



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Essays on legislative decision-making in the European Union

Pourebrahimi Andouhjerdi, A.

Citation

Pourebrahimi Andouhjerdi, A. (2025, January 14). *Essays on legislative decision-making in the European Union*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4175838>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4175838>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Essays on Legislative Decision-making in the European Union

Arash Pourebrahimi

Essays on Legislative Decision-making in the European Union

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op dinsdag 14 January 2025
klokke 13:00 uur

door

Arash Pourebrahimi Andouhjerdi
geboren te Iran.

Promotor: prof. dr. M. O. Hosli

Co-promotor: dr. J.J. Kantorowicz

Promotiecommissie: prof.dr. C.L.J. Caminada
prof.dr. A.C. Verdun
prof. dr. F. J. Arregui (Pompeu Fabra University)
prof. dr. D. Finke (Aarhus University)
dr. P. van Gruisen
dr. J. S. Golub (University of Reading)

All parts of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without permission from Arash Pourebrahimi

Acknowledgement

I am deeply grateful to my promoter, Prof. Madeleine Hosli. Her extensive knowledge along with her exceptional kindness, patience, and support, greatly helped me in writing this dissertation. She encouraged me to pursue various academic activities such as visiting fellowships and presenting my research in conferences. She also provided me with many other opportunities to expand my academic career. I truly appreciate her support and trust.

I am profoundly thankful to my co-supervisor, Dr. Jaroslaw Kantorowicz. He has been incredibly generous in answering all my quantitative and career-related questions. His support was invaluable when I began assisting him in teaching a course on quantitative methods. I have always felt that he has my back, both at the university and on the football field, when he is the goalkeeper and I am the last defender to lose the ball, which happens more often than not. Both advisors I've had during the Ph.D. program are the best examples of how well experienced academics can help and support newcomers.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Adam Chalmers, who was my co-promoter from the beginning of my Ph.D. until he left the Netherlands. I am grateful to Prof. Peter Hall, who supervised my visiting fellowship at Harvard University. Additionally, I would like to thank Prof. Mehrzad Boroujerdi, Prof. Merih Uctum, Prof. Yüksel Sezgin, Prof. Mirjam Künkler, and Prof. Gary King, with whom I worked on a number of research projects. I would also like to thank the members of the committee for taking the time to read my thesis and for providing invaluable feedback. My sincere thanks go to Prof. Amy Verdun, Prof. Francisco Arregui, Prof. Daniel Finke, Dr. Philippe van Gruisen, and Dr. Jonathan Golub.

Ragnhild Drange and Naya Pessoa deserve my special thanks. For the past few years, I have been trying to uncover how they manage the heavy workload of coordinating the MSc International Relations and Diplomacy (MIRD) program at Leiden University. The answer is hard work, teamwork, and love and support for team members and students. This is what I strive to learn from them. Finally, I would like to pay tribute to the MIRD students I have had the pleasure of working with in various classes. Their determination and passion to make the world a better place give me hope for the future.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	5
ABSTRACT:.....	11
1. INTRODUCTION.....	12
1.2 THE CONSENSUS MODEL	14
1.3 A NEW DATASET ON EU LEGISLATIVE DECISION-MAKING	16
1.4 POLITICIZATION AND CONTESTATION	18
1.5 VOTING ALIGNMENT IN THE COUNCIL	20
2. A CONSENSUS MODEL IN LEGISLATIVE DECISION-MAKING: THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION	22
2.1 INTRODUCTION	23
2.2 FORMAL MODELS IN EU DECISION-MAKING	26
2.3 A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE CONSENSUS MODEL	32
2.4 THE CONSENSUS MODEL	34
2.5 DEMONSTRATING AN EXAMPLE USING THE DEU DATASET	39
2.6 RESULTS.....	44
2.7 CONCLUSION.....	52
3. A NEW DATASET ON LEGISLATIVE DECISION-MAKING IN THE EUROPEAN UNION.....	54
3.1 INTRODUCTION	55
3.2 EXPLORING THE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS IN THE EU	56
3.3 EXAMINING THE DURATION OF LEGISLATIVE DECISIONS IN THE EU	64
3.4 CONTESTATION IN THE COUNCIL	71
3.5 CONCLUSION.....	83
4. POLICY DIMENSIONS AND CONTESTATION IN THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION 2010 TO 2021	85
4.1 INTRODUCTION	86
4.2 CLEAVAGES IN THE COUNCIL	88
4.3 LEGISLATIVE ACTS, VOTES AND VOTING OUTCOMES	90
4.4 DIMENSIONS OF CONTESTATION: OPERATIONALIZATION AND EVALUATION	94
4.5 POLICY DIMENSIONS AND VOTES IN THE COUNCIL OF THE EU.....	105
4.6 CONCLUSIONS.....	113
4.A. APPENDIX	117
4.A.1 Correlation Matrix.....	117
4.A.2 Robustness Check	118
5. A DYADIC METHOD TO INVESTIGATE VOTING BEHAVIOUR IN THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION	120
5.1 INTRODUCTION	121
5.2 POLICY POSITIONS AND VOTING BEHAVIOUR IN THE COUNCIL	123
5.3 A DYADIC DATASET ON COUNCIL DECISIONS.....	125
5.4 DIFFERENCES ON POLICY DIMENSIONS AND MEMBER STATE VOTING BEHAVIOUR.....	130
5.5 OTHER CLEAVAGES IN THE COUNCIL.....	136
5.6 MODEL ESTIMATES: ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	138
5.7 CONCLUSIONS.....	145
5.A. APPENDIX	147
5.A.1 Estimations for QMV cases only.....	147
5.A.2 Robustness checks.....	150
5.A.3 Standardized estimations	153

5.S.4 Multicollinearity tests.....	154
REFERENCES	155
OVERVIEW OF AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS.....	163
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	165
NEDERLANDSE ABSTRACT	166
NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING.....	167
HET CONSENSUS MODEL	167
EEN NIEUWE DATASET OVER EU WETGEVENDE BESLUITVORMING.....	169
POLITICISERING EN CONTESTATIE	171
STEM AFSTEMMING IN DE RAAD	173

List of figures:

Figure 2. 1: Utility function in which x is the distance between member state's ideal position and a possible outcome.....	35
Figure 2. 2: Players' ideal positions and saliences on Issue 4 of the DEU-III dataset	41
Figure 2. 3: Histogram of the absolute errors of the Consensus model's predictions.	45
Figure 2. 4: Histogram of the absolute errors of the baseline model's predictions.....	50
Figure 2. 5: Density function of the absolute errors of the predictions of the baseline model and the Consensus model.	51
Figure 3. 1: Council legislative decisions, 2010 - 2021.....	57
Figure 3. 2: Frequency of opinions from various EU institutions on legislative proposals, 2010-2021	61
Figure 3. 3: Distribution of duration based on year of signature for concluded EU legislative proposals	66
Figure 3. 4: Duration disparities in EU legislative proposals based on the number of readings, 2010 – 2021	67
Figure 3. 5: Duration disparities in legislative acts by act types, 2010 - 2021	68
Figure 3. 6: Duration disparities by the number of advisory bodies in legislative decision-making: 2010 – 2021	69
Figure 3. 7: Yearly proportion of EU contested proposals: 2010 – 2021.....	72
Figure 3. 8: Comparison of contestation rates among different legislative procedures in the EU, 2010 – 2021	73
Figure 3. 9: Contestation rate by voting system in Council legislative decisions, 2010-2021	74
Figure 3. 10: Contestation rate by act type in Council legislative decisions, 2010-2021	75
Figure 3. 11: Contestation rate by the number of EU advisory bodies in Council legislative decisions, 2010-2021.....	76
Figure 3. 12: Contestation rate by the round of reading in Council legislative decisions, 2010-2021	78
Figure 4. 1: Left-Right Policy Positions, EU Member States 2010 - 2021(Minimum, Average and Maximum)	97
Figure 4. 2: State-Market Positions, EU Member States 2010 to 2021 (Minimum, Average and Maximum).....	98
Figure 4. 3: Liberty-Authority Positions, EU Member States 2010 to 2021 (Minimum, Average and Maximum)	99
Figure 4. 4: EU Anti-Pro Positions, EU Member States 2010 to 2021 (Minimum, Average and Maximum)	100
Figure 4. 5: Aggregate Left-Right Policy Positions of the Council from 2010 to 2021.....	101
Figure 4. 6: Aggregate State-Market Policy Positions of the Council from 2010 to 2021	102
Figure 4. 7: Aggregate Liberty-Authority Policy Positions of the Council from 2010 to 2021.....	103
Figure 4. 8: Aggregate EU Anti-Pro Policy Positions of the Council from 2010 to 2021.....	104
Figure 5. 1: Comparative Distribution of Distances on Three Policy Dimensions, Council of the EU 2010 – 2021	133
Figure 5. 2: Scatterplots for Distances of Governments with each Dyad on Different Policy Dimensions, Council of the EU 2020 - 2021.....	134
Figure 5. 3: Euclidean Distance between Governments on Three Policy Dimensions Combined, 2010 – 2021.....	135

List of tables:

Table 2. 1: Mean absolute errors of the Consensus model's predictions by legislation type	46
Table 2. 2: Mean absolute errors of the Consensus model's predictions by legislation procedure.....	47
Table 2. 3: Mean absolute errors of the Consensus model's predictions by legislation voting rule	47
Table 3. 1: Council legislative decisions by type of legislative procedure, 2010 - 2021	58
Table 3. 2: Council legislative decisions by voting rule, 2010 - 2021	59
Table 3. 3: Council legislative decisions by act type, 2010 – 2021	60
Table 3. 4: Distribution of EU legislative proposals by policy area, 2010 – 2021	62
Table 3. 5: Distribution of legislative proposals by EU Council configuration, 2010 - 2021	64
Table 3. 6: Duration summary based on policy areas for legislative proposals in the EU: 2010 – 2021	70
Table 3. 7: Duration summary based on Council configurations for legislative proposals in the EU: 2010 – 2021	70
Table 3. 8: Contestation rates by policy areas in Council legislative decisions, 2010 – 2021.....	79
Table 3. 9: Contestation rates by Council configurations in Council legislative decisions, 2010 – 2021	79
Table 3. 10: Voting records of member states in the Council of the EU, 2010 – 2021. Sorted from highest to lowest contestation rate.	81
Table 3. 11: Voting alignment among Member States in the Council of the EU, 2010 – 2021	82
Table 4. 1: Vote Choice by EU Member States in the Council, 2010-2021.....	91
Table 4. 2: Relations between Negative Statements and Vote Decisions, Council 2010 - 2021.....	93
Table 4. 3: Explaining Contestation in the Council. Ordered Logistic Models, 2010 - 2021	111
Table 4. A. 1: Correlation Matrix	117
Table 4. A. 2: Explaining Contestation in the Council. Ordered Logistic Models, 2010 – 2021.	118
Table 5. 1: Votes in the Council of the EU 2010 to 2021: in favour, abstention or against	127
Table 5. 2: Vote Choice in the Council of the EU 2010-2021: Support compared to opposition.	127
Table 5. 3: Votes in the Council 2010 to 2021: Categories in favour, abstention, opposition (against)	128
Table 5. 4: Frequency and Percentage of Decision Distances, Council of the EU 2010 - 2021.....	129
Table 5. 5: Categorization of EU Member State Positions on three Policy Dimensions	130
Table 5. 6: Descriptive Statistics for Government Locations on Three Policy Dimensions, Council of the EU 2010 – 2021.....	132
Table 5. 7: Results of Models One and Two (Random Effects Binary Logistic Regression) in which the dependent variable is binary and can take the value one if both member states in a dyad take the same decision in terms of supporting (or not supporting) the legislative act.	139
Table 5. 8: Results of Models Three and Four (Random Effects Binary Logistic Regression) in which the dependent variable is binary and takes the value one if both member states take the same voting decision.....	141
Table 5. 9: Results of Models Five and Six (Ordinal Logistic Regression) in which the dependent variable is the distance between member states' voting decisions	143
Table 5. A. 1: Results of Models One and Two (Random Effects Binary Logistic Regression) for QMV observations only.....	147
Table 5. A. 2: Results of Models Three and Four (Random Effects Binary Logistic Regression) for QMV observations only.	148
Table 5. A. 3: Results of Models Five and Six (Random Effects Binary Logistic Regression) for QMV observations only.	149
Table 5. A. 4: Results of robust estimations of Models One and Two.....	150
Table 5. A. 5: Results of robust estimations of Models Three and Four.....	151
Table 5. A. 6: Results of robust estimations of Models Five and Six.	152
Table 5. A. 7: Results of standardized estimations.....	153
Table 5. A. 8: Correlation matrix for independent variables of interest	154
Table 5. A. 9: Variance inflation factor (VIF).....	154

List of abbreviations and acronyms:

CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
COREPER	Committee of Permanent Representatives
DEU	Decision-making in the European Union
Ecofin	Economic and Financial Affairs Council
EP	European Parliament
EU	European Union
GMO	Genetically Modified Organisms
GNI	Gross National Income
OLP	Ordinary Legislative Procedures
QMV	Qualified Majority Voting
UK	United Kingdom