

- C7.P17 Fortunately, there are two simple pieces of information that can be considered as relatively good proxies of organizational continuity and rootedness. The first aspect, *organizational continuity*, can be grasped by the average age of parties that achieved a minimal level of social support. Using party age as a proxy of party institutionalization is a well-established practice (cf. Basedau and Stroh, 2008; Tan, 2006; Kuenzi and Lambricht, 2005; Roberts and Wibbels, 1999; Mainwaring, 1998; Mainwaring and Scully, 1995; Dix, 1992; Huntington, 1968). We decided to average the age of parties without taking into consideration their electoral size (that is, parties are weighted equally) in order to maximize the difference between this aspect of institutionalization and the other one, the dimension of rootedness, as the measure for the latter (see below) is strongly influenced by the size of electoral support. We take into consideration all those parties that achieved, at any point in their career, 3 per cent of the vote at a national election.
- C7.P18 For tapping *rootedness*—namely how well parties are entrenched—we look at the degree to which elections are dominated by the same parties across the entire history of the party system. This index, referred to further below as the Established Party Dominance (EPD) index. It is constructed, following the logic of Lewis’s (2006) Index of Party Stabilization, by considering the percentage of votes given to parties at each election while enhancing the weight of those parties that have already achieved at least 3 per cent support during past national elections. In this way, the longer a party has been around in the political history of a country, the greater the weight attached to its electoral results.
- C7.P19 A party is included in the calculations as long as it obtained at least 3 per cent of the votes at least once during its existence. EPD is calculated in several steps. First, at each election the vote share of a party is increased by 5 per cent for each year that has passed since the party first appeared in the electoral arena. These modified vote shares are summed up across all parties to calculate a weighted score for each election. Second, a notional score is calculated for each election, which equals 100 plus five times the number of years that have passed since the first election (i.e., the maximum weighted score we would get for an election if no new party had come onto the scene). Finally, to obtain a value for EPD for an election, the weighted score for an election is divided by the nominal score for that election and multiplied by 100. As opposed to Lewis’s Index of Party Stabilization (*ibid.*), EPD is not confined to parliamentary parties and it uses a different weighting strategy: while Lewis’s index implicitly assumes that the time between elections is equal, EPD takes into consideration the actual differences in years between two elections.<sup>2</sup> EPD can be calculated as follows:

<sup>2</sup> Assuming that elections take place every four years, Lewis (2006) increased a party vote share at each election by 20 per cent. But in fact, elections can take place much more frequently, sometimes even more than once in a single year. To bring the calculus closer to real-life dynamics, we have decided to increase the vote share of a party by 5 per cent per year.

$$w_e = \sum_i^n p_i (1 + 0.05 \times y_i)$$

$$x_e = 100 + 5 \times y_e^*$$

$$EPD_e = \frac{w_s}{x_s} \times 100$$

C7.P20 where  $w_e$  is the weighted score for election  $e$  for all parties  $i$  that are considered;  $y_i$  is the number of years that have passed since party  $i$  has run in an election,  $p_i$  is the vote share (%) of party  $i$  at election  $e$ ;  $n$  is the number of parties at election  $e$  that are considered;  $x_e$  is the nominal score for election  $e$ ; and  $y_e^*$  is the number of years that have passed since the first election by election  $e$ .

C7.P21 Consider the example of three consecutive elections, organized every three years (Table 7.1). Only seven parties manage to cross the 3 per cent threshold, out of which only three (A, B—in coalition with A during the second election—and C) manage to present candidates in every single election. Party E dissolves after the first election, while party D only manages to contest the first two. Parties F and G only appear after the second and third elections, respectively.

C7.P22 Given that for the first election the EPD score simply equals the percentages gained by parties that have reached at that time or later more than 3 per cent, the score for the first election is 94.3 in this case. For the second election the EPD index will be 82.7: the weighted results of the second election divided by the notional score for the second election. For the third election the score will be 87.4 (Table 7.2).

C7.P23 EPD, similarly to fragmentation, polarization or volatility, changes election by election. In order to integrate this variable into the year-based data files we project onto the specific years the values of the last election.

C7.P24 Using the 3 per cent threshold implies a rather comprehensive coverage of parties. Similar indexes typically consider only parliamentary parties (Lewis, 2006) or parties above a higher, for example 10 per cent, threshold (Mainwaring and

C7.T1 **Table 7.1** Election results for the EPD index

Parties	Election 1 (t = 0)	Election 2 (t = 3)	Election 3 (t = 6)
Party A	48.6	51.9	45.6
Party B	3.8	(in coalition with A)	4.2
Party C	14.1	16.8	11.1
Party D	13.1	6	
Party E	14.7		
Party F		9.2	22.8
Party G			8.2

