# Proportional and Mixed Systems 

PMCb1012 Elections and campaigning

## Elections

- A necessary but not a sufficient condition for democracies
- Various benefits:
- Accountability
- Representation
- Legitimacy
- A peaceful transfer of power (unlike a military coup)
- Civic mobilization
- Only free and fair elections fulfil this role


## Proportional Representation (PR) Systems

- Main aim - distribution of seats resembles the proportion of votes
- Multi-member constituencies
- Two main categories:
- List proportional representation
- Single transferrable vote


## Ideal proportionality



## The reality might be quite different



Seats \%


## List Proportional Representation

- Parties create lists of their candidates for each constituency
- Voters have a single vote given to one political party
- Some systems allow support some candidates within the party list
- A unique set of several features:

1) Number and size of constituencies
2) Allocation formula
3) Threshold

- Their specific rules have key impact on true proportionality

| A. Socialdemokratiet |
| :--- |
| Frode Sorensen |
| Inger Bierbaum |
| Dorte Dinesen |
| P. Qvist Jorgensen |
| Lise Roth Seelen |
| Soren Ebbesen Skov |
| B. Det Radikale Venstre |
| Nicolas Lund-Larsen |
| Per Kleis Bannelycke |
| Bente Dahl |
| Bjarke Larms |
| Henrik Larsen |
| Ca Det Konservative Folkeparti |
| Kaj Ikast |
| Martin Andresen |
| Bent P. Have |
| Jens M. Henriksen |
| Bente Lassen |
| Lars Munk |
| Klaus Rehkopff |
| D. Centrum-Demokraterne |
| Henning Nielsen |
| Henning Borchert-Jorgensen |
| Helmuth Carstens |
| Fomming Hübschmann |
| Peter Madsen |
| Kai Paulsen Nissen |
| Fa Socialistisk Folkeparti |
| Bjarne Eliasen |
| Bent Iversen |
| Jesper Petersen |

## 1) Constituencies

- Always multi-member constituencies (>1 seat)
- Two options:
- Countries divided into various constituencies - most countries
- A single nationwide constituency - Netherlands, Slovakia
- Size of constituency (number of seats) is critical
- The main rule:
- The smaller are the constituencies, the better for large parties


Wybory parlamentarne w Polsce w 2023 roku 2023 Polish parliamentary election



| Zjednoczona Prawica (ZP) United RIght <br> Lder (LEADER): Jaroslaw Kacryiskt) | $\underset{\substack{\text { MADMINY } \\ \text { SEATS }}}{ }$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Koalicja Obywatelska (KO) civic coalition <br> Lder (LEADER): Donaldust | $\frac{157}{\text { MANTIV }} \text { SEATS }$ |
| Trzecia Droga (TD) Thirchasy <br> Lder (LEABER): Symon Holownia Madyslaw Kosiniak Kanyysz | $\underset{\substack{\text { MANATV } \\ \text { SEATS }}}{ }$ |
| Lewica (SLD) <br> The Left <br> Lider (LEADER): Wiodzimierz Czarzasty/Robert Biedroń | $\underset{\substack{\text { MANATV } \\ \text { SEATS }}}{26}$ |
| Konfederacja (WN) <br> Confederation <br> Lider (LEADER): Sławomir Mentzen/Krzysztof Bosak | $\underset{\substack{\text { MANATY } \\ \text { SEATS }}}{18}$ |



## 2) Allocation Formula

- A mathematical transformation of votes to seats
- Various ways
- Quotas
- Divisors
- Also impacts the final proportionality


## Quota

- A set number of votes needed for one seat
- A party receives a seat for each time its votes pass the quota
- Most simple example - the Hare quota
- Number of all valid votes / number of seats
- If we have 1,000 votes and 20 seats then the quota is:
- 1,000 / 20 = 50 votes
$\rightarrow$ parties receive a seat for each acquired 50 votes

| Party | Votes | Quota | Seats 1 | Remaining <br> votes | Seats 2 | Seats final |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 415 |  | 8 | 15 |  | 8 |
| B | 340 | $1,000 / 20=$ | 6 | 40 | 1 | 7 |
| C | 165 | 50 | 3 | 15 |  | 3 |
| D | 80 |  | 1 | 30 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 1,000 |  | 18 |  | 2 |  |

## Divisor

- Alternative to quota
- Votes of parties are divided by a series of growing numbers
- Seats are distributed based on results of division
- D'Hondt divisor: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,...


## Example

## 20/20

- 4 parties
- 20 seats to distribute

| Party | Votes | Votes divided by |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| A | 415 | 415 | 208 | 138 | 104 | 83 | 69 | 59 | 52 | 46 | 42 |
| B | 340 | 340 | 170 | 113 | 85 | 68 | 57 | 49 | 43 | 38 | 34 |
| C | 165 | 165 | 83 | 55 | 41 | 33 | 28 | 24 | 21 | 18 | 17 |
| D | 80 | 80 | 40 | 27 | 20 | 16 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 |

## Now only 11 seats

| Party | Votes | Votes divided by |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| A | 415 | 415 | 208 | 138 | 104 | 83 | 69 | 59 | 52 | 46 | 42 |
| B | 340 | 340 | 170 | 113 | 85 | 68 | 57 | 49 | 43 | 38 | 34 |
| C | 165 | 165 | 83 | 55 | 41 | 33 | 28 | 24 | 21 | 18 | 17 |
| D | 80 | 80 | 40 | 27 | 20 | 16 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 |

## And now only 4 seats

| Party | Votes | Votes divided by |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| A | 415 | 415 | 208 | 138 | 104 | 83 | 69 | 59 | 52 | 46 | 42 |
| B | 340 | 340 | 170 | 113 | 85 | 68 | 57 | 49 | 43 | 38 | 34 |
| C | 165 | 165 | 83 | 55 | 41 | 33 | 28 | 24 | 21 | 18 | 17 |
| D | 80 | 80 | 40 | 27 | 20 | 16 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 |

## Why size of constituencies matters

| Party | Votes | Votes \% | 4 seats | 11 seats | 20 seats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 415 | 41.5 | 2 | 5 | 9 |
| B | 340 | 34.0 | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| C | 165 | 16.5 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| D | 80 | 8.0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Votes
4 seats
11 seats
20 seats

$\square A \square B \square C \square D$

## You can also switch the divisor (example with 11 seats)

| Party | Votes | Imperiali - votes divided by |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| A | 415 | 208 | 138 | 104 | 83 | 69 | 59 | 52 |  |
| B | 340 | 170 | 113 | 85 | 68 | 57 | 49 | 43 |  |
| C | 165 | 83 | 55 | 41 | 33 | 28 | 24 | 21 |  |
| D | 80 | 40 | 27 | 20 | 16 | 13 | 11 | 10 |  |


| Party | Votes | Saint-Laguë - votes divided by |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 13 |  |
| A | 415 | 415 | 138 | 83 | 59 | 46 | 38 | 32 |  |
| B | 340 | 340 | 113 | 68 | 49 | 38 | 31 | 26 |  |
| C | 165 | 165 | 55 | 33 | 24 | 18 | 15 | 13 |  |
| D | 80 | 80 | 27 | 16 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 6 |  |

## 3) Threshold

- A minimum percentage of votes a party must pass to obtain seats
- Typically around 5\%
- National v. regional
- Impact on:
- Level of fragmentation of elected bodies (parliaments, assemblies)
- Stability of governments
- Level of political representation


## Details are essential

- Proportional representation is only a general term
- Necessary to know the specific features
- Real outcomes might not be that proportional
- Are some proportional systems truly proportional?


## Impact of PR systems

- Representation of various interests (and parties)
- Reduced waste of votes
- Allow survival of minority parties
- Lower candidates' accountability
- Coalition governments

| Country | Number of parties | Strongest party | Government |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austria | 5 | 31,5 | Coalition |
| Belgium | 12 | 16,0 | Coalition |
| Bulgaria | 6 | 25,4 | Coalition |
| Croatia | 8 | 37,3 | Coalition |
| Czech Republic | $4(7)$ | 27,8 | Coalition |
| Denmark | 12 | 27,5 | Coalition |
| Estonia | 6 | 28,9 | Coalition |
| Finland | 10 | 20,8 | Coalition |
| Greece | 8 | 40,6 | Single party |
| Latvia | 7 | 19,2 | Coalition |
| Luxembourg | 7 | 29,2 | Coalition |
| Netherlands | 15 | 23,5 | Coalition |
| Poland | $5(17)$ | 29,1 | Coalition |
| Portugal | 10 | 41,4 | Single party |
| Romania | 5 | 28,9 | Coalition |
| Slovakia | 7 | 23,0 | Coalition |
| Slovenia | 5 | 34,5 | Coalition |
| Spain | 11 | 33,1 | Coalition |
| Sweden | 8 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |



## Mixed Systems

- Systems based on (at least) two tiers:
- Nominal - Majority/Plurality mechanism
- List - Proportional representation
- Share of seats assigned to each tier:
- Equal distribution - nominal tier 50\%, list tier 50\%
- Prevalence of one tier - for instance nominal tier 75\%, list tier 25\%
- Voters usually have two votes, one for each tier
- The best of both worlds?


## Example

- Parliament has 200 seats
- Nominal tier (100 seats):
- Country divided into 100 single-member districts
- FPTP rules
- List tier (100 seats):
- Country divided into 10 multi-member districts (8-12 seats each)
- List PR system

Nominal tier

| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

## Linkage Between the Tiers

- Critical for effects of mixed systems
- Parallel system:
- The tiers work completely independently
- Seat distribution is separated for to tiers
- Basically two different electoral systems existing next to each other
- Compensatory system:
- Existing linkage between the tiers
- Typically some sort of compensation to lower advantage of large parties
- List tier used as a protection of small parties


## Lithuania (Parallel)

- Lithuanian parliament Seimas (141 members)
- Nominal tier:
- 71 seats in single-member districts
- Majoritarian run-off system
- List tier:
- 70 seats in one nationwide constituency
- List PR system


## Lithuanian 2020 election

| Party | List tier |  | Nominal 1 |  | Nominal 2 |  | Total seats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Votes \% | Seats | Votes \% | Seats | Votes \% | Seats |  |
| TS-LKD | 25.8 | 23 | 24.2 | 1 | 40.2 | 26 | 50 |
| LVZS | 18.1 | 16 | 15.2 | 0 | 23.6 | 16 | 32 |
| DP | 9.8 | 9 | 7.9 | 0 | 0.9 | 1 | 10 |
| LSDP | 9.6 | 8 | 11.8 | 0 | 8.5 | 5 | 13 |
| LP | 9.5 | 8 | 6.5 | 0 | 8.1 | 3 | 11 |
| LRLS | 7.0 | 6 | 9.3 | 0 | 6.9 | 7 | 13 |
| Others | 20.2 | 0 | 25.1 | 2 | 11.8 | 10 | 12 |

## Italy 1994-2001 (Compensatory)

- 630 seats
- 475 seats in nominal tier (FPTP)
- 155 seats in list tier (PR)
- Linkage (Scorporo):
- Penalty for large parties winning in the nominal tier
- Each victory in nominal tier leads to penalty in list tier
- Penalty = votes needed for the victory in nominal tier
- Huge disproportionality in favour of nominal tier


## Scorporo - example

| Candidate | Party | Votes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | AAA | 50000 |
| B | BBB | 30000 |
| C | CCC | 15000 |
| D | DDD | 10000 |

- Penalty for party AAA:
- Votes of the second best candidate +1 (votes needed for victory)
- Party AAA will lose 30,001 votes in the list tier


## It worked for a while (1994 election)

| Alliance / Party | Nominal seats | PR votes \% | PR seats | Seats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Polo Delle Libertá | 302 |  | 64 | 366 |
| Forza Italia - CCD (FI-CCD) |  | 21,0 | 30 |  |
| Alleanza Nazionale (AN) |  | 13,5 | 23 |  |
| Lega Nord (LN) |  | 8,4 | 11 |  |
| Alleanza Dei Progressisti | 164 |  | 49 | 213 |
| Partito Dem. della Sinistra (PDS) |  | 20,4 | 38 |  |
| Partito della Rif. Comunista (RF) |  | 6,1 | 11 |  |
| Others | 9 | 16,6 | 42 | 50 |
| Sum | 475 | - | 155 | 630 |

## It worked for a while (1996 election)

| Alliance / Party | Nominal seats | PR votes \% | PR seats | Seats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L'Ulivo | 247 |  | 38 | 285 |
| Partito Dem. della Sinistra (PDS) |  | 21,1 | 26 |  |
| Popolari-SVP-PRI-UD-Prodi |  | 6,8 | 4 |  |
| Lista Dini |  | 4,3 | 8 |  |
| Federazione dei Verdi |  | 2,5 | - |  |
| Polo Delle Libertá | 169 |  | 77 | 246 |
| Forza Italia (FI) |  | 20,6 | 37 |  |
| Alleanza Nazionale (AN) |  | 15,7 | 28 |  |
| CCD-CDU |  | 5,8 | 12 |  |
| Lega Nord | 39 | 10,1 | 20 | 59 |
| Others | 20 | 8,8 | 20 | 40 |
| Sum | 475 | - | 155 | 630 |

## Failure of scorporo (2001 election)

| Alliance / Party | Nominal seats | PR votes \% | PR seats | Seats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Casa Delle Libertá | 282 | 49,6 | 86 | 368 |
| Forza Italia (FI) |  | 29,4 | 62 |  |
| Alleanza Nazionale (AN) |  | 12 | 24 |  |
| L'Ulivo | 189 | 34,9 | 58 | 247 |
| Democratici di Sinistra (DS) |  | 16,6 | 31 |  |
| La Margherita (DL) |  | 14,5 | 27 |  |
| Partito D. R. Comunista (RF) | 4 | 5,5 | 11 | 15 |
| Spolu | 475 | - | 155 | 630 |

## How the system failed

- Italian parties developed a strategy to avoid scorporo
- Candidates in nominal tier with decoy partisan affiliation
- Penalty accounted to these decoys (Abolizione scorporo, Paese nuevo)
- Real parties faced no penalties
- Formally compensatory $\rightarrow$ parallel in reality


## Mixed Systems - Summary

- Various configurations of the tiers
- Allow more strategies to voters (ticket splitting)
- Political scientists differ in their evaluation
- Personal ties between voters and elected officials
- Wasted votes, representation, governance
- Best or worst of the both worlds?

