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This volume centers on the puzzle arising from the cases of Taiwan and Japan. The two have used very similar electoral systems that nonetheless produce very different outcomes—particularly in relation to the number of political parties. In their introduction Batto and Cox build on existing theory to argue that the reason the Taiwan and Japanese cases may seem puzzling is that, essentially, we have been looking in the wrong place. Scholars have focused overly much on the effects of electoral systems at the constituency level and the competition for legislative seats. While this type of competition is a crucial determinant of a country’s party system, it is not the only determinant—nor is it necessarily the most important one. The electoral system gives us clues about the incentives of candidates, voters, and parties to coordinate within a given electoral system, but it tells us little about the incentives of these groups to coordinate across districts to form a modest number of large, national parties. These cross-district coordination incentives are shaped by assessments of the value of, and competition for, executive office (Cox 1997; Hicken 2009). The potential reward for forming a large national party to compete for the executive reflects the power the executive wields vis-à-vis subnational governments (Chhibber and Kollman 2004), the concentration of power within national level political institutions (e.g., the power of the president vis-à-vis the legislature) (Hicken 2009; Hicken and Stoll 2011, 2013), and the chance that the largest legislative party will be able to capture executive power (Hicken 2009).
Drawing on these executive-centric theories Batto and Cox argue that the differences in the nature of competition for executive office in presidential Taiwan versus parliamentary Japan account for differences in the number of parties under similar electoral systems. Competition for the presidency in Taiwan travels down the ticket and drives party competition toward two large parties allied with the two presidential front-runners (see also Hicken and Stoll 2011). By contrast, the indirect selection of the prime minister and cabinet in Japan, combined with the specific norms about which legislative parties are able to form the government, undermine incentives for bipartism.

Given this argument the cases of Thailand and the Philippines appear to present us with an additional puzzle. Both countries have adopted mixed-member systems similar to those found in Japan and Taiwan. And yet it is parliamentary Thailand that has moved closest to a two-party system, while the party system in presidential Philippines remains highly fragmented. In remainder of this chapter I explain this variation using an executive-centric approach, but I draw on elements of this approach that focus as much on the differences within regime types as between them. In the next section I briefly review the legislative and executive institutions in Thailand and the Philippines, focusing on the adoption of mixed-member systems in 1997 and 1987, respectively. I then compare each case to its East Asian counterpart, focusing on why presidential institutions produce two parties in Taiwan but many in Philippines, and why the parliamentary systems of Thailand and Japan consolidated at different rates after reform.

**Legislative and Executive Systems**

Thailand is a parliamentary system. For most of its history the parliament has consisted of two chambers, the House of Representatives and the Senate. Prior to 1997 the Senate was a fully appointed body. Between 1997 and 2007 the Senate was directly elected, and since 2007 half of senators are elected and the other half appointed. Thailand has used two basic sets of electoral systems for electing the House of Representatives. Prior to 1997 the vast majority of Thailand’s prereform elections for the House of Representatives used the block vote electoral system. This relatively uncommon electoral system combines multiseat constituencies with multiple votes and the plurality rule. In the Thai case the country’s 76 provinces were divided into 142–156 electoral constituencies, almost all containing two or three seats. Voters in each constituency could cast as many separate votes as there were seats in that constituency (e.g., two votes in a two-seat constituency,
three votes in a three-seat constituency). Voters cast their votes for individual candidates (not parties) and were allowed to split their votes between candidates from different parties and to partially abstain (i.e., not cast all of their votes). However, they were prohibited from cumulating multiple votes on a single candidate. Political parties wishing to contest a constituency were required to field a full team of candidates (e.g., three candidates in a three-seat constituency).

The 1997 constitution dramatically overhauled Thailand’s electoral system for the House. The block vote system was replaced by a mixed-member majority system with 400 seats elected from single-seat constituencies via the plurality rule and 100 seats elected from a single nationwide constituency via proportional representation. Voters cast two separate votes—one for a candidate in their single-seat constituency, and one for a party for the national list tier. Neither the votes nor seat allocation between the tiers were linked in any way and, unlike in Japan, candidates had to choose between running in the constituency or running on the party list—they could not do both. Parties who received fewer than 5% of the party list votes received no list tier seats.

In 2006 the military launched a coup against the government of Thaksin Shinawatra and subsequently crafted a constitution (adopted in 2007) designed to undermine the capacity of future political parties and elected leaders to challenge Thailand’s conservative forces (Hicken 2007, 2013). First, the single-seat electoral constituencies were replaced with the old multiseat, block vote system. Second, the single national party list election was scrapped and replaced with eight regional party lists, with parties allowed to run in just some of the lists. The consequence of this reform was that the party list campaign no longer served as a national referendum on each party’s platform and prospective prime minister since each region voted on a separate slate of party list candidates, and potentially, a different set of parties.4

In 2011 the electoral system was once again amended back to a more standard mixed-member system, with 375 single-seat constituencies and 125 seats filled via PR party list elections in a single nationwide district.

The Philippines uses a presidential system with a directly elected president, and two legislative chambers: the House of Representatives and the Senate, both directly elected.5 During the premartial law period (1946–72) the House was elected from single-seat districts. After the fall of Marcos in 1986 a new constitution was passed that included provisions for an unusual mixed-member system. However, while the provision for a mixed-member majority system was included in the 1987 Constitution a law fully imple-
menting the measure was not passed until 1995 and not used in an election until 1998. In the Philippines MM system the party list seats make up to 20% of the total House and are allocated using proportional representation. Both political parties and sectoral organizations can compete for the seats, save the five largest parties from the previous election, which are barred from competing. To obtain a seat parties (or sectoral organizations) must receive at least 2% of the PR votes. For every 2% of the vote a party is awarded a seat, with an upper limit of three seats in the list tier (Hicken and Kasuya 2003). The remainder of the House seats are filled from single-seat districts.

Explaining Variation

In both Thailand and the Philippines legislative-centric explanations fail to fully account for the size of the legislative party system and variation over time. That is not to say that legislative-centric explanations have no power. Quite the contrary. The average effective number of parties competing at the district level in both countries is about what we would expect given the electoral system (table 8.1). Changes in average district magnitude correspond to the expected changes in the average effective number of parties in each constituency, though the changes over time are rather modest. But this is only a small part of the story. The local-level party system in the Philippines, for example, increased by less than .2 parties between the pre- and post-martial law periods, from 2.0 to 2.2. At the same time the national party system nearly doubled in size, from 2.3 to 4.3 parties. In Thailand the party electoral reforms lowers the constituency-level party system from 3.2 to 2.3, but we see an even greater decline in the number of parties nationally, from 7.2 to 3.2. In short, in both countries the number of parties nationally has often departed quite dramatically from the number of parties locally. Variation in the incentives over executive-focused competition explains this pattern.

Thailand
Pre-1997

Elsewhere I have argued that the dramatic decline in the number of parties nationally in Thailand primarily reflects stronger incentives for voters, parties, and candidates to coordinate across districts in a bid to capture executive power (Hicken 2009). (Cross-district coordination is also referred to as
nationalization, linkage, and aggregation in the literature). Those nationalization incentives are a function of (a) the payoff to being the largest party at the national level (the size of the prize) and (b) the odds that the largest party will capture that payoff. In pre-1997 Thailand an appointed Senate, factionalized parties, and reserve domains combined to limit the size of the potential nationalization payoff. The practice of selecting someone other than the leader of the largest party as premier for much of the period also reduced the expected utility of nationalization.

Leaders of the largest party in pre-1997 Thailand faced significant checks on their power, which reduced the perceived payoff to coordination and nationalization. Specifically, the presence of bicameralism, reserve domains, and party factionalism all reduced the size of the nationalization payoff (Hicken 2009). First, Thailand’s Senate reduced the potential payoff to large parties in the House. Strictly speaking the Senate was not a formal veto gate, possessing only delaying power. However, while the Senate did not have the formal power to block legislation, it was nonetheless difficult for elected governments to ignore the interests of the Senate. Until 1997 the Senate was an appointed body. During the 1980s these appointees were generally former military officials and bureaucrats. Representing as it did the interests of Thailand’s conservative forces—who had a long history of intervening to shut down democratic institutions—the Senate’s position on a matter carried a good deal of weight. This was especially true when the senators were relatively united on an issue. In effect the Senate functioned as a reserve domain. The existence of an unelected Senate stocked with representatives of the military and bureaucracy meant that the parties that controlled the House and cabinet still did not hold all the reins of power.

Throughout much of the 1980s another piece of executive power was off-limits to party leaders—macroeconomic and budgetary policy. This reserve domain emerged as the result of a compromise between elected politicians, Thailand’s conservative forces, and Prime Minister (and former

### TABLE 8.1. District Magnitude and Effective Number of Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District magnitude (for lower tier in MMS)</th>
<th>Average effective number of parties / constituency</th>
<th>Effective number of electoral parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (1946–69)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (1987–2010)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand (1986–97)</td>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand (1997–2006)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand (2007)</td>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand (2011)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
general) Prem Tinsulanonda. As part of this “pork-policy compromise” macroeconomic and budgetary policy was shielded from elected politicians and run by Prem-backed technocrats. In exchange, the political parties were given control of the sectoral ministries (e.g., Commerce, Industry, Education, Agriculture) and were allowed to run them as they saw fit provided they avoided major scandal and respected the budgetary ceilings set by the technocrats (Hicken 2001).

By the early 1990s both of these reserve domains were withering away. In 1988 an elected politician became Thailand’s prime minister for the first time since 1976 and immediately did away with the pork-policy compromise by seizing control of macroeconomic and budgetary policy (Hicken 2001). In addition, the composition of the Senate gradually changed so that over time business interests came to make up a larger and larger portion of Senate appointees. Yet, while these reserve domains were in place they represented a significant diffusion of political authority and a disincentive for coordination and nationalization.

Another factor contributing to weak nationalization incentives—one that did not change over the course of the 1980s and 1990s—was the factionalized nature of Thai parties. Similar to Japan, Thai political parties were extremely factionalized. Although, unlike Japan, Thai factions were relatively promiscuous—frequently changing parties from election to election. Because of the rampant party factionalism the leader of a political party was more like a first among equals than the head of a political hierarchy. The fact that the leader of the largest party might still find his power checked by rival factions within his own party discouraged greater attempts at building larger parties. Party factionalism was a major cause of the frequent cabinet reshuffles and short-lived governments that so characterized Thailand’s prereform system as disgruntled faction leaders actively sought to bring down their rivals, including sometimes the nominal head of the party—the prime minister (see Chambers 2003). Factional conflict within the ruling party and/or within its coalition partners was a major cause of the collapse of nearly every democratic government prior to 1997 (Chambers 2003).

During this pre-1997 period Thai political parties were not large national organizations. Each governing party controlled only a relatively modest plurality of parliamentary seats and drew support from only one or two regions. Yet even these moderately sized, nonnational parties were unable to manage internal conflicts between factions. The lesson internalized by nearly all party leaders and politicians during the 1980s and 1990s was that attempts to better coordinate across districts in an effort to
build a larger, national party would not be worth the cost to party cohesion (Chambers 2003).

Finally, in parliamentary systems like Thailand’s the method of selecting the prime minister determines the probability that becoming the largest party will translate into control of government and access to cabinet positions. If the rules or norms of parliament are such that the leader of the largest party always has the first opportunity to form a government and usually succeeds, then nationalization may be worthwhile. If, on the other hand, actors other than the leader of the largest party often form or get a chance to form the government, then coordination incentives are weaker.

In Thailand the leader of the largest party did successfully head a new government after the September 1992, 1995, and 1996 elections, but this was not always the norm. After the 1979, 1983, 1986, 1988, and March 1992 elections, nonelected individuals (military figures) were invited to form a government either immediately after the election or after political party leaders failed in their attempts. In 1988 the man invited to be prime minister, General Prem Tinsulanonda, turned down the invitation, and the head of Chart Thai, the largest party, became prime minister. After a nonelected individual was again invited to form the government after the March 1992 elections (resulting in mass protests) a constitutional amendment was passed requiring that the prime minister be a member of the House of Representatives. Prior to the amendment, however, the high probability that the leader of the largest party would not get the opportunity to form a government undermined the incentives to try to create a large national party.

To summarize, the pre-1997 institutional environment generated weak coordination and nationalization incentives. The existence of party factionalism together with an appointed Senate and the presence of other reserve domains placed checks on the power of the largest party and kept the potential payoff to nationalization low throughout the period. In addition, for much of the pre-1997 period the selection procedure for the prime minister was uncertain. This uncertainty together with the small nationalization payoff undermined the incentives to try to create a large national party.

1997 and 2007 Constitutional Reforms

By 1997 most of these structural barriers had been removed. Since 1992 the prime minister was required to be a member of the House of Representatives, and the norm was such that the leader of the largest party formed the government. Parts of the bureaucracy were also no longer shielded
from partisan control. The final reserve domain—the unelected Senate—was removed in 1997 as the Senate became a fully elected body. However, the change in the 1997 constitution with the biggest bearing on nationalization incentives was increased powers for the prime minister relative to factions within his own party. This enhanced the power of the prime minister over intraparty factions and thereby increased the payoff to being the largest party in government.

The result was a sharp reduction in the number of parties. Some of this reduction was due to changes to the electoral system—specifically the reduction in district magnitude—and the accompanying decline in the effective number of parties at the local level. By only the second post-reform election in 2005 competition at the constituency level was essentially a two-party affair (figure 8.1). However, more dramatic was the improved coordination across districts—consistent with the stronger nationalization incentives under the 1997 constitution. Figure 8.1 compares the effective number of parties at the constituency and national levels before and after constitutional reform. Note the narrowing of the gap between the effective number of parties nationally and the average effective number of parties locally in 2001 and 2005. This is evidence of improved cross-district coordination. Whereas before the reforms poor nationalization accounted for the majority of the size of the national party system (54%), in 2005 only 16% of the effective number of parties nationally was attributable to poor cross-district coordination.

The result of fewer parties at the local level (lower $N_{local}$) and improved nationalization is a sharp reduction in the effective number of parties nationally ($N_{SMD}$). The number of parties nationally ($N_{SMD}$) fell to 3.8 in 2001 and 2.4 in 2005 from an average of 7.2 prior to 1997. Better nationalization was a bigger factor in reducing the effective number of parties nationally than the decline in the average effective number of parties at the district level. The effective number of parties contracted by 67% nationally compared to only 38% at the district level.

As discussed earlier, the 2006 coup leaders attempted to refragment the party system via the 2007 constitution. Specifically, they sharply reduced the power of the prime minister, including power over party factions; split the national party list tier into eight regional party list elections; and reintroduced the block vote at the constituency level. However, the nature of partisanship had fundamentally changed in Thailand in the wake of the 1997 reforms. As a result, the potentially fragmentary effects of the 2007 reforms on the party system were muted. New party reputations and collective partisan identities largely overrode attempts to undercut the success.
of national parties. The result is that while we saw a modest increase in the number of parties in each constituency and nationally, as expected, the number of parties stayed well below the pre-1997 level. Finally, the 2011 election, held under modified 1997 rules, produced a return to the smaller party system characteristic of 2001 and 2005.

The comparison between Thailand and Japan is an interesting one. Both are parliamentary systems that, prior to the introduction of an MM system, employed highly candidate-centered electoral systems. The party system in each country was composed of multiple, highly factionalized political parties—though the Thai party system was more fragmented than the Japanese system. The MM systems adopted in the two countries were also very similar. And yet the effect of the reforms on the party systems was somewhat different. While both countries experienced greater consolidation of their party systems, the move toward two parties occurred much more rapidly in Thailand than it did in Japan. Despite starting at a much higher level of party system fragmentation, a two-party system had emerged in Thailand by the second postreform election, as measured by the effective number of parties in the legislature (table 8.2). (The military intervention and subsequent constitutional reforms led to an increase in fragmentation in the third election.) By contrast, after the second postreform election in Japan the effective number of legislative parties was still more than three. Only after the last election, the fifth since the reforms were introduced, did Japan approach bipartism (table 8.2).
What accounts for the different rates of consolidation across the two countries? As Batto and Cox suggest in the introduction, the key lies in the different norms relating to competition for executive office. In Japan the 1993 election shattered the norm that the largest party in the Diet would form the government and capture the premiership. After the post of prime minister went to the leader of a party with less than 7% of the seats, party leaders rightly calculated that it was worth competing as a small or medium-sized party, given that there was still a chance that they could emerge as the head of government after postelectoral bargaining. This was not the case in Thailand, where the strong norm and practice was that the leader of the largest party formed the government and assumed the post of prime minister. There the removal of lingering structural barriers and the increase in the incentives to form large, national parties brought about by the 1997 reforms were enough to induce greater coordination across districts and a quick move toward bipartism.10

Philippines

The Philippines has one of the oldest democratic traditions in Asia. Under U.S. colonial auspices elections for both national and local offices were the norm from the early 1900s. After a brief interruption during the Japanese occupation, elections resumed in 1946 in a fully independent Philippines. Elections were a mainstay of Filipino life until 1972 when President Ferdinand Marcos declared martial law. After 14 years of dictatorship democratic government was restored in 1986. The post-Marcos constitutional drafters chose to reinstate the pre-Marcos American-style presidential system, with an elected president, a House of Representatives, and a Senate.

What has the Filipino party system looked like during the two democratic periods since independence? In many respects the parties and party system in the two eras look remarkably similar (Hicken 2009). Parties in both periods are characterized by factionalism, frequent party switching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last 3 prereform elections</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First postreform election</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second election</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third election</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth election</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth election</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(called “turncoatism” in the Philippines), and party labels that generally mean little to voters or candidates. Philippine parties are generally organized around a powerful leader, or a temporary alliance of leaders, and tend to be primarily concerned with distributing the spoils of government to themselves and their local supporters. This continuity over time makes sense given (a) the sociohistorical roots of the Philippine party system (see Hutchcroft and Rocamora 2003; Landé 1965; Wurfel 1988), and (b) political institutions that have provided disincentives for forming strong, national parties (Hicken 2009).\textsuperscript{11}

Prior to the imposition of martial law more than 20 years of elections in the Philippines had produced a relatively stable two party system—with the Nacionalista and Liberal parties vying for power in every election. By contrast, in the post-Marcos party period a multiparty system has been the rule.

So, compared to Thailand, Taiwan, and Japan, the Philippines is an exception. It is the only case where the move to a MM system has been accompanied by substantial fragmentation of the party system. From 1946 to 1969 the average effective number of national parties ($N_{SMC}$) was 2.3. Since 1987 $N_{SMC}$ has averaged 4.3 (see table 8.1), reaching a high of 5.3 in the 2007 election.\textsuperscript{12} This is puzzling given the executive-centric theories discussed in the introduction and in this chapter. Presidential institutions tend to have a deflationary effect on the legislative party system (Shugart 1995; Hicken and Stoll 2011; Golder 2006). Competition for the top prize of the presidency drives the number of presidential candidates to two, and the competition between these two frontrunners casts a shadow down into legislative contests.\textsuperscript{13} Both within and across districts candidates, parties, and voters have incentives to organize themselves behind one of the frontrunners, and thus bipartism in the presidential party system tends to have a deflationary effect on the number of parties in the legislative party system (Hicken and Stoll 2011).

It is this deflationary effect that Batto and Cox cite as the primary reason for why there are fewer parties under the Taiwanese MM system than we observe in Japan. Why, then, do we not see something similar in the Philippines? Why do presidential elections not produce the same deflationary effect we observe in Taiwan? Why do the Philippines have more parties than parliamentary Thailand?

One possibility could be the MM system itself. As discussed above, the Philippines uses an unusual MM system that (1) caps the number of seats any party can win in the list tier at three seats, and (2) prohibits mainstream political parties from competing for list tier seats. Thus, the system provides ample opportunity for fragmentation and the proliferation of
small parties. Despite this, the MM system is clearly not the main driver of greater fragmentation. To begin with, while the MM provisions were part of the 1987 constitution the system was not implemented until 1998. In the three elections prior to 1998 the system operated as a simple single-seat district election, the same as had existed prior to martial law. And in those elections there was already clear evidence of fragmentation. The average effective number of parties before martial law was 2.1. In 1992 and 1995 the number was 4.6 and 3.0, respectively. To make comparison easier across time I have excluded the party list election results from the calculation of $N_v$ in this chapter, but even with the party list parties excluded the average effective number of electoral parties post-Marcos is 4.6.

To understand this increase we must understand its source. I will first demonstrate that the rise in the number of parties nationally is not being driven by more competitors winning votes at the district level. Rather, post-Marcos we have a deterioration in the extent to which candidates coordinate across districts under the banners of a few large parties. Finally, I will show how changes to the 1987 constitution, particularly the imposition of a single term limit for the president, undermined the incentives to coordinate across districts during elections.

Table 8.3 compares the mean effective number of parties nationally ($N_{SMD}$) with the average number of parties in each district ($N_{local}$), before and after martial law. The table makes it clear that the growth in $N_{SMD}$ is not a result of many more parties winning seats at the district level after 1986. From 1946 to 1969 the average effective number of parties at the district level was 2.0. After 1986 $N_{local}$ increased only slightly to 2.2, an increase of less than 10%. Indeed, a large change in $N_{local}$ would be surprising given that the electoral rules for the House remained virtually unchanged between the two periods. This small increase in the average size of the local party system cannot account for the 87% increase in the size of the national party system. In short, more competitors winning seats at the local level is not primarily to blame.

So what, then, is the cause of the post-Marcos fragmentation of the party system? Recall that the national party system is the product of two sets of interactions—within districts and across districts. It is in the area of cross-district coordination where we see the greatest change post-Marcos. This is where the party system, in short, has broken down. One way to measure the extent of cross-district coordination or nationalization is with a fragmentation score. This party system fragmentation score ($F$) is computed by dividing the difference between the average number of parties per district ($N_{local}$) and the number of parties nationally ($N_{SMD}$) by $N_{SMD}$.
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Thailand and the Philippines under MMM (Cox 1999, 17). \( F = (N_{SMD} - N_{local})/ N_{SMD} \). The resulting fragmentation score tells us what portion of the size of the national party system is due to poor cross-district coordination/nationalization, and what percentage reflects what is happening within districts. If \( F \) is .10 this suggests that 10% of the size of the national party system can be attributed to different parties garnering votes in different parts of the country (poor nationalization), with the other 90% ascribable to the average number of parties at the district level. The larger the fragmentation score, the lower the level of nationalization.

Prior to martial law coordination between districts was extremely good. The same two parties, the Nacionalista and Liberal parties, were the front-runners in most districts nationwide. Thus, the average inflation score was .098—in other words, less than 10% of the size of the national party system was due to nationalization failures. This stands in stark contrast to the post-Marcos inflation score of .48 (table 8.3). Nationalization has clearly declined in the recent democratic period and it is this failure to coordinate across districts that is primarily responsible for the larger effective number of parties nationally.

How, then, do we explain the deterioration of nationalization post-Marcos? A variety of explanations have been offered in an attempt to explain the fragmentation of the national party system since 1986. I argue that the key change was new limits to presidential reelection. When democratic government made its return to the Philippines the rules and institutions in place before martial law were largely readopted. Within the national government the distribution of power remained relatively concentrated in the hands of the president. But, while there was a high degree of institutional continuity before and after martial law, the 1987 Constitution did introduce one important change—a ban on reelection for the president. Before 1972 Philippine presidents were limited to two terms. In the wake of the Marcos dictatorship the constitution drafters opted to limit presidents to a single term. Elsewhere I have argued that the introduction of a reelection ban was a key factor in fragmenting the party system (Hicken 2009). I reexamine that claim here, using new data.

Prior to 1972 incumbent Filipino presidents regularly marshaled the

| TABLE 8.3. Nationalization and the Number of Parties before and after Martial Law |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|--------|
| Country (election year)         | Average \( N_{local} \) | Average \( N_{SMD} \) | Average \( F \) |
| Philippines I (1946–69)         | 2.0        | 2.3        | .098   |
| Philippines II (1992–2010)      | 2.2        | 4.3        | .48    |
resources and influence of the presidency to back their reelection bids. All but Marcos were unsuccessful in their bid for a second term, but nonetheless the costs associated with challenging a sitting president weeded out all but the most serious of challengers and enabled voters to easily distinguish the frontrunners from the also-rans. This changed with the introduction of the reelection ban. The ban lowered the barriers to entry for presidential contenders and undermined the incentives for sitting presidents to invest in party-building. The result has been a large increase in the number of viable presidential candidates.17 This is clear from a comparison of the effective number of presidential candidates. During the 26 years before martial law the average effective number of presidential candidates ($N_{\text{Pres}}$) was 2.2. By contrast, the effective number of presidential candidates between 1992 and 2010 ranged between 3.2 and 5.8, for an average of 4.2 (see the $N_{\text{Pres}}$ column in table 8.4). The end of incumbency does appear to have had the effect of fragmenting the presidential races.

To understand why more presidential candidates should affect the legislative party system, recall that the deflationary effect of presidential elections is a contingent one. Proximate presidential elections only have the theorized deflationary effect when there are a small number of presidential candidates (Cox 1997; Golder 2006). Hicken and Stoll (2011) find that beyond two candidates the deflationary effect of presidential elections disappears, and there is some evidence that where the effective number of presidential candidates is very large, presidential elections may actually have an inflationary effect on the legislative party system.

With this in mind we can see how the differences in the competition for the presidency in Taiwan and the Philippines enable us to explain the dif-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$N_{\text{Pres}}$</th>
<th>$N_{\text{SMD}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average:</strong> 1946–1969</td>
<td><strong>2.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average:</strong> 1992–2010</td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ferent level of consolidation in the two countries. In Taiwan “[c]ompetition for the presidency . . . drove the system toward two main candidates who, in turn, had strong incentives to organize legislators behind their candidacies” (Batto and Cox, introduction). In the Philippines a ban on reelection led to a proliferation of presidential candidates, and this has corresponded with the fragmentation of the legislative party system (table 8.4). Before martial law the effective number of electoral parties is 2.4, as opposed to 4.3 after martial law.18

Conclusion

The cases of Thailand and the Philippines underscore the argument of this volume—namely, that the appeal of, and competition for, executive office shapes the legislative party system as much as, and perhaps more than, competition in the legislative arena. In both cases changes to the legislative electoral systems had predictable effects, but it was other constitutional changes—a presidential reelection ban in the Philippines and greater incentives for cross-district coordination in Thailand—that had the most substantial impact on the party system.

Taken together the cases of the Philippines, Thailand, Japan and Taiwan suggest that while the differences between presidential and parliamentary systems have a powerful effect on the party system, variation within regime type can be just as powerful. In parliamentary Japan and Thailand differences in the norms about which party could form the government help explain why the Japanese party system was slower to consolidate compared to the Thai system, while the differences in the number of presidential candidates standing for office produced differently sized party systems in the Philippines and Taiwan.

NOTES

1. The scope and pattern of ethnic cleavages can modify these institutional effects (Cox and Knoll 2003; Hicken and Selway 2011).
3. Senators are elected from multiseat districts using SNTV.
4. In addition, the coup leaders outlawed the Thai Rak Thai party and banned its top leadership, including Thaksin, from office.
5. Senators are elected via the block vote within a single nationwide district.
6. For more on this compromise, see Christensen (1993), Doner and Ramsay (2004), and Hicken (2001).
7. Two changes are particularly worth noting. First, cabinet members were
required to give up their seats in parliament if they choose to join the cabinet. Since parties or ministers that chose to leave the cabinet, or are expelled by the prime minister, could no longer return to parliament the stakes associated with breaking with the prime minister were much higher. Second, the constitution placed new restrictions on party switching. In order to compete in future elections candidates had to be members of a political party for at least 90 days. The rule was designed to curb the 11th hour party switching by individuals and factions that traditionally occurred in the run-up to Thai elections. Once the House was dissolved elections had to be held within 45 days (if the House’s term has expired) or 60 days (if parliament is dissolved)—not enough time for would-be party switchers to meet the membership requirement. The prime minister, with the power to dissolve the House and call new elections, gained the most from this change. The prime minister could credibly threaten to call new elections if party factions tried to bolt, thus forcing the members of the faction to sit out one election.

8. Since the 1997 Thai system contains both constituency and party list votes one must decide whether to combine those votes to produce $N_{SMD}$ and the inflation scores or to use only the votes cast in the constituency elections. There are pros and cons to either approach. The numbers I report in the text, tables, and figures are calculated using total party vote shares—that is, I combine the party list and constituency votes for each party. Excluding party list votes produces slightly higher $N_{SMD}$ and inflation scores for 2001 and 2005 but these inferences remain the same.


10. An additional difference is the effect of upper house elections. In Japan strong performance in upper house elections could result in smaller parties receiving a more favorable portfolio allocation within the government (see Lin’s chapter 2 in this volume). As a result, small parties who did poorly in lower house elections could still gain access to the cabinet if they did well in upper house elections. By contrast, Thai Senate elections were, by constitutional requirement, nonpartisan affairs—candidates for the Senate were forbidden from affiliating with a political party. Thus, unlike in Japan, election results for the Senate could not boost the fortunes of smaller parties.

11. These institutions include a powerful presidency (see Samuels and Shugart 2010), candidate-centered electoral arrangements for both the House and Senate, and, until 2010, ballot design that undermined the utility of party labels. See Hicken 2009 for more details.

12. The 1987 elections are excluded due to the lack of comprehensive data on candidate and party vote shares. This rise in the number of parties has been the subject of much scholarly attention in the Philippine literature (see, for example, Kimura 1992).

13. The shadow of presidentialism is strongest where presidential and legislative elections are concurrent (Shugart 1995; Cox 1997), where there are few presidential candidates (Golder 2006; Hicken and Stoll 2011), and where the president is very powerful vis-à-vis the legislature (Hicken and Stoll 2013).

14. Note, this is equivalent to Cox’s Inflation score (I) (1997). Because the word inflation can be confusing due to its use as an economic term, I use the term “fragmentation.”

15. These include a change in the structure of local politics in the Philippines,
the decreased importance of the board of elections, and the advent of synchronized local and national elections. See Hicken 2009 for a critique of these explanations.

16. In a response to the excesses of the Marcos era a few of the president’s powers were curtailed, including the ability to declare a state of emergency and the ability to transfer “saved funds” between governmental departments.

17. Choi (2001) also draws the connection between term limits and an increase in the effective number of presidential candidates post-Marcos, but does not discuss the implications for the legislative party system.

18. However, a closer look at the post-Marcos presidential elections presents us with a few puzzles. First, while there is clearly a correlation between the rise in the effective number of presidential candidates and the increased number of parties, the year-to-year correlation is imperfect. Second, it is puzzling that in 2004, post-Marcos lows in both the effective number of presidential candidates (3.2) and the effective number of parties in the district (1.9) correspond with a post-Marcos high in terms of the number of parties nationally (4.7). Something else other than presidential term limits is clearly at work in 2004 (see table 8.4). Finally, one wonders why nationalization has not improved over time. In fact, there is a noticeable increase in fragmentation starting in 2001 that continues through the most recent election. A ban on presidential term limits post-Marcos cannot account for this change over time. Hicken (2011) argues that the timing of decentralization reforms in the Philippines helps explain these puzzles.
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