



V-Dem Lunch Seminars Spring 2019 Detailed Schedule

The Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Institute is hosting several leading scholars on democratization and democracy during Spring 2019. Please find below information about the scholars, research, duration of stay and scheduled seminars.

Time: 12.00-13.00

Adress: Stora Skansen (B336), Sprängkullsgatan 19, Gothenburg, Sweden

9 January: Fernando Casal Bertoa (visiting scholar 7-11 January)

Title: Sickness or Symptom? The Crisis of Representative Democracy and the Rise of Anti-establishment Parties

Abstract: That political parties are in a deep crisis is nothing new. The number of works foreseeing the decline of representative democracy and trying to explain the rise of populist parties is copious. However, studies that empirically examine the causes of anti-political-establishment parties' (APEp) success or the relationship between the latter and liberal democracy are almost inexistent. This talk tries to fill a gap in the literature by answering these essential, and especially current, research questions. In order to do so, it makes use of an original dataset looking at European countries since 1848. Our results show, on the one hand, that the rise of APEp is determined by a process of de-alignment affecting traditional parties and, on the other, that the relationship between the former and the levels of democracy is negative and significant.

Bio: International Relations at the University of Nottingham (United Kingdom). He is co-director of REPRESENT: Research Centre for the Study of Parties and Democracy as well as member of the OSCE/ODIHR "Core Group of Political Party Experts", International IDEA collaborator and Venice Commission expert. His work has been published in Journal of Politics, European Journal of Political Research, Sociological Methods and Research, Electoral Studies, West European Politics, Party Politics, Democratization, European Constitutional Law Review, Political Studies Review, Government and Opposition, International Political Science Review, South European Society and Politics, East European Politics and Societies or East European Politics. He was awarded the 2017 Gordon Smith and Vincent Wright Memorial Prize, the 2017 AECPA Prize for the Best Article and the 2018 Vice-Chancellor Medal of the University of Nottingham for "exceptional achievements".

23 January: Vanessa Boese (visiting scholar 21-25 January)

Title: Patterns of Authority Over Space and Time (with Scott Gates, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Håvard Mokleiv Nygård and Håvard Strand)

Abstract: Why are some political systems riven by political instability and regime failure while other polities stably endure for decades? Focusing on the institutional composition of different political systems, we posit that the basis for political stability stems from institutional configurations that are significantly more congruent than others and instability results from incongruent institutions. Building on Gates et al (2006) and Knutsen and Nygård (2015) the new historic Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) dataset (dating back to

1790) is used to propose a novel polity type conceptualization along electoral, liberal and participatory dimensions. The three dimensions span a cube covering all regime types. An "axis of democracy" connects the perfect democracy and perfect autocracy corners of the cube. The further away a certain regime type is from the axis, the less likely it is to ever exist or - if it does, the more likely it is to fail quickly. In a second step, regime survival times are analyzed and tested using both a Cox regression as well as theoretically informed parametric functional forms, such as a Log-logistic duration model. Preliminary results suggest that non-congruent sets of institutions are less stable, i.e. the long-lasting and more consistent regimes are those located around the perfect democracy and autocracy corners of the cube. The ability of the institutional configuration to hinder competing actors from randomly seizing power is singled out as a central determinant of regime stability.

Bio: Vanessa Boese is a PhD Candidate at the School of Business and Economics, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and a visiting doctoral fellow at the Department of Economics, University of Oslo. Her work centers on the relationships between economic and political factors and armed conflict. To draw valid inference using country level data one thread of her research focuses on ensuring data validity. Her paper "How (not) to measure democracy" and "'Tis but thy name that is my enemy: on the construction of macro panel data in peace economics" (with Katrin Kamin) address the questions how to adequately quantify a social construct such as democracy for empirical cross country analyses and how to manage country naming inconsistencies between different data sets going beyond pure spelling discrepancies. Another branch of Vanessa's work centers on the adequate econometric modeling of the highly endogenous and complex international system. Her paper "Quadrangulating Peace: Democracy, Development, Trade and Conflict" (with Katrin Kamin) uses a panel vector autoregressive model to study the relationships between democracy, development, trade and conflict for a panel of 160 countries from 1960-2016. Employing Granger causality and impulse response functions it shows how movements in one variable impact the other factors over time.

6 February: Steven Finkel (visiting scholar 5-8 February)

Title: Effects of U.S. Foreign Assistance on Democracy Building, 1990-2014 (co-authors: Aníbal Pérez-Liñán, University of Notre Dame; Michael Neureiter and Chris Belasco, University of Pittsburgh)

Abstract: This paper updates an earlier assessment of the effect of United States (USAID) democracy assistance on democratic outcomes between 1990 and 2003 (Finkel et al., *World Politics* 2007), using newly available data for 145 countries in the 2001-2014 period. The analyses estimate the effect of USAID's Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance (DRG) expenditures on overall democracy using V-Dem's Electoral and Liberal Democracy indices, the effects of aid expenditures in four DRG sub-sector program areas using customized V-Dem indices, and examines the conditions that moderate the impact of DRG funding in recipient countries. The results show that US DRG assistance overall has a significant impact on democratic outcomes, but that the effect has declined considerably in the post-2001 period. The results also indicate that DRG assistance has greater impact when: levels of prior investment are lower, when investments are more stable over time, when U.S. security sector assistance to the recipient country are low, and when countries are not otherwise "backsliding" away democracy.

Bio: Dr. Steven Finkel Steven E. Finkel is the Daniel H. Wallace Professor of Political Science at the University of Pittsburgh. His areas of expertise include comparative political behavior, public opinion, democratization, and quantitative methods. He is the author of *Causal Analysis with Panel Data* (Sage Publications, 1995) as well as over 40 articles on political participation, voting behavior, and civic education in new and established democracies. Since 1997, he has conducted numerous evaluations of the effectiveness of US and other international donors' civic education programs in promoting democratic attitudes and political participation in South Africa, Poland, the Dominican Republic, and Kenya. He has also pioneered the use of survey research as an aid to peace negotiations in conflict settings such as Sri Lanka and Kosovo. Between 2004 and 2007, he conducted the first macro-comparative evaluation of the impact of all USAID democracy

assistance programs on democratic development in recipient countries (published in *World Politics*, 2007). He received his PhD in 1984 in political science from the State University of New York at Stony Brook, and taught at the University of Virginia for 21 years before joining the Pittsburgh faculty in 2005. He held a joint appointment as Professor of Applied Quantitative and Qualitative Methods from 2005-2008 at the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin, Germany. From 2001 to 2018 he served as Chair of the University of Pittsburgh's Department of Political Science.

27 February: Constanza Sanhueza Petrarca (visiting scholar 25 February – 1 March)

Title: Trust in Parliament and Political Parties and the Fortune of Mainstream Parties (Paper co-authored with Heiko Giebler and Bernhard Weßels)

Abstract: The end of the Cold War marked the triumph of democracy over autocratic rule, raising democratic hopes. Yet, quite soon, citizens' mistrust in the democratic process became a central concern (Dalton, 1999). Empirical evidence demonstrates that confidence in political institutions has indeed declined in most Western countries (Kaase, 1999; Norris, 2011; Van Erkel et al. 2016; Rose and Weßels, 2018). In the context of changing electoral markets, at the same time, party systems have experienced declining voters' support for mainstream parties (Mair et al., 2004) and increased support for populist parties as well as protest politics (Cheles, Ferguson and Vaughan 1995; Hooghe et al. 2011; Fieschi and Heywood, 2004).

Interestingly, the role of political mistrust for the decline of mainstream parties has not been empirically established but merely deduced from the fact that new parties are often supported by dissatisfied citizens. Can the decline of mainstream parties be traced back to increasing levels of mistrust? In this paper we adopt an institutional and actor-centered approach to political support and trust by investigating the effect of mistrust in parliaments and political parties on the electoral performance of mainstream parties. We examine this relationship in over 130 elections across 35 countries from 1997 to 2018 with an original dataset and a time-series cross-sectional set-up controlling for several rival explanations to establish the robustness of our findings.

Bio: Constanza Sanhueza Petrarca is a Research Fellow at the WZB Berlin Social Science Center. Constanza received her PhD from the University of Mannheim, and prior to joining the WZB she served as a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the V-Dem Institute, worked at Sciences Po Paris, with the Electoral Integrity Project at the University of Sydney, and was a Marie Curie Fellows at the University of Mannheim. Constanza is Associate Editor of *Representation*, a Journal of Representative Democracy, and has carried out consultancy work for the European Commission, USAID and other organisations. Her research interests include democracy, political institutions, voting behavior, parties, representation, migration, political text analysis and survey research.

4 March: Mario Chacón (visiting scholar 4-8 March)

Title: The Political Effects of Authoritarian Elections, Mario Chacón

Abstract: This paper investigates the joint effect of multiparty elections on patterns of state repression, popular protest, and regime stability in authoritarian regimes. The analysis is guided by a dynamic model of nondemocratic politics which incorporates the role of repression and social unrest as key determinants of regime change. Comparative statics suggests that when authoritarian elections are more competitive, state repression is less likely. In addition, when the cooptation by the liberalized regime is limited, these type of elections can lead to a full-scale democratization. Using a panel of countries during the post-Cold War period we show that an increase in the competitiveness of authoritarian elections, decreases the likelihood of repression, has no apparent effect on the incidence of opposition protests, and increases the chances of democracy. These effects are robust and consistent with the motivating theory.

Bio: Mario Chacón is an Assistant Professor of Politics at the New York University Abu Dhabi and faculty fellow of the Politics Department at NYU. He studies historical political economy, political development, and armed conflict, particularly in Latin America and the US South. Currently, Chacon is doing work on the determinants of selective political violence in Colombia, on the economic and political consequences of democratization, as well as investigating the long-lasting effects of civil wars. He obtained a Ph.D. in Political Science from Yale University and a M.A. in Economics from Los Andes University in Bogotá, Colombia.

6 March: Gulnaz Sharafutdinova (visiting scholar 4-8 March)

Title: The Politics of Insecure Collective Identity: Lessons From Putin's Russia

Abstract: Collective identity, or the shared sense of 'us' is a powerful political factor that is currently reverberating in various political contexts around the world. Whether it is Trump 'making America great again,' Putin rising 'Russia up from its knees,' or Orban preserving 'Europe for Europeans' – they all present themselves as embracing the will of whole peoples. All three could be called successful 'identity entrepreneurs' who responded to and shaped their audiences' perspective advancing and instantiating a sense of widely shared collective identity. The main aim of this study is to explore this issue in the context of contemporary Russian politics. I rely on focus group interviews and a survey experiment conducted in Russia in November 2017 to explore the potential of social identity theory for explaining Russian recent political developments.

Bio: Gulnaz Sharafutdinova is Reader at King's Russia Institute (King's College London). Previously, Gulnaz worked at Miami University (Ohio), where she was an associate professor of political science and international studies and an associate of the Havighurst Center for Russian and Post-Soviet Studies. Gulnaz's research interests focus on post-communist political economy, social psychology, and federalism. She is an author of *Political Consequences of Crony Capitalism Inside Russia* (Notre Dame University Press, 2010) and editor of *Soviet Society in the Era of Late Socialism, 1964-1985* (Lexington Press, 2012) as well as various journal articles. She is currently working on a book project *Securing Russia* concerned with the politics of legitimation in Putin's Russia.

20 March: Melis Laebens (visiting scholar 18-22 March)

Title: Dangerous Parties? Party Organization and the Success of Executives with Hegemonic Aspirations

Abstract: The last two decades have witnessed a remarkable increase in the number of democratically elected leaders who implement policies aiming to establish hegemonic control over political institutions and becoming dominant in the electoral arena. Leaders with hegemonic aspirations, despite governing in countries with very diverse political institutions, history and culture, adopt a similar set of policy goals and discursive styles. In general, their strategy is to remove judicial, legislative and budgetary checks on executive power, and to establish control over political discourse and public information.

Yet, the effort to implement hegemony-seeking policies is not equally successful everywhere, and produces different levels of democratic backsliding and tenure security for leaders. The present paper describes this variation and attempts to explain it. I argue that the extent to which leaders with hegemonic aspirations are successful in expanding their powers and keeping themselves in office, depends primarily on their ability to remain electorally dominant, at least until authoritarian institutions can be established and repression is normalized. This ability to establish and maintain electoral superiority while legislating a radical and polarizing institutional transformation, increases when the leader has a highly centralized political organization that can sustain direct ties with a large base of voters. The organizational capacity at the leader's disposal becomes all the more important if and when economic growth slows down.

Using the cases of the AKP government in Turkey, the PiS government in Poland and Rafael Correa's presidency in Ecuador, the paper lays out the causal mechanisms linking political organization to the success of the hegemonic-authoritarian project, and discusses the interactions between political organization and other factors that the literature suggests explain the success of executive aggrandizement: Economic growth and polarization. To do so, I rely on elite interviews conducted in all three countries, as well as on electoral data and data on legislator backgrounds.

Bio: Melis Laebens is a PhD candidate in the political science department at Yale University, and is currently a Fox Fellow at the Free University in Berlin. Her research focuses on executive aggrandizement and democratic backsliding. Her dissertation project is a comparative analysis of presidents and prime ministers who try to perpetuate themselves in power. She attempts to explain why certain executive leaders successfully remain in power while others lose elections, fail to extend their term limits or are removed irregularly. For her dissertation research, she conducted fieldwork in Turkey and Ecuador, where she interviewed politicians, journalists and experts to understand how Erdogan and Correa succeeded in creating support for and passing institutional reforms to increase their powers. Previously, she also conducted research on clientelism in rural areas of Colombia, where she resided for several months, and on voting behavior in Turkey. Before coming to Yale, she studied Economics and Political Science and International Relations at Bosphorus University in Istanbul.

3 April: Luca Tomini, Andrea Cassani (visiting scholars 1-5 April)

Title: Patterns of Contemporary Autocratization: A Cross-Regional Comparative Analysis

Abstract: Attention grows towards contemporary regime changes opposite to democratization. However, while democratization has been extensively studied, we know relatively little about how the processes of autocratization happen. Accordingly, we offer one of the firsts cross-regional comparative analyses of the forms and modes of post-Cold War processes of autocratization. The analysis builds on a framework that distinguishes the different forms of regime transition that autocratization can take and the various modes through which these processes can happen. Hence, we map geographical and historical trends of post-Cold War autocratization. Most importantly, we use Qualitative Comparative Analysis to examine the relationship between modes and forms of autocratization and to identify the prevailing paths followed by these processes of regime change. The analysis confirms that autocratization represents an increasingly relevant political phenomenon, which tends to take different forms in different regions and to "evolve" through time. Moreover, contemporary processes of autocratization unfold through combinations of multiple modes. More specifically, each form of autocratization is associated with a "core" mode that variously combines with other modes.

Bios: Andrea Cassani, PhD, is Research Fellow at the Department of Social and Political Sciences of the Università degli Studi di Milano, in Italy. His research interests include democratization, comparative authoritarianism and the relationship between political institutions and human development, with a focus on non-Western countries. His work has appeared in, among others, *International Political Science Review*, *Italian Political Science Review*, *Africa Spectrum*, *European Journal of Political Research*, *Contemporary Politics*, and *European Political Science*. He co-authored the book "Autocratization in post-Cold War political regimes", forthcoming with Palgrave Macmillan.

Luca Tomini, PhD, is Chercheur Qualifié FNRS - Research Associate Professor at the Centre d'Etude de la Vie Politique of the Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), in Belgium. He studies democratization, autocratization and the quality of democracy in European countries. His work has been published in *European Journal of Political Research*, *Europe-Asia Studies*, *Comparative European Politics*, *Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe*. He recently published the book "When democracies collapse" with Routledge. He co-

authored the book "Autocratization in post-Cold War political regimes", forthcoming with Palgrave Macmillan.

17 April: Anne Meng (visiting scholar 15-18 April)

Title: Tying the Big Man's Hands: From Personalized Rule to Institutionalized Regimes

Abstract: How can authoritarian regimes become institutionalized, such that the regime does not depend on any particular set of leaders to survive? How does a dictatorship evolve from a government run by "big men" to a system run by rules? This book examines the creation and consequences of executive constraints in authoritarian regimes. To do so, I focus on the concept of autocratic regime institutionalization - the creation of rules and procedures that tie the leader's hands. Rather than assume that institutions, such as parties or legislatures, always constrain autocrats, this book examines the creation of explicit executive constraints within constitutions and presidential cabinets. I examine these questions using new data on constitutional constraints of executive power, such as term limits and presidential succession policies, as well as informal methods of power-sharing within presidential cabinets in Sub-Saharan Africa. I argue that leaders who enter office initially weak must pursue the counter-intuitive strategy of committing to give power away in order to buy support from other elites. Such measures are most likely to persist when they empower other elites by providing them with access to the state, therefore reducing the costs of collective action. This initial period of weakness, however, ties the autocrat's hands in the long run, as institutions gain stability over time. Initially self-interested actions ultimately generate stable power-sharing arrangements that facilitate peaceful leadership succession, setting the stage for durable authoritarian rule. This project employs a wide range of evidence, including an original dataset of 46 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa from 1960-2010, formal theory, and case studies. Altogether, this book aims to paint a picture of how some dictatorships evolve from personalist strongman rule to institutionalized regimes.

Bio: Anne Meng is an Assistant Professor in the Politics Department at the University of Virginia. Her research centers on authoritarian politics, institutions and game-theoretic approaches to the study of dictatorship, with a regional focus on Sub-Saharan Africa. She is currently working on a book project on how executive constraints become established in dictatorships, primarily in state constitutions and presidential cabinets. She also has other work on democratic erosion, leadership succession, ruling parties, electoral authoritarianism, and coup proofing. She received her Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley and also holds a M.A. in Economics from Berkeley. Her work has been published in *Studies in Comparative International Development* and won the 2016 Best Paper Award from the Comparative Democratization section of the American Political Science Association.

15 May: Inken von Borzyskowski (visiting scholars 13-17 May)

Title: The Credibility Challenge: How Democracy Aid Influences Election Violence.

Abstract: The key to the impact of international election support is credibility; credible elections are less likely to turn violent. *The Credibility Challenge* provides an explanation of why and when election support can increase violence and when it can reduce it. The book answers four major questions: under what circumstances can election support influence election violence? How can election support shape the incentives of domestic actors to engage in or abstain from violence? Does support help reduce violence or increase it? And, which type of support —observation or technical assistance—is best in each instance? *The Credibility Challenge* pulls broad quantitative evidence and also qualitative case materials from Guyana, Liberia, Kenya, Sierra Leone, and Bangladesh to respond to these questions. The findings suggest that international democracy aid matters for election credibility and violence; election observers can exacerbate post-election violence if they cast doubt on election credibility; and technical election assistance helps build

electoral institutions, improves election credibility, and reduces violence. These results advance research and policy on peacebuilding and democracy promotion in new and surprising ways.

Bio: Inken von Borzyskowski is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Florida State University. Her research focuses on the domestic politics of international relations with an emphasis on international organizations and their effect on domestic conflict and elections. Specifically, her research falls into three areas: international democracy promotion; the causes and consequences of election violence; and international organizations' membership politics (withdrawals and suspensions). Her research is published or forthcoming in *International Studies Quarterly*, *British Journal of Political Science*, *Review of International Organizations*, and *Cornell University Press*. She received a Ph.D. from UW-Madison, a predoctoral fellowship from the EUI in Florence, and a postdoctoral fellowship from Free University Berlin. She has also been involved with the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) and the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP) in Washington, D.C.

For any questions, please contact Natalia Stepanova at natalia.stepanova@v-dem.net

Website: <https://www.v-dem.net>