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1.1 Aims of the project

In this project we call attention to the role of political parties in contemporary democracies. The main research question is whether parties have primarily changed or declined as organizations and whether parties’ contributions to democracy are stable or in decay. Our empirical focus is the behaviour and inter-relationship of party members, candidates and leadership, both with regard to policy-making, recruitment to public office, and campaigning. Furthermore, a largely overlooked aspect of parties’ position in government will be explored through a study of party patronage, that is, the use of partisan appointments in public and semi-public life. Thereby, we supplement earlier comparative studies of political parties in civil society, which have largely focused on the formal structures of parties as organizations. Previous research has concluded that parties’ membership figures and organizational strength have declined, and that the party in public office is empowered. But less is known about how members, activist and leaders behave within the organizational frameworks. In this way, we aim at bridging the gap between empirical studies of party organizations, election and campaign studies and studies of parties in government.

Empirically, the project consists of three sub-studies of Norwegian politics, and the main project publication will be a co-authored book on parties in Norwegian democracy. Moreover, the project forms a part of international, coordinated efforts to gather data on party membership and activity, as well as party recruitment, campaigning and career patterns. Consequently, the entire project is designed as a contribution to genuine comparative research, in a European or wider context. It is therefore not only of relevance to advanced democracies but also of interest to institution-builders in new democracies.

1.2 Project organization

The project aims to further develop the comparative research on parties, elections and democracy of the Department of Political Science (ISV) at the University of Oslo (see section 1.5 below). The project will also involve co-operation with the group for studies of political behaviour and democracy at the Institute for Social Research (ISF) in Oslo, host of the Norwegian Election Studies since 1957. ISV will be the main research site and responsible for project administration. The project leader will be Hanne Marthe Narud, Professor of Political Science and a specialist on political recruitment and representation, election studies and government formation.

The research group will consist of both senior and junior researchers all being political scientists. Together they have complementary experience within the field of comparative politics and involve expertise of both quantitative and qualitative methods. The project will recruit new scholars to the field by means of two student grants, one doctoral fellowship and one postdoctoral fellowship. The supervisor(s) of the PhD student will be appointed by the University of Oslo, but one of the senior researchers will be principal supervisor. As of today, the research group is:

- Hanne Marthe Narud, dr. polit., Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Oslo
- Knut Heidar, PhD, Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Oslo
- Elin Haugsgjerd Allern, dr. polit., Senior Researcher, Institute for Social Research

The project comprises three sub-studies with individual research questions that will be described in more detail below, after a brief summary of their joint framework: 1) A study of party members and congress delegates, 2) A study of candidates for general elections and 3) A study of party patronage in public and semi-public life.

The three project members are all involved in well-established and high-profiled international networks, which form the comparative bases for the national studies. The principal researcher on
**The party members sub-study**, Professor Knut Heidar, is already engaged in work to establish a European group doing comparative party member and activist research with Professor Paul Whiteley, Essex University. The national study director of the candidate list study, Professor Hanne Marthe Narud, participates in a collaborative effort of two networks specializing in different aspects of electoral politics in Europe. One is the Comparative Candidate Survey (CCS) headed by Professor Hermann Schmitt, University of Mannheim (www.comparativecandidates.org). The other is the well established Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES), covering already 50 participating countries (www.eses.org). Senior Researcher Elin H. Allern, who is heading the party patronage study, takes part in a comparative project headed by Petr Kopecký, Leiden University, and Peter Mair, European University Institute, Florence (EUI), covering 16 countries in Europe.

### 1.3 Theoretical background and status of knowledge

The starting point of this project is the connection between parties and democracy. The three sub-studies all revolve around the question of parties’ role in democratic processes connecting citizens and elites, voter opinion and public policies, in contemporary politics. From different angles, the project addresses the debate on how parties perform as institutional mechanisms a century after the rise of modern party politics. In so doing, we pick up and further elaborate on some of the unresolved questions that were raised in the final report of the recently completed Power and Democracy Study in Norway (Osterud et al. 2003).

The decline of traditional social identities and old cleavages, post-industrial work habits, new family structures, the emergence of non-partisan mass media, and the rise of the EU as a political system have challenged political parties in numerous ways. More than thirty years after “the end of party” hypothesis was put forward in the United States (Broder 1972), however, ‘democracy’ implies representative government and – in most if not all cases – some system of multiple political parties (Anckar and Anckar 2000). Parties still recruit politicians, develop political programs, organize election campaigns, and form government after the election. A political system based on ‘rule by the people’ must create institutional mechanisms for registering and transforming voter preferences into public policies. Parties are still a solution to collective action problems in politics and useful tools in the pursuit of votes (Müller 2000). Yet, the capacity of parties to connect the citizenry with government agencies is often questioned.

It is widely agreed that the organization and position of political parties have changed significantly in recent decades, especially in civil society. The decline of party membership since the heyday of the 1950s and early 1960s is well-documented (Scarrow 2000; Mair and van Biezen 2001), as is the decrease in party identification and increase in electoral volatility (Dalton 2000; Wattenberg 2000). Popular confidence in parties is today generally low in Western democracies (Pharr, Putnam and Dalton 2000). In recent decades, the public has increasingly turned to various types of interest groups and ad-hoc protests – more individualistic modes of political action like signing petitions – to make its voice heard to the government (Dalton 2006). No longer can political parties depend primarily on members to support their activities, and state subventions now constitute a major financial resource for party organizations. The major campaigning arena is not conventions, rallies or caucuses, but non-partisan national radio and TV channels. Also, grassroots within parties seem to have lost power to the benefit of the party leadership and party groups in the national assembly (Katz and Mair 2002).

However, unlike the extra-parliamentary section of the party, the party in government appears not to have clearly weakened in recent decades (Strom et al. 2003: 665). What thus seems to have happened is that ‘the golden age’ of the mass membership party and party-controlled electoral politics is over in Europe and elsewhere (Katz and Mair 1995; Farrell and Schmitt-Beck, forthcoming), and it is argued that parties consequently have declined as channels for popular demands, or as facilitators of citizen control over the people’s agents in public office (Kirchheimer 1966; Strom et al. 2003: 665). Some even claim that the parties have lost their legitimacy as representative organisations in the entire parliamentary chain of delegation and accountability (see e.g. Mair 2006), by turning into so-called cartel parties, that is, professionalized parties which are dominated by the leadership in public office and have retreated from civil society, through
accumulation of public subventions and by means of deideologized competition for votes (Katz and Mair 1995). At least, a shift seems to have taken place from the combined representative (‘input’) and procedural roles of parties (‘output’) to a more exclusively procedural function, in terms of recruitment, organization of government and delivery of public policies (Bartolini and Mair 2001: 336). The point is that several empirical pieces of the puzzle are still largely missing.

First, as will be argued below, we lack important knowledge about the development of parties as membership organizations: For example, much of what is said about the impact of declining membership figures hinges on the extent to which remaining party members are able to influence party policies (Heidar 2006; Allern and Pedersen 2007: 86). Although there have been a formal shift towards ascendancy of the parliamentary group as documented by Katz and Mair and their colleagues (Katz and Mair 1994; Heidar and Koole 2000), this does not necessarily mean that parties have become hollow organizations.

Second, parties are still in charge of candidate recruitment, but an under-studied topic is exactly how – and how predominantly – parties do perform this function following the decrease of party members and increased leadership dominance, the rise of broadcast media, and concomitant decline of a partisan press. These developments all make new demands on parties’ political communication with the electorate. Reasonable questions to ask is whether the nomination process has become more influenced by non-party actors, if the profile of the candidates has changed, and if candidates today run their own campaigns distinct from those of their parties.

Finally, the extent to which parties’ roles within public office has declined or not, is also open to debate. Governmental parties maintain much of their cohesion and thus their ability to discipline individual politicians (Strøm et al. 2003: 665), but it is less clear how parties and their leaders perform vis-à-vis other parts of the state – to what extent the state is in the reach of the party? More specifically, systematic research on the extent to which parties employ ‘party patronage’ as a governing instrument has been limited so far (Strøm et al. 2003: 664). In sum, this leads to three major research questions which are further specified with regard to Norwegian parties below:

1. What characterizes the parties’ membership organizations today, compared to the traditional European mass party model in terms of motivations for individual participation, level of grass root involvement and the nature of decision-making processes?
2. What characterizes the candidate selection and electoral campaigning of contemporary political parties, compared to the ‘golden era’ of party-controlled activity, in terms of for example how the nomination process is structured, which demands that are put forward to the candidates, and the nature of their own campaigning efforts?
3. To what extent is the allocation of jobs and other important public and semi-public positions in the gift of, or controlled by, political parties in the Norwegian political system? Has party patronage in this sense increased over time?

In all three cases, what factors explain variation over time, across countries and between individual parties are also key issues.

### 1.3.1 In civil society: The party members and delegates study

Above all, in addition to the literature on individual political participation, this study departs from the long-lasting debate on party organizational development after the Second World War in established democracies. Have former mass membership parties by the early 2000s turned into top-heavy cartel or cadre parties, as suggested by Katz and Mair (1995) and others? It is widely agreed that the mass membership model has declined in Europe (Katz and Mair 1994), but the extent to which parties have by and large become close to ‘empty vessels’ in civil society is still a somewhat moot point (cf. Poguntke 2006). Although parties have lost members, they can still represent significant arenas for popular involvement in the qualitative sense (Allern and Pedersen 2007). Structural changes in direction of empowered parliamentary groups – or use of ‘armchair participation’ like membership ballots – do not necessarily lead to the end of substantial intra-party democracy. Some empirical work has previously been done on European party members, but basically this has been one-party or one country studies (e.g. Heidar 1988; Heidar and Saglie 2002,
Pattie, Seyd and Whiteley 2004). There is very little research-based knowledge of a comparative nature (but see Pedersen and Saglie 2005; Heidar and Pedersen 2006; Weldon 2006).

To find out more about how party membership organizations functions in practice is of paramount importance no matter how we define party-based democracy. The behaviour within membership-based organizations can affect the very nature of democratic processes. More specifically, empirical knowledge on degrees of internal party vitality would feed into the normative debate between the elite competition and the participatory schools. Limited party activism and leadership dominance hinders parties from being ‘academies’ for political education of citizens and lack of linkage between the party organization and the candidates for public office could make democracy a fake in terms of popular control. On the other hand, seen from a Schumpetarian point of view, viable intra-party democracy risks preventing fair preference aggregation at the system-level, depending on, for example the opinion profile of party activists. If party members make up an arena with a different agenda and policy views compared to the attitudes of voters (and party candidates), this could create a democracy of ‘double standards’ which in extreme cases could relegate electoral democracy to a mere facade.

We therefore need comparative surveys and time series of members’ and congress delegates’ behaviour to find out what is actually going on – behind formal structures and beyond leadership-oriented media coverage of party politics (Heidar 2006). This study will be Norway’s contribution to an international, comparative effort. Relevant questions for survey analysis – in light of the discussion above – are legion, but key issues to explore are: Who are the members? Why do they join and what explains their activities? What opinions do they hold and how knowledgeable are the party activists? What is the evidence for decline or for change in terms of participatory or deliberative grass root democracy? By surveying both members and delegates we would be able to report on the character of the decision-making process within the parties, or in other words on the nature of internal party democracy.

Moreover, we will look for sources of variation across time, between parties and – in a comparative setting – between countries and party families. We would expect party members to have different backgrounds, different motivations and involvements, different political views and issue engagements across time, space and according to organizational levels. At the same time we hypothesize members and delegates to conform to the general research findings on political participation that activists are more educated, more resourceful and more socially integrated than the average citizen.

**Research design and progress plan**

We plan to include all seven parties currently represented in the Storting. It is necessary to study both members and delegates to cover the internal policy processes. The questionnaires will be designed to make comparisons with previous Norwegian surveys possible (see Heidar 1988; Heidar and Saglie 2002), and also with the surveys – both conducted and planned – in other European countries. All Congress delegates (about 1800) will be surveyed and a representative sample of 1000 drawn from the parties’ member lists (i.e. altogether 7000 respondents/members). The member survey is planned for January 2009 and the delegate study for the congresses during the spring of 2009. The aim is to minimize the time span between the surveys and also to the list candidate survey. Comparisons with the list candidates would bring out the potential differences between the party organization and the ‘party in the electorate’. Are they of a different brand, giving the public representatives a more centrist profile (cf. ‘Mays law’)?

To carry out the research on this sub-study we would need a three years doctoral research fellowship from August 2008. This person shall follow the party congresses in 2009 and is expected to write a PhD-thesis on the material. We also include a grant for a 6 months study abroad for the PhD-student. In addition, we plan to recruit students to write their MA-theses on the material. This is both to create opportunities for advanced students and to help out with the analysis of the material. Finally, it should be noted that the principal researcher on this sub-study, Knut Heidar, currently holds the Dean position at the Social Science Faculty, University of Oslo for the period
2008-11. His department position will be filled by a person that can take over his main responsibilities on the project, but Heidar will still be engaged in the project as much as time allows.

1.3.2 Towards public office: The candidate list study

One of the most important tasks of political parties is the recruitment of candidates for public office. After the process of screening and selection, the candidates are presented to the electorates in the election campaign. The campaigns require from candidates and parties to identify their goals and outline their politics, and candidates need to present themselves to the electorates, measuring their personal qualities against those of their competitors. The question is, however, whether the way parties and their candidates perform this task has changed significantly in recent years. To what extent – and in which ways – have the developments in the electoral markets, the mass media, and the membership base of the political parties influenced the parties’ recruitment strategies and their subsequent roles as campaign organizations?

Studies indicate that party recruitment to public office is different than it once was, as regards both the process of candidate selection and the parties’ performance in the election campaign (Katz 2001; Farrell 2006). First, election campaigns have become more important due to changes in voting behaviour such as increased volatility and increasing ‘medialization’ of politics. These developments have important implications from the perspectives of the elites; they make for the rise of new types of electoral markets which generally suggest new strategies and types of political representation (Klingemann and Wessels 2001; Müller et al. 2001; Ferrererea and Herron 2005). For example, it seems likely that parties put more emphasis on the candidates’ capacity as efficient media-communicators than they used to do (Narud and Valen 2007). In this context we seek to replicate earlier studies of party nominations in Norway, which make it possible to assess the degree of change over time (e.g. Valen 1988; Valen et al. 2002). Second, the organization and position of political parties have changed in recent decades, not least in terms of reduced membership, which may in turn have influenced their recruitment strategies and subsequent behaviour as campaign organizations. For example, dwindling recruitment pools may have stimulated parties to open up the nomination process more to outsiders (see Hazan and Rahat 2006). Several questions thus arise: To what extent are the standards for – and outcome of – candidate selection set by other actors than the parties themselves? To what extent have the campaign activities of political parties moved from party-oriented towards personalized ones? And what is the “spill-over” effect between nomination procedures and the campaign strategies of individual candidates? Electoral campaigning as seen from the perspectives of the individual candidates is, in other words, a major issue in this sub-study.

The candidate study forms a part of the international Comparative Candidate Survey, acronym: CCS. This study is interested in the nature and effectiveness of political representation and in particular, whether the 20th century European ‘standard’ of collective (i.e. party-centered) representation is being replaced by individual (i.e. candidate-centered) representation in ‘weak party’- environments such as post-communist or EU electoral politics. Changes in the level of party organization stand in a direct relationship with the erosion of party membership. Katz and Mair (1995) argue in the context of the cartel party that established parties in Western democracies are no longer based upon a broad membership basis and linked to a particular social context via organizational structures. Party headquarters and strategic communication via public relations strategies form the core of the cartel party. Hence, the debate about the modernization of electoral campaigns in political communication is closely related to the concept of the cartel party. These concepts signify a further important development in the context of European political parties. Modernized electoral campaigns are by definition characterized through candidate centered organizational structures at the national level that are based upon the experience of professionalized consultants who use new strategies of political marketing to communicate with the public (see e.g. Farrell and Webb, 2000). One of the central objectives in the project is then to explore cross-national patterns of candidates’ campaigning in “old” as well as “new” party systems. For this reason, the nature of the candidates’ campaign is examined in the light of the institutional context in each country, e.g. the system of governments, the different nomination and election systems, the
characteristics of the electoral district, as well as the parties and party systems. These are all factors that make and shape the incentives of the actors involved, as well as their strategies and behavior.

Research design and progress plan

Empirically, the study rests mainly upon surveys among party elites. In addition, there is a macro-questionnaire intended at giving information about the relevant institutional and contextual factors. Finally, a planned election survey will give information about the views and attitudes of individual voters. This study will cover most European electoral systems and some beyond (like the US, India, New Zealand and Australia). National study directors have agreed on a common core questionnaire, which they field together with national specific questions in the aftermath of the next national elections in the period between 2006 and 2011. For Norway, this in effect means the nominations and campaigning that take place in connection with the national election of 2009. Since this project is concerned with mutual level comparisons, we need to collect three types of data. 1. A candidate survey covering all list candidates in all constituencies for the seven parties represented in the Norwegian parliament (Storting) (N = ca. 2,600). This survey will take place immediately after the general election of 2009. 2. A macro-questionnaire to be completed by country-specialists providing information about political institutions and contextual factors in Norway. 3. A limited voter survey after the parties’ nominations (late spring of 2009), providing information about voters’ policy attitudes and views on individual candidates and parties. In sum, this sub-study, which Hanne Marthe Narud will be responsible for, combines an internationally agreed and locally adapted questionnaire. Due to the extensive scope of the study, Narud plans to involve a post-doc fellow as well as MA students.

1.3.3 In government: The party patronage study

Despite theoretical interest, party patronage is one of the largely overlooked dimensions of party government. Patronage party politics, in terms of distribution of rewards to activists and others, in exchange for organizational loyalty and support, have traditionally been seen as a function of early modern societies and therefore as a phenomenon likely to disappear in the process of further societal development (e.g. Shefter 1977, for a research review, see Hopkin 2006; Kopecký and Mair 2006). However, in a somewhat different perspective, party patronage can simply be defined as the power of parties to appoint people to positions in public and semi-public life and thus as a tool to benefit the party organization – and above all the party in public office – more than its supporters (ibid). Then party patronage becomes a way for state subsidised ‘cartel parties’ to further penetrate the state, and is also among the prime indicators of the strength of parties in government – the ‘partyyness of government’. In order for parties to deliver policies to their voters, they need to control the most prominent political offices of the state (Strom et al. 2003: 663).

Indeed, by looking at party patronage as an organizational resource this research project challenges the traditional view that party patronage has become the exception, not the general rule, in modern democracies. The reasons for this are numerous. For example, recent developments within the state – like delegation of power from the core executive to non-governmental or semi-public agencies (Peters 2003) – are widely seen as institutional changes disempowering political parties. Stronger emphasis on partisanship in key appointments to positions in these agencies could be a way to counterbalance such a development. By means of patronage, parties characterized by weakened membership organizations may also hope to gain better oversight over likely grievances posed to political leaders and what policies are best suited to meet these demands (Kopecký and Mair 2006). Hence, this project will explore the contention that party patronage has become more important over time. Hereby it then aims to fill an important empirical void in our knowledge of contemporary European politics, being part of a larger comparative project exploring party patronage on a systematic cross-national basis in Europe (named “Party Patronage in Contemporary European Democracies”, see below).

The first specific concern of the study is to establish how far within the political system the allocation of jobs and other important public and semi-public positions is in the gift of, or controlled by, political parties. The second objective is to map out the precise institutional location of
patronage appointments, to include not only the core of civil service, but also institutions that are not part of the civil service, but are under some form of state control, such as public hospitals and state owned companies. The third objective is to explore the relative importance of the national, regional and local levels of the state in the location and scope of patronage. The fourth aim is to explore changes in the parties’ ability to exercise patronage resources over time, and the extent to which party patronage is exercised in a ‘majoritarian’ as opposed to a more ‘consensual’ or ‘proportional’ manner across the spectrum of (mainstream) political parties. The study of party patronage should also try to bring out to what extent the typical appointees are similar or different to party activists and candidates as regards party background. Moreover, the project aims to use the empirical evidence to theorize about party patronage within the context of party organizational development and transformation, on the one hand, and political-institutional transformations of modern state, on the other. Despite incentives to use patronage more, parties face enduring conflicting motivations in this context: For example, partisan appointments may in some respects jeopardize government efficiency and electoral support (see Strom et al. 2003: 664). So a final goal will be to analyze the conditions under which parties use partisan appointments in public and semi-public agencies as an organizational resource.

Research design and progress plan

Proxy indicators – like changes in spending on personnel budgets of ministries – are often used in existing empirical analyses of party patronage (see Kopecký and Mair 2006). However, some of the measurement problems experienced so far relate to the emphasis on patronage as exchange and hence being a part of covert politics. Moreover, the growing volume of legislation and regulations governing political appointment has made the task of mapping patronage easier.

First, the idea is to create a generic model of the state to delineate the areas where patronage appointments can and do happen. The state will be divided by the type of policy areas, i.e. classic state sectors, such as Finance, Judiciary, and Media. We further plan to sub-divide each policy area by type of institutions, namely Ministerial Departments, Non-Departmental Agencies and Commissions, and Executing Institutions. As our second step, we will use the constitutional and legal framework of the state to determine whether parties have formal and prescribed powers to appoint people to positions in these institutions. Third, conducting between 40 and 50 structured expert interviews with for example politicians, state bureaucrats and journalists for each policy area, we will (in)validate our interpretation of appointment procedures. A detailed research design for comparative research will be completed during the opening meeting of the comparative project, at the European University Institute in Florence. The data gathering is planned for the calendar year of 2008 (summer and autumn). Preliminary case reports will be presented to a project meeting towards the end of 2008.

Elin Haugsgjerd Allern will carry out this sub-study, possibly assisted by one of the students we will recruit to the project.

1.4 ISV’s research strategy, national network and international project co-operation

The topics of party change and roles in contemporary democracies are central to the research strategy of the Department of Political Science at the University of Oslo (ISV). One of ISV’s major objectives is to maintain and further develop the international character of its research. The present initiative therefore forms an important part in the scientific development of the department. This is brought out also in the fact that all the three project participants form a part of comparative research groups. In addition, the project themes fit nicely into the teaching profile of the department. Moreover, the project meets both the requirement of intra-departmental as well as cross-institutional cooperation (Department of political science and Institute for social research), which the national plan for political science defines as a matter of priority (cf. the Norwegian Research Council, evaluation report from 2004). Finally, an over-all objective with this project is to further develop the Department’s expertise within comparative politics by means of recruitment of younger scholars specialized in electoral politics and political parties. The research group will cooperate closely on a day-to-day basis, and plan to arrange joint seminars in due course. In so doing,
we will invite colleagues both nationally and internationally who we expect to contribute with their expertise to our work.

As stated initially, the project participants are all involved in cooperative efforts with well-established international networks. Knut Heidar, the principal researcher on the party members sub-study, organized together with Paul Whiteley, Essex University, a workshop at the ECPR meeting in Helsinki in May 2007, with participants from many European countries and also from North America (see also Heidar 2007). Many of the participants there had received research grants for national party member surveys or were in the process of applying. We expect to have a project meeting (probably in Brussels) in the autumn of 2008. We also plan to apply the ESF for ‘seed money’ to finance more group meetings to coordinate and also, hopefully, to prepare a 7th Frame Program application to finance as many additional European surveys as possible. Heidar and Whiteley have also applied for an ESS module for a Europe-wide survey on political activism, so far unsuccessful. Ruud Koole, Leiden, will apply for another ECPR workshop in Lisbon in 2009.

The candidate list study (CCS) was initiated last year (2006) in Bad Dürkheim on the initiative of scholars at the University of Mannheim (MZES), and is currently headed by professor Hermann Schmitt. The second research network to be involved is the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems – acronym: CSES. This group is focusing on the distinctiveness of electoral choice options, and on the causes and consequences of possible variations in this distinctiveness. The CSES is a world-wide group, and covers most of Western Europe, and many of the post-communist systems, as well as the US, Japan, India and Oceania (see www.cses.org). As the CSES network is the more established of the two networks (covering already three waves of surveys), the 50 countries being a part of this group are considered to be the main universe for the CCS network. They do not only vary by system characteristics, but also have in common a tradition of empirical election and elite research. In fact, about half of these countries took part in the above mentioned start-up conference of CCS in early October 2006. The national study directors, in this case Narud for the Norwegian survey, are expected to raise funding for the individual country studies. We expect to have several future meetings to discuss among other things the completion of the comparative datasets as well as publication strategies.

The party patronage study, headed internationally by Petr Kopceky, Leiden University, and Peter Mair, European University Institute, Florence (EUI), is the product of a workshop on parties and patronage which Kopecy and Mair directed at the ECPR Joint Sessions in 2006. Through the Research Council of the EUI, they have generated enough funding to cover the participants’ travel and stay in Florence for the initial meeting. Through another project financed by the Dutch NWO, they have also generated sufficient funding to cover local field research in the Czech Republic and Bulgaria. However, it is principally expected that each national collaborator or a team of collaborators selected for this project, Norway included, will be able to raise sufficient funds to support his/her own data gathering and salary if needed, as in our case.

1.5 Dissemination of results

Scientific publications:
We anticipate this project to generate a number of scientific publications as well as to provide a meeting-place for scholars preoccupied with comparative studies of parties and democracy. As has been stated above, all three sub-studies are designed for comparative purposes, and will be parts of various edited volumes abroad. However, the present data-sets give unique opportunities for comprehensive analyses of party development also in a national political context. Consequently, the major output of this joint project is the aforementioned co-authored book discussing party change and the contributions of parties in contemporary Norwegian democracy. Such a book, which will be published in English, is going to contribute to the general comparative debate on the development of parties and democracy. In addition, we have extensive plans for international publications in terms of articles in renowned refereed journals, as well as articles in national journals directed towards a Scandinavian audience.

In the party patronage study the case report on Norway should lead into a book chapter for the principal outcome of the comparative project; an edited volume on Party Patronage in
Contemporary European Democracies. The project leaders will negotiate with leading academic publishers to obtain contract for the book. The aim is also to create a cross-national database on practices of party patronage in contemporary democracies. The same is the case for the CCS sub-study. The CCS participants have agreed to provide standardized datasets in order to receive all other CCS datasets in exchange. National study directors are invited to take part in common publications using the CCS data. In addition, we plan a joint publication based on collaboration with colleagues from New Zealand, who have signaled great interest in a bilateral case-study. In the party member and delegate study, the outcome will be in international articles and in comparative work with the other members of the network. The plans here are not finalized but most likely there will be an anthology or co-authored book on party members in European democracies. There will also be publications in Norwegian to report the findings to a Norwegian public, like Heidar and Saglie did in their 2002 publication.

### 1.6 Gender equality, environmental impact and ethical aspects

The project promotes gender equality in the sense that women will be well-represented, and in head of the research group. Moreover, a key variable in both survey analyses of participation and political recruitment is gender. Female representation has been one of the dominant aspects of modern party development in the Scandinavian countries, and the question is how the various societal and organizational changes affect the character of female activity and party work. Finally, it should be noted that no environmental implications are assumed involved in this study, and we will, of course, conform to ethical norms for social research, by providing anonymity for respondents and immediately notifying the Privacy Ombudsman for Research about our project.
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