

**Regional Conference on Gender Equality in Electoral Processes
Tbilisi (Georgia), 25th to 2th November 2015**

**The impact of electoral systems, including gender candidate quotas,
on women's representation in parliament¹**

by Michael Krennerich²

I. Introduction

According to the data from the Inter-Parliamentary Union, women's parliamentary representation in single or lower house legislatures worldwide has increased slowly, but steadily during the last few decades: 4.9% (1960), 5.4% (1970), 8.7% (1980), 9.1% (1990), 11.9% (2000), and 16.3% (2005). By 1 September 2015, the overall proportion of women in single or lower houses of parliament had reached 22.9%.

At the regional level, in the Americas and in Europe women hold 27.4% and 25.8% of the parliamentary seats, respectively, as of 1st September 2015. It is generally acknowledged that women need to reach a critical mass of at least one third of the seats of a legislative body in order to be able to exert a real influence on the decisions taken by this body. For a balanced gender representation even a minimum of 40% of each sex in parliament needs to be achieved.

At the national level, some member states of the Council of Europe had reached such a balanced gender representation by 1st September 2015: Sweden, Finland, Iceland and Spain. In Norway, Andorra and Belgium almost 40% of the Members of Parliament are female. Ten other CoE member states had reached the critical mass level of at least 30%. At the bottom, with women's representation around 10% to 12%, are currently Hungary, Armenia, Georgia and the Ukraine (see Appendix B). The under-representation of women in many European parliaments must be considered as problematic from a democratic and human rights perspective.

Obviously, there is a wide variety of socio-economic, cultural and political factors that can hamper or facilitate women's access to parliament. Women's participation in politics is dependent on factors such as the socioeconomic status of women, the levels of female education or the proportion of women in employment. Cultural approaches refer to gender differences in political socialisation and adult gender roles and to the role of religion or cultural traditions.

¹ The presentation is mainly based on the author's "Report on the Impact of Electoral Systems on Women's representation in Politics", CDL-AD(2009)029.

² Senior researcher on human rights and human rights politics and one of the Program Directors of the Master Human Rights at the University of Erlangen-Nueremberg; Chair-person of the Nueremberg Human Rights Centre; Co-editor of the "Zeitschrift für Menschenrechte. Journal for Human Rights". Contact: michael.krennerich@fau.de

Among genuine political factors, e.g. the institutional features of democracies and party systems, the degree of party support or the strength of women's movement are important as well.

Besides the need to have the right to be elected and to be willing to stand for elections, women need to pass two fundamental barriers to get elected: First they need to be chosen as candidates by the parties. Especially the stage at which parties nominate their candidates for elections is most critical for women's access to parliament. Who will be elected is mostly pre-decided by the nomination committees of the parties since they choose the candidates and may place them in prominent positions on the party lists or in "safe" constituencies. Depending on which nomination procedures are used, national or regional party leaders, a broader set of party officials, or party members play the gatekeeper role. Second, female candidates need to be elected by the voters. Depending, among others, on women's role in society and politics, voting patterns may favour or disfavour women.

As for the topic of this speech, the crucial question is, thus, how gender quotas and electoral systems affect the candidates' selections and the possibilities of expressing voting preferences.

Gender quotas

First a few words on gender quotas which directly aim to improve the gender balance in parliament. Both legislated candidate quotas and voluntary party quotas specify the minimum percentages of female party candidates for elections.

Legislated candidate quotas are mandatory for all parties presenting candidates or candidates' lists for the elections. Following the example of Belgium, more than a dozen CoE member states introduced such mandatory quotas in the last two decades. However, they differ considerably with regard to the minimum percentage of each sex among the candidatures. While only a few countries provide for the equal share of women and men on the party lists (Belgium) or among the overall number of candidates (France), in most cases the required minimum of both sexes lies between 20% and 40%.

It is important to note, however, that the effectiveness of mandatory quotas depends not only on the minimum percentage of each sex among the candidatures but also on strict rules for placing women on prominent positions on the list. Without such rules, legalized candidate quotas can be easily bypassed. Existing ranking rules, however, are rather few and leave much to be desired in the CoE member states. None of the mandatory quotas provides for a "zipper system", where every other candidate on the list must be a woman. (see Appendix B).

Voluntary party quotas are adopted voluntarily by parties, expressing the political will of the respective party leadership to include a certain share of women on party lists or in candidatures. In many CoE member states, at least some parties have accepted voluntary party quotas, ranging from 20% to 50%. Voluntary party quotas contributed towards a higher parliamentary representation of women in a number of countries. As a rule, it can be said that the more and the larger the parties that apply voluntarily gender quotas, the higher is the impact on women's representation in parliament. Thus, it is of paramount importance that particularly the large parties introduce voluntary quotas and apply them in such a way that female candidates are placed on prominent list positions or are allowed to run for winnable constituencies. Interestingly, there are, for instance, some green and leftist parties using a "zipper system".

Electoral systems

In contrast to gender quotas, electoral systems rather indirectly influence women's representation in parliament. Within the member states of the Council of Europe a wider variety of electoral systems is applied (see Appendix C). Plurality or majority systems are rare. Much more common are proportional representation (PR) systems, which are used in multi-member districts or at the national level. Some countries apply electoral systems which combine technical elements of the plurality/majority systems and PR systems (see Appendix C)

While it is a well-established finding that in countries applying PR systems it is often easier for women to get access to parliament than with other types of electoral systems, a closer look at electoral systems is necessary to obtain a differentiated assessment. Even electoral systems which belong to the same family, or type, may differ in important aspects.

Single member districts vs. multi-member districts

As for women's parliamentary representation, a crucial factor is whether the electoral system has single-member districts (SMDs) where only one parliamentarian is elected per constituency, or multi-member districts (MMDs) where several members of parliament are elected per constituency.

Among the Council of Europe member states, only a few plurality or majority systems are applied which use SMDs throughout the country for parliamentary elections. With some combined systems, however, a significant number of representatives are also elected in SMDs.

In SMDs each party can only nominate one person per district, and only the candidate with the plurality or majority of the votes will be elected there. The challenge for potential female candidates is, first, to be nominated by her party and, second, to be elected by the voters. Thus,

women must compete against men in their own party (for nomination) and against men of other parties (to be elected).

This might be difficult. The nomination of women is often hindered by the aspirations of powerful male politicians of the same party and their “boys networks”. Moreover, party gatekeepers may perceive women as being less capable of winning a face-to-face competition against a male candidate of another party, especially if the nomination of a woman requires the de-selection of a male incumbent. Thus, SMDs are usually considered to be less conducive to female nomination and representation than MMDs. Even with mixed member proportional systems, SMDs tend to disfavour women. Especially if traditional gender roles are prevalent, this may disfavour women.

In contrast to SMDs, multi-member districts (MMDs) theoretically allow for balancing the party ticket since several candidates will be elected there and, consequently, nominated on the parties’ lists. Party gatekeepers, thus, may have good reasons for introducing women on their lists: It may not only be seen as a strategy for attracting female voters, but also as a mechanism to represent various internal party interests and, thus, to strengthen the party’s coherence. Moreover, integrating women on the party list may be considered as a matter of equity, particularly if there is an active women’s branch inside the party and a strong women’s movement in the civil society.

District magnitude in multi-member constituencies

While multi-member districts are expected to be more advantageous for women than SMDs, they may differ considerably in their magnitude, that is, the number of seats to be elected per district. In the Council of Europe member states there are, for example, PR systems in predominantly small or medium-sized districts, PR systems in rather large districts, as well as PR systems in a nation-wide district. Moreover, there are also multi-tier PR systems with districts of different sizes at various levels. Finally, with combined systems at least a part of the parliamentarians are elected on PR lists.

It is often expected that the more members of parliament are elected per constituency, the more women will be nominated and elected. As it has been seen, this assumption is based on the dynamics of party-nominating processes and parties’ strategies for balancing their ticket. Several studies seem to prove such an assessment, but there is also some debate as to whether this argument is empirically valid.

Recent empirical research suggests that it is not so much district magnitude as “party magnitude” that matters. While district magnitude is defined by the number of seats to be elected in a district,

party magnitude describes the number of seats a party wins (or expects to win) in a district. Only if a party anticipates that it will win several seats in a constituency will ticket-balancing come into effect.

If parties are expected to win only one or two seats in the respective constituency, however, the effect will be rather limited or non-existent. Taking into account that in many PR systems men are the first on the list, the probability of women being elected is low, when party magnitude is one (that is, when the party gains only one seat).

Evidently district magnitude and party magnitude are interrelated. For example, in small constituencies of about three to five seats even strong parties are expected to win only a few mandates. With medium-sized or large constituencies, strong parties can expect to gain several seats, making strategies for ticket-balancing effective. Smaller parties, however, may even battle it out to gain a few seats there. In a nation-wide district, the number of parties which are expected to win several seats is likely to increase. However, there are also more small parties entering parliament with only a few seats, if not excluded by legal thresholds.

Of course, high district and party magnitudes alone do not guarantee high female representation levels, but at least they allow for effectively applying ticket balancing strategies, if politically wanted. Only in countries where well-designed gender quotas with strict placement mandates exist are the differences between the various district and party magnitudes not necessarily significant, as long as the parties gain several seats.

Legal thresholds

Legal thresholds define a minimum vote share a party needs to be awarded seats. Parties which get less than this percentage of the vote are excluded from parliamentary representation by legal provisions. The vast majority of member states of the Council of Europe are using PR systems in combination with legal thresholds at the constituency or national level.

Intuitively, legal thresholds do not appear to favour female representation. They aim to exclude small parties from access to parliament. This may prevent the fragmentation of the parliamentary party system, but does not favour the overall representativeness of the electoral system. Indeed small parties which may represent minorities' or women's interests are excluded from parliamentary representation.

However, the exclusion of small parties is not automatically associated with a lower representation of women in parliament. If we consider party magnitude as an important factor for stimulating (gender) ticket-balancing, legal thresholds are more likely to have the opposite effect:

They exclude small parties, which would gain only a few seats, from parliamentary representation. At the same time, those parties which pass the threshold gain enough seats in order to make ticket-balancing meaningful. Thanks to the legal threshold, therefore, only parties with a relatively high party magnitude enter parliament. They even profit from the exclusion of small parties. Since they have more room on the ticket to nominate women, it is more likely that women will be among the mandate-holders.

Due to the effect of party magnitude women will theoretically be helped by both the combination of high electoral district magnitudes *and* high legal thresholds. According to the dynamics of ticket-balancing, the combination of PR in large or even nation-wide districts with legal thresholds appears to be advantageous for women's nomination and representation.

Closed versus open or free lists

While in plurality/majority systems in SMDs, only individual (party) candidatures are possible, in PR systems different list forms are applied. Such lists may be closed, open or free. With closed lists the political parties determine the ranking order of candidates on the party list, and the voter endorses the entire list without any possibility of changing the order in which the seats are allocated to the candidates. In contrast, with open lists the voter may express a preference for particular candidates by casting a certain number of preference votes, thus changing the ranking order of the list. With free lists, the voter may even choose between candidates from different lists.

Against the general perception that PR systems are mostly associated with closed party lists, many PR systems in Europe apply open lists. Free lists and cross-voting, however, are somewhat rare in elections to national parliaments.

With closed party lists, it is of crucial importance that women, when nominated, are placed on winnable list positions. Thus, it depends largely on the party gatekeepers whether they put women on prominent positions on the parties' lists. If they do so, women's representation can be effectively favoured. If they refuse to do so, women are likely to be under-represented in parliament.

With open or free lists, voters may alter the ranking order of the list. If preference voting or cross-voting is possible, however, voters will not necessarily choose candidates from both sexes, and this may result in an unbalanced composition of the parliament. Especially in countries where traditional gender roles prevail, open lists may work to the advantage of well-known male candidates and may result in the election of fewer women.

However, open lists and preferential voting need not hamper women's representation. In Nordic countries such as Sweden, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Denmark, which offer voters the opportunity to cast preference votes, not only parties' nomination practice, but also voting behaviour favour high levels of women's representation. Open lists, for instance, were also used to elect women who were placed in the lower part of the candidate lists in Poland (even before the introduction of a legal quota).

As for the list form, therefore, general recommendations can hardly be made. However, in countries where both party nomination practices and voting behaviour work against women, closed party lists combined with legal gender quotas and strict ranking rules may be helpful to ensure women's election to parliament. Instead, with unbiased or women-friendly nomination practices and voting behaviour, PR systems with open list and voluntary gender quotas might be sufficient (or even preferable) to ensure balanced women's representation in parliament.

Conclusions

There are a wide variety of socio-economic, cultural and political factors that can hamper or facilitate women's access to parliament. Among the institutional factors of politics, both gender quotas and the electoral system can strongly influence women's parliamentary representation.

Given the profound under-representation of women, gender quotas should be viewed as compensation for existing obstacles to women's access to parliament. To date, gender quotas have proved to be the single most effective tool for improving women's representation in parliament. In order to be effective, gender quotas should provide for at least 30% of women on party lists, while 40% or 50% is preferable. Gender quotas are more effective if they provide for both strict ranking rules and effective enforcement mechanisms.

As for the electoral system, generally, with PR systems it is easier for women to get access to parliament than with other electoral systems. In countries where both party nomination practices and voting behaviour work against women, the following combination may, theoretically be helpful to ensure women's election to parliament: PR list systems in large constituencies and/or a nation-wide district, with legal thresholds, closed lists and a mandatory quotas which provide not only for a high portion of female candidates, but also for strict rank-order rules and effective sanctions for non-compliance. Instead, with unbiased or women-friendly nomination practices and voting behaviour, open lists and voluntary gender quotas might be sufficient (or even preferable) to ensure balanced women's representation in parliament.

It should be noted, however, that the electoral system, apart from favouring women's representation, can also pursue other political aims. The aim to improve women's representation

by introducing, for instance, PR in large constituencies in combination with high legal thresholds, closed lists and gender quotas may conflict with the objective of ensuring a fair parliamentary representation of small parties and improving the voter-representative relationship via single-member or small multi-member constituencies, or via open lists and preference voting. Although they tend to disfavour women, in some countries, single-member constituencies are a solid component of the political culture, being hard to change.

Consequently, the appropriateness of an electoral system is dependent on the political aims which are given priority in a particular socio-cultural and political context. Thus, also other combinations which fit with the aim of increasing women's parliamentary representation, should be considered. Both electoral systems and gender quotas can thus be modified and adapted to suit the particular conditions of each country.

Finally, it should be remembered that the electoral system and gender quotas are not the only factors that influence women's parliamentary representation. In order to effectively increase both the numerical ("descriptive") and substantial representation of women in politics, a much broader and more comprehensive approach is necessary than changing electoral legislation. Nevertheless, appropriate electoral reforms may facilitate such a process. Both, the electoral system and gender candidate quotas are of sufficient relevance that their effects should be taken seriously and properly discussed.

Appendix A: Glossary

Closed lists: The political parties determine the ranking order of candidates on the list. The voter endorses the entire list without any possibility of changing the order in which the seats are allocated to the candidates.

Combined systems contain technical elements usually belonging to plurality/majority systems as well as to PR list systems. Under combined systems, one part of the parliamentary seats is distributed, usually in single-member constituencies, by plurality/majority rule. The other part of the parliamentary seats is allocated by a PR formula to national or regional party lists. For the classification of the electoral system it is important whether both allocation procedures are separated from each other, as it is the case in parallel systems, or whether they are interrelated, as it is the case of Mixed Member Proportional Systems.

Compensatory seats are allocated to parties/alliances at higher tier(s) to compensate for the disproportionality between votes and seats share of parties/alliances at lower tier(s).

District magnitude is defined by the number of seats to be elected in a district (also constituency magnitude).

Effective threshold of representation: mathematical equivalent to a legal threshold of representation. Each district of a given magnitude has its own “effective” or “natural” threshold. On the basis of the district magnitude (and the number of running parties and the PR formula) the minimum share of the votes a party needs to win a seat under optimal conditions (inclusion thresholds) can be calculated mathematically. The same can be done with regard to the maximum share of votes with which a party can still fail to win a seat under the most adverse conditions (exclusion threshold). The average of inclusion and exclusion thresholds is a useful approximation of the sufficient vote share a party needs to get a seat in a constituency. The higher the district magnitude, the lower is mathematically the effective threshold.

First-past-the-Post system (FPTP): another term for the plurality system in single-member districts.

Free lists allow voters to cross party lines and, thus, completely rearrange the party lists.

Gender quotas specify the minimum proportion of candidacies (or seats) that must be filled by members of one gender. Apart from reserved seats for women (not discussed here), one can distinguish between legalized candidate quotas (legal quotas or mandatory quotas) and voluntary party quotas.

Legal threshold: minimum percentage of votes that a party needs to qualify for parliamentary representation, by legal provision.

Majority system in single-member districts: This system differs from the First-past-the-Post system only insofar as the winning candidate has to get the absolute majority of the votes (50% plus 1) in the first round of elections. If no candidate wins an absolute majority in the first round, either alternative votes come into effect (Alternative Vote) or a second round will be held (Two-Round system). The second round can be a “run-off” contest between the two top candidates. Alternatively several candidates participate in the second round winning the candidate with the most votes.

Mixed Member Proportional system (MMP) combines a personal vote in single-member districts with the principle of proportional representation. Though a portion of the representatives are elected, usually in single-member districts, by majority/plurality rule, the party list vote determines how many representatives will be sent from each party to parliament. The number of seats won directly by a party in the SMDs is subtracted from the total number of seats allocated to the party lists.

Multi-member district: more than one representative is elected per district (also multi-member constituency).

Multiple-tier PR list systems provide for the proportional allocation of seats at different levels.

Open lists: The parties pre-structure the ranking order of the lists. The voter may express a preference for particular candidates by casting a certain number of preference votes, thus, changing the ranking order of the list.

Parallel system: This system provides for a separate allocation of parliamentary seats. A proportion of the seats are distributed, usually in single-member districts, by the plurality or majority rule, the remainder being allocated separately to regional or national PR lists. The overall electoral outcome is achieved by adding together the two part results as determined separately.

Party magnitude describes the number of seats a party wins in a district.

Plurality system in single-member districts: With this system, also known as “First-past-the-Post system”, the country is divided into single-member districts. In each constituency one candidate is elected to parliament. Each voter has one vote, and the winning candidate is simply the person who gets most votes in the respective constituency.

Preference vote: The voters can give preference vote(s) to one or several candidates on the party list.

Preferential vote: In a preferential electoral system, voters choose candidates in order of preference, putting "1" next to their first choice, "2" by their second choice and so on.

PR list systems at the national level: With this system, parliamentary seats are allocated proportionately at the national level, that is, parties receive seats in proportion to their overall national share of the vote. Usually, each party (or alliance) presents a national list of candidates.

PR list systems in multi-member districts: The country is divided into multi-member districts. Each party (or alliance) presents a list of candidates for the respective constituencies. On the basis of the votes, seats are distributed to party lists according to a PR formula at the constituency level.

Single transferable vote: This is the proportional form of the preferential vote.

Single-member district (SMDs): In each district, one person is elected (also single-member constituency).

Tier: level at which seats are allocated to parties or candidates. Electoral systems may have one or several electoral tiers.

Two-Round system (TRS): another term for the majority system – generally in single member districts - with a second round, if majority is not achieved in the first round (or not achieved for all seats in the case of a multi-member district).

Appendix B: Women's representation in parliament (lower house) and gender quotas

Country	Women Share %	Legal Quota %	Ranking rules	Party Quotas %*	Electoral System, list form
Sweden	43.6	---	---	50	PR, open
Finland	41.5	---	---	---	PR, open
Iceland	41.3	---	---	40-50	PR, open
Spain	41.1	40	40% in every 5	40	PR, closed
Norway	39.6	---	---	40-50	PR, open
Andorra	39.3	---	---	---	Parallel, closed
Belgium	39.3	50	1 of top 2	---	PR, open
Denmark	37.4	---	---	---	PR, open
Netherlands	37.3	---	---	% not clear	PR, closed
Slovenia	36.7	35	---	40	PR, open
Germany	36.5	---	---	33-50	MMP, closed
Serbia	34.0	30	1 of every 3 rd	---	PR, closed
FYR Macedonia	33.3	33	1 of every 3 rd	---	PR, closed
Portugal	31.3	33	1 of every 3 rd	---	PR, closed
Italy	31.0	---	---	50	PR bonus, closed (applied 2013)
Austria	30.6	---	---	33-50	PR, open
Switzerland	30.5	---	---	40	PR, free
United Kingdom	29.4	---	---	40-50	Plurality
Luxembourg	28.3	---	---	33-50	PR, free
France	26.2	48	---	50	Majority
Croatia	25.8	40	---	40	PR, closed
Poland	24.1	35	1 of top 3	---	PR, open
Estonia	23.8	---	---	% not clear	PR, open
Lithuania	23.4	---	---	33	Parallel, open
Greece	23.0	one third	---	40	PR, closed
Rep. of Moldova	21.8	---	---	----	PR, closed
Bosnia & Herzeg.	21.4	40	1 of 2, 2 of 5, 3 of 8	---	PR, closed/open
Monaco	20.8	---	---	---	Parallel (BV)
Albania	20.7	30	1 of top 3	---	PR, closed
Bulgaria	20.4	---	---	---	PR, closed
Czech Republic	20.0	---	---	25	PR, open
Lichtenstein	20.0	---	---	---	PR, free
Slovakia	18.7	---	---	% not clear	PR, open
Latvia	18.0	---	---	---	PR, open
Turkey	17.8	---	---	30-40	PR, closed
Montenegro	17.3	30	---	---	PR, closed
San Marino	16.7	---	---	---	PR-bonus, closed
Ireland	16.3	30	---	---	STV, free
Azerbaijan	15.6	---	---	---	Plurality
Romania	13.7	---	---	30	MMP, closed
Russian Fed.	13.6	---	---	---	PR, closed
Malta	12.9	---	---	20	STV, free
Cyprus	12.5	---	---	20-30	PR, open
Ukraine	12.1	---	---	---	Parallel, closed
Georgia	11.3	(20)**	(2 of 10)	---	Parallel, closed
Armenia	10.7	20	every 5 th , from 2 nd on	---	Parallel, open
Hungary	10.1	---	---	20	MMP, closed

Sources: IPU, 1st September 2015 (www.ipu.org), Quota Project (www.quotaproject.org). *At least one parliamentary party voluntarily applies gender quota. ** Not mandatory, but legalized incentives.

Appendix C: Electoral systems in the member states of the Council of Europe (2015)

Category	Electoral system	Seat allocation	Candidacy	Voting	Country
Plurality systems	First-past-the-Post	Plurality in SMD	Individual	Single vote	Azerbaijan United Kingdom
Majority systems	Two-Round system	Majority in SMD (2 nd round: plurality)	Individual	Single vote	France
National PR	National PR list systems (with national or regional lists)	PR-formula at national level	Closed lists	Single vote	Bulgaria* Moldova* Montenegro* Netherlands* Russian Federation* Serbia* Turkey*
			Open lists	Preferential voting	Poland* Slovakia*
Constituency PR	PR list system in MMD	PR-formula in MMD	Closed lists	Single vote	Albania** Croatia* The FR of Macedonia, Portugal Spain (2 SMD)*
			Open lists	Preferential voting	Belgium Cyprus Czech Republic* Finland Latvia* Slovenia (2 SMD)*
			Free lists	Cross-voting	Luxembourg Switzerland (5 SMD) Liechtenstein*
	STV-system	PR-formula in MMD	Free lists	Preferential voting	Ireland Malta
Two-tiers PR systems	PR list system in MMD with additional list	PR-formula in MMD, remaining seats to national party lists	Open (and closed) lists	Preferential voting	Estonia* Greece* (8 SMD) Poland*
	PR list system in MMD with compensatory list	PR-formula in MMD and compensatory national PR seats	Closed and open lists	Partly preferential voting	Bosnia and Herzegovina*
			Open lists	Preferential voting	Denmark* Iceland* Norway* Sweden*
Three-tiers PR systems	PR list system in MMD with	PR-formula in MMD and	Open lists	Preferential voting	Austria*

	compensatory list	regional MMD, compensatory national seats			
Combined systems	Parallel system	Parallel calculation: Plurality in SMD and PR-formula at national level	Individual (SMD) and closed lists (PR)	Two votes: Constituency vote for candidate (SMD) and single vote (PR lists)	Georgia*, Ukraine
			Individual (SMD) and open lists (PR)	Constituency vote for candidate (SMD) and preferential voting (PR lists)	Armenia*, Lithuania*
	Parallel system (Block vote and PR list)	Parallel calculation: Plurality in binominal districts, PR-formula at national level	Closed lists at both levels	List vote at both levels	Andorra
	Parallel system (Block vote and PR list)	Parallel calculation: partly by plurality in nationwide MMD (block vote), partly by PR list votes at national level	Free lists	Cross voting	Monaco*
	Mixed Member Proportional system	Combined allocation: plurality in SMD, but overall seat allocation according to PR list votes	Individual (SMD), closed lists (PR)	Two votes: single vote (SMD), single vote (PR list)	Germany*
	Mixed Member Proportional system	Combined allocation: Majority in SMD, compensatory seats at regional and/or national level	Individual (SMD), closed lists (PR)	Two votes: single vote (SMD), single vote (PR list)	Hungary*, Romania*
“Bonus system”		PR-formula in MMD with “bonus seats” (majority price) for largest party/alliance	Closed lists	Single vote	Italy***, San Marino*

Source: Krennerich 2015.

SMD = single member districts, MMD = multi-member districts- * Legal threshold at MMD level and/or national level. *** As of July 2016: Two-round bonus PR system with (semi-)open lists and (limited) preferential voting