

Comparative Governance Effectiveness Across Constitutional Systems An Analysis of Parliamentary, Presidential, Semi-Presidential, and Hybrid Models (UK, USA, France, and India)

Sangamithrai V

Independent Researcher, India

Corresponding author

Sangamithrai V, Independent Researcher, India.

Received: June 30, 2026; **Accepted:** July 13, 2026; **Published:** July 15, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines governance effectiveness across four constitutional systems: parliamentary (United Kingdom), presidential (United States), semi-presidential (France), and hybrid (India). Using a qualitative comparative case study approach based on secondary data, the research analyzes how institutional design influences governance outcomes such as stability, accountability, flexibility, and policy efficiency. The study finds that presidential systems provide stable governance through fixed executive tenure but may experience policy deadlock, whereas parliamentary systems enhance accountability and adaptability despite the possibility of executive instability. Semi-presidential systems offer a balance between executive authority and legislative responsiveness but can face institutional conflict during periods of cohabitation. India's hybrid constitutional model demonstrates adaptability and resilience within a diverse socio-political environment. The study concludes that governance effectiveness is shaped not only by constitutional design but also by political culture, historical context, and institutional flexibility. The study contributes to comparative governance literature through a multi-system analytical framework.

Keywords: Comparative Governance, Constitutional Systems, Parliamentary System, Presidential System, Hybrid Governance, Political Institutions

AI Disclosure Statement

AI-assisted tools were used during the drafting and language refinement process of this manuscript. The author reviewed, edited, and takes full responsibility for the final content, interpretations, and conclusions presented in the study.

Introduction

Constitutions serve as the foundational framework for political governance by defining institutional structures, distributing powers, and regulating the relationship between state institutions and citizens. Across the world, different constitutional systems have evolved in response to distinct historical trajectories and socio-political conditions. Among these, parliamentary, presidential, semi-presidential, and hybrid systems represent the principal models of democratic governance.

The United Kingdom exemplifies a parliamentary system characterized by the fusion of executive and legislative powers

and the principle of parliamentary sovereignty [1]. The United States operates under a presidential model, emphasizing the separation of powers and an independently elected executive. France provides an example of a semi-presidential system, combining features of both presidential and parliamentary models through a dual executive structure [2]. India represents a hybrid constitutional system that blends parliamentary mechanisms with federal and quasi-presidential features [3].

This study contributes to comparative governance literature by providing a multi-system analytical framework beyond traditional binary comparisons.

Research Question

How do different constitutional systems influence governance effectiveness in terms of stability, accountability, flexibility, and efficiency?

Objective

To comparatively evaluate how variations in institutional design affect governance outcomes across four major constitutional systems.

Citation: Sangamithrai V. Comparative Governance Effectiveness Across Constitutional Systems An Analysis of Parliamentary, Presidential, Semi-Presidential, and Hybrid Models (UK, USA, France, and India). *J Bus Econ Stud*. 2026. 3(4): 1-3. DOI: doi.org/10.61440/JBES.2026.v3.143

Literature Review

The theoretical foundations of constitutional governance can be traced back to Montesquieu (1748), who emphasized the doctrine of separation of powers as a safeguard against tyranny. A. V. Dicey highlighted parliamentary sovereignty as the defining feature of the British system [1].

Juan Linz argued that presidential systems may be prone to rigidity due to fixed executive tenure and dual legitimacy [4]. In contrast, Arend Lijphart emphasized that parliamentary systems perform effectively due to inclusiveness and flexibility. Giovanni Sartori categorized semi-presidential systems as hybrid frameworks that risk executive conflict, while Elgie highlighted issues of cohabitation [2].

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative comparative case study approach using a Most-Different Systems Design (MDSD). It examines four countries—UK, USA, France, and India—representing structurally distinct governance systems.

Data Sources

Constitutional documents, academic literature, World Bank reports, and policy studies.

Key Variables

Executive-legislative relationship, stability, accountability, and policy efficiency.

Analytical Framework

Governance effectiveness is evaluated through:

- **Stability:** Continuity of government
- **Accountability:** Executive responsibility to legislature
- **Flexibility:** Adaptability to political change
- **Efficiency:** Effectiveness in decision-making

Comparative Analysis

United Kingdom (Parliamentary System)

The UK parliamentary system ensures strong accountability through continuous legislative oversight. The executive remains directly answerable to Parliament, enhancing democratic responsibility [5]. However, reliance on legislative confidence may lead to instability during coalition governments or political fragmentation.

United States (Presidential System)

The United States presidential system provides high institutional stability through fixed executive tenure. The separation of powers prevents concentration of authority but often leads to policy gridlock, particularly during divided government [4]. This reduces flexibility in governance.

France (Semi-Presidential System)

France's semi-presidential system combines presidential authority with parliamentary accountability. This dual executive structure promotes balance but may result in conflicts during cohabitation, when the President and Prime Minister represent different political parties [2].

India (Hybrid System)

India's constitutional framework demonstrates flexibility and adaptability by combining parliamentary governance with federal features and judicial review. This hybrid system effectively accommodates socio-political diversity, although institutional imbalances may arise under dominant political majorities [3].

Comparative Table:

Dimension	UK	USA	France	India
Stability	Medium	High	Medium	Medium
Accountability	High	Medium	Medium	High
Flexibility	High	Low	Medium	High
Efficiency	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

Findings

The analysis reveals that presidential systems ensure high stability but limited flexibility [4]. Parliamentary systems provide strong accountability but may face instability [5]. Semi-presidential systems offer institutional balance but risk executive conflict [2]. Hybrid systems demonstrate adaptability, particularly in diverse political contexts.

Discussion

Governance effectiveness depends not solely on institutional design but also on political culture, party systems, and historical conditions. For example, despite structural rigidity, the United States maintains stable governance due to strong institutional traditions. Similarly, India's hybrid model exhibits resilience through constitutional flexibility and judicial oversight. This suggests that institutional performance is significantly shaped by broader socio-political factors.

Conclusion

No single constitutional system can be considered universally superior. Each system reflects a balance of strengths and weaknesses shaped by historical and institutional contexts. Parliamentary systems prioritize accountability, presidential systems emphasize stability, and hybrid systems enhance adaptability. India's constitutional framework particularly demonstrates the importance of flexibility in managing diverse societies. Governance effectiveness emerges from the interaction between institutional design and contextual factors [6-8].

References

1. Dicey AV. Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution. 1885.
2. Elgie R. Semi-Presidentialism. Oxford University Press. 2011.
3. Basu DD. Introduction to the Constitution of India. LexisNexis. 2018.
4. Linz JJ. The perils of presidentialism. Journal of Democracy. 1990. 1: 51-69.
5. Lijphart A. Patterns of democracy and governance performance. Journal of Democracy. 2012. 23: 45-59.
6. Bhagwan V, Bhushan V. World Constitution: A Comparative Study (9th ed.). Sterling Publishers. 2009.
7. Heywood A. Politics (5th ed.). Palgrave. 2019.

8. Shugart MS, Carey JM. Presidents and Assemblies: Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics. Cambridge University Press. 1992.