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Abstract

Integrating into a political democratic regime has not been a simple task for post-communist states such as Bosnia and Herzegovina. The signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement in 1995 marked the end of the catastrophic war that took place in the region, and was the start for the democratic developments that would now fully integrate Bosnia and Herzegovina into a consolidated democratic regime. However, the history after the signing of the agreement has not been as idealistic. Corruption, ethnic limitations and restrictions, disagreement between the various governmental bodies, and the lack of accountability between the political authorities are just some of the factors which have hindered Bosnia and Herzegovina from reaching any major democratic progress for the past years. This essay will examine if Bosnia and Herzegovina can be regarded as a political democratic regime in accordance to Robert Dahl’s eight institutional guarantees. It will also investigate the democratic development that has taken place before and after the elections in 2014.
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1. Introduction

Democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been a rather complicated story, characterized by inefficiency and unwillingness to move beyond ethnical divisions. For a country that has for centuries been the center of conflict in southern Balkan and former Yugoslavia, the idea of a new start was a welcoming gust of wind after the war in 1995. Being geographically placed between Croatia and Serbia, it has always played an important role in the geopolitics in southern Balkan. It has been a centrum for many different ethnic, religious, and social groups in southern Balkan, creating internal conflicts and a political system based upon ethno-politics. Thus, the challenge of transitioning from a former communistic regime part of the Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia, to a political democratic regime has been anything but smooth and fruitful.

Democracy-building started to take traction in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1995 with the signing of the Dayton Agreement, officially marking the end of the destructive war that ended in 1995, which still affects the country’s agenda to this day. The main purpose with the Dayton Agreement was and still is to promote stability and peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the conflicts. Under the new constitution, also called Annex IV of the Dayton Agreement, citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina were now going to enjoy the highest level of political rights and liberties, such as freedom of expression and freedom of assembly and association.¹

The Dayton Agreement divided the country’s political system into various subdivisions, creating a multi-level governance. The first subdivision is the central government. The next level is the two main entities of BiH, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) and Republika Srpska (RS). There is also the self-governing administrative unit Brcko District, which can choose to partake in either FBiH or RS elections. The third level is the ten cantons of FBiH, all of whom have their own governments with their own prime ministers, but are under the law of the FBiH. The last subdivision is the municipalities of BiH, whom also have their local governments.²

We can already see why many consider Bosnia and Herzegovina to have one of the most complicated, contradicting, and complex political systems in the world. Reform processes and enactment of effective legislations have been slow and inefficient, giving little hope to political and social change. The progress toward implementing political democracy has historically been lusterless, showing more signs of regression than progression. This complexity provides interesting and important research subjects for political science, as it highlights the establishment of democracy as according to Western models in a post-communistic state which is divided and segregated by ethno-politics in all spheres of life.

1.1 Democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Before this essay goes any further, it is important to present and account for some information about the history of democratic progress in Bosnia and Herzegovina. As mentioned earlier, the developments toward implementing democracy took off after the end of the catastrophic events that took place between 1992 and which ended in 1995. Implementing a new constitution, Annex IV of the Dayton Agreement, and involvement from the international community, BiH integrated new institutions and new system of governance that would be in accordance with a Western model of democracy. However, the transition to democracy has been characterized by post-war grievances, unequal political rights among BiH’s citizens, corruption within the national and local governments, and the lack of consensus between political authorities regarding how the regime’s governance should be integrated.

The most prominent character of the many problems regarding democratic progress in Bosnia and Herzegovina is ethnic divisions and limitations. These ethnic divisions can even be found in the constitution, in Article IV: Parliamentary Assemble, which states that the House of Peoples (one of the two chambers of the Parliamentary Assemble) will be comprised of 15 delegates, two-thirds from the Federation of BiH, five Bosniaks and five Croats, and one-third from the Republika Srpska, five Serbs. Article V: Presidency

---


states that the three-member state presidency can only be comprised of one Bosniak, one Croat, and one Serb. This means that any citizen who do not recognize themselves as either Bosniak, Bosnian Serb, or Bosnian Croat is not eligible to run for the House of Peoples or the state Presidency. As these three ethnic groups dominate the political sphere of BiH, they do not represent all citizens of BiH, with minorities such as Bosnian Romani or Bosnian Jews being left out of the political arena.

BiH’s multi-party system was introduced as early as 1990, during the dissolution of Yugoslavia, but due to the ethnic composition of BiH’s entities and the power distribution mechanisms the elections have been dominated by ethnic voting and nationalistic political parties, leaving little chance for non-nationalistic parties to become political authorities. Elections take place every four years but with different conditions for different levels. The three members of Presidency are selected by plurality, with every voter in FBiH (Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina) choosing a Bosniak or a Croat and every voter in RS (Republika Srpska) choosing a Serb. Members of Parliament are elected through proportional representation and through open lists. During the elections at state level, BiH is split into eight different electoral units, five in FBiH and three in RS. At the entity level, it is guaranteed by the law that there should always exist a minimum representation of the three constituent people, and if this condition is not met the elections will be supplemented by compensatory mandates.

The transition toward democracy has historically proven to be a difficult task in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The complexity of BiH’s political system, which is divided by ethno-politics, and unclarified jurisdiction between the different institutions and administrative levels has contributed to an inefficient and slow democratic progress, not giving much hope for any major progress in the future. Furthermore, the constitution seems to promote the ethnical divisions and restrictions that have helped creating a hostile political and social environment. It can be discussed whether the contribution of the
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5 Ibid. :11
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
international community had the goal of helping BiH integrate into a consolidated democracy or had the goal of making sure that the regime of BiH would not return to being a communistic state. To conclude, the democratic transition has been anything but successful for BiH, being plagued by many issues within the country and its citizens.

1.2 Aim of the Essay & Research Questions
The aim of this essay is to understand what progress Bosnia and Herzegovina has made in implementing political democracy as its system of governance, and if they can be regarded as a political democratic regime. As will be further explained later, this essay will follow the democratic terminology made famous by Robert Dahl and his conditions for a regime to be regarded as political democratic regime. The research questions which will guideline this essay to fulfill its purpose are:

- In accordance to Robert Dahl’s eight institutional guarantees for political democracy, can Bosnia and Herzegovina be regarded as a political democratic regime?
- How has the progress towards implementing a political democracy as the system of governance of Bosnia and Herzegovina been before and after the 2014 elections?

These research questions states that this essay will look at the developments that have taken place in the political system of BiH during five years, to understand if the recent elections helped with the progress or with the regress of democracy in the country. The aim and the questions are also based on results from earlier research, such as David Chandler11 and Larry Diamond12, where the results have shown the difficulties post-communistic regimes have been experiencing in trying to integrate a Western model of democracy, an integration which has been heavily influenced by the international community. With these results in mind, I wanted to research about how Bosnia and Herzegovina, a post-communistic state, have been developing and transitioning towards a political democratic regime and if this development has been a success story. With the results obtained from these research questions, I hope to contribute to widen the understanding of what factors contributes to democratic progress.

1.3 Hypothesis

The hypothesis for the measures and results of this essay is that Bosnia and Herzegovina does not fulfill all the criterions to be regarded as a political democratic regime. One reason for this belief is because of the results from earlier research, showing that post-communistic states have had a lot of difficulties and problems hindering the democratic progress. Another reason to why I believe this is because of experiencing the political and social situation firsthand. The disbelief of the civil society that any positive future major changes in the political or social arena will take place is running higher and higher, and no one wants to take responsibility of the issues of the country. No political authority is being held accountable for the outcome, while everyone is pointing their fingers at each other. The ethnical divisions, restrictions and limitations affects the citizens and affects the fundamental democratic principles BiH has tried to implement. These factors are severely undermining and obstructing the democratic progress of BiH, which is why I believe that Bosnia and Herzegovina does not fulfill Robert Dahl’s criterions of a political democracy.

1.4 Disposition of the Essay

The essay starts with an introduction to the subject at hand and presents the purpose of the essay; the research questions which will guideline this essay; as well as the hypothesis for the results from the measures of this essay. After the introduction, we move forward to the theoretical framework. Here I will present earlier research and how we can understand the upcoming results through different theories, then present the chosen theory and the operationalization of the theory to understand how I will measure data and help explain the results. We then move forward to the presentation of the research design for this essay, and the method and material used to gather and sample data which will be measured. Here I will present the approaches that have been taken for this essay in studying the research topic and why I chose the material that I did. Delimitations of this essay will also be accounted for during this chapter. We then continue to the results and analysis for the data measured. Here I will present, explain, and analyze the outcomes of the measured data. The last chapter of this essay will be the conclusion. The conclusion will summarize the results and the findings that have been
made, giving the final answers to the research questions. Discussion about other alternative explanations for the results will also take place in this chapter, understanding how different perspectives provide different explanations.
2. Theory

It is easy to find yourself in a predicament when researching about a broad subject such as democracy. The different terminologies surrounding democracy and how to measure democracy in a country, such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, can become both confusing and frustrating for the researcher and reader. This is where the chosen theory plays its most vital part. It does not only help you define the terminologies to base your research after but it also helps operationalize the research to understand what kind of empirical data to measure and gather for the research, creating the foundation which guidelines the research. The theoretical framework for this paper is built upon Robert Dahl’s democratic theory and Dahl’s eight guarantees a state must provide for its demos to establish itself as a political democratic regime. As for the terminology for this paper, I will use the standard definition of democracy developed by Robert Dahl. But before presenting and explaining the theory the paper will account for scholars and earlier contributions to the field of democracy. Scholars such as Axel Hadenius, David Chandler, and Larry Diamond have contributed to the understanding and measuring of democratic progress, the dynamics of democracy as well as its dilemmas as a system of governance for a country, and these contributions will make up for a section in this chapter as Earlier Research.

2.1 Earlier Research

To appreciate the complexity of democratic theory, this section will account for different scholars within the field of democracy, which have contributed to the understanding and the meaning of being a democratic regime. The goal, as for the whole essay in general, is to remain objective and present relevant material to best understand what democracy in a regime signifies and constitutes, and to understand if there are any theories that might provide alternative explanations for the results of this research.

Larry Diamond in his essay, The Democratic Rollback\textsuperscript{13}, argues that there has been a setback and recession of democracy due to the growth of semi-corrupted democracies, such as Nigeria and Russia, where the expansion of executive power, the rigging of

electoral process and the intimidation of the opposition have “extinguished even the most basic form of electoral democracy.”

Diamond argues that western policymakers and organizations have failed to acknowledge the democratic recession and that western leaders have been reluctant to criticize degradations of democracy. In post-communistic states, such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, democracy has been more a superficial system of governance with indifferent and incompetent state bureaucracies, inaccessible and corrupt judiciaries and ruling elites who are accountable to only themselves. Rigged elections between corrupt parties are being held, providing the citizens few meaningful channels of participation and thus alienating the democratic principle of citizenship. Larry Diamond therefore argues that for democratic institutions and structures to endure, regimes “must, over time, hear people’s voices, engage their participation, tolerate their protests, protect their freedoms, and respond to their needs.” Diamond means that before regimes try to spread and share their ideas of democracy to the rest of the world, they have to work, develop and sustain their own system. If a regime declares itself as a democracy it does not necessarily mean that this regime fulfills or implements proper and functioning democratic structures.

One theory that could provide alternative explanations for this essay’s research questions and results is Axel Hadenius five conditions for democracy and its progress. In his book, Demokrati–en jämförande analys, Hadenius presents five factors which have continuously appeared in his research and contributed to explaining the different levels of democratic progress in different regimes. These are: Socio-economic development; Civil society; Segregation amongst the population; Institutional prerequisites; and International Factors. All these factors together provide an extensive analysis on a country’s democratic progress, trying to explain why some regimes do not have the same conditions of implementing a fully democratic system of governance.
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For this research, I will strive to measure democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina through Robert Dahl’s theory about the eight institutional guarantees and provide the answers for the current state of democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The important aspect for this research is then measuring democracy, which has proven to be complicated, as Kenneth Bollen illustrates in his article Political Democracy: Conceptual and Measurement Traps\textsuperscript{20}. In the article, Bollen describes some conceptual issues with various theoretical definitions of political democracy, as they often do not have a “sharp line separating their theoretical from their operational definitions.”\textsuperscript{21} With Dahl’s eight attributes, Bollen looks at the two dimensions which are created by the eight attributes, public contestation and inclusiveness, and argues that these dimensions creates unclear tracking and measuring of the dimensions on their own as most attributes partake in both dimensions. Bollen largely agrees with Dahl’s attributes, and praises Dahl for his dedication and level of details to define political democracy.

As most of this section has been reserved to different discussions and outlooks on the democratic theory, there will be a presentation about earlier research regarding Bosnia and Herzegovina as a political regime and the process of democratization the country has partaken in since the Dayton Peace Accords were adapted in 1995. The material gathered about Bosnia and Herzegovina will show the complex political situation that has existed since 1995, which has greatly affected the installation and implementation of democracy as the system of governance.

In his book, Bosnia: Faking Democracy After Dayton\textsuperscript{22}, David Chandler argues that the democratic processes which have taken place in BiH since the war ended in 1995 has been anything but democratic, and has been intended to govern Bosnia through western interests. Chandler means that the universal values of democracy that has been asserted as the new standard for international relations post-Cold War are driven by security concerns and not driven by the need of a regime or region\textsuperscript{23}. Furthermore, BiH displayed that social collapse and civil war were the inevitable results of unrestrained liberal freedoms in a country without international regulation or Western cultural

\textsuperscript{23} Chandler. Bosnia: Faking Democracy After Dayton.
values. The lack of cultural and regulative frameworks gave the opportunity for nationalist elites to manipulate voters, which helped slow down any democratic progress for Bosnia and Herzegovina.

2.2 Robert Dahl: Democracy and Polyarchy

The reason to why Robert Dahl and his theory has been chosen for this essay is because of Dahl’s attention and ability to separate the distinction of the theoretical and operational definitions of Democracy, by establishing the concept of full democracy as a theoretical utopia, and providing the concept of Polyarchy as the more operational and measurable classification of a regime. Robert Dahl established himself as a one of the most influential political scientist of the twentieth century after the introduction and establishment of the pluralist theory of democracy. Dahl’s argument was that Democracy is a theoretical utopia which no state to this point has been able to replicate and argues that most states today that are regarded as democracies are de facto Polyarchies, which could be described as regimes that have been liberalized and popularized, meaning that these regimes are “highly inclusive and extensively open to public contestation.” In his book, Democracy and its critics, Dahl illustrates five different criterions to be fulfilled in a democratic process for a regime to truly be regarded as a perfect fully democratic government, and these criterions are: Inclusion, Effective Participation, Voting Equality at the Decisive Stage, Enlightened Understanding and Control of the Agenda.

For Dahl, these criterions represent “different ideas of human possibilities which actualities may be compared” and are useful in the sense that they provide evaluation of real world possibilities, though these criterions do not specify particular procedures, such as majority rule, and thus fail to provide unambiguous answers and fails to eliminate all elements of judgement in evaluation. But this is the nature of the Democratic Theory, argues Dahl, as it is the nature for all other normative theories to
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not be able to completely provide unambiguous answers for every situation in “which a choice has to be made between alternative proposals.”

The idea that always correlates through Dahl’s view of the Democratic Theory is that democracy is an extremely complex interconnected web of ideas that does not solely depend on few factors or dimensions, but is rather consistently, through historical aspects, being developed and revised in its philosophical and empirical arguments. What we today would call a democracy would not correlate with the idea of democracy in the fifth century B.C. Greece for example. Reaching a perfect democracy with perfect democratic decision process is unattainable. But what about the current democracies that many of us today live in, the ones’ Dahl calls polyarchies? What are the criterions for those kinds of regimes that we denote as democracies?

2.3 The Eight Institutional Guarantees: An Introduction

In his book, *Polyarchy*, Dahl presents three conditions he argues are necessary for a democracy, but not necessarily sufficient. These three conditions are: (1) To formulate citizens preferences, (2) To signify citizens preferences to their fellow citizens and the government by individual and collective action, (3) To have citizens preferences weighed equally in the conduct of the government, meaning that there shall be no discrimination because of the content or source of the preference. For these three conditions to exist and work among a large number of people, which most states today comprise, the institutions of the society needs to provide at least eight guarantees. These eight institutional guarantees provide great indicators of measurement. These guarantees will thus be the focal point for this research and will provide the guidelines for gathering and processing the empirical data, providing the analysis, and providing the answers to the research questions. What these eight guarantees are and the relationship between them and the three conditions will be presented in table 3.1, as displayed and presented in Robert Dahls table 1.1, and provides this research with a theoretical scale for measuring different political systems.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The conditions (the opportunity to):</th>
<th>Guarantees that are required:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Formulate preferences**                               | 1. Freedom to form and join organizations  
2. Freedom of Expression  
3. Right to vote  
4. Right of political leaders to compete for support  
5. Alternative sources of information | **2. Signify preferences**  
1. Freedom to form and join organizations  
2. Freedom of Expression  
3. Right to vote  
4. Eligibility for public office  
5. Right of political leaders to compete for support  
6. Alternative sources of information |**3. Have preferences weighted equally in conduct of government**  
1. Freedom to form and join organizations  
2. Freedom of Expression  
3. Right to vote  
4. Eligibility for public office  
5. Right of political leaders to compete for support  
5a. Right of political leaders to compete for votes  
6. Alternative sources of information  
7. Free and fair elections  
8. Institutions for making government policies depend on votes and other expressions of preference |
As presented by Dahl\textsuperscript{33}, these eight institutional guarantees provide two different dimensions of democratization: public contestation and inclusiveness. These dimensions help create a scale in where we can classify a regime in accordance to its level of inclusiveness and liberalization of public contestation. In order to comprehensively explain these two dimensions, longer quotations directly from Robert Dahl will need to be recited to avoid any mistranslation. Public contestation is “the extent to which the eight institutional conditions are openly available, publicly employed, and fully guaranteed to at least some members of the political system…” and inclusiveness is “the proportion of the population entitled to participate on a more or less equal plane in controlling and contesting the conduct of the government: to participate, so to speak, in the system of public contestation.”\textsuperscript{34} Dahl illustrates how some of the guarantees, such as the right to vote (3) in free and fair elections (7), partakes in both dimensions in the way that a regime that grants this right to its citizens goes toward a greater public contestation, and the larger number of citizens that enjoy this right, the more inclusive the regime\textsuperscript{35}. The use of these dimensions will be further explained in the next section.

2.4 Operationalization

Democracy for this essay will regarded as a political system where one of the characteristics are the quality of being completely or almost completely responsive to all its citizens. I have chosen Robert Dahl’s democracy theory regarding polyarchies. As Robert Dahl believed that no regime will probably ever be able to achieve the four criterions for a full democracy, he stated that most democracies today are polyarchies. Polyarchies are neither authoritarian nor democratic, they are a regime that provides high levels of inclusiveness and liberalization to its citizens.

For a regime to be regarded as a polyarchy, it needs to fulfill three conditions for its citizens; (1) Formulate preferences, (2) Signify Preferences, and (3) Have preferences weighted equally in conduct of government. These three conditions are guaranteed when the regime fulfills eight attributes, which were presented in table 2.1. These eight attributes create two dimensions of democratization, public contestation and inclusiveness, which together creates a scale for how we can classify regimes. The eight

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} Ibid: 4.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Ibid: 4.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Ibid: 4.
\end{itemize}
attributes will therefore be used to measure the attributes of political democracy, and with the scale created by the two dimensions I will classify whether the regime can be regarded as a political democracy (polyarchy).

In the next table I will present the variables and factors that have been analyzed to measure the eight attributes. These variables have been chosen from Dahl’s “Appendix A”\textsuperscript{36} to form a satisfactory scale for measurement.

**Table 2.2 Measuring the Eight Guarantees\textsuperscript{37}**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Guarantee which is required:</th>
<th>Indicated by factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Freedom to form and join organizations | Freedom of group opposition  
Interest articulation by associational groups |
| 2. Freedom of Expression                  | Freedom of the press   |
| 3. Right to vote                          | Current electoral system  
Representative character of current regime |
| 4. Eligibility for public office          | Current electoral system  
Representative character of current regime |
| 5. Right of political leaders to compete for support | Freedom of group opposition  
Interest articulation by political parties  
Party system  
Current electoral system |
| 6. Alternative sources of information     | Freedom of the press  
Freedom of group opposition  
Party System  
Representative character of current regime |
| 7. Free and fair elections                | Freedom of the press  
Freedom of group opposition |

\textsuperscript{36} Dahl. *Polyarchy; Participation and Opposition*. pp 235-236.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid. 235-236.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current electoral system</th>
<th>8. Institutions for making government policies depend on votes and other expressions of preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party System</td>
<td>Current status of legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative character of current regime</td>
<td>Constitutional status of present regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest aggregation by legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal power distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a regime does not fulfill any of the eight attributes, meaning it does not fulfill any of the three conditions for its demos, then the regime will be classified as a *Closed hegemony*. A closed hegemony is a regime with low liberalization and low inclusiveness, meaning that there is neither contestation nor participation in the political society. If it only fulfills the attributes necessary for the first condition, it will be classified as a *Competitive oligarchy*. Competitive oligarchies have high liberalization and low inclusiveness, meaning high levels of contestation but no participation in the political society. If it fulfills the guarantees for both condition (1) and (2), but not for condition (3), it will be classified as an *Inclusive hegemony*. These regimes have low liberalization and high inclusiveness, where all eligible citizens of a regime vote for the only candidate available, as in former Soviet Union for example. If it fulfills all eight attributes, and thus fulfills the third condition, it will be classified as a *Polyarchy*. Polyarchies are those regimes which have high liberalization and inclusiveness, having political authorities being dependent on support from the citizens and competing for their support. Some examples of polyarchies are United States, Great Britain, and Sweden. This scale and the terminology for regimes are not however completely adequate, as regimes can theoretically be classified anywhere between these two dimensions, creating a gray zone for this scale.  

---

3. Research Design & Method

Before you set out writing your essay, you should construct and develop a plan for your essay to ensure that the results obtained enables you to answer the research questions as unambiguously as possible. This is the focal point of a research design. The design type that has been chosen for this essay is a case study and there is an argument for what truly constitutes a case study, which will be explained later. The method, the different approaches and procedures, that has undergone while collecting, processing, and implementing empirical data will also be presented and is an essential aspect for any research as it makes it possible for future researchers to trace back, revise and finding new data. Research design could therefore be seen, as taken from de Vaus train of thought39, a construction plan while the method is the construction itself.

3.1 Case Study as Research Strategy

The type of design that has been chosen for this research is case study as this research is focused in depth on political democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina. As Robert Yin thoroughly explains in Case Study Research: Designs and Methods40, case studies are the preferred strategy when a research is looking to answer “how” and “who” questions, when the researcher, or investigator, does not have much control over events, and when the research is focused on “contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context”41. This is called explanatory case study and can be complemented with two other types, exploratory and descriptive case studies42. This research will focus, as mentioned, the state of democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina before and after the elections of 2014, which means that this case study takes the approach of studying one context (political democracy in Bosnia) within two different timelines (before and after 2014).

42 Ibid. 4-5.
The strength of a case study lays in its ability to deal with different varieties of evidence, while some traditional prejudices and concerns have been regarding the lack of rigor of case study researches. What this means is that too many times the case study investigator has not followed systematic procedure in conducting a case study and has been sloppy, or the investigator has allowed biased views or ambiguous evidence to influence the direction of the findings and conclusions. Another common concern for case studies is that they provide a weak foundation for scientific generalization. Case studies are, as Yin argues, not generalizable to populations or universes but are rather generalizable to theoretical propositions, meaning that in this sense the goal for a case study is to expand and generalize theories, which Yin refers to as “analytical generalization”, and not recount frequencies, also called “statistical generalization”. Case study as a research design can cover various data collection techniques, the logic of design, and specific approaches to data analysis, but is hard to conduct as specific systematic procedures does not exist on how to, step by step, set up a good case study.

3.2 Material & Data Gathering

By operationalizing political democracy, as in the earlier chapter, there is now a guideline for what data to measure. The next step would then be to find the right material to measure. To find material, one can go through various techniques. Academic literature, peer-reviewed articles, public documentations, and statistics from recognized organizations have been the most prominent techniques for gathering and sampling data throughout this essay. Sources such as Freedom House’s annual Nations in Transit reports and the EIU’s Democratic Indexes have been the most prominent sources as they provide well measured data of democratic progress. The challenge with these sources has been the difference in their conceptualization and operationalization of democracy, but they do however have common denominators of what a political democracy should constitute, which correlates through all these sources and correlates with Dahl’s eight guarantees as well. Reports from the European Commission and the European Parliament will help provide information from historical contexts as well as

43 Ibid. 10
44 Ibid. 10
45 Ibid. 10
46 Ibid. 14
contemporary information about the political situation and the democratic progress of BiH, contributing to the analysis of Dahl’s eight guarantees.

The organization Contemporary Constitute Project provides the essay with structured and easily read documents of the constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Annex IV of Dayton Peace Agreement. The International institute for Middle East and Balkan Studies professor Dr. Mirko Pejanovic in the publication The Dayton Peace Agreement and the Development of Political Pluralism in Bosnia and Herzegovina\(^{47}\) contributes to the understanding of political pluralism in BiH from both a historical aspect as well from a contemporary aspect. These are few of the well-respected journals, reports, and publications which have contributed to the understanding of the democratic and political situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Freedom House’s Nations in Transit ratings and scores are presented in a scale from 1 (best) to 7 (worst), giving each country an average rating regarding political rights and civil liberties in accordance to this scale. The scores are organized by seven different categories: National Democratic Governance; Electoral Process; Civil Society; Independent Media; Local Democratic Governance; Judicial Framework and Independence; and Corruption. The ratings in the category National Democratic Governance are measured by analyzing the democratic character and the stability of the government; the effectiveness, independence, and accountability of the executive and legislative bodies; and the democratic oversight of security and military services\(^{48}\). The Electoral Process looks at the country’s executive and national elections, electoral processes, the development of multiparty systems, and popular participation in the political process\(^{49}\). Civil Society looks at the organizational capacity and assessments of nongovernmental organizations and the legal and political environment where they operate; the development of free trade unions; and interest group participation in the policy process\(^{50}\). Independent Media looks at the current state of press freedom; the

---


\(^{49}\) Ibid.

\(^{50}\) Ibid.
emergence of financially viable press; and internet access for private citizens\textsuperscript{51}. Local Democratic Governance considers the power distribution; the responsibilities, capacity, and elections of the local governments; and the accountability and transparency of local authorities\textsuperscript{52}. Judicial Framework and Independence highlights judicial independence, compliance with judicial decisions, human rights protections, constitutional reform, criminal code reform, the status of ethnic minority rights, guarantees of equality before the law, and treatment of suspects and prisoners\textsuperscript{53}. The last category, Corruption, is measured by public perceptions of corruption, the efficiency of anticorruption initiatives, business interest of top policymakers, and laws on financial disclosure and conflict of interest\textsuperscript{54}.

After having analyzed and assessed the scores for each category, the regime then gets a final Democratic Score, from 1 to 7. The scores 1 to 2 gives the regime the classification Consolidated Democracy. The score of 3 classifies the regime as a Semi-Consolidated Democracy. The score of 4 classifies the regime as a Transitional Government or Hybrid Regime, the score of 5 as a Semi-Consolidated Authoritarian Regime, and the scores from 6 to 7 classifies the regime as a Consolidated Authoritarian Regime. It is therefore clear that the indexes from Freedom House provides well thought out measurements and terminologies. The criticism against Freedom House however is that they are sympathetic and biased towards regimes that are supportive of US interests.

The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) posts annual reports regarding the democracy in 167 countries. The ambition of this index is to present a more comprehensive democracy index, index which includes more informal democratic aspects in comparison to Freedom House’s reports, and the minimalistic definitions of political democracy of Robert Dahl’s eight attributes. The index is based on five categories: Free and fair competitive elections, the basic requirement for any political democratic regime; Civil liberties, such as freedom of speech and freedom of expression, are embodied in democratic constitutions and the protection of these human rights have been widely accepted; Functioning of government, if democratic decisions are not

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid.
implemented then the concept of democracy loses its meaning; *Political culture*, crucial for the legitimacy and the sustainability of democracy; and *Participation*, necessary component as apathy and abstention are inimical to democracy.\textsuperscript{55}

Each category then receives the score from 0 to 10. All scores are then calculated together to provide for an aggregate score, the *Overall Score*. If a regime receives a score between 0 & 3.99 then it will be classified as an *Authoritarian Regime*. If it scores between 4 to 5.99, it will be classified as a *Hybrid Regime*. If it scores between 6 & 7.99 it will be classified as *Flawed Democracy*. And, finally, if it receives a score between 8 & 10 it will be classified as *Full Democracy*. The criticism of this index is that it does not provide a report or any insight to why the regimes received the scores they did, nor any reports explaining why a country’s score declined or improved as it did.

An important aspect of measuring data and for the research design is that it needs to be reliable as well as valid. Reliability means that the indicator consistently comes up with the same results.\textsuperscript{56} If the results fluctuate wildly then that means that the results are unreliable. Validity for the measurements depends on the way it is used and the sample for which it is being used, but refers to the credibility of the research. There are three basic ways of assessing validity. As described by de Vaus,\textsuperscript{58} these are: *criterion validity*, how well a measure predicts the outcome for another measure; *content validity*, how well a measure represents the different aspects of the concept as we have defined it; and *construct validity*, how well the results obtained from the measures fit with theoretical expectations. Measures will never be perfectly reliable nor perfectly valid. These concepts are created to maximize the validity of a research. The validity and reliability of measurements for this essay have been heavily implemented and taken into consideration, and with the operationalization of the democratic theory, along with the material measured, the belief is that this research maintains a good balance of these two concepts.


\textsuperscript{58} Ibid. 29–31
3.3 Delimitations

As this research does not intend to cover all regimes that have been trying to implement democracy, this section intends to motivate and present the choices of delimitations that has been made for this essay. First to be accounted for is the choice of studying and researching democracy rather than other theories and systems of governance. Democracy is a phenomenon which has affected all spheres of life for millennia. The idea of democracy has existed for so long and has impacted our everyday life and personal beliefs. Democracy is in its core such a simple and understandable principle, to let the people rule, but becomes so fascinatingly complex the more we try to implement the theory in practice. Democracy is interconnected with so many theoretical and empirical assumptions, which have been revised and challenged over the course of history, and has shown that it often is anything but unambiguous. The reason to why Bosnia and Herzegovina has been chosen as research subject for this essay lies in its complex political system, and having first-hand experience with the situation in BiH.

Another delimitation to be found is the use of Robert Dahl’s eight attributes for a political democratic regime. Robert Dahl is highly respected in the field of democratic studies and his democratic theory and terminology has often been cited by previous research and fellow academics. The eight guarantees also present an operationalization of the democratic theory and constitutes a guideline for measuring collected empirical data for this research.

This research will measure data from before the elections in 2014 and after the elections. The reason to why I will conduct the research based around the elections in 2014 is that one of the aims for this study is to look at the recent democratic developments that has taken place in BiH. By looking in to the developments of democratic progress that took place before the elections at 2014 and then investigate whether the elections helped impact the democratic progress, the essay will be able to present results that can be generalized for democratic developments in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Specifically, the years that have been chosen from the indexes for analysis are 2012, 2013, 2015 & 2016. My motivation for choosing these specific years is that these can provide much data on what state the democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina
was in just before the elections of 2014, and what changes, if any, has been made after the elections.
4. Results & Analysis

We are now at the stage where the theory, its operationalization, the method, and the research design for this essay has been accounted for and the time has come to present the results that have been provided by the gathered data. This chapter will be divided by sub-sections for each of Dahl’s eight attributes, presenting and analyzing the results from the data of each source, before it is all being tied together to present a full-scale analysis for this research. After the guarantees have been accounted for, the essay will present the index and data from Freedom House’s *Nations in Transit* and EIU’s Democracy Index to understand how the development for democracy has been like in Bosnia and Herzegovina before and after the 2014 elections.

4.1 The Eight Institutional Guarantees

Having gained an understanding for the complexity of the political system in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is now time to present the data and tie it all together with Robert Dahl’s eight institutional guarantees to understand if the political system in Bosnia and Herzegovina fulfills the guarantees required to be regarded as a political democratic regime, as according to Dahl.

4.1.1 Freedom to Form and Join Organizations

The constitution of BiH provides freedoms of assembly and association. The governments at the various levels usually respects this right, and allows political parties to operate and organize freely. The political arena is however ethnically segregated, where Bosniaks and Bosnian Croats dominate the politics in FBiH while Bosnian Serbs dominate the politics in Republika Srpska. It can thus be understood that the

---
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constitution provides the freedom to form and join organizations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, fulfilling this institutional guarantee.

### 4.1.2 Freedom of Expression

The constitution of BiH states that all citizens of BiH are entitled to express their opinion, a right which in practice is denied to minorities living in the different territories, for example Bosniaks and Croats living in Republika Srpska and Serbs in FBiH, which is a prominent factor in all spheres of life. The human rights annex to the Dayton Peace Accords and the constitution of BiH provide for freedom of the press, a right which is not always respected. The media outlets and its journalists have been heavily financially and politically pressured, and its journalists and editors have been subjected to intimidation and threats. To survive the high unemployment and low salaries many media outlets have resorted to public financing, threatening their professional integrity. The media independence and self-censorship are key factors to the implementation of freedom of expression. While the constitution provides freedom of expression and, supported by the Dayton Peace Agreement, the freedom of press, these rights are often not respected and challenged in the political, social, and judicial sector. The freedom of the press cannot be declared as free in the current political and financial arena of BiH while being constantly manipulated and pressured from all angles. By accounting for all these factors, we can make the judgement that the regime of BiH does not fulfill this criterion.

### 4.1.3 Right to Vote

Ethnicity based restrictions on the right to vote are still an issue in the legal framework. Voters in Republika Srpska can only vote for a Serb candidate for the presidency, and voters in FBiH can only vote for either a Bosniak or Croat candidate. As earlier mentioned only citizens that are recognized as one of the three constituent people can run for the state presidency and to be elected to the House of Peoples. These discriminatory provisions have not been amended, even after the European Commission.

---
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of Human Rights ruling in the case Sejdic-Finci\textsuperscript{65} required Bosnia and Herzegovina to do so. Gathered data have reported that the elections of 2014 implemented the most fundamental dimensions of democratic elections, allowing the citizens to vote freely for their representatives. The judgement is that BiH does provide its citizens the right to vote and thus fulfills this criterion.

4.1.4 Eligibility for Public Office

The ethnical restrictions and limitations are noticeable for this criterion. Only citizens that are recognized as one of the three constituent people are eligible to run for the state presidency and to be elected to the House of Peoples. The citizenship of BiH does not only include these three main ethnic groups however.\textsuperscript{66} There are many other citizens who recognizes themselves outside of the main ethnic groups, as, for example, Bosnian Roman or Bosnian Jew.\textsuperscript{67} This regime can then be understood as not fully inclusive, leaving some of its citizens outside of this aspect of political process. It can therefore be understood as that BiH does not fulfill this criterion.

4.1.5 Right of Political Leaders to Compete for Support

Bosnia and Herzegovina has a multi-party system, where political parties and leaders needs continuous social support and are competing for support, and the constitution allows political parties to organize and operate freely.\textsuperscript{68} The characteristic for the party competition in BiH is that they take place in ethnically homogenous territories and there is no inter-ethnic competition for support and votes, displaying the ethnic-political issues that have correlated with many fundamental problems of BiH’s political system\textsuperscript{69}. As political leaders then have the right to compete for support, we can conclude that BiH fulfills this criterion.

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{69} Pejanovic, Mirko. The Dayton Peace Agreement and the Development of Political Pluralism in Bosnia and Herzegovina. International institute for Middle East and Balkan Studies. Date unknown.
4.1.6 Alternative Sources of Information

The constitution of BiH guarantees free speech and free press, which are fundamental to public expression and alternative sources of information, but these rights are under heavy political and financial pressure. Some political parties indirectly censored the media and helped influence editorial policies of some media outlets to publish items with help of advertisement and propaganda in line with their own interests, thus causing some media outlets to practice self-censorship\(^{70}\). An oversaturated media market, where around 400 journalists are being trained and when the need for journalists in the market are even less than that, has resulted in financial and political pressure. For the media outlets to survive, many have resorted to public financing, such as financing from public companies, which threatens their professional integrity\(^{71}\). Media outlets have been limited to their access to official information and have been threatened with loss of advertising, thus losing the main financial income\(^{72}\).

Low salaries and high unemployment in the media sector has been a problem for years in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Media reporting has remained deeply divided politically and ethnically, resulting in a lack of solidarity among journalists and the diminishing of their organizational power. Media consumption has been rising as a direct result of the widespread use of smartphones, but ownership of online media is unregulated and without an effective oversight, which allows for political control over these websites and copyright violations.\(^{73}\)


We can clearly see that the state of the media sector in BiH is damaged and divided, with little hope for changes to the better in the future. The media market is underpaid and displays high unemployment among journalists and editors. Media outlets are being controlled by political parties and officials, diminishing their professional integrity. These factors are fundamental to alternative information. This criterion provides an unambiguous answer, as the constitution guarantees the right of free speech and freedom of the press, but these rights are not respected in practice because of the contradictory structure of the political system. Because of this unambiguity, we can conclude that BiH does not indeed fulfil this criterion.

4.1.7 Free and Fair Elections

The constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina only allows citizens which recognize themselves as one of the three main ethnic groups (Bosniaks, Bosnian Croats, and Bosnian Serbs) to run for the state level presidency and for the House of Peoples Parliamentary Assembly. Even after this was declared as a violating practice of human rights from the European Court of Human Rights, no steps were taken to resolve this issue. The elections have been deemed generally fair and free, allowing citizens to choose their representatives freely. As mentioned, the party system in BiH is based on a multi-party system, meaning that multiple parties compete for votes during the national and local elections. Since BiH has implemented electoral procedures that are dependent on votes, and has implemented a multi-party system which creates political competition and opposition, we can conclude that BiH therefore fulfills this criterion.

4.1.8 Institutions for making Government Policies depend on Votes and Other Expression of Preference

The central state government constitution is conducted by recognized constitutional norms. BiH’s current constitution was signed in 1995 after the war and is the Annex IV
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of the Dayton Agreement\textsuperscript{78}, meaning that the constitution is part of a larger international peace agreement. The legislative power is vested in the bicameral Parliamentary Assembly of Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as in the Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina, while the executive power is exercised by the Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The judiciary is coordinated by the Ministry of Justice of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The constitution therefore implements a horizontal power distribution to the political system, with allocation of power to functionally autonomous executive, legislative and judicial organs.\textsuperscript{79}

These institutions lack efficiency however, especially in the legislate branch. Bosnia and Herzegovina having four different administrative levels (the central state, Republika Srpska, Federation of Bosnia, and the Brcko District) creates frequent conflicts of jurisdiction and plagues the court system with political pressure, backlogs, and lack of staff. Trials can be stalled for years while prosecutors’ offices and the courts keep trading important cases back and forth, trying to avoid responsibility. Many high-profile cases are unsuccessful due to procedural mistakes, such as missing documents. The judicial system is overwhelmed with old cases and, in addition to this, 91 verdicts of the Constitutional Court have not been implemented by authorities from both entities. Several judicial employees, including three judges, were accused in 2015 of taking bribes and were accused for abuse of office.\textsuperscript{80} \textsuperscript{81}

The legislature has three key roles to perform. These three key roles are: representation of the citizens, oversight of the government, and passing effective legislation. We have earlier discussed how the reform process is slow and inefficient, and those reforms that have been implemented have not contributed nor caused any major changes or helped with major progress in BiH’s political issues. Effective legislature is a key contributor

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid.
for good governance and is necessary to uphold and implement democratic principles and policies for a regime. The legislature of BiH can then be understood as inefficient. The national governance has been characterized by political stalemates, deadlocks, as well as personal disputes, overshadowing important economic and social issues while also obstructing any form of progress towards effective governance and effective decision-making. The local governments are subjected to political pressure as they are funded and financed from several sources, such as local revenues and taxes as well as transfers, donations, and grant from highly influential people. Overlapping jurisdiction and unclear power distribution between the ten cantons, the country’s administrative divisions, has characterized the local governments. Furthermore, the local governments have failed to provide updated and transparent information, which usually contains propaganda promoting different political leaders instead of publishing relevant information on local services.

The attempts to progress towards an EU membership also failed as political authorities failed to take any concrete steps of the Statement of Commitment agreement signed by the Presidency in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2015. This criterion provides another unambiguous answer, as BiH has the required institutions and have the horizontal power distribution between these institutions and the administrative level, which are necessary for a democratic regime. However, accounting for all these factors, we can conclude that BiH does not fulfill this criterion as its institutions are neither efficient or completely responsive to its citizens.

82 Ibid.
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4.1.9 Regime Type

Now that the criterions have been measured and analyzed for, it is time to consider the type of regime that BiH can be classified as in accordance to these eight guarantees. The two dimensions earlier presented, though not sufficient enough, will help us understand how we should classify the BiH regime. From the results, we can see that not all criterions have been fulfilled, and that Bosnia and Herzegovina as a regime is not fully inclusive nor has it fully liberalized public contestation. This then means that the regime of BiH would place itself somewhere along in the middle sphere of the two dimensions, which are unspecified and unclassified regimes in Robert Dahl’s theory. But as the results have shown, the relevant terminology for this regime would be a hybrid regime, one that is ideologically striving to reach full inclusiveness and full liberalization but one that in practice falls short of achieving this goal. BiH could not really be classified as a competitive oligarchy, nor a closed hegemony, or even an inclusive hegemony. We cannot classify the regime as a polyarchy either, meaning that BiH is located somewhere in the space bounded by the two dimensions.  

---

4.2 The Development of Political Democracy in BiH

Having presented and accounted for the results regarding whether the regime of Bosnia and Herzegovina can be regarded as a political democratic regime, or polyarchy, it is now time to look at the how the development of democratic progress has been before and after the elections in 2014. Indexes from Freedom House and EIU have been chosen to present the data.

4.2.1 Freedom House’s Nations in Transit

Freedom House provides annual reports regarding the democratic progress in regimes, reports that are called Nations in Transit (NIT). Consequently, this report covers political and civil rights, such as electoral process and associational rights, as well as topics such as independent media and democratic governance. Because Freedom House covers more formal aspects of democracy, rather than covering informal ways of influence and power relations, the results gathered from their reports will be compared with EIU’s Democracy Index and the documentations and reports from other respected organizations. The reports from Freedom House provides, however, well measured guidelines and data for understanding the situation of democracy in a regime.

The results for Bosnia and Herzegovina in Freedom House’s Nations in Transit report will be presented in table 4.1. After the results have been presented, a shorter explanation will be conducted for these specific results. A small reminder before presenting the tables is that the scores for Nations in Transit follows a scale between 1 to 7, where 1 stands for the best democratic progress while 7 for the worst, and are measured in seven different categories, where the aggregate result from these categories are presented as Democracy Score. The official status of a country is then being categorized between Consolidated Democracy; Semi-Consolidated Democracy; Transitional Government or Hybrid Regime; Semi-Consolidated Authoritarian Regime; and Consolidated Authoritarian Regime.
Table 4.1. Freedom House’s Democracy Rating for Bosnia and Herzegovina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Democratic Governance</td>
<td>Score, 1= best democratic progress, 7= worst democratic progress</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Democratic Governance</td>
<td>Score, 1= best democratic progress, 7= worst democratic progress</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Process</td>
<td>Score, 1= best democratic progress, 7= worst democratic progress</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>Score, 1= best democratic progress, 7= worst democratic progress</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Media</td>
<td>Score, 1= best democratic progress, 7= worst democratic progress</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Framework and</td>
<td>Score, 1= best democratic progress, 7= worst democratic progress</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Score, 1= best democratic progress, 7= worst democratic progress</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Score</td>
<td>Score, 1= best democratic progress, 7= worst democratic progress</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we can read from this table is that the score for the indicator *National Democratic Governance* received a score of 5.50 for both 2012 & 2013 and declined to 5.75 in 2015 & 2016. The indicator *Local Democratic Governance* consistently scored 4.75 for all measured years. The *Electoral Process* consistently scored 3.25 for all measured years. *Civil Society* scored 3.50 for all measured years. *Independent Media* scored 4.75 throughout all measured years. *Judicial Framework and Independence* scored 4.25 in 2012 & 2013, and declined to 4.50 in 2015 & 2016. *Corruption* scored 4.50 in 2012, declined in 2013 to 4.75 and held this score in 2015 before declining once again to 5.00 in 2016. The *Democracy Score* shows steady decline for every year. In 2012, it received a score of 4.36; in 2013 4.39; in 2015 4.46; and in 2016 it received the score 4.50. This shows that the democratic progress in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been declining for each year, with its political system getting caught up in its inability to demand responsibility from authorities for each governmental and political institution. There are few ways that citizens can affect the political arena, all which are systematically designed to be inefficient, and no authority is ready to claim any responsibility for the issues. There is no authority that are serious to resolve the issues of the ethnic and social divisions which plague the whole country in all segments of life.

The data presented showed no progress and mostly regression for the indicators, meaning that Bosnia and Herzegovina has some way to go before being regarded as a democratic regime by Freedom House. The official Freedom House regime classification for Bosnia and Herzegovina is *Transitional Government or Hybrid Regime*.

### 4.2.2 EIU’s Democracy Index

The Economist Intelligence Unit is a British business within The Economist group providing reports such as the Democratic Index. This index is based on sixty indicators grouped in five different factors: electoral process and pluralism; political culture; the functioning of government; civil liberties; and political participation. The ambition for EIU is to create an index which does not implement a minimalistic approach to
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democracy, but rather an index with a more inclusive and wider measurements of democracy than Freedom House. The index measures 167 countries in accordance to the five indicators and, after being measured and ranked with a score between 0 (worst) to 10 (best), are categorized in either of the four regimes: Full democracy; Flawed democracy; Hybrid regime; and Authoritarian regime\(^{92}\). For a country to be ranked as a Full democracy in this index, it needs to have an overall score of between 10.0 to 8.0; for a Flawed democracy, between 7.99 to 6.0; for a Hybrid regime, between 5.99 to 4.0; and finally, for an Authoritarian regime the overall score must be between 3.99 to 0. After the results are presented, an analysis will explain the scores measured.

**Table 4.2. Bosnia and Herzegovina’s Democratic Performances\(^{93,94}\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Process and Pluralism</td>
<td>Score, 10=Full democracy, 0=Authoritarian regime</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functioning of Government</td>
<td>Score, 10=Full democracy, 0=Authoritarian regime</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Participation</td>
<td>Score, 10=Full democracy, 0=Authoritarian regime</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Liberties</td>
<td>Score, 10=Full democracy, 0=Authoritarian regime</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Culture</td>
<td>Score, 10=Full democracy, 0=Authoritarian regime</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>Score, 10=Full democracy, 0=Authoritarian regime</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{92}\) Ibid.


\(^{94}\) Ibid.
What we can read from this table is that indicator *Electoral Process and Pluralism* has a score of 6.92 in 2012, and then declines to 6.50 in 2013, where the following measured years receive the same score. The indicator *Functioning of Government* consistently scores 2.93 throughout all measured years. *Political Participation* scores 3.33 for both 2012 & 2013, which the score thereafter steadily improves to 3.89 in 2015 and to 5.0 in 2016. *Civil Liberties* scores 7.35 for 2012 & 2013, where the score thereafter declines to 6.47 in 2015 and to 6.18 in 2016. *Political Culture* scores 5.0 for both 2012 & 2013, where the score then declines to 4.38 in 2015 and to 3.75 in 2016. The *Overall score* steadily declines from 5.11 in 2012 to 5.02 in 2013 and to 4.83 in 2015, and in 2016 it improves to 4.87. The *Overall Score* shows a consistent and steady decline of democratic progress in BiH, and with all the information and data we have measured it is not hard to understand why. Bosnia and Herzegovina are thus classified as a *Hybrid Regime*, the same classification as Freedom House gave.
5. Conclusion

Now the time has come to conclude all the gathered, processed, and presented data, providing the final answers to the research questions presented at the start of this essay. The conclusion and correlation to be made from the gathered data is that Bosnia and Herzegovina can be best described as a hybrid regime, one which implements and shows promise in some fundamental aspects of democratic progress and less promise in others. With the indexes provided from Freedom House’s *Nations in Transit* and EIU’s Democracy Index, we can look at the results and understand that the development of democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina has not showed significant democratic progress. If anything, it has shown more tendencies of regression. All the materials used for this essay seems to have a common denominator which helps explain the lack of democratic progression in BiH, and this denominator is ethno-politics. Ethnical divisions, limitations, and restrictions plays a prominent role in the political and cultural frameworks of BiH. From the public office to the media section, and even in the constitution, ethno-politics can be found in every corner of the political and social arena in BiH.

As David Chandler\(^95\) displayed, the reason to why ethno-politics gained the traction it did can be traced back to the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the start of democratization in Bosnia and Herzegovina. With all the liberal freedoms BiH was enjoying as the result from the democratization, these freedoms were unrestrained from international regulation and the regime of BiH had yet to implement Western cultural values\(^96\). The lack of any regulative and cultural frameworks for democracy was the beginning of the social collapse in the country, as nationalist elites started to manipulate voters and slowing down any democratic progress for the regime\(^97\). The social collapse of BiH contributed to the destructive war that took place between 1992 and 1995.

After having analyzed and measured whether Bosnia and Herzegovina fulfills Robert Dahl’s eight guarantees, and therefore fulfills the three necessary conditions for a


\(^97\) Ibid.: 29
regime’s citizens in a political democracy or polyarchy, the results showed that the regime has indeed not fulfilled these criterions and cannot be regarded as a political democratic regime. The results classified the regime as more of a hybrid regime, one who is not fully inclusive nor fully liberalized, but one who is placed somewhere between these two dimensions. This result correlates with the hypothesis and earlier research about democratization in post-communistic states, displaying the shortcomings of the Western model of democratization in regime’s which have not adopted the universal Western cultural values and frameworks necessary for democratic progress, and ultimately leading to social collapse.

There are many challenges that lay ahead of Bosnia and Herzegovina to resolve if they want to integrate into an advanced political democratic regime. Sense of accountability amongst the political authorities and elites is one step towards this goal, to find common ground between the governing bodies, restructuring the complexity that is the political system of BiH. A stronger civil society is necessary for democratic progress, and the citizens of BiH must be provided the resources and the arena to impact the decision-making processes. A clear transparency for the citizens must be implemented from the various governing and administrative bodies, and is a necessity and an effective method of preventing the spread of corruption in the political system. The systematical ethnical restrictions and divisions is hindering the democratic progress, and will be an obstacle for any effective change or reform until it is abolished. As we can clearly see then, the challenges are many and only time will truly tell if BiH will be able to move beyond its current limitations.
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