

Elections and Democratization: A New Assessment

By

Adil Omar Fala

SUNY/Albany

The debate on the relation between election and democratization has attracted many scholars recently. Elections have been a very popular prerequisite of democracy in both scholarship and policy. Based on the assumption that democracy is “the government by the people for the people”, many scholars and policy makers linked democracy to holding free and fair elections. However, many critics of this argument were raised, stating that this is a minimalist definition of democracy and what it is really about.

The key questions that this paper will address are: What are the different definitions of democracy in the scholarly literature? What position did these scholars give to elections in a democracy? What are the indicators of a fair and free election? Does fair and free election consolidate the democratic process? Under which conditions elections lead to democratization?

The Concept of Democracy:

The concept of democracy has evolved along the years to meet new challenges and opportunities that democracies face. It is obvious from the literature that there is no consensus on the meaning of the concept of democracy. David Collier and Steven Levitsky reviewed 550 subtype of democracy. Collier and Levitsky studied how scholars labeled democratizing regimes in more than 150 studiesⁱ. They noted in their study how variant is the concept of democracy and how it was used to describe different types of regimes in the scholarly work. This shows that

The concept of democracy incorporated some social and economic elements, especially in the 1960s and 1970s. In this literature, social inequality was seen as a barrier to full democracy. However, this tendency is changing in recent decades as scholars and policymakers refer to democracy as a purely political phenomenon. This has facilitated the study of democracy and its relation with some socio-economic phenomenonⁱⁱ.

The concept of democracy has been used to refer to a political phenomenon, which created a lot of diversion among scholars. Joseph Schumpeter, defined democracy as “a system for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of competitive struggle for the people’s vote”ⁱⁱⁱ. Joseph Schumpeter has described the classical doctrine of democracy as “holding that the democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions which realizes the common good by making the people themselves decide on issues through the election of individuals who are to assemble in order to carry out its will”. Against this view, Schumpeter has argued that there are some fundamental disagreements between people. There was nothing as defined to be a common good that all people could agree upon^{iv}. He offered another theory, which states that “the purpose of democratic method was not to select representatives who would carry out the will of the people, but to choose individuals who would govern on their behalf”^v.

Another view that should be considered while discussing the concept of democracy is that of Robert Dahl. Dahl presented a more narrowed definition of the concept of democracy compared to Schumpeter. He states that democratic theory is concerned with “processes by which ordinary citizens exert a relatively high degree of control over leaders”. In his definition, Dahl focused on processes as the building block of democracy. These processes include, among others, elections as a central component of citizens’ power.

Dahl accepts that not every group has equal control over political outcomes in a pluralist democracy. He argued that “so long as its social prerequisite remained intact, the system provided a relatively efficient means for reinforcing agreement, encouraging modernization, and maintaining social peace.” This is one of the critiques that one may address to Dahl’s democracy, which is the lack of “equal opportunity” to influence the system. Democracy is built on the ideal of

“government of the people by the people”. However, if only the elite can influence the political outcomes, this puts democracy into question and limits its promises.

In his book polyarchy, Robert Dahl argues that polyarchy has two dimensions: opposition (organized contestation through regular, fair and free elections) and participation (the right of everyone to participate in the system by running for office and voting)^{vi}. Dahl has offered the most generally accepted listing of what he terms the "procedural minimal" conditions that must be present for modern political democracy (or as he puts it, "polyarchy") to exist:

- 1) Control over government decisions about policy is constitutionally vested in elected officials.
- 2) Elected officials are chosen in frequent and fairly conducted elections in which coercion is comparatively uncommon.
- 3) Practically all adults have the right to vote in the election of officials.
- 4) Practically all adults have the right to run for elective offices in the government
- 5) Citizens have a right to express themselves without the danger of severe punishment on political matters broadly defined
- 6) Citizens have a right to seek out alternative sources of information. Moreover, alternative sources of information exist and are protected by law.
- 7) . . . Citizens also have the right to form relatively independent associations or organizations, including independent political parties and interest groups^{vii}.

Building on Dahl's theory of democracy, Phillippe Schmitter and Terry Karl, presented a more inclusive view of democracy. In their essay entitled “what democracy is and is not?”, Schmitter and Karl argues that democracy is not made from a single set of unique institutions, but there are rather multiple forms of democracy. They built on Dahl's seven conditions and added two more conditions to his list. The first condition is the ability of the elected officials to exercise their

powers without failing to be overridden. Democracy can be in danger if military officials or civil managers control the decision making in elected bodies. The second condition is “the polity must be self-governing; it must be able to act independently of constraints imposed by some other overarching political system.”^{viii}

This definition has brought an interesting component, which is the independence of elected bodies. This independence has not always existed in the democratic world because elected officials are influenced by external factors. For instance, lobbyists have a tremendous influence on members of the US Congress, which has been criticized by many scholars. This influence does not sometimes reflect the will of the constituents, but it is still adopted by members. Therefore, questions are raised about how representative is this body of the peoples’ will?

A more cynical view of the above definitions was presented by Larry Diamond, in his book “developing democracy: toward consolidation”. Diamond argues that both Schumpeter and Dahl’s definition of democracy are minimalistic. Diamond focuses on civil liberty as another determinant of democracy. For him, the two dimensions of polyarchy can not be achieved unless the people have the freedom to speak and publish dissenting views^{ix}. Diamond called for a liberal democracy, instead of an electoral democracy, that offers, in addition to holding fair and free elections, elements of civil liberties and freedom. According to Diamond, liberal democracy has the following components: “control of the state and its key decisions lies with elected officials...executive power is constrained by other government institutions...cultural, ethnic, religious, and other minorities are not prohibited from expressing their interests..beyond parties and elections, citizens have other channels of expression, citizens are politically equal before the law...”^x.

Diamond also raised in his book the question of democracy consolidation, while he viewed democracy as a developmental phenomenon that should change over time. Diamond defined consolidation as: “the process of achieving broad and deep legitimating, such that all significant political actors, both at the elite and mass levels, believe that the democratic regime is the most right and appropriate for their society, better than any other realistic alternative they can imagine”^{xi}.

Diamond further notes how the political actors should believe that democracy is the “only game in town”. Democracy should be the only way that can take a political actor to govern and advance his own interests. Diamond states that the political actor should believe that “...It [democracy] is the most right and appropriate for their society, better than any other realistic alternative they can imagine.”^{xii}

As we can see from the above reviewed definition, the concept of democracy has no one or definite meaning. Democracy is an elastic concept that adapts to the contexts in which it is being applied. The elasticity of democracy should not, however, omit us from adopting a more maximalist definition of the concept that can guide this research effort. Diamond seems to offer an interesting definition of the concept by his consideration of most of the aspects that make democracy.

In diamond’s theory, elections are given an important position as one of the pre-requisites of democracy. However, Diamond’s definition does not stop at the stage of election, but continues to include the aspects of free and fair elections. The rest of this essay will tackle the different dimensions and indicators of fair and free elections and how they relate to Diamond’s maximalist definition of democracy.

The determinants of free and fair elections:

The concepts of “fair” and “free” must be clearly defined and distinguished from other determinants of democracy. The two concepts should be also translated into some specific criteria that can allow an assessment of how free and fair an election is.

According to Jorgan Elkit and Sevensson Palle, the concept of “freedom” contrasts with coercion. “Freedom entails the right and the opportunity to choose one thing over another. Coercion implies the absence of choice, either formally or in reality: either all options but one are disallowed, or certain choices would have negative consequences for one's own or one's family's safety, welfare, or dignity.”^{xiii}

“Fairness” means impartiality. According to Jorgan Elkit and Sevensson Palle, “the opposite of fairness is unequal treatment of equals, whereby some people (or groups) are given unreasonable advantages. Thus fairness involves both regularity (the unbiased application of rules) and reasonableness (the not-too-unequal distribution of relevant resources among competitors)”.^{xiv}

In election context, the freedom dimension should include elements of participation of citizens in the process (voting and running for office), without any coercion. On the other hand, fairness deals mainly with “the rules of the game”. For Elkit and Sevensson, freedom should be given the priority, “because it is a precondition for democracy and for elections as a means to that end. Without rules granting formal political freedoms, the question of the fair application of rules is meaningless, and the question of equality of resources, irrelevant.”^{xv}

The freedom dimension includes the following criteria:

- Freedom of movement
- Freedom of speech (for candidates, the media, voters, and others)

- Freedom of assembly
- Freedom from fear in connection with the election and the electoral campaign
- Absence of impediments to standing for election (for both political parties and independent candidates)
- Equal and universal suffrage
- Opportunity to participate in the election
- Legal possibilities of complaint

While the fairness dimension includes the following criteria:

- A transparent electoral process
- An election act and an electoral system that grant no special privileges to any political party or social group
- Establishment of an independent and impartial election commission
- Absence of impediments to inclusion in the electoral register
- Impartial treatment of candidates by the police, the army, and the courts of law
- Equal opportunities for political parties and independent candidates to stand for election
- Impartial voter-education programs
- An orderly election campaign (observance of a code of conduct)
- Equal access to publicly controlled media
- Impartial allotment of public funds to political parties (if relevant)

- No misuse of government facilities for campaign purposes
- Access to all polling stations for representatives of the political parties, accredited local and international election observers, and the media
- Secrecy of the ballot
- Absence of intimidation of voters
- Effective design of ballot papers
- Proper ballot boxes
- Impartial assistance to voters (if necessary)
- Proper counting procedures
- Proper treatment of void ballot papers
- Proper precautionary measures when transporting election materials
- Impartial protection of polling stations
- Official and expeditious announcement of election results
- Acceptance of the election results by everyone involved^{xvi}

After examining the academic literature and how different scholars tackled the relation between election and democracy at a theoretical level, it is time to have a closer look on how practitioners viewed this issue. The reviewed literature suggests that there is a consensus among the practitioners about the importance of elections for any democratic consolidation. However, the practitioners' literature went beyond that to explore specific component of elections that play a

role in democratization, namely electoral management and its contribution to democratic consolidation.

Legal framework of election: gate to a democratic election

The first and decisive step in holding an election is preparing the legal framework according to which the election is going to be held. The legal framework can play a decisive role in shaping the process and the results of an election. It is necessary that the legal architecture for elections aim to consolidate the democratic process, but it is not always the case in many countries.

In a recent study published by the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI), Patrick Merloe suggested that promoting legal frameworks for elections should be the interest of all democratic stakeholders in the society, namely political parties, civic groups and candidates. These parties should be prepared to advance initiatives to defend and maintain elements of the legal framework that they deem essential for fairness, as well as to advocate for modifying the legal framework in order to remove impediments to fairness and to improve their chances of winning office^{xvii}.

Knowing the rules is not enough to ensure a democratic election. Monitoring the implementation process is necessary for a fair and transparent election. For instance, a key element of election laws implementation is drawing district boundaries, which is usually important for candidates and political parties. Parties should monitor the process to make sure that the boundaries respect equal suffrage, by including approximately the same number of citizens for each elected representative, and drawing boundaries that do not improperly discriminate against minority populations and do not discriminate on the basis of political opinion are not simply abstract considerations^{xviii}.

Citizens and Civil society organizations should also be involved in drawing legal frameworks for democratic elections. Democratic legislative and regulatory processes present opportunities for individual citizens to review existing legal frameworks and comment on proposed changes, as well as to suggest modifications in order to ensure that citizens are guaranteed their right to vote. Civil society organizations (CSOs) can play vital roles in developing, safeguarding and improving legal frameworks for democratic elections, if they establish relationships and take on advocacy roles with political parties, parliamentary groups and members, election management bodies and others responsible for administering electoral processes^{xix}.

Merloe placed a great importance on the process by which the legal framework of democratic election is designed. According to Merloe: “The process by which legal frameworks are developed is therefore vitally important to achieving democratic elections. The principles of inclusiveness, transparency and accountability, which help to ensure fairness and promote public confidence, should be fundamental elements of the process for developing the legal framework, just as they must be imbedded in the substance of the framework itself”^{xx}. He stressed that the process of developing the legal framework reflect the political will to establish a democratic governance.

The process that leads to a legal framework for democratic election should be democratic itself. In a legislative system, the parliamentary caucuses should extend the opportunity to civic organizations and the citizens to present their views and interests in the legal framework for elections. Allowing public input ensure the element of transparency and public engagement in the decision making process, which an important component of democratic practice. “Surprise legislative maneuvers to gain an electoral advantage may provide a tactical advantage for certain

interests, but they subvert the democratic character of elections and undermine the legitimacy of those who are elected to office”^{xxi}.

Merloe indentified a set of elements for frameworks of democratic elections. There are a number of elements that typically appear in legal frameworks for democratic elections. They may be divided or labeled somewhat differently, though the categories outlined below provide an overview of the various election processes:

- **Recognition of Rights and Description of Governmental Structure and the Electoral System:** the constitution and electoral laws should recognize as fundamental the right to genuine democratic elections and electoral related rights.
- **Election Districts:** Equal suffrage requires that the weight of each person’s vote be essentially the same. This has particular significance when developing the legal framework for delimiting election districts.
- **The Election Management Bodies and election administration:** the EMB must be impartial and competent, and it must be perceived to be both by the electoral contestants and the public.
- **Monitoring by Parties, Candidates, Referenda and Ballot Initiative Groups, Domestic Nonpartisan Election Monitors, News Media, and International Election Observers:** The legal framework is key to ensuring that all elements of the election process are open to monitoring by political parties, candidates, groups supporting referenda and other ballot initiatives, domestic nonpartisan election monitoring organizations, news media and international organizations.
- **Voter Registration and Voter Lists:** Voter registration serves to guarantee that all eligible voters can exercise the right to vote and that illegal voting is prevented. This

ensures against disenfranchisement and against diluting the weight of each person's legitimate vote, thus supportin.

- **Voter Education:** Elections cannot be genuinely democratic unless voters understand the differences among the electoral contestants so that they can cast an informed vote. Voters must also know when, where and how to register to vote, as well as when, where and how to voteequal suffrage.
- **Legal Recognition and Status of Political Parties:** The legal framework must provide, on a nondiscriminatory basis and without undue restrictions, provisions concerning the legal recognition and continuation of the legal status of political parties and other political organizations, such as candidate support groups and groups supporting or opposing referenda and other ballot initiatives.
- **Election Campaigning:** The legal framework for democratic elections must ensure fair conditions for electoral contestants, sometimes referred to as a level playing field.
- **Campaign Resources:** Where the legal framework provides campaign resources to political contestants, it must do so on a nondiscriminatory basis that sets equitable treatment for all contestants.
- **Media:** A legal framework for democratic elections must address several issues related to the media: protections for the media to exercise freedom of expression in the electoral context; providing electoral contestants with a genuine opportunity to communicate their electoral messages to the public; and providing the electorate with accurate information upon which to make decisions about voting choices.
- **Voting:** The legal framework must address a myriad of issues to ensure a genuine opportunity to exercise the right to vote on the basis of equal and universal suffrage.

- **Vote Counting, Results Tabulation and Results Announcement:** Vote counting, transmission of results, results tabulation and announcement of results all require clear and specific provisions in the legal framework for democratic elections. Honest and accurate determination\ of the people’s will concerning who shall occupy elected office depends on these provisions.
- **Complaint Mechanisms:** The legal framework for democratic elections should state for each element of the election process a complaints procedure that provides due process, equality before the law, equal protection of the law, effective remedies for violations of electoral rights and accountability for those who commit violations.

Merloe also presented how these elements can be evaluated. He developed a checklist that would help assist the review of election laws and proposed amendments to election laws, as well as the consideration of broader legal frameworks for democratic elections. It also can be used by those charged with legislative drafting. The principles of inclusiveness, transparency and accountability and the related concepts of electoral fairness and developing public confidence are imbedded in the checklist^{xxii}.

Developing new legal frameworks for elections can also be a source for legitimacy for some regimes or maintaining the status quo in others. Leaders of some countries developed new “rules of the game” to gain more legitimacy or to serve their own interests. Therefore, developing legal frameworks for election can be very sensitive and may drive a country into different directions.

In Morocco, after Mohamed VI accessed the throne in 1999, he reformed the electoral law to give his reign more legitimacy. Given the importance of elections in any democratic practice and in order to send a message to the local and international actors about the democratization intentions of the new king, the electoral reform was one of the first actions that the king took. In

preparation of the 2002 legislative elections, the king presented an electoral reform that changed the electoral system from a nominal to proportional system. The preparation phase for these elections has known the development of new electoral code. Therefore, the voters had to elect a number of persons that represent a political party. By adopting such system, the voter would not be voting for a person but for his / her political program that he / she represents, which is a good practice of democracy^{xxiii}. Also, the new code brought about some serious anti-corruption policies, since all the previous experiences were marked by corruption. The new law also brought a quota of 10% of the lower house seats for women, which was welcomed by national and international actors.

The process of developing the new framework was relatively democratic. The political parties were engaged in the discussion and amending the law, unlike before, when the electoral code was conducted exclusively by the ministry of interior^{xxiv}. However, some aspects of the electoral code are still not discussed by the political parties. For instance, the electoral districting, which is the most important part of the electoral process, is still conducted by the ministry of interior. Parties have almost no say in this process, which was always explained by security reason (control of Islamilst parties).

This move from the nominal system to a proportional system was meant to increase the popularity of the political parties, but at the same time to control the rise of the Islamists that are seen as a threat to the regime. The new system came up with larger electoral districts, so not all parties were able to cover all the electoral districts. In addition, the system showed some failure because of the large number of parties, which lead to defragmentation of the political spectrum. In Egypt, president Mubarak reformed the constitution in 2005 to allow contested presidential elections. While this reform was praised by his party, the National Democratic Party, the

opposition perceived it as a political maneuver by the regime and an illusion of democratic reform. This reform was widely seen as a change of style rather than of substance. The regime's rhetoric has outpaced its actions for change^{xxv}.

On another note, Merloe tried to come-up with a comprehensive guide for policy makers on how to develop democratic election legal frameworks. In his discussion of the interest of stakeholders in the process of developing the legal framework, Merloe assumed that citizens, civic organizations and political parties are given a say in the political system. In most post-authoritarianism countries, these groups are still in the margin, especially the civil society organizations and citizens. The civil liberties are still undermined in such countries, where elections are only a façade.

In this case, we recall Larry Diamond definition of democracy and democratic consolidation, which he does not link to holding elections only, but to the presence of civil liberties as well. If the process of developing legal frameworks for election is not inclusive and does not take into account the input of most stakeholders in the society, it can not consolidate the democratic practice in a given country.

Election Management:

In any election, the question about how the elections are run is very essential to qualify an election as democratic or not. While the focus was primarily on the normative notion of election and its relationship with democracy, the causal effect of the institutionalization of electoral politics (election administration) and the emergence of democracy has been neglected in the scholarship.

Today, across the globe, we witness an increase in the number of the so-called “electoral Management bodies” (EMBs) as institutions for electoral management. EMBs are important institutions for democracy-building. They deal directly with the organization of multi-party elections and indirectly with governance and the rule of law. “An EMB is an organization or body which has been founded for the purpose of, and is legally responsible for, managing one or more of the elements that are essential for the conduct of elections, and of direct democracy instruments – such as referendums, citizens’ initiatives, and recall votes – if those are part of the legal framework.”^{xxvi}

In a study published by United Nations Development Program (UNDP, Professor Rafael López-Pintor conducted an assessment of EMBs as permanent public institutions of governance in a democratizing world. He discussed technical aspects of their sustainability, as well as their contribution to the legitimacy of democratic institutions and to the enhancement of the rule of law in a democratic state. Lopes-Pintor stressed that countries are now moving towards independent electoral authorities as the preferred form of EMBs. The second model that other countries are following is the one in which the election is run by the government, but regulated and monitored to some extent by an independent commission that also has adjudication capacity for questions of electoral conduct. However, all forms of EMBs have a certain commission membership is either party-based or includes at least a few representatives of political parties.^{xxvii}

Lopes-Pintor stressed in his study that elections that are run by the executive branch are far away from being democratic. However, most democratic countries moved from this form of electoral management to a form of EMBs as part of the developmental process of democracy. He argued that “of the 27 most stable democracies identified by analysts in the second half of the 20th century, only seven countries retain this type of electoral authority. All of them are in North-

western Europe (including Switzerland), and they constitute 25 per cent of all the older democracies.” Lopes-Pintor also presented a taxonomy that classifies 148 countries by region according to their type of electoral administration (see appendix 1).

On another note, the importance of the quality of election administration both as a theoretical issue and at the more management-oriented and policy relevant level has not merely been addressed as a general issue. Lopes-pintor argued that permanent EMBs with professional staff operate more efficiently than temporary bodies is supported by evidence of variations in electoral budgets (average cost per voter) relative to the length of the country’s experience in organizing elections.

Elklit, Jørgen and Reynolds, Andrew tried to study the impact of the institutional factors of electoral management in enhancing legitimacy. They claimed “1) that individual experiences in a number of fields related to the conduct of elections have a direct bearing on how the sense of political efficacy develops in individual citizens, and 2) that this is an important factor behind the eventual development of legitimacy and a principled commitment to democracy, that is, progression towards democratic consolidation (even if during the transition phase).^{xxviii,}”

Electoral Performance Survey

Based on the reviewed literature, it seems that while there is consensus on the importance of elections for democracy building, there was no attempt to offer a measurement for fair and free elections. The literature focused mainly on the normative aspect of election and its relation with democracy. Therefore, this research comes to fill a gap in the literature by offering a concrete measurement of fair and free elections.

The Electoral Performance Index (EPI) was developed based on the different theories of democracy and elections. It offers a set of indicators that measure the two dimensions of ‘fair’

and 'free' elections. The survey is made of 25 questions divided into four main areas of elections, namely: general rules of elections, legal framework, electoral process, and post election period. The index's questions are phrased to allow a Yes/No answer. This would facilitate the analysis of the data and assign a score to countries based on the index.

The items of the survey are posed in such a way that affirmative answers indicate more fair and free elections. The EPI score will be calculated by simply dividing the number of affirmative answers by the total number of questions. The score will be based on answers about the last legislative elections held in each country. The rationale for choosing the legislative elections is that parliaments are supposed to be the most representative body of the population. Therefore, the democratic election of a representative to the parliament means a commitment from the bottom-up to democratization.

General rules of elections:

1. Are elections held to elect the chief executive, legislature and local officials?
2. Are elections held regularly at constitutionally set time intervals?
3. Does every citizen have the right to vote in elections, on a non-discriminatory basis?
4. Does every citizen have the right to run for elections, on a non-discriminatory basis?
5. Are all the votes equally weighted?

Legal Framework:

1. Does the constitution guarantee the organization of elections?
2. Is there a clear, detailed and fair legal framework according to which elections are held?
3. Are elections managed by independent commissions?
4. Are elections managed by a branch of the government (Ministry of Interior or Justice Department)?

Electoral Process:

1. Is the registration of voters and candidates conducted in an accurate, fair and transparent manner?
2. Are there clear criteria for registration of voters and candidates (age, citizenship, residence)?
3. Is the update of electoral rolls conducted regularly and in a transparent manner?
4. Is the districting conducted by an independent body in a nonpartisan way?
5. Does the law specify the electoral campaign period?
6. Do candidates have equal access to mass media to present their electoral platforms?
7. Do candidates have the right to hold public meetings, reach out to citizens, and assemble freely?
8. Are there instances of vote buying and corruption in the electoral campaign?
9. Is the vote conducted by secret ballots?
10. Are voters able to vote for the candidate and political party of their choice?
11. Is the vote count conducted in the presence of the media, political parties' observers, and civil society organizations?
12. Are the results of the election made public, by district and polling station?
13. Can election be monitored by national and/or international observers?

Post Election Period:

1. Do candidates and political parties accept the outcome of the election?
2. Can candidates and/or political parties appeal election results to a jurisdiction capable to review such decisions?
3. Did a reputable national and/or international election monitoring commission judge the election to be free and fair?

Key conclusions

Throughout the literature, scholars and practitioners agree that elections are an important prerequisite for democratic consolidation. The organization of elections is the first step in a long democratization process that should include, in addition to elections, other elements of civil liberties and freedom of speech. These elements could make the democratic consolidation more complete and appealing.

Democracy evolves as a complex system that involves different dimensions and inter-society relations. There might be other factors that contribute to the emergence of democracy, other than elections. However, the argument of the study is that free and fair elections are only an essential component of the democratic process and contribute to the emergence of a democratic rule. The rationale is that democratically elected officials would be more committed to maintain democracy than anyone else.

On another note, one could argue that elections are a mechanism of authoritarianism in many countries. Elections are held to give legitimacy to the regime by producing pro-regime elites that are less inclined to challenge the status quo. This fact actually supports the argument of this paper. It shows that elections do not mean democratization, but fair and free election can lead to democracy.

Appendix 1

Summary Distribution of EMBs by World Regions (percent)^{xxix}

Institutional model	North America and Western Europe	Latin America and the Caribbean	Asia and the Pacific	MENA	East and central Europe	Sub-Saharan Africa	Total	Number of cases per institutional model
Government runs the elections	43	12	30	45	-	8	20	29
Government under supervisory authority	43	18	7	33	33	39	27	40
Independent electoral commission	14	70	63	22	67	53	53	79
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	148
Number of cases per region	21	34	30	9	18	36	148	

End Notes

ⁱ David Collier and Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with adjectives: Conceptual innovation in comparative research", *World Politics*, 49, (3), 430-451.

David Collier and Steven Levitsky reviewed 550 subtype of democracy. Collier and Levitsky studied how scholars labeled democratizing regimes in more than 150 studies

ⁱⁱ David Collier and Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with adjectives: Conceptual innovation in comparative research

ⁱⁱⁱ Schumpeter, Joseph, 1947. "Capitalism, Socialism and democracy". New York: harper.

Schumpeter has described the classical doctrine of democracy as "holding that the democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions which realizes the common good by making the people themselves decide on issues through the election of individuals who are to assemble in order to carry out its will"

^{iv} Ibid., 32

^v Ibid., 32

^{vi} Dahl, Robert 1971. "Ployarchy: participation and opposition". Yale University pres: New Haven

^{vii} Ibid., 2-3

^{viii} Phillippe C. Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl, 1991. "What democracy is...and is not". *Journal of democracy*, 2 (3), 75-88.

^{ix} Diammond, Larry, 1999. *Developing Democracy: towards consolidation*. The john Hopkins university press

Diammond sets a theoritical perspective on democratic evolution and consolidation in the late 20th century. Rejecting the theories of precondition for democracy, Diamond argues for "a developmental theory of democracy, one that views democracy everywhere as a work in progress, developing at different rates, in different forms, and in different countries.

^x Ibid., 11.

^{xi} Ibid, Larry, 65

^{xii} Ibid, Larry, 65

^{xiii} Elkit, Jorgan and Severson Palle, 1997. "What makes elections free and fair". *Journal of democracy* 8 (3):32-46

^{xiv} Ibid., 35

^{xv} Ibid., 35

^{xvi} Ibid., 45

^{xvii} Merloe, Patrick. "Promoting legal frameworks for democratic elections". National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, 2008

^{xviii} Merloe, 20

^{xix} Ibid., 28

^{xx} Ibid., 54

^{xxi} Ibid., 50

^{xxii} Ibid., 54

^{xxiii} Sater, James. "Morocco after the parliamentary elections of 2002". *Mediterranean politics Journal*. Issue 8, Spring 2003

^{xxiv} Sater, 5

^{xxv} Khairi, Abaza. "Legislative Elections in Egypt: Another Test for Democracy". *The Washington Institute for Near East Policy*, November 2005.

^{xxvi} López-Pintor, Rafael. *Electoral Management Bodies as Institutions of Governance*. Bureau for Development Policy, United Nations Development Programme, September 2000

^{xxvii} Lopez-Pintor, 65

xxviii Elklit, Jørgen and Reynolds, Andrew. "The impact of election administration on the legitimacy of emerging democracies: A new research agenda". Kellogg Institute for International Studies, September 2000
xxix Lopez-Pintor, 95

DRAFT