# Power and Conflict in the Swiss Political Elite: An Aggregation of Existing Network Analyses

Fischer, Manuel; Fischer, Alex; Sciarini, Pascal

**How to cite**

FISCHER, Manuel, FISCHER, Alex, SCIARINI, Pascal. Power and Conflict in the Swiss Political Elite: An Aggregation of Existing Network Analyses. In: Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft, 2009, vol. 15, n° 1, p. 31–62. doi: 10.1002/j.1662-6370.2009.tb00122.x

This publication URL: https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:17276
Publication DOI: 10.1002/j.1662-6370.2009.tb00122.x

© (2009) Swiss Political Science Review 15(1): 31–62

# Power and Conflict in the Swiss Political Elite: An Aggregation of Existing Network Analyses

Manuel Fischer, Alex Fischer* and Pascal Sciarini
University of Geneva and *Central European University Budapest

*Since Kriesi's (1980) pioneering work no study has attempted to provide an overall picture of power configuration among the Swiss political elite. To fill this gap we aggregate recent network analyses carried out in various policy domains. Based on meta-hypotheses regarding the likely effects of the contextual changes that have taken place during the last thirty years, we compare the structure of the Swiss political elite existing in the 1970s to that of the last decade with respect to reputational power, collaboration and conflict. Our results suggest that important transformations have indeed occurred. Thus, both political parties and some specific state bodies could increase their power, whereas most interest groups have lost some. While the internationalization of politics has overall had the expected effects with respect to the power structure and to conflict among political parties, it did not lead to the hypothesized, new conflict among interest groups.*

Keywords: Power Configuration • Conflict • Swiss Political Elite • Contextual Changes • Network Analysis

## Introduction[1]

In the late 1970s, Kriesi (1980) wrote a seminal work on decisionmaking structures and processes in Switzerland.[2] Based on a network analysis, he found that the Swiss political system was dominated by a small core of po-

[1] An earlier version of this article was presented at the "Applications of Social Network Analysis" Conference (ASNA) at University of Zurich, September 12–14, 2007. The authors would like to thank the ASNA-workshop participants as well as the two anonymous reviewers of SPSR for their helpful comments.

[2] While Kriesi's study covers both the structure and processes of the Swiss political system, we focus here only on the structure of political decisionmaking.

litical actors that controlled a high number of decision-making processes. This core was closed towards the outside and its members were highly integrated internally, meaning that they strongly collaborated with each other (Kriesi 1980: 76ff.). A well working social partnership between employers' associations and trade unions accounted for the strong dominance of the system of interest groups over both the party system and the legislative body (Kriesi 1980: 390, 588–602, 691). The "inner circle" of the political elite and all subsystems were dominated by the Radical Democratic Party (Kriesi 1980: 697). The political left was not excluded from the network, but it was under-represented, and weak (Kriesi 1980: 693–96). Similarly, economic interest associations had a much stronger position than trade unions (Kriesi 1980: 693).

Since Kriesi's (1980) study, a series of contextual changes have occurred (Schmitter 2008) and have presumably had an influence on the very nature of Swiss politics. To mention a few, Europeanization has altered power configuration among domestic actors, while increased international economic competition has challenged traditional patterns of social partnership. Similarly, growing mediatization has also undermined the basis of Swiss, corporatist-like, decision mode, not least by rendering decision-making behind closed doors more difficult. Finally, institutional and administrative reforms have modified the roles of parliament, government and the administration. Given these changes, an update of Kriesi's study is of utmost importance. However, no recent study has attempted to provide an overall picture of the decision-making system in Switzerland. Only some specific policy domains have been analyzed. Taken separately, these sectoral studies provide detailed insights into the respective policy domains, but they do not permit to draw general conclusions about the Swiss decision-making system as a whole. We are thus facing a major research gap.

In the absence of network data on the Swiss decision-making system as a whole, a cost-effective way to fill this gap consists in the aggregation of the existing, sectoral, network analyses. This paper undertakes such an endeavour. The aggregation of network data raises tricky issues, however. By discussing how one can address them, our paper aims to provide a methodological contribution. Besides, the main purpose of the paper is to offer an updated view of power configuration among the Swiss political elite. To that end, we shall analyze the power and conflict structures that transpire from the sectoral network analyses carried out in the late 1990s and early 2000s, and compare it to the situation prevailing at the beginning of the 1970s (Kriesi 1980).

The paper is structured as follows: In the next section, we start with a discussion of some of the major contextual changes that have impacted on Swiss politics. From this we derive a set of meta-hypotheses on how power configuration among the Swiss political elite has been affected by these changes. In the third, methodological section we present the policy networks under consideration and we discuss the related problems of data aggregation. Empirical results follow. Section five concludes.

## Theories and Meta-hypotheses

In the following sub-sections we highlight the most important changes that have occurred since the 1970s. Focusing on Europeanization, increased international economic competition, mediatization, and political-administrative reforms, we briefly describe these changes and we elaborate on their likely impact on power configuration and conflict lines among the Swiss political elite.

### *Europeanization*

Despite not being a member of the European Union (EU), Switzerland is strongly influenced by the decisions made at the EU level (Mach et al. 2003; Sciarini et al. 2004; Fischer 2005). Sciarini et al. (2004) show that Europeanization does not only affect the substance of public policies, but also the institutions and actors of the decision-making process. Thus, in line with the intergovernmentalist argument (Moravcsik 1994) Europeanization leads to the empowerment of state actors that are directly or indirectly involved in the international negotiations. At the national level, formal consultation procedures are often replaced by more informal, selective, consultation mechanisms. This enhances the discretionary power of the government and weakens domestic interest groups that once dominated the pre-parliamentary stage of the decision-making process. Similarly, the strong "take-it-or-leave-it" character of legislative acts arising from – or influenced by – the international arena reduces the room for maneuver of the legislative body.

*Increased International Economic Competition*

In the heydays of corporatism, collective decisionmaking in Switzerland was characterized by consensus seeking among the domestic actors – interest groups and political parties alike (Kriesi 1980, 1998; Katzenstein 1984, 1985; Lijphart 1984, 1999). The increased economic competition associated with the globalization process has challenged the traditional, corporatist-like, mode of decisionmaking. More specifically, it has exacerbated both the traditional dividing line between the left and the right, and the more recent conflict regarding the desired level of openness of the country to the outside world.

First, increased international economic competition questions the effectiveness of the traditional concertation mechanisms between social partners (employers' associations and trade unions). Thus, several studies carried out in the field of social policy demonstrate that social partnership no longer works in Switzerland, and this especially in the pre-parliamentary stage of the decision-making process (e.g. Häusermann et al. 2004; Fischer 2005). Following Häusermann et al. (2004), we may expect the political parties in parliament to benefit from the failure of social partnership in earlier stages of the legislative process.

Second, international economic competition, together with Europeanization, is also expected to exacerbate the conflict between the export-oriented and the domestic sectors of the economy: Representatives of the internationalized sectors of the economy have been increasingly reluctant to subsidize the domestic economy and to compensate it for the costs of increased economic openness ("side payments", Sciarini 1994; Bonoli and Mach 2000; Fischer 2005). Similarly, one has witnessed a growing conflict within the party system on the openness-closedness dimension. Issues regarding the opening up of the country to Europe, to foreign workers or to asylum seekers have pitted the Swiss People's Party against the political left (Brunner and Sciarini 2002). Besides, this new conflict line also accounts for the electoral rise of the Swiss People's Party during the last fifteen years (e.g. Kriesi et al. 2005). From this we may firstly assume that this new conflict also transpires from the network analyses of the 1990s and 2000s, and secondly that the electoral rise of the Swiss People's Party has also strengthened that party in the decision-making processes.

Finally, economic globalization has also had an impact on power distribution among domestic interest groups. According to Scharpf (1998), economic globalization has led to an increasing competition between states

over (mobile) production factors. In Switzerland, like in other countries, this trend has been reinforced by the dominant political discourse emphasizing the importance of improving the competitiveness of the Swiss economy (Mach 2006: 328). In this context, the internationally-oriented sectors of the economy can take advantage of their "exit-option" to increase their influence over the legislative process (Keohane and Miller 1996). This is expected to empower them at the expense of both the domestic economy and trade unions (Sciarini et al. 2004).

*Mediatization*

With the rise of the third age of communication in the Western world (Blumler and Kavanagh 1996), the mass media should be regarded as behaving autonomously and independently from political actors (Kitschelt 2000: 164; Kriesi 2001).[3] In this new context, political actors compete over media attention in order to attract public support for their policy plans (Wichert 1997; Wolfsfeld 1997; Kriesi 2001).

Media increasingly tend to use commercial criteria when deciding what to broadcast, and political actors have to adapt to this evolution. Often, political messages are said to become event- or person-oriented (Blumler and Kavanagh 1996; Wichert 1997; Mazzoleni and Schulz 1999). Actors that will benefit from this development are those with a good marketing strategy, and those that receive "institutionalized" attention from the media, such as political parties or state actors (Kriesi 2001). More generally, by rendering trustful negotiations behind closed doors increasingly difficult the rising mediatization of legislative processes undermines the basis of social partnership and corporatist-like arrangements (Häusermann et al. 2004: 34f.). As a result, increased mediatization is expected to strengthen political parties and state actors, whereas interest groups are supposed to suffer from it.

*Internal Political-administrative Reforms*

Both the Swiss parliament and Swiss public administration have undergone substantial changes during the last twenty years. The reform of Swiss parliament in the early 1990s explicitly aimed at increasing its weight in the decision-making process. The main aspect of this reform was the creation

[3] In Switzerland newspapers with a strong party affiliation have almost disappeared.

of permanent parliamentary committees (Ochsner 1987: 57; Lüthi 1996: 3). Before the reform, ad-hoc committees dealt with a single issue only and were hotspots for MPs close to interest groups. Ad-hoc committees also prevented MPs from gaining substantial knowledge in a specific field, thus widening the information gap between them and the highly specialized bureaucrats of the federal administration. The 1992 reform was supposed to increase the professional skills of MPs ("specialization") and to reduce the influence of interest groups on parliamentary committees. Accordingly, political parties, the main actors in the parliamentary arena, are expected to be strengthened by the reform, this at the expense of specialized interest groups and the executive.

While the size of the Swiss federal administration was still very small at the beginning of the 1970s, it has constantly – though moderately – increased since then (Germann 1996: 11 and 1997: 4ff.). Population growth, urbanization, and welfare state expansion account for both the growth of the public sector and the professionalization of the federal administration (Geser et al. 1987; Germann 1997). In addition, several administrative reforms have taken place over the last thirty years. They have, for example, resulted in the reinforcement of the coordination services (Federal Chancellery, general secretaries) (Varone 2006: 293). In addition, new administrative units dealing with information technology and international relations were created (Germann 1996). These developments have presumably contributed to an increased influence of the Swiss federal administration over decision-making processes. Other developments, however, run in the opposite direction: repeated reforms aiming at reducing public deficits and debt have led to several saving programs in the federal administration and may thus have weakened it accordingly. This also holds for "New Public Management" programs, whose introduction was accepted as a means to improve federal finances (Germann 1996: 172 and 1997: 16).

*Summary of the Meta-hypotheses*

We can now summarize the meta-hypotheses that will guide our empirical tests (Tables 1a and 1b). These meta-hypotheses are based on the discussion above and reflect the likely changes that have occurred among the Swiss political elite between the early 1970s and the late 1990s–early 2000s. Note that these meta-hypotheses are not true hypotheses: Given the high number of possible explanatory factors and the low number of observations, we will not be able to carry out a robust test of our meta-

hypotheses. Instead, our purpose in this paper is mostly to check whether the expected changes in power configuration among the Swiss political elite have actually taken place. If yes, then our meta-hypotheses may offer a possible explanation for these changes (George and Bennett 2005: 181–84). This so-called "congruence method" is a way to cope with the well-known "many-variables small-N problem" (Lijphart 1971: 685–91, cited in Collier et al. 2004: 251): Especially when the theoretical arguments are powerful and well validated, inferences can be drawn from the congruence of concrete observations with specified predictions from abstract theories (Blatter and Blume 2008).

## Methodology

The aggregation of existing networks is a demanding task, this all the more when it relies on work done by different researchers using different approaches and addressing different problems. In the following sections, the issues of case selection (which networks?) and data aggregation (how to aggregate?) will be shortly discussed.[4]

### *Case Selection*

In order to get a meaningful overall picture, an aggregation needs to be based on network data that are not too different from each other. Therefore, we limit our aggregation to networks that meet the following criteria: they were collected based on interviews, they focus on the national level, they deal with a specific policy sector or a specific reform project, and they treat collective actors (political organizations or administrative entities) as units of observation (Knoke et al. 1996: 7).

Nine policy networks meet these criteria and are consequently included in the analysis: Sciarini's (1994) network analysis of the Swiss agricultural policy in the GATT negotiations, Fahrenkrug's (1996) analysis of drug policy, Sager et al.'s (2001; also Maibach et al. 1999) analysis of Switzerland's traffic policy in relation with EU negotiations, Dupont et al.'s (2003) analysis of Swiss policy towards World Bank/International Monetary Fund, Jegen's (2003; also Kriesi and Jegen 2001) analysis of energy

[4] For space reasons we refrain from entering into too many details in the present paper. The methodological discussion relies strongly on Fischer and Sciarini (2004), where the reader can find finer-grained information about the selection of networks and data aggregation.

Table 1a: The changing pattern of power relations among the Swiss political elite (meta-hypotheses)

| POWER<br>Actors | 1970s (Kriesi 1980) | Expected changes | Potential reasons for these changes (meta-hypotheses) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Whole network | Highly integrated and closed core | More open | - Crisis of social partnership<br>- Reform of the parliamentary committees<br>- Mediatization |
| Interest groups | Most powerful actors, and strongly integrated in the network | Less powerful and less integrated, except the internationally-oriented economy | - Europeanization<br>- Mediatization<br>- Increased economic competition |
| Political parties | Less powerful and less integrated than interest groups | More powerful and more integrated | - Reform of the parliamentary committees<br>- Mediatization |
| | Dominance of the Radical Democratic Party | Weakening of the Radical Democratic Party; strengthening of the Swiss People's Party | - Europeanization<br>- Increased economic competition |
| Federal Council | Most powerful and integrated | Most powerful and integrated | - Professionalization of public administration<br>- Europeanization<br>- Mediatization |
| Public administration | Highly integrated and powerful (Economy, finances) | More powerful and more integrated, especially the internationally-oriented offices | - Europeanization<br>- Professionalization of public administration |
| | Not very powerful nor integrated (other offices) | Not very powerful nor integrated | - New Public Management |

Table 1b: The changing patterns of conflict among the Swiss political elite (meta-hypotheses)

| CONFLICT<br>Actor | 1970s (Kriesi 1980) | Expected changes | Potential reasons for these changes (meta-hypotheses) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Whole network | Low level of conflict | Higher conflict level | - Mediatization<br>- Increased economic competition |
| Interest groups | Opposition trade unions–employers | Opposition trade unions–employers *and* export-oriented economy–domestic industries and trade unions | - Increased economic competition |
| Political parties | Economic left–right conflict | Economic left-right conflict *and* cultural/ political conflict between the conservative right and the left | - Increased economic competition<br>- Europeanization |
| Federal Council / Public administration | Few conflicts with other actors | No change | |

policy, Fischer's (2005) and Sciarini et al.'s (2004) analysis of the reform of Swiss telecommunication policy, of the bilateral agreement between Switzerland and the European Union on the free movement of persons, of the related flanking measures, and of the eleventh reform of the old-age insurance.[5]

While Kriesi (1980) gathered his own network data based on the most important decision-making processes of the early 1970s, we are dependent on the network data collected by other researchers. By chance, the nine networks mentioned above cover a large part of the most important contemporary issues in Swiss politics (Fischer and Sciarini 2004):[6] In comparison to the most important contemporary issues – and also in comparison to Kriesi's (1980) study – the only policy domain that is missing in our data set is financial/fiscal policy. Besides, we can note that policy processes with a strong international character are strongly represented in our data set.[7] On the one hand, the high number of internationalized policy processes may be due to a selection bias, namely to the growing interest for the impact of internationalization among Swiss political scientists. But on the other hand, there are good reasons to believe that it is the result of a substantial change in Swiss politics, which is indeed increasingly influenced by the globalization/Europeanization processes (see, e.g., Sciarini et al. 2002; Mach et al. 2003; Fischer 2005). We nevertheless have to keep the possible selection bias in mind when interpreting our results.

[5] We are grateful to all of the authors cited for providing us their data. For additional information regarding one of the datasets one should consult the original source quoted as reference.

[6] Fischer and Sciarini came to this conclusion based on the comparison between the nine networks included in the analysis and the most import processes of the legislative period 1995–99 according to an expert survey (research project "The Swiss Decision Making System in the Era of Globalization).

[7] Three out of the nine datasets regard cases where Switzerland took part in international negotiations (Sciarini's (1994) study of the farm negotiations in the Uruguay Round, Dupont et al.'s (2003) study of the IMF/WB membership, Fischer's (2005) and Sciarini et al.'s (2004) study of the bilateral agreement on the free movement of persons with the EU), whereas two datasets concern cases of strongly internationalized, but still domestic, policies (Sager et al.'s (2001) study of transport policy and Fischer's (2005) and Sciarini et al.'s (2004) study of the telecommunication reform).

*Aggregation of Data*

Our database comprises three sets of data: data on reputational power, data on collaboration networks and data on the conflict structure among the political actors.

All original, sectoral, data-sets but one include a similar measure of reputational power,[8] that is, a measure of the power that a collective actor is said to have according to the other actors of the network: In each study, interview partners were asked about all state and non-state actors that, in their view, have been "very influential" in a given decision-making process, this from a list comprising all actors that took part in that process. Based on this measure, we first calculate for each network the score of reputational power of each actor, i.e. the frequency by which an actor is perceived as important by the other actors of the network.[9] Then, we calculate the mean value of an actor's power across all networks.[10] The resulting, aggregate, database covers 8 policy domains and 307 actors.

We use the same strategy to create the aggregate collaboration[11] network, but here we face an additional problem, namely the differences existing across studies with respect to symmetrization: In some of the original data-sets, the collaboration network was only available in a symmetrized version,[12] whereas in others it was available in a non-symmetrized form. Given the loss of information that is linked to symmetrization (Fischer and Sciarini 2004) we kept all data in a non-symmetrized form whenever

[8] Dupont et al. (2003) did not include a comparable measure of reputational power. This study is thus not included in the aggregated dataset on reputational power.

[9] To control for the fact that the number of interviews carried out varied greatly from one study to the next, we use the % of actors mentioning a given actor as being very influential in a particular network.

[10] A specific problem arises in case of a merger of two organizations. Our dataset included the current names and structure of an organization. Following the maximum method, an organization was considered to be mentioned as important if at least one of the precursors was mentioned to be important.

[11] The data on collaboration stems from a standard question through which interview partners were asked to mention the actors with whom they collaborated closely during the decision-making process, this based on a list comprising all major actors participating in that process.

[12] If organization x indicates a contact with organization y, it is assumed that y cooperated also with x.

possible. The aggregate collaboration network comprises all 9 policy networks and includes 132 actors.

We also apply a similar procedure for the data on conflict,[13] but here again we face an additional problem: In two networks (Sciarini 1994 and Jegen 2003) a conflict between two actors is coded with 1 and the absence of conflict with 0, whereas all other networks distinguish between conflict (-1), convergence of view (1) and neither/nor (0). We recode the latter in two categories by merging "convergence of views" with "neither/nor". We have data on conflict for all 9 policy domains but one (drug policy), and our aggregate conflict matrix includes 120 actors.

## Empirical Tests

Our analyses are based on the three data-sets (reputational power, collaboration network and conflict structure) that we described in the previous section. In order to test our meta-hypotheses we compare our results with those of Kriesi's (1980) study. We start with the power structure and then turn to the conflict structure.[14]

### *The Power Structure*

Following in the footsteps of Kriesi (1980: 314f.), we calculate three different measures of power. Two of them are based on the scores of reputational power, whereas the third is based on the collaboration network. From the scores on reputational power we first derive a measure of "hierarchical power" (Kriesi 1980: 316–24), i.e. a measure of the overall intensity of power, and second a measure of "sectoral power" (Kriesi 1980: 324–32),

[13] The data on convergence/divergence stems from a standard question through which interview partners were asked to mention the actors with whom they had diverging or converging views, this again based on a list comprising all major actors participating in that process.

[14] Given that our point of comparison is the work by Kriesi (1980), we could only use techniques which were also used by Kriesi. Note also that Parliamentary Commissions, National Council or State Council, which were considered as actors in Kriesi's (1980) study, are not reported in our tables, because most recent studies did not treat them as actors, but as institutional arenas. Given this, it was not possible to include them in our analyses of power, collaboration and conflict.

Table 2: Reputational power on the hierarchical dimension (single actors)

| 1971–1975 (Kriesi 1980: 316–19) | | | | 1994–2004 (own calculations) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Actor | Rank | Reputation (stand.) | Evolution | Actor | Rank | Reputation (stand.) | Evolution |
| Swiss Federation of Trade Unions | 1 | 1.00 | ⇩ | Swiss People's Party | 1 | 1.00 | ⇧ |
| Economiesuisse (Vorort) | 2 | 0.99 | ⇘ | Radical Democratic Party | 2 | 0.98 | ⇖ |
| SME umbrella organization (SGV) | 3 | 0.94 | ⇩ | Social-Democratic Party | 3 | 0.94 | ⇖ |
| Federal Council | 4 | 0.91 | ⇨ | Economiesuisse | 4 | 0.93 | ⇘ |
| Swiss Farmer's Union | 5 | 0.87 | ⇩ | Federal Council | 5 | 0.79 | ⇨ |
| Christian Democratic Party | 6 | 0.80 | ⇨ | Christian Democratic Party | 6 | 0.75 | ⇨ |
| Radical Democratic Party | 7 | 0.78 | ⇖ | Swiss Federation of Trade Unions | 7 | 0.74 | ⇩ |
| Social-Democratic Party | 7 | 0.78 | ⇖ | Swiss Employers Association | 8 | 0.66 | ⇖ |
| National Bank | 9 | 0.70 | ⇩ | State secretariat for Economic Affairs | 9 | 0.63 | ⇖ |
| Federal Department of Economic Affairs | 10 | 0.68 | ⇨ | SME umbrella organization (SGV) | 10 | 0.59 | ⇩ |
| Federal Ministry of Finance | 11 | 0.62 | ⇩ | Integration Office | 11 | 0.45 | ⇧ |
| Santésuisse (health insurance concordate) | 12 | 0.60 | ⇩ | Federal Department for Economic Affairs | 11 | 0.45 | ⇨ |
| State secretariat for Economic Affairs (Handelsabteilung and OFIAMT) | 13 | 0.59 | ⇖ | Christian trade unions | 13 | 0.39 | ⇖ |
| Swiss Employers Association (Zentralverband) | 14 | 0.58 | ⇖ | Swiss Mission at the EC | 14 | 0.35 | ⇧ |
| Federal Finance Administration | 15 | 0.55 | ⇩ | Federal Department for Environment, Transport, Energy and Communications | 15 | 0.31 | ⇧ |
| Touring Club Switzerland | 16 | 0.54 | ⇩ | Swiss Farmer's Union | 16 | 0.30 | ⇩ |
| Federal Department for Interior Affairs | 17 | 0.51 | ⇨ | Negotiators of Bilateral Agreements | 17 | 0.26 | ⇧ |
| Swiss Bankers Association | 18 | 0.49 | ⇩ | Federal Department of Interior Affairs | 18 | 0.23 | ⇨ |
| Christian trade unions | 19 | 0.46 | ⇖ | Conference of Cantonal Governments | 19 | 0.22 | ⇧ |
| Pro Natura | 19 | 0.46 | ⇩ | Swisscom | 19 | 0.22 | ⇧ |
| Federal Department for Justice and Police | 21 | 0.44 | ⇩ | Federal Office for Communications | 21 | 0.21 | ⇧ |
| Federal Office for Social Insurance | 22 | 0.43 | ⇩ | Federal Office for Health Insurance | 21 | 0.21 | ⇧ |
| Swiss People's Party | 22 | 0.43 | ⇧ | Green Party | 23 | 0.18 | ⇧ |
| Swiss Women's Union | 24 | 0.42 | ⇩ | Swiss Association of Employees | 24 | 0.17 | ⇧ |
| | | | | Swiss Master Builder's Union | 24 | 0.17 | ⇧ |

i.e. a measure of the breadth of power. From the collaboration data we derive a measure of actors' integration in the network.

(1) Reputational Power on the Hierarchical Dimension.—Table 2 presents the scores of reputational power and the related ranking of actors in the 1970s (left hand side) and in the recent period (right hand side).[15] The last column (arrows) offers a summary of the evolution between the two periods. Applying Kriesi's (1980: 316) criteria that an actor belongs to the "core" of the power structure if it is seen as influential by more that 50% of the interviewees, we first see that the core of the Swiss political elite has narrowed over time: While 17 actors met the criteria and belonged to the core in the 1970s, this holds for only 10 actors in the 1990s–2000s. This result runs counter our first meta-hypothesis that the core of the political elite is less closed than before.

Second, and perhaps more importantly, Table 2 highlights a clear change in power relations between political parties and interest groups: While the latter held the top positions in the 1970s, political parties – and more specifically the governmental parties – now seem to take the lead with respect to reputational power.[16] This brings support for our meta-hypothesis regarding the increasing power of political parties and the decreasing power of interest groups. Contextual changes such as Europeanization, mediatization, parliamentary reform and the crisis of social partnership may account for this evolution.

Among interest groups, we see from Table 2 that Economiesuisse (the peak association of the export-oriented economy) is clearly the most influential actor, and the only one that is as influential as political parties. This was not the case in the 1970s, when the most important interest groups were quite close to each other. This evolution is compatible with our meta-hypothesis that actors representing the export-oriented economy are em-

[15] In Kriesi's (1980) study, interviewees were asked to mention the important actors "in general", and this from a single list. Our aggregate measure of reputational power, by contrast, emanates from eight distinct studies, i.e. from eight separate decision-making processes. To be seen as a very important actor in several specific policy domains is a more demanding condition than to be a very important actor in general, this all the more since in Kriesi's (1980: 316) study respondents were allowed to interpret the "in general" in a rather permissive way. As a result, the absolute figures of reputational power are overall far lower in the recent studies than in Kriesi's study. To overcome this bias, we have standardized the results by setting the score of the actor receiving the highest reputational power to 1, and by recalculating the score of the other actors accordingly.

[16] While the power of the political parties represented in the Federal Council has increased, that of the smaller parties has decreased.

Table 3: Reputational power on the hierarchical dimension (groups of actors)

| Category of actors | 1971–1975 Mean % of actors (stand.) | n | 1994–2004 Mean % of actors (stand.) | n | Evolution |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parties of Federal Council | 0.80 | 4 | 1.00 | 4 | ⇗ |
| Federal Council | 1.00 | 1 | 0.86 | 1 | ⇘ |
| Important Interest Groups | 0.95 | 5 | 0.69 | 5 | ⇩ |
| Federal Administration | 0.56 | 10 | 0.27 | 16 | ⇩ |
| Other Trade Unions | 0.51 | 1 | 0.22 | 4 | ⇩ |
| Other Parties | 0.30 | 1 | 0.20 | 1 | ⇘ |
| Inter-cantonal Conferences | 0.38 | 1 | 0.18 | 2 | ⇘ |
| Professional Organisations | 0.44 | 4 | 0.16 | 4 | ⇩ |
| Enterprises | 0.29 | 1 | 0.16 | 4 | ⇘ |
| Other Interest Groups | 0.33 | 9 | 0.14 | 1 | ⇘ |
| Other Employers Unions | 0.39 | 1 | 0.12 | 1 | ⇩ |
| Experts | / | / | 0.12 | 1 | ⇗ |
| Environment Protection Organisations | 0.49 | 1 | / | / | ⇩ |
| Women's Organisations | 0.46 | 1 | / | / | ⇩ |
| Cantons and Cantonal Offices | 0.38 | 1 | / | / | ⇩ |

powered by globalization and increasing state competition, whereas the other interest groups representing the domestic and/or sheltered sectors of the economy (trade unions, SME umbrella organization, Swiss Farmers' Union) suffered power losses.

An important change also occurred among political parties: According to our aggregate data-set the Swiss People's Party (SVP) is now the most important actor in the Swiss decision-making system. This actor did an incredible jump from the 22nd place in the 1970s to the first place in the late 1990s–early 2000s. This increase in power is in line with the considerable electoral gains that this party has enjoyed over the last fifteen years.

Table 4: Reputational power on the sectoral dimension

| 1971–75 (Kriesi 1980: 326) | | 1994–2004 (own calculations) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Actor | Presence | Actor | Presence |
| Economiesuisse | 85% | Economiesuisse | 88% |
| Swiss Federation of Trade Unions | 77% | Swiss People's Party | 75% |
| Federal Council | 77% | Christian Democratic Party | 63% |
| SME Umbrella Organization (SGV) | 69% | Radical Democratic Party | 63% |
| Social-Democratic Party | 69% | Social-Democratic Party | 63% |
| Swiss Farmer's Union | 54% | Federal Council | 63% |
| Christian Democratic Party | 54% | SME Umbrella Organization (SGV) | 38% |
| Swiss Employer's Association (SAV) | 46% | Swiss Employer's Association (SAV) | 38% |
| Federal Ministry of Finance | 46% | Swiss Federation of Trade Unions | 38% |
| Radical Democratic Party | 46% | Christian Trade Unions | 38% |
| Swiss Bankers Association | 38% | State Secretariat for Economic Affairs | 38% |
| Inter-cantonal Conferences | 38% | Inter-cantonal Conferences | 38% |
| Christian Trade Unions | 31% | | |
| State Secretariat for Economic Affairs | 31% | | |
| Swiss People's Party | 31% | | |

Table 5: Centrality of actors (average geodesic distance)

| Category of actors | 1971–1975 (Kriesi 1980: 345) Average geodesic distance | Rank | 1994–2004 (own calculations) Average geodesic distance | Rank | Evolution |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parties of Federal Council | 1.8 | 3 | 1.6 | 1 |  |
| Federal Council | 1.7 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 |  |
| Important Interest Groups | 1.7 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 |  |
| Inter-cantonal Conferences | 1.8 | 3 | 2.1 | 4 |  |
| Federal Administration | 1.9 | 5 | 2.2 | 5 |  |
| Women's Organisation | 2.2 | 7 | 2.2 | 5 |  |
| Enterprises | / | 14 | 2.2 | 5 |  |
| Experts | / | 14 | 2.2 | 5 |  |
| Other Employers Unions | 2.2 | 7 | 2.4 | 9 |  |
| Cantons and Cantonal Offices | 2.4 | 12 | 2.4 | 9 |  |
| Other Trade Unions | 2.1 | 6 | 2.5 | 11 |  |
| Other Interest Groups | 2.2 | 7 | 2.5 | 11 |  |
| Environment Protection Organisations | 2.3 | 11 | 2.5 | 11 |  |
| Other Parties | 2.6 | 13 | 2.7 | 14 |  |
| Professional Organisations | 2.2 | 7 | 2.8 | 15 |  |

*Note*: For this calculation, the network data has been dichotomized.

It may also be due to the SVP's highly professional media strategies. The Radical Democratic Party was the dominant party in the 1970s, both in the decision-making system and in the federal administration (Kriesi 1980: 697). Even if this party has suffered from constant electoral losses since the late 1970s it is still highly influential in decision-making processes. In this specific case, some sort of "institutional inertia" may account for its lasting power.

Finally, given the high number of administrative bodies it is difficult to get a clear view of the evolution of power among state actors based on Table 2. Therefore, we refrain from interpreting the results regarding state actors and we turn, instead, to Table 3: Table 3 is based on the same information as Table 2, but it offers a more synthetic view of power distribution, since it reports the reputational power for aggregated categories of actors.[17]

Remember that our meta-hypothesis regarding state actors was mixed: there were reasons to believe that they have gained power, but there were also reasons to believe that they have lost. This ambivalence clearly shows up in Table 3. First, while the reputational power of governing parties has increased, that of the Federal Council has decreased. Second, the picture is even less clear-cut with respect to the different administrative units. On the one hand, based on Table 3 we should conclude that the federal administration as a whole has lost much power. But in Table 2 we see that the evolution in reputational power differs markedly from one administrative unit to the other. More specifically, units responsible for economic policy were very influential in the 1970s, and they still are. By contrast, the Ministry of Finance seems to have lost power. However, this result may be an artifact of the absence of a decision-making process in fiscal/financial policy in our aggregate data-set. Conversely, administrative units responsible for Switzerland's European policy (Integration Office, Direction of Negotiation for the first bilateral agreements, Swiss Mission in Brussels) seem to have strongly increased their power, and now they belong to the top twenty most influential actors. Of course, this result is a direct consequence of the high number of internationalized decision-making processes included our aggregated dataset.

(2) Reputational Power on the Sectoral Dimension.——Our second measure of power is also based on the reputational power, and it informs

[17] The aggregated power is calculated on the same number of actors (44) for both periods of time.

Table 6: Structural equivalence of the conflict network: blocks of actors

| Block | Members |
|---|---|
| 1 | SVP |
| 2 | GPS |
| 3 | FDP / Economiesuisse / SGV / SAV |
| 4 | SD / Lega |
| 5 | SPS / SGB / Travail.Suisse (CNG/VSA) / Unia (SMUV) |
| 6 | CVP / LPS / SBV (Farmers) / SBV (Master Builders) / EVD / SECO |
| 7 | AUNS |
| 8 | Überlandwerke |
| 9 | EFD / IB / Mission EC / UVEK / BAFU / Federal Council / KdK / Experts / SBB / SAB / WWF / Migros / Erdölvereinigung / VSE |

us about the scope of power. More specifically, it enables us to distinguish the "generalists", namely the actors that are powerful in a number of processes, from the "specialists", which are strong only in a limited number of processes. In line with Kriesi (1980: 325), we use the following criteria: An actor is considered as being a generalist if it has a distinctive influence in at least three decision-making processes out of eight (i.e., in at least 30% of the processes). Now, Kriesi's measure of the distinctive influence was based on an open-ended question asking the political elite to mention all actors that had such a distinctive influence ("prägender Einfluss") in the decision-making processes under study. We do not have a similar measure. As a proxy, we again rely on our measure of reputational power and we apply a threshold of 30% to distinguish actors that have a distinctive influence in a given process from those that have not.[18] In sum, an actor is seen as having a distinctive influence if he is mentioned as being influent in a given process by at least 30% of the respondents, and it is considered as a generalist if it has a distinctive influence in at least three processes out of eight.

Three interesting results emerge from Table 4. First, we see that that the number of generalists is smaller in our aggregate data-base than in

[18] Defining a more demanding threshold of 50%, two actors (Christian trade unions, intercantonal conferences) are no longer part of the group of generalists.

Table 7: Structural equivalence of the conflict network: density table

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 3 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Kriesi's (1980) study (15 against 12). This finding is in line with our previous results regarding the hierarchical dimension of reputational power, but it again contradicts our first meta-hypothesis that the core of the Swiss political elite is more open now than it used to be.

Second, looking at the actors belonging to the group of generalists, Table 4 highlights some changes. Among the peak associations of the Swiss economy only Economiesuisse, which was the most generalist actor in the 1970s, still holds its position. By contrast, the SGV (the umbrella organization of small and medium firms) and the Swiss Federation of Trade Unions were recently active in far less processes than thirty years ago. The Swiss Farmer's Union even disappeared from the list of generalist actors.

Third, the evolution of political parties runs in the opposite direction: Parties have a broader influence now than 30 years ago, and the four parties of the Federal Council even belong to the top generalist actors. As a result, political parties now seem to outweigh interest groups with respect to the breadth of intervention. The case of the Swiss People's Party is again spectacular: This party has dramatically widened its scope of influence over time, and it is now the most generalist actor among the political parties.

(3) Integration in the Cooperation Network (Average Geodesic Distance).——Our third indicator of power is based on the position in the collaboration network, as measured by the average geodesic distances[19] (Table 5).

This measure informs about the integration in the cooperation network: the smaller the average geodesic distance, the higher the integration (and

[19] The geodesic distance is the number of relations in the shortest possible walk from one actor to another (Hanneman 2007: 50).

power).[20] It can be observed from the last column (arrows) that all categories of interest groups are now less integrated in the collaboration network than what was the case in the 1970s. The same holds for the Federal Council, the inter-cantonal conferences and the federal administration as a whole, which all suffered a loss in terms of integration. Conversely, the governmental parties are the only actors that have enjoyed an increase in integration during the last thirty years. This finding is again in line with our hypothesis of reinforcement of political parties vis-à-vis interest groups. Private enterprises and experts, which were not present in the collaboration network in the 1970s, are now at least mildly integrated.

### *The Conflict Structure*

We now turn to the conflict structure among the Swiss political elite. Note, as is already stated by Kriesi (1980: 363), that conflict relations are not automatically the opposite of collaborative relations and that even actors that cooperate closely can have a conflict among themselves. We first compare the overall conflict level in the two periods under study. To that end, we calculate the overall conflict density existing in the two networks. Once we control for the number of actors present in the network, conflict turns out to be higher nowadays (0.27) than in the 1970s (0.19).[21] This general finding is in agreement with our meta-hypothesis of a growing conflict among the Swiss elite as a result of mediatization and economic competition.

Next, to shed light on the conflict structure among the Swiss political elite we carry out a structural equivalence analysis. For reasons of parsimony we refrain from presenting Kriesi's (1980) results regarding conflict structure, and we focus instead on the results derived from our aggregated conflict data-set. Remember, however, that Kriesi's results served as a starting point for the formulation of our meta-hypotheses regarding the likely changes over time (see Table 1b).

---

[20] While centrality measures (degree, closeness, betweenness, see Freeman 1979) would have also been appropriate, they were not reported in Kriesi's (1980) study. Note, however, that average geodesic distance correlates closely with closeness centrality.

[21] As it is not meaningful to compare densities of two networks with different numbers of actors, we calculated the densities for 58 actors in each network: Kriesi (1980: 363) only has conflict data for 58 actors; therefore, we extracted the 58 actors with the highest degree centrality from our symmetrized, dichotomized conflict dataset. The average conflict level for Kriesi's data was calculated on the basis of the density matrix for the conflict blocks (1980: 327).

The principle of structural equivalence is to summarize a complex network of relations between actors in relations between positions or blocks of actors. The initial operation consists in identifying the positions of equivalence, i.e. in grouping actors with the same relational profile. In the present case, actors are grouped according to the similarity of their divergence profile towards the other actors of the network. Given that not all actors in the aggregated matrix participated in all separate networks, we divide the conflict score of each actor by the number of networks to which this actor belongs. In addition, to reduce the number of missing cases in the data matrix we eliminate all actors that were not present in at least two policy processes. The conflict network was then analyzed with UCINET (Borgatti et al. 2002) as well as with STRUCTURE (Burt 1991). In the present case the two softwares produce very similar results.

Table 6 presents the nine blocks resulting from the structural equivalence, and the related list of actors. The strength of relations (i.e. the level of conflict) between and within the "blocks" are then presented in a so-called "density table" (Table 7).[22]

According to Table 6, the constellation of conflict in contemporary Switzerland is still structured along a left-right dimension. More specifically, the equivalence analysis results in two main blocks on the left side of the political spectrum and three blocks on the right side. On the right side, Block 3 includes the Radical Democratic Party (FDP) and the most important employers associations (Economiesuisse, SAV, SGV), and can thus be labeled "economic-liberal". Block 6 contains the Christian Democratic Party (CVP), the Farmers' Union (SBV), the Baumeister (SBV) as well as the State Ministry and Secretariat for Economy. It hence forms a more moderate, economic block. Finally, the Swiss People's Party (SVP) occupies a separate position in the network structure, which means that it has a single conflict profile. It hence constitutes a so-called "residual" in the equivalence analysis. On the left side, we find a classical left block (5) comprising the Socialist Party and the major trade unions (SGB, Travail. Suisse, Unia) and a block consisting only in the Green Party – again an actor with a single conflict profile.

Finally, some blocks appear as secondary and will thus not be discussed further: Block 8, formed only by the electricity industry (Überlandwerke),

[22] Density measures appeared as fractions, but we rounded them. The minimum value of 0 between two blocks means that the actors in these blocks have no conflict at all, whereas the maximum value of 10 means that the two blocks had a conflict in each and every domain in which they were both present.

which was active only in a few policy domains (electricity, telecommunications); Block 9, comprising among others the Federal Ministry of Finance, the Integration Office, the Federal Council, and the Cantons;[23] and blocks 4 and 7, which includes three far-right parties and associations that are marginalized in the collaboration structure and have highly conflictual relations with most of the other blocks.

We see from Table 7 that there is almost no conflict at all between the two "right-economic" blocks 3 and 6, and a low conflict level between the SVP and these two blocks, too. Note, however that the SVP has also consensual relations with the two blocks of far right actors, which account for its single conflict profile. Similarly, the two blocks on the left-side of the political spectrum have no conflict at all between them.[24]

Now, to what extent do we observe a change in the conflict structure among interest groups, as compared to the 1970s? Remember that at that time a leftist block with the Socialist Party and the main trade unions (SGB, CNG) was opposed to two rightist blocks comprising first the Vorort, the Swiss Farmers Union and the BIGA, and second the Radical Democratic Party and the SGV. According to our meta-hypothesis, this "old" conflict between trade unions and employers should still hold, but it should be complemented by a new conflict between the internationally-oriented and the domestic-oriented sectors of the economy. The first hypothesis is confirmed by the data, but not the second.

As can be seen from Table 7, the conflict between the peak associations of economy and employers (block 3) and the major trade unions (block 5) is indeed still salient. By contrast, the hypothesis of a growing conflict between the export-oriented and the domestic sectors of the economy is not borne out by our data: The two most important business associations representing both the export-oriented economy (Economiesuisse) and the domestic-oriented economy (SGV) do not only share the same conflict profile (they both belong to block 3), but they also display no conflict among

[23] This block displays very low conflict with all of the other blocks (see Table 7), and thus seems to be some kind of neutral block. This result is conform to our hypothesis that state actors still have non conflictual relations with the other actors of the network.

[24] The fact that the Green Party does not belong to the left block is mainly due to two factors. First, the Green Party displays a lower level of conflict with far right organizations (blocks 4 and 7) than other left parties or associations. This lower conflict, in turn, is mainly due to the fact that the Greens and far right groups are not active in the same policy processes. Second, the Green Party displays higher conflict than the socialist/trade unions block with the representatives of the electricity market of block 8.

themselves. Only the representatives of the most sheltered sector of the economy, the agriculture, do not belong to the same block. However, and as already stated, the conflict between the liberal-economic block (3) and the conservative economic block to which the Farmer's Association SBV belongs (6) is very weak.

The left-right divide also still appears as the most salient conflict line among political parties. However, both the nature of the left-right cleavage and the actors concerned have substantially changed over time. While in the 1970s the left-right conflict was mostly structured along the classical, economic, dimension, and mainly opposed the Radical Democratic Party to the Socialist Party, it now pitted the whole left (blocks 2 and 5) against the Swiss People's Party. Indeed, and in line with the ever growing polarization in the Swiss party system, our data highlight a strong conflict between block 5 (Socialist Party and trade unions) and 2 (Greens), on the one hand, and block 1 (SVP), on the other. By contrast, the classical conflict between the left and the right-economic blocks (3 and 6) has strongly weakened. As it has been shown in several studies (e.g. Hug and Sciarini 2002; Kriesi et al. 2006), the very change of the left-right cleavage went hand in hand with the growing conflict regarding the desired level of openness of the country to the outside world. This new value conflict, in turn, owes much to the increasing internationalization of Swiss politics.

In sum, while in our data the expected conflict on the openness-closedness does not show up among interest groups, it is very salient in the left-right conflict within the party system.

## Conclusion

By aggregating recent, sectoral network analyses the main purpose of this paper was to update Kriesi's (1980) pioneering work and to provide fresh data on the decision making structure in Switzerland. Besides highlighting the present situation we also wished to compare it with the situation prevailing in the 1970s. To that end, we started with a discussion of the likely changes that have occurred during the last thirty years as a result of Europeanization, increased international competition, mediatization and institutional-administrative reforms. More specifically, we formulated several meta-hypotheses regarding the likely consequences of these developments for the power and conflict structure among the Swiss political elite. Even if we could not definitively test whether the changes in the decision-making

structure that we observed were indeed due to these contextual developments, we could at least show that some important changes have indeed taken place.

First, while in the 1970s the core of the Swiss political elite was concentrated on a small number of highly integrated and exclusive actors, we bet on a more open core in contemporary Switzerland. Our analysis of the reputational power on the hierarchical and on the sectoral dimensions contradicts this expectation: With respect to both the overall intensity of power and the breadth of power, the core of Swiss politics seems to be even more restrained and closed then 30 years ago. While mediatization, the crisis of social partnership and the reform of the parliamentary committees may have rendered the "negotiations behind closed doors" more difficult, they did not lead to an extension of the core of actors. To account for this unexpected result, we can point to the increasing complexity of social problems, which forces actors to become specialists in few policy domains and, therefore, reduces the number of actors that are able to be influential in several decision-making processes.

Second, we expected a reinforcement of political parties as a result of mediatization, polarization and parliamentary reform. Throughout our analyses we can indeed observe a much stronger position for political parties, which have become the more important actors on the both the hierarchical and sectoral dimensions, and are also highly integrated in the cooperation network.[25]

Third, and relatedly, we assumed that interest groups would overall lose power and that associations representing the export-oriented sectors of the Swiss economy would gain power in comparison with labor unions and the domestic sectors of the economy. The empirical analyses confirm that interest groups indeed suffered a net loss of influence. While the peak organization of the export-oriented economy (Economiesuisse) still ranks high, its counterparts of the domestic economy have lost much power. On the other hand, the analysis of the conflict structure reveals that the conflict between the domestic and the export-oriented economy has not increased, and is therefore lower than expected. In other words, changes in power configuration among interest groups did not result in an increased conflict among themselves.

[25] The reinforcement of political parties may also imply a reinforcement of the legislative body. We were, however, not able to test this additional assumption, since the parliament was not included as an actor in our aggregated dataset.

Fourth, our expectations were mixed with regard to the Federal Council and the public administration. So were the results. Regarding public administration, it became clear in the different analyses that it is very difficult to treat it as a unitary actor: Among all the departments and offices there are some that hold a strong power. In particular, and as was already the case in the 1970s, the main actors of the financial and economic administration are still very influential and well integrated. The SECO, the successor of the influential BIGA, remains one of the most important administrative actors. The novelty, however, stems from the fact that some actors that are mostly involved in foreign (economic) relations are overall among the most important actors in Swiss politics. More specifically, the units responsible for the relations with the European Union now seem to belong to the core of the Swiss political elite. While this result is in line with the growing internationalization of Swiss politics, remember that it may also partly be due to a selection bias (see below).

The Federal Council was one of the most important actors at the time of Kriesi's (1980) study. According to our data its role is less central in contemporary Switzerland. True, the Federal Council is still considered as a powerful actor (hierarchical dimension of reputation). However, it scores lower on both the "generalist" measure and with respect to its integration in the cooperation network.

Our analysis shows how far one can get with aggregated data. It was possible to highlight some important changes and, therefore, to contribute to updating Kriesi's (1980) study. However, such an aggregation has necessarily its limits. First, we were dependent on the network data that were collected during the last fifteen years. This alone raised problems of representativeness: Among the most important policy processes financial issues were clearly lacking, which of course account for the weakening of the Department of Finance. Similarly, the power loss of both the Inter-cantonal Conferences and the Cantons also stems from the lack of a decision-making process with a federal character. Recent studies have, however, emphasized the increasing power of cantonal actors (Sciarini 2005; Vatter 2006).

Conversely, one may also wonder whether issues relating to internationalization/Europeanization, but also issues relating to infrastructure, were not overrepresented in our dataset, thus leading to an overestimation of the strength and centrality of the administrative units responsible for these

policy domains.[26] Second, the divergent methodological choices made in these sectoral network analyses, for example regarding symmetrization of the data, affect the quality of our aggregated data-set. Third, as we have seen in our analysis of reputational power, a data set aggregating several sectoral networks is necessarily different than a single dataset on Swiss politics as a whole, and forces the analyst to set thresholds that obviously have an influence on the results. For all these reasons, the present paper can certainly provide a valuable contribution to the understanding of the structure of Swiss decisionmaking, but it remains of course sub-optimal in comparison to an analysis based on a new dataset gathered with the same methodology as in Kriesi's (1980) study.

## References

Blatter, J. and T. Blume (2008). In Search of Co-Variance, Causal Mechanisms or Congruence? Towards a Plural Understanding of Case Studies. *Swiss Political Science Review* 14 (2): 315–56.

Blumler, J. and D. Kavanagh (1999). The Third Age of Political Communication: Influences and Features. *Political Communication* 16(3): 209–30.

Bonoli, G. and A. Mach (2000). Switzerland: Adjustment Politics within Institutional Constraints. In Scharpf, F. and V. Schmidt (eds.), *Welfare and Work in the Open Economy: Diverse Responses to Common Challenges*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borgatti, S., Everett, M. and L. Freeman (2002). *UCINET for Windows: Software for Social Network Analysis*. Harvard: Analytic Technologies.

Brunner, M. and P. Sciarini (2002). L'opposition ouverture-traditions. In Hug, S. and P. Sciarini (eds.), *Changements de valeurs et nouveaux clivages politiques en Suisse*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Burt, R. (1991). STRUCTURE Network Analysis Program Version 4.2. New York: Columbia University.

Collier, D., Brady, H. and J. Seawright (2004). Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology. In Brady, H. and D. Collier (eds.), *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse*

[26] We are grateful to one of the anonymous reviewers of the SPSR for alerting us to the likely bias concerning the UVEK and the Cantons.

*Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Dupont, C., Sciarini, P., Knubel, D. and S. Donzé (2003). *La Suisse dans les institutions de Bretton Woods: Evaluation du statut de membre (acteurs, compétences, influence.)*. Rapport d'expertise à l'intention de l'organe parlementaire du contrôle de l'administration. Genève / Lausanne.

Fahrenkrug, H. (1996). *Macht und Einfluss in der nationalen schweizerischen Drogenpolitik*. Forschungsbericht Nr. 28. Lausanne: Schweizerische Fachstelle für Alkohol- und andere Drogenprobleme.

Fischer, A. (2005). *Die Auswirkung der Internationalisierung und Europäisierung auf Schweizer Entscheidungsprozesse*. Zürich: Verlag Rüegger.

Fischer, A. and P. Sciarini (2004). *Die politische Elite der Schweiz: Eine Aggregation auf Basis bestehender Netzwerkanalysen*. Paper read at Jahreskongress der Schweizerischen Vereinigung für Politische Wissenschaft, 18./19. November, at Balsthal.

Freeman, L. (1979). Centrality in Social Networks: Conceptual Clarification. *Social Networks* 1(3): 215–39.

George, A. and A. Bennett (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Germann, R. (1996). *Administration publique en Suisse: L'appareil étatique et le gouvernement*. Bern: Haupt.

——— (1997). Emerging Administrative Sciences within Federalism and Direct Democracy in Switzerland. *Discussion Paper of IDHEAP* No. 8/1997. Lausanne: Institut Des Hautes Etudes en Administration Publique.

Geser, H. et al. (1987). *Gemeindepolitik zwischen Milizorganisation und Berufsverwaltung. Vergleichende Untersuchungen in 223 deutschschweizer Gemeinden*. Bern: Haupt.

Hanneman, R. (2007). *Introduction to Social Networks*. Online: http://www.analytictech.com/networks.pdf.

Häusermann, S., Mach, A. and Y. Papadopoulos (2004). From Corporatism to Partisan Politics: Social Policy Making under Strain in Switzerland. *Swiss Political Science Review* 10(2): 33–59.

Hug, S. and P. Sciarini (2002), (eds.). *Changements de valeurs et nouveaux clivages politiques en Suisse*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Jegen, M. (2003). *Energiepolitische Vernetzung in der Schweiz: Analyse der Kooperationsnetzwerke und Ideensysteme der energiepolitischen Entscheidungsträger*. Basel: Helbling und Lichterhahn.

Katzenstein, P. (1984). *Corporatism and Change: Austria, Switzerland, and the Politics of Industry*. Ithaka: Cornell University Press.

——— (1985). *Small States in World Markets*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.

Keohane, R. and H. Miller (1996). *Internationalization and Domestic Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kitschelt, H. (2000). Citizens, Politicians and Party Cartellization: Political Representation and State Failure in Post-Industrial Democracies. *European Journal of Political Research* 37(2): 149–79.

Knoke, D., Pappi, F., Broadbent, J. and Y. Tsujinaka (1996). *Comparing Policy Networks: Labor Politics in the U.S., Germany, and Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kriesi, H. (1980). *Entscheidungsstrukturen und Entscheidungsprozesse in der Schweizer Politik*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

——— (1998). *Le système politique suisse*. Paris: Economica.

——— (2001). Die Rolle der Öffentlichkeit im politischen Entscheidungsprozess. *Discussion Paper* P 01–701. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB).

Kriesi, H. and M. Jegen (2001). The Swiss Energy Policy Elite: The Actor Constellation of a Policy Domain in Transition. *European Journal of Political Research* 39: 251–87.

Kriesi, H., Lachat, R., Selb, P., Bornschier, S. and M. Helbling (2005), (eds.). *Der Aufstieg der SVP. Acht Kantone im Vergleich*. Zürich: Verlag NZZ.

Kriesi, H., Grande, E., Lachat, R., Dolezal, M., Bornschier, S. and T. Frey (2006). Globalization and the Transformation of the National Political Space: Six European Countries Compared. *European Journal of Political Research* 45: 921–56.

Lijphart, A. (1984). *Democracies: Patterns of Majoritarian and Consensus Government in Twenty-One Countries*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

——— (1999). *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lüthi, R. (1996). Die Wirkung von institutionellen Reformen dargestellt am Beispiel der Reform des Kommissionensystems der Schweize-

rischen Bundesversammlung von 1991. *Swiss Political Science Review* 2 (2): 1–32.

Mach, A. (2006). *La Suisse entre internationalisation et changements politiques internes: La législation sur les cartels et les relations industrielles dans les années 1990*. Zürich: Verlag Rüegger.

Mach, A., Häusermann, S. and Y. Papadopoulos (2003). Economic Regulatory Reforms in Switzerland: Adjustments without European Integration, or how Rigidities become flexible. *Journal of European Public Policy* 10(2): 301–18.

Maibach, M., Vatter, A., Sager, F. and D. Peter (1999). *Schweizerische Verkehrspolitik im Spannungsfeld der Aussenpolitik. Eine Policy-Netzwerkanalyse am Fallbeispiel der 28-Tonnen-Limite*. Materialien des NFP 41 und NFP 42. Materialienband M6. Bern: EDMZ.

Mazzoleni, G. and W. Schulz (1999). "Mediatization" of Politics: A Challenge for Democracy? *Political Communication* 16: 247–61.

Moravcsik, A. (1994). Why the European Community Strenghtens the State: Domestic Politics and International Cooperation. *Working Paper* 52. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ochsner, A. (1987). *Die schweizerische Bundesversammlung als Arbeitsparlament: Vollanalyse der parlamentarischen Kommissionen einer Legislaturperiode*. Entlebuch: Huber Druck AG.

Sager, F., Meyrat, M. and M. Maibach (2001). ''Boundary Delineation'' in grenzüberschreitenden Policy-Netzwerken: Primat der Policies oder der Polity? Das Fallbeispiel des Policy-Netzwerks zur 28-Tonnen-Limite. *Swiss Political Science Review* 7(1): 51–82.

Scharpf, F. (1998). Globalization: The Limitations on State Capacity. *Swiss Political Science Review* 4(1): 92–8.

Schmitter, P. (2008). The Changing Politics of Organised Interests. *West European Politics* 31(1–2): 195–210.

Sciarini, P. (1994). *La Suisse face à la Communauté Européenne et au GATT: Le cas test de la politique agricole*. Genève: Editions Georg.

——— (2005). Le centralisme et le pouvoirs cantonaux: Quelles évolutions? In Mazzoleni, O. (ed.), *Fédéralisme et décentralisation: L'expérience suisse et les nouveaux défis européens*. Lugano: Gianpiero Casagrande editore.

Sciarini, P., Nicolet, S. and A. Fischer (2002). L'impact de l'internationalisation sur les processus de décision en Suisse: Une

analyse quantitative des actes législatifs 1995–99. *Swiss Political Science Review* 8(3/4): 1–34.

Sciarini, P., Fischer, A. and S. Nicolet (2004). How Europe Hits Home: Evidence from the Swiss Case. *Journal of European Public Policy* 11(3): 353–78.

Varone, F. (2006). L'administration fédérale. In Klöti, U., Knoepfel, P., Kriesi, H., Linder, W., Papadopoulos, Y. and P. Sciarini (eds.), *Handbuch der Schweizer Politik*, 4th edition. Zürich: Verlag NZZ.

Vatter, A. (2006). Föderalismus. In Klöti, U., Knoepfel, P., Kriesi, H., Linder, W., Papadopoulos, Y. and P. Sciarini (eds.), *Handbuch der Schweizer Politik*, 4th edition. Zürich: Verlag NZZ.

Wichert, O. (1997). *Politik(er) im Fernsehen: Zum Wandel der Politikvermittlung in einer sich verändernden Medienlandschaft*. Diplomarbeit. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz.

Wolfsfeld, G. (1997). *Media and Political Conflict. News from the Middle East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---

**Macht und Konflikt innerhalb der Politischen Elite der Schweiz: Eine Aggregation existierender Netzwerkanalysen**

Seit Kriesis (1980) bahnbrechender Arbeit hat keine Studie mehr versucht, ein Gesamtbild der Machtkonfiguration innerhalb der politischen Elite der Schweiz zu zeichnen. Um diese Lücke zu füllen, aggregieren wir Daten, welche kürzlich im Rahmen von Netzwerkanalysen verschiedener Politikbereiche gesammelt worden sind. Basierend auf Meta-Hypothesen über die Auswirkungen der kontextuellen Veränderungen, welche in den letzten 30 Jahren stattgefunden haben, vergleichen wir die Struktur der politischen Elite der Schweiz in den 1970er Jahren mit der des letzten Jahrzehnts bezüglich der Reputationsmacht, der Zusammenarbeits-, sowie der Konfliktbeziehungen. Unsere Resultate lassen vermuten, dass in der Tat wichtige Veränderungen stattgefunden haben. So konnten sowohl die politischen Parteien als auch einige staatliche Akteure ihren Einfluss erhöhen, während viele Verbände an Einfluss verloren. Während die Internationalisierung der Politik insgesamt die erwarteten Auswirkungen bezüglich der Macht- und Konfliktstrukturen im Parteiensystem hatte, so hat sie doch nicht zum neu erwarteten Konflikt innerhalb des Verbandssystems geführt.

**Pouvoir et Conflit dans l'Elite Politique Suisse: Une Agrégation d'Analyses de Réseaux Existantes**

Depuis le travail pionnier de Kriesi (1980), aucune étude n'a tenté de fournir une image complète de la configuration du pouvoir existant au sein de l'élite politique suisse. Pour

combler cette lacune, nous agrégeons des données d'analyses de réseaux collectées dans des études sectorielles récentes. Sur la base de méta-hypothèses relatives aux effets des changements contextuels qui se sont produits au cours des trente dernières années, nous comparons la structure de l'élite politique suisse des années 1970 à celle de la dernière décennie, du point de vue du pouvoir réputationnel, de la collaboration et du conflit. Nos résultats suggèrent que des transformations importantes ont effectivement eu lieu. Ainsi, tant les partis politiques que certains acteurs étatiques ont pu augmenter leur pouvoir, alors que la plupart des groupes d'intérêt en ont perdu. Si l'internationalisation de la politique a globalement eu les effets attendus en termes de pouvoir et de conflit au sein du système des partis, elle n'a en revanche pas débouché sur un conflit accru au sein du système des associations d'intérêt.

---

*Manuel Fischer* holds a master's degree in Political Science and works as a research assistant at the Department of political science, University of Geneva. He collaborates on the SNF research project "The Swiss decision-making system in the 21st century: power, institutions, conflicts" (direction: Pascal Sciarini) and is working on a dissertation within the framework of this project.

*Address for correspondence*: Department of Political Science, University of Geneva, 40, Bd. du Pont d'Arve, 1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland. Phone: + 41 (0)22 379 83 81; Fax: + 41 (0)22 379 83 64; Email: manuel.fischer@unige.ch.

*Alex Fischer* works as part-time associate professor at the Department of Public Policy at Central European University in Budapest and as a political advisor for WWF Switzerland. He has published *Die Auswirkungen der Internationalisierung und Europäisierung auf Schweizer Entscheidungsprozesse* (Rüegger, 2005).

*Address for correspondence*: Central European University, Nador utca 9, H–1051 Budapest, Hungary. Email: fischera@ceu.hu.

*Pascal Sciarini* is Professor of Swiss and Comparative Politics, and currently Head of the Department of political science, University of Geneva. He has written on Swiss politics (direct democracy, decision-making processes, European policy, Europeanization, opinion formation) and European integration in various journals such as *British Journal of Political Science*, *European Union Politics*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, and *West European Politics*.

*Address for correspondence*: Department of Political Science, University of Geneva, 40, Bd. du Pont d'Arve, 1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland. Phone: + 41 (0)22 379 83 86; Fax: + 41 (0)22 379 83 64; Email: pascal.sciarini@unige.ch.