

Democratization in Political Parties of Pakistan: Mediating Role of Leadership in the Intra-Party Democracy

Jamshed*, Muhammad Ismail†

Abstract

Aim of this article was to explore the democratization in Pakistan's political parties, which is vital for strengthening democracies. Most of political parties lack intra-party democracy (IPD). This study revealed the significant concepts to understand the democratization. These concepts were institutionalization, inclusiveness and decentralization. Role of leadership was analyzed as mediating effects on the intra-party democracy. This article displayed those facets of democratization positively, significantly and strongly associated with intra-party democracy. Partial mediating role of leadership was found between facets of democratization and democratization in the political parties of the country. Among sociodemographic variables, age and education have significant effects on respondents' views. The study recommends intra-party democracy should be implemented in letter and spirit which will strengthen the democracy in the country. The study also presented implications for the future researchers on IPD.

Keywords: political parties; intra-party democracy; institutionalization; decentralization; democratization; inclusiveness; Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz (PML-N); Pakistan People's Party-Parliamentarian (PPP-P).

Introduction

Political parties attempt to reorganize their bond with common people (Ryan & Smith, 2011) through announcing reorganizations that targeted at enhancing the chances for common people to have participated in the political decision making, with special reference to their participation within the political parties (e.g. Scarrow, 1999; Gauja, 2015). Similarly, at the organization stage, several states have introduced reforms targeted at associating common people more regularly and closely in the processes of making decisions separate from the cycles of electoral processes (e.g. Scarrow, 2001; Fung & Warren, 2011). At the levels of the political party, restructuring and reorganizations have also been introduced in several political parties which were carried out to increase the citizens' active participation in policy and decision-making procedures (Cross & Katz, 2013). In current debates on intra-party democracy, two features of the IPD generally obtain consideration, such as the selection methods of the leadership or the candidate (for example, Hazan & Rahat, 2010; Cross, 2013; Rahat, 2013; Spies & Kaiser, 2014; LeDuc, 2001); and the

* PhD Scholar Political Science Department, Qurtuba University of Science & Information Technology, Email: jamshed.malik.phd.scholar@gmail.com

† Assistant Professor Political Science Department Qurtuba University of Science & Information Technology

second one is the prospects for directly electing the members of the party and influencing the internal decisions, for example membership ballots (for Sussman, 2007; example, Scarrow, 2014). Some scholars have also discussed the people attitude towards IPD (Anderson et al., 2005; Blais & Gelineau 2007; Bowler & Donovan 2002; Norris, 1999). Across the globe, political parties are quickly opening up their inner events and dealings, implementing party elections, and permitting party supporters and followers to play a dynamic as well as an unswerving part in the decision-making and life of the political parties (Cross & Katz 2013; Cross et al., 2016; Hazan & Rahat, 2010; Kenig et al., 2015; Sandri et al., 2015; Scarrow 1999; Seyd 1999; Young & Cross, 2002a). Nowhere is this IPD more seeming than in the issues related to personnel selection: nomination of the candidate and selection of the political parties' leadership. In both issues, members of the political party are gradually granted authority about the selection (Bille, 2001; Cross & Pilet, 2015; Kenig, 2009; Pilet & Cross, 2014; Stewart, 1997). The political parties are not only vital for democratic and representative systems but are also ever-present (LaPalombara & Weiner, 1966). These political parties assist manifold purposes in a democratic system, together with interest enunciation as well as combination, political socialization, enlistment or staffing, holding political executives and governments responsive and answerable, and making a government.

Literature Review

In this volume, the editors, Cross & Katz (2013), have discussed the problematic concept of 'intra-party democracy' (IPD), which has been extensively discussed because it concerns the dispersal of power inside the political parties. Their work investigated diverse strictures that describe or effect IPD, such as model of organization, legal provisions, social influences, the membership's role, involvement of women, methods of selecting party leadership, development of policies, selection of candidate and the decisions about the finances for running the party affairs. This work also searches to set a research program aimed at scholars working on the issues related to IPD. Improvements and reorganizations in the idea of IPD decision-making procedure are frequently based on the notion and principle that common people desire more direct voice and participation in these procedures, nevertheless, the empirical information to back this claim is rare. Close, Kelbel & van Haute (2017) explore those voters have diverse likings in terms of the procedures for the selection of candidate. Their findings confirmed that common people do have unambiguous and strong likings for what way political parties should organize and how democracy should operate.

The issue related to the decreasing level of political parties' worker participation and their engagement in the political parties, the issue of IPD has turned their attention considerably in recent past. The major desire behind these initiatives was to invigorate the IPD which may reverse the global tendency of diminishing party activism among the common masses. The scholars have also turned their attention towards the theoretical and practical aspects of the IPD (e.g. Cross & Katz, 2013; Loxbo, 2013; Scarrow, 2000, Scarrow & Gezgor, 2005; Von dem Berge et al., 2013). Several scholars have studied one particular aspect of IPD such as membership of the political parties (Scarrow & Gezgor, 2005; van Haute & Gauja, 2015; Scarrow & Gezgor, 2010) or selection processes for the electoral candidates (Rahat, 2013; Rahat & Hazan, 2001; Rahat, Hazan & Katz, 2008). In fact, the most significant contribution was done in the areas of political party organization and its change. In this respect, Katz & Mai (2009) had done important contributions by studying various political parties across the globe.

Some scholars have also discussed the more important feature of IPD, the selection of electoral candidates (Von Berge & Poguntke, 2017). Writers also defined it as the 'extra-legal procedure by which a political party agrees on a candidate hold a public office which will be elected through ballot process and the way elites in political parties recommend and support one candidate over the others' (Ranny quoted in Hazan & Rahat, 2010). Therefore, in numerous states, the procedures adopted for the selection of candidates are mostly not properly regulated and are considered that these are the private or internal affairs of every political party. Labeled as the 'secret garden' of political affairs or politics (Gallagher & Marsh, 1988), the process of the selection of the candidate is less studied and focused, across the globe for the reason that challenges connected or associated with the absence and unapproachability of the experimental and practical information (Hazan & Rahat, 2010). However, regardless of the challenges, the importance of the procedures regarding the selection of candidates cannot be underrated. Undeniably, Schattschneider (quoted in Hazan & Rahat, 2010) highlights the significance of the selection of candidates in modern party politics.

Various current works on the selection of candidates have focused mainly on the political parties in the developed countries and their democratic systems (Gallagher & Marsh, 1988; Hazan & Rahat, 2010), or some scholars have also focused their attention on the nascent democratic systems in Latin America, such as, Caey & Polga-Hecimovich, 2006) have recognized that the participation of party workers in the selection of candidates for electoral processes strengthened IPD. Moreover, Aragon, (2009) authorizes that selection

of candidates for election by the political party workers to get also recognition from the voters. Though, a maximum number of works have focused mainly on the electoral rivalry between political parties, in addition to those which factors help them to win elections (Bratton & Van de Walle, 1997; Levitsky & Way, 2010; Makulilo, 2007; Sulley, 2015a).

Table 1
Ruling Political Parties since 1985

Party	Established	1973-1977	1988-1990	1990-1993	1993-1996	1997-1999	2008-2013	2013-2018	Total
PPP	1967	Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto	Benazir Bhutto		Benazir Bhutto		Yousaf Raza Gilani; Raja Pervaiz Ashraf		12 Years; 7 Months; 12 Days
PML-N				Nawaz Sharif		Nawaz Sharif		Nawaz Sharif; Shahid Khaqan Abbasi	10 Years; 3 Months

A substantial number of authors have also researched the authoritarian inclinations of the political parties, progress, and development of political parties, institutionalization of the political parties, as well as the inner traits of the political party traits across the globe and especially in developing and underdeveloped states (Carey, 2002; Lindberg, 2006; Rakner & Van de Walle, 2009; Randall & Sv°asand, 2002; Paget, 2018; Sulley, 2015b). Scholars have also studied the systems of the political parties, the role of, the political leadership, and elites in the developed democracies where they have introduced reforms that intended to improve opportunities for common people and political party workers to have active political participation (Altman, 2011; Anderson & Goodyear-Grant, 2010; Bowler et al., 2007; Donovan & Karp, 2006), or the progress or development in arranging events for the common people and political party workers to take an active part in decision making (Jacobs et al., 2009; Neblo et

al., 2010; Parkinson & Mansbridge, 2012; Ugarriza & Caluwaerts, 2014). Similarly, smaller political parties have also introduced reforms (Marangoni, 2012).

Research Gap

The researcher explored the existing works about the IPD and their role in strengthening democracy, but it was found that very few researches has been done in Pakistan, on this particular aspect. Many researchers have, due to its significance, has explored the phenomena of democratization in political parties, but no one has ever studied the mediating effects of leadership role in cementing the IPD or playing as a constraint role in implementing true IPD. This particular research has carried out research on this vital issue in the country which desperately needs strengthening democratic norms and values. Pakistan, which has faced several interruptions in democratic history of the country and needs a smooth sail of democracy and development. Political parties have to play significant role in strengthening democracy in Pakistan and that can only possible when these political parties introduce true democratic norms in the country and in this way this country will make progress to a better and bright future.

Research Methods and Materials

The scholar employed the mixed method research design, which comes under Pragmatism, a research philosophy where researchers use both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The scholar selected the experts and interviewed and bring forth some fruitful themes through thematic analysis. Those themes were then converted to variables, Independent, dependent, and mediating variables, to test them through a survey among the political party workers and scholars of social sciences. The questionnaire was utilized to gather empirical evidence or information. The sample of the participants of this research was selected through a multi-stage sampling technique, a type of probability sampling. The dependent variables were Democratization in political parties while the independent variables were Inclusiveness; Institutionalization and Decentralization. The most significant and important section of this study was built on empirical evidence or data gathered through dispensing questionnaires amongst the sample of the respondents selected for the study and those were the politicians, political party workers of high and low repute, and experts and technocrats from the political parties on the one hand, and the scholars in addition to the commentators, on the other hand, those all were picked through a systematic way, the multi-stage sampling technique. This survey method was adopted because Fink (2003), Babbie (2002), and Hagan

(2006), argued that this statistical, numerical, and quantitative approach allows the scholars to collect the primary data and information from the respondents and the means and methods also allow us to generalize the outcomes and results over the study's population selected for the research. Through the structured questionnaire, the scholar collects the data on various variables influencing the IPD such as internal structures, decision-making processes in addition to the institutional set-up.

Inferential statistical tools were employed to examine a population and the sample drawn from it (Mason & Lind, 1996) (Tables 5 and 6). The authors employed the Mediation Analysis (Tables 2 to 4). Furthermore, two important statistical tests, for example, t-Test as well as ANOVA were also run to find out whether there was any meaningful mean difference in the opinions of respondents on basis of sociodemographic attributes (Table 9). Interviews were also conducted, through Thematic Analysis, to understand the major concepts derived from the literature review and before going to collect the numerical data and analyze that data, the sample is mentioned in table 3.

Analysis of the Numerical Data

The scholar explored the facets of IPD and then transformed them as variables. The variables were, Inclusiveness (X_1), institutionalization (X_2); and Decentralization (X_3). The hypotheses to check the relationship through mediation were formulated as:

H₀₁: Leadership plays mediating role in the association between Inclusiveness and IPD in political parties of Pakistan. (Analysis done in Table 2).

H₀₂: Leadership plays mediating role in the association between Institutionalization and IPD in political parties of Pakistan. (Analysis done in Table 3).

H₀₃: Leadership plays mediating role in the association between Decentralization and IPD in political parties of Pakistan. (Analysis done in Table 4).

Two major political parties, PML-N and PPP-P, were taken as a sample among the political parties of Pakistan. Through exploratory literature review, major variables were explored. To check the association between predictors, and criterion variables through intervening variables, a statistical approach was selected. Among 550 questionnaires, 520 were returned back and were used in the research. The respondents of the study were scholars, teachers, local government representatives, and political parties' workers of the political parties selected for the study (PPP and PML-N). It is fact that an extensive variety of sources of data has positive impacts on the validity and credibility of the findings of the research (Pratt and Loizos

1992). SPSS was used as a statistical software tool for analysis of the information and evidence collected in the form of numerical data, Correlation, Regression, t-Test, and ANOVA.

H₀₄: Predictors (Institutionalization; Inclusiveness and Decentralization) correlated with the Criterion (IPD in Pakistan’s political parties) (Analysis done in Table 5).

H₀₅: The facets of IDPs (Institutionalization; Inclusiveness and Decentralization) predict Criterion (IPD in Pakistan’s political parties) (Analysis done in Table 6).

H₀₆: Sociodemographic attributes influence the opinion of the respondents about the role of the facets of IDPs (Institutionalization; Inclusiveness and Decentralization) in the Criterion (IPD in Pakistan’s political parties) (Analysis done in Table 7).

Major Findings and Discussion

Leadership Role in IPD: Mediation Analysis

H₀₁: Leadership plays mediating role in the relationship between Inclusiveness and Democratization.

Table 2
Coefficients for the Mediating Effect

Testing Paths	
Path c: dependent variable = IPD in Political Parties	
p = .0000**	
Path a: dependent variable = Leadership	
p = .0000**	
Path b and c' dependent variable = IPD in Political Parties	
p = .0352*	
independent variable= Inclusiveness (c')	
independent variable = Leadership (b)	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The scholar concluded that Path a is significant; Path b is significant; Path c is significant and Path c' is insignificant. If all the four paths are significant, it shows full mediation, while the first three significance indicates partial mediation. However, the above results show that the first three paths are significant, which justifies partial mediation. The hypothesis is accepted.

H₀₂: Leadership plays mediating role in the relationship between Institutionalization and IPD in Pakistan’s political parties.

Table 3

Coefficients for the Mediating Effect

Testing Paths	
Path c: dependent variable = IPD in Political Parties	
p = .0000**	
Path a: dependent variable = Leadership	
p = .0000**	
Path b and c' dependent variable = IPD in Political Parties	
p = .0346*	
independent variable= Institutionalization (c')	
independent variable = Leadership (b)	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The scholar concluded that Path a is significant; Path b is significant; Path c is significant and Path c' is insignificant. If all the four paths are significant, it shows full mediation, while the first three significance indicates partial mediation. The above results show that first three paths are significant, it justifies partial mediation. The hypothesis is accepted.

H₀₃: Leadership plays mediating role in the relationship between Decentralization and IPD in Pakistan’s political parties.

Table 4

Coefficients for the Mediating Effect

Testing Paths	
Path c: dependent variable = IPD in Political Parties	
p = .0000**	
Path a: dependent variable = Leadership	
p = .0000**	
Path b and c' dependent variable = IPD in Political Parties	
p = .0456*	
independent variable= decentralization (c')	
independent variable = Leadership (b)	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The scholar concluded that Path a is significant; Path b is significant; Path c is significant and Path c' is insignificant. If all the four paths are significant, it shows full mediation, while the first three significance indicates partial mediation. The above results show that the first three paths are significant, which justifies partial mediation. The hypothesis is accepted.

Cause and Effect Relationship*Correlation*

H₀₄: Predictors of IPD (Institutionalization; Inclusiveness and Decentralization) associated with Criterion (IPD in Pakistan's political parties).

Table 5*Correlation Results*

		Institutionalization	Inclusiveness	Decentralization
IPD in Pakistan's political parties	<i>R</i>	.900**	.838**	.821**
	<i>P</i>	.000**	.000**	.000**
	<i>N</i>	520	520	520

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The scholar established that there is a significant, positive, and strong association between Inclusiveness and IPD in Pakistan's political parties ($r = 0.838, p < 0.005$); between Institutionalization and IPD in Pakistan's political parties ($r = 0.900, p < 0.005$); between Decentralization and IPD in Pakistan's political parties ($r = 0.821, p < 0.005$). The scholar accepted the hypothesis. It was established that respondents of the study believe that IDP is important for the survival and success of political parties of Pakistan.

Regressions (Cause and Effect Relationship between IPD in Pakistan's Political Parties)

H₀₅: The facets of IDPs (Institutionalization; Inclusiveness and Decentralization) predict Criterion (IPD in Pakistan's political parties).

Table 6*Multiple Regression Results*

Model	Institutionalization	Inclusiveness	Decentralization
$R^2 = 0.815$, 81.5 % or 82 % contributing in IPD in Pakistan's political parties	0.000**	0.016*	0.000**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The scholar revealed that, according to the opinion of the respondents, Inclusiveness; Institutionalization; Decentralization predicts 82 % change in the IPD in Political Parties of Pakistan.

Impact of Sociodemographic Variables on Opinions: Tests of Significance (Group-Mean Differences)

H₀₆: Sociodemographic attributes influence the opinion of the respondents about the role of the facets of IDPs (Institutionalization; Inclusiveness and Decentralization) in the Criterion (IPD in Pakistan's political parties) (Analysis done in Table 7).

Table 7
Mean Differences

	Residence	Gender	Education	Family Income	Age
Institutionalization	0.363	0.654	0.001**	0.244	0.000**
Inclusiveness	0.257	0.598	0.000**	0.352	0.000**
Leadership	0.190	0.797	0.000**	0.610	0.000**
Decentralization	0.279	0.966	0.002**	0.055	0.001**
IPD in Pakistan's political parties	0.289	0.965	0.004**	0.205	0.001**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The researcher found that there was no significant impact of sociodemographic variables on the respondents' opinions, except age (respondents between 18-35 years scored higher mean as compared to other age groups) and education (M. Phil and Ph.D. respondents scored higher mean). Hence, the scholar partially rejected the hypothesis.

Discussion

This article was aimed at exploring the facets of IPD among the political parties of Pakistan. The facets were explored through extensive review of the existing literature. PML-N and PPP-P were selected as sample political parties. The respondents (550) were selected on probability technique. Scholars and teachers were also present among the respondents of the study. The concepts derived from the literature review were passed through extensive and systematic operationalization of concepts and variables. Proper codification was done with great care. The importance of IPD can't be ignored. The study revealed important and novel results. The results cemented the view that without visible and viable IPD the political parties can't make significant progress in the arena of democracy and representative systems. Even, the workers of the political parties were very skeptical about the issue. They believe that political parties' leadership are afraid of the new emerging leadership and they do not allow the young blood and they also want to take firm hold of the policy and decision making inside the political parties.

Conclusions

Without viable and working political parties, democracy and democratic norms couldn't flourish. These are institutions that provide significant and vital training for the political socialization of the youth and their political workers. To act more viable and stronger, the concept of IPD is very important to be asserted and implemented in letter and spirit. It is believed that most of the political parties in the developing states are not implementing the IPD. The same is the case with Pakistan, except *Jamat-e Islami*, most of the political parties do not follow the rules and regulations for the implementation of IPD.

It is concluded that key facets or indicators of IPD as explored by the scholar as institutionalization, decentralization, and inclusiveness are significantly, positively, and strongly associated with the IPD in the political parties of Pakistan. Similarly, it was also concluded that leadership of the political parties is also significantly mediating in introducing true IPD in political parties of Pakistan.

Among sociodemographic attributes, only age and education were recorded as having a significant impact on the behavior of the respondents.

The results of the article also replicate the results about the sufficient amount of Inclusiveness; Institutionalization; Decentralization, and its role in bringing true IPD in Pakistan (Helmke and Levitsky, 2004).

This study also forwards some important recommendations for the political parties and for future scholars. Political parties should implement it in letter and spirit. The Election Commission of Pakistan (ECP) should not neglect it. Workers of political parties should also put pressure on their leadership to bring IPD to Pakistan.

References

- Altman D (2011) *Direct Democracy Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson C and Goodyear-Grant E (2010) Why Are Highly Informed Citizens Sceptical of Referenda? *Electoral Studies* 29 (2): 227–238.
- Anderson C, Blais A, Bowler S, et al. (2005) *Losers's Consent: Elections and Democratic Legitimacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aragon FM (2009) Candidate nomination procedures and political selection: evidence from Latin American parties. LSE STICERD Research Paper 3. London: Economic Organization and Public Policy Programme (EOPP).
- Bille L (2001) Democratizing a democratic procedure: myth or reality? Candidate selection in Western European parties 1960–1990. *Party Politics* 7(3): 363–80.
- Blais A and Gatieneau F (2007) Winning, losing and satisfaction with democracy. *Political Studies* 55(2): 425–441.
- Bowler S and Donovan T (2002) Democracy, institutions and attitudes about citizen influence on government. *British Journal of Political Science* 32(2): 371–390.
- Bowler S, Donovan T and Karp JA (2007) Enraged or Engaged? Preferences for Direct Citizen Participation in Affluent Democracies. *Political Research Quarterly* 60 (3): 351–362.
- Bratton M and Van deWalle N (1997) *Democratic Experiments in Africa: Regime Transitions in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carey JM and Polga-Hecimovich J (2006) Primary elections and candidate strength in Latin America. *The Journal of Politics* 68(3): 530–543.

- Carey SC (2002) A comparative analysis of political parties in Kenya, Zambia and the Democratic Republic of Congo. *Democratization* 9(3): 53–71.
- Close C., Kelbel C., & van Haute E. What Citizens Want in Terms of Intra-Party Democracy: Popular Attitudes towards Alternative Candidate Selection Procedures. *Political Studies*. 2017;65(3):646-664. doi:10.1177/0032321716679424
- Cross W and Pilet JB (eds) (2015) *The Politics of Party Leadership: A Cross-national Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cross W, Kenig O, Pruyers S, et al. (2016) *The Promise and Challenge of Party Primary Elections: A Comparative Perspective*. Toronto: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Cross WP (2013) party leadership selection and intra-party democracy. In: Cross WP and Katz RS (eds) *The Challenges of Intra-Party Democracy*. Oxford: OUP.
- Cross WP and Katz RS (eds) (2013) *The Challenges of Intra-Party Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cross, W. P. & Katz, R. S. (eds). (2013). *The Challenges of Intra-Party Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Donovan T and Karp JA (2006) Popular Support for Direct Democracy. *Party Politics* 12 (5): 671–688.
- Fung A and Warren ME (2011) The Participedia Project: An Introduction. *International Public Management Journal* 14 (3): 341–362.
- Gallagher M and Marsh M (1988) *Candidate Selection in Comparative Perspective: The Secret Garden of Politics*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Gauja A (2015) The Individualization of Party Politics: The Impact of Changing Internal Decision-Making Processes on Policy Development and Citizen Engagement. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 17 (1): 89–105.
- Hazan R and Rahat GW (2010) *Democracy within Parties: Candidate Selection Methods and their Political Consequences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hazan R and Rahat GW (2010) *Democracy within Parties: Candidate Selection Methods and their Political Consequences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hazan RY and Rahat G (2010) *Democracy within Parties: Candidate Selection Methods and Their Political Consequences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hazan RY and Rahat G (2010) *Democracy Within Parties: Candidate Selection Methods and their Political Consequences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobs LR, Cook FL and Delli Carpini MX (2009) *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Katz R and Mair P (2009) The cartel party thesis: a restatement. *Perspectives on Politics* 7(4): 753–766.
- Kenig O (2009) Democratization of party leadership selection: do wider selectorates produce more competitive contests? *Electoral Studies* 28(2): 240–247.
- Kenig O, Cross W, Pruyers S, et al. (2015) Party primaries: towards a definition and typology. *Representation* 51(2): 147–160.
- LaPalombara J and Weiner M (1966) *Political Parties and Political Development*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- LeDuc L (2001) Democratizing party leadership selection. *Party Politics* 7(3): 323–341.
- Levitsky S and Way LA (2010) Why democracy needs a level playing field. *Journal of Democracy* 21(1): 57–68.
- Lindberg SI (2006) Opposition parties and democratization in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 24(1): 123–138.
- Loxbo, K. (2009) ‘Har den interna demokratin i politiska partier försämrats över tid?’, *Sociologisk Forskning*, 46, 7–28.
- Loxbo, K. (2013). The fate of intra-party democracy: Leadership autonomy and activist influence in the mass party and the cartel party. *Party Politics*, 19(4), 537–554. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068811407583>
- Makulilo AB (2007) *Tanzania: A de facto one-party state?* MA Diss. Tanzania: University of Dar es Salaam.
- Marangoni F (2012) Technocrats in Government: The Composition and Legislative Initiatives of the Monti Government Eight Months into Its Term of Office. *Bulletin of Italian Politics* 4 (1): 135–149.
- Neblo MA, Esterling KM, Kennedy RP, et al. (2010) Who Wants to Deliberate – and Why? *American Political Science Review* 104 (3): 566–583.
- Norris P (1999) *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paget D (2018) The authoritarian origins of well-organized opposition parties: the rise of CHADEMA in Tanzania. *African Affairs* 118(473): 692–711.

- Parkinson J and Mansbridge J (2012) *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pilet JB and Cross W (eds) (2014) *Leadership Selection in Contemporary Parliamentary Democracies: A Comparative Study*. London: Routledge.
- Rahat G (2013) What Is Democratic Candidate Selection? In: Cross WP and Katz RS (eds) *The Challenges of Intra-Party Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.136–149.
- Rahat G (2013) What is Democratic candidate selection? In: Cross WP and Katz RS (eds) *The Challenges of Intra-Party Democracy*. Oxford: OUP.
- Rahat G and Hazan RY (2001) Candidate selection methods: An analytical framework. *Party Politics* (7)3: 297–322.
- Rahat G, Hazan RY and Katz RS (2008) Democracy and political parties: On the uneasy relationships between participation, competition and representation. *Party Politics* 14(6): 663–683.
- Randall V and Sv°asand L (2002) Party institutionalization in new democracies. *Party Politics* 8(1): 5–29.
- Ryan M and Smith G (2011) Towards a Comparative Analysis of Democratic Innovations: Lessons from a pilot fs-QCA of Participatory Budgeting. In: *Paper Presented at the ECPR General Conference, Reykjavik, 26 August*.
- Sandri G, Seddone A and Venturino F (2015) *Party Primaries in Comparative Perspective*. Ashgate: London.
- Scarrow S (1999) Parties and the expansion of direct democracy: who benefits? *Party Politics* 5(3): 341–362.
- Scarrow S (2005) *Implementing intra-party democracy. Political Parties and Democracy in Theoretical and Practical Perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, pp. 1–22.
- Scarrow SE (1999) Parties and the Expansion of Direct Democracy: Who Benefit? *Party Politics* 5 (3): 341–362.
- Scarrow SE (2001) Direct Democracy and Institutional Change a Comparative Investigation. *Comparative Political Studies* 34 (6): 651–665.
- Scarrow SE (2014) *Beyond Party Members*. Oxford: OUP.
- Scarrow SE and Gezgor B (2010) Declining memberships, changing members? European political party members in a new era. *Party Politics* 16(6): 823–843.
- Scarrow SE and Gezgor B (2010) Declining memberships, changing members? European political party members in a new era. *Party Politics* 16(6): 823–843.

- Seyd P (1999) New parties/new politics? A case study of the British Labour Party. *Party Politics* 5(3): 383–405.
- Spies DC and Kaiser A (2014) Does the mode of candidate selection affect the representativeness of parties? *Party Politics* 20(4): 576–590.
- Stewart D (1997) The changing electorate: an examination of participants in the 1992 Alberta Conservative leadership election. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 30(1): 107–128.
- Sulley CR (2015a) Opposition Political Parties in Africa: Kenya and Tanzania in Comparative Perspective. PhD Thesis, University of Leipzig, Germany.
- Sulley CR (2015b) The state of intraparty democracy in Tanzania. In: Mukandala RS (ed) *The Political Economy of Change in Tanzania: Contestations over Identity, the Constitution and Resources*. Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Press.
- Sussman G (2007) Are party ballots approximating national referendums? *Representation* 43(1): 1–18.
- Ugarriza E and Caluwaerts D (eds) (2014) *Democratic Deliberation in Deeply Divided Societies: From Conflict to Common Ground*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Haute E and Gauja A (2015) *Party Members and Activists*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- von Berge B, Poguntke T, et al. (2017). In: Scarrow S, et al. (ed) *Organising Political Parties: Representation, Participation and Power*. 9th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- von dem Berge B and Poguntke T (2017) Varieties of intra-party democracy: conceptualization and index construction. In: Scarrow S, Webb P and Poguntke T (eds) *Organizing Political Parties: Representation, Participation and Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 136–157.
- von dem Berge B, Poguntke T, Obert P, et al. (2013) *Measuring Intra-Party Democracy: A Guide for the Content Analysis of Party Statutes with Examples from Hungary, Slovakia and Romania*. Berlin: Springer.
- von dem Berge, B., Poguntke, T., Obert, P. & Tipei, D. (2013). *Measuring Intra-Party Democracy: A Guide for the Content Analysis of Party Statutes with Examples from Hungary, Slovakia and Romania*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Young L and Cross W (2002a) The rise of plebiscitary democracy in Canada. *Party Politics* 8(6): 673–99.
- Young, L. and Cross, W. (2002b) Incentives to membership in Canadian political parties. *Political Research Quarterly* 55(3): 547–69.