

# Presidentialism vs parliamentarism (very easy)

Is the government responsible to the legislature

No: presidential

Yes: is there a popularly elected head of state?

No: parliamentary

Yes: semi-presidential

(Clark et al.)

## Semi-presidential

Government responsible to the president?

No: premier-presidential

Yes: president-parliamentary

(Shugart & Carey)

### **Premier-presidential**

President no de facto power, symbolical

Ireland

Pretty much parliamentary

### **President-parliamentary**

Oscillates from presidential to parliamentary

Cohabitation, France (Duverger)

Internal outcomes in the middle (Amorim & Strom)

## Internal outcomes

### **Minority governments & multi-party coalitions**

President is formateur, and in presidentialism you don't need support from other parties:

In the situation that the largest party fails to get the majority:

Presidential: 70% minority governments

Parliamentary: 40% minority governments

(Cheibub et al., 2004)

This is also why there are more legislation-coalitions in presidential regimes. However, we don't live in a purely office seeking world so still some majority governments in presidential to get policy through.

Though, lower expected benefits for other parties so ties are weaker.

### **Composition of cabinet**

Gramson's law (=cabinet proportionality to seat share) does not hold for presidential, as opposition parties do not have as much leverage over the government as in parliamentary systems

More non-partisan ministers in presidential as ministerial positions are not bargaining chips

(Clark et al.)

## **External outcomes**

### **Democratic backsliding**

Maybe presidential backslides more easily:

- Dual mandate leads to deadlock
- Symbolism of powerful president

(Linz)

This is not the case in parliamentary regimes, where the parliament and premier are very dominant (Lijphart, 2012)

Empirically supported by looking at non-OECD countries. However, this can be explained by Latin-American countries, which are more often presidential (Cheibub et al.) and Eastern-European countries. So probably not true, and more explained by other social, cultural and economic factors:

- (Cheibub et al., 2020) location of new democracy more important in predicting democratic outcome.
- (Przeworski et al., 2000) once you are above a certain economic threshold, probably won't turn into autocracy.

### **Economic outcomes**

Parliamentary have a bit better economic outcomes (McManus & Ozkan, 2018).

However, same issue as with democratic backsliding: maturity might explain differences.

### **Semi-presidential**

Premier-presidential probably no difference with parliamentary

President-parliamentary:

Best of both worlds?

Maybe

Former Soviet bloc, Ukraine. Dual mandate leads to instability and democratic backsliding

**Decision making in presidentialism is similar to multi party parliamentarism?**

**Veto players: with a presidential you have more veto players like in multi-party system. However, they are different so maybe the answer is different: institutional can be bad with gridlock, with multi-party there are also more veto-players but they could reach consensus. It is not really the same type of coalition building in a presidential system, maybe more in a semi-presidential system.**