Political Concepts
Committee on Concepts and Methods
Working Paper Series

25

September 2008

Conceptualizing and Measuring Party Patronage

Petr Kopecky, Gerardo Scherlis & Maria Spirova

Leiden University

(kopecky@fsw.leidenuniv.nl, gcherlis@fsw.leidenuniv.nl,

mspirova@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

C&M
The Committee on Concepts and Methods
www.concepts-methods.org

IPSA
International Political Science Association
www.ipsa.org

CIDE
Center for Economic Research and Teaching
www.cide.edu

Editor

Andreas Schedler (CIDE, Mexico City)

Editorial Board

José Antonio Cheibub, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

David Collier, University of California, Berkeley

Michael Coppedge, University of Notre Dame

John Gerring, Boston University

Russell Hardin, New York University

Evelyne Huber, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

James Johnson, University of Rochester

Gary King, Harvard University

Bernhard Kittel, University of Oldenburg

James Mahoney, Brown University

Cas Mudde, University of Antwerp

Gerardo L. Munck, University of Southern California, Los Angeles

Guillermo O'Donnell, University of Notre Dame

Frederic C. Schaffer, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Ian Shapiro, Yale University

Kathleen Thelen, Northwestern University

The C&M working paper series are published by the Committee on Concepts and Methods (C&M), the Research Committee No. 1 of the International Political Science Association (IPSA), hosted at CIDE in Mexico City. C&M working papers are meant to share work in progress in a timely way before formal publication. Authors bear full responsibility for the content of their contributions. All rights reserved.

The Committee on Concepts and Methods (C&M) promotes conceptual and methodological discussion in political science. It provides a forum of debate between methodological schools who otherwise tend to conduct their deliberations on separate tables. It publishes two series of working papers: "Political Concepts" and "Political Methodology."

Political Concepts contains work of excellence on political concepts and political language. It seeks to include innovative contributions to concept analysis, language usage, concept operationalization, and measurement.

Political Methodology contains work of excellence on methods and methodology in the study of politics. It invites innovative work on fundamental questions of research design, the construction and evaluation of empirical evidence, theory building and theory testing. The series welcomes, and hopes to foster, contributions that cut across conventional methodological divides, as between quantitative and qualitative methods, or between interpretative and observational approaches.

Submissions. All papers are subject to review by either a member of the Editorial Board or an external reviewer. Only English-language papers can be admitted. Authors interested in including their work in the C&M Series may seek initial endorsement by one editorial board member. Alternatively, they may send their paper to workingpapers@concepts-methods.org.

The C&M webpage offers full access to past working papers. It also permits readers to comment on the papers.

www.concepts-methods.org

Petr Kopecký, Gerardo Scherlis and Maria Spirova

Department of Political Science, Leiden University, the Netherlands

kopecky@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

gcherlis@FSW.leidenuniv.nl

mspirova@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Previous versions of this paper were presented at the workshop on Party Patronage, Florence, 22-23 November, 2007, and at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, August 30th-September 2nd, 2007

Abstract

This paper defines and operationalizes the concept of party patronage and presents a design of empirical inquiry into patronage practices from a comparative perspective. The first section of the paper reviews several existing concepts of particularistic behavior and modes of state exploitation, disentangles the relationships among them, and situates the concept of party patronage within this context. We argue that party patronage can be seen as a distinct phenomenon, clearly different from other concepts of particularistic exchanges with which it has been frequently intertwined. It is chiefly defined by the subject of the action and the practice of allocating public jobs in a discretional manner. Based on our definition of patronage, we also present and discuss four hypotheses related to patronage practices in contemporary democracies, suggesting the probable effects of party organizational changes on the scope, the institutional location, and the rationale of party patronage. We then review and critique currently used ways to define and especially to measure patronage. The last part of the paper outlines our approach to measuring patronage and presents an example of its applicability in an empirical setting.

Introduction

Rent-seeking by political parties is one of the common challenges of modern democracies. Party patronage can be seen as one of the ways through which parties try to "colonize" the state, or rent-seek within the state (Kopecky 2006; van Biezen and Kopecky 2007). Knowing the scale of party patronage gives us an indication of the state politicization and hence of the state autonomy. Understanding practices of party patronage tells us about the nature of party organizations; about how parties organize, how far they are able to reach into the state institutions and how they are using access to state institutions for their own organizational and electoral purposes. Insofar as party patronage is related to different particularistic exchanges like corruption, nepotism, fraud and clientelism, it tells us about the nature of democracy and its legitimacy. In other words, whether one looks at the challenges of state-building or the problems of party organizational emergence and transformation, party patronage appears to be an important area of inquiry.

This paper defines and operationalizes the concept of party patronage and presents an innovative empirical inquiry into patronage practices from a comparative perspective. The first section of the paper reviews some existing concepts of particularistic behavior, disentangles the relationships among them, and situates our concept of patronage within this context. Based on this definition, we also briefly present and discuss four hypotheses related to patronage practices in contemporary

democracies. The second part of the paper critiques some of the currently used ways to define and, especially, to measure patronage. The following section outlines our approach to measuring patronage and presents an example of its applicability in an empirical setting. While our approach was originally developed for the purpose of studying patronage in new democracies, it is directly applicable to established ones as well.[1] To date the approach has been used to study party patronage in Argentina, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Ghana and South Africa.[2]

Disentangling Concepts

The study of patronage has been normally associated with the study of particularistic exchanges. The literature on political particularism draws a distinction between a traditional and a modern variety of patron-client relationships. The former characterizes economically backward and politically traditional settings. It consists of a pattern of exchanges in which a particular individual (a landlord or local notable) offers protection or access to certain goods and services that he/she controls to other individuals or groups (typically peasants) in exchange for their collective political allegiance. In that sense, political patron-client relationships are the political version of a widespread pattern of social exchanges typical of traditional societies, which had originally deserved more attention in anthropological and sociological studies (see Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007:3).

The process of modernization followed by political democratization brought about substantial changes in patron-client relationships. These changes entailed the emergence of political parties as major intermediaries between states resources and societies. As Weingrod noted, the passage from traditional to mass democratic societies is "the stage where party patronage develops" (1968: 383). The traditional linkage, defined by a face-to-face contact managed by a powerful person is replaced by exchanges in which an organization, the political party, becomes the broker between state goods and services on the one hand and the clients on the other. In this way, the political party performs the role of a 'collective patron' through the

[1] An ongoing research project directed by Petr Kopecký (Leiden University) and Peter Mair (European University Institute) on party patronage in contemporary Europe, covering mainly but not exclusively old established democracies, uses the same methodology as outlined in this paper. The fieldwork in 14 European countries is scheduled for late 2008 and first results should be available in Spring 2009.

[2] The authors of this paper are currently writing a research monograph based on the findings from the extensive fieldwork carried out in these countries in 2006 and 2007. Contact the authors for more information and data availability.

distribution of public resources (Hopkin 2006).[3] The emergence of political party-directed patronage is thus associated with modernization and the expansion of state powers throughout the society.

However, as clear as this distinction between notables- and party-directed patronage can be, once we focus on modern party politics it turns apparent that studies on the subject have long suffered from a high degree of conceptual vagueness and ambiguity (Landé 1983; Piattoni 2001:4; Stokes 2007). This problem is particularly evident and troublesome in the use of the concepts of patronage and clientelism, which more often than not are indistinctly employed as generic labels to name all kinds and forms of state exploitation and rent-seeking by political parties.[4] It is likewise customary that authors make use of these two concepts synonymously, as though they referred to one and the same phenomenon.[5] In turn, it is equally frequent to find studies that do the opposite, mentioning one and the other as if they were referring to different phenomena but without offering any explanation of what differentiates one from the other. Similarly, concepts as pork-barrel politics or corruption are often included as forms of either patronage or clientelism. The ambiguous use of these key terms has hindered the understanding of the specificity of all these different forms of state exploitation by political parties. Disentangling their meaning is therefore critical for a systematic study of party patronage. In the remaining of this section we draw from both classic and contemporary literature to put forward a clear distinction between these generally intertwined concepts.

---

[3] In this same vein, Graziano (1976) distinguishes between *clientelism of the notables* and *party directed patronage*.

[4] A notable and illustrative recent example is to be found in the *Handbook of Party Politics* edited by Richard Katz and William Crotty (2006). In the chapter titled 'Party Patronage and Party Colonization of the State', Wolfgang Müller uses the concept of patronage as a generic definition: 'Party patronage is the use of public resources in particularistic and direct exchanges between clients and party politicians or party functionaries'. These goods and services provided by the politicians 'cover a wide range'. From packets of macaroni to subsidies, government contracts, tax relieves, pork barrel legislation, and jobs in the public sector, the latter being 'the most important patronage resource' (pp. 189-190). In the same volume, Jonathan Hopkin attributes an identical meaning to clientelism, which includes practices varying 'from strictly partisan allocation of jobs … to the selective distribution of bogus sickness pensions and a variety of subsidies and development projects of questionable utility'(410).

[5] On occasions, scholars explicitly allege that these concepts are interchangeable (as Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007:7). In most cases, however, authors just use one or the other interchangeably without any clarification.

Party Patronage

We define and understand party patronage as the power of a party to appoint people to positions in public and semi-public life, considering the scope of patronage to be the range of positions so distributed.[6] As Table 1 illustrates, the key feature of this definition is that it limits patronage to the discretional allocation of state positions by party politicians, irrespective of the characteristics of the appointee and the 'legality' of the decision. Although the goal pursued is not a defining feature of party patronage, parties typically allocate jobs in order to either gain control of policy-making and state institutions or to obtain or maintain political allegiance from activists and elites.[7]

Our definition suggests that party patronage does not necessarily exclude merit as a criterion for personnel selection. Nor does it imply that appointees are exclusively party members or party voters. A party may decide to appoint people on the basis of their skills or people without previous linkages with the ruling party, or both. Rather, our definition suggests that patronage appointments are made 'without any encumbrance in terms of due process or transparency' (Denton and Flinders 2006) or, in other words, that politicians have discretion to choose the criterion based on which they fill state positions. In that sense, it is worth mentioning that nepotism - understood as the appointment of friends and relatives to public jobs - is just one of the possible forms of patronage.

Table 1: Forms of State Exploitation

	PATRONAGE	**CLIENTELISM**	**PORK BARREL**	**CORRUPTION**
STATE RESOURCE	Jobs in public and semi-public sectors	Subsidies, jobs, loans, medicines, food, etc.	Funds + Legislation	Public decisions
PARTY GOALS	Control (of policy making and state institutions) - Political support	Electoral support	Electoral support	Financial resources
RECIPIENTS	Anybody	Present or Potential Party Voters	People belonging to a specific constituency	Anybody (but typically economic firms)
LEGAL STATUS	Legal or Illegal	Legal or Illegal	Legal	Illegal

[6] For this definition, we draw on Sorauf (1969), Wilson (1971), Piattoni (2001), and van Biezen and Kopecky (2007).

[7] In that sense, Eschenburg (1961) distinguishes between power and service patronage. See also Müller (2006).

Clientelism

Party clientelism refers to an exchange between a political party and individuals, in which the former releases a benefit that the latter desires in order to secure their electoral support. These exchanges may include a wide variety of benefits, ranging from food and medicines to a pension or a low interest loan, and they are equally likely to be the result of legal and illegal public decision. What matters in this definition, however, is not so much the state resource involved or the legal status of the practice, but the fact that there is a benefit which is divisible and targeted directly towards the client in order to gain their electoral allegiance. Clientelism generally implies an asymmetrical nature of the linkage, which takes place between actors of different status and power. Even when both sides accrue benefits and both may perceive the exchange as mutually beneficial, the clientelistic linkage entails an element of inequality, which is preserved and reproduced by the nature of the exchange (Eisenstadt and Roniger 1980; Müller 1989:329; Brachet-Márquez 1992; Mainwaring 1999: 177-180; Kitschelt 2000).[8] Consequently, clientelism is more likely to find fertile ground in the context of widespread urban and rural poverty and inequality than in the context of affluent societies (Stokes 2007, Müller 2006:255; Kitschelt and Wilkinson 2007).

Pork barrel

Pork barrel politics is normally subsumed as a sub-type of either clientelism or patronage. Yet, it is a distinct practice which connotes tactical allocation of government funds, usually in the form of legislation on public works projects, to favour specific constituencies (Lancaster and Paterson, 1990). Stokes (2007) distinguishes pork barrel from clientelism on the basis of the distributive criterion of each of them. While the distributive criterion of clientelism is: *did you (will you) vote me?*, the implicit criterion in the distribution of pork is: *do you live in my district?* In other words, while clientelism entails a benefit for particular individuals, pork barrel implies that a whole constituency is favoured by a public policy decision. Although

[8] Piattoni (2001) has contested this point. She suggests that democratization and the extension of citizenship rights usher in clients who are no longer *forced* to accept the clientelistic deal but rather *choose* to do so in order to gain privileged access to public resources. Likewise, Auyero (2001) sees clientelism as an endurable relationship in which strong elements of identity are usually involved. Yet, most authors agree in linking clientelistic exchanges to patterns of inequality, stressing the fact that control of scarce and vital resources enables politicians to command the political obedience of those dependent on their access to such resources. We follow here that understanding of the concept.

the goal of both clientelism and pork-barrel politics is to obtain the recipients´ electoral support, they also differ in that the element of exploitation and inequality that characterizes the former is absent in the latter. That is probably the reason why these two practices are viewed differently in normative terms. Politicians who deliver goods and services on a clientelistic basis usually try to keep it as a ´secret matter´ between them and the clients. In contrast, politicians who manage to pass pork-barrel legislation are often eager to present them as a political asset. The collective nature of the beneficiaries blurs somewhat the particularistic character of the practice of pork-barrel. Nonetheless, pork barrel does involve a particularistic exchange insofar as it requires a deliberate decision to benefit a particular constituency – typically a distinct geographic area - in order to obtain its political support, regardless of the overall efficiency or convenience of the measure. As Aldrich (1995: 30) describes it, pork-barrel politics entails benefits that are provided to one or a few districts while costs are shared across the whole country.

Corruption

As shown in Table 1, we understand party patronage as conceptually distinct not only from clientelism and pork barrel, but also from corruption. Corruption is another concept that is often used in connection with, and even instead of, various forms of state exploitation. However, due to its conceptual vagueness and empirical ambiguity, corruption is a slippery concept; here we define it as illegal public decisions taken by parties in order to obtain financial resources. For example, parties may favour firms by handing over the concession of a public utility or permitting the development of an economic activity without the fulfilment of all legal requirements, and demand, in exchange, a "contribution" to the governing party. Corrupt practices might include patronage appointments, in cases when these are done for the purpose of kickbacks or in exchange for bribes. However, not all (probably not most) patronage appointments are "corrupt" in the sense used here. Hence it is important to note that while many times the exercise of party patronage is largely perceived as illegitimate, a large number of appointments done by political parties in modern democracies are often

quite overt and above the board and need not be seen as corrupt (Weyland 1998:108-109).[9]

Defining patronage in terms of appointments as we do it here helps to distinguish it but also to clarify its relation to clientelism, pork barrel, and corruption. Firstly, clientelism, pork barrel, and corruption are per definition more penetrating than party patronage, usually reaching larger numbers of people and covering wider ranges of exchanges. The point is, however, that patronage is the necessary condition for the emergence of the three of the other, since it is only due to their ability to control state positions that parties are able to manipulate state resources in the three referred ways. In other words, insofar as a party does not control state agencies it will hardly be in the position to develop large-scale clientelistic exchanges, to favour specific constituencies through the allocation of funds, or to make illegal use of public resources for private gains (Blondel 2002:234; Kopecký 2008:9).

Secondly, as indicated in Table 1, while clientelism and pork barrel can essentially be considered electoral tools in which benefits are delivered in order to obtain the recipients' electoral allegiance, party patronage serves mainly organizational and governmental ends. Patronage may certainly be employed as a clientelistic exchange for political allegiance, as for example when jobs are handed out on a large scale in order to reward party voters. But it may also very well be used to attain various other goals, such as entrenching party networks within the state, securing party funding, or ensuring the effectiveness of party government by controlling the process of policy making and implementation.

Theorizing about Patronage in Contemporary Settings: Four Propositions for Empirical Inquiry

Studying patronage practices in empirical terms has always been a difficult task. As should be clear from above, this has partly been so because of the conceptual confusion and definitional imprecision related to different types of particularistic exchanges. Defining party patronage in terms of appointments not only solves these

[9] In this same sense Nicolas van de Walle (2007:52) distinguishes between patronage, which "is often perfectly legal" and prebendalism, which "invariably entails practices in which important state agencies unambiguously subvert the rules of law".

conceptual problems, but it also redirects our theoretical concerns towards studying patronage as an organizational resource. If party patronage is defined in terms of appointments, it becomes less interesting to study it as a form of vote gathering or as a means of establishing loyal clienteles, and more interesting to approach it as a potential strategy for building parties' organizational networks in the public sector. In other words, it becomes less interesting to ask how a party might use state positions for the benefit of its supporters and more interesting to ask how the party uses these positions for the benefit of the organization itself. It is this basic theoretical outlook that lies behind the four following hypotheses.

First, we do not specify explicitly the presence of a single motivation for party patronage. Our definition is neutral with respect to parties' potential motivation to control appointments. It is clear, though, that the traditional literature on patronage, especially the literature on party patronage as a form of particularistic exchanges, often assumes that parties use appointments as the means to reward their loyal members (e.g. Panebianco's notion of selective incentives – see Panebianco 1988). In contrast to much of that literature, our first hypothesis is that party patronage in contemporary democracies, both old and new, is, to a large extent, motivated by the need of parties to control the policy-making process and to ensure the flow of communication within the fragmented governance structures that characterize the contemporary state[10]. Importantly, we believe that there may be elements of both reward and control at one and the same time, and that political systems, or even individual institutions within a particular state, will differ in terms of a dominant motivation for patronage appointments. Therefore, we would like to develop an empirical approach that taps into these different motivations for patronage.

Secondly, our definition implies a distinction between the opportunity that exists for political parties to perform patronage and their actual use of this opportunity (see also Meyer-Sahling 2006b). When patronage operates as a form of vote- or support-gathering, or as a form of exchange, the availability of patronage positions is likely to fall far short of the expected demand, and hence the positions are also likely to be highly valued. Patronage is, in that sense, demand driven. However, there are good reasons to expect that it may sometimes be difficult for contemporary parties to fill the positions which they regard as necessary for their own survival (Sundberg

[10] See Kopecký and Mair (2007) for more detail.

1994; Kopecky and Mair 2007). Therefore, in contrast to much of the traditional literature, our hypothesis is that party patronage in contemporary democracies will be a supply driven phenomenon. We take the "opportunity" to be the area where party political appointments can happen, as delineated by and embodied in the formal rules of the state. This also allows us to view patronage partially as part of "normal politics" and, therefore, as something relatively easy to quantify. However, we also need to develop a measure that allows us to appreciate the actual use of this 'opportunity structure', as well as establish whether parties in fact do not appoint in areas where they are prohibited to do so by formal rules.

Thirdly, our definition of party patronage expands the area where patronage appointments are carried out to include not only the core of civil service - as commonly done in most existing research (see below) - but also institutions that are not part of the civil service, but are under some form of state control. Public hospitals, state-run media, and state owned companies are a just a few examples of such institutions that are often considered by the traditional literature on patronage. However, research on new forms of governance shows that in the context of modern states the power has increasingly been delegated from the core executive to an ever increasing number of regulatory agencies and other non-majoritarian institutions that are responsible for the formulation, implementation and regulation of public policy (see, for example, Peters 2002; Thatcher and Stone 2002). If parties are to retain their grip on policy-making, even if only indirectly, then it is likely that they will need to exert influence on the form and composition of these bodies through their appointments policies. It is therefore our hypothesis that the semi-public sector is likely to be more politicized through party appointments than the traditional state bureaucracy. Consequently, we need to develop a measure that provides us with a picture of appointments across a relatively large number of state and semi-state institutions.

Fourth, our definition is concerned with *party* patronage, as opposed to patronage in general. It implies that political parties are capable of acting as 'collective patrons'. It is therefore logical that case selection of any research on party patronage should be limited to political systems with some form of party government; i.e. to countries in which parties are meaningful entities and display signs of

reasonable degree of organizational continuity, stability and autonomy.[11] Even then, however, there is the question of who within the party serves as patron – is it the party leader, the party in central office, the parliamentary party, or the party on the ground? Much of the traditional literature on patronage shows that patrons were typically found among the local party political bosses or the leaders of various intra-party factions who were responsible for distributing the spoils among the members and supporters. In contrast to much of that literature, we hypothesize that patronage will predominantly be the activity of the party in the public office. Rather than being a means by which networks of support are sustained or rewarded, patronage will be a mode of governing, a process by which the party acquires a voice in the various policy-making institutions of the modern multi-level governance systems.[12] Therefore, we also need to develop an empirical measure that taps into these intra-party dynamics.

Existing Operationalizations and Empirical Measures

In order to look for empirical support for our propositions, we need to estimate the extent of patronage – including the opportunity for it as well as its practice, range and depth – and to assess the motivations and mechanics behind it. While patronage (as defined here) has rarely been the subject of systematic comparative analysis by itself, previous works have used several types of approaches to estimate the extent of patronage appointments in a given system.

One approach focuses on the potential recipients of patronage appointments and uses interviews with a somewhat large group of party members and voters to estimate the extent of patronage in single countries.[13] This method of estimating the extent of patronage clearly gets to the heart of the issue by asking the respondents if their party affiliation was in any way connected to the jobs they have. However, the approach might also produce biased estimates as it includes only a small fraction of the potential recipients of patronage appointments. Other problems of survey research

[11] In our own research we include the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Ghana, South Africa and Argentina.
[12] See Kopecký and Mair (2007) for more detail
[13] For example, Burstein (1976) interviewed 732 voters from Haifa, asking if they got some help from a party to get a job or to solve some other problem, and used this data to assess the spread of party patronage in Israel. Similarly Müller (1989) used opinion polls and interviews with Austrian party members across time to estimate the spread of patronage appointments in Austria.

such as a possibly biased sample and inaccurate reporting might also plague the research. Finally, comparable surveys are logistically difficult to administer in a comparable way across countries. More importantly, however, it does not help to answer the research questions posed by our study, which go beyond a general estimation of how much patronage there is a in given system.

A second approach focuses on the career paths of a smaller group of potential patronage recipients – top ministerial officials, for example – and looks at their backgrounds to determine the role of political parties or a political connection in appointing them.[14] Some of these studies propose a clear separation between a partisan and a professional (or career) appointment (Meyer Sahling 2006a) while others permits for each appointment to have elements of both (Kristinnson 2006). This method allows for the composition of comparable indicators across countries and certainly is a valid way to study the phenomenon of a party's political appointments, but it leaves appointments made by the political party but not considered "political" outside the realm of patronage. In addition, it does not allow for an estimation of the range and depth of the practice as it is limited to small groups of civil servants.

To get an idea about the bigger picture, a third approach uses proxy indicators as estimate for patronage appointments. These usually relate to the size or growth of the state administration sector and have included the share of public employment, the size of the state administration, the share of temporary appointments in the administration, or the percentage of total expenditure allocated to personnel spending. These purely quantitative measures are relatively accessible and can be utilized easily in different contexts.[15] The most obvious problem that studies using this approach

[14] Examples include Meyer-Sahling's several works in which he uses the political paths of top civil servants and their turnover to estimate the extent of politicization of the state (Meyer-Sahling 2006 and b); Kristinsson's account of patronage in Iceland for which he used expert surveys to estimate the percentage of top ministerial jobs that were seen as having being filled for "political" reasons (Kristinson 2006); and Sikk's work on political appointments in Estonia (Sikk 2006).

[15] Gordin (2002) and Mannow (2006), for example, conceptualize patronage as the level of job growth in the high-level bureaucracy and measure it as the percentage of total expenditures allocated by the central government and ministries to personnel spending. In a similar conceptual vein, Brusco, Nazareno and Stokes (2005) use municipal spending on personnel as a proportion of its total budget per year to estimate the extent of patronage at the local level and O'Dwyer (2004 and 2006) uses the increase of the absolute number of positions in the state administrative personnel at the national-level as a proxy measure of party patronage. Grzymala-Busse (2003) also used the share of state administration employment out of total employment and its absolute numbers to estimate the rent-seeking behaviour of political parties. Ferraro (2006) used the proportion of temporary personnel compared to permanent personnel to judge the extent of political appointment. Going even further, Manow (2002) and Kopecky and van Biezen (2007) have used several variations of the widely available corruption indices compiled by Transparency International to approximate the extent of rent-

share is that the proxies might not reflect the extent and nature of patronage practices, as they measure different aspects of the rate of *employment* in the state administration. They focus on how many people are employed, a figure that might be influenced by more than just the ability and likelihood of parties to make appointments. Institutional reform, economic situation, international factors such as EU integration and NATO membership, as well as domestic actors such as trade unions, syndicates, lobbies, and professional corporations are examples of factors that might independently influence the number of people working for the state. Conversely, patronage appointments might happen even if there is no noticeable change in the size of the administration; parties might appoint by replacing people rather than through adding new positions. In addition, these studies are usually limited to the central administration or ministries and thus ignore a large proportion of the public sectors (regulatory agencies, state owned enterprises, state services, etc) in which as Grzymala-Busse herself has argued, a large proportion of the patronage appointments might be. [16]

A final and separate approach in itself has been the work of Barbara Geddes. In *Politician's Dilemma*, Geddes combines several indicators into an Appointment Strategy Index that estimated the extent to which the executives use competence rather than partisanship or personal loyalty as the basis for making administrative appointments. The index is a count of the negative answers to eight separate questions that capture quite different realities such as the criterion (competence or partisanship) for choosing the finance minister and the presence or absence of scandals about partisan appointments in the press.[17] Based on detailed information about each country and government, the index allows for comparisons across space and time. However, it still suffers from several shortcomings as it ignores partisan appointments that are not political, and simplifies partisan appointments to a yes and no answers.

---

seeking behaviour, including patronage. However, given our earlier discussion of the conceptual differences between corruption and patronage and the highly contested ability of the corruption indices themselves to capture the real as opposed to perceived levels of corruption, this approach is clearly inappropriate.

[16] In her earlier work she did not make a clear distinction between this concept and party patronage. However in her 2007 book she uses a narrow definition of patronage and clearly separates it from the study of the growth of the state administration (Grzymala-Busse 2007:136-149). She limits patronage to the exchange of jobs for votes. In fact, her definition of state expansion, a process driven by parties' discretion in hiring, comes closer to our present definition of patronage.

[17] The index is a count of the negative answers to eight separate questions that capture quite different realities such as the criterion (competence or partisanship) for choosing the finance minister and the presence or absence of scandals about partisan appointments in the press.

Overall, the most problematic issue in research on patronage to date has been, in our opinion, its failure to provide for a measure that allows for an estimation of the actual scope of patronage practices but is also useful for cross country comparisons. Given how complex patronage appointments are, their scope can hardly be captured by figures such as number of jobs or ministerial spending or equated with the level of corruption. In-depth interviews and analysis of career paths, provide good insights into patronage appointments, but are very limited in the scope and difficult to replicate in several contexts. The current approaches also fail to go beyond the extent of patronage and empirically investigate the motivations and mechanics of patronage appointments.

Measuring Party Patronage

The basis of our data collection consists of the face-to-face expert/elite interviews with respondents familiar with patronage practices in different policy areas and different sets of state institutions. For our own research we aimed to gather at least 5 respondents/experts for each policy area, expecting that experts will be able to cover different institutional groups within each policy area (see below for more details). Experts include the following categories of respondents: academics, journalists, NGO sector experts, key bureaucrats involved in the reforms of state administration, and some politicians. The following section outlines the design of our empirical inquiry in some detail.

Mapping out the State

As the first step of operationalizing the concept of patronage, we create a generic model of the state. This helps us to delineate the areas where patronage appointments can and do happen. Here we borrow from Peters (1988) comparative work on public administration. He argues that to compare the public administration sectors across countries one can use several approaches including comparing the size of the public administration in different settings, comparing public administration according to different policy-areas, and comparing different organizational structures of the administration. We have chosen to combine these approaches by, firstly, dividing the state by the type of policy areas. The state can of course be divided into nearly infinite

number of policy areas. However, for comparative and analytical purposes, we have chosen to include only what can be considered the classic state sectors; i.e. sectors in which political parties may especially be expected to control appointments. This yields the following nine categories of state areas:

Economy
Finance
Judiciary
Media
Military and Police
Welfare
Culture and Education
Foreign Service
Regional and Local Administration

We do not include "political institutions" (e.g. Cabinets, Parliaments, Presidential staff etc.) to our generic model of the state. We assume these institutions are per definition subject to party patronage. We also include Regional and Local Administration (RLA) under policy areas. The RLA is of course not a policy area in a strict sense; including RLA also diverts attention from our main research focus: the state at the national level. In addition, RLA is likely to be a very large area, since it encompasses same or similar institutions on the national level across *all* policy areas, especially in decentralized states. However, we expect that political parties may have good reasons to try to control appointments on the sub-national level as well, and so we include these sub-national institutions as a special area on its own.

We further sub-divide each policy area by the type of institutions that might represent it. This will allow us to compare patronage practices across institutional types and for example, test propositions whether patronage practices are more widespread among regulatory agencies than in within the core of civil service. We include three different types of institutions:

- Ministerial Departments (i.e. core civil service)
- Non-Departmental Agencies and Commissions (i.e. regulatory and policy advising and devising agencies).
- Executing Institutions (i.e. institutions involved in delivering services and provisions, or in production)

Mapping out the Opportunity for Patronage Practices

Having defined the policy areas and their institutional representations we take each group of institutions within each policy sector to be the unit of analysis at this stage and move to investigate deeper. For instance, as in the example in the appendix, if we are investigating the financial sector, we conduct the analysis for each of the three groups of institutions within it.

As the second step, we use the constitutional and legal framework of the state (i.e. appointment procedures) to determine whether parties have formal and prescribed powers to "reach" these institutions, i.e. to appoint people to positions in these institutions. Next, using expert interviews, we *(in)validate* our interpretation of appointment procedures for each of the units of analysis.

Mapping out the Practice of Patronage

We then move on with the interviews to examine the actual situation, i.e. try to find an answer to the question do parties use the opportunity for patronage appointments presented to them by the formal rules? Alternatively, even if formal rules do not permit patronage appointments, we ask respondents if parties actually reach into these institutions. We are essentially interested in the respondents' idea whether patronage appointments happen in each sector.

Next, assuming that patronage appointments happen in the state sector under investigation, we examine both the range and depth of patronage appointments in it. We ask about two slightly different aspects of patronage: the range of patronage practices (Q4a), and the depth of the practice of patronage (Q4b).

The remaining questions are all open-ended and they ask respondents about the nature of patronage practices as they relate to the whole policy area: Q5 asks about the mechanism of making patronage appointments within the party/parties; i.e. who

within political parties is the patron; Q6 concerns the changes of practices of patronage over time; Q7 tries to get to the motivations behind party patronage; and finally Q8 asks experts to think about the people who actually get appointed to the positions in the policy area. Importantly, as in the previous question (Q7), we do not see these conditions as mutually exclusive. Consequently, we are interested which of the conditions is necessary and sufficient for candidates to be appointed by political parties.

Aggregating the Data from Expert Surveys

To re-cap, we have divided the state into nine policy areas and each area into three institutional sub areas. We record answers from a minimum of 5 interviewees for each of these 27 units for questions 1-4 and for each of the policy areas for questions 5-8. We compose several measures from this information. Firstly, there are three measures which will allow us to compare the extent of patronage across countries:

- A measure of the patronage opportunity in each country based on the answers to questions 1 and 2. It is standardized to vary between 0 and 1, with higher numbers (close to 1) reflecting a situation where the whole state is a possible arena for patronage and values close to 0 representing the opposite.
- A measure of the patronage practice in each country, based on the answers to question 3, again standardized to vary from 0 to 1. Value close to 1 reflecting a situation when the whole state is subjected to party patronage and 0 that none of the state is.
- A measure of the pervasiveness of patronage in each country, based on answers to questions 4a and 4b. These are added to produce a single indicator of how wide and how deep the practice of patronage is with values close to 1 reflecting a very widely and deeply entrenched patronage and value closer to 0 reflecting a more limited practice.

In addition, the scores for each policy sector and institutional type can be aggregated in different ways so as to allow different policy and institutional areas within the state, and different policy and institutional areas across states.

Finally, the answers to questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 will provide us with the basis for several key outputs of the study. Data from question five allows us to test H2 through a comparative analysis of the mechanisms through which party patronage is carried out, including internal party dynamics. The answers to question 6 provide some insights into the trends in patronage practices over time, thus allowing us to test H4. H1 is investigated through the analysis made possible from the data in question 7, about the motivations of political parties to make patronage appointments. Finally, question 8 allows us to validate some one of the key assumptions of the study, namely that patronage appointees might be merit-based.

Conclusion

Overall, this several-step approach to measuring and explaining party patronage allows us and (anybody else who uses it) to carry out comparative analysis into the opportunity, practice, motivations, and mechanisms of party patronage. It allows for both cross-country and cross-sectoral comparisons that might shed more light into common trends and dissimilar patterns. Not only is this approach easily replicable by country teams in numerous settings, thus presenting an opportunity to collect and compare invaluable new data, but we also believe that the methodology used improves substantially on the measures developed thus far.

Firstly, our approach broadens the potential scope of patronage by including ministries, agencies and executing institutions alike as potential arenas of party patronage appointments. This is a distinct improvement on existing studies that have been limited to the central administration and is particularly relevant to contemporary democracies where non-departmental institutions (such as quangos) are more and more important in the decision-making process.

Secondly, our measures do not use proxy indicators such as money or number of people employed. Instead, we attempt to define the possible range and depth of the practice of patronage and then measure against this yardstick. Using expert opinions we can claim to present a numeric estimate about the extent of patronage practice in each system and each sector.

Finally, by using in-depth expert interviews by country specialists we provide first hand insights into the dynamics of patronage practices in each country. Thus,

rather than positing certain assumptions into the motivations and uses of patronage in contemporary democracies, we can investigate them by getting into the heart of the matter in each setting.

References:

Aldrich, John H. 1995.*Why Parties. The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America,* Chicago, The University of Chicago Press

Auyero, Javier. 2001. *Poor People's Politics.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Biezen, Ingrid van and Petr Kopecký. 2007. 'The state and the parties: public funding, public regulation and rent-seeking in contemporary democracies', *Party Politics*,. 13(2) 235–254.

Blondel, Jean. 2002. 'Party Government, Patronage, and Party Decline in Western Europe', in Richard Gunther et al (eds.), *Political Parties: Old Concepts and New Challenges* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 233-256.

Brachet-Márquez, Viviane. 1992. ´Explaining Socio-political change in Latin America: the case of Mexico´, LARR, 27:3, 91-121

Brusco, Valeria, Marcelo Nazareno, and Susan Stokes. 2005. 'The electoral consequences of particularistic distribution in Argentina', prepared for the conference *Poverty, Democracy, and Clientelism: The Political Economy of Vote Buying*, Stanford, November 28-December 2, 2005.

Burstein, Paul. 1976. 'Political Patronage and party choice among Israeli voters' *The Journal of politics*, Vol. 38, pp. 1024-1032.

Denton, Matthew and Matthew Flinders. 2006. ´Shrinking Reach and Delegated Governance. Political Parties and Patronage in Britain´, paper prepared for the workshop on Political Parties and Patronage, ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, Nicosia, 25-30 April, 2006.

Eisenstadt, S.N. and Louis Roninger. 1980. 'Patron-Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social Exchange', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 22(1), pp.42-77.

Eschenburg, Theodor. 1961. *Ämterpatronage*, Stuttgart: Curt E. Schwab

Ferraro, Agustín. 2006. ´Una idea muy precaria. El nuevo servicio civil y los viejos designados políticos en Argentina´, *Latin American Research Review,* 41:2, pp. 165-186.

Geddes, Barbara. 1994. *Politician's Dilemma. Building State Capacity in Latin America.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gordin, Jorge. 2002. 'The political and partisan determinants of patronage in Latin America 1960-1994: a comparative perspective', *European Journal of Political Research* 41.

Graziano, Luigi.1976. 'A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Clientelistic Behaviour', *European Journal of Political Research*, 4, pp.149-174.

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2003. 'Political competition and the politicization of the state in East Central Europe', *Comparative Political Studies*, 36(10).

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2007. *Rebuilding Leviathan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopkin, Jonathan. 2006. 'Clientelism and Party Politics', in Richard S. Katz and William J. Crotty (eds.), *Handbook of Party Politics* (London: Sage), pp.

Kitschelt, Herbert. 2000. ´Linkages between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Polities´, *Comparative Political Studies*, 33-6/7, pp. 845-879.

Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven Wilkinson (2007), "Citizens-politician Linkages: An Introduction", in Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven Wilkinson (eds.), *Patrons, Clients, and Policies. Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-49.

Kopecký, Petr and Peter Mair, 2007. 'Political Parties and Patronage in Contemporary Democracies', paper prepared for the workshop on Political Parties and Patronage in Contemporary European Democracies, Florence, 22-23 November 2007, pp. 17.

Kopecký, Petr. 2008 'Political Parties and the State in Post-Communist Europe: The Nature of Symbiosis', in Kopecký, Petr (ed), *Political Parties and the State in Post-Communist Europe,* Londond: Routledge.

Kristinsson, Gunnar Helgi. 2006. "Patronage and public appointments in Iceland." Paper prepared for the workshop on Political Parties and Patronage, ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, Nicosia, 25-30 April, 2006.

Lancaster, Thomas and David Paterson. 1990. 'Comparative Pork Barrel Politics', *Comparative Political Studies,* 22:4, pp. 458-477.

Landé, Carl. 1983. ´Political Clientelism in Political Studies: Retrospect and Prospects´, *International Political Science Review*, 4:4, pp. 435-454.

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

Manow, Philip. 2002. 'Was erklärt Politische Patronage in den Ländern Westeuropas?', *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 43: 20–45.

Manow, Philip. 2006. "Parliamentary Elections and Party Patronage - an empirical study of the German top ministerial bureaucracy at the federal and state level, 1957-2005." Paper prepared for the workshop on Political Parties and Patronage, ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, Nicosia, 25-30 April, 2006.

Meyer-Sahling, Jan- Hinrik. 2006a. 'The Rise of the Partisan State? Parties, Patronage and the Ministerial Bureaucracy in Hungary', in Petr Kopecký (ed.), Political Parties and the State in Post-Communist Europe, special issue of *The Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 22(3), 2006, pp..

Meyer-Sahling, Jan-Hinrik. 2006b."The Institutionalization of Political Discretion in Post-Communist Civil Service Systems: The Case of Hungary." *Public Administration* Vol. 84(3): 693-716.

Müller, Wolfgang C. 1989. 'Party Patronage in Austria. Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Findings', in Anton Pelinka and Fritz Plasser (eds.), *The Austrian Party System* (Boulder: Westview Press), pp. 327-355.

Müller, Wolfgang C. (2006). 'Party Patronage and Party Colonization of the State', in Richard S. Katz and William J. Crotty (eds.), *Handbook of Party Politics* (London: Sage), pp.189-94.

O'Dwyer, Conor (2004). 'Runaway State Building; How Political parties Shape States in Postcommunist Eastern Europe', *World Politics*, 56, pp.520-53.

O’Dwyer, Conor (2006). *Runaway State Building: Patronage Politics and Democratic Development* , Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Panebianco, Angelo (1988). *Political Parties. Organization and Power* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Peters, B. Guy. (1988). *Comparing Public Bureaucracies. Problems of Theory and Method*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Peters, Guy B. (2002). ‘Dismantling and Rebuilding the Weberian State’, in Jack Hayward and Anand Menon (eds.), *Governing Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.113-127.

Piattoni, Simona, ed., (2001), *Clientelism, Interests, and Democratic Representation. The European Experience in Historical and Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Sikk, Allan. 2006. “From Private Organizations to Democratic Infrastructure: Political Parties and the State in Estonia” in Petr Kopecký, ed. “Political Parties and the State in Post-Communist Europe”, special issue of *The Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 22(3), 2006, pp.

Sorauf, Frank (1969), The Silent Revolution in Patronage, in Edward Banfield (Ed), Urban Government: A reader in Administration and Politics, New York: The Free Press, pp. 376-386

Stokes, Susan (2007), ´Political Clientelism´, in Carles Boix and Susan Stokes, *Handbook of Comparative Politics,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sundberg, Jan (1994). ‘Finland: Nationalized Parties, Professionalized Organizations’, in Richard S. Katz and Peter Mair (eds.), *How Parties Organize*. London: Sage, 158-84.

Thatcher, Mark and Alec Stone Sweet, eds., (2002). *The Politics of Delegation: Non-Majoritarian Institutions in Europe*, special issue of *West European Politics*, 25(1).

Walle, Nicolas van de (2007), “Meet the New Boss, Same as the Old Boss? The Evolution of Political Clientelism in Africa”, in Kischelt, Herbert and Steven Wilkinson, *Patrons, Clients, and Policies. Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 50-67

Weingrod, Alex (1968), ´Patrons, patronage, and political parties´, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 10:4, pp. 377-400

Weyland, Kurt (1998), The Politics of Corruption in Latin America, *Journal of Democracy,* 9:2, 108-121

Wilson, James (1971), Political Organizations, New York: Basic Books

Winter, Lieven de (2006) “Sixty Years of Party Patronage in the Belgian Partitocracy: Quantitative and Qualitative Transformations.” Paper prepared for the workshop on Political Parties and Patronage, ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, Nicosia, 25-30 April, 2006.

Appendix: Data collection card and expert survey questionnaire *(example based on South Africa)*

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">

Area: <u>Financial Sector</u>

Institutions:

Department: National Treasury

NDACs: Financial and Fiscal Commission (FFC), Auditor General (AG), Financial Services Board (FSB); State Tender Board (STB); Accounting Standards Board (ASB);

Executive: SA Reserve Bank (RB); Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), Land Bank (LB), Public Investment Corporation (PIC),

Size:
</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">

Ask the respondent to be aware of the following:

- Unless we specify otherwise (i.e. Q6 below), we are interested predominantly in patronage appointments in the **current situation**. We understand “current” to mean the period from the last election/government formation until the moment of the interview.
- As indicated above, we are interested in appointments that can be considered “**party appointments**”; i.e. they are done by persons clearly related to a particular party or who are in positions of power because of a political party. These might be the Prime Minister, the President, ministers, party chairmen, and deputy ministers.
- We also ask the respondents to think of the **general situation** in a particular state area, rather than particular cases that they might be specifically familiar with, when answering the questions.
</td></tr>
<tr><td>Department: National Treasury</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>

Q1. Is this institution formally reachable by political parties, i.e. do parties have legal power to appoint individuals to jobs in …..?

Mechanisms: Public Service Act; all admin departments set up/abolished/changed by the Pres (Ministers) at will; Heads of Departments (HoDs) appointed by the Pres (or the relevant Minister); HoDs appointed for 5 years (can be extended); Limited no. of Special Advisors can also be appointed for a fixed period by the Pres (or the Minister); HoDs appoint, promote, confirm as permanent, and transfer other officials (A and B class);
</td><td>Yes/No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Questions for the expert interviews:</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Q2. In your opinion, is the Treasury formally reachable by “political parties,” i.e. in general, do people linked to political parties have legal power to appoint individuals to jobs in these institutions?</td><td>Yes/No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Q3. In your opinion, DO such individuals (ministers, PM, President, party chairman) actually appoint individuals to jobs in the National</td><td>Yes/No</td></tr>
</table>

Treasury?	
Q4a. If yes, would you say that "political parties" appoint (choose the one that applies): -- in a few institutions ; -- in most institutions; or -- in all FIs. Q4b. If yes, would you say that "political parties" appoint at…..: -- at the top managerial level -- at the middle level employees -- at the bottom level technical and service personnel Data: Expert interviews	Not Applicable Range 1-3

NDACs**:** Financial and Fiscal Commission (FFC), Auditor General (AG), Financial Services Board (FSB); State Tender Board (STB); Accounting Standards Board (ASB);	
Q1. Are these institutions formally reachable by political parties, i.e. do parties have legal power to appoint individuals to jobs in …..? **Mechanisms**: AG (appointed by P by a nomination approved by 60% vote in parliament); FFC appointed by P (approx. 9 people);	Yes
Questions for the expert interviews:	
Q2. In your opinion, are the NDACs formally reachable by "political parties," i.e. in general, do people linked to political parties have legal power to appoint individuals to jobs in these institutions?	Yes/No
Q3. In your opinion, DO such individuals (ministers, PM, President, party chairman) actually appoint individuals to jobs in the NDACs?	Yes/No
Q4a. If yes, would you say that "political parties" appoint (choose the one that applies): -- in a few institutions ; -- in most institutions; or	Range 1-3

-- in all NDACss. Q4b. If yes, would you say that "political parties" appoint at…..: -- at the top managerial level -- at the middle level employees -- at the bottom level technical and service personnel Data: Expert interviews	 Range 1-3

Executive**:** SA Reserve Bank (RB); Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), Land Bank (LB), Public Investment Corporation (PIC),	
Q1. Are these institution formally reachable by political parties, i.e. do parties have legal power to appoint individuals to jobs in …..? **Mechanisms**: RB (Pres appoints Gov + 6 Deputy Gov = RB Executive; other 7 directors elected by shareholders), LB (12 Board members?); NDA (11 appointed Board members); PIC (9 Board members chaired by Dep Fin Minister, and appointed by the Fin Minister);	Yes
Questions for the expert interviews:	
Q2. In your opinion, are these instituions formally reachable by "political parties," i.e. in general, do people linked to political parties have legal power to appoint individuals to jobs in this institution?	Yes/No
Q3. In your opinion, DO such individuals (ministers, PM, President, party chairman) actually appoint individuals to jobs in the executing institutions of the Financial Sector?	Yes/No
Q4a. If yes, would you say that "political parties" appoint (choose the one that applies): -- in a few institutions ; -- in most institutions; or -- in all institutions. Q4b. If yes, would you say that "political parties" appoint at…..: -- at the top managerial level	Range 1-3 Range 1-3

-- at the middle level employees -- at the bottom level technical and service personnel Data: Expert interviews	

Q5: In reality, who within the parties is responsible for making these appointments?	Open ended
Q6: Do you think that the current practices of appointments differ substantially from previous periods? If so, how and why?	Open ended
Q7: In your opinion, why do "political parties" actually appoint people to these jobs? Are they interested in rewarding their loyal party activists and members with state jobs or do they want to control these sectors by having personnel linked to the party appointed in them?	Open ended
Q8: Now, we want to ask you a question about the people appointed to these positions. Would you say that they have gotten their jobs because they are professionally qualified for them, or because of their political link, or because of their personal allegiance, or any other allegiance?	Open ended
Q9: Additional comments, questions and clarifications. Potential explanations for the scope and extent of party patronage.	Open ended