next two chapters focus on explaining nationalization. Chapter <5> first develops a theoretical model, focusing primarily on electoral systems, executive system, decentralization, and ethnic fractionalization as explanatory variables. Building on my earlier analysis (Morgenstern, Swindle, and Castagnola, 2009) a primary emphasis is that since the two dimensions of nationalization are independent, the factors that drive them must be distinct. I thus emphasize the effect of electoral systems on the static dimension and the executive system on the dynamic dimension. Different from the earlier work, the chapter introduces a new electoral system variable, the number of electoral districts, as a prime driver of static nationalization. Chapter <6> uses a multivariate model to find support for the hypotheses.

The third part of the book has three chapters that consider the impacts of party nationalization. Chapter 7 focuses on the role of regionalism in party nationalization, while exploring the theoretical issues of accountability and the responsible party model. There is a clear tension between identity or regional voting and the responsible party model, and the chapter uses the concepts of nationalization to explore these themes. It argues that the responsible party model requires at least moderate levels of SN and DN, since low levels would imply that some regions are responding differently to national stimuli. The chapter also provides a typology of regional parties and a method for modeling and statistically testing the importance of states or regions.

The next chapters explicitly use party nationalization as an independent variable. The eighth chapter reviews work that discusses how the dimensions relate to legislative behavior and voter beliefs. It then uses the cases of Spain, Argentina, Bolivia, and Canada to analyze retrospective voting within the context of low levels of nationalization. How does accountability work if a party’s policy stance will lead to increased support in some areas and a decrease in others? In part I find that there is more consistency among voters in holding incumbent parties responsible (retrospective voting) than there is in coordinating on alternatives (prospective voting). Chapter 9 then looks at a different impact of party nationalization, returning to the query about legislative behavior that spawned this study. Cox and McCubbins (1993) argued that the electoral tie among co-partisan U.S. legislators was sufficient to encourage collective action. In a comparative context, however, this book shows that the U.S. legislators have weak ties (low party nationalization). The chapter thus questions whether the weak tie is sufficient to drive intra-party collaboration. Using roll call and NOMINATE data for the United States, and then co-sponsorship data on the United States and three Latin American countries, I show that legislators are prone to co-sponsor bills with co-partisans who have similar electoral concerns; the legislators' personal electoral fates does not have much effect on roll call voting or NOMINATE scores. The first tests therefore tear at the logic in Cox and McCubbins by showing that legislators do not seem to be driven by the commonalities in their electoral fates. The second test challenges their findings in the opposite way, showing that personal concerns sometimes override partisanship in legislative decisions. Chapter 10, finally, concludes by summarizing the main arguments and findings.