

RESPONSIVEGOV Project Final Workshop Programme

Democratic Responsiveness in Comparative Perspective

Monday 19 February 2018

9.30 am – 5.30 pm

Sciences Po
Salle du Conseil
13, rue de l'Université
75007 Paris



@aurielaki_shutterstock

Contact: siresa.lopez@sciencespo.fr
Compulsory registration on the link above

Programme

- 9.30 - 9.45 am: *Registration*
- 9.45 – 10 am: **Welcome and introductions**
- 10 - 10.30 am: **An overview of the ResponsiveGov project**, **Laura Morales**, Sciences Po, CEE
- 10.30-11.30 am: **“Is online protest effective? The impact of offline and online protest against ACTA”**, **Louisa Parks**, University of Trento, **Luca Bernardi**, Autonomous University of Barcelona, **Laura Morales**
Discussant: **Marco Giugni**, University of Geneva
- 11.30-11.45 am: *coffee break*
- 11.45 am – 12.45 pm: **“Does Timing Matter? How campaign periods affect parties’ reactions to the public”**, **Daniel Bischof**, University of Zurich
Discussant: **Jan Rovny**, Sciences Po, CEE & LIEPP
- 12.45-1.45 pm: *Lunch break (lunch provided in the room)*
- 1.45- 2.45 pm : **“Governing Status and Intra-party Disagreement in Europe”**, **Luca Bernardi**, **Oriol Sabaté**, Lund University, **Francesco Visconti**, University of Milan, **Laura Morales**
Discussant: **Luis Ramiro**, UNED
- 2.45-3-45 pm: **“Financial regulatory debates during the Global Financial Crisis”**, **Roy Gava**, University of Geneva, **Laura Morales**
Discussant: **Matthias Thiemann**, Sciences Po, CEE
- 3.45-4 pm: *Coffee break*
- 4 – 5.30 pm: **Book project**, **Laura Morales**
Discussant: **Anne Rasmussen**, University of Copenhagen

Paper Abstracts

Is online protest effective? The impact of offline and online protest against ACTA

Authors: Louisa Parks (University of Trento), Luca Bernardi (Autonomous University of Barcelona), Laura Morales (Sciences Po, CEE)

Abstract: Scholars of social movements have taken a keen interest in how activists engage online, in the connections between online and 'offline' protest, and in campaigns concerning Internet issues. The impacts of social movements, both on activists themselves as well as politics and policies, form another focus for social movement scholars. This paper bridges these two focuses of interest by investigating the impacts of 'offline' and online protest on policy. The chosen case is the Anti-counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA), an international trade agreement that came hot on the heels of the US's Stop Online Piracy and Protect Intellectual Property Acts, and was seen to contain clauses of equal danger to digital rights. By drawing on data from a comparative study of more than 20 western democratic governments' reactions to various types of pressure from the public on a wide range of policy issues – including the regulation of copyright protection on the Internet – collected within the ResponsiveGov project (<http://www.responsivegov.eu>), we are able to assess to what extent and under what conditions online and 'offline' protest are effective in achieving their goals. The paper uses fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fs-QCA) to examine the effects of different types of protest in a number of different countries, while taking into account scope conditions by employing a political opportunity framework.

Does Timing Matter? How campaign periods affect parties' reactions to the public

Author: Daniel Bischof (University of Zurich)

Abstract: Democratic theory understands elections as an edict to hire or fire political representatives. Thus, if elections are imminent political parties will pay careful attention to the mood of the majority of society. Therefore, I argue that during campaigns parties will be more likely to respond to the majority opinion and less likely to respond to protesters in an effort to seek re-election. A new and unique data-set has been created that contains rhetorical party positions on nuclear energy -- revealed in interviews, press statements, and press conferences -- for 67 parties in 12 democracies. My analysis shows that parties are more likely to respond to the median voter during campaign periods, while protesters' activity leads to counter reactions in party rhetoric during campaigns. The findings have important implications for our understanding how campaign periods affect party behavior.

Governing Status and Intra-Party Disagreement in Europe

Authors: Luca Bernardi (Autonomous University of Barcelona), Oriol Sabaté (Lund University), Francesco Visconti (University of Milan), Laura Morales (Sciences Po, CEE)

Abstract: Most of the studies on parties' internal divisions around policy issues analyse party cohesion in legislative behaviour while little attention is paid to the study of intra-party policy disagreement outside the parliamentary arena. This paper focuses on the impact of governing status on publicly expressed intra-party policy disagreement, as captured by the media. We argue that governing parties are more likely to experience higher internal policy disagreement than opposition parties, as they face a larger number of tensions. Additionally, we also argue that the distance between the party and the public matters. We analyse data on a variety of verbal statements by party representatives on the policy issue relating to the regulation of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) obtained through national press agencies. The dataset includes 696 statements from representatives of 19 parties in 9 European democracies. We find that internal disagreement is much higher in governing parties than opposition parties and that the policy distance between parties and voters matters differently for governing and opposition parties. By providing evidence of the additional internal tensions that governing parties need to deal with, our study contributes to research on party cohesion, parties' policy positions and coalition governance.

Financial regulatory debates during the Global Financial Crisis

Authors: Roy Gava (University of Geneva), Oriol Sabaté (Lund University), Laura Morales (Sciences Po, CEE)

Abstract: This draft paper argues that analytically describing and qualifying the scope of debates on financial regulation contributes to our understanding of the complex processes behind regulatory responses to the Global Financial Crisis (GFC). Analytically, the paper seeks to map different types of debates on financial regulation during the GFC by considering the pressure for change coming from inside and outside the practitioners' community. Empirically, the paper focuses on two regulatory issues: (1) the separation and restriction of banking activities, and (2) the debate on the remuneration of bankers. Our dataset tracks political events and covers 21 established democracies. In this draft paper, we discuss contrasting scenarios in terms of policy debates, present our dataset (still under construction) and discuss preliminary empirical findings.

Sciences Po, 5th Floor
13 rue de l'Université, 75007 Paris

