

Three Faces of President Institution Development: Theoretical and Psychological Aspects

Anton S. Krasnov, Olga O. Volchkova and Guzel K. Saikina
Kazan Federal University, Kremlevskaya Str. 18, 420008 Kazan, Russia

Abstract: The study presents the analysis of transformation process concerning the forms of government in the European region states since the beginning of the XXth century. The tendency of the executive power role reinforcement is revealed in the process of political decision-making in countries with parliamentary and semi-presidential form of government. The term “president institution development” was determined and the conceptual differences of “president institution development” from the concepts of “presidential” and “presidentialism” are provided. Also the characteristics of the revealed process were studied. The key aspects of “president institution development” is the growth of resources and the autonomy of the executive power head, the increase of informal political leader pressure on the party, as well as the strengthening of a politician individual during the election campaign, that is, the centralization of the election process around a leader's personality. On the basis of political institution development experience in Europe over the past two decades, we created three dynamic models of presidential political systems, conventionally identified as: crisis, informal and constitutional one. A number of conclusions was made concerning the description of the essential characteristics of president institution development concept. Firstly, president institution development is a political process and it is revealed exclusively as a dynamic phenomenon that is realized in political practice. Secondly, president institution development is a complex multifactorial phenomenon, a combination of factors influences the development of the described process. The key factors are historical, cultural and economic one. Besides, the development of a presidential institution may act as an indicator of the crisis processes in the public administration system and in the “black box” as a whole.

Key words: President institution development, forms of government, political system, political institutions, political development, leadership, power

INTRODUCTION

The end of the XXth century was marked by the emergence of new political trends in the development of European parliamentary democracy. The activity of such Western European political leaders like Margaret Thatcher, Helmut Kohl, H. Schroeder served as the basis for the discussion of political leadership type change and the growing role of the executive power head in parliamentary and semi-presidential systems. The development of European democracies is increasingly determined by the logic of relationship between government and parliament typical for presidential systems.

The president institution of a political system development is reflected in the fact that systems become more presidential in practice, but their formal structure does not change usually (Zaznayev, 2014).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The object of the study is the political institutions of Europe. In order, to analyze the process of political transformations a number of techniques was used by which the formal and non-formal aspects of president institution development were studied. Using the methodology of governmental form index analysis developed by A. Crowell, the formal characteristics of the president institution development process were identified which are reflected in the transformation of constitutional law, the changing of rules and the procedures for the election of executive power head performance. In order to study the informal aspects, in particular, the increase of a political leader pressure on a party activity in the parliamentary and semi-presidential countries as well as the value of a leader figure during the period of an electoral campaign the methods of event analysis and

discourse analysis were used. An event chronology of the electoral process was traced using event-analysis and the discourse analysis allowed us to determine the semantic connotations of political leader public speeches.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The starting point for the formation of “president institution development” concept definition is an ideal type of a parliamentary system, where a candidate for the post of executive power head is an impersonal individual and the loyalty to him is completely determined by the behavior of the party supporters. The prime minister in parliamentary regimes, in contrast to the elected president during presidential elections, regardless of who he is, does not have a separate, independent position that differs from the position of the party in the eyes of voters. He or she cannot act as an independent and autonomous influence lever on the choice of the citizens and the voting results. The party leader is only the “first among equals” but not an independent entity with extensive formal and informal powers (Kaase, 1994). Of course, these characteristics refer to an ideal type of parliamentary democracy which cannot be found in reality, however, in comparison with it one may conclude the following.

The concept of “presidential” suggests an independent effect of a political leader on the electorate while the “president institution development” implies that such an impact on the current moment is stronger than it was in the past, so the “president institution development” is defined as a phenomenon that is revealed in the analysis of a political system dynamic development.

The term “president institution development” refers to the long transition from the collective to the individual management. The president institution development is the process of a political system transformation, characterized by the fact that an autonomous political leader becomes the central subject of politics who has a large amount of formal and informal powers and has a direct impact on all aspects of the political life of the country.

It is a long and multifaceted political process affecting the basic principles of relations between the authorities and key political actors. Today, an actual transformation of a government form takes place in many countries, the rules of interaction between the main political institutions are changed. In a presidential political system, a prime minister in a parliamentary system begins to perform the same functions and has the same independence in the political decision-making that the head of a state has within a presidential system. The

process of president development institute is reflected in the political experience of the European countries at the beginning of the XXIst century.

German chancellor has broad powers in many areas of public policy, determines the number of ministers and the areas of their responsibility. With prescriptive competence stated in the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany, the chancellor also has the sole right to prescribe the basic trends of the governmental activity, to which all cabinet members should adhere. The dominance of the prime minister in the political arena and the transition from collective to one-man rule under the cabinet is noted in UK. Tony Blair and Gordon Brown sought to replace government with numerous advisory bodies, which resembled personal administration of prime ministers (Foley, 2000).

Similar processes take place in the countries of central and eastern Europe, most of which are parliamentary and semi-presidential ones. New constitution of Hungary which came into force in 2012, establishes an extensive prime minister's autonomy from the Parliament and sets a complicated procedure of non-confidence vote in the government which implies the consultations with the president and the availability of a qualified majority in the parliament. Since the beginning of the XXIst century the tendencies of prime minister wide range of powers constitutional consolidation in the area of political decision-making are also specific for Poland (Tarasov, 2009). In particular, the Polish Prime Minister has the right to create, combine and remove government departments at his discretion, to change the composition of their powers with the approval of the President of Poland to introduce additional members into government, the so-called “ministers without portfolio”.

The result of the political practice analysis in recent decades performed by political scientists Poguntke (2005) identified three aspects of a presidential political system development.

The increase of resources and the autonomy of the executive power head. The autonomy of executive power head may be expressed in provision of wider formal powers, such as the right of appointment to key government positions, the right to make decisions on specific political issues unilaterally. Also, the autonomy of a political leader may be expressed in direct control of public authorities, the creation of monitoring organizations, analytical centres and advisory councils at the prime minister offices.

The strengthening of a political leader influence on the activities of a party. Political parties are the key players on a political arena in parliamentary and semi-presidential systems. In recent decades, the party leaders

become much more than a “first among equals”, the focus of political decision-making is shifted from the collegial form on an individual one. Increasingly, within the parties the personal teams of assistants and leader advisors are developed. A leader, who became the executive power head, expands the range of his responsibilities and becomes more independent from the party members, personally directing his activity on the political arena of a state, adjusting and adapting the party program and ideology.

The strengthening of a political leader role in the electoral process. In recent decades, the role of personality in the parliamentary election campaigns is becoming more significant. From the classic “fight of party programs and ideologies” we turn to the political struggle, defending in the first place personal interests and not the party ones. The elections in parliamentary democracies are increasingly reminiscent of the pre-election campaign of US presidents, where the most popular candidate wins who managed to win the trust and sympathy of the majority of society and not a political force, armed with a program and an ideology.

These three aspects disclose the meaningful essence of president development institution. It should be noted that president development institution as any political process has different bases and specificity characteristic of each particular case. In various cases, we may observe the development of all three aspects, so as one or two ones. Depending on the expression of formal and informal president institution development parts you can select the degree and intensity of this process. The development of a president political system was always conditioned by historical, cultural and situational factors.

For example, the beginning of a British political system president institution development dates to the mid 80s of the XXth century. The empowering of executive power head was initiated during the period of M. Tetcher as a prime minister by the strengthening of her impact on the operations and the policies of the Conservative Party of Great Britain as well as the increase of a political leader role in the electoral process. Despite the fact that the process of UK president institution development proceeds rather slowly, it is worth noting that at this moment we can talk about one-man rule of the British prime minister within the cabinet. In Germany and Italy, the powers of the executive power head were constitutionally stated in the 80-90s of the XXth century and were not expanded to date. At the same time the tendencies strengthening the leader influence on the electoral process and the increase of government head autonomy from the parliament (Mair, 2001). In the Baltic States, in particular in Lithuania and Latvia, the process of

president institution development began in the 1990s of the XXth century. Initially aimed at preserving the balance between the branches of government the parliamentary systems with a dominated parliament role turned into a presidential republic with strong features 20 years later. In Lithuania, most of the powers of the prime minister at the moment is concentrated in the hands of the president and it is a key political actor, in Latvia, there are strong president parties with sole control of a political leader and also increases the influence of politicians in the electoral process (McAllister and White, 2007). Analyzing the political practices of European countries significant differences in the constitutional, institutional and electoral manifestations of president institution development may be observed.

Despite the differences in terms of intensity and the aspects of president institution development process in various parliamentary and semi-presidential systems, it is possible to identify a number of generalizing president institution development models that reflect the most important and essential characteristics of the various forms of this institution. After studying political experience of European democracies in the last two decades, we have identified the following models.

Constitutional presidential institution development: The most important feature of this presidential institution model is the change of constitutional law to increase the powers of executive power head, the increased autonomy of the government, the reduced control over the activities of executive bodies. The change of constitution entails the change in the institutional design of the political system, which in its turn may lead to a change in the form of government. Constitutional changes indicate a high level of presidential institution development process (Strom, 2000).

Informal presidential institution development: As in any other social process, the changes in policy may occur *de jure* and *de facto*. “Informal presidential institution development” is the process of change in the relationship between an executive power head and other subjects of a state political life which takes place without constitutional amendments or other legalization. “Informal presidential institution development” is manifested in the transformation of state management system in the absence of constitutional and legislative changes (Shedler, 2002). The president institution development of this type can be expressed in the increase of the informal influence on taken political decisions, the electoral process, a central of which is a political leader that also increases the level of his informal authority.

Crisis president institution development: It is no secret that in times of crisis the need for a fast, an efficient and an effective policy-making increases substantially (Riuer, 1980). In parliamentary democracies within the difficult transition periods, the full responsibility for decisions is passed on to the head of government. In this regard, the powers and possibilities of a chief executive expand significantly to manage the political process in a country. During such periods, as a rule, prime ministers enjoyed broad autonomy in decision-making, they are independent in their actions from any party and from parliament. However, after the crisis, there are two versions of events on a political arena: a prime minister has sufficient resources for the legal registration of his “crisis” authorities and the process president institution develops further or a political leader, who performed the function of a crisis manager will be shifted by stronger and more popular political players.

Summary: The president institution development is the phenomenon associated with the development of European parliamentary republics during the last decades. This process can be an indicator of changes in the political structure of a state, the problems in a control system, as well as it may be the result of the crisis processes, expressed in the weakening of control by society and the concentration of power in a single center.

CONCLUSION

The president institution development defined as a phenomenon that is revealed during the analysis of political system dynamic development. The process of president institution development is reflected in the strengthening of political leadership role and influence, as well as in the increase of his autonomy as a political subject. During the study process of president institution development one should take into account historical and social preconditions of the process. Depending on the importance of presidential institution development trend factor, each case can be attributed to one of three models: an informal, crisis and constitutional one.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

- Foley, T., 2000. The British Presidency: Tony Blair and the politics of public leadership. Foley, T. (Eds.), Manchester University Press, pp: 25-26.
- Kaase, M., 1994. Is there Personalization in Politics? Candidates and Voting Behaviour in Germany. *Intl. Political Sci. J.*, pp: 30.
- Mair, P., 2001. Party Membership in Twenty European Democracies 1980-2000. *I.van Biezen Party Politics*. No. 7, pp: 11.
- McAllister, I. and S. White, 2007. Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Post-Communist Societies. *Party Politics*, 13 (2): 250.
- Poguntke, T., 2005. The presidentialization of politics: a comparative study of modern democracies. T. Poguntke, P. Webb. New York: Oxford University Press, pp: 361.
- Riuer, W.H., 1980. Implications from the Disequilibrium of Majority Rule for the Study of Institutions. *Am. Political Sci. Rev.*, No. 74, pp: 432-460.
- Strom, K., 2000. Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies. *Eur. J. Political Res.*, No. 37, pp: 88-89.
- Shedler, A., 2002. The Menu of Manipulation. *J. Democracy*, 13 (2): 36-50.
- Tarasov, I.N., 2009. Political institutions and practices of post-communism in Central and Eastern Europe. A.N. Nikolaev (Eds.), Saratov State Socio-Economic University. Saratov, pp: 288.
- Zaznayev, O.I., 2014. Understanding of government forms in a foreign political science: the latest discussions. *Political Sci.*, No. 1, pp: 10-33.