

# **Dataset of New Parties and Party System Innovation in Western Europe since 1945**

**Vincenzo Emanuele (LUISS Guido Carli)**

**Codebook (May 2, 2018)**

## **Table of contents**

<b>Description</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Content</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Sources</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Details on the two measures and methodological choices</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>List of new parties in Western Europe since 1945</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Notes on individual countries</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>How to cite this dataset?</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Publications based on this dataset</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>11</b>

## Description

This dataset identifies and lists all the new parties emerged in Western Europe since 1945 and provides data about party system innovation, defined as the aggregate level of ‘newness’ recorded in a party system at a given election. Data are based on parliamentary elections (lower house) of 20 Western European countries since 1945. This dataset covers the entire universe of Western European elections held after World War II under democratic regimes. Data for Greece, Portugal and Spain have been collected after their democratizations in the 1970s.

## Content

**Country:** country where the parliamentary election is held (in alphabetical order)

**Election Year:** year in which the election is held

**Election Date:** exact date of the election

**PSInn** (Party System Innovation): overall vote share of new parties in a given election. PSInn is calculated at time  $t$  with respect to time  $t-1$  (namely, PSInn is calculated with respect to the status quo established at the previous election) and therefore each observation in each country is completely independent from the previous ones. In order to exclude marginal parties, I have set a threshold at 1% of the national share for a given party to be considered as part of the party system in a given election and I have collected data starting from the third post-World War II or democratic election of each country, for a total of 209 new parties (see the complete list of new parties below) in 327 elections. The underlying assumption is that the party system innovation we are interested in is that occurring after the initial institutionalization of the party system. According to PSInn, a party is considered ‘new’ only in the first election when it enters the party system by receiving at least 1% of the national share. Then, in the subsequent elections, it becomes ‘old’.

**CPSInn** (Cumulative Party System Innovation): sum of the vote share received by non-founder parties in each election. A party is considered as a *founder* if it has received at least 1% of the national vote share in at least one of the first two post-WWII elections (or, in the case of Greece, Portugal and Spain, the first two democratic elections). Otherwise, the party is counted as a *non-founder*. The rationale behind this choice is that we look at the first two post-WWII or post-authoritarian elections and make a dichotomous distinction between relevant parties that formed the system (those who received more than 1% of the votes) and parties that emerged later or were only marginal actors (those below 1%) at that time.

## Sources

The main source followed to collect electoral data has been the work by Nohlen and Stöver (2010) for elections until 2008. For the elections held since 2009, we have relied on official data provided by the pertinent electoral authority for each country. Information about the formation of new parties comes from Bartolini and Mair (1990), Nohlen and Stöver (2010) as well as party websites and other available online sources. Details about sources and other methodological choices are specified below in the notes on the individual countries. Please note that decisions on doubtful cases have been taken consistently with Chiaramonte and Emanuele (2015) and the related dataset (Emanuele 2015).

## Details on the two measures and methodological choices

As defined above, **PSInn** simply aggregates, for each election, the overall vote share of new parties. I have relied on Bartolini and Mair's criteria (1990) as regards what can be defined as a new party. This approach is rather conservative in the sense that it excludes mergers and splits from the definition of new party. Bartolini and Mair (1990) consider as splits all those separations that derive from official decisions of a minority within the structure of a given party. Indeed, according to Bartolini and Mair (1990, 311-312) a party is considered as new only when it does not derive from the structure of an existing party (as in the case of mergers and splits), or, in other words, when it is a start-up organisation. These criteria have been followed by other scholars who have dealt with the analysis of party system change from a comparative perspective (Ersson 2012; Dassonneville and Hooghe 2015; Chiaramonte and Emanuele 2015). Moreover, PSInn relies on electoral results by taking into account the relative size in terms of votes obtained by all the new parties jointly considered. This choice is in contrast with Tavits' *'Supply of parties'* (2008) and Marinova's *'Electoral Instability in Parties'* (2015), which deliberately exclude the electoral results from the calculations and simply count parties as units. Indeed, a change in the supply side becomes relevant for the system to the extent to which it receives the electoral support of the voters. This is true especially when one wants to build a systemic measure and cannot attribute the same weight to a change concerning the emergence of a major party and to another one related to the rise of a marginal party. Moreover, by considering parties' vote share in the calculation of PSInn, we rely on the electoral arena. This latter is the only arena where the interactions between parties and voters can be taken into account. The electoral results of new parties are the only measurable tools to gauge voters' reactions to parties' structural changes and, therefore, are crucial to assess whether the innovation has a sizeable impact or not.

We have also set a threshold at 1% at a given election in order to exclude marginal parties. Note that the threshold of 1% is set to identify the 'borders' of a given party system. A similar choice is consistent with other authors (Marinova, 2015; Powell and Tucker, 2014), although they rely on more exclusive

thresholds. Any threshold could be considered arbitrary and has its own trade-offs. However, not to set any threshold would be even more distorting for calculating the extent to which a party system is undergoing an innovation. Indeed, given that we are interested in parties that are somewhat relevant for the system, a threshold is necessary to set a qualitative distinction between parties that produce a significant change within the system and parties that simply enter the election game. From this choice it follows that when a new party reaches 1% it enters the calculation of PSInn, even if it had already run in previous elections without reaching the threshold (as the French National Front in 1986). Moreover, when a party that has already reached one per cent in the past moves from less to more than one per cent at a given election, it enters the calculation of PSInn as well (as the Austrian Liberal Forum in 2008). A complete list of all new parties entering in the calculation of PSInn can be found below in Table 1.

**CPSInn** is the sum of the vote share received by non-founder parties in each election. A party is considered as a *founder* if it has received at least 1% of the national vote share in at least one of the first two post-WWII elections (or, in the case of Greece, Portugal and Spain, the first two democratic elections). Otherwise, the party is counted as a *non-founder*. Nevertheless, problems of classification may arise as far as time goes by and founder parties undergo organizational transformations (party relabeling, joint lists, splits, mergers). In order to detect under what conditions a party can be considered as a founder or as a non-founder – consistently with PSInn and following again Bartolini and Mair's choices about party splits and mergers (1990: 311–312) – we have used the following rules: 1) when a founder party changes its name, it remains a founder party; 2) when two founder parties merge, the resulting party is still considered a founder one; 3) when two parties split from a founder, both are considered as founders; 4) when a founder party and a non-founder party merge, the resulting party is a founder if the former was the larger one, otherwise it is a non-founder.

Note that other scholars have followed a somewhat similar approach: Mair (1993: 128) calculates the percentage of votes won by *old parties*, 'those parties which contested both the first and the most recent elections'. In another work (2002: 126), Mair investigates the electoral success of new parties, defined as 'those which first began to contest elections no earlier than 1960'. Mainwaring and Scully (1995) consider the number of seats held by parties founded before 1950.

Finally, please note that when in a given country at the beginning of the period no new parties have emerged yet, PSInn is still 0 but CPSInn could be not 0, and this is because this latter is counted as a residual measure with respect to the overall vote share received by *founder* parties, thereby including also the vote share of non-founder parties below 1%, while PSInn considers as new parties only those reaching the 1% threshold.

Table 1. List of new parties in Western Europe since 1945.

Country	New parties entering in the calculation of PSInn	
	N	Names
Austria	11	Communist Party of Austria (1970; 2006); United Greens (1983; 1990); Alternative List (1983); No - Civic Action Group against the sale of Austria (1995); The Independents - Lugner's List (1999); Dr. Matin's List (2006); Liberal Forum, Citizens Forum of Austria (2008); Team Stronach (2013)
Belgium	12	Christian Flemish People's Union (1954); Democratic Front of the Francophones (1965); Walloon Rally (1968); Ecolo, Agalev, Democratic Union for the Respect of Labour (1981); Rossem, National Front (1991); Vivant (1999); List Dedecker (2007); Workers' Party, People's Party (2010)
Cyprus	10	PAME, Union of the Centre, New Democratic Front (1981); United Democrats, New Horizons, Movement of Ecologists, (1996); Free Citizens Movement (2006); National Popular Front (2011); Citizens' Alliance, Animal Party (2016)
Denmark	9	The Independent Party (Sept. 1953); Socialist People's Party (1960); Liberal Centre (1966); Christian People's Party (1971); Progress Party (1973); Common Course, The Greens (1987); New Alliance (2007); The Alternative (2015)
Finland	9	Smallholders' Party of Finland (1962); Finnish Christian League (1970); Constitutional People's Party (1975); Green League (1983); Pensioners' Party (1987); Young Finns, Alliance for Free Finland (1995); Reform Group, True Finns (1999)
France	24	Gaullist Union (1946); Poujade List, Extreme Right (1956); Unified Socialist Party (1958); Reformist Movement, Republican Radicals (1973); Ecologists, Workers' Struggle (1978; 2002); National Front, Other Right (1986); Other Left (1988); Greens, Ecology Generation, Other Greens, Extreme Left (1993); Hunting-Fishing-Nature-Tradition, Revolutionary Communist League, Republican Pole, Other Greens, National Republican Movement (2002); Mouvement pour la France (2007); En Marche, Debut la France (2017)
Germany	11	German Peace Union (1961); National Democratic Party of Germany (1965); The Greens (1980); Party of Democratic Socialism, The Republicans, Alliance '90 (1990); German People's Union (1998); Pirate Party (2009); Alternative for Germany, Free Voters (2013); Die Partei (2017)
Greece	12	Progressive Party (1981); Popular Orthodox Rally (2004); Ecologist Greens (2007); Independent Greeks, Golden Dawn, Democratic Alliance, Recreate Greece, Action Liberal Alliance, Front of the Greek Anticapitalist Left (May 2012); The River, Union of Centrists, Teleia (January 2015)
Iceland	19	National Preservation Party (1953); Independent Democratic Party (1967); Candidature Party (1971); Independents from the South (1979); Women's Union (1983); National Party, Humanist Party (1987); Liberals (1991); Liberal Party (1999); New Force (2003); Icelandic Movement - Living Country (2007); Citizens' Movement (2009); Bright Future, Pirate Party, Household Party, Iceland Democratic Party, Right-Green People's Party, Rainbow (2013); People's Party (2016)
Ireland	14	Sinn Féin (1957; 1987); National Progressive Democrats (1961); Workers' Party (1973); Anti H-Block (1981); Progressive Democrats (1987); Green Party (1989); National Party (1997); Socialist Party, People Before Profit (2011); Social Democrats, Renua Ireland, Independents for Change, Independent Alliance (2016)
Italy	17	Proletarian Democracy, Radical Party (1976); Pensioners' Party (1983) Green List (1987); Lombard League, The Network (1992);

		Forza Italia, Democratic Alliance (1994); Italian Renewal (1996); Italy of Values, European Democracy, New PSI (2001); The Right (2008); Five Star Movement, Civic Choice, Act to Stop the Decline (2013); +Europe (2018)
Luxembourg	11	Independent Party of the Middle Class (1954); Popular Independent Movement (1964); <i>Enrôlés de Force</i> , Independent Socialist Party (1979); Green Alternative Party (1984); Alternative Democratic Reform Party, National Movement (1989); Green and Liberal Alliance (1999); Communist Party Luxembourg (2009); Pirate Party Luxembourg; Party for Full Democracy (2013)
Malta	2	Democratic Alternative (1992; 2008)
Netherlands	16	Pacifist Socialist Party (1959); Farmers' Party (1963); Democrats 1966 (1967); Reformed Political League (1971; 1986); New Middle Party (1971); Reformed Political Federation (1981); General Elderly Alliance, Socialist Party, Centre Democrats (1994); List Pim Fortuyn, Liveable Netherlands (2002); Party of Freedom, Party for the Animals (2006); 50Plus (2012); Forum for Democracy (2017)
Norway	5	Progress Party (1973); Red Electoral Alliance, Pensioners' Party (1993); Coastal Party (2001); Green Party (2013)
Portugal	9	Christian Democratic Party (1979); Workers' Party for Socialist Unity, Revolutionary Socialist Party (1980); Democratic Renewal Party (1985); National Solidarity Party (1991); Left Bloc (1999); Workers' Communist Party (2009); People-Animals-Nature (2011); Democratic Republican Party (2015)
Spain	12	Democratic and Socialist Centre (1982); Communist Unity Board, Democratic Reformist Party (1986); Ruiz Mateos' Group (1989); Galician Nationalist Bloc, Canarian Coalition (2000); Republican Left of Catalonia (2004); Union for Progress and Democracy (2008); Amaiur (2011); Podemos, Citizens (2015); Animalist Party (2016)
Sweden	5	Christian Democrats (1964); Green Party (1982); New Democracy (1991); Sweden Democrats (2002); Feminist Initiative (2014)
Switzerland	11	Evangelical People's Party (1951); Republican Movement, National Action (1971); Progressive Organizations of Switzerland (1975); Federation of Swiss Green Party, Feminist and Green Alternative Group (1983); Swiss Motorists' Party (1987); Ticino League (1991; 2015); Green Liberal Party (2007); Alternative Left (2015)
UK	6	Scottish National Party (1970); Ulster Unionist Coalition (Feb. 1974); Referendum Party (1997); United Kingdom Independence Party (2001); Green Party (2005); British National Party (2010)
Total	225*	

*\* The total includes seven parties that have entered twice in the calculation of PSInn given that they first obtained 1% of the national share or more in a given election, then declined under 1% and eventually re-emerged at or above 1% (both the two years of emergence at 1% or more are indicated in brackets).*

## **Notes on individual countries**

### **Austria**

Following Bartolini and Mair (1990, Appendix II), the Democratic Progressive Party (DFP) splits from the Social Democrats (SPÖ) in 1966, thus it does not enter the calculation of PSInn and it is not a non-founder party. Liberal Forum (LF) in 1994 splits from FPÖ, therefore it is a continuation of a founder party and does not enter the calculation of CPSInn. After having not contested elections in 2006, the LF reappeared in 2008 above 1%, thus entering the calculation of PSInn in that year (see Table 1 above).

### **Belgium**

Red Lions (RL) in 1971 is a split from the Socialist Party (PSB), thus it does not enter the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn.

### **Denmark**

The Independent Party (DU) in 1953 has been treated as a new party (PSInn and CPSInn). Following Bartolini and Mair (1990) but unlike Ersson (2012, 22), the Socialist People's Party (SF) in 1960 has been considered as a new party. The Centre Democrats (CD) splits from the Social Democratic Party in 1973, thus it is a continuation a founder party. The Red-Green Alliance (EL) in 1990 is a merge of the Communist Party of Denmark (DKP) and of the Left Socialists (VS): following the rule specified above, it is a founder party, given that the founder DKP was larger – in terms of votes received in the previous parliamentary election – of the non-founder VS at the time of the merge.

### **Cyprus**

The United Democrats has been classified as a new party (entering the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn) and not as a split from AKEL, since it was founded in 1993 by Georgios Vassiliou, former President of Cyprus, elected as an independent with the support of AKEL.

### **Finland**

Following Bartolini and Mair (1990), the People's Party in 1951 has been considered in continuity with the National Progressive Party, which disbanded in 1951, thus it has been treated as a founder party. The Social Democratic Union of Workers and Smallholders (TPSL) splits from the Social Democratic Party (SDP) (Ersson 2012, 22). The Finnish Rural Party (SMP) in 1962 has been classified as a new party (entering the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn). In 1975, the Constitutional Right Party (PO) has been considered as a new party (Bartolini and Mair 1990, 316), while the Finnish People's Unity Party (SKYP) is a split from SMP: this means that it does not enter the calculation of PSInn (it is not a new party, as

defined above), but, given that its predecessor, SMP, is a non-founder party, SKYP enters the calculation of CPSInn.

## **France**

As recognized by Bartolini and Mair (1990, 316-317) and Ersson (2012, 21), establishing which parties are new or in continuity with their predecessors in France is not easy due the extremely fluid nature of French parties. Moreover, electoral data are very often inconsistent given that different sources report different electoral results. In 1958, the Unified Socialist Party has been considered as new (entering the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn). In 1967, the conservative political scene in France is very confused: I have followed the choices made by Bartolini and Mair (1990, 317). Note that Ersson (2012, 21) disagree on how to treat the Center Democrats (CD). In 1973, the two groups of Left Republicans (MR and RR) have been treated as new. In 1981, the two Green lists have been considered as splits from the previous Green list running in 1978. In 1997, votes grouped in the categories of 'other left' and 'extreme left' have been considered in continuity with the same groups in 1993. The National Republican Movement (MNR) and the Republican Pole have been treated as new parties in 2002 (therefore entering the calculations of PSInn and CPSInn). In 2017, the Union of Democrats and Independents is a merge of two founder parties, the Radical Party and the New Centre. Therefore, it does not enter the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn.

## **Germany**

In 1990, the electoral results in the reunified Germany have been put in comparison with the results in West Germany in 1987. Following Bartolini and Mair (1990), the German Peace Union (DFU) in 1961 and the National Democratic Party (NPD) in 1965 are non-founders and enter the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn.

## **Greece**

In 1993, Political Spring (POLAN) has been considered as a split from New Democracy, following Bolgherini (2002), thus not entering the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn. In 1996, the Democratic Social Movement (DIKKI) splits from the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK). In May 2012, the Independents Greeks (ANEL) has been considered a new party. In 2015 (September), Popular Unity splits from Syriza.

## **Iceland**

In 1953, the Republican Party (Lý) is a splinter from the Independence Party (Si). In 1967, the Independent Democratic Party (Ól) has been treated as a new party (therefore entering the PSInn and

CPSInn calculation). In 1971, the Union of Liberals and Leftists (Sf) is a continuation of Ól under a different label. In 1979, 'Independents from the South' have been treated as a new list. In 1987, the Association for Justice and Equality (Suj) splits from the Progressive Party (Fr). Following Ersson (2012, 18), in 1995 the National Awakening (*Dj*) splits from the Social Democratic Party (Al). In 1999 there is a process of splits and mergers on the left wing scene: I have followed Ersson's conservative choices (2012, 18-19) as regards the two new parties, Social Democratic Alliance (Sa) and Left-Green Movement (Vi), both considered as an emanation from the four left parties that contested the 1995 election (and therefore not entering the PSInn and CPSInn calculation). The Liberal Party (Ff) is instead a new party (thus considered in the RegV calculation). In 2016, the Reform Party (VIDREISN) splits from the Independence Party, while People's Party is new and enters the PSInn and CPSInn calculations.

### **Ireland**

In 1987, the Progressive Democrats (PDs) have been considered a new party (the leader O'Malley was expelled from Fianna Fáil and then launched the new party), thus entering the PSInn and CPSInn calculations. In 1992, Democratic Left (DL) splits from Workers Party (WP): therefore, it is not included in the PSInn but, since WP is a non-founder, DL enters the CPSInn calculation. In 2016, Independents 4 Change and Independent Alliance have been treated as new parties, separated from the residual list of Independent candidates.

### **Italy**

In 1968, the Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity (PSIUP) splits from the Italian Socialist Party (PSI). In 1976, the Radical Party (PR) and Proletarian Democracy (DP) are new parties (and considered for the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn). In 1979, National Democracy (DN) splits from the Italian Social Movement (MSI). In 1992, The Network (La Rete) has been considered a new party and so does also Democratic Alliance (AD) in 1994, while the Segni Pact (PS) has been treated as a split from Christian Democracy (DC). In 2006, the Union of Democrats for Europe (UDEUR) is a split from the Daisy, which in turn was a merge of various parties, among which the larger, the Italian People's Party (PPI) was a direct successor of the Christian Democracy (DC). Therefore, UDEUR is a continuation of a founder party. In 2008, The People of Freedom (PDL) is a merge of various parties, among which the larger is *Forza Italia* (FI). Therefore, the PDL is considered a new party and it enters the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn. Conversely, The Right (La Destra) is treated as a new party.

### **Luxembourg**

In 1999, Green and Liberal Alliance (GLA) is a new party, thus considered for PSInn and CPSInn.

## **Malta**

In 1962, both the Democratic Nationalist Party (DNP) and the Christian Workers Party (CWP) have been classified as splinter parties from, respectively, the Nationalist Party (PN) and the Labour Party (PL) (this choice is consistent with Ersson 2012, 19). Therefore, both parties do not enter the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn.

## **Netherlands**

Following Bartolini and Mair (1990), the Political Party of Radicals (PPR) splits from the Catholic People's Party (KVP) in 1971. The Reformed Political League (GPV), a former split from the Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP) in 1952 (and, therefore, a direct successor of a founder party), enters the calculation of PSInn as it overcomes 1% in 1971. Following Bartolini and Mair (1990), the Reformatory Political Federation (RPF) in 1981 has been considered a new political party (thus also considered for the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn). In 1989, the Green Left (GL) is the result of the merge among four small left-wing parties, among which the Political Party of Radicals (PPR) and the Pacifist Socialist Party (PSP) were above 1% in 1986: consequently, it is not a new party and it does not enter the calculation of PSInn. Moreover, given that before the merge, the PPR (founder) was larger than the PSP (non-founder), the GL does not enter the calculation of CPSInn. Conversely, in 2002, the Christian Union (CU) is a merge of RPF (a non-founder party) and GPV (a founder party): given that RPF was larger than GPV before the merge, CU is considered a non-founder party and included in the calculation of PSInn. In 2006, the Party for Freedom (PVV) has been considered a new party: Gert Wilders, a former member of the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD), left the party in 2004, and later in 2006 founded the Party for Freedom (PVV) but without any formal breakaway within the structure of the VVD.

## **Norway**

Following Ersson (2012, 22), the Socialist People's Party (SF) has been considered as a splinter from the Labour Party (A) in 1961.

## **Portugal**

Contrary to international practice, official electoral results include blank and invalid votes into valid votes. In order to provide more accurate volatility scores and following Nohlen and Stöver (2010), parties' vote share has been recalculated by subtracting blank and invalid votes from the total number of valid votes.

## **Spain**

Similarly to Portugal, in Spain official electoral results include blank votes into valid votes. In order to provide more accurate volatility scores, parties' vote share has been recalculated by subtracting blank

votes from the total number of valid votes. In 1982, the Democratic and Socialist Center (CDS) is a doubtful case, given that it has been launched by Adolfo Suárez, the former leader of the Union of the Democratic Center (UCD). However, there has not been a formal split in UCD and CDS can be therefore considered a new party (entering the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn). In 1986, the Communists' Unity Board (MUC) and the Democratic Reformist Party (PRD) are new parties. In 1989, the Basque Solidarity (EA) splits from the Basque Nationalist Party (PNV).

### **Sweden**

Feminist Initiative (F!), exceeding 1% of the national share for the first time in 2014, is a genuinely new party (and it enters the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn).

### **Switzerland**

Following Bartolini and Mair (1990), the Republican Movement (RB) has been considered a new party in 1971 (thus entering the calculation of PSInn and CPSInn). For the 2007 federal election, electoral data have been gathered from the Swiss Federal Administration website [http://www.politik-stat.ch/nrw2007CH\\_it.html](http://www.politik-stat.ch/nrw2007CH_it.html). In that year, the Green Liberal Party (GLP) has been considered a new party.

### **How to cite this dataset?**

Emanuele, V. (2016), *Dataset of New Parties and Party System Innovation in Western Europe since 1945*, Rome: Italian Center for Electoral Studies, <http://dx.doi.org/10.7802/1363>.

### **Publications based on this dataset**

Emanuele, V. and Chiaramonte, A. (2016), A Growing Impact of New Parties: Myth or Reality? Party System Innovation in Western Europe after 1945, *Party Politics*, DOI:10.1177/1354068816678887.

### **References**

- Bartolini, S. and Mair, P. (1990), *Identity, competition, and electoral availability: The stabilisation of European Electorates 1885-1985*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolgherini, S. (2002), Elezioni, famiglie politiche e sistema partitico nella Grecia democratica (1974-2000). *Quaderni dell'Osservatorio Elettorale* 47: 33-86.
- Chiaramonte, A. and Emanuele, V. (2015), 'Party System Volatility, Regeneration and De-Institutionalization in Western Europe (1945-2015)', *Party Politics*, Online First, DOI:10.1177/1354068815601330.

- Dassonneville, R. and Hooghe, M. (2015), Economic indicators and electoral volatility: economic effects on electoral volatility in Western Europe, 1950–2013, *Comparative European Politics*, Epub ahead of print. DOI:10.1057/cep.2015.3.
- Emanuele, V. (2015), *Dataset of Electoral Volatility and its internal components in Western Europe (1945-2015)*, Rome: Italian Center for Electoral Studies, <http://dx.doi.org/10.7802/1112>.
- Ersson, S. (2012), Electoral volatility in Europe: Assessments and potential explanations for estimate differences. In: *Elections, Public Opinion and Parties (EPOP) Conference*, Oxford, UK, 7 - 9 September 2012.
- Nohlen, D. and Stöver, P. (eds) (2010), *Elections in Europe: A Data Handbook*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Mainwaring, S. and Scully, T. R. (1995), *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Mair, P. (1993), Myths of electoral change and the survival of traditional parties, *European Journal of Political Research* 24(2): 121-133.
- Mair, P. (2002), In the aggregate: mass electoral behaviour in Western Europe, 1950-2000. In: Keman, H. (ed), *Comparative Democratic Politics*, London: Sage, pp. 122-140.
- Marinova, D. M. (2015), A New Approach to Estimating Electoral Instability in Parties, *Political Science Research and Methods* 3(2): 265-280.
- Powell, E. N. and Tucker, J. A. (2014), Revisiting electoral volatility in post-communist countries: New data, new results and new approaches, *British Journal of Political Science* 44(1): 123–147.
- Tavits, M. (2008), On the linkage between electoral volatility and party system instability in Central and Eastern Europe, *European Journal of Political Research* 47(5): 537-555.