The Arab Barometer: Taking Stock After Five Years

Amaney Jamal, Princeton University
Mark Tessler, University of Michigan

Mission, Accomplishments, Significance

The Arab Barometer Project strives to create a resource that will serve both the scholarly and policy-making communities. The assembled database is of value to both academics and policy makers who are interested in the normative and behavioral orientations of ordinary men and women in the Arab world. It enables scholars to measure and explain within-country, cross-national and cross-temporal variation. Of particular importance are views about politics and governance, religion and its political role, other countries and international affairs, and the status of women and gender relations.

All of these issues and concerns were explored in depth in the first and second wave of the Arab Barometer’s surveys, making this project the most comprehensive and timely public opinion dataset on the Arab region to date. The first wave, conducted in 2006-2007, with one survey added in 2009, was carried out in eight countries. The second wave, initiated in late 2010 and completed in fall 2011, was carried out in eleven countries.

(continued on page 4)

Afrobarometer
Robert Mattes, University of Cape Town

The Afrobarometer is a comparative series of public opinion surveys on democracy, governance, development and civil society in Africa. It is simultaneously a social science project committed to using state-of-the art methods to produce reliable attitudinal data, and a political intervention designed to give voice to ordinary Africans—who have too often been ignored by elites and policy makers in their own countries—through a dedicated program of dissemination and direct engagement with news media, elected officials and policy-makers. More than ten years after its inception, and after completing four rounds of surveys, the Afrobarometer has earned a reputation as one of the African continent’s most reliable sources of data and analysis.

History

The Afrobarometer began as an amalgamation of a survey project called the Southern African Democracy Barometer, which had been conducted in seven countries in 1999 and 2000 (Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe) by

(continued on page 9)
Asian Barometer’s Achievements, Underutilized Areas of the Survey Materials, and Future Prospects

Takashi Inoguchi, University of Tokyo

The AsiaBarometer is the most comprehensive comparative public opinion survey ever conducted in Asia, which covers East Asia, Southeast Asia, South Asia and Central Asia. The AsiaBarometer has achieved a task which had never been undertaken before and would not be feasible in the near future had the project not started, which is to carry out national sample surveys in the entire continent of Asia for a period of six years. The AsiaBarometer distinguishes itself from other survey projects in two important respects: (1) it covers the entire Asian continent, that is 31 countries except from Timor Leste and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea; (2) it focuses on daily lives of ordinary Asian peoples and peoples of three adjacent countries: Russia, Australia, and the United States. The AsiaBarometer might be as well called an Asian “quality of life” survey.

Asia is a huge continent of enormous dynamism and diversity, which is evident in its geographic, cultural, economic, political, linguistic and other dimensions. In geographical terms, the continent may be divided into East Asia (China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan), Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, Myanmar, Cambodia, Brunei), South Asia (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Bhutan, the Maldives and Afghanistan), and Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and Mongolia). In cultural terms, Asia is home to five major civilizations: Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Confucianism. In political terms, many types of political regimes coexist in the region. If the categories used in the 2011 Democracy Index as developed by the Economist Intelligence Unit are


Asian Barometer Survey

Yun-han Chu, Academia Sinica and National Taiwan University

Asian Barometer Survey (ABS) represents an indigenous initiative to develop a regional intellectual community of democracy studies based on surveying ordinary citizens. The project’s intellectual agenda is built on the premises that public attitudes and orientations toward democracy are crucial to the process of political legitimation and that political culture operates autonomously as a key factor mediating the impact of socioeconomic modernization on the evolution of the political regime, particularly in democracies.

The Asian Barometer Survey was launched under the co-directorship of Fu Hu and Yun-han Chu in 2000 to address an overriding concern for the future of democracy in Asia and an intellectual agenda which underscores the importance of the growth of mass belief in democratic legitimacy to the process of democratization. It received major funding support under R.O.C. (Taiwan) Ministry of Education Program for Promoting the Academic Excellence of Universities. This regional initiative was built on a substantial base of completed scholarly work in a number of East Asian localities. During its formative years, the ABS was known as East Asia Barometer Survey (EABS). The EABS brought together eight country teams and more than twenty leading scholars from across the region and the United States. Its U.S.-based founding members include Larry Diamond, Doh Chull Shin, Andrew Nathan, Tianjian Shi and Robert Albritton.

Between 2002 and 2003, the project successfully implemented a comparative survey encompassing eight East Asian political systems—Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, Mongolia, Hong Kong and the PRC. In each of the eight countries (or regions), our collaborating national team administered one wave of comparable country-wide survey under a common research framework and standardized survey instruments as well as research methodology.
THE AMERICAS BAROMETER BY LAPOP: WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED, WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE

Mitchell A. Seligson, Vanderbilt University
Elizabeth J. Zechmeister, Vanderbilt University

This collection of “Barometer” essays is being published within months of the 50th anniversary of the 1963 publication of Almond and Verba’s The Civic Culture. For scholars of public opinion in Latin America, The Civic Culture has special importance, as it is the seminal work that sparked the birth and development of the field. The work of Almond and Verba brought comparative survey research into the region and into the discipline more broadly, an accomplishment for which all students in the field owe their deepest gratitude.

The field has come a very long way since those pioneering efforts. Today we have the luxury of benefiting from no fewer than four regional survey projects in the Americas: the AmericasBarometer of the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP), the Latinobarómetro, the Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE) Foreign Affairs survey, and the Barómetro Iberoamericano of the Consorcio Iberoamericano de Investigaciones de Mercados y Asesoramiento (CIMA). Of these, the AmericasBarometer is the largest in geographic scope, collecting national level survey data with samples that are set at a minimum of 1,500 respondents every even year from 2004 through the present day, and covering 26 countries in the Americas in both the 2010 and 2012 rounds.


THE FLOURISHING OF OPINION BAROMETERS - THE LATINOBAROMETRO

Marta Lagos, Latinobarometro

Barometers are in fact a European product invented by the European Commission. In 1972 W.J. Schuijt, a journalist by training, who was member of European Parliament, issued a report in which he recommended the application of surveys to the population in order to know about the image of the European integration process. This formed the political support that led to the production of the surveys. Jean Jacques Rabier was given the task of starting this initiative, which was academically linked with a first generation of scholars, among whom we can count Jean Stoetzel, Ronald Inglehart, Jan Kerkhofs, Ruud de Moor, Gordon Heald, Juan Linz, Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, Jacques Rabier, and Helene Riffault.

In 1973 the first-ever pilot survey of an ongoing comparative survey research project was undertaken. Since 1974 twice a year two “standard” surveys with face-to-face interviews have been applied in all member countries (with increasing number of members over the years). In 2013 fifty years of ongoing comparative survey research will be available on the richest and most developed region of the world.

In these 50 years opinion barometers have flourished. First in Europe itself, surveying different parts of Europe before and after 1990; then in the applicant countries to the EU with the “New Democracies Barometer” and the “New Europe Barometer”, and today in what is being called Eurasia Barometer. No other region of the world has collected so much comparative public opinion information and developed so many barometer initiatives. Then the barometers flourished in the world starting with the Latinobarómetro.


(continued on page 20)
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Editors/Amaney and Tessler

FROM THE EDITORIAL BOARD, continued
(continued from page 1)

Ehrlich Eminent Scholar Chair, the support from our own Department Chair Michael Martinez, and Dean Paul D’Anieri of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

As the new lead editors, we feel both a little intimidated and greatly energized to take over the important task of facilitating and steering our conversation about the field’s progress, accomplishments, and challenges. Following in the footsteps of Michael Bernard who did such an excellent job at this, we realize that the bar is set high. We will do our utmost to live up to expectations. As before, however, we have the ever-present bastion of excellence Melissa Aten at the International Forum for Democratic Studies at the National Endowment for Democracy to support us.

This issue features a symposium on the accomplishments, challenges, and the under-explored treasures of the regional barometers across the world. We think it is a conversation worth having at this point when many of them have been in operation for more than a decade. The barometers provide scholars with a wealth of survey-based public opinion and data on attitudes on a regional basis, while at the same time many survey items are based on the same questions across the barometers. Hence, with a little bit of work, a host of issues can be addressed in cross-regional analyses as well. Support for democracy and voting may be the issues that have been explored the most but the barometers with their typically 200 or more questions covers many more issues that we have yet to analyze. For graduate students, as well as for established scholars, the barometers just keep growing in importance as a source of data with each new round. The regional spread now encompasses not only the classic Eurobarometer, the efforts in Latin America and two surveys in Asia, but also the Americas writ large, Africa and the Middle East and North Africa. Everyone was invited to contribute to this issue and we regret that the Eurobarometer opted out because of time constraints. We are proud to feature contributions from all the others in this issue. Readers may find one or more of the contributions provocative.

We as the editors do not take a position on any of them, but instead see this newsletter as a venue for scholarly discussion and debate, even spirited debate. We hope readers will appreciate our position.

The winter issue of APSA-CD will deliver a symposium on the long-lasting and immensely influential contributions of Barrington Moore. A series of his former students and disciples will be reflecting on Moore’s legacy and impact on our field. We also have issues in the works focusing on development and on colonial legacies. As always, we welcome suggestions for symposia for future issues and feedback on our work.

On behalf of the editorial committee, Staffan I. Lindberg & Benjamin Smith

Jamal and Tessler, continued
(continued from page 1)

The events of the Arab Spring (2011) clearly demonstrate the importance of Arab public opinion and the need to understand the opinions and values of ordinary men and women. For too long, at least until recently, both policymakers and students of comparative politics have looked almost exclusively at structural and elite-based phenomena when describing and seeking to understand Arab politics. Yet, despite uncertainty about what will emerge from the Arab Spring, one feature of this extraordinary revolutionary moment stands out: ordinary citizens think about politics, have predispositions, preferences and commitments, and these political orientations matter.

**Research Program and Agenda:**

Arab Barometer surveys rely on the most advanced scientific expertise in the region and were co-directed by Arab specialists who have a firm understanding of the Arab World. In order to launch the project, Arab scholars from five countries met regularly in the Middle East and the United States with the two U.S. co-PIs, Mark Tessler (Michigan) and Amaney Jamal (Princeton).

Working as a “governing committee,” this group selected the topics to be investigated, the items which would be used to measure each concept, and the appropriate refinements following a pretest of the survey instrument in each country. The group also addressed other methodological issues, such as sampling and interviewer training, as well as plans for data analysis and dissemination and outreach activities.

Yet, the Arab Barometer is not only a data collection endeavor. The data are designed to make analytical contributions to the scholarly literature in political science, in particular to

the literature on governance in non-democratic countries. As examples, we can mention two of our papers. The first, which took advantage of the first wave data, concerned political system preferences and understandings of democracy. The more recent paper examined determinants of electoral behavior and political participation. In recognition of the value of the project for political science research, the Arab Barometer received in 2009 the American Political Science Association Lijphart, Przeworski and Verba award for the best publicly available dataset in comparative politics. One should also note that the Barometer is a member of the Arab Social Science Research Council, an association that works to enhance and standardize social science research in the region, and that Barometer data are used by many Arab scholars.

Equally important, the project also forms a carefully tailored effort with two basic aims. The one is to inform policy through outreach and dissemination activities; the other is to build capacity for social science research in the Arab world. The former objective is pursued through public presentations, press releases and country reports published on the Arab Barometer website. A particularly important part of this effort is the Barometer’s cooperation with the Arab Reform Initiative (ARI) and the use of the Arab Barometer’s data in the construction of ARI’s Arab Democracy Index, which is designed to monitor democratic developments across the region. Dissemination and outreach activities also include major conferences to which both opinion leaders and the broader public are invited. For example, in summer 2012 the Barometer partnered with ARI to hold such a conference in Cairo. Another conference, scheduled for spring 2013, will be held in Doha.

In addition, the Barometer data help officials and policy-makers in the Arab world, the U.S. and elsewhere assess more systematically public views and priorities about various policy issues. For example, the Norwegian Center for Democracy Support convened in 2008 a workshop for political party leaders from six Arab countries and featured a session in which Arab Barometer data were presented and extensively discussed. More recently, following completion of the second wave, articles based on the Arab Barometer surveys in Tunisia and Egypt were prepared for dissemination through the Middle East Channel, a foreign policy website widely read by American government officials. As well, the Arab Spring stimulated publication of Barometer-based press articles in Egypt, Algeria, Lebanon and elsewhere.

An additional dimension of all of the aforementioned activities and objectives is the Arab Barometer’s participation in the Global Democracy network, which includes representation of Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa and East and South Asia. Further, the Arab Barometer works closely with the Latin Opinion Public Opinion Project (LAPOP). We share information and encourage coordination regarding survey content and methodology. At least one publication is based on a pooled analysis of data from a number of barometers. This summer, the Arab Barometer will join other regional barometers on a panel on democratic values at the 2012 meeting of the International Political Science Association in Madrid.

Finally, beyond these contributions, the Arab Barometer allows for the ongoing identification of prevailing national and cross-national trends in Arab public opinion and for the comparison of these trends to those in other regions of the world. In addition, now that the second wave of surveys has been completed and the third wave is in preparation, it will be possible to identify and assess the analytical and policy implications of temporal changes in public opinion trends in the Arab world.

Different than Other MENA Survey Projects

Besides the Arab Barometer, there are a few other polling projects in the Arab World, including the World Values Survey and the Gallup, Pew and Zogby organizations. Still, the Barometer is different from those projects due to its comprehensive character, as data collection forms only one if its components. Equally important, the Arab Barometer distinguishes itself from the other data collections efforts in the following ways:

First, the Barometer upholds the most rigorous standards of social scientific research. While other survey projects may be no less rigorous with respect to methodology, the Arab Barometer draws its overall framework from theoretical models grounded in political science inquiry. As such, the project is concerned with explanation as well as description. In part, this reflects the substantive focus of the


Arab Barometer, which gives primacy to issues of governance, political involvement, Islam and politics, gender and international and regional relations. However, the distinction is not only, or primarily, one of substantive focus. What distinguishes the Arab Barometer and the other regional barometers is their “drilling down.” This allows us to identify not only what people think, but also the experiences and forces that explain why they hold certain views or exhibit certain behavior patterns. In other words, the barometers are able to account for variance and discern causal stories, often through multi-variate and sometimes multi-level analysis.

Second, the Arab Barometer is concerned with compiling the most systematic and relevant dataset on public opinion in the Arab world. Unlike other cross-national survey projects, whose primary focus is on cross-country comparisons, our main goal is to investigate citizen attitudes and behaviors shaped by the particular experiences of the Arab and Muslim world. In consequence, the orientations and concerns of the region’s citizens guide our data collection efforts. Naturally, our secondary goal is to engage in cross-regional comparisons, but it is addressed only after we have paid adequate attention to our primary focus.

Third, no other political attitude survey project focuses exclusively on the Arab world and selects items exclusively on the basis of their importance and relevance in Arab countries. Further, by systematically covering more than half of the countries in the region, the Arab barometer permits a level of generalization that, while incomplete, goes far beyond what has been achieved by any of the other survey projects.

Fourth, the Arab Barometer is registered and managed by colleagues in the US and the Arab world. The Arab Barometer is governed by a committee on which most members are Arab scholars based in their home countries. They share leadership in all aspects, including research and instrument design, writing reports, and using the data. Connected to this are the survey training and capacity building work we are doing with some of our partners, and especially the outreach and dissemination dimension of the project. Part of the latter is our connection with the Arab Reform Initiative (ARI), with whom we share a commitment to using the data in ways that contribute to political openness and responsiveness to ordinary citizens. All of this means that the project has been developed to a very significant extent by and for the people of the region.

Fifth, as discussed, the Arab Barometer is part of the larger Global Barometer. Inter-barometer cooperation permits an unusual degree of rigorous cross-regional analysis, which in turn means that our understanding of citizen attitudes and behavior in the Arab world may both inform and be informed by insights from other world regions.

Sixth, inter-Arab linkages are another important contribution of the project. An Arab Barometer network was created in 2004, composed of scholars from Algeria, Morocco, Jordan, the Palestinian Territories, Kuwait and Egypt. Along with two U.S. scholars, these individuals work together to design and carry out public opinion surveys in each country and to organize outreach and dissemination activities in order to share findings and increase their impact. Scholars from other countries, including Yemen, the UAE, Bahrain and Oman have participated in some of the conferences and workshops at which Arab Barometer data have been presented in the region. In June 2012, the Arab Barometer team convened in Cairo Egypt to present findings from the second wave surveys. Academics, policy makers and public intellectuals from across Egypt and the Arab world attended this important conference.

A final element of this distinction concerns access to the data. While the Gallup, Zogby and others are commercial firms that contract to have their surveys done and then sell the data to recover costs and make a profit, the Arab Barometer is a purely scholarly enterprise. Committed to the free exchange of scientific information, and to the principle of assessment through replication and secondary analysis, the Arab Barometer data are being made available to the broader scholarly community. The first wave data were made available in 2009 through both ICPSR and the Arab Barometer website. Late next year we expect to release of the second wave data.

None of this is to say that the public opinion research being carried out by others is without value or merit. On the contrary, there are a number of other scholars who are making important contributions to our understanding of the attitudes, values and behavior of ordinary citizens in the Middle East, including the Arab world. As we wrote several years ago, well in advance of the Arab Spring, the number of Arab countries in which systematic political attitude research can be conducted is growing. More surveys, and better surveys, are being carried out as a result, 6.


and this is greatly to be welcomed. The region, and the discipline, can only benefit from situation. Nevertheless, for the reasons summarized above, the Arab Barometer remains unique in many ways, including its concern for explanation as well as description, the primacy it gives to governance and domestic political affairs and, perhaps above all, its firm grounding in and commitment to the Arab world.

Data and Contribution
Summarized below are the activities that have been carried out in pursuit of the overall objectives of the Arab Barometer in the region.

Monitoring Public Opinion
Representative national surveys have been conducted in eight Arab countries in the first wave (Algeria, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Yemen, and Bahrain). The Bahraini survey was carried out in 2009; all of the others were done in 2006-2007. In the second wave, surveys were conducted in eleven countries (Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, and Yemen). As already noted, these surveys provide information and insight about public attitudes and orientations relating to governance, the political role of religion, voting behavior, partisan preferences, and other dimensions of participation in political and social life. The surveys also provide information about cultural diversity, including attitudes toward different social groups, categories and nationalities; feelings of social and inter-personal trust; and the strength and locus of linguistic, religious, ethnic and national identities.

The Surveys
The interview schedule includes some items that have been used in the barometer surveys conducted in other regions of the world, and some that have been used in the World Values Survey. These “standard” items also facilitate comparison across countries and regions. In addition, the Arab Barometer includes items that pertain to the specific experiences, culture, religion, and political climate of the Arab world. Among these are detailed questions about dimensions of Islamic belief, practice and interpretation and about regional relations and conflicts. Approximately 30 percent of the items in the Arab Barometer survey instrument are from a module used in Global Barometer surveys in other world regions. Roughly 70 percent of the items were developed specifically for use in the Arab world, and among these were many items dealing with Islam and politics and international issues of concern to the Arab world. In both the first wave and the second, the interview schedule was extensively pretested and refined when needed.

Methodology
Rigorous scientific methods were employed in all aspects of the survey research process, and international standards that protect human subjects were respected. Data were collected through face-to-face interviews, and representative national samples of men and women over the age of 18 were drawn using, in most cases, multi-stage area probability sampling. More specifically, in order to produce a sampling frame in which virtually all citizens were included, geographic and administrative districts of decreasing size were selected randomly, with households and then one member of each chosen household randomly selected at the end-point. This procedure permits the application of random selection principles when direct random sampling is not possible, and information was gathered for subsequent weighting in order to adjust for the number of persons residing in the selected households. Except for the surveys in Kuwait and Bahrain, sample sizes varied between 1200 and 1500 according to the population of the country.

Key Topics and Variables
In addition to standard demographic and household information, the survey instrument questions dealt with the following topics:

- Support for democracy
- Support for political Islam
- Support for government
- Support for US policies in the region
- Support for US democracy promotion initiatives
- Support for globalization and economic integration
- Attitudes toward the U.S., other countries, and the Western culture
- Definitions of terrorism and attitudes toward terrorist groups
- Understandings and interpretations of Islam
- Tolerance and respect for diversity
- Civic engagement and associational life
- Political interest, political knowledge and political efficacy
- Interpersonal trust
- Evaluations of regimes, regime types, and political institutions
- Religiosity, religious observance and religious attachments
- The status and roles of women and gender relations
- Political and social identity
- Assessment of personal and national economic circumstances

Utilization
We do not have an accurate count of the number of papers and articles that have been prepared either using the Arab Barometer data directly or drawing upon reports posted on the Barometer website or published elsewhere. Data from the first wave of surveys were not released to the public until 2009, and...
recently collected data from the second wave are still under embargo. Even without comprehensive information, however, it is probably safe to say that the utilization of Arab Barometer data in political science research is still at an early stage.

Nevertheless, we estimate that data from the first wave have been downloaded from the website or acquired from ICPSR hundreds if not perhaps several thousand times. During the first five months of 2012, the Arab Barometer website was accessed 31,000 times, with an average of four hits per session resulting in a total of 127,000 hits. There were 12,700 downloads during this period, most of which involved papers and country reports. Data from the Arab Barometer’s first wave have also been incorporated into a larger multi-country dataset prepared by Tessler and deposited with ICPSR. Supported by a Carnegie Islamic Scholar award, the dataset focuses on attitudes, values and behavior pertaining to Islam and Governance. More broadly, although we do not have a systematic count, we are aware of dozens of papers in which Arab Barometer data are used or cited and two recent Ph.D. dissertations that draw heavily upon Arab Barometer data.

We also expect that interest in the Arab Barometer data and their use will continue to grow as a result of the recent and forthcoming international conferences, the impact of the Lijphart, Przeworski and Verba award, and publication by the Barometer team of papers and presentations based on the second wave data. All of this increases awareness of the Arab Barometer and recognition of its value.

Future Goals
The Arab Barometer strives to maintain its record of excellence in providing the most comprehensive dataset on Arab public opinion in the world. It will continue to employ state of the art social science techniques in order to collect and disseminate information and insight about Arab public opinion to both policy and academic audiences. As we embark on the third wave of surveys, the Arab Barometer hopes to expand into Arab countries that have not been represented in the project thus far. In particular, we hope it will be possible to include Libya and additional countries in the Arab gulf region. Developments unfolding in Syria may also make it possible to conduct the Arab Barometer there in 2013.

Political conditions and associated permission requirements—which exist in some countries but not in others—are the main factors that will determine the degree to which the Arab Barometer can continue to expand. In Algeria, for example, it has never been necessary to obtain official permission to conduct a national political attitude survey, whereas in Morocco such permission is needed and has been easier to obtain at some periods than others. Egypt illustrates another pattern. The country was not surveyed in the first wave of the Arab Barometer because, despite numerous requests through various channels, permission could not be obtained. After the fall of Mubarak, by contrast, permission was not required and the country was included in the second wave without difficulty. It also was not required in Tunisia in 2011, whereas there had been no possibility of gaining approval at the time the first wave of surveys was being carried out. These examples shed light on the varying conditions under which the Arab Barometer has been obligated to work and call attention to the most important factor that will determine in the future, as it has determined in the past, when and where our surveys are conducted.

There will also be a substantive expansion of the Arab Barometer, and possibly a methodological one as well. With respect to substance, the advent of the Arab Spring not only increases the centrality of the some of the questions the Barometer has already explored, such as the way people understand democracy and the role Islam should play in political affairs, it also brings forward a series of new issues, such as the response to new opportunities for political participation and the possibility of a change in the way that political institutions and leaders are evaluated. With respect to methodology, the next wave of the Arab Barometer will consider the possibilities for incorporating embedded list and priming question experiments, for gathering place-specific information about a respondent’s immediate environment, and for assessing more systematically the interaction between interviewer and interviewee. Although no decisions have as yet been made, and while some appealing innovations may turn out not to be practical, these are among the possibilities for expansion that will be considered as plans for the third wave of Arab Barometer surveys take shape in the coming months.

In collaboration with local partners in the Arab region, the Arab Barometer also plans to continue its outreach and dissemination activities, such as the 2012 Cairo conference and the 2013 Doha conference mentioned earlier. These activities are a central component of the Arab Barometer. They are designed to increase interest and awareness of the Barometer and its findings among policy makers, opinion leaders, and the general public. Part of this effort also includes preparation, in both Arabic and English, of country reports based on the Arab Barometer
data, which are written by scholars from the respective countries. All reports, as well as various other papers, are made available on the Barometer website, which is perhaps the most important vehicle for the dissemination of information. The data, when released following a period of embargo, are also made available on the website.

The Arab Barometer hopes to continue to contribute to research in the service of development and good governance. The project will thus have the greatest benefit if it increases recognition of the importance of research on public opinion and if it enhances the expertise, experience and institutional capacity needed for such research. Some of this is already in place, of course, and more will be acquired through the activities to be carried out during the third wave of the Arab Barometer surveys.

Finally, the Arab Barometer plans to continue its work with local in-country partners to strengthen social science research capacity. Although this capacity is already well-developed in some of the countries in which the project operates, this is not the case in some others. We believe that work with the Arab Barometer team provides experience and builds capacity related to the design and implementation of public opinion surveys, the analysis of survey data, and research design broadly conceived. In addition, it builds appreciation of the value of rigorous empirical social science research.

Amaney Jamal is an associate professor of politics at Princeton University and principal investigator of the Arab Barometer Project. Mark Tessler is Samuel J. Eldersveld Collegiate Professor of Political Science. He is also codirector of the Arab Barometer Project.

Mattes, continued
(continued from page 1)

Robert Mattes at the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA), with three other surveys that had been conducted in Ghana (1999), Nigeria and Uganda (2000) by Michael Bratton of Michigan State University (MSU), and E. Gyimah-Boadi of the Ghana Centre for Democratic Development (CDD-Ghana).1 After joining forces, the three subsequently added additional surveys in Mali and Tanzania (2001). Eventually, the data from all 12 of these surveys were merged into a single data set, and the surveys were re-branded as Round 1 of the Afrobarometer.


Fieldwork, project management, and other related activities have been made possible through generous support from a number of donors, especially the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the UK Department for International Development (DfID), the Netherlands Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the World Bank.

What Has Been Accomplished
Showing It Could Be Done
As late as the 1878 Berlin Conference, western geographers knew more about the topography of the moon than the interior of Africa.2 Yet as late as the 1989 fall of the Berlin Wall, much the same thing could be said about social scientists’ knowledge of ordinary Africans. As scholars of political behavior scrutinized virtually every aspect of the opinions and actions of American and European voters, we knew virtually nothing about the values, preferences or knowledge of the mass of humanity living in Africa, even though much of the continent stood on the precipice of breaking its authoritarian chains and embarking on a wide range of democratic experiments.

Part of this ignorance was due to the continent’s limited infrastructural development and high levels of poverty, which meant that many African states had limited bases of social data to use as sampling frames and poor transportation networks with which to reach national samples. But it was also due to the fact that the ideologies of Africa’s anti-colonial movements and ensuing post-independent governments left a range of bitter political legacies that to this day question the role of, and shrink the space for, independent and open intellectual inquiry, whether conducted by universities or civil society organizations. These same ideologies have bequeathed a great deal of skepticism and suspicion toward the positivist systematic empirical methodology of behavioral social science. The combination of political hostility to independent inquiry and anti-positivist hostility to empirical research has had important impacts on both the supply of, and demand for survey research in the developing world. On the supply side, it has severely reduced the stock of
scholars trained in systematic empirical research and quantitative methods in general, let alone survey research. On the demand side, it has produced a relatively innumerate and skeptical political class of elected leaders, policy-makers, civil society leaders and news journalists.

Indeed, as late as 2001, Africanist scholars reviewing an Afrobarometer application to the US National Science Foundation remained skeptical. First, they did not think that a coordinated multi-country project was feasible. Second, they doubted that Africans would reveal their true political opinions or beliefs to survey researchers. And third, everyone knows, they reasoned, that the key socio-political division in Africa ran within national societies, mostly along rural-urban and gender lines, not between the artificial states created by the Berlin Conference: so why the need to sample multiple countries?

When viewed against this backdrop, the first achievement of the Afrobarometer was simply demonstrating that it could be done. Against expectations, national research teams now regularly carry out personal interviews, as far as possible in the language of the respondent’s choice, with representative, random, stratified area probability, multi-stage samples of at least 1,200 respondents (with larger samples in countries like Nigeria or South Africa). In many places, fieldwork teams have traversed tortuous dirt or gravel roads, and on at least one occasion built their own bridge, to reach remote enumerator areas. In mountainous Lesotho, Afrobarometer researchers once rode horses to reach selected villages. While surveys have largely taken place in peaceful conditions, Ugandan sample drawers have had to work around areas marked by armed conflict, and Zimbabwean fieldworkers have been violently abused at the hands of local ruling party thugs. Nonetheless, the Afrobarometer has now interviewed over 100,000 Africans across 20 countries since 1999, with as many as four surveys in 12 of these countries. And in 2004, the project won the American Political Science Association’s Data Set Award in Comparative Politics (now called the Lijphart/Przeworski/Verba Data Set Award).

Building Capacity
From the very beginning of the project, we were conscious not to replicate colonial modes of production, employing Africans to mine raw data while shipping it outside the country to be turned into a finished product, analysed and interpreted by outsiders. The project was thus designed as a research consortium featuring three core partners (CDD-Ghana, IDASA and MSU) as well as national partner organizations based at universities, non-governmental organizations or private sector research organizations within each country who not only carried out the surveys but also who had primary responsibility for reporting first results and disseminating them within their own countries. And given the state of empirical social science in Africa, this also dictated a strong commitment to building capacity in statistical analysis and interpretation, especially amongst younger staff at partner organizations. In the early years, this goal was pursued in short sessions included in annual project workshops. In later years, the University of Cape Town began a regular four-week Afrobarometer Summer School featuring intensive introductions not only to research design and basic social statistics, but also to core literatures covered by various areas of the current questionnaire. The project regularly convenes other workshops and mentoring exchanges to build institutional capacity in other areas such as sampling, data entry and financial management.

Accordingly, primary project management has shifted over time from North America (MSU) to Africa (CDD-Ghana), with core partners at IDASA, IREEP (Benin), and the Institute for Development Studies at the University of Nairobi (Kenya). The University of Cape Town (UCT) and MSU continue to provide analytic and capacity building support services to the network.

Political Impact: Dissemination
While academic publication is an important goal, the more immediate purpose of the Afrobarometer is the political impact of giving voice to ordinary Africans and feeding results directly into policy processes. Thus, all surveys are followed by the timely release of brief topical reports and summary of results to top-level elected officials (usually including the President, selected Ministers, and top parliamentary and party officials), followed by briefings to local news organizations and civil society. Afrobarometer results have been featured in hundreds of newspaper articles, and radio and television news spots across the continent. We have also conducted many specialized workshops for interested groups, such as journalists, civic educators, civil society activists and international organizations on how to interpret and use public attitude data to inform their daily work. Moreover, the project website (www.afrobarometer.org) serves as a major portal on the project through which users from around the world access results, data, publications and a wealth of other information about the project, including an Online Data Analysis page that is accessible in English, French and Portuguese.

Scholarly Impact: Publication and Analysis
Most scholarly analyses of Afrobarometer data are initially published on our website either as policy relevant Briefing
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Papers or the more academic styled Working Papers series. There are now 130 Working Papers, over three dozen of which have been published in refereed academic and policy journals, including landmark contributions to several of the top-rated international journals in political science. Finally, we have published one full length academic book, and a new volume of selected papers is coming out later this year.

Across these various publications, Afrobarometer findings have made a number of important contributions to the study of African politics as well as the comparative study of public opinion and political behaviour.

First of all, the data have challenged many standard touchstones of the traditional Africanist literature. For instance, where most economists and political scientists had asserted that Africans were implacably opposed to the neo-liberal economic reforms of the 1990s, Afrobarometer found a far more mixed picture, with substantial popular support for price reforms and user fees, so long as they resulted in more goods on the shelves and better government services. And, as mentioned above, the African politics literature traditionally assigned heavy emphasis to the role of demographic categories, such as gender, rural-urban residence and ethnicity. While it is true that men and city dwellers tend to be more engaged and politically active, these differences tend to diminish or altogether disappear once we control for differences in formal education and access to modern news media. In contrast, we find regular and far more substantial variations in a wide range of indicators across national boundaries.

While many scholars have assumed that the original colonial borders created at the 1885 Berlin Conference and later ratified by the Organization for African Unity were artificial, Afrobarometer questions have found very high levels of national identity which appear to co-exist with strongly held social identities. But in contrast to some expectations, there is no natural tension between national and sub-group identities. The data also show that African social identities are not always focused around their ethnic or tribal group. In several countries, industrialization or intensive state interventions in education have created strong occupational and class identities.

A second major contribution has been in the area of attitudes to democracy. Analyses of Afrobarometer data found that the survey item measuring “satisfaction with democracy” that had been widely used as a measure of popular support for democracy is highly correlated with the responses to a new question developed by Afrobarometer that asks respondents to rate the extent of democracy in their country on an ordinal scale. In other words, we demonstrated that the item was actually a measure of the perceived supply of democracy, not support. Moreover, Africans are not only willing to offer opinions about the extent of democracy in their country, and extremely critical opinions, even in places like Zimbabwe, but their opinions are, in the aggregate, very consistent with expert ratings of the level of democracy provided by organizations such as Freedom House.

Indeed, we found that it is possible to use a wider range of “supply side” measures of democratic performance to develop valid and reliable indicators of the eight dimensions of Larry Diamond and Leonardo Morlino’s quality of democracy framework. And while citizen opinions converge in important respects with other expert ratings, they also diverge in important respects, which enable us to capture valid ‘insider’ measures of procedural and substantive dimensions that may be missed by expert judges and macro-level indicators.

All of this helped us draw a novel distinction between popular “demand” for democracy and its perceived “supply,” devising separate measures of each. These measures are not only empirically distinct but also have different etiologies. The perceived supply of democracy is based overwhelmingly on performance evaluations. Yet, in contrast to those who see African politics as the “politics of the belly,” the delivery of political goods (such as free and fair elections, and civil and political rights) matters far more than economic goods.

In contrast, popular demand for democracy is based largely on an overarching construct that we call cognitive awareness. Cognitive awareness includes things like formal education, news media usage, political interest and discussion, and political knowledge such as the identity of incumbents. But the single most important factor within this larger construct is respondents’ understanding of democracy. Confirming Joseph Schumpeter’s basic insight, those who conceive of democracy in substantive terms (universal access to a job and basic necessities, equal education, and a small income gap) are no more likely to prefer democracy to its alternatives or reject forms of authoritarian rule. However, those who see democracy as a set of political procedures (majority rule, regular elections, party competition, and free speech) have far greater levels of democratic demand.


The supply-demand approach is now surfacing increasingly amongst other international scholars outside the Afrobarometer network. A module on popular conceptions of democracy has been added to the most recent World Values Survey and the topic was the focus of a special set of articles in the October 2010 Journal of Democracy. Most recently, a new module has been placed on the present round of the regional projects of the Global Barometer Surveys.

Beyond these micro-level findings, analyses of Afrobarometer data have identified a series of macro-level foundations to public attitudes. For instance, while social identities are far more stable than post-modernists might anticipate, ethnic identities appear to increase in country surveys conducted closer to national elections, suggesting that candidates and political parties can in many places stimulate, if not construct identities through campaign appeals and rhetoric. Multi-level analysis has also demonstrated that national regime paths have important direct and interaction effects. Controlling for all individual level characteristics, for example, respondents from countries with a history of multiparty competition (like Ghana and Botswana) are more likely to demand democracy, while those living in countries with a history of settler oligarchy (South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe) are less likely to do so. A procedural understanding of democracy is even more important to demand in countries with a settler legacy, and the performance of the president is less important to the perceived supply in countries with a history of multiparty competition. 7 At an even deeper historical level, Afrobarometer scholars have even identified a fascinating linkage between recent variations in interpersonal trust and geographic variations in the extent of slave raiding two centuries earlier. 8

Thus, we have found evidence of citizen “learning” from at least four different sources. First, people learn about the content of democracy through cognitive awareness of public affairs. Second, people learn about the consequences of democracy through direct experience of the performance of governments and (to a lesser extent) the economy. Third, people also draw lessons about democracy from national political legacies. And finally, at least some basic norms are shaped by deep historical legacies.

Underutilized Areas

The publication and advances discussed above only scratch the surface, however, of what is available in Afrobarometer data sets (freely available from www.afrobarometer.org). While cross-national analyses have focused heavily on attitudes to democracy and governance, the data on religion, social identity and group and individual level comparisons remain under-explored. And given the profound importance of development and poverty, and the paucity of overtime series of income and expenditures surveys in Africa, the Afrobarometer index of “lived poverty” should receive far more attention and testing. Also relevant here are the extensive observational measures collected by enumerators of the quality of neighborhood or village level infrastructure and services. Finally, even as cross-national analyses push the frontiers of comparative knowledge, country experts need to test and explore how well cross-national findings hold up across differing country contexts.

Looking Forward

Because the Afrobarometer started in those multiparty systems most amenable to survey research, our ability to make inferences to “Africans” has always been somewhat limited. But as we move into a 5th Round of surveys in 2012, we have received an exciting challenge from the Mo Ibrahim Foundation, who among other things publishes an annual Index of African Governance, to expand our country coverage to 35 countries. With their help, and the support of our traditional donors, we have already conducted surveys in two new countries (Mauritius and Sierra Leone), and will also work with the Arab Barometer to do new surveys in five North African countries which will make it a truly Pan-African enterprise. We are currently carrying out a range of assessment visits to identify the remaining countries.

However, in expanding into new areas, we also encounter new challenges. In some countries, the lack of recent census data prevents drawing representative samples. In others, restrictions on non-governmental organizations make it difficult to find local partners. In still others, political instability or the lack of civil liberties limits respondents’ ability to answer questions freely. But even though the identity of the new countries which we eventually add is still unclear, the next few years promise to yield a treasure chest of new lessons about African public opinion.

Robert Mattes is a Professor of Political Studies at the University of Cape Town and cofounder and deputy director of Afrobarometer.


applied to characterize the continent’s political systems, then it turns out that the AsiaBarometer covers four full democracies (Japan, South Korea, Australia, and the United States), eight flawed democracies (Taiwan, India, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Indonesia, Mongolia, Malaysia, and the Philippines), and eight hybrid regimes (Hong Kong, Singapore, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Bhutan, Pakistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Nepal) and 10 authoritarian regimes (Russia, Kazakhstan, China, Vietnam, Tajikistan, Afghanistan, Laos, Myanmar, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan). From the economic point of view, we cover high income countries like Japan, Singapore, and Brunei, and low income countries like Afghanistan, Myanmar, and Tajikistan. 35 languages are used to carry out the AsiaBarometer, and the survey has run every year between 2003 and 2008 with a different Asian sub-region covered each year.

What Has Been Accomplished
The principal objective of the AsiaBarometer is to examine the quality of life in Asia. To pursue that objective, we have used face-to-face interviews throughout the continent. In order to describe and explain daily lives of ordinary people as embedded in a wider society, questions pertaining to such subjects as personal health, interpersonal trust and confidence in social institutions, political orientations and international relations. Inclusion of such auxiliary questions enables a researcher to make sense of the quality of life in Asia’s immensely diverse social settings. This objective has been accomplished by the AsiaBarometer.

The subsequent description of its accomplishments is divided into three categories: methodological, theoretical and substantive.

Methodologically, the fact that the surveys were conducted in 29 Asian countries (plus Hong Kong) and in three Western countries for a period of six years allowed for as many as four different types of comparative analyses. These analyses included comparisons within each sub-region of Asia, between sub-regions, between Asian and Western countries, and within each Asian country over time. Because our focus was on daily lives of ordinary people in Asia, we have been able to execute surveys of a normal kind, i.e. nation-wide random sample surveys, even though authoritarian regimes, hybrid regimes and flawed democracies amount to 27 political systems in Asia. Yet, we have been able to carry out surveys in all of 27 non-democratic Asian countries because our principle has been to accommodate a regime’s deletion of certain kinds of questions with simultaneous retention of the rest of the questionnaire. In not a single country has been our request to conduct AsiaBarometer rejected. Still, we did not ask authorities in Timor-leste and North Korea to let us carry out the AsiaBarometer. North Korea is known for rejection of such requests in principle. Timor-leste was judged to be risky for internal volatility reasons in 2002 when we considered to carry out the survey there. The fact that the AsiaBarometer has been successfully executed in such a large number of countries, including in authoritarian regimes, represents a strategic victory of the project achieved at the time when Asia was changing rapidly and in a very complex manner. If the AsiaBarometer covered only full democracies and a few flawed ones, the dynamics of Asia’s democratization could not be fully captured by the project. To achieve that task, AsiaBarometer had to survey also politically volatile countries such as Thailand, Myanmar and Nepal. As a matter of fact, we were able to analyze the Thailand’s democratization process with two surveys, one conducted before and the other after the country’s military coup of 2006.3

From the theoretical perspective, these comparisons enabled us to test a variety of theories, including those of modernization, globalization, the clash of civilizations and the Asian values hypotheses. Building on individual responses to the quality of life questions, Inoguchi/Fuji4 have proposed to divide Asian societies into a few types depending on their characterization in terms of the degree of materialism, post-materialism and public sphere dominance. The position of societies categorized within these dimension was subsequently fruitfully compared to their categorization within regime type classification provided by the Economist Intelligence Unit. One may ask at this point why we have used for our purposes the EIU classification instead of the more commonly applied regime type classifications in political science, which are Freedom House and/or Polity? The reason is that EIU political system classification criteria are more sensitive to the Asia’s enormous diversity and its ongoing rapid transformation. As far as political activism in daily life is treated as an aspect of democratic participation, our results suggest that globalization enhances democracy. Turning to the clash of civilizations hypothesis, Inoguchi/Collet5 argued after
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analyzing public opinion trends that its plausibility may have been reduced as a result of the increasing tide of globalization. In this context, the clash of values which takes place within each society becomes more pronounced than the cross-national value conflicts.6

Substantively, the AsiaBarometer has focused on the perceived quality of life among Asians. The most notable findings on the quality of life data include the following three 1) High economic achievers and highly democratic citizens of Japan, South Korea and Taiwan are the least happy in Asia and in the world whereas the lowest income getting societies of Southeast Asia are the happiest in Asia, suggesting the roles that religion and community play in reaching what John Stuart Mill calls the “happiness by the way”; 2) One might identify five societal patterns in Asia, with their qualities exhibiting certain mixes of materialism (survival), post-materialism (social relations) and public sphere (state dominance). Here materialism means survival-driven lifestyle, post-materialism means social relations-driven lifestyle and public sphere dominance means the lifestyle strongly constrained by the state’s imposition and regulation; 3) Deeply rooted in the aspects of social relations pertaining to the quality of life, interpersonal trust and confidence in social institutions are complex phenomena to gauge and assess. Empirical examinations of trust and confidence suggest that these phenomena could be to a large extent explained by broad, historically shaped and accumulated patterns of political culture, such as belief in human nature preached in Confucianism and Hinduism, individual utilitarian calculus bred under British colonialism, and compliance with social system which emerged under communist regimes.7

Underutilized Data
First, one should mention the policy priority expressed by citizens in 29 countries as to which policy area one should give first priority to, especially pension and defense. The hypothesis named “geriatric peace” by Mark Haas is being tested. By geriatric peace we mean that as the aged population increases and enhances its political voice, it starts to prioritize government spending on pensions rather than on defense. The testing of the geriatric peace hypothesis points to the need to develop more meaningful indicators tapping such socioeconomic characteristics as income, education and occupation, and the cultural characteristics of language and religion. In most Asian countries except for South Asia the long-term demographic trend of aging has already been examined. Inoguchi and Fujii empirically test the geriatric peace hypothesis country by country in Asia. The overall result seems to point to the correctness of the hypothesis. However, whether these preferences are translated and legislated into government action needs further research. The distributive dimension of life qualities needs to be analyzed systematically in order to address the increasingly controversial issue of equality and justice.8

Second, analyzing responses to interpersonal trust questions by the Chinese and Japanese, I have been developing a hypothesis about what these two national groups have in mind when asked about interpersonal trust with the question, “Do you think that people can be trusted or one cannot be too careful about other persons?” Chinese seem to have in mind primarily their family, thus receiving a higher figure of trust whereas Japanese seem to have in mind primarily unfamiliar persons outside the family, thus producing a lower figure of trust. But this is still an area where the data remains to be fully explored.

Third, multi-language surveys pose a serious question of linguistic sameness. The AsiaBarometer uses English for the master questionnaire and then translates it into 35 languages. Part of the difficulties arising in the process is due to the peculiarity of the English language. A good example is a sentence “one cannot be too careful in dealing with people”. This sentence represents two components, cannot and too, which may not be easily and accurately rendered to some local languages in one sentence. How can one assure that one’s translation of this sentence into Tamil or Burmese is correct and similarly nuanced? Another example is the range of choices available when one needs to choose one of the five options: very positive, positive, neutral, negative or very negative regarding questions like: “overall do you trust other persons?” Many Japanese respondents tend to choose neutral or at least neither very positive nor very negative especially when the context of a question is not sufficiently specified. This phenomenon makes the task of assuring cross-national linguistic sameness more difficult. To this question I do not see any pragmatic, but only disciplined answer.

Future Prospects

The AsiaBarometer has produced a substantial body of research. Most immediately forthcoming is the massive volume entitled *The Mirror That Reflects the Minds of Asian People*. One volume of approximately 1500 printed pages, this book collects many articles analyzing AsiaBarometer survey data, published in reputed journals on the quality of life. Three other books that use the AsiaBarometer data have been published on the topic.9 Reflecting on the AsiaBarometer’s products, one first of all needs to address the agenda which concerns the need to consolidate infrastructure for this kind of empirical social science projects, which require large scale data processing, analysis and storage.10

First, in the phase two, surveys will need to be conducted every year with a regular set of questions asked for every country and another set of questions asked for subregions in order to acquire more localized, contextualized and nuanced data.

Second, infrastructure building is slow but steady. Unlike the European Union-funded or sponsored polling and academic institutions, Asian institutions do not coordinate very much. Yet, one positive and encouraging sign in this regard is the steady increase in the number of academic institutions collaborating with one another. The AsiaBarometer is a very good example of such a practice. Whenever the AsiaBarometer decides to execute surveys in a country X, it is expected that locally residing academics are sought after to analyze the data, write a country profile and analyze relevant subjects. A recently conducted survey of AsiaBarometer users worldwide has revealed the need to execute AsiaBarometer regularly, say every year, and more widely. This is a challenging call.

Third, the national and global sampling methodology needs to be discussed and improved. By national sampling I mean a normal way of handling surveys using the national unit as given and comparing the national or sub-group averages. These are called cross-national surveys. By global sampling I mean a process through which global population is divided into numerous sampling blocs with similar population. Thus if one carries out a survey in the ASEAN member countries, their population size vis-a-vis the entire global population determines the number of sampled respondents. Instead of using the same amount of money for Brunei (population of approximately 300,000) and Indonesia (population of close to 300 millions), for instance, the global sampling can execute surveys with smaller costs and similar scientific credentials.

To encourage the hope for the future regarding the aforementioned two points, I would like to propose to establish an international journal of social research. While US-edited journals are “autocentric” in a sense that their own competitive dynamics often semi-automatically rejects submissions from outside, and while European solidarity of poll organization with pooled resources is admirable, one may ponder about publishing a journal of social research attuned to grasp and analyze more localized, contextualized and nuanced social behavior.

Takashi Inoguchi is Professor Emeritus at the University of Tokyo.
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In July 2001, the EABS joined with three partner projects—New Europe Barometer, Latinobarometro, and Afrobarometer—in a path-breathing effort to launch Globalbarometer Surveys (GBS), a global consortium of survey research across emerging democracies and transitional societies. Since 2004, the EABS has become a true pan–Asia survey research network with the participation of new partner teams from Indonesia, Singapore, Cambodia, Malaysia and Vietnam. Also, the Survey of the State of Democracy in South Asia, under the leadership of Yogendra Yadav, Sandeep Shastri and Suhas Pishikar of the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (in New Delhi), entered into a collaborative agreement with the EABS for the creation of a more inclusive regional survey network under the new identity of Asian Barometer Survey. The collaborative framework entails the adoption of common modules, data exchange, and joint analyzing and publishing efforts. The Asian Barometer Survey now stands as the largest link in the global survey network for the study of democracy, covering 18 political systems, more than 48% of the world population, and the bulk of the population living in the developing world. The project has also played a crucial role in deepening the collaboration between the five regional barometer surveys and forging the long-term ties with important international organizations such as the World Bank, UNDP and EU.

All ABS country surveys are conducted with face-to-face interviews of randomly selected eligible voters, in the language of the respondent’s choice. They are based on representative, random, stratified area probability, multi–stage samples of more than 1,200 respondents (with the exception of Hong Kong). Interested readers are welcome to browse the project’s website (www.asianbarometer.org) for methodological details. The first-wave survey data were cleared in August 2003 and released for public access in August 2005.

Between 2006 and 2007, the ABS completed the second wave survey in thirteen East Asian countries. In addition, the merged cross-national data from the two wave surveys were released in July 2008 and are also online retrievable. The third-wave survey for East Asia was launched in the second half of 2009. By January 2012, eleven country teams have completed their fieldwork with Cambodia and Hong Kong due to catch up with rest by the summer of 2012. The first wave survey for South Asia was carried out between October 2004 and August 2005 in India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal, and Bangladesh. The second wave survey for South Asia is currently being planned and expected to be completed by the spring of 2013.

The ABS has four major objectives: The first is to generate a region-wide base of scientifically reliable and comparable data on citizens’ views, attitudes and orientations toward political regime, democracy, governance, human security and economic reform. ABS gathers this information by means of face-to-face interviews with randomly selected samples of respondents which represent the adult population in each country. The second is to make major theoretical and substantive contributions to our understanding of a two-fold question: First, how variation in the trajectory of regime transition, macro-level properties of political systems, and the lingering influence of traditional culture can affect the impact of modernization and globalization on value change, influence the acquisition of democratic value-orientations and democratic legitimacy, and otherwise shape the ways citizens evaluate their political system and process? Second, to what extent positive orientations toward democratic (as well as non-democratic) regimes should be understood as a consequence of the capacity of political institutions to supply human security, economic well-being and good governance.

The third of ABS objectives is to strengthen institutional capacity for democracy studies using surveying the ordinary citizens in all participating countries. ABS fosters exchange of ideas, perspectives and expertise by bringing partners together for planning and analysis at national, regional, and global levels. During this process National Taiwan University is poised to become a leader in a global effort to study and analyze the process of regime transition, democratization and qualities of democratic governance.

Fourth, ABS aims to disseminate survey results to popular and policy audiences in order to enlighten the public discourse on political reform and democratization. Outreach publications and outreach programs are directed to a wide assortment of users, including decision makers, policy advocates and civic educators, journalists, academic researchers, international organizations and donor agencies concerned with democratic development.

The ABS is headquartered in Taipei and co-hosted by the Institute of Political Science of Academia Sinica and the Institute for Advanced Studies of Humanities and Social Sciences of National Taiwan University. The ABS is presently headed by Yun-han Chu as the Director and governed by the Steering Committee which is
composed of one representative from each country team plus two prominent political scientists (Andrew Nathan and Larry Diamond) acting as co-PIs without country portfolio. The ABS has received principal funding support from the two host institutions for its cross-national data-collecting activities and daily administration. The Taipei headquarters provide all key functions—intellectual leadership, methodological innovation, capacity building, central coordination, and headquarters operation—for running and building up of this region-wide research network.

The ABS has also received substantial funding support from the Henry Luce Foundation and World Bank and other national funding agencies, such as Japan’s Ministry of Education, Korean Research Foundation, and Hong Kong Research Council. It has also benefited from occasional supplemental funding support from its partner institutions, such as the Weatherhead East Asia Institute of Columbia University, the Center for Democracy, Development and Rule of Law of Stanford University, the International Forum for Democratic Studies of NED, King Prajadhipok’s Institute, and the Institute of Arts and Humanities of Shanghai Jiaotong University. The first-wave survey in South Asia was co-funded by International IDEA, the Ford Foundation and the European Union.

We have thus far published two ABS books1 and one collaborative volume.2


ABS data has served as the basis for dozens of book chapters and more than 50 peer-reviewed articles in journals such as Journal of Politics, Journal of Democracy, Electoral Studies, Asian Survey, Journal of East Asian Studies, Washington Quarterly, International Journal of Public Opinion Research, and International Political Science Review. The ABS website has released over 68 academic-style ABS Working Papers and more than 100 conference papers. To date, more than 800 scholars, graduate students and professionals have made request to use the ABS data for their research projects, dissertations or policy-related analyses. At the same time, an on-line data retrieval system based on the first-wave East Asian survey was ready for public access in February 2007.

The ABS has benefited greatly from many of its intellectual predecessors including World Values Survey and other regional barometers. It has adopted many existing batteries from other comparative surveys because of their proven measurement quality and comparability. Yet, the ABS has also made important contributions to the techniques of survey research on democracy. Our survey is especially noted for its innovation in conceptualizing and measuring a few key theoretical concepts, such as democratic legitimacy, liberal democratic value-orientation, Confucian values, and quality of democracy.

The starting point of our data collection efforts is popular conceptions of “democracy,” a cognitive issue that has been taken for granted by most students of democratization. We do not assume that ordinary citizens share one common understanding of democracy or conceive of democracy in the same way as political scientists. Before we can make sense out of our data about people’s attitudes and orientations toward “democracy,” we need to explore how people understand the concept. In our survey, we adopt both open-ended and closed-ended questions to identify the “schema” the respondents use to conceptualize democracy.

The ABS also introduced an extensive battery for measuring popular support for democracy. Like any other complex concept, democratic legitimacy consists of many attitudes. But for many years, students of democracies have relied heavily on one of the following two items for measuring popular support for democracy as a preferred political system. Either, respondents were asked to choose among three statements: “Democracy is always preferable to any other kind of government,” “Under some circumstances, an authoritarian government can be preferable to a democratic one,” and “For people like me, it does not matter whether we have a democratic or a non-democratic regime.” Or, respondents were asked to express their agreement or disagreement with the following statement, “Democracy may have its problems, but it is still the best form of government.” The two items have been widely used not only for its face validity but also for its availability for cross-regional comparison.

The ABS team contends that this prevailing measure suffers from a lack of conceptual breadth and depth, not to mention the familiar problem of yielding lower reliability as compared to multiple indicators. We have identified four other important aspects of democratic legitimacy, namely, the desire for democracy, the suitability of democracy, the efficacy of democracy, and the degree to which democracy is a priority. The desire for democracy refers to the level of democracy desired by citizens. The suitability of democracy
refers to the degree of which citizens feel that democracy is appropriate for their country. The efficacy of democracy measures how well the democratic regime is handling the country’s major problems. The priority of democracy focuses on how important democracy is as compared with other desirable societal objectives. ABS has designed specific items for measuring the four additional dimensions mentioned above and made available a five-item battery to gauge the popular foundation of democratic legitimacy.

To further probe the depth of normative commitment to liberal democracy, we found it necessary to employ questionnaire items that avoid the “d” word, because in our time the concept of “democracy” has been embraced by virtually all politicians everywhere, including leaders of non-democratic regimes. Items carrying the “d” word run the danger of eliciting what survey researchers call “socially desirable” answers from respondents. The ABS survey therefore included a series of questions that probed respondents’ value orientations toward some of the organizing principles of liberal democracy, including political equality, rule of law, political freedom, and popular accountability. Responses to this battery reveal both the substance and depth of respondents’ commitment to liberal democratic values.

Furthermore, our questionnaire design enables us to engage the Asian Values debate. We differentiate the core elements of Confucian values into two broad types, social and political. The former features social collectivism and deals primarily with the norms of interpersonal life, including filial piety and family loyalty, respect for authority based on seniority, the primacy of community over individual, and the priority of collective order over personal freedom. The latter features political paternalism and consensus. It focuses on the norms and practices of government, including those of benevolent paternalism, the moralistic role of the state, and consensual governance. Because we can employ more comprehensively developed notions of Confucianism and liberal democracy and apply them to both Confucian Asia and non-Confucian Asia, we are in a unique position to answer the following questions: To what extent do the ordinary citizens of East Asia uphold the values and norms of Confucianism? Are these norms and values unique to East Asia? And to what extent do these values and norms shape East Asian citizens’ understanding, attitudes and behavior toward liberal democratic politics under different socioeconomic conditions and political regimes?

The ABS is also the first comparative survey that initiated a fully-fledged battery for evaluation of “quality of democracy” based on citizens’ assessments. In recent years an increasing number of individual scholars and research institutions have attempted to discern the distinct qualities of democracy and distinguish high-quality democracies from low-quality ones in response to a growing sense of public discontent in both old and new democracies. The ABS battery is designed around a systematic conceptual scheme for identifying the essential properties of liberal democracy developed by Larry Diamond and Leonardo Morlino. These scholars posited that quality usually refers to one of three following things: procedure, content or results. From the perspective of procedure, they identified five dimensions: the rule of law, participation, competition and accountability, both vertical and horizontal, on which democracies vary in quality. From the perspective of quality in terms of content, they identify two dimensions: respect for civil and political freedoms and the progressive implementation of greater political equality. From the perspective of results, they identify one key dimension, i.e., responsiveness, which links the procedural to the substantive by measuring the extent to which public policies correspond to citizen demands and preferences as aggregated through the political process. During its second-wave survey the ABS developed, pilot-tested and employed a full array of indicators that correspond to these eight dimensions.

Several ABS-initiated modules are widely recognized for their value in advancing our theoretical frontier. They have been adopted by other barometer surveys and as a consequence promoted comparability across regions. Thus, the ABS data base has enabled international social science community to pursue comparative research on the region’s democratic transition and consolidation, quality of democracy, and sources of regime legitimacy. There are also many underutilized areas of the ABS survey data. For example, the ABS module contains an extensive battery measuring social capital in term of interpersonal trust, social networking, participation in communal affairs, and membership in civic organizations. Another underutilized area is democratic citizenship in terms of psychological involvement, sense of citizen empowerment, civic engagement and political participation. In addition, our battery on social cleavages (including market vs. state, free trade vs. protectionism, Westernization vs. indigenous cultural identity, as well as tensions and discrimination along ethnic and religious lines) should enable scholars to unravel why there has been an ostensible absence of “left-
right” cleavage in East Asia’s electoral politics.

The project’s next phase aims to make major theoretical and substantive contributions to our understanding of a three-fold question: First, how can the variation in the trajectory of regime transition, macro-level properties of political systems, and the lingering influence of traditional culture affect the impact of modernization and globalization on value change, influence the acquisition of democratic value-orientations and acceptance of democratic legitimacy, and otherwise shape the ways citizens evaluate their political system and process? Second, to what extent should positive orientations toward democratic (as well as non-democratic) regimes be understood as a consequence of the capacity of political institutions to supply human security, economic well-being, and good governance? And third, is the legitimacy of democratic regime necessarily more robust than legitimacy of non-democratic regimes, which include some of East Asia’s most resilient authoritarian regimes? When a regime’s legitimacy is thin, its stability is largely drawn from specific support for the authorities based on performance rather than on diffuse support for the regime. If a regime’s legitimacy is robust, its stability is based on congruence of its institutional set-ups with deep public values, which should help the regime survive periodic downturns in performance.

Yun-han Chu is Distinguished Research Fellow of the Institute of Political Science at Academia Sinica and Professor of Political Science at National Taiwan University.
Seligson and Zechmeister, continued

(continued from page 3)

Some Key Accomplishments

The AmericasBarometer is a product of a consortium of universities and think tanks throughout the Americas that we have the privilege of coordinating from our base at Vanderbilt University. We think that our survey is unique in many ways, and yet, as we point out in the second half of the essay, we believe that we still have many miles to go before feeling satisfied that we have been able to answer some of the critical questions that vex the field of comparative politics.

We also want to use this opportunity to announce that the entire series of the AmericasBarometer surveys - which includes the 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, and 2012 rounds - is available to download for free2 and without registration3 beginning December 1, 2012. Details regarding options for institutional subscribers can be found at the project website.4

Founded by Mitchell A. Seligson over two decades ago and currently directed by him with the co-direction of Elizabeth J. Zechmeister, both at Vanderbilt University, the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) has its origins in studies of democratic values in one country, Costa Rica. Those studies took place in the 1970s, a time when much of the rest of Latin America was caught in the grip of repressive regimes that largely prohibited studies of public opinion on issues related to democracy. As Latin America began to democratize, the pilot work in Costa Rica gradually expanded and coalesced into LAPOP. By the early 1990s, with support from the North-South Center, the Andrew Mellon Foundation and the Tinker Foundation, LAPOP began to carry out surveys of democratic values in all of Spanish-speaking Central America. Subsequently, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) began to support this research selectively, both in Central America (at first in Nicaragua, Guatemala, and El Salvador) and then in South America (specifically, in Paraguay and Peru). In 1998, a longer-term project was started in Bolivia. Ecuador was added in 2001 and Colombia in 2004.

Today LAPOP regularly carries out public opinion surveys in every independent country of mainland Latin America5 and much of the Caribbean, but also includes the U.S. and Canada, thus meriting the title of the “AmericasBarometer” (in Spanish, El Barómetro de las Américas). It is supported by a wide range of donors, both bilateral and multilateral.6

The AmericasBarometer includes a core series of questions that attempt to measure the underlying values that can contribute to stable democracy, including experience with and perceptions of governance. Thus, the surveys tap into the extent to which citizens in the Americas believe in the legitimacy of key government institutions, and the extent to which they are tolerant of groups that they dislike. Moreover, since participation is at the heart of democracy, we carefully measure civil society participation and social capital more generally. In addition, with the growth of decentralization efforts throughout the region, we measure participation in and satisfaction with municipal government.

Each round includes new items based on a series of special themes. For example, the 2010 round included a number of items that measured the impact of the economic crisis that began in 2008 and reactions to it. The 2012 survey focuses on ethnic, racial and gender discrimination. Moreover, we allow space in the questionnaire for our country teams to add their own country-specific questions.

The LAPOP team believes that our surveys should have pro-democratization and educational functions in and of themselves. To that end, we publish book-length studies of nearly all of the countries for each wave. These studies, known as “country reports,” are written in non-technical language, and most of the findings are illustrated with easy-to-interpret graphs and charts. Furthermore, virtually all of the studies are translated into Spanish (or French in the case of Haiti, or remain in English for the English-speaking Caribbean) and presented during public lectures and

---

2. This replaces our former system in which the raw data files were made available for free to nationals who requested the data for their own country and to those institutions and individuals who subscribed to access the entire AmericasBarometer series for a small fee. Going forward, continuing and new subscribers will receive access to a complete set of merged files, technical assistance, and Stata “do” files.

3. We know that there are many political sensitivities, so for that reason we do not ask users to sign in and identify themselves. Rather, we have a “click-license” that asks users not to use the data for commercial purposes and to respect the rights of human subjects.


5. French Guiana/Guyane, a dependency of France, is excluded.

6. The key donor has long been USAID, and our own institution, Vanderbilt University. The Inter-American Development Bank and the United Nations Development Program are also important long-term donors. More recently, the project has received support from the United States National Science Foundation and its Brazilian equivalent, the CNPq. The Swedish Development agency (SIDA) has become an important donor in recent years, as have the Université of Laval, York University, Algonquin College, as well as the Environics Institute in Canada. Finally, we have received support from U.S. academic institutions, including Duke, FIU, Princeton, Brigham Young and the Kellogg Institute at Notre Dame. The Tinker Foundation has recently provided generous funding as well.
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seminars in the countries in which the data are gathered. These events draw members of the academic community, NGOs, government policy-makers and international donors. All of the studies are available on-line in PDF format and free of charge. Hard copies of the studies are deposited in key library collections throughout the world. Another way in which we work to distribute findings from the AmericasBarometer surveys is via our Insights series, which distributes short reports that typically examine one question in the survey in comparative perspective.7

LAPOP also believes that its surveys should be of maximum utility for those in public policy positions, including international donors. To achieve this goal, we tailor the questionnaires to individual countries so that we are able to focus on country-specific democratization issues. For example, if a country has initiated a process of judicial reform or legislative restructuring, we attempt to determine the public’s knowledge about such reforms and the extent to which it supports or opposes them. The data can also be used to assess the consequences of new programs, either on their own or in conjunction with special samples and sophisticated methodological approaches such as “difference in difference” designs. Still, we also try to determine if these immediate issues link to deeper underlying attitudes toward democracy so that we can see if success in promoting a particular program helps increase the attitudinal basis of support for democratic rule.

Meeting Challenges in Survey Research

LAPOP is committed to the implementation and analysis of survey projects that are of the highest scientific quality. LAPOP always attempts to develop true national probability samples, covering urban and rural areas alike. In linguistically diverse countries, questionnaires in multiple languages are used; in Guatemala, for example, we develop the questionnaires in several Mayan languages.

The LAPOP approach begins with a common questionnaire, and carries out a rigorous series of iterative pretests. We deploy extensively trained staffers to each country. Together with a field supervisor from our partner institution they conduct a series of interviews, both in urban and rural settings. Based on the pilot, the staffer makes suggestions on changes to the questionnaire. If changes are accepted at LAPOP Central, another round of pretests is carried out and more changes are suggested and accepted or rejected, until diminishing returns set in. At that point the questionnaire is finalized and locked.

This process, which takes place over a period of about a year, produces literally hundreds of changes in new questions or in the questionnaire format, most of them minor, but the end result is a highly refined and polished instrument. LAPOP carries out many of its surveys using handheld computers with software designed by our partners at the Universidad de Costa Rica and at Ciudadanía, an NGO based in Cochabamba, Bolivia. We believe that this innovation substantially improves the quality of data entry. Most survey data on individuals (demographic, health, social, economic and political) in developing countries originate from household visits, since telephones have limited coverage and administrative records (such as social security, births, deaths, voting, disease reports, and so on) are either non-existent or of poor-quality. Armies of trained interviewers, social workers, health professionals, and others have traditionally collected such data using paper and pencil interview (PAPI) methods. Newly developed computer-aided interviewing techniques (CAPI for personal interviews and CATI for telephone interviews) are an important advance over PAPI, but they have proved to be difficult to implement in developing countries. CATI simply cannot be used for our purposes since large proportions of households do not have a telephone, or if the only phone they have is a cell phone, such a phone is impossible to geocode. Moreover, the costs of receiving a cell phone call that could last as long as an hour would be too great to impose on an interviewee (and likely would exceed the capacity of the typical cell phone battery). In turn, a major barrier to using CAPI in household visits is the high cost of laptop computers, which cannot reasonably be afforded in developing countries. Beyond the fundamental issue of cost, there are numerous other limitations to the use of laptops during data collection in developing countries, such as theft, ergonomic difficulties, and reliability.

Handheld computers share the well-known advantages of CAPI and CATI, including: full control of the flow of questions (skips and filters) and elimination of such problems as inconsistencies, being out-of-range, blank and null responses, and coding and data entry errors. They also reduce costs by eliminating paper forms and data entry, and enable immediate data retrieval. In addition, handheld computers are more likely to have built-in software that can virtually eliminate fraud by recording the real location and time of the interview and question duration. An important side-benefit of this technology is that it can improve sampling implementation by guaranteeing that the chosen

7 See: http://www.vanderbilt.edu/laop/insights.php
household is in the location specified for the sampling point that had been determined by the project’s central office. We are now in our third generation of handheld computers. The first was built for the Palm platform, which is no longer in use, the second was built for the Windows mobile platform, which is disappearing from the market, while the third and newest, which we call “Golector,” is built on the Android platform, and hence is usable on the most widely accessible hardware/software platform on the market today. This current version enables us to change the language at any point during an interview, which is a situation that occurs when a respondent “code-switches” between languages. The platform allows for control of the sample down to the block and household level, thus avoiding many sampling problems. It also allows for the easy implementation of experiments (e.g. respondents can be randomly assigned to different versions of a given question).

We believe that it is important for the datasets to become a public good so that they become accessible to the largest possible number of scholars and agencies. It is equally important for the data to be made available in a timely manner, since long embargoes can reduce the utility of the data to scholars and to those who need to make policy decisions in real time. On the other hand, sustainability of access and adherence to U.S. federal regulations governing the protection of human subjects are also factors that need to be taken into consideration.

LAPOP has expended considerable resources in order to make its data available to the broadest possible community. To achieve that objective, in addition to making available the raw datasets, LAPOP and its partners at the Universidad de Costa Rica have produced and maintain a web site that allows users to access each dataset and to produce frequency distributions, cross- tabulations with and without control variables, and OLS and Logistic regression analyses. The website allows for free analysis of the entire AmericasBarometer series (well over 100 datasets), plus other studies produced by LAPOP extending back to the 1970s.

We are heartened to see that both policymakers and academics have been making significant use of the data. Worldwide, over 3,000 individuals per month access the LAPOP web site to download datasets, country studies or Insights reports, with the heaviest usage coming from Latin America and Washington, DC. The data, for example, are being used by the World Bank Governance Indicators series, the Inter-American Development Bank for its Governance Indicators database (DataGov), the Americas Quarterly for its Social Inclusion Index, and in various reports developed by research analysts working for and within policy-making institutions. In addition, we note that the data are being used by scholars across the Americas in PhD dissertations, conference proceedings, articles and books. We ourselves have used the data to advance our understanding of political legitimacy in the Americas, to disentangle the causes and consequences of charismatic political leadership, and to identify “hot spots” for political instability in the region. Since 2008 we are aware of over 100 published or forthcoming scholarly books, chapters, and articles that make use of AmericasBarometer data, though any figure we can generate is an underestimate given that we are frequently unaware of multiple ways in which the data are being used by academic researchers. Each of these efforts contributes to our growing stock of knowledge about public opinion and political behavior across the Americas.

Looking Towards the Future

However, we can learn much more from the data, given their sheer volume and our still-limited capacity to answer key research questions. In short, we can honestly attest to the fact that there are many important research topics that remain to be tapped through analyses of the over 175,000 individual interviews that comprise the AmericasBarometer 2004-2012 series.

In tandem with the proliferation of comparative survey data, of which our regional project forms just one part, comes scholars’ ability to apply increasingly sophisticated data analyses such as multi-level modeling methods, which allow one to examine the impact of context on political opinions and behaviors. Differences across contexts are perhaps the most defining feature of comparative survey research. On the one hand, it is these differences that raise the question of cross-national equivalence, a problem that vexes all comparative research, on both institutions and public opinion. Even when rigorous and thorough pre-testing is applied, we still must consider a possibility that survey questions and the scales on which individuals record their responses may mean different things across countries and across sub-populations within countries. On the other hand, it is in detecting and offering
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explanations for differences in public opinion and behaviors across contexts that scholars in our field have the most to offer to the discipline as a whole. Thus, scholars of comparative survey data have tested the “traveling” capacity of key concepts derived from classic research on the United States, such as ideology and party identification, and of key theoretical frameworks, such as the resource model of participation. But, the jury is still out on the larger question: are there substantial true national differences in opinion, or are many of our results an artifact of translation and interpretation?

Researchers in the field of comparative public opinion must always address the question of where the detected differences come from, as they may result either from question wording or comprehension or they may represent genuine differences in individuals’ orientations toward politics and degree in their political involvement. Despite the challenge of commensurability, scholars do find credible cases where attitudes about, reactions to, or participation in politics vary across contexts. It is striking to note, for example, that while wealth tends to positively predict political engagement in the United States, it only sometimes exhibits a positive relationship with participation in Latin America and just as often, if not more often, appears inconsequential, or even negative, in multivariate models. Findings such as these, which highlight how citizens across different contexts react differently to politics, speak to the importance of comparative survey research not only in Latin America, but also around the globe. In conjunction with the other regional barometers discussed in this symposium, the AmericasBarometer offers opportunities to discover and explain varieties of political citizenship around the world. In referring to the other barometers, we note another challenge which we would like to address, which is to work toward increased comparability in practices and content across the regional barometers, so that they can be used by scholars interested in worldwide analysis, and not only in any particular region. Through such efforts and through our continuing work to refine and advance LAPOP’s techniques for survey design, implementation, and analysis, as well as through our attempts to increase accessibility and use of the AmericasBarometer data, we continue to move toward the objective of advancing understanding of democratic public opinion and behavior in the Americas and beyond.

Mitchell A. Seligson is the Centennial Professor of Political Science and Professor of Sociology at Vanderbilt University. Elizabeth Zechmeister is an associate professor of political science, associate director of the Latin American Public Opinion Project, and faculty affiliate of the research on individual, politics, and society lab at Vanderbilt University.
Lagos, continued

After that monumental background of comparative public opinion data, which has been gathered on Europe, the next region of the world with the longest longitudinal public opinion data is Latin America with Latinobarómetro, which started in 1995. The differences between Latinobarómetro and European survey projects are of course enormous in terms of scope, length and also with respect to the amount of resources dedicated to the endeavor. While the above mentioned are based in the first world (the Eurobarometer is state-financed), Latinobarómetro is a small NGO in Santiago de Chile, financed by cooperation agencies and international organizations on a medium term perspective of three to five years with no state support.

Latinobarómetro was the first barometer established outside of Europe, which developed in 1995 out of a modest project proposal (to the European Union) for four countries in the Southern Cone of Latin America. The project presented in 1989 was approved in 1994; by then a group of scholars had already declared interest in another four countries so that the first wave was applied in 1995 to eight countries. The first application took six months of fieldwork. When the results were published, the other 10 countries of Latin America who had not participated in the project complained because they had not been invited. Latinobarometro is a barometer born out of demand for information from governments and international organizations.

The second wave of 1996 expanded to 17 countries. The Latinobarómetro project was not properly written as a project for the whole region until 1997, when it became obvious that it needed to survive beyond the two years of financial support it had received from the European Union. In order to host the survey, the Corporation Latinobarómetro was created, which is a NGO based in Santiago de Chile whose sole purpose is to conduct the survey once a year. The total budget of the institution is 1.3 million dollars with multiple sources of funding. The initial funding amounted to 200.000 USD from the European Commission for the 1995 and 1996 waves.

As a result of demand and being principally linked to the European tradition, Latinobarómetro has today a donor table composed of cooperation agencies of European governments, as well as all multilateral Latin American international organizations.

Latinobarómetro gathered the principal public opinion indicators available in social science to try to grasp the public in the process of transition to democracy in the 18 Latin American Countries. Surveys in 1995 and 1996 were in several countries only urban-based, but were later expanded to cover the entire population of every country. In 2004 Dominican Republic was added to the 17 continental countries.

Over 1000 variables in approximately 300.000 interviews in 18 countries have been applied between 1995 and 2011. Since 2006 the data is available in a friendly data bank produced with Spanish technology, JD system. In 2011 alone over 5000 researchers in the region downloaded our data. Latinobarómetro is the first one international comparative public opinion data bank in the Spanish language, the first compiled in the southern hemisphere, and the first in the non-developed world. It is also the most visited one after the World Values Survey. The Latinobarómetro data bank broke the monopoly of the English language over public opinion data.

It took a decade from 1995 to 2005 to transform Latinobarómetro from a modest initial four-country study into a regional public good of 18 countries. This would have not been accomplished without the support and leadership of SIDA, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, which gathered and convinced donors for this purpose. It must also be said that at the beginning some donors were of the opinion that Latinobarómetro should become a commercial product and be “sold” as such.

Latinobarómetro is today a regional public good about which the number of quotes in documents and press has been doubling every year, and has very little use in the academy. The number of articles using the project data written for media has had an exponential development, so much that we cannot keep track of them other than by Google alerts. Data is mainly used by social and political actors, journalist and analysts, mainly to understand societies. Public policy is the most important target of the survey. The web pages of regional governments, local county councils, ministers, governments in general, parliaments and NGOs, are frequent in using results.

UNDP published in 2004 its first report on Latin America, “Democracy in Latin America: Towards a Citizen Democracy” on the basis of Latinobarómetro results and a module of proprietary questions. IDB, CAF, World Bank, OAS and International IDEA use the results regularly in their numerous documents and publications, and they are also widely used by OECD, the EU and UN (beyond UNDP).

Academic articles in English based on survey data are less frequent. Some of them have been published in the Journal of Democracy. One could say that
there are some authors and institutions which have used the study, for example, the Latin American Program of The Brookings Institution has used many survey waves to address a multiple number of subjects in books and articles. “Aspiration and Happiness of Potential Latin American immigrants” by Carol Graham and Julie Markowitz has been recently published by the Journal of Social Research (Dec 2011, Vol 2, Issue 2). In Spanish there is a very wide production of survey-based publications, from books to articles. The only institutional survey-based book was published with CEPAL under the title “Latin America in the Mirror”, in 2010. When looking at the impact of a single survey-based publication, maybe the most salient one is the article written by Benno Torgler “Tax Moral in Latin America” (Third International Research Conference Responsive Regulation: International Perspectives on Taxation, March 2003), which triggered the interest of the OECD, resulting in the development of more than one related project.

As far as we know, the most used variable (as measured by the number of e-mails, consultations, questions, and comments that are made) by academics in the survey is the preference for a political party. Latinobarómetro has created a summarized coding scheme for all parties in the region and since 2005 all surveys have this code included in the compiled data base. This coding scheme was developed in collaboration with Hans Dieter Klingeman from WZB (Wissenschaft Zentrum Berlin). Previous years will be uploaded at a later point in time. At present a new initiative has been undertaken by an Italian scholar to compile coding of all individual political parties for all years; this will be an important input for the numerous students who seek to research this variable. We have not been able to track the numerous master and PhD theses that has been based on the survey; we usually have contact with PhD and master students when they work with the data. We do know that in 2011 5000 people from Latin America downloaded data from the data bank, which means that the data is being used, but we have no way of knowing what is being produced with the data other than through Google search.

Latinobarómetro has become almost an obligatory reference when analyzing the region. It has in fact “created” the region inasmuch as it has shown its homogeneity as well as showing its enormous heterogeneity. It has been widely used in speeches, as well as by heads of international organizations during local and foreign presentations.

Latinobarómetro has not been free of controversy in the US. Critique was made regarding the way in which the survey was released and produced. The survey was born outside of the academia in an NGO and is a public policy-oriented survey, but nevertheless it became a first and unique source for scholars. In the opinion of the donors of the survey, first world universities did not need a subsidy in order to access the survey, but on the contrary should contribute to the formation of the time series with small contribution to funding. Latinobarómetro till 2006 asked Euro 100 to download one wave of data (18 countries). This was considered an outrage among many US-based scholars, together with the fact that the survey did not abide to US standard, according to the critics (but rather to European ones). This critique was led and organized by one particular scholar based in a US university, who gathered signatures to send a letter to donors saying the survey should not be supported any longer (approximately 200 signatures were collected).

Latin American societal, cultural and economic ties to the USA were a decade ago much stronger than today. The beauty of Latinobarómetro is that it is properly a Latin American product, which looks at the region from the regions’ own perspective, and not from the point of view of a third party. As our colleague and friend Roger Jowell, one of the great pollsters of our generation and founding director of the European Social survey, used to say: “you cannot beat the level of development of a country”, and opinion barometers have proven that it is not possible to beat the level of development of different regions of the world. Maybe Latin America would be much better off if it had always looked for development of their own instruments (no doubt imperfect in the eyes of the north), without copying those of the north.


With respect to the survey results, the most striking are the differences which are found in the region where language and common religious background as...
well as having been colonized by Spain
give the impression that they should be
the smallest.

According to the results of the 16
survey waves, democracy seems to be
a phenomenon that is a function of
people's original position in society.
The starting point where each society is
placed is crucial for understanding the
evolution of different factors that affect
democracy. Observed heterogeneity in
the consolidation process of democracy
is a result of those initial differences, of
the original position. Latinobarómetro
has observed that societies have rather
sustained than changed the initial
levels of democratic support since the
beginning of the transition. Only the
societies that have undergone strong
structural changes have experienced
a significant change regarding the
views their citizens have on democracy.
Supporting democracy has to do with
the amount of power each citizen has
in society. Inasmuch as democracy
administers a given distribution
and amount of power already given,
attitudes towards it do not change.

If this hypothesis proves to be correct,
then consolidation of democracy would
need a process of transformation within
societies in order to distribute power in
a different way than at the starting
point. In other words, consolidation of
democracy can occur either by slow
intergenerational change or by sudden
structural change. In that sense, new
constitutions and political reforms
which have not been adopted yet are at
the core of the process of consolidation
democracy. Paradoxically enough,
the economic reform, not the political
reform, was the first task democratic
government addressed basing on the
hypothesis that without prosperity,
without dismantling poverty and
inequality, no democracy could
flourish. Economic reforms have been
successful in producing growth, but
have failed to dismantle inequalities.
These inequalities are not only material
inequalities, but mainly inequalities of
access, i.e. power to decide. Political
reforms have been almost absent,
or scarce. Very few countries have
undergone constitutional changes and
the political party system is suffering
from a severe crisis of representation
in the region as a whole and in each
individual country. Trust levels in all
types of institutions, from the Catholic
Church to political parties, are at their
historic low.

At the end of the day, economic growth
without a balanced development
produces disenchantment from politics,
weakening the political system and
democracy. Monitoring societies has
its downside since the mirror produced
has no mask; there is nowhere to hide.
Things can get much darker before they
get better. Events that are happening to
produce the necessary change, without
revolutions and without the use of force,
the only road is the unconventional,
illegal, massive participation of the
population which is increasingly
educated and increasingly aware of
their right to have rights. Is the excess
of social capital producing change?
Latin American democracies do not
lack participation, they have it in excess.
On the other hand, government and
party politics lack participation. One
must not confuse these two dimensions.
And there lies the problem. Civic
engagement is inorganic; individual
demands massively manifested are the
name of the game. The increase in
self-expression that is shown in the
last World Values Survey (WVS) has
produced a strong demand for plurality
and diversity, and the political system has
not been able to respond to this change
in demand. The lack of leadership and
the crisis of representation results in
phenomena yet to be clearly seen.

Very unorthodox, not previously seen,
are the results of the road taken by each
individual 18 societies monitored. Each
one is very understandable when looking
back at each society's own history.
Altogether they are very contradictory
with one another. Differences are much
more striking than similarities.

Whereas the first three decades after
the return of democracy were the
time when freedom of expression and
liberties in general were guaranteed,
while governments performed deep
economic reforms, the next decades will
be about the demand for guarantees of
social and economic rights, while the
political system needs to undergo deep
political reforms.

Latinobarómetro has been testing
new dimensions and variables in the
measurement of democracy to try
to tap this heterogeneity. It has also
undertaken qualitative studies as well
as elite studies to complement the
comprehension of social phenomena.
The study of democracy in Latin
America as such is only starting.

Finally, the largest weakness of the
survey is the weakness of the region
at the same time. Latin America has
no functioning integration institution
where Latinobarómetro could be
hosted. Today the project is linked to
CEPAL which is based in Santiago
de Chile. Continuing to be a Latin
American product requires conviction,
since it has received quite a few offers
to become part of universities of the
first world, which unlike the above
mentioned critics have not tried a
takeover but simply an acquisition of
the project.

Marta Lagos is the founding director of
Latinobarómetro.
Section News

Editors’ Note: Since APSA was cancelled this year, there will be no meeting minutes to report. However, we are pleased to present the winners from the Section’s 2012 Awards.

Section Awards:

**Juan Linz Prize for the Best Dissertation in the Comparative Study of Democracy**

Noam Lupu (Princeton University) won the Juan Linz Dissertation Prize for the Best Dissertation in the Comparative Study of Democracy for his work on “Party Brands in Crisis: Partisanship, Brand Dilution and the Breakdown of Political Parties in Latin America”

This year’s award committee included Nancy Bermeo (Oxford University) (Chair), Tom Pepinsky (Cornell University), and Pauline Jones Luong (University of Michigan).

Committee’s Remarks on the Award Winner:

“Lupu’s research is about political party longevity. He asks why political parties that have been nationally competitive for decades collapse in the course of a single electoral cycle. After illustrating that the phenomenon is not simply an artefact of performance failures, he teaches us that the explanation derives from the role of party brands, meaning, voters’ beliefs about what a party stands for. When party brands are strong, voters’ party attachments are durable and can withstand even disastrous governing performance. When party brands become diluted, attachments erode and voters are more likely to vote on performance measures alone. Ironically, party brands are likely to become diluted during crises, when leaders form “strange-bedfellow alliances” and provoke intra-party conflict.”

Lupu defends this intriguing argument with six matched case studies from Venezuela and Argentina, plus two experiments embedded in a survey of Argentine voters. He uses primary sources, extensive interviews, statistical data and formal models in an exemplary fashion, combining them seamlessly in a manuscript that was a pleasure to read. His meticulous empirics, his innovative methodology and his answer to an original question of practical importance to democracy make his dissertation precisely the sort of scholarship the Linz Prize is intended to reward.”


This year’s award committee included Michael Ross (University of California, Los Angeles) (Chair), Thad Dunning (Yale University), and Benjamin Smith (University of Florida).

Committee’s Remarks on the Award Winner:

“Members of the book award committee reviewed 23 submissions, each one a testimonial to the vitality and breadth of current scholarship on democratization. Our unanimous choice for the book award is Susan Hyde’s *The Pseudo-Democrat’s Dilemma*. The book documents and helps explain one of the most important new phenomena in democratic transitions: the establishment of a global norm that credible elections must be monitored by reputable international observers. To account for the norm’s diffusion, the book develops an original theory of norm formation based on the logic of signaling, then tests it with cross-national data, natural experiments, and qualitative case studies; the result is an empirical tour de force, at once elegant, convincing, and highly creative. *The Pseudo-Democrat’s Dilemma* is both a powerful analysis and a reminder how scholarship from other fields of political science can enrich the study of comparative politics.”

“The committee also chose Vineeta Yadav’s *Political Parties, Business Groups, and Corruption in Developing Countries* for honorable mention for the award. It asks why some developing democracies seem to promote corruption while others curtail it. Dr. Yadav’s book, like Dr. Hyde’s, approaches its central question with an admirable combination of research methods, including close case studies of legislative institutions and business groups in Brazil and India as well as analysis of data from 64 developing democracies. Yadav finds paradoxically that strong parties bode less well for corruption than more fragmented ones, and the book’s meticulous approach to answering an important but tricky question makes it well worth honorable mention.”

3. Best Article Award:

Carles Boix (Princeton University) was awarded the Best Article Award for his work on “Democracy, Development and the International System” (November 2011 *American Political Science Review*). Susan Hyde (Yale University) received an honorable mention for her work on “Catch Us If You Can: Election Monitoring and International Norm Diffusion” (April 2011 *American Journal of Political Science*).

This year’s award committee included Daniel Posner (University of California, Los Angeles) (Chair), Anna Grzymala-Busse (University of Michigan), and Edmund Malesky (University of California, San Diego).

Committee’s Remarks on the Award Winners:

“In this important and novel contribution to the literature on the relationship between democracy and development, Carles Boix highlights the ways that the...
structure of the international system has historically played a key role in shaping the likelihood that countries will be democratic. Drawing on a new panel data set including all sovereign states from the early nineteenth century to the end of the twentieth century, Boix shows that the relationship between income and democracy has varied historically over time: income is positively associated with democracy during the democratic “first wave” (1850-1920) but not in the years that preceded or followed this historically unique period. Then Boix accounts for this variation by demonstrating that the effect of income on democracy is conditional on the whether or not the great powers of the day promoted democratization in the countries over which they held sway.

“It is rare that a contribution to such a well-developed literature offers fresh insights, but Boix’s paper does just this. His demonstration of the periodicity of the relationship between democracy and development challenges the presumption that these two variables exhibit a constant relationship. And the compelling evidence he provides for the importance of the international system adds a critical new variable to existing accounts. No inquiry into the origins of democracy will be able to ignore the arguments he has advanced in this terrific paper.”

“In Catch Us If You Can,” Susan Hyde documents the dramatic expansion of international election observation since the late 1980s—a phenomenon she explains as a consequence of the emergence and diffusion of a new international norm equating “democracy” with the holding of elections that international observers have judged to be free and fair. Hyde argues persuasively that this norm emerged as the product of an international system that conferred benefits on countries that were seen to be democratic and was reinforced by the desire of even non-democratic countries to avoid the negative consequences of refusing to invite election observers. The analysis helps to account for a number of puzzling outcomes, including why only weakly democratic states would invite international monitors to observe their elections and why improvements in election monitoring techniques in the late 1990s (which made it harder for governments to get away with electoral fraud) did not lead to a decrease in the rate of international election monitoring (in fact it increased). The paper also contributes to the literature on international norm diffusion by showing that the desire of states to signal their type—and not just the mobilization efforts of activists or incentives to comply with international institutions—can explain why states will voluntarily constrain their behaviors in ways that, on their face, would appear to run counter to their interests.”

4. Best Field Work Award:
This year’s Best Field Work Prize was awarded to Simon Chauchard for his work on “From Political Power To Changing Group Relations? Tracking the Psychological Impact of Political Inclusion in Rural India.” James Long was awarded an honorable mention for his work on “Ethnic Voting in Kenya and Ghana and Election Fraud in Uganda and Afghanistan.”

This year’s committee members included Kenneth F. Greene (University of Texas at Austin) (Chair), Claire Adida (University of California, San Diego), and Lily L. Tsai (Massachusetts Institute of Technology).

Committee’s Remarks on the Award Winners:
“The committee is pleased to honor Simon Chauchard with the 2012 Dissertation Fieldwork Award from the Comparative Democratization Section of the American Political Science Association for his dissertation “From Political Power To Changing Group Relations? Tracking the Psychological Impact of Political Inclusion in Rural India”. Simon’s work distinguished itself from a field of very strong candidates, and indeed the committee was impressed with the hard work and ingenuity evident in all of the dissertations that were nominated. What set Simon’s work apart was the incredible nuance in the development and application of the survey instrument he used to measure the dynamics of political participation among scheduled castes in Rajasthan, India. Simon wanted to know how the use of executive positions reserved for scheduled castes in some villages but not in others affected political attitudes toward scheduled castes. Whether political representation for stigmatized social groups has psychic benefits rather than engendering backlash—a finding that Simon’s dissertation supports—has clear implications for the literatures on ethnic politics and political representation. It also supports the notion that electoral engineering can yield positive social outcomes, a finding relevant to many ethnically heterogeneous countries around the world, including the United States.

To test his central hypothesis, Simon first selected 32 matched-pairs of villages, 64 in all, where half had reserved seats and half did not. He then interviewed individual villagers using a sample survey. In designing the instrument, Simon grappled with the issue of functional illiteracy that can render otherwise high quality survey instruments of little use in many developing-world contexts. To overcome this problem as well as potential measurement error due to social desirability bias and interviewer effects, Simon created scripted recordings of interview questions that were spoken by professional actors using local accents appropriate to each sampling point. The scripts were then put on MP3 players and respondents were asked to listen through headphones as they self-administered questionnaires that used icons instead of
words for response categories. This simple but novel approach turned out to be very cost effective and thus reproducible for most graduate students in the field.

Simon’s work demonstrates great sensitivity to the particular characteristics of his respondents. Instead of blindly applying an off-the-rack methodology, he took pains to adapt survey methods to his particular research setting and subjects. The committee views this kind of ingenuity as especially laudable and is very pleased to honor Simon with this year’s dissertation fieldwork award.”

“The committee also wants to single out James Long with an Honorable Mention for his extremely impressive work on ethnic voting in Kenya and Ghana and on election fraud in Uganda and Afghanistan. In Kenya, James was interested in whether and to what extent the long-noted tendency of voters to choose a co-ethnic candidate are conditioned by evaluations of the candidate’s likely performance in office. To test this hypothesis, James carried out an amazingly large exit poll among 6,400 voters, training 300 interviewers and conducting four nationwide pre-election surveys along the way. The exit poll included split-sample experiments that manipulated the ethnicity and job performance of hypothetical candidates. He showed that perceived performance can matter, sometimes driving voters to choose a well performing candidate from a different ethnicity over a poorly performing co-ethnic.

His fieldwork also dealt with questions of election fraud. In Uganda and Afghanistan, James tested a new approach for controlling election-day malfeasance. Among a sample of precincts, half of the poll managers received a letter, early in the day, stating that a photo would be taken of the final vote tally after voting was completed. Although photos were in fact taken in both the treated and untreated precincts, James found at least a 25% reduction in fraud in precincts where letters were delivered ahead of time. This finding has clear implications for democracy promotion advocates around the world. The committee also notes that James conducted his work in difficult and sometimes dangerous circumstances that makes us wince with concern as dissertation advisors but also leaves us very impressed with his dogged pursuit of important and useful data.”

5. Best Paper Award:
Susan Stokes (Yale University) was awarded the best paper award for her work on “What Killed Vote Buying in Britain?” (presented at 2011 APSA meeting).

This year’s award committee included Marc Morjé Howard (Georgetown University) (Chair), Lisa Blaydes (Stanford University), and Christian Houle (Trinity College).

Committee’s Remarks on Award Winner: “How do countries move from having elections where candidates are selected for providing patronage to elections won or lost on policy platforms? Scholars of comparative politics have made important progress describing the political implications of social systems of patronage common in developing countries. Similarly, the role of party positioning in established democracies is much discussed. The critical issue of how countries transition from electoral environments where vote-buying dominates to one where individuals are choosing candidates for the policies they hope to see passed in the legislature has not been widely examined. Drawing on historical sources and new empirical evidence from England since the Industrial Revolution, Susan Stokes’ paper “What Killed Vote Buying in Britain?” represents the most important attempt to answer this question since Gary Cox’s The Efficient Secret. The paper is very well-written written and adds significantly to our understanding of this key area of comparative politics. The committee therefore unanimously agreed that Susan Stokes’ paper should be awarded the prize for best paper in Comparative Democratization.”

New M.A. Program in Governance, Leadership, and Democracy Studies:
The Instituto de Estudos Políticos at the Universidade Católica Portuguesa in Portugal has instituted a one-year Master’s Degree program in Governance, Leadership, and Democracy Studies. The program is divided into winter and summer semesters. Courses on Europe and Democracy, Contemporary International Politics, Global Political Economy, Democracy in Western Political Thought, as well as a research tutorial and two optional courses are offered during the Winter 2012 semester. The Summer 2013 semester offers courses on the Third Wave of Democratization, Institutions of Governance and Representation, Leadership and Strategic Challenges, Democracy, Public Choice and Economic Analysis, Democracy, Civil Society, and Religion, as well as an international seminar and research tutorials. All seminars will be conducted in close collaboration between Portuguese and foreign scholars. More information about the M.A. Program and how to apply is available by visiting www.iep.lisboa.ucp.pt/site/custom/template/ucptpl_fac.asp?SSP AGEID=924&lang=1&artigoID=5459 or by writing to Filipa do Amparo at maiep@ucp.pt.

Call for Applications: Reagan-Fascell Democracy Fellowships in Washington, D.C.:
The Reagan-Fascell Democracy Fellows Program at the International Forum for Democratic Studies (IFDS, U.S.) invites applications for fellowships in 2012–2013. This federally funded program enables democracy activists, practitioners, scholars, and journalists from around the
world to deepen their understanding of
democracy and enhance their ability to
promote democratic change. Dedicated to
international exchange, this five-month,
residential program offers a collegial
environment for fellows to reflect on their
experiences; conduct independent research
and writing; consider best practices and
lessons learned; engage with counterparts
in the United States; and develop professional relationships within a global
network of democracy advocates.

The program is intended primarily to
support practitioners, scholars, and
journalists from developing and aspiring
democracies; distinguished scholars from
established democracies may also apply. A
working knowledge of English is required.
All fellows receive a monthly payment,
health insurance, travel assistance, and
research support. The program does not
fund professional training, fieldwork,
or students working towards a degree.
The program will host two five-month
fellowship sessions in 2013–2014: Fall
2013 (October 1, 2013–February 28, 2014)
and Spring 2014 (March 1–July 31, 2014).

The online application system opened
July 15, 2012, and applications are due
by November 1. Please see www.ned.org/
fellowships for more information.

New Journal on Comparative Governance
and Politics:
In 2011, the first Special Issue of the
Journal on Comparative Governance and
Politics, edited by Gero Erdmann and
Marianne Kneuer and published by the
Committee on Democracy Research of the
German Association of Political Science
was released. The theme of this special
issue is “Regression of Democracy?” More
information about the journal can be found
at www.springer.com/springer+vs/politik/
book/978-3-531-182162-2.

Constituency-Level Elections Archive
Receives Award:
The Constituency-Level Elections
Archive (CLEA) has been awarded the
2012 Lijphart/Prezeworski/Verba Data
Set Award, which is presented annually
by the Comparative Politics section of
APSA. CLEA is a publicly available
online repository of detailed results at
the constituency level for lower house
legislative elections conducted around the
world, as well as of corresponding measures
of party nationalization. The latest release
(September 2011) encompasses 1,120
elections in 73 countries dating back
to 1788. Future releases will add more
elections from the current set of countries
and provide greater global coverage. To
access, see www.electiondataarchive.
org. Co-directors of the project are Ken
Kollman, Allen Hicken, Daniele Caramani,
and David Backer. The project manager is
Jill Willrock.

Call for Applications: Department of
Political Science, University of Illinois at
Chicago:
The University of Illinois at Chicago has
issued a call for applications for head of its
political science department. The successful
candidate will provide leadership for the
growth of the department and a vision
for its continued excellence in research,
teaching, and service. The Head is the chief
administrative officer of the department
with responsibility for instructional
programs and for administrative,
budgetary, promotion, and recruitment
matters. The successful candidate will have
a distinguished scholarship record
commensurate with the rank of full
professor, a strong teaching record, and
appropriate academic administrative
experience. The desired appointment date
is August 16, 2013. Salary is competitive
based on qualifications. To apply complete
an on-line application and upload a full
curriculum vitae and the names and full
contact information of four references
at https://jobs.uic.edu. Please click on
the Job Board and then the position.
For information please contact Ms.
Rachel Leamon at 312-413-3504 or at
polisciheadsearch@las.uic.edu.

NEWS FROM MEMBERS
Naazneen H. Barma, assistant professor of
national security affairs, Naval Postgraduate
School, published “Peace-building and
the Predatory Political Economy of
Insecurity: Evidence from Cambodia,
East Timor, and Afghanistan,” in the July
2012 Conflict, Security & Development. Mr.
Barma uses evidence from peace-building
attempts in Cambodia, East Timor, and
Afghanistan to illustrate that the political
economy incentives facing domestic elites
in an environment of low credibility and
weak institutionalization lead to a cycle
of patronage generation and distribution
that undermine legitimate and effective
governance.

Matt Cleary, associate professor of
political science at the Maxwell School of
Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse
University, received a National Science
Foundation grant to support two years
of research for a project, “The Effects
of Indigenous Autonomy in Southern
Mexico.”

In June 2012, Benjamin R. Cole,
assistant professor of political science
and international relations, Simmons
College, concluded a one-year postdoctoral
fellowship at Dartmouth College’s Nelson
A. Rockefeller Center for Public Policy,
and began his current position at Simmons
College in September. During the summer,
Mr. Cole joined the faculty of the Harvard
University Summer School and presented
at the BISA-ISA Joint Convention in
Edinburgh, Scotland after supervising
an undergraduate researcher conducting
interviews in Northern Ireland. He
continues to serve as research associate at
the Center for Systemic Peace in Vienna,
Virginia.

Javier Corrales, professor of political
science, Amherst College, and Carlos
Romero published U.S.-Venezuela
Relations: Coping with Midlevel Security Threats (Routledge, 2012). The authors explore relations between these two countries since 1999, when Hugo Chavez came to office and proceeded to change Venezuela’s historical relations with the United States and other democracies. They analyze the reasons for rising bilateral conflict, the decision-making process in Venezuela, the role played by public and private actors in shaping foreign policy, the role of other powers such as China, Russia, Iran, and Saudi Arabia in shaping U.S.-Venezuelan relations, the role of Venezuela in Cuba and Colombia, and the impact of broader international dynamics in bilateral relations.

Todd A. Eisenstadt was promoted to a full professor in American University’s Department of Government in September 2012. He edits (along with Michael S. Danielson, Jaime Bailon, and Carlos Sorroza) Latin America’s Multicultural Movements and the Struggle Between Communitarianism, Autonomy, and Human Rights (Oxford University Press, 2013).

John P. Entelis has been elected chair of Fordham University’s department of political science and received the Outstanding Teaching Award in the Social Sciences in Spring 2012 at Fordham College at Rose Hill. He recently published a Project on Middle East Democracy Policy Brief, “Silent Complicity: The International Community and Algeria’s Democratic Façade,” which argues that the United States cannot continue to prioritize oil and security over democratic reform in its relationship with Algeria.

Daniel E. Esser, assistant professor of international development, American University, published “When We Launched the Government’s Agenda… Aid Agencies and Local Politics in Urban Africa,” in the September 2012 Journal of Modern African Studies. Mr. Esser asserts that local actors in impoverished countries emerging from violent conflict are hindered in conducting political affairs by the interests and influence of national governments as well as international agencies. However, he believes it is imperative to look beyond the national scale to uncover the drivers of institutional change and gauge the promise of donor-driven local political empowerment. Mr. Esser uses the case of Freetown, Sierra Leone to provide an illustration of macro-level alignment and resulting local frictions; at the same time, he also demonstrates how local politics, perpetuated by the international aid industry, have challenged the technocratic, apolitical reinvention of urban governance in the global South. Mr. Esser also recently won a Social Science Research Council post-doctoral fellowship on Drugs, Security, and Democracy, and is currently collecting data on neighborhood-level non-violent collective action in Ciudad Juarez.

Vladimir Gel’man became a Finland Distinguished Professor in the Aleksanteri Institute, University of Helsinki. From 2013 to 2017 he will conduct a research project, “Regimes, Institutions, and Change: Politics and Governance in Russia in a Comparative Perspective,” funded by the Academy of Finland.

Henry Hale, associate professor of political science and international affairs, George Washington University, published “Trends in Russian Views on Democracy 2008-2012: Has There Been a Russian Democratic Awakening?” in Russian Analytical Digest No. 117. With the surprising outbreak of the largest street demonstrations of the Vladimir Putin era because of widely perceived election fraud in the December 2011 Duma elections, many observers have speculated that a democratic awakening might be afoot in Russia. Comparison of original public opinion surveys of the Russian citizenry just after the parliamentary-presidential election seasons of 2008 and 2012 reveals little evidence of an awakening and finds that broad support for democracy have remained steady during this period. Mr. Hale reviews survey evidence to show that the idea of an “awakening” might be misplaced, however, since the “democracy” that many Russians tend to support is fully compatible with a “strong leader” who rules without checks and balances.

Evelyn Huber, distinguished professor of political science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and John D. Stephens published Democracy and the Left: Social Policy and Inequality in Latin America (University of Chicago Press, 2012). The authors argue that the resurgence of democracy in Latin America is the key to political change, and, in addition to directly affecting public policy, democratic institutions enable left-leaning political parties to emerge, significantly influencing the allocation of social spending on poverty and inequality. But while democracy is an important determinant of redistributive change, international power structures also influence the direction of social policy.

John Ishiyama, professor of political science, University of North Texas, and Anna Batta published “The Emergence of Dominant Political Party Systems in Unrecognized States,” in the March-June 2012 Communist and Post-Communist Studies. The authors address the question of why in some de facto states something like “dominant party” politics has emerged, whereas in others there at least appears some form of real political competition. They empirically assess some of the commonly cited factors that affect the character of politics within de facto states (the wealth of the entity, the militarization of society, the level of ethnic homogeneity, and political institutional features), and using Fuzzy-Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis, a method developed specifically to deal with the “small N problem” in empirical inquiry, apply this framework to 13 post-secessionist unrecognized states.
Amaney A. Jamal, associate professor of politics, Princeton University, published Of Empires and Citizens: Pro-American Democracy or No Democracy At All? (Princeton University Press, 2012). Ms. Jamal argues that to understand support for the authoritarian status quo in parts of the Arab world—and the willingness of citizens to compromise on core democratic principles—one must factor in how a strong U.S. presence and popular anti-Americanism weakens democratic voices. Examining Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Palestine, and Saudi Arabia, she explores how Arab citizens decide whether to support existing regimes, regime transitions, or democratization projects and how the global position of Arab states shapes attitudes toward governments.

Rieko Kage, associate professor of political science, University of Tokyo, received the 2012 Jury’s Prize from the Japan Nonprofit Organizations Research Organization for her recent book, Civic Engagement in Postwar Japan: The Revival of a Defeated Society (Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Fabrice Lehoucq, associate professor of political science, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, authored The Politics of Modern Central America: Civil War, Democratization, and Underdevelopment (Cambridge University Press, 2012). Mr. Lehoucq analyzes the origins and consequences of civil war in Central America, and explains why the inability of autocracies to reform led to the civil wars of the 1980s and how violent conflict led to the unexpected transition to non-military governments in the 1990s. He concludes by drawing lessons to improve explanations of regime change and the outbreak of civil war. Mr. Lehoucq was also awarded a Residential Fellowship from the Kellogg Institute for the spring of 2013.

Carl LeVan, assistant professor in the School of International Service, American University, won the 2011 Frank Cass Prize for Best Article by a Young Scholar for his essay in the February 2011 Democratization, “Questioning Tocqueville in Africa: Continuity and Change in Nigeria’s Civil Society during Democratization.”

Cas Mudde, professor of political science, University of Georgia, and Erin K. Jenne published “Hungary’s Illiberal Turn: Can Outsiders Help?” in the July 2012 Journal of Democracy, which argues that Hungary’s “constitutional revolution” presents the most significant case of democratic backsliding in the European Union to date. The authors argue that the illiberal constitution, introduced by the Orbán government and protected by a host of new appointees, undermines the independence of various political institutions and guarantees virtually unlimited powers for the ruling party. Mr. Mudde and Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser also edited Populism in Europe and the Americas: Threat or Corrective for Democracy? The volume offers a cross-regional perspective on populism and its impact on democracy and analyzes current experiences of populism in Europe and the Americas.

Pipa Norris, professor at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, published Making Democratic Governance Work: How Regimes Shape Prosperity, Welfare, and Peace (Cambridge University Press, 2012). It focuses on three core questions. Is democratic governance good for economic prosperity? Has this type of regime accelerated progress toward achieving the Millennium Development Goals, social welfare, and human development? Does it generate a peace-dividend and reduce conflict at home? Ms. Norris advances the argument that both liberal democracy and state capacity need to be strengthened in parallel to ensure effective development, within the constraints posed by structural conditions, and uses systematic evidence gathered from countries worldwide during recent decades and selected cases to illustrate the effects of regime change on development.

Heiko Pleines, head of the department of politics and the Economics Research Center for East European Studies, University of Bremen Klagenfurter (Germany), and Andreas Heinrich edited Challenges of the Caspian Resource Boom. Domestic Elites and Policy-Making (Palgrave McMillian, 2012). It asserts that the true cause for the failure of oil and gas booms to promote socioeconomic development is the conscious choice of political elites who pursue regime survival and personal enrichment over political development. In-depth case studies illustrate how political elites in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, and Turkmenistan have responded to the resource challenges related to ownership rights, foreign direct investment, corruption, oil revenue management, and socio-economic development.

Scott Radnitz was promoted to associate professor in the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, and was named the director of the Ellison Center for Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies, University of Washington.

Fredrik M. Sjoberg, postdoctoral fellow, Columbia University, authored a paper, “Making Voters Count: Evidence from Field Experiments about the Efficacy of Domestic Election Observation,” in which he argues that voters in less than democratic states are often marginalized because of widespread election fraud, and uses field experiments in three different countries to show that high quality civil society observers can reduce fraud on election day. The results also confirm that all regimes are not equally sensitive to such interventions. The paper can be downloaded at Mr. Sjoberg’s website: https://sites.google.com/site/fredrikmsjoberg/home/research.
Dan Slater, associate professor of political science, University of Chicago, published “Coping by Colluding: Political Uncertainty and Promiscuous Power Sharing in Indonesia and Bolivia,” in the December 2012 *Comparative Political Studies*. He claims that democracy forces political elites to compete for power in elections, but it also often pushes them to share power after the electoral dust has settled, and that promiscuous power-sharing arrangements undermine representation by loosening parties’ commitments to their core constituents and threaten accountability by limiting voters’ capacity to remove parties from power via the ballot box.

Daniela Stockmann, associate professor of political science, Leiden University (The Netherlands), published *Media Commercialization and Authoritarian Rule in China* (Cambridge University Press, 2012). She argues that the consequences of media marketization depend on the institutional design of the state, and that in one-party regimes, such as China, market-based media promote regime stability, rather than destabilize authoritarianism or bring about democracy. By analyzing the Chinese media, Ms. Stockmann ties trends of market liberalism in China to other authoritarian regimes in the Middle East, North Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa, and the post-Soviet region.

Milan Svolik, associate professor of political science, University of Illinois-Champaign, authored *The Politics of Authoritarian Rule* (Cambridge University Press, 2012). Mr. Svolik argues that all authoritarian regimes must resolve two fundamental conflicts. First, dictators face threats from the masses over which they rule—the problem of authoritarian control—and a challenge from the elites with whom they rule—the problem of authoritarian power-sharing. Crucially, whether and how dictators resolve these two problems is shaped by the dismal environment in which authoritarian politics takes place: in a dictatorship, no independent authority has the power to enforce agreements among key actors and violence is the ultimate arbiter of conflict.

Michael Wahman, postdoctoral fellow in the Center for European Studies, University of Texas at Austin, successfully defended his dissertation “Uniting Against Autocrats—Opposition Coordination, Turnovers, and Democratization by Elections” at Lund University (Sweden) in April 2012. He began his appointment at the University of Texas at Austin in September 2012.

Shannon Drysdale Walsh was awarded a faculty fellowship to the Institute for Advanced Study, University of Minnesota, to conduct research on her book manuscript, *Engendering State Institutions: State Response to Violence Against Women in Latin America*. Ms. Walsh explains variation in the construction and performance of specialized justice system institutions that address violence against women in Latin America.

Georgina Waylen, professor of politics, University of Manchester (UK), has been awarded a European Research Council Advanced Grant for a project, “Understanding Institutional Change: A Gender Perspective.” The five year project will run between 2012 and 2017 and includes research on institutional design in post-conflict transitions to democracy as well as other aspects of institutional change in new democracies. For further information, please contact Ms. Waylen at georgina.waylen@manchester.ac.uk.

Kurt Weyland, Lozano Long Professor of Latin American Politics, University of Texas at Austin, published “Diffusion Waves in European Democratization: The Impact of Organizational Development,” in the October 2012 *Comparative Politics*. Mr. Weyland claims that, surprisingly, waves of political regime contention in Europe have slowed throughout history but have achieved greater success in triggering advances toward democracy, as a comparison of the revolutions of 1848 and 1917—1919 shows.
**NEW RESEARCH**

**Journal of Democracy**
The October 2012 (Volume 23, no. 4) issue of the *Journal of Democracy* features clusters of articles on “European Disintegration?” and “The Opening in Burma,” as well as individual pieces on the media and democracy, Arab monarchies, public opinion in the Arab world, and ethnocracy. The full text of selected articles and the tables of contents of all issues are available on the journal’s website.

**European Disintegration?**
Europe’s ongoing troubles are not merely a matter of budgets and bailouts, but have a political dimension as well. If the crisis is not resolved, is there a danger that the EU might unravel and democracy itself face a serious threat?

I. “Warnings from History” by Sheri Berman
II. “The Sources of Extremism” by Joao Carlos Espada
III. “A Fraying Union” by Ivan Krastev
IV. “Twin Troubles” by Alexander Graf Lambsdorff
V. “A Way Forward?” by Philippe C. Schmitter
VI. “Markets, Institutions, and Legitimacy” by Loukas Tsoukalas
VII. “Elusive Solidarity” by Jan Zielonka

“Media and Democracy: The Long View” by Marc F. Plattner

Modern democracy was born in the era of print, and the press has been one of its essential institutions. With the decline of newspapers and the rise of new media, what are the implications for democracy?

“The Arab Spring” has been very hard on autocratic presidents but so far has left the Arab world’s monarchies intact. How and why have Arab royals been able to resist the tide of protest?

“New Findings on Arabs and Democracy” by Mark Tessler, Amaney Jamal, and Michael Robbins

The second wave of the Arab Barometer reveals strong and steady support for democracy in the Arab World but a deficit in democratic culture.

**The Opening in Burma**

I. “The Democrats’ Opportunity” by Min Zin and Brian Joseph

The Burmese transition that began in 2011 will be a protracted process. The main challenge now is to build a state in which democracy can take root and grow.

II. “The Generals Loosen Their Grip” by Mary Callahan

Although active or retired military officers still hold top government posts, direct rule by the military as an institution is over, at least for now.

III. “A Union for All of Us” by Hkun Htun Oo

Elections alone will not answer the question of how to build a lasting democracy. Minority rights also must be protected.

IV. “Strengthening Civil Society” by Min Ko Naing

For the country to develop, it needs an informed and engaged citizenry that has the knowledge and freedom to question those in power.

V. “The Need for a Political Pact” by Larry Diamond

The hardest work of the transition—negotiating political pacts—has not yet begun. Burma’s democrats must help to forge a system of mutual security that can allow democratization to proceed.

“Politics in Crisis?” by Pierre Hassner

Although politics today is in critical condition—some even say it is dying—it is all the more important to revive it.

“The Ethnocracy Trap” by Lise Morjé Howard

A political system in which power is formally divided among ethnic or sectarian groups may seem like a good idea in conflict-ridden societies, but it bears a high price and makes true democratic transition harder to achieve.

**Putinism Under Siege**

It had long seemed as if Russians were resigned to the rule of Vladimir Putin, until angry protests over the most recent parliamentary and presidential elections stripped the Putin regime of its veneer of legitimacy. Why this sudden change, and what is likely to come next?

I. “Implosion, Atrophy, or Revolution?” by Lilia Shevtsova
II. “An Autopsy of Managed Democracy” by Ivan Krastev and Stephen Holmes
III. “The Strange Alliance of Democrats and Nationalists” by Nicu Popescu
IV. “The Protesters and the Public” by Denis Shevtsova

“The Transformation of the Arab World” by Olivier Roy

The electoral triumph of Islamist parties has dampened the enthusiasm of democrats for the “Arab Spring.” Yet hope for a democratic outcome remains. For in the Arab world the re-Islamization of society is likely to lead—however paradoxically—to the secularization of politics.
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V. “Can There Be a Color Revolution?” by Sharon L. Wolchik

“Turkey and Thailand: Unlikely Twins” by Duncan McCargo and Ayşe Zarakol

Turkey and Thailand, two countries at different corners of the Asian landmass, appear at first glance to be an odd couple, but a closer look at their respective political situations reveals surprising parallels.

“African Elections: Two Divergent Trends” by Kennedy Ochieng' Opalo

Regular elections have become a fixture of political life throughout sub-Saharan Africa, but there are now “two Africas” in this regard: one where elections bring the blessings of greater political openness and competition, and another where elections are, in effect, one more tool that authoritarians use to retain power.

“Oil, Politics, and Ghana’s Democracy” by E. Gyimah-Boadi and H. Kwasi Prempeh

Ghana has won praise for its steady progress toward democratic consolidation, but in late 2010 it joined the ranks of the world’s oil producers. Will the country’s democratic institutions be able to resist the “resource curse”?

“The DRC’s Crumbling Legitimacy” by Mvemba Phezo Dizolele and Pascal Kalume Kambale

On 9 December 2011, incumbent president Joseph Kabila was declared the official winner of the DRC’s deeply flawed presidential election, resulting in a legal president without legitimacy and an uncertain political future.

“Senegal: What Will Turnover Bring?” by Catherine Lena Kelly

Although Senegal has often been regarded as a democracy, its regime should more properly have been classified as competitive authoritarian. Will the 2012 election of a new president prove to be a turning point?

Hungary’s Illiberal Turn

I. “How Things Went Wrong” by Jacques Rupnik

How has Hungary, initially seen as a leading postcommunist success story, fallen into its current troubles?

II. “Disabling the Constitution” by Miklós Bánkuti, Gábor Halmay, and Kim Lane Schepple

Can outside actors help Hungarians to loosen Fidesz’s centralized grip on all their country’s governing institutions?

“The Surprising Success of Multiparty Presidentialism” by Carlos Pereira and Marcus André Melo

Until recently, political scientists argued that democracy had poor chances of survival in a multiparty presidential regime. Latin America’s recent experience tells a different story.

Democratization

The August 2012 (Volume 19, no. 4) Democratization features articles on political party activism in Ghana, minority representation in Georgia, the role of the military in Turkey, and ethnic bloc voting in Africa.

“Minority Representation in a Semi-Democratic Regime: The Georgian Case” by Daniel Zollinger and Daniel Bochsler


“Political Party Activism in Ghana: Factors Influencing the Decision of the Politically Active to Join a Political Party” by George M. Bob-Milliar

“Where to Draw the Line? From Degree to Dichotomy in Measures of Democracy” by Matthijs Bogaards

“Going beyond the Roman Dictator: A Comprehensive Approach to Emergency Rule, with Evidence from Latin America” by Claire Wright

“The Changing Role of the Military in Turkish Politics: Democratization through Coup Plots?” by Yaprak Gürsoy

“Explaining Ethnic Bloc Voting in Africa” by John Ishiyama

“Majoritarian Democracy and Globalization versus Ethnic Diversity?” by Daniele Conversi

The June 2012 (Volume 19, no. 3) Democratization is a special issue on “Do All Good Things Go Together? Conflicting Objectives in Democracy Promotion.”

“Not All Good Things Go Together: Conflicting Objectives in Democracy Promotion” by Sonja Grimm and Julia Leininger

“Democracy Promotion, Empowerment, and Self-Determination: Conflicting Objectives in US and German Policies towards Bolivia” by Jonas Wolff


“Coerced Transitions in Timor-Leste and Kosovo: Managing Competing Objectives of Institution-Building and Local Empowerment” by Nicolas Lemay-Hebert

“Power-Sharing and Democracy Promotion in Post-Civil War Peace-Building” by Jai Kwan Jung

“Two at One Blow? The EU and Its Quest for Security and Democracy by Political Conditionality in the Western Balkans” by Solveig Richter

“Inconsistent Interventionism in Palestine: Objectives, Narratives, and Domestic Policy-Making” by Sandra Pogodda

“Peace-Building and Democracy Promotion in Afghanistan: The Afghanistan Peace
and Reintegration Programme and Reconciliation with the Taliban” by Marissa Quie

“The Two Sides of Functional Cooperation with Authoritarian Regimes: A Multi-Level Perspective on the Conflict of Objectives between Political Stability and Democratic Change” by Tina Freyburg

SELECTED JOURNAL ARTICLES ON DEMOCRACY
This section features selected articles on democracy that appeared in journals received by the NED’s Democracy Resource Center, May 15–October 1, 2012.

“Security Votes in Nigeria: Disguising Stealing from the Public Purse” by Obiamaka Egbo, Ifeoma Nwakoby, Josaphat Onwumere, and Chibuike Uche

“Rendering Difference Visible: The Kenyan State and its Somali Citizens” by Emma Lochery

African Affairs, Vol. 111, no. 444, July 2012
“Extraversion, Vulnerability to Donors, and Political Liberalization in Africa” by Caryn Peiffer and Pierre Englebert

“Developmental Patrimonialism: The Case of Rwanda” by David Booth and Frederick Golooba-Mutebi

“Managing Donor Perceptions: Contextualizing Uganda’s 2007 Intervention in Somalia” by Jonathan Fisher

“Historicity, Power, Dissidence: The Third-Generation Poetry and Military Oppression in Nigeria” by Sule E. Egya

“Control, Politics and Identity in the Angolan Civil War” by Justin Pearce

Central Asian Survey, Vol. 31, no. 2, June 2012
“Good Neighbours or Distant Relatives?”

Regional Identity and Cooperation in the South Caucasus” by Tracey German

“Institutional Exclusion as a Destabilizing Factor: The Mass Unrest of 1 July 2008 in Mongolia” by Anton Oleinik

Communist and Post-Communist Studies, Vol. 45, nos. 1–2, March–June 2012
“FDI Determinants in an Idiosyncratic Country: A Reappraisal over the Russian Regions during Transition Years Original” by Concetta Castiglione, Yulia Gorbunova, Davide Infante, and Janna Smirnova

“The Paradigm of Nationalism in Kyrgyzstan: Evolving Narrative, the Sovereignty Issue, and Political Agenda” by Marlène laruelle

“A.S. Support for Ukraine’s Liberation during the Cold War: A Study of Prolog Research and Publishing Corporation” by Taras Kuzio

“The Nationalization of Political Parties and Party Systems in Post-Communist Eastern Europe” by Guido Tiemann

“Institution, Network and Elites’ Political Attitudes: An Analysis of the ‘Wen Jiabao Phenomenon’” by Sangkuk Lee

“The Emergence of Dominant Political Party Systems in Unrecognized States” by John Ishiyama and Anna Batta


“De Facto States and Democracy: The Case of Nagorno–Karabakh” by Pål Kolstø and Helge Blakkisrud

“Political Rule and Violent Conflict: Elections as ‘Institutional Mutation’ in Nagorno–Karabakh” by Franziska Smolnik

“Secession and Hybrid Regime Politics in Transnistria” by Oleh Protsyk

“The Problematic Role of EU Democracy Promotion in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh” by Licínia Simão

“Incomplete State Building – Incomplete Democracy: How to Interpret Internal Political Development in the Post-Soviet de facto States” by Silvia von Steinsdorff

Comparative Political Studies, Vol. 45, no. 10, October 2012

Comparative Political Studies, Vol. 45, no. 9, September 2012
“Electoral Majorities, Political Parties, and Collective Representation” by Michael D. McDonald, Ian Budge, and Robin E. Best

“Citizens’ Conceptualizations of Democracy: Structural Complexity, Substantive Content, and Political Significance” by Damarys Canache

“Presidents, Parties, and Referenda in Latin America” by Angélica Durán-Martínez

Comparative Political Studies, Vol. 45, no. 8, August 2012

“If You’re Against Them You’re With Us: The Effect of Expropriation on Autocratic Survival” by Michael Albertus and Victor Menaldo

“Legislative Institutions and Corruption in Developing Country Democracies” by Vineeta Yadav

Comparative Political Studies, Vol. 45, no. 7, July 2012
“Making Democratic Citizens: The Effects of Migration Experience on Political Attitudes in Central and Eastern Europe” by Romana Careja and Patrick Emmenegger

“Is There a Necessary Condition for Democracy? The Role of State Capacity in Postcommunist Countries” by Jessica Fortin

“Comparative Politics, Vol. 44, no. 5, October 2012
“The Institutional Origins of Ethnic Violence” by Evan S. Lieberman and Prerna Singh

“Diffusion Waves in European Democratization: The Impact of Organizational Development” by Kurt Weyland

“Coalition Government and Party System Change: Explaining the Rise of Regional Parties in India” by Adam Ziegfeld

“Uncertainty, Political Clientelism, and Voter Turnout in Latin America: Why Parties Conduct Rallies in Argentina” by Mariela Szwarcberg

“Comparative Politics, Vol. 44, no. 4, July 2012
“Rituals of Respect: Sufis and Secularists in Senegal in Comparative Perspective” by Alfred Stepan


“Party Discipline, Electoral Competition, and Banking Reforms in Democratic Mexico” by Gabriel Aguilera

“Crafting Courts in New Democracies: Ideology and Judicial Council Reforms in Three Mexican States” by Matthew C. Ingram

“Contemporary Southeast Asia, Vol. 34, no. 2, August 2012
“Performance-based Legitimacy: The Case of the Communist Party of Vietnam and Doi Moi” by Le Hong Hiep

“Bauxite Mining in Vietnam’s Central Highlands: An Arena for Expanding Civil Society?” by Hunter Marston

“Understanding Recent Political Changes in Myanmar” by Kyaw Yin Hlaing

“Students, Soldiers, Sports, Sheep and the Silver-Screen: New Zealand’s Soft Power in ASEAN and Southeast Asia” by Andrew Butler

“Single Party Dominance in Sarawak and the Prospects for Change” by Wilson Woon

“The Next Russian Revolution” by Lilia Shevtsova

“Why Moscow Fears Arab Unrest” by Jeffrey Mankoff

“Inequality: The Russian Experience” by Daniel Treisman

“Moscow on the Pacific: The Missing Piece in the ‘Pivot to Asia’” by Dmitri Trenin

“Central Asia Grows Wobbly” by Eric McGlinchey

“Demokratizatsiya, Vol. 20, no. 4, Autumn 2012
“Kyrgyzstan: A Parliamentary System Based on Inter-Elite Consensus” by Erica Marat

“The Kazakh Neopatrimonial Regime: Balancing Uncertainties among the ‘Family,’ Oligarchs and Technocrats” by Sebastien Peyrouse

“The Elite in Post-Soviet and Post-Niyazow Turkmenistan: Does Political Culture Form a Leader?” by Slavomír Horák

“The Sub-National Roots of Authoritarianism: Neopatrimonialism and Territorial Administration in Uzbekistan” by Lawrence P. Markowitz

“Demokratizatsiya, Vol. 20, no. 3, Summer 2012
“Reflecting on Twenty Years of Post-Soviet Experience” by Yulia Nikitina

“Foreign Policy and Aging Central Asian Autocrats” by Eric McGlinchey

“Multi-Vectorism in the Foreign Policy of Post-Soviet Eurasian States” by Sergey Minasyan


“East European Politics, Vol. 28, no. 3, September 2012
“Re-Conceptualising Russian Party Politics” by David White

“United Russia and the Dominant-Party Framework: Understanding the Russian Party of Power in Comparative Perspective” by Sean P. Roberts

“The Russian Duma ‘Opposition’: No Drama Out of Crisis?” by Luke March

“The Youth Movement Nashi: Contentious Politics, Civil Society, and Party Politics” by Maya Atwal and Edwin Bacon

“Party Finance in Russia” by Derek S. Hutcheson

“Members and Leaders in Russian Party Organisations” by Paul Chaisty

“Institutional Factors and Russian Political Parties: The Changing Needs of Regime Consolidation in a Neo-Patrimonial System” by Neil Robinson
New Research

“Party and Power: Between Representation and Mobilisation in Contemporary Russia” by Richard Sakwa

East European Politics and Societies, Vol. 26, no. 3, August 2012
“Keeping the Doors Closed: Leadership Selection in Post-Communist Romania” by Mihail Chiru and Sergiu Gherghina

“Patterns of Parliamentary Representation and Careers in Ukraine: 1990–2007” by Elena Semenova

“Minority Representation and Reserved Legislative Seats in Romania” by Ronald F. King and Cosmin Gabriel Marian


“Success against All Odds?: Determinants of Sectoral Rise and Decline in Central Europe” by Lucia Kureková

Human Rights Quarterly, Vol. 34, no. 3, August 2012
“Institutionalizing Human Rights in Southeast Asia” by John D. Ciorciari

“Local, National, and International Determinants of Truth Commission: The South Korean Experience” by Hun Joon Kim

“Human Rights in Canadian Domestic and Foreign Politics: From ‘Niggardly Acceptance’ to Enthusiastic Embrace” by Dominique Clément

“Governing Human Rights and Roma Inclusion: Can the EU be a Catalyst for Local Social Change?” by Eva Sobotka and Peter Vermeersch

“Challenges to Freedom of Expression Within the Inter-American System: A Jurisprudential Analysis” by Claudio Grossman

“Bashir is Dividing Us’: Africa and the International Criminal Court” by Kurt Mills

“Building a Barometer of Gay Rights (BGR): A Case Study of Uganda and the Persecution of Homosexuals” by Susan Dicklitch, Berwood Yost, and Bryan M. Dougan

“Rights-Based Approaches to Development: Implications for NGOs” by Shannon Kindornay, James Ron, and Charli Carpenter

“Iran: An Anthropologist Engaging the Human Rights Discourse and Practice” by Reza Afshari

“When We Launched the Government’s Agenda…?: Aid Agencies and Local Politics in Urban Africa” by Daniel E. Esser

“Women Smuggling and the Men Who Help Them: Gender, Corruption and Illicit Networks in Senegal” by Cynthia Howson

“Bringing ‘Indigenous’ Ownership Back: Chinese Presence and the Citizen Economic Empowerment Commission in Zambia” by Peter Kragelund

“The Grabbed State: Lawyers, Politics and Public Land in Kenya” by Ambreena Manji

“Memorial Politics: Challenging the Dominant Party’s Narrative in Namibia” by Elke Zuern

Middle East Policy, Vol. 19, no. 3, Fall 2012
“Syrian Revolt Fallout: End of the Resistance Axis?” by Erik Mohns and André Bank

“Turkish-Syrian Relations: A Checkered History” by Michael B. Bishku

“The Arab Spring: Its Geostrategic Significance” by Mohammed Ayoob

“Oman: The ‘Forgotten’ Corner of the Arab Spring” by James Worrall

“The Arab Revolutions: A Preliminary Reading” by Yusri Hazran

Middle East Policy, Vol. 19, no. 2, Summer 2012
“America and the Regional Powers in a Transforming Middle East” by F. Gregory Gause, III, and Ian S. Lustick

“Political Islam in the Arab Awakening: Who Are the Major Players?” by John Voll, Peter Mandaville, Steven Kull, and Alexis Arief

“Egyptian Politics and American Diplomacy” by William A. Rugh

“The Perverse Effect of Good Governance: Lessons from Morocco” by Abdeslam Maghraoui

“Algeria’s Path to Reform: Authentic Change?” by Yahia H. Zoubir and Ahmed Aghrout

“The Battle for Bahrain: Iranian-Saudi Rivalry” by Simon Mabon

“The Iranian Armed Forces in Politics, Revolution and War: Part One” by Ahmed S. Hashim

“Iran in the Horn of Africa: Outflanking U.S. Allies” by Jeffrey A. Lefebvre

“Post-Mubarak Egypt: History, Collective Memory and Memorialization” by Judy Barsalou

“Roots of Alawite-Sunni Rivalry in Syria”
by Ayse Tekdal Fildis

Orbis, Vol. 56, no. 3, Summer 2012
“The Diplomacy of a Rising China in South Asia” by John W. Garver

“Tibet and China’s ‘National Minority’ Policies” by Michael C. Davis

“Political Aspects of Taiwan’s Security in a New Asian Environment” by Arthur Waldron

“Can China and India Rise Peacefully?” by Sumit Ganguly and Manjeet S. Pardesi

Party Politics, Vol. 18, no. 5, September 2012
“Electoral and Party System Effects on Ruling Party Durability” by Misa Nishikawa

“Strategic Voting in Proportional Representation Systems: Evidence from a Natural Experiment” by Ignacio Lago

“Factionalism in Multi-Level Contexts: When Party Organization Becomes a Device” by Tania Verge and Raúl Gómez

“Legislative Recruitment: Using Diagnostic Testing to Explain Underrepresentation” by Jeanette Ashe and Kennedy Stewart

“The Behaviour of Political Parties and MPs in the Parliaments of the Weimar Republic” by Martin Ejnar Hansen and Marc Debus


Party Politics, Vol. 18, no. 4, July 2012
“Newness as a Winning Formula for New Political Parties” by Allan Sikk

“Political Market Orientation: A Framework for Understanding Relationship Structures in Political Parties” by Robert P. Ormrod and Heather Savigny

“How Many Political Parties Are There, Really? A New Measure of the Ideologically Cognizable Number of Parties/Party Groupings” by Bernard Grofman and Reuben Kline

Representation, Vol. 48, no. 3, September 2012
“Representation(s) in the Middle East” by Oren Barak and Gideon Rahat

“Women, Representation and Democracy in Post-Saddam Iraq, 2003–10” by Noga Efrati

“From Presence to Action: Political Representation and Democracy in Iraqi Kurdistan” by Ayelet Banai

“Representation and Democratic Progress in Kuwait” by Doron Shultziner and Mary Ann Tétreault

“Presence Out, Ideas In: Representation and Socio-Political Change in Jordan” by Assaf David

“Political Representation in Israel: Minority Sectors vs. Women” by Gideon Rahat and Reut Itzkovitch Malka

“Representation and Stability in Postwar Lebanon” by Oren Barak

“Civic Participation and Political Trust: The Impact of Compulsory Voting” by Krista Lundell

Taiwan Journal of Democracy, Vol. 8, no. 1, July 2012
“Argentine Democratic Politics in an Era of Global Economic Crisis” by Alejandro Bonvecchi and Javier Zelaznik

“A Democracy under Stress: Greece since 2010” by Dimitri A. Sotiropoulos


“Direct Democracy Upside Down” by Uwe Serdült and Yanina Welp

“The Risk of Partyarchy and Democratic Backsliding: Mexico’s 2007 Electoral Reform” by Gilles Serra

“Party Competition, Nomination Errors, and the Electoral Decline of the Japan Socialist Party” by Dennis Patterson and Joseph Robbins

“Activating Support for Social Movements: The Effect of the Internet on Public Opinion toward Social Movements in Hong Kong” by Francis L. F. Lee and Joseph Man Chan

“Shifting Eastern Mediterranean Geometry” by Jon B. Alterman and Haim Malka

“Turkey’s Strategic Vision and Syria” by Ömer Taspinar

“Turkey’s Role in Defusing the Iranian Nuclear Issue” by Aylin Gürzel

“Turkey’s Eroding Commitment to NATO: From Identity to Interests” by Tarik Oguzlu

“The Mystery of Phantom States” by Daniel Byman and Charles King

“Israel’s National Security Amidst Unrest in the Arab World” by Ephraim Inbar

“Recalibrating U.S.-Pakistan Relations” by Haider Ali Hussein Mullick

World Affairs, Vol. 16, no. 2, April/June 2012
“The Arab Spring: Over A Year Later” by Rajendra Abhyankar
New Research

“The ‘Rise of Asia’ Thesis” by Arunoday Bajpai

“Alternative Scenarios for Asia” by Sohail Innayatullah

“China 2020: A Confucian Democracy?” by Ravi Bhoothalingam

“Sri Lanka: An Unreadable Future” by Apratim Mukarji

World Politics, Vol. 64, no. 3, July 2012

“Global Networks and Domestic Policy Convergence: A Network Explanation of Policy Changes” by Xun Cao

“Coalitions and Language Politics: Policy Shifts in Southeast Asia” by Amy H. Liu and Jacob I. Ricks

“Associational Networks and Welfare States in Argentina, Brazil, South Korea, and Taiwan” by Cheol-Sung Lee
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**Benjamin Smith** is an associate professor of political science at the University of Florida. His research focuses on ethnic conflict, regime change, and the politics of resource wealth. His first book, *Hard Times in the Land of Plenty: Oil Politics in Iran and Indonesia*, was published in 2007 by Cornell University Press, and his articles have appeared in *World Politics*, the *American Journal of Political Science*, *Studies in Comparative International Development*, *the Journal of International Affairs*, and other journals and edited volumes. Dr. Smith is currently working on a book exploring the long-term factors that shape the success of separatist movements.
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Conor O’Dwyer is an associate professor of political science at the University of Florida. His book *Runaway State-Building: Patronage Politics and Democratic Development* examines the relationship between party-building and state-building in new democracies, looking specifically at the relationship between party competition and patronage politics in postcommunist Eastern Europe. His latest research examines the European Union’s use of conditionality to promote more liberal minorities policies in postcommunist states. Specifically, it examines the EU’s role in the contentious politics of homosexuality in postcommunist societies. Looking beyond just policy adoption, it examines the impact of EU-sponsored minority-rights policies: do they lead to shifts in attitudes regarding religious difference, national belonging, and minority rights?
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Managing Editor
Melissa Aten-Becnel is the senior research and conferences officer at the National Endowment for Democracy’s International Forum for Democratic Studies and associate director of the Network of Democracy Research Institutes. She earned an M.A. from The George Washington University’s Elliott School of International Affairs, where she focused on foreign policy and Central Europe.
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Adam Bilinski received a B.A. in International Relations at the University of Warsaw (Poland) and M.A. in Social Sciences from the University of Chicago. Currently he is a PhD student in Political Science at the University of Florida with specialization in comparative politics. His research interests include the problems of survival of democracy, electoral revolutions and democracy promotion. He is currently working on his dissertation, which evaluates how pre-democratization historical legacies (in the form of pre-democratization regime discontinuities and regime type both in independent states and colonies) conditioned the probability of survival of once-established democracies.