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Abstract

These three papers examine the broader theme of deviations from presidential term limits. The first paper identifies the economic and political effects of these deviations in low- and middle-income democracies. Using event study analysis, this paper demonstrates the negative political effects of term limit deviations; the economic effects are less clear, however, showing mixed results. To reduce these negative consequences, this paper recommends that low- and middle-income democracies prioritize the respect for presidential term limits in their domestic policy agendas to protect political rights and civil liberties and reduce corruption. High-income countries, for their part, should emphasize the importance of maintaining presidential term limits through their foreign policy to promote political freedom and transparency and should consider conditioning aid upon this requirement.

The second paper argues that the retention of term limits in Colombia and their elimination in Venezuela in 2009 was a critical determinant that led to the divergent fortunes of these once-similar countries. Using a causal narrative approach, this case study reveals the key institutional and environmental differences that led to decidedly different economic and political fortunes in these two countries. The continued adherence to presidential term limits is itself a crucial factor, but the active presence of a loyal opposition, a more diversified macroeconomy, and the independence of key institutions, in particular the judiciary, also proved critical to paving the path to prosperity for Colombia; their absence in Venezuela, however, led down a road to ruin.

The third paper evaluates a set of relevant historical cases using a qualitative comparative analysis method to determine which institutions have been associated with the successful prevention of term limit deviations in the past. The findings of this study suggest that governments and civil society organizations in low- and middle-income democracies that want to protect term limits, as well as their high-income donors, should make promotion of the independence and strength of national legislatures their priority, in addition to supporting independent judiciaries, electoral commissions, and militaries and strong opposition parties.
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1. The Effect of Deviations from Presidential Term Limits in Low-and Middle-Income Democracies

“History has shown us that if you let a person stay for a long time, that person wields a lot of power. He holds the purse strings of the nation because government is the biggest employer; it is the paymaster and it is difficult to say that people are free to make decisions on their own...One cannot anoint oneself in perfume but be surrounded by garbage and expect to smell good.”

- Anderson Mazoka, Zambian presidential candidate\(^1\)

“The problem of Africa in general and Uganda in particular is not people, but leaders who want to overstay in power which breeds impunity, corruption and promotes patronage...For us in NRM/A, we shall be here for only four years, after which we shall hand over power to a free and fairly elected civilian government.”

- Yoweri Museveni, President of Uganda, Inaugural Speech, 1986\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) (Baker, 2002)

\(^2\) (Dulani, 2011)
Introduction

The gulf in living standards between high-income and low- and middle-income countries is attributable in large measure to the differences in quality of governance between these groups of nations. Poor quality governance is often accompanied by corruption, stagnant growth and development, and political instability. In electoral democracies, the degradation of political rights and representation often results from the consolidation of power by democratically-elected presidents through the alteration or elimination of constitutional term limits. In recent years, the increase in term limit deviations, particularly among the leaders of Latin American and African countries, has raised concern among those who worry about their effects.

In an ideal world, we would not need artificial constraints that mandated when elected leaders would be forced to leave power. Sage, respected leaders, in the mold of George Washington, would give up power willingly and at the appropriate time to preserve the charter and character of the democracy. Historical experience, however, teaches us that this is not always the case. While no democracy in a developed country has ever backslid into dictatorship, many electoral regimes in the developing world have. In his 2004 article “Democracy and Economic Development,” Adam Przeworski addressed this very subject. He found a strong correlation in observing that no democracy that has surpassed a GDP per capita of over $6,000 has ever lapsed into dictatorship. While Przeworski did not claim that economic development leads to democracy, he did observe that democracies that reach a certain per capita income threshold remain democratic in perpetuity. In contrast, numerous low- and middle-income democracies below this threshold have reverted to dictatorships after popularly-elected leaders consolidated and then refused to cede power at the appointed time, often removing constitutional term limits in the process. Because of the increasing prevalence and potentially profound political and economic consequences of these term limit deviations, it is imperative that we understand their impact in order to craft appropriate policies to preserve this constitutional safeguard if it does indeed merit protection.

---

3 (Kaufmann, Kraay, & Zoido-Lobaton, 1999)
4 (Democracy, Governance, and Growth, 2003)
5 (Collier, 2007)
6 (Governance, Corruption, and Economic Performance, 2002)
7 (Yiew, Habibullah, Law, & Azman-Saini, 2016)
8 (Dulani, 2011)
9 (Armstrong, 2011)
10 (Corrales & Penfold, 2014)
11 (Posner & Young, 2007)
12 (Przeworski, 2004)
While the theoretical and empirical arguments in favor of presidential term limits have been made by many political scientists, the specific political and economic consequences of term limit deviations in countries that have had these constitutional provisions remain to be established. In this paper, I seek to make the consequences of these deviations explicit. I begin by discussing the relevant background literature on term limits, including an assessment of the balance of the existing theoretical arguments and empirical evidence. To further existing scholarship, I extend this research using the unique database I have created, based on the most recent data available, to determine the specific economic and political effects of term limit deviations. The evidence shows that there are demonstrable political consequences resulting from term limit deviations: significant declines in both political rights and civil liberties ensued in countries that experienced these deviations relative to similar countries that did not. While the political effect was clear, the economic variables under study showed no significant effects from term limit deviations. Using the results of this statistical analysis, I propose various policy alternatives to address the issue of term limit deviations in low- and middle-income democracies.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 1 discusses the relevant literature on presidential term limits. Section 2 explains the methodology used in the paper. Section 3 presents the data and describes the approach to data collection, data manipulation, descriptive statistics, and the testing of key assumptions. Section 4 discusses the results from the event study analysis as well as various robustness checks. Section 5 presents the discussion of the results and their policy implications for the institution of presidential term limits. Section 6 concludes the paper.
1.1 The Relevant Literature on Presidential Term Limits

The issue of term limit deviations and their potentially profound impact on the economic and political fortunes of a country appeared to be an understudied phenomenon throughout developing democracies the world over. Conducting preliminary internet searches for research on presidential term limits yielded global studies (Ginsburg, Melton, and Elkins)\textsuperscript{13} and various regional studies on Latin America (Corrales and Penfold)\textsuperscript{14} and Africa (Posner and Young; Armstrong)\textsuperscript{15,16}. These foundational pieces all argue for the importance of upholding term limits, confirming my initial belief in their importance. They also led me to other related research that dealt with democracy promotion and consolidation and the utility, rationale, and prevalence of the constitutional safeguard of presidential term limits.

Having examined the broad arguments around presidential term limits, I then began working backward, delving into the history behind them and the governance literature more broadly. Governance is of course a field that has attracted considerable attention, but I tried to narrow my focus to its application to term limits while using the history of the issue to frame the modern debate. Before determining the specific economic and political effects of term limit deviations, however, I needed to have a firm grasp of the different theoretical arguments for and against presidential term limits as well as the existing empirical literature on the subject.

1.1.1 The Broader Governance Literature

Term limits are a niche but important part of the broader universe of governance, an oft-used, catch-all subject that has garnered considerable interest over the years from academics and policy makers alike. There are numerous different definitions of governance and exactly what it incorporates, but for my purposes I will use the United Nations Development Programme’s fairly traditional, inclusive version: “the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country’s affairs at all levels. It comprises the mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences.”\textsuperscript{17} Governance, therefore, is not only the exercise of authority, but also the way in which that authority is exercised and the various groups that play a role in its administration throughout the different segments of society.

---

\textsuperscript{13} (Ginsburg, Melton, & Elkins, 2011)
\textsuperscript{14} (Corrales & Penfold, 2014)
\textsuperscript{15} (Posner & Young, 2007)
\textsuperscript{16} (Armstrong, 2011)
\textsuperscript{17} (UNESCO, 2006)
Effective governance in democratic states is therefore of great importance because it
determines a government’s ability to deliver services, adjudicate disputes, and uphold the rule of
law. In well-run states, government capacity is high and the active participation of civil society
both aids and monitors the implementation of policies and services. This symbiotic relationship
often breaks down in states with less capacity or transparency, as the government and civil society
are often at odds over the use and distribution of public funds or the exercise of state power.
Perhaps no place is more indicative of the pervasive impact of governance than on the island of
Hispaniola, home to both the Dominican Republic and Haiti. Numerous studies have examined the
sources behind the divergent fortunes of these two neighbors that boasted approximately the same
per capita GDP in 1960, with two papers specifically concluding that it can be explained by the gulf
in governance18 and policy.19 Reliable, if unspectacular governance has allowed the Dominican
Republic to achieve middle-income status by virtue of reasonable governmental/societal
performance while Haiti remains mired as a low-income country in no small part due to its dismal
record in this regard. Governance, as witnessed in this and other examples, can have tremendous
impact on a range of key outcomes and therefore merits the continued scrutiny it has received in
academic and policy circles.

The issue of the measurement of governance, given that term limits are a subset of
governance, is also an important part of the broader previous literature. The problem of how best to
measure governance has been the subject of considerable interest and debate. Because governance
is by its nature a somewhat nebulous concept, there is undeniable subjectivity in both its definition
and its measurement. Moreover, the way in which governance is defined will necessarily dictate the
way in which it is measured. Many measures of governance, such as the World Bank’s Worldwide
Governance Indicators (often perceived as the industry standard), include indicators of democratic
accountability, such as voice and transparency. This view presupposes that good governance and
democracy are fundamentally linked. Most alternative measures of governance, such as those
provided by Bertelsmann, The Economist, or Polity, are all intertwined with indicators of
democracy as well. Critics of this approach, however, have not necessarily accepted the
compulsory connection between democracy and good governance, contending instead that factors
such as performance, capacity, and autonomy should be the principle yardsticks by which
governance is measured. Francis Fukuyama, in particular, illustrates that some of the World Bank’s
criteria, such as political stability and lack of violence, could just as easily appear in a totalitarian
state such as North Korea as in an advanced democracy such as Denmark.20 The connection
between democracy and governance is a subject that I will return to in examining the effects of
presidential term limits.

18 (UNEP, 2013)
19 (Jamarillo & Sancak, 2007)
20 (Fukuyama, 2013)
It is widely believed that presidential term limits reinforce the rule of law and therefore good governance. The research of Posner and Young, Corrales and Penfold, and Zamfir supports this connection. The importance of a government’s ability to uphold presidential term limits is perhaps best exemplified in the contrasting cases of Colombia and Venezuela since the beginning of the 21st century. In Colombia, Alvaro Uribe’s 2010 bid to change the constitution to allow himself a third term was denied by the constitutional court; that country then transitioned successfully to new leadership and has maintained a positive growth trajectory. Venezuela, on the other hand, has become a cautionary tale. Hugo Chavez, initially rebuffed in his attempts to abolish term limits, was eventually successful in doing so in 2009 and was thus able to continue the ruinous policies that have led to fiscal deficits, runaway inflation, and rampant crime even after his death in 2013. Two neighbors, with similar demographics and economic profiles, headed in opposite directions in no small measure due to the adherence to and elimination of presidential term limits. This critical case is examined in greater detail in a companion paper that details the specific ways in which term limits contributed to the divergent development paths of current-day Colombia and Venezuela.

1.1.2 The History of Term Limits

Term limits are by no means a new phenomenon, having been both debated and implemented as far back as ancient Greece. Athenian democracy embraced the use of term limits for certain offices, as did the Roman Republic. Both of these foundational civilizations recognized the inherent danger to democracy of a ruler or certain officials consolidating power and remaining in office indefinitely. No less an authority on politics than Aristotle weighed in on the subject, asserting that “a man should not hold the same office twice…and that the tenure of all offices should be brief.” As the idea and practice of democracy resurfaced with the dawn of the Enlightenment, so too did the issue of term limits. In crafting the United States Constitution, Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton clashed over the inclusion of presidential term limits. Jefferson, dismayed at the exclusion of term limits in the final draft of the Constitution, wrote to James Madison in 1787 that “I dislike, and greatly dislike, the abandonment in every instance of the necessity of rotation in office and most particularly in the case of the President.” He believed that it was a failing of the Constitution that it included no specific provision on presidential term limits, which had been debated during the Constitutional Convention of 1787 but eventually left out. Alexander Hamilton,
defending this decision, contended that the experience of the executive mattered and that the state needed capable leaders in times of emergency or during the critical times when the state is forming and democracy is nascent.\footnote{Ginsburg et al., 2011} These arguments, now 230 years old, echo into the present.

Other famed figures of the Enlightenment and the wars of revolution and liberation also weighed in on the subject. The British political philosopher David Hume asserted that governance requires experience and that people get better over time. While this is undoubtedly true of most jobs and positions, none other than The Liberator, Simon Bolivar, claimed that

> “Nothing is more perilous than to permit one citizen to retain power for an extended period. The people become accustomed to obeying him, and he forms the habit of commanding them; herein lie the origins of usurpation and tyranny…Our citizens must with good reason learn to fear lest the magistrate who has governed them long will govern them forever.”\footnote{Carey, 2003}

The fact that Bolivar would later reverse course on the issue of term limits once in office only serves to underscore the importance of his point.

In the 1990s, what Samuel Huntington dubbed the “third wave of democracy”\footnote{Huntington, 1993} rekindled the debate over term limits. As developing nations emerged from the shadows of the Cold War, they began to democratize and redesign their constitutions. Because of the traditions of caudillismo\footnote{Caudillismo is the tradition in former Spanish colonies of deferring to the rule of a caudillo, or local political or military leader/strongman, which reinforces the tendency of these countries toward autocratic government.} in Latin America and “the Big Man” syndrome in Africa, which placed considerable importance on the indispensability of a particular leader, democratic actors in these countries sought constitutional protections to prevent the consolidation of executive power. Though Latin America had long had nominal term limits, they were often ignored when convenient, while African experience with this mechanism was less common.

Since the 1990s, however, term limits have in fact become the norm in presidential regimes throughout the world.\footnote{Baturo, 2010} In Africa, 33 of the 48 constitutions enacted in sub-Saharan Africa during the 1990s included presidential term limits, as compared with only six beforehand.\footnote{Zamfir, 2016} In Latin America, meanwhile, term limits gained greater traction in the 1990s, with the constitutional
challenges of prominent leaders such as Argentina’s Carlos Menem and Peru’s Alberto Fujimori. These challenges were met with either political or popular resistance; as a result, these leaders were often forced to compromise (as in the case of Menem) or pushed out of power entirely (as in the case of Fujimori). Despite these initial successes and the fact that presidential term limits remain in place in many developing democracies, there remain numerous instances of them being eliminated or ignored.

Despite their uneven record of being respected in the developing world over the last thirty years, popular support for presidential term limits remains high. A 2013 Afrobarometer survey conducted in 34 countries with presidential or semi-presidential regimes throughout Africa found that approximately 75% of people favor a two-term presidential limit. Even in a country such as Uganda, which voted to abolish term limits in 2005, 85% of the population supports the concept (see Figure 1). While African populations support presidential term limits in theory by wide margins, it appears the Big Man tradition still holds sway. Nonetheless, the widespread support for term limits remains encouraging for advocates of this constitutional check on executive power.

Figure 1.1: Support for presidential term limits in African countries, 2011-2013

Source: Dulani, 2015

33 (Dulani, 2015)
In Latin America over the last few years, the citizens of both Ecuador and Bolivia have pushed back against popular presidents (both of whom had previously extended their terms) and rejected the abolition of term limits through a combination of national referenda and popular protests. While Rafael Correa has since stepped down in Ecuador and been barred from re-election, Evo Morales continues to try to find ways to remain in power in Bolivia. Term limits remain contentious, as their history shows, but the specific empirical effects of deviations have yet to be conclusively established.

1.1.3 The Theoretical Arguments for Term Limits

While scholars and policy makers alike have long advocated for presidential term limits, the most convincing arguments continue to center around the check on personal ambition, the inherent advantages of incumbency, the promotion of democracy and democratic institutions, and the need for systemic stability. Term limits, as Jefferson and others have argued, represent a necessary curb on the ambitions of the executive. They stand as a bulwark against presidents becoming dictators and the dangerous consolidation of authority that often results from individuals remaining in power. Term limits act as a failsafe when highly influential or charismatic leaders seek to prolong their stints in office. One of the chief dangers of presidentialism (the unique characteristics of a presidential system), according to Juan Linz, is the tendency of the president to conflate his/her elected position with the will of the people. According to this line of thinking, effective term limits ensure a hard stop to a president’s time in office and apply the brakes on the dangerous accumulation of power.

An additional hypothesized benefit to term limits is the promotion of the integrity of institutions and democratic consolidation through the consistent application of the rule of law. In this capacity, they support adherence to constitutional norms in elevating the state over the individual. They reinforce institutional rules. Supporting this view, Sub-Saharan African leaders in particular have been more beholden to the formal rules of their respective constitutions and less reliant on extraconstitutional means during the “third wave,” even if they may still alter the terms. These safeguards are designed to promote a party-based, rather than a personality-based democracy with a healthy turnover in leadership. In developing countries, where the personalization of politics has often trumped faith in institutions, term limits can “create a window of opportunity for many ordinary citizens to ascend to public office.”

34 (Linz, 1990)
35 (Linz, 1990)
36 (Posner & Young, 2007)
37 (Dulani, 2011)
While several presidents have argued that term limits undermine policy continuity and therefore development, academics have long lauded the benefits of alternation in power with regard to stability. Having a predictable pattern to electoral change is, they contend, a good thing for democratic consolidation and stability. Samuel Huntington argued that successful democratic consolidation requires two peaceful turnovers of authority.\(^{38}\) Having new blood in office ensures that new ideas will come to the forefront and different constituencies will be represented. In Latin America, the steady parade of ex-presidents rotating in office in some countries (e.g., Chile, Peru) may in fact guarantee elite survival rather than elite renewal and bring about the subsequent narrowing of politics.\(^{39}\) Hard term limits can potentially prevent this elite capture while simultaneously providing the opposition with an opportunity to contest elections and possibly gain the highest office. This openness and opportunity discourage an opposition movement from resorting to unconstitutional actions including violent attempts to overthrow the government.\(^{40}\) If, however, the opposition feels that it has no legal recourse to attain power, it is much more likely to resort to violence, which can be fatal for stability and prosperity.

A further compelling argument put forth in favor of term limits is the considerable incumbency advantage of sitting presidents. On a basic public relations level, the president is simply more familiar to the populace and has greater name-brand recognition. People are often tempted to stick with what they know. Furthermore, allowing for non-consecutive re-election, as some Latin American countries do, may also favor known candidates and crowd out newer leaders, as discussed in the previous paragraph. From an economic perspective, sitting presidents may have access to substantial public resources, including money to fund their re-election campaigns and state-run media to promote their candidacy and agenda.\(^{41}\) Many presidents in developing countries, in order to ensure popular support, also establish broad patronage networks that leave large swaths of the population dependent upon their largesse and continuation in power.\(^{42}\) The collective impact and weight of these factors often make it difficult to unseat an incumbent without the artificial constraint of term limits.

Finally, there is the supposition that politicians in their final term, freed from the constraints of re-election, are free to promote the policies they feel are in the best interests of the nation. This effect, known commonly as “lame-duck syndrome,” may result in better policy because of the

\(^{38}\) (Huntington, 1993)
\(^{39}\) (Corrales & Penfold, 2014)
\(^{40}\) (Ginsburg et al., 2011)
\(^{41}\) (Baker, 2002)
\(^{42}\) (Baker, 2002)
prioritization of the public welfare over more myopic political concerns.\textsuperscript{43} It bears mention though that this argument has an easy and natural, if cynical, counterargument in that politicians are just as likely to pursue their own self-interests as those of the state during their final term in office.

As an ancillary issue to the existential debate on term limits, there is the question of the ideal number of presidential terms. Is a one-term limit, as exists in several Latin American countries (Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, Paraguay, and Colombia once again) and a few others (South Korea and the Philippines), too short of a mandate to allow presidents to enact necessary change? Or might a two-term limit (or more) allow for the dangerous consolidation of power? The argument that presidents need two terms to gain critical experience but also have time to implement their vision and cement their legacies is certainly plausible and may well be the reason that one-term limits remain rare in presidential systems. Colombia, interestingly, changed from a one-term limit to a two-term limit under then-President Alvaro Uribe in 2005, realizing important security and economic gains. After a failed attempt to secure a third term, Uribe’s successor subsequently pursued and secured a return to a one-term limit. While this is a potentially fruitful and important area of inquiry, I will leave this question to future, follow-on research, as it is not the focus of this paper.

1.1.4 The Theoretical Arguments against Term Limits

Despite the numerous compelling theoretical arguments in favor of presidential term limits, valid arguments against their universal implementation exist as well. The main reason offered against term limits is that they are inherently anti-democratic, but other arguments assert that they undermine stability and continuity, lead to a lack of accountability, and, in the extreme, may foment constitutional crises. Moreover, having term limits in place is no guarantee that former presidents will not continue to yield considerable influence—as when Vladimir Putin assumed the position of prime minister in Russia—or that a rotation in the ruling party necessarily occurs if term-limited elections are contested—a fallacy to which the PRI’s monopoly of power in Mexico during the better part of the 20th century testifies.\textsuperscript{44}

The most fundamental argument against presidential term limits is that it may controvert the will of the democratic majority. If the people want to retain a president, the argument goes, they should have the ability to do so in an election unconstrained by constitutional mandate or imposition. Taking the decision out of the hands of the electorate presupposes that they are not qualified or politically mature enough to make this decision themselves. The populace, if it so

\textsuperscript{43} (Smart & Sturm, 2003)
\textsuperscript{44} (Dulani, 2011)
desires, should have the ability or option to change course downstream and re-elect a president or even change or alter term limits if there is sufficient support.\footnote{(Ginsburg et al., 2011)}

There is also the contention that maintaining the same leader or administration in power provides a necessary source of policy stability and continuity, especially in developing democracies that tend to be more fragile. It is undoubtedly true that presidents, like anyone else, improve at their jobs over time, and that experience is often the best teacher. Though at the same time, it is also possible that presidents may become better at the art of consolidating power. That they may figure out how best to manipulate the levers of power, including state resources, intelligence capabilities, and media to maintain their position and authority. Zamfir found a clear correlation between the length of time a leader stays in power and the decline of political rights, civil liberties, governance, and press freedom.\footnote{(Zamfir, 2016)} Still, the argument remains that frequent executive turnover may indeed promote unnecessary policy fluctuations in countries that lack stability. While the shortcomings of this argument were addressed in the previous section, there have been noteworthy examples of long-serving elected leaders who achieved impressive development gains. Singapore’s Lee Kwan Yew and Rwanda’s Paul Kagame are examples that are put forward by some scholars. However, even the most ardent opponent of term limits would likely agree that these transformative leaders have been the exception, rather than the rule. Furthermore, the conflict and violence that result from the attempts to unseat long-standing rulers also undermine this argument.\footnote{(Zamfir, 2016)}

Finally, there is the issue of electoral constraint and potential constitutional crisis. If a sitting president is unconstrained by the desire or need to get re-elected, there is the danger that they may seek to promote their own narrow personal gain or wealth during their final term. Knowing that the state is often the principal source of revenue in developing countries, they may attempt to squeeze all the possible benefits out of the office of the presidency before exiting the position. Additionally, with a final term on the horizon, a constitutional crisis might arise. Alexander Hamilton argued that leaders might provoke such a constitutional crisis in order to remain in power, and Gouveneur Morris (another founding father and a signatory of the US Constitution) claimed that leaders might resort to violent means to stay in power. Both of these actions could easily destabilize a fragile government.

\subsection{The Evidence on Term Limits}

In assessing the arguments of these opposing theoretical camps, the balance of the empirical evidence should weigh heavily. Numerous research studies exist that provide this empirical
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evidence, either directly or indirectly, on term limits including papers on political stability, the benefits of rotating leadership, the advantages of incumbency, and the reasons that leaders respect or violate term limits. Before addressing the overall research trends, I first present a general overview of the empirical literature.

1.1.5.1 On Political Stability

On the subject of political stability, Przeworski’s landmark study “Democracy and Economic Development” examined the commonly-held perception that dictatorships outperform democracies where development is concerned. The conventional wisdom holds that dictatorships, due to their longer tenure and ability to mandate certain economic, investment, or infrastructure policies, tend to produce higher growth. In a comparison of democratic versus dictatorial economic performance from 1951-1999, Przeworski found this claim to be unsubstantiated. He performed regression analysis on his historical dataset to establish that neither investment nor capital stock growth was higher under dictatorships, and, moreover, that per capita income actually grew faster under democracies (due to slower population growth in democratic regimes).48 Dictatorships, he demonstrated, do not necessarily produce better economic results than democracies; therefore, there is no reason to “sacrifice democracy at the altar of development.”49 Within democracies, he further debunked the argument that changes in chief executives impair stability and therefore growth and development; changes in chief executive only undermined economic growth in dictatorships, not democracies, he found. These conclusions undercut the political stability argument of those who oppose presidential term limits on the grounds that longer-serving leaders (be they autocratic or democratic) promote stability and hence growth and development.

Democracies have come to be associated with higher incomes, with the vast majority of high-income countries full participatory democracies. As a result of the association of democracy with higher incomes, Przeworski claimed that people will respect electoral results if they believe that they have a chance to gain power in future elections. This idea highlights the reason that respect for term limits is critical: if there is even a possibility of an opposition victory, “the mere prospect of alternation in office can avoid violence”50 if people have a vested stake in the system. The likelihood of victory still matters though—if the system is perceived as rigged, then the possibility of overthrow becomes more rational and likely. Still, as Posner and Young pointed out in their 2007 paper “The Institutionalization of Political Power in Africa,” the increasing reliance of African leaders on institutions over extraconstitutional methods to extend their terms in office has improved stability and predictability and augurs well for the future of democracy on the continent.

48 (Przeworski, 2004)
49 (Przeworski, 2004)
50 (Przeworski, 2004)
Posner and Young used observational data to create an updated dataset from 1960-2005 that details the ways in which 227 Sub-Saharan African leaders left power (Figure 2).

Figure 1.2: How African Leaders Have Left Power, By Decade

According to their data, by the 2000s, African leaders were as likely as leaders in the rest of the world to leave power by regular vs. irregular means. Faith in the democratic system matters, and their data indicate that adherence to democratic norms and institutions increasingly matter as well.

1.1.5.2 On the Benefits of Rotating Leadership

Numerous research studies demonstrate that the practice of rotation in leadership has proven democratic benefits. Alesina et al. used robust regression techniques on a dataset from 1960-1985 to conclude that while coup d’états do reduce economic growth, “routine” turnovers of leadership do not. Taking this logic one step further, Przeworski, again using regression analysis on the aforementioned dataset, concluded that democracies are in fact more likely to survive when heads of government change every few years. Zamfir used recent data (1990s-2015) on sub-Saharan African countries from several widely available sources (the Ibrahim Index of African Governance, Reporters Without Borders, and Freedom House) to support the benefits of rotation in office. He found that there is a negative correlation between length of time in office and political and civil

---

51 (Posner & Young, 2007)
52 (Posner & Young, 2007)
53 (Alesina, Ozler, Roubini, & Swagel, 1996)
54 (Przeworski, 2004)
rights; he also found a similar negative correlation between length of time in office and governance and press freedom scores.\textsuperscript{55} Collectively, these results undermine the argument that term limits are inherently destabilizing, establish the importance of preventing deviations to maintain civil liberties, and support the broader enforcement of presidential term limits.

A consistent rotation in the executive, however, often only occurs because leaders are compelled to step down as a result of term limits. Baturo analyzed historical records from 1960-2008 and cites the critical impact of term limits in assuring new candidates have a legitimate chance to win elections:

“in 60 percent of elections without incumbents, the latter did not run because of term limits, while in 38 percent they did not run because they died or exited ‘irregularly’, which suggests that term limits were the most important obstacle preventing them from standing for re-election.”\textsuperscript{56}

\textbf{Figure 1.3: Presidential Tenure Restrictions, 1960-2008}\textsuperscript{57}

Figure 3 shows that the incorporation of terms limits into the constitution (whether respected or not) has dramatically increased over the last fifty years, as has the proportion of countries in which formal term limits are actually in effect. When coupled with Cheeseman’s finding that in Africa

\textsuperscript{55} (Zamfir, 2016)  
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\textsuperscript{57} (Baturo, 2010)
“opposition parties are almost four times more likely to win elections when the sitting president
does not stand,”58 the importance of term limits in assuring a healthy rotation in the highest office
becomes clear. Additionally, when presidents honor term limits, their successors are more likely to
do the same. Dulani traced this path dependency in his 2011 dissertation, using regression analysis
on his dataset of Sub-Saharan African countries from 1990-2009 to show that the established
precedent of alternation in office is significantly associated with the entrenchment of the institution
of presidential term limits.59

1.1.5.3 On the Advantages of Incumbency

There is a considerable empirical literature that establishes the overwhelming advantages that
incumbent candidates, and presidents in particular, enjoy in elections throughout the world. In the
United States, Lee used a regression discontinuity analysis to show that incumbency had a
significant causal effect, raising the probability of re-election by 0.40 to 0.45.60 In the developing
world, with the deck stacked even further in favor of incumbents, this probability is likely to be
even greater. Posner and Young, in compiling their historical database of potential term limit
deviations, found that incumbents in Africa won re-election more than 85% of the time.61 Using his
more recent 2016 dataset, Zamfir noted that “since independence, only 18 African heads of state
have lost re-election—a small proportion on a continent with 54 states,”62 and these eighteen leaders
came from only eleven countries. The statistics on incumbency in Latin America are no more
encouraging: incumbents won 90% of the time under consecutive re-election and 83% of the time
under indefinite re-election.63 Corrales and Penfold’s regression model estimated that “the right to
re-election increases the electoral advantage of incumbents” by approximately 60%.64 While they
did not find any particular electoral advantages for former presidents in countries that allow non-
consecutive re-election (just under half of all Latin American democracies with term limits), the
practice of bringing back former presidents may result in elite capture of the presidency and
“crowding out” of newer candidates.65 Given that Latin America has far and away the highest
incidence of this constitutional quirk of any other region, it is not surprising to see a number of ex-
 presidents return to office as in Bolivia (de Lozada in 2002), Peru (Garcia in 2006), Nicaragua
(Ortega in 2007), Chile (Bachelet in 2014), and Uruguay (Vazquez in 2015), among others.
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Beyond the potential stagnancy resulting from having the same leaders in office, there is the more salient issue of governance performance. Corrales and Penfold found that countries with non-consecutive re-election performed significantly better on the World Bank’s Worldwide Governance Indicator (WGI) scores relative to countries that feature other types of electoral designs with less restrictive rules. Countries without any limits on consecutive election scored the worst among all types of presidential regimes. While this finding is not enough to prove causation, the correlation between more restrictive presidential term limits and better governance scores is telling.

1.1.5.4 On the Reasons That Leaders Respect Term Limits

Several studies have sought to determine the factors that influence leaders to respect term limits. Posner and Young, based on their observational dataset in Africa, claimed that public opinion, age of a leader, and foreign aid dependence are the most salient variables. Analyzing their data set from 1990-2005, they found that leaders with higher margins of victory in the previous election were more likely to test term limits. They also posited that younger leaders would be more likely to test term limits because they would expect to benefit more from being in office and may have a greater fear of prosecution for potential crimes given a longer life expectancy post-presidency; leaders who sought a third term in their sample had an average age of 60 compared to 66 for those who did not. Finally, Posner and Young cited foreign aid dependence as an important predictor of term limit deviation. They asserted that higher dependence on foreign aid makes countries more susceptible to donor pressures to respect constitutional norms. The attempted violators in their sample had a median aid as a percentage of GDP of 7.3% while those presidents who respected term limits averaged 12.1%. While observational data is important, a more quantitative approach could reinforce these hypotheses. Thankfully, Dulani conducted just such a similar study of African leaders with a larger database and a more rigorous, regression-based approach and found the statistically significant third-term determinants to be a precedent of alternation, government legislative majority, ethnic fragmentation, legislative fractionalization, a president’s military background, and foreign aid dependency. Dulani found no such connection between either the share of vote in the previous election or age of the president and the seeking of a third presidential term.

---

66 (Corrales & Penfold, 2014)
67 (Posner & Young, 2007)
68 (Posner & Young, 2007)
1.1.6 Reconciling the Two Arguments

Despite the presence of valid theoretical arguments on both sides of the term limit debate, the weight of the scholarship falls clearly on the side of the pro-term limits camp. One could argue that the majority of political scientists, who conduct these studies, themselves support term limits, but the overwhelming nature of the empirical results speak volumes. Term limits do seem conclusively to promote stability and good governance and therefore democratic consolidation. Democratic consolidation requires institution building, protected freedoms, and the consistent application of the rule of law; it involves more than just holding elections, and many elections, particularly in Africa, do not qualify as “free and fair.” Huntington’s two-turnover test, in which a democracy is not consolidated until it has had two peaceful turnover of power, still applies, and the measure of a mature democracy is when those in power accept the rules of the game as legitimate and unalterable.

Term limits may represent a lack of faith in the electorate, but many democracies—African ones in particular—may not be established enough to have complete electoral freedom. The incumbency advantages are simply too strong. Term limits themselves do not produce democracies, rather they foster an environment in which they are more likely to survive. Where term limits are repealed, it is often in an undemocratic, corrupt process. Bribery, intimidation, and influence peddling are frequently employed. The paradox then, is that restricting democratic choice may allow for greater democratic consolidation. The weight of the existing scholarship clearly appears to favor term limits.

1.1.7 Limitations of the Literature

While the theoretical and empirical arguments have been made that presidential term limits promote alternation in power, provide more space for opposition parties and candidates, and open up the political space, the specific political and economic consequences of term limit deviations remain to be established. I did not find any empirical before-and-after comparisons to measure the empirical effects of term limit deviations. If we are to advocate against the alteration or elimination of presidential term limits, our arguments would be strengthened with specific, demonstrable proof of any negative effects. There is also the question of which institutions most effectively prevent deviations from term limits. While there are several good small-N case studies available, such as the dissertations by Armstrong and Dulani, there are not any medium or larger cross-country studies that might delve into the comparative cases to find commonalities and patterns in the protection of term limits. A companion paper examines the institutions that most effectively protect term
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limits,\textsuperscript{72} while this paper will attempt to determine the specific economic and political effects of deviations. It is on this latter subject that the following research and results shed further light. There are also interesting questions that remain unanswered regarding the ideal number of terms as well as the ideal length of presidential terms, but I do not address those issues in this paper.

\textsuperscript{72} (Gelfeld, 2018c)
1.2 Methods

The primary methodology used in this study is event study analysis, which is a subset of difference-in-difference design. Difference-in-difference design is chiefly used to measure and compare the before-and-after effects of a particular policy, intervention, or event using a quasi-experimental approach at a single point in time. However, because I am trying to pinpoint the effects of a specific event—presidential term limit deviations—that happened at different points in time in different countries, I used event study analysis which was initially developed for economics and finance to measure market or regulatory interventions\(^73\) but has since been used in a variety of social science fields including political science.\(^74\) Event study analysis allows researchers to measure the impact of asynchronous events across time and therefore represents the ideal methodology for this study.

Traditional difference-in-difference (DID) design examines the effect of a policy or event at one point in time on a particular group (treatment) compared to another group (control) that does not experience the intervention. Data is collected before the intervention and after the intervention, with the difference between the treatment and control group in the second period testifying to the salience or non-salience of the intervention being studied. A critical assumption of DID design hinges on the assumption of similar initial trends in the data. If data trends are generally similar, researchers can reasonably conclude that any post-intervention differences may have been caused by the intervention, since they have accounted for fixed effects by studying comparable groups (s=state) at similar times (t=time). Any unobserved factors should have had the same effect on both groups, thereby eliminating a potential source of omitted bias. The double difference, or “difference-in-difference,” is therefore the difference between the before-and-after effect on the treatment group and the before-and-after effect on the control group. Using ordinary least squares (OLS) regression techniques, researchers can isolate the treatment effect on the dependent variable by finding the coefficient on the interaction variable (\(\beta_3\)) for the treatment group in the post-intervention period. \(\beta_1\) shows the effect of being in the treatment group (s=1) while \(\beta_2\) shows the effect of being in the second period after the intervention (t=2). The standard formula\(^75\) for the OLS regression is as follows:

\[
Y_{st} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Treatment}_s + \beta_2 \text{Post}_t + \beta_3 (\text{Treatment}_s \text{x Post}_t) + \epsilon_{st}
\]

This study poses an additional challenge because the critical events—presidential term limit deviations or challenges—do not take place during one specific point in time but in various years.

\(^{73}\) (MacKinlay, 1997)
\(^{74}\) (Abadie & Gardeazabal, 2003)
\(^{75}\) (University, 2015)
throughout the selected timeframe. In the following analysis section, I will attempt to quantify the effect of these deviations and challenges by comparing low-and middle-income presidential regimes in those countries that experienced term limit deviations and challenges with those countries that did not. To set up the experiment, this study borrows the methodology used by Chen, Loayza, and Reynal-Querol (2008).76 In this paper, the authors used event study analysis to determine the effects of conflict on a series of economic, health, political, and demographic variables. Civil wars in different states were used as the event and the conditions in the years immediately before the conflict in each country were compared to the conditions in the years immediate afterward. This set of conflict countries was then compared to a control group of countries that was similar to the treatment group except for the presence of conflict.

The set-up of the basic OLS regression for event study analysis uses a different format but still functions on the same principles as difference-in-difference methodology. In this version, however, a coefficient on the Treatmentst (β) measures the effect of indicator variables that register 1 for both the state and time period of interest. Also included in the equation are variables that control for group fixed effects (θs) and time fixed effects (λt), which are the equivalent of β1 and β2 in the previous model.77 The equation then takes on the following form (which is simply a different way to state the previous equation):

\[ Y_{st} = \beta \text{Treatment}_{st} + \theta_s + \lambda_t + \epsilon_{st} \]

Using the formula above, the OLS regression will then test whether the dependent variables in question show statistically-significant differences before and after the intervention for countries in the treatment and control groups using this modified DID design. Unlike in traditional DID design, however, the time periods in event study analysis are no longer fixed dates or years across the dataset, but a set period before the event and after. As in the exemplar paper, the comparative time periods in this study are represented by the data in the number years before the event (T -1, T -2, etc.) and the number of years following the event (T +1, T +2, etc.). This comparison therefore will allow for the examination of the before and after effects of asynchronous events such as presidential term limit deviations and challenges.

1.2.1 Critical Assumptions

Fundamentally, an event study analysis is an exercise in the counterfactual. The baseline assumption is that if the term limit deviation had not occurred in a treatment country, then it would have behaved like a country in the control group. Though individual cases may and do vary

76 (Chen, Loayza, & Reynal-Querol, 2008)
77 In the study I am conducting, these group and time fixed effects become country and year fixed effects.
considerably, the key supposition is that with more cases, we can ascertain the differential effects of this intervention—term limit deviations—over a larger number of relevant cases.

The first and most critical check is the verification of the parallel trends assumption. Event study analysis, as a subset of difference-in-difference methodology, relies on the pre-event trends in the data being similar for both treatment and control groups to establish a causal effect. The assumption of parallel trends in the data before the intervention is therefore critical to pinpoint any meaningful post-event differences that result between these two groups. If the parallel trends assumption is not met, the trends in post-event data in the treatment countries can be analyzed, but researchers cannot credibly claim a causal effect for the independent variable under investigation.

Because the critical events in this study are asynchronous, I had to establish a method to compare the pre-event and post-event data. To do so, I used the method employed by Chen, Loayza, and Reynal-Querol in their paper that relies on the use of relative time periods before and after each event—in my case a presidential term limit deviation, challenge, or unsuccessful challenge. Using Venezuela (which had a successful deviation from term limits in 2009) as an example, the year in which the deviation occurred (2009) would be represented as T=0; the year before the deviation (2008) would be T -1 and the year after (2010) T +1. The measure for the treatment group (all countries with successful deviations) for a particular variable—political rights in this example—in T -5 was the average of the scores of all of these deviating countries five years before the successful deviation in question (2004 in the case of Venezuela). The trend lines for the average of deviating country data before the event must then be compared with the trend lines for the set of control country data in the same relative time periods. The set of control countries is comprised of all the non-deviating countries in the sample. The average value for all non-deviating countries for political rights in 2004 (T -5) is used as the control reference point to Venezuela’s treatment value. By calculating the overall average of all the control country reference points for each time period (T -5, T -4, etc.), I can construct a control group to compare with the treatment group. If the trend line of the deviating countries (treatment) runs approximately parallel to that of the non-deviating countries (control) in the pre-event years (T -5 to T -1), the critical assumption of parallel trends would therefore be met. After this initial condition is met, I can then examine any subsequent differences in patterns in the post-event trend lines (T +1 to T +5) to determine what if any effect the event had on the dependent variables in question. The results of the checks on the parallel trends assumption are presented in the next section.

1.2.2 Statistical Conventions

Because OLS regression does not work well with ordinal variables, which are measured along a confined scale (e.g., political rights and civil liberties, which are measured by Freedom House on a scale of 1-7), I used ordered logistic regression (ologit) when examining the effect of term limit
deviations on these variables. Ordered logistic regression produces an odds ratio as the coefficient on the salient variable, rather than the numerical effect, and must be interpreted differently.
1.3 Data

To measure the effect of presidential term limit deviations and challenges, I collected historical data on these events as well as the salient economic and political variables within the countries in question. This section details the data collection and data techniques employed to gather and analyze the relevant data.

1.3.1 Data Collection

Using available secondary sources, I compiled an original dataset of all potential and actual term limit deviations in all regions of the world from 1989-2016. To bound the cases in question, I narrowed the time period to the post-Cold War Era. It was during this period that Huntington’s third wave of democracy began, ushering in many fledgling presidential democracies, particularly in Africa, and the majority of these countries incorporated term limits into their new constitutions. I further limited the scope of my investigation by including only low- and middle-income countries and presidential regimes. I exclusively examined low-and middle-income countries because no high-income countries experienced a term limit deviation in this period, and low- and middle-income countries may also have more comparable democracies, given that they are often not as mature or consolidated. I also excluded parliamentary regimes because they usually do not employ executive term limits given that the prime minister can be removed at any time through a vote of no confidence.

In deciding whether a term limit deviation had occurred, I established certain guidelines. To begin with, any democratic election in which a sitting president faced a constitutional term limit or an instance in which there was an independent change to constitutional term limits qualified as a case. I distinguished between actual deviations, in which a presidential term limit was successfully changed, and potential deviations, in which there may or may not have been an attempt to change a term limit but no actual deviation took place. In all of these cases, the incumbent president had reached the constitutional term limit which theoretically prevented them from running again (unless they had altered term limits before this point, in which case it was counted as an actual deviation). I designated the following events as actual deviations from existing presidential term limits: the constitution was changed to allow for more terms for the president; the constitution was changed to allow for longer or shorter terms for the president; or existing presidential term limits were eliminated. In assessing potential deviations, the distinction as to what qualifies as an attempt to change term limits is necessarily grayer. The standard used was that if attempts by government officials, political parties, or incumbent presidents to alter constitutional term limits made it into multiple reliable news sources, I deemed that a challenge to term limits had taken place. If this challenge did not result in a deviation from existing term limits, it was classified as an unsuccessful

78 The sources consulted included the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) database, annual Freedom House country reports, annual US State Department country reports, and contemporary articles from reputable news sources (e.g., The New York Times, BBC, The Economist, Al Jazeera, The Guardian, etc.), among other sources.
challenge. While there have undoubtedly been any number of informal inquiries into the possibility of extending the terms of various presidents that never made it into the news, because these claims cannot be substantiated, I did not include them in this category. Finally, if there was no discernible effort to alter a presidential term limit, I categorized this as no challenge to term limits.

1.3.2 Summary Statistics

Applying the aforementioned criteria, 75 total countries qualified for the study sample across all regions of the world. When researching the 75 countries in the sample, 32 of these countries experienced presidential term limit deviations from 1989-2016 while 43 countries did not. Within the 43-country subset that did not have term limit deviations, unsuccessful challenges to term limits occurred in 15 countries while 28 countries had no challenges to term limits. Looking at the total number of possible presidential transitions across all countries, there were 131 transitions when an incumbent president came up against a constitutional term limit; there were successful deviations from term limits in 36 of these cases, unsuccessful challenges in 17 of these cases, and no challenges to term limits in 78 of these cases. Figure 4 offers a graphical representation of the breakdown of these transitions.

Figure 1.4: Distribution of Successful Deviations, No Challenges, and Unsuccessful Challenges out of the Total Number of Possible Transitions

Viewed in aggregate, these summary statistics yield some key insights. First, presidential term limits have been challenged in 40 percent of all transitions in low- and middle-income
democracies. This figure demonstrates that challenges to term limits are a relatively frequent phenomenon in presidential systems; as such, they therefore merit closer study. Second, in those instances where term limits were challenged, leaders were successful in overturning these constitutional protections two-thirds of the time. If successful deviations are indeed a common outcome of challenges, it behooves us to know the consequences of these constitutional changes. And finally, the number of challenges to presidential term limits (both successful and unsuccessful) increased noticeably during the time period of the study, along with opportunities for these deviations (Figure 5). It is worth noting, however, that because many new constitutions incorporated presidential term limits in the 1990s, there may be fewer violations because leaders had not had a chance to reach term limits in some of these states. Figure 6 shows the geographic distribution of those countries that have experience successful deviations from established term limits with the vast majority of those states concentrated in Latin America and Africa.

Figure 1.5: Number of Successful, Unsuccessful and Potential Term Limit Deviations by Year
1.3.3 Variables of Interest

I selected certain economic and political dependent variables because of a theorized connection between these indicators and presidential term limit deviations. On the economic side, GDP per capita, economic growth, and foreign direct investment (FDI) seemed like they could all have a potential correlation with term limit deviations. In regard to GDP per capita and economic growth, if the political instability caused by actual or attempted term limit deviations disrupted the normal economic flow, it could lead to reductions in growth and living standards. Furthermore, this instability could potentially scare off foreign investment. Alternately, the possible predictability and stability of having the same ruler indefinitely could have the opposite effect of encouraging foreign investors, who may care more about return-on-investment and potential profits than democratization or good governance. The World Bank website provided the data for all three of these economic variables from 1989-2016.

Regarding political variables, political rights, civil liberties, governance, and corruption stood out as the variables that would be most directly linked to or influenced by presidential term limit deviations. Political rights and civil liberties would both seem to suffer under regimes that attempt to consolidate control or leaders who try to perpetuate their rule. A standard play from the authoritarian handbook is to crack down on popular expression, dissent, and interest articulation. Previous studies reinforce this connection. Moreover, governance and corruption might also worsen within regimes that seek to continue in power as leaders become less accountable over time.
and certain key interest groups are bought off. Freedom House’s annual scores for political rights and civil liberties from 1989-2016 were used to measure these variables, and the World Bank’s Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) were used to measure corruption and governance from 1996-2016.79

Table 1.1: Dependent Variables in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Measure Of/Proxy For</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>Living standards and well-being</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>Economic progress and development</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign direct investment</td>
<td>Attractiveness to foreign investors and investment capital</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political rights</td>
<td>Political freedom and representation</td>
<td>Freedom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil liberties</td>
<td>Freedom of expression and assembly</td>
<td>Freedom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Government effectiveness</td>
<td>World Bank (Worldwide Governance Indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Extent of corruption and government transparency</td>
<td>World Bank (Worldwide Governance Indicators)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that because the WGI dataset does not cover the full time period of the study, there is less data for corruption and governance than there is for the other dependent variables. This means that the four successful term limit deviations that took place before 1996 are not accounted for in the model results for corruption and governance, which could slightly skew results. Thankfully, these four deviations represent only three percent of the total number of transitions (140) and should not greatly impact the overall results for these two variables.

While the country and year fixed effects controlled for certain trends that happen within countries and across time, there are still other independent variables for which I needed to control. These variables, which can vary across countries, include overall wealth (measured by GDP80), degree of globalization or integration with the world market (measured by percentage of trade of GDP and whether a country is landlocked), population size, social fragmentation (measured by the number of official languages), and poverty levels. It may be the case that country wealth or the degree of globalization impacts susceptibility to foreign influence (via aid, trade, or diplomatic pressure). Or that larger nations have more domestic resources to rely on and can afford to buck

---

79 The World Bank’s WGI only began measuring governance and corruption in 1996.
80 When GDP per capita is the dependent variable in question, I removed GDP as an independent variable so as not to have it on both the left and right side of the equation.
external pressure in violating constitutional provisions or rolling back democratic norms. Or that more socially fragmented or poorer countries are more susceptible to the elimination of term limits and the consolidation of executive power. By controlling for these potential sources of variation, I hope to isolate the effect of term limit deviations on the dependent variables under examination.

Table 1.2: Independent Variables in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Measure Of/Proxy For</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Country wealth</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of trade of GDP</td>
<td>Degree of globalization or integration with world markets</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlocked</td>
<td>Access to trade and world markets</td>
<td>CIA World Factbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Size of domestic market and economy</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of official languages</td>
<td>Degree of social fragmentation</td>
<td>CIA World Factbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate</td>
<td>Level of economic development</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.4 Transformations of Individual Variables

There were several variables that needed to be transformed to more closely meet the assumptions of the statistical procedures and mathematical functions being performed. For all financial variables (GDP, GDP per capita, and FDI), I used the log value of the raw data to reduce the relative disparities between richer and poorer nations to allow for better comparisons. This is a standard practice in economic studies.\(^81\) Because net FDI flows have negative values in the World Bank data set, a simple log transformation was not possible. To transform FDI, I first took the absolute value of the data, logged it, and then multiplied it by its original sign. This preserved the distribution of FDI values while making them easier to work with and is an accepted way to transform negative values for logged data.\(^8283\)

1.3.5 Initial Comparison of Key Groups

In order to better understand the profiles of the countries in the study, I conducted a baseline examination of the different country groupings. When examining the data for the countries in the

\(^{81}\) (John B. Burbidge, 1988)  
\(^{82}\) (John & Draper, 1980)  
\(^{83}\) (Wicklin, 2014)
study, there are several distinct groups of countries that beg comparison. Perhaps the most important comparison juxtaposes countries that have experienced deviations from presidential term limits with those that have not. Other distinctions that bear examination include countries that have experienced challenges to term limits from those that have not; countries that have experienced an unsuccessful challenge to term limits from those that have not; and countries that have experienced successful challenges to term limits to those that had unsuccessful challenges.

1.3.5.1 Countries with Term Limit Deviations vs. Countries with No Deviations

In order to compare these two sets of countries, I ran a paired t-test between the countries that had ever experienced a deviation from presidential term limits (in the years before the deviation) and all of the control countries in the study. The country-year data provided the unit of analysis for each of the independent and dependent variables under consideration. This test provided the opportunity to assess whether there were inherent differences between the mean values of these two groups of countries for the selected set of independent and dependent variables before the event (term limit deviation). Several variables demonstrated statistically-significant differences for the mean values between these groups.

Regarding the independent variables, there were several notable differences between the two sets of countries. The following mean differences were significant: population, country size, landlocked, number of official languages, trade as a percentage of GDP, and GDP. Countries that experienced deviations from presidential term limits were, on average, less populous, geographically larger, more likely to be landlocked, home to more official languages, less dependent upon trade, and wealthier, when compared to countries that did not have these deviations. Knowing which of the independent variables were significant ensured that I controlled for those factors that actually changed over time (population, degree of globalization, poverty, and GDP) in the OLS regressions discussed in the previous section.

Regarding the dependent variables, only political rights and civil liberties were significantly different. Countries that would later experience presidential term limit deviations were characterized by less political rights and civil liberties. Among the dependent variables, none of the economic variables were significantly different, nor were governance or corruption. Despite the differences in the political rights and civil liberties scores for these two groups of countries, the difference-in-difference design of event study analysis can account for these variances as long as the initial trends in the data are similar. The parallel trends assumption is tested later in this section. Table 3 shows the results for these paired t-tests.
Table 1.3: Paired T-Tests for Countries with Term Limit Deviations vs. Those with No Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Treatment</th>
<th>Mean control</th>
<th>P-value of Difference</th>
<th>n treatment</th>
<th>n control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population***</td>
<td>19,246,220</td>
<td>25,760,188</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country size* (land area)</td>
<td>1,041,503</td>
<td>806,540</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlocked***</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social fragmentation***  (number of official languages)</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of globalization*** (trade as a % of GDP)</td>
<td>60.08</td>
<td>78.85</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP***</td>
<td>23.06</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>2,003,225,214</td>
<td>1,519,061,670</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rights***</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Liberties***</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05  ** p<0.01  *** p<0.001

Note: This table compares the mean values of all the relevant independent and dependent variables for countries that have experienced term limit deviations (treatment group) before these deviations with those that have not experienced them (control group). The p-value of the difference between these mean values is also included, along with the number of observations for each variable. Statistical significance of the difference between these mean values is also indicated at different levels of significance.

1.3.5.2 Countries with Term Limit Challenges vs. Countries with No Challenges to Term Limits

The next means comparison stacked the 47 countries in the sample that have experienced challenges (successful or unsuccessful) to presidential term limits (before these challenges) against the 28 countries that have not had any challenges. Again, there are several significant differences
among the independent and dependent variables for these two sets of countries. Regarding the independent variables, landlocked, number of official languages, poverty, trade, and GDP remain statistically significant. Among the dependent variables, GDP per capita, political rights, and civil liberties demonstrate a statistically significant difference between the two groups. The table with the results of these paired t-tests can be found in Appendix A.

1.3.5.3 Countries with Unsuccessful Challenges to Term Limits vs. Countries without Unsuccessful Challenges

In assessing countries that had unsuccessful challenges to presidential term limits (before these unsuccessful challenges) to those that did not, there were only 15 countries where presidents failed to secure additional or longer terms; the other 60 countries in the sample had either successful challenges or did not have a challenge. While it may be instructive to contrast these two groups of countries to determine if there is anything unique or particular about countries that are able to ward off or prevent challenges to term limits, the small sample size could skew the results or not provide enough evidence to reach definitive conclusions. Bearing this limitation in mind, country size, number of official languages, trade, and GDP were all independent variables that demonstrated a statistically-significant difference. For the dependent variables, FDI, political rights, civil liberties, governance, and corruption displayed a statistically-significant difference. Again, the results for the paired t-tests can be found in Appendix A. Because of the small sample size, I cannot make definitive conclusions about countries with unsuccessful challenges to term limits, therefore I have not included the analysis of these results in the main report (though they can be found in Appendix D).

1.3.5.4 Conclusions from Preliminary Paired T-Tests

Several trends emerged from the various paired t-tests conducted on the sample countries. First, regarding the independent variables that measure general, more static country characteristics, the countries that tend to experience deviations from term limits or have challenges to term limits are more likely to be wealthier, landlocked, and less dependent upon trade and have more official languages and higher overall GDPs. This suggests that these countries may be more autonomous and isolated from either economic pressure (foreign aid or economic sanctions) or more socially fragmented, making the consolidation of presidential power either easier or more attractive in a secluded, potentially-divided country. Second, regarding the dependent variables that point to the political climate, I witnessed consistently lower scores for political rights, civil liberties, governance, and corruption in countries where deviations from or challenges to term limits have occurred. This connection indicates that attempted and actual term limit deviations are associated with lower levels of political expression and freedoms and government accountability and performance. In and of themselves, these are noteworthy correlations that indicate the potential relationship of adherence to presidential term limits and representative, quality governance.
1.3.6 Testing the Parallel Trends Assumption

1.3.6.1 Countries with Successful Term Limit Deviations vs. Non-Deviators

1.3.6.1.1 Economic Variables

I first assessed the economic dependent variables to compare countries that experienced successful term limit deviations with those that did not. The parallel trends assumption held up well for GDP per capita and FDI, which both demonstrated relatively similar slopes in the years before the event, as seen in Figure 8 and Figure 9. Economic growth, however, displayed faster growth and greater variation in countries with term limit deviations in the five-year period prior to these events (Figure 10). While I can still evaluate before-and-after trends for all these variables, a causal effect can only be ascribed to those variables (GDP per capita and FDI) that exhibited similar pre-event trends.

Figure 1.7: Pre- and Post-Event Trends for GDP per capita
Looking at Figure 7 and Figure 8, I get a somewhat unexpected result for the post-event trends. Both GDP per capita and FDI went up after successful term limit deviations relative to the countries that did not experience these deviations. My initial hypothesis was that the potential disruption that resulted from the process of securing additional terms or changing the constitution to allow a leader to stay in power might have had a harmful effect on per capita income and FDI; however, it may be that the stability or predictability of having the same regime in power allowed per capita incomes to rise and encouraged continued foreign investment. In the final analysis, I believe it more likely that term limit deviations exhibit a lagged effect whereby the true impact of these events take a few years to manifest economically (though they may have a more immediate
political impact because of the greater rapidity of political change). Further analysis using lagged independent variables, discussed in greater detail in the results section, confirmed this supposition and demonstrated that there was no statistically-significant effect, either positively or negatively, of term limit deviations on GDP per capita or FDI.

1.3.6.1.2 Political Variables

Assessing trends in the political variables for term limit deviating versus non-deviating countries, the parallel trends assumption appears for the most part to hold for all of these variables, though with greater variation in governance and corruption. When interpreting the numerical results for political rights and civil liberties, it is again important to note that higher scores for these variables represent worsening conditions. Therefore, a Freedom House score of 1 for political rights indicates a country’s status as “most free” while a score of 7 indicates a status of “not free.” For consistency and ease of visual comparison, I have inverted the vertical axes of the political rights and civil liberties graphs, so that higher graphical values represent better scores for these indicators. For the World Bank’s WGI, higher scores reflect better governance and less corruption and range from -2.5 to 2.5.

In the pre-event years, political rights were getting marginally worse in term limit deviating countries while they got marginally better in non-deviating countries (Figure 10). The same trend is true of civil liberties in these groups of countries (Figure 11). Regarding pre-event governance, term limit deviators appeared to be improving marginally in terms of governance performance while non-violators were flatlining; the trends seem to be largely parallel with little variation evident in the either set of countries (Figure 12). Looking at pre-event corruption, there was no real change in non-deviating countries while deviating countries saw a slight improvement; the parallel trends assumption appears to hold for corruption as well (Figure 13).
**Figure 1.10: Pre- and Post-Event Trends for Political Rights**
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**Figure 1.11: Pre- and Post-Event Trends for Civil Liberties**
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Figure 1.12: Pre- and Post-Event Trends for Governance
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Analyzing post-event trends in political rights and civil liberties, both indicators continue to gradually improve in non-deviating countries while they display an uneven deterioration in deviating countries. The two sets of scores for governance and corruption display much less variation, though the trends in governance present a surprising result. Governance in deviating countries witnessed marginal improvement in the pre-event years and actually continued this slight improvement in the post-event years, albeit at an almost imperceptible pace. At the same time, governance actually declined marginally in non-deviating countries in the post-event years. Corruption follows a more expected outcome, with corruption improving slightly in the pre-event years in deviating countries and deteriorating equally slightly in the post-event years. Meanwhile, the quality of governance in non-deviating countries stayed relatively constant in both the pre- and post-event years. Taken as a whole, we see the expected deterioration of political rights and civil liberties in deviating countries relative to non-deviating countries after the event; an unexpected convergence in the area of governance after the term limit deviation between the two sets of countries; and an expected worsening of corruption in deviating countries relative to non-deviating countries after the event.

1.3.6.2 Countries with Term Limit Challenges vs. No Term Limit Challenges

As a result of the considerable overlap between countries with term limit challenges and those with term limit deviations, the trends in the pre- and post-event results are largely similar to the trends discussed in the previous section. I witness the same general improvements in certain economic variables (GDP per capita and FDI) and the same deterioration in certain political variables (political rights, civil liberties, and corruption). Because countries that deviate from term limits must first challenge them, the group of challenging countries necessarily includes those
countries that have successfully challenged term limits as a subset, and this subgroup (67 percent of the whole) is likely driving the overall results in both the pre- and post-event comparisons. The relevant parallel trends graphs are available in Appendix B.
1.4 Results

1.4.1 Model Exploration

I began with an initial model that used the working assumption that countries were fundamentally different after challenges to presidential term limits, whether successful or unsuccessful. Using indicator variables for each of the 75 countries in each year from 1989-2016, I created three different categories: post deviation, post challenge, and post unsuccessful challenge. These three indicator variables would be turned on (or be assigned a value of 1) after a successful challenge to term limits (i.e. a successful deviation), any challenge to term limits (whether successful or unsuccessful), or an unsuccessful challenge to term limits, respectively. Using the aforementioned event study design in which the treatment could be measured when the state (study countries that had a deviation, challenge, or unsuccessful challenge) and time (the years after which one of these events occurred) were both equal to 1, I can compare the countries in these periods (the treatment group) with the other countries in the sample who did not undergo these effects (the control group). When examining the results of the different models, I focused on the dependent variables since these are the effects in which I am most interested.

In my initial model, I turned on the indicator variable for all the remaining years in the study after the event. This model supposes that the effects of term limit challenges are lasting and perhaps permanent. In the second iteration of the model, however, I revised my original model to turn on the indicator variable for the six years following a successful deviation and five years for an attempted or an unsuccessful challenge. I selected six years for successful deviations because this was the average time length of all presidential term limit extensions for the countries in the study. For attempted and unsuccessful challenges, I selected five years as an appropriate medium-term time period, since the length of successful challenges had no bearing on the time period of these other categories. This model presupposed that the effect of challenges to term limits would last approximately six or five years (depending on the success of the challenge), after which the country would have either adjusted to the new normal or reverted to previous forms of democracy. But in numerous instances in the cases under scrutiny, leaders who were able to alter or eliminate term limits stayed in power for many years after doing so. Therefore, my final model attempted to reflect this dynamic by going country-by-country and turning on the indicator variable for only successful challenges (actual deviations) for the entire duration of that leader’s term in office. This final model, which reflected the entire term length for presidents who successfully changed term limits and the five years following a challenge or an unsuccessful challenge, seemed to most closely reflect the reality on the ground in the study countries.
1.4.2 Deviations from Term Limits

Using this final model with entire length-of-term effects—which based on the rationale above seemed to best reflect the on-the-ground reality in low- and middle-income democracies—I found the strongest differential effects in instances of term limit deviations. The model showed significant effects for actual deviations on four dependent variables: GDP per capita, political rights, civil liberties, and governance.

In the initial iteration of the model with length-of-term effects, GDP per capita rose after term limit deviations when compared to states that did not experience deviations. Because FDI also went up (though not significantly), this effect could be attributed to the perceived stability of the regime and increased foreign and domestic investment that came into the country as a result. While it may be possible that the stability or predictability of having the same regime in power allowed per capita incomes to rise and encouraged continued foreign investment, I do not believe that term limit deviations necessarily result in better economic outcomes. Therefore, I decided to look more closely at the data to see if I could discover what was behind these seemingly counterintuitive results. Believing that the economic effects of term limit deviations may take time to manifest economically, I tweaked the model to incorporate lagged effects of the independent variables of two and four years and found that the statistical significance of the relationship with term limit deviations diminished over time and even became negative after five years. Using these same lagged effects, I still found no statistically-significant relationship between term limit deviations and either FDI or economic growth. In fact, FDI followed the same pattern as GDP per capita, with the positive relationship in the data diminishing and turning negative after a five-year lagged effect.

One other interesting result that emerged from a closer look at the data was the influence of a small subset of six post-Soviet countries. Each of these former Soviet republics experienced an approximate ten to fifteen-year period of post-communism doldrums after the end of the Cold War; these economies witnessed slumping macroeconomic performance as these newly-independent countries tried to shake off the old state-centric model and adjust to market capitalism. After about a decade of declining economic growth into the early to mid-2000s, the economic fortunes of these country began to reverse course as they found their economic footing. Around this same time, post-independence leaders in many of these countries (Turkmenistan in 1999, Tajikistan in 2006, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan in 2007, Russia in 2008, and Azerbaijan in 2009) successfully consolidated authority and removed presidential term limits, buoyed by higher resource prices that were themselves fueled by a global increase in commodity prices. When I removed these six countries from the regression along with the lagged effect, any relationship between GDP per capita and term limit deviators relative to non-deviators disappeared entirely. Furthermore, when I both removed these countries and incorporated a two-year lag, the effect of term limit deviations on GDP per capita turned negative, though not statistically significantly so.

Political rights emerged as significantly worse after term limit deviations relative to those states that did not experience them while holding up to the aforementioned robustness checks.
involving lagged effects of up to four years. The explanation behind the deterioration of political rights in these states appears straightforward, as citizens in states where political authority has been consolidated and potentially monopolized would likely see their voting power and political expression curtailed. At the same time, it could also be true that leaders seek to eliminate term limits precisely to erode political rights and maintain their grip on power, but the design of this study establishes the specific causation from term limit deviations to deteriorating political rights (and civil liberties—discussed below—for that matter). The composite score for political rights, as constructed by Freedom House, is measured by electoral process, political pluralism and participation, and functioning of government; in and of itself, it is not an automatic proxy for political freedom. There is also the reasonable concern of possible endogeneity: that term limit deviations in a particular year would result in lower political rights scores. However, in verifying the three aforementioned criteria that Freedom House uses to measure political rights, there is no mention of term limit deviations or term limits more broadly. Therefore, based on the stated definition, this decrease in political rights is not a result of the term limit deviation itself.

Civil liberties also significantly worsened in these countries and remained significant with a lagged effect of up to five years. The deterioration in civil liberties parallels that of political rights, as regimes that consolidate authority typically crack down on dissent, freedom of expression and assembly, interest articulation, and personal rights. Again, the composite score for civil liberties, itself measured by freedom of expression and belief, associational and organizational rights, rule of law, and personal autonomy and individual rights, is not an automatic proxy for the variable of interest. The same verification of civil liberties that was conducted for political rights yielded no concerns for endogeneity.

The final dependent variable that was significant was governance, which surprisingly improved after term limit deviations but diminished with the use of greater lagged effects. This is the most curious result, since I would have expected the opposite result; however, it could be that presidents sought to legitimize their consolidation of power after term limit deviations by providing better services to their citizens in the years immediately following the extension of their rule. It could also be that because the World Bank measures governance among a series of different dimensions (government effectiveness, regulatory quality, and rule of law, among others), and I selected only one—government effectiveness—that this sub-category is not an automatic proxy for what I am trying to measure. I believe it more likely that the effects of term limit deviations on the quality of governance or government effectiveness to take a few years to fully manifest, and that governance does not improve but decrease in the long-term as a result of term limit deviations. The regressions using longer-term lagged data (five years, ten years) bears this relationship out.

Table 4 shows the results of the difference-in-difference OLS regressions for the dependent variables under study for each of the three types of events.
Table 1.4: Results of the Event Analysis Study Regressions for the Final Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diff-in-Diff Effect</th>
<th>GDP per capita</th>
<th>FDI</th>
<th>Economic Growth</th>
<th>Political Rights</th>
<th>Civil Liberties</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Corruption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Term Limit Deviation</td>
<td>0.122***</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>-0.401</td>
<td>1.391***</td>
<td>1.208***</td>
<td>0.103*</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.67)</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(-0.69)</td>
<td>(5.08)</td>
<td>(4.19)</td>
<td>(2.55)</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Term Limit Challenge</td>
<td>0.0745*</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.4577</td>
<td>0.0154</td>
<td>-0.0264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.33)</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>(-0.53)</td>
<td>(1.86)</td>
<td>(1.63)</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(-1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Unsuccessful Challenge</td>
<td>0.0304</td>
<td>-0.637</td>
<td>-0.398</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.2295</td>
<td>-0.0351</td>
<td>-0.0430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td>(-0.64)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(-1.18)</td>
<td>(-1.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t and z statistics in parentheses

Note: This table shows the coefficients on the dependent variables for separate OLS regressions for each of the three scenarios for all available data: before-and-after differences in states with actual term limit deviations vs. no deviations; differences in states with challenges to term limits and no challenges; and differences in states with unsuccessful challenges to term limits and no unsuccessful challenges. These three scenarios are measured through independent OLS regressions on each of the seven dependent variables of interest. The coefficients are displayed along with the respective t-values, and statistically-significant results are indicated. Each regression controlled for GDP (except GDP per capita), population, poverty, and degree of globalization, along with country and year fixed effects. For GDP per capita, FDI, economic growth, governance, and corruption, a positive coefficient indicates a direct relationship, i.e. a positive coefficient for GDP per capita indicates that GDP per capita increased in states that experienced a successful term limit deviation after the deviation relative to those states that did not experience said deviation. For political rights and civil liberties, a positive coefficient indicates a worsening in these indicators due to the way in which Freedom House scores these variables (1-7, with 1 being most free and 7 not free). For example, for political rights, a positive coefficient indicates that political rights have worsened after a successful term limit deviation relative to states that have not experienced this deviation.

1.4.3 Challenges to Term Limits

As Table 2 shows, there were not many significant effects of term limit challenges after these challenges between the countries that did and did not experience them. The only dependent variable that was significantly different was GDP per capita which also diminishes with the use of lagged data, as with deviations. Again, FDI went up in countries with challenges to term limits and the previous logic could also apply that where term limits were challenged, the state was perceived as stronger; this could have fostered higher investment and therefore higher per capita incomes. This relationship also disappears with the use of lagged data. Political rights and corruption, on the other hand, did worsen in these countries relative to their non-challenging peers, but the difference was not statistically significant.
1.4.4 Robustness Checks

Regarding the model itself, I am testing the effect of these term limit deviations, challenges, or unsuccessful challenges for a series of salient dependent variables. But the question of how long the effects a deviation or challenge linger is critical and open to interpretation. It may be that these effects are enduring, living on in the national memory and permanently altering institutions. It seems more likely, however, that these effects are somewhat temporary or medium-term. I therefore set up the three different models to account for these different assumptions about the length of the effect of these events: Model 1. The effects were permanent; Model 2. The effects lasted five years; Model 3. The effects lasted as long as the leader remained in power (in the case of successful deviations) and five years otherwise (in the case of an unsuccessful challenge).

Other important robustness checks involve whether certain regional effects are driving the results and if the time frame of certain independent variables matters. Because Africa and Latin America are the two regions with the most term limit deviations and challenges, it would be important to know if either of these regions are solely responsible for significant changes in the dependent variables. Additionally, it may be that limiting the time frame of certain dependent variables may change whether they are statistically significant.

To test the assumptions behind my analysis, I conducted several different robustness checks on the alternate models, regional variation, and certain key variables in addition to the aforementioned checks using lagged independent variables. These further robustness checks confirmed the previous analysis and did not undermine any of the initial observations regarding patterns in the data. The full table of the results with a four-year lag for all independent variables is presented below in Table 5. I chose a four-year lag because this is the median length of the political cycle in the study countries, though lag period and effects will differ by country and context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diff-in-Diff Effect</th>
<th>GDP per capita</th>
<th>FDI</th>
<th>Economic Growth</th>
<th>Political Rights</th>
<th>Civil Liberties</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Corruption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Term Limit Deviation</td>
<td>0.0601</td>
<td>0.8897</td>
<td>-0.8164</td>
<td>0.6775*</td>
<td>0.3503*</td>
<td>0.0434</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>-(1.29)</td>
<td>(2.25)</td>
<td>(2.10)</td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Term Limit Challenge</td>
<td>0.0490</td>
<td>-0.0520</td>
<td>-0.7210</td>
<td>-0.2457</td>
<td>-0.1440</td>
<td>-0.0043</td>
<td>0.0093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.26)</td>
<td>-(0.14)</td>
<td>(-1.60)</td>
<td>(-0.90)</td>
<td>(-0.44)</td>
<td>(-0.18)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Unsuccessful Challenge</td>
<td>-0.0028</td>
<td>0.7284</td>
<td>-0.3277</td>
<td>-0.5144</td>
<td>-0.8590</td>
<td>-0.1019***</td>
<td>-0.0614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-0.06)</td>
<td>(-1.60)</td>
<td>(-0.60)</td>
<td>(-1.23)</td>
<td>(-1.37)</td>
<td>(-3.67)</td>
<td>(-1.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t and z statistics in parentheses
= *p<0.05 **p<0.01 *** p<0.001

1.4.5.1 Results of Different Models

In this first model in which the indicator variable is turned on permanently after an event (challenge to term limits), the greatest differences manifest themselves in the contrast between countries that had successful challenges to term limits and those that did not. In this model, there are statistically-significant differences in economic growth, political rights, and civil liberties. Countries that experienced these deviations from term limits had statistically-significant lower rates of economic growth and lower scores for political rights and civil liberties. While I ultimately did not use this model, these findings do suggest lingering deleterious effects for political rights and civil liberties and a possible drag on economic growth. For those countries that experienced a challenge to term limits, political rights and civil liberties also saw statistically-significant declines relative to those countries that did not. For countries with unsuccessful challenges to term limits, only civil liberties emerged as statistically significant, and that variable of interest also declined.

In the second model in which the indicator variable is turned on only for the six years after a successful challenge/deviation from term limits and the five years after a challenge or unsuccessful challenge, there were not many changes from the first model. Scores for political rights and civil liberties remain statistically significantly different after successful, attempted, and unsuccessful challenges to term limits and are actually worse in this shorter-term model than the previous one.
The only other variable that is significant is GDP per capita, which increased significantly after a successful challenge or a challenge, as in the final model.

1.4.5.2 Differing Results by Region

Because there could be regional variations that influence the dependent variables that may be affected by term limits, I decided to test for this in a couple different ways. Initially, I set up dummy variables for each of the two major regions where the majority of term limit deviations have occurred: Latin America and Africa. When I re-ran all of the regressions including these dummy variables, I did not find any statistically-significant differences for the economic variables. I did, however, find some statistical significance among the political variables. In Latin America, political rights and civil liberties were significantly worse after a challenge and an unsuccessful challenge; governance worsened significantly after a successful challenge; and corruption worsened significantly after an unsuccessful challenge. In Africa, the only variable that was significantly worse was civil liberties after a successful challenge or a challenge.

Because Latin America displayed more significant differences in terms of the salient variables, it could be that the changes in these countries after deviations or attempted challenges are influencing the overall shifts. However, the changes in the variables in Africa manifest in the same direction so it does not seem like the Latin American countries are completely driving these changes.

As an additional check on the impact of regional variation, I included fixed regional effects in to the model as another control. Controlling for regional fixed effects did not appreciably change any of my results.

1.4.5.3 Shorter-Term Effects of Political Rights and Civil Liberties

The final robustness check involved the examination of whether the deterioration of political rights and civil liberties in countries with term limit deviations was an immediate effect of these events or a longer-term phenomenon. To test this supposition, I included only data from the six years before and after a successful deviation (the average length of an extended presidential term in the database) to see if a statistically-significant decline in these variables persisted. It did. Political rights and civil liberties worsened under both models, therefore I concluded that it was not the timeframe of the data that was influencing this result.
1.5 Discussion

Political rights and civil liberties both decline significantly in the wake of term limit deviations according to the data in the study. Despite the lack of evident economic effects, the demonstrable negative political effects of term limit deviations appear clear and provide cause for concern and action. Recent history has demonstrated that presidents who are able to extend their term in office generally do not look favorably upon dissent or opposition to their rule. In country after country where these deviations have occurred, the consolidation of executive authority has led to crackdowns on the media, expression, assembly, free and fair elections, and interest aggregation.

It was somewhat surprising that there were no discernible, significant economic effects of term limit deviations, as I initially believed that they might harm growth or scare off investment. While this did not prove to be the case for the study data, it may still be that the economic effects take longer to manifest, and the majority of the term limit deviations in the study occurred within the last ten years. Extending the data set to previous years may yield broader conclusions about the economic effects of these deviations. It may also be true that businesses and other economic actors see political events or disturbances coming and make the necessary economic adjustments in advance, which would make the effect of term limit deviations that much more difficult to measure, given the before-and-after design of the event analysis study.

Returning to the political sphere, another potential consequence of successful term limit deviations is that these newly-empowered presidents often seek to curtail the powers of other institutions to check their authority, if they have not already done so in securing the extension of their stay in power in the first place. Legislatures find their ability to make and pass laws curtailed and frequently have the power of the state purse taken out of their hands; judiciaries no longer have the power to interpret the law as they see fit or provide judicial review for new laws; national militaries are used not to protect borders but to enforce decrees, often after the declaration of martial law; and electoral commissions become beholden to the leader or party in power and cease to be able to ensure the fairness of the electoral process. This was Yoweri Museveni’s modus operandi in Uganda; Idriss Déby in Chad and Paul Biya in Cameroon followed his lead. It was Hugo Chavez’s playbook in Venezuela; Evo Morales in Bolivia, Rafael Correa in Ecuador, and Daniel Ortega in Nicaragua borrowed from the same script. The same pattern is also evident in Central Asia with the rash of aforementioned term limit deviations in the former Soviet republics.

The data confirms that these deviations are indeed on the rise; given the evidence that these deviations are linked to deteriorating political rights and civil liberties, this is a trend that democratic proponents and actors should pay close attention to and actively fight to reverse. With less space to advocate for policies and articulate interests, fewer perspectives will be heard and more voices muzzled, and governance may well worsen as well. In light of the causal evidence presented in this study, domestic actors, aided by the international community, should do more to prevent these deviations.
In a separate paper, I determined that independent legislatures, independent judiciaries, independent militaries, and strong opposition parties are the most important institutional factors that can prevent term limit deviations. These then, are the key institutions that civil servants, civil society members, and international actors must work to protect and strengthen.

While there may well be long-term or lingering effects of these deviations from term limits or attempts to challenge them, deviations from term limits are by no means a political death sentence. There are numerous examples of countries that have resumed normal democratic election cycles or reinstated constitutional term limits after a deviation. Colombia represents just such an example, as then-President Alvaro Uribe was able to change the constitution to secure a second term in 2004, but after being denied an attempt to further amend the constitution for a third term in 2009, the country reverted to one-term presidential term limits in 2015. Just this year, Ecuador voted to reinstate term limits after they had been eliminated under the previous president. Though these are just two examples, it demonstrates that the effects of term limit deviations or challenges need not be permanent. Yes, there are often negative political effects, but they can be reversed through the protection of certain key institutions, such as the independent judiciary in the case of Colombia. Domestic actors, with the aid of the international community, should work to prevent term limit deviations before they happen, but when they do, they should continue to push to have them reinstated.

1.5.1 Limitations

This paper focused solely on term limit deviations and challenges in low- and middle-income presidential democracies between the years 1989 and 2016. I believed that this allowed for a group of countries, whether treatment or control, that were most alike and comparable in terms of political systems, income levels, democratic maturity, and other general characteristics. Including high-income democracies could have skewed the average before-and-after values of the control group of non-term limit deviating countries (as no high-income democracy has experienced a term limit deviation). Though it is possible that this could happen in a developed democracy, I wanted to focus my research on those countries most likely to experience a term limit deviation so that the conclusions from my study would be the most meaningful and relevant for those countries in the sample population. However, including these countries in my study would have increased the sample size and therefore the power of my statistical analysis. Furthermore, it may also have been valuable to compare the increase in the likelihood of a developing country deviating from term limits to one that is already developed to have a framework for comparison as well as an established benchmark.
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Another variable that I could have changed is the selected timeframe. I chose to bound the study at the front end in the year 1989 to ensure the comparability of the presidential democracies in question. The rationale for the current timeframe is that before 1989, the US and the Soviet Union propped up various dictatorships or illiberal regimes throughout the developing world solely to gain their favor and win these countries over to their respective sides. After the end of the Cold War, this practice diminished considerably. Therefore, variables such as political rights, civil liberties, and governance would be rated under a reasonably similar global political order after 1989. On the other hand, there is an argument for including earlier data, first to have a larger dataset and second to exploit the exogenous variation of the end of the Cold War. The timeframe of the study could certainly be expanded in a future iteration of this study to see how this affected the dependent variables.

I excluded parliamentary regimes in this study because they typically do not employ executive term limits given that a prime minister can be removed at any time through a vote of no confidence. I also believed that by focusing solely on presidential regimes, the countries in question would be similar in constitutional structure and therefore more comparable. Though this made for a more natural comparison, an empirical evaluation of presidential versus parliamentary regimes from a term limits perspective could be instructive. Several theoretical\(^{87,88}\) and empirical\(^{89}\) studies on the differing performance of presidential and parliamentary regimes more broadly already exist in the literature, but no study has focused on this dynamic with respect to term limits, the difference between the two systems in developing countries, or the length of presidential versus parliamentary regimes and their effect on economic or political variables. There were thirty-five parliamentary democracies that would have otherwise qualified for this study which represent another potential source of further inquiry.

There are also other valid research questions on the issue of presidential term limits that would be fruitful to pursue. In particular, the question of the ideal number of presidential terms, raised earlier in the literature review, is an interesting and potentially impactful matter that bears examination. This paper does not seek to answer this question, but with the existing dataset at my disposal, this is a question I hope to address in a future paper.

\(^{87}\) (Linz, 1990)
\(^{88}\) (Schmidt, 2002)
\(^{89}\) (Lijphart, 1994)
1.6 Conclusion

If the quality of governance truly makes the difference that many political scientists believe it does to growth and development, then it is incumbent upon the international community to promote good governance through all available means. Relatedly, if we believe that greater political rights and civil liberties lead to better governance, then political actors at every level—local, national, and international—should make the promotion and preservation of these institutions clear priorities. The findings presented in this paper demonstrate the clear connection between term limit deviations and the deterioration of political rights and civil liberties. Therefore, to promote better governance and a more open, inclusive, and representative process, democratic actors should protect presidential term limits where they exist and seek to establish them where they do not.

It has been suggested that would-be authoritarian leaders seek to eliminate presidential term limits in order to restrict political rights and curtail civil liberties. With fewer voting and representation rights and less ability to articulate or aggregate interests, controlling societies becomes far easier. Though this causation may well be valid and is not tested in this paper, what has been established herein is that presidential term limit deviations do indeed lead to worsening political rights and civil liberties. Given this clear connection, the international community should devote more resources to supporting domestic actors and institutions dedicated to the prevention of efforts to eliminate or alter term limits.
2. At the Crossroads of Democracy: The Case for Term Limits in Colombia and Venezuela

Introduction

Because of their inherent demographic and geographic similarities, Colombia and Venezuela present a natural opportunity for political and economic comparison. These two neighbors, separated only after their birth, began their history as one larger Bolivarian ideal: Gran Colombia. Since their split in 1831, they have had a tempestuous relationship, but the last decade and a half has witnessed a more pronounced and bitter divide. The two iconic leaders who came to power at the start of the 21st century, Alvaro Uribe in Colombia and Hugo Chavez in Venezuela, took their respective nations in radically different directions over the next decade: Uribe favored a more traditional, Washington Consensus-style capitalism while Chavez employed a more radical, populist, and redistributionist brand of socialism. Although both countries continue to struggle with issues of displacement and inequality, Colombia now appears to be on the path to stability and continued development whereas Venezuela finds itself in an unprecedented crisis marked by rampant inflation, spiking crime and violence rates, and widespread civil unrest.\(^90\)\(^91\) Despite the obvious ideological differences, a key divergence between the two states stems from the fact that constitutional presidential term limits, and therefore the rule of law, were upheld in Colombia while their abrogation in Venezuela led directly to political and economic turmoil. Alvaro Uribe eventually stepped aside peacefully and respected the Colombian constitution. Hugo Chavez rewrote and undermined successive versions of the Venezuelan constitution until he achieved his goal—the elimination of term limits and the continuation of Chavismo. The key difference between the two rivals—evidenced by the results of their respective successor administrations—stems largely from their relative success in extending their terms of office. Accordingly, this paper argues that the retention of term limits in Colombia and their elimination in Venezuela was a critical determinant that led to the divergent fortunes of these two once-similar countries.

In making the case for the importance of term limits, I employ the following structure. In the first section, I review the relevant literature and summarize the opposing arguments for and against presidential term limits. In the second section, I detail the specific methodology used in this case study. In the third section, I provide the historical context for the Uribe regime in Colombia and the Chavez regime in Venezuela. In the fourth section, I present the cases of Colombia and Venezuela including the reasons behind their respective adherence to and elimination of presidential term limits.
term limits as well as key institutional differences. In the fifth section, I examine the implications of deviations from presidential term limits: I discuss the short and long-run effects, offer a counterfactual example, and evaluate alternative hypotheses for the differences in the two countries. In the sixth section, I explore the useful lessons that we can glean from the cases of Colombia and Venezuela. I then present my conclusions in the final section.
2.1 The Opposing Arguments for Term Limits

Constitutionally-mandated executive term limits have been enshrined in the majority of constitutions in low and middle-income countries in order to promote democratic consolidation and the rule of law. The fundamental theoretical argument for presidential term limits is that they prevent the potentially dangerous consolidation of power in constitutional democracies by powerful, entrenched, or charismatic individuals or interests; this argument takes on added importance in fragile or fledgling democracies. These safeguards promote a healthy, rotating, representative government that assures different parties the opportunity to state their case and a legitimate chance to have their turn in power. As one Colombian political scientist so succinctly put it, “term limits are important to provide oxygen to the political system. An opportunity to at least provide a chance to the opposition.”  

This democratic consolidation should in turn increase stability and allow for greater domestic and foreign investment, both of which are directly predicated upon said stability. Political stability has been linked with economic development (Przeworski, 1996), growth (Jong-a-Pin, 2009; Aisen and Veiga, 2010), and investment (Alessina and Tabellini, 1989; Alessina and Perotti, 1996) in numerous studies. Once popular and investor confidence is established, the argument goes, growth and development can follow.

The counter-arguments for term limits raise some salient theoretical questions that present both democratic and pragmatic concerns. If it represents the general will, is it not inherently anti-democratic to prevent people from electing their president of choice? Why should we worry about deviations from constitutional term limits, especially when incumbents follow established constitutional amendment processes? Is the stability that comes from having one ruler or party in power not a desirable outcome in often-volatile countries? These are all valid questions that bear closer examination.

On its surface, the charge that presidential term limits are anti-democratic holds water, but further scrutiny shows the gaps in this logic. Opponents of term limits claim that the public should be able elect the candidate of their choice, regardless of previous time served—that this represents a truly democratic outcome and the manifestation of the general will. However, many laws now exist and have long existed to insulate the government and its institutions from the tyranny of the majority, strident populism, or aspiring autocrats. Using the oldest constitutional democracy as but one example, the Electoral College and Supreme Court offer two clear examples of this practice in American democracy. The inclusion of presidential term limits in the US Constitution was in fact a topic of hot debate during the 1787 Constitutional Convention (its predecessor, the Articles of Confederation, actually included legislative term limits), but they were eventually left out, much to chagrin of Thomas Jefferson who claimed that “I dislike, and greatly dislike, the abandonment in every instance of the necessity of rotation in office and most particularly in the case of the
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President. "94 For Jefferson and numerous others, the dangers of dictatorship outweigh the desires of the general will in regard to the executive. Because it is such a position of power, prominence, and visibility, the presidency is unique. As such, it merits unique protections that are perhaps not necessary for legislators, whose long-serving experience may well benefit these bodies. Term limits function as a safeguard to protect institutions against the danger that people will become enamored of a particular leader. By keeping term limits in place, we hope to ensure that good people come and good people leave and prevent the dangerous consolidation of authority that can lead to dictatorship.

In regard to the issues of continuity and incumbency, having one leader in power indefinitely may provide greater predictability, but it also limits the scope of policy and the diversity of political actors. Despite the potential for policy continuity, the monopoly of power by a person or party necessarily restricts political space. The significant and proven advantages of incumbency in all democracies, nascent or established, allow entrenched individuals or interests to persist in power to the continued frustration of opposition actors. Numerous studies conducted in the United States (Cox and Morgenstern, 1993; Lee, 2006), Latin America (Corrales and Penfold, 2014), and Africa (Posner and Young, 2007; Zamfir, 2016) have demonstrated the massive benefit bestowed on incumbents for a variety of reasons including name and party recognition, the perceived benefits of experience, and access to superior financial and media resources. If presidents are allowed to run indefinitely, this may lead to imperial presidencies and the degradation of democracy, especially in developing countries where institutions are often fragile. Recent studies (Zamfir, 2016) have demonstrated the empirical negative correlation between time in office and governance and political and human rights index scores in the case of African democracies. The stranglehold on power of sitting presidents sends a clear signal to the opposition that they have no democratic, peaceful means by which to gain power and therefore encourages and legitimizes violent conflict as a means of political expression. Because governments in low- and middle-income countries control the public purse and a larger share of scarce resources, the stakes and the dangers of incumbency are heightened in developing countries.95 The institution of presidential term limits, however, represents a bulwark against the power of entrenched authority and affords at least the prospect of the alternation of power.

Imperial presidencies undermine not only the quality of democracy but often feature high levels of corruption and cronyism as well. In the last two years alone, the presidents of DRC, Tajikistan, Burundi, Congo, Sudan, and Uzbekistan all extended their terms in office; it should come as no surprise that each of these countries ranks among the most corrupt countries in the
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world. It bears mentioning that Venezuela, which itself eliminated term limits in 2009, also ranks among the world’s most corrupt countries.

The issue of stability also features prominently as a common argument against term limits. Some politicians and academics have argued that policies need time to work and that term limits can therefore undermine long-term development. However, research on the subject has shown that a stable democracy with a history of peaceful transfers of authority has a better shot at long-term development and investment than a nation in which one leader retains power indefinitely. The debate and discussion promoted by a healthy, genuine contest of power and ideas produces more accountable, transparent government. Adam Przeworski of NYU found that “changes of chief executives, while much less frequent in dictatorships, are economically costly only in these regimes. Whether because of institutional constraints or of motivations of those who govern democracies, neither past nor expected changes of heads of governments affect growth under democracies.”

Skeptics may point to Lee Kwan Yew in Singapore or Paul Kagame in Rwanda as counter-examples. These leading lights, however, are far more often the exception than the rule. For every Lee Kwan Yew there are five Ferdinand Marcos’ who bankrupted their country or stole liberally from the state treasury; for every Paul Kagame, a liberator-turned-dictator such as Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana or Yoweri Museveni in Uganda. While inspirational, once-in-a-generation leaders can bring a country out of civil war or set a formerly-impoverished nation on the path to development, there are often negative side effects for human rights and freedom of expression, both of which are now on display in Rwanda and to a lesser extent Singapore. If democracy is to be consolidated, the system must come before the individual. As another Colombian political science professor quipped, “politicians are like diapers, you have to change them every once in a while, and both for the same reasons.”
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2.2 Methods

To shed light on both the factors leading to and the repercussions of deviations from presidential term limits, I have chosen a two-country comparison of Colombia and Venezuela. The comparability of the two countries and the initial similarity of the environments allows for the conduct of a unique natural experiment. I use these two analogous cases, beginning at approximately the same starting point in the early 2000s, to pinpoint the various factors that led to the different outcomes for term limits in 2009. I also examine the vastly divergent results that stemmed from this turning point to reach certain conclusions about this constitutional feature in the Colombian and Venezuelan cases: namely that presidential term limits can protect institutions vital to the success of democracy and development.

I will use causal narrative as the principle method through which to draw out the lessons of the Colombian and Venezuelan cases. Causal narrative is a comparative-historical analysis method whereby “the researcher compiles evidence, assesses it, and presents a sequential causal account.”\(^99\) The chief benefit of this methodology is that it has high internal validity and captures the lessons and nuances of the specific cases under study in great detail and accuracy. The weakness of this approach, however, is that it may lack in external validity given that other instances of presidential term limit deviations may differ in key contextual factors, making the lessons learned from this comparative case study less applicable.\(^100\)

To complement my secondary research, I conducted fourteen semi-structured interviews with academics, former government officials, and key members of civil society from both Colombia and Venezuela. I traveled to Colombia in August of 2017 to conduct these in-person interviews in both English and Spanish. To find a qualified group of interviewees, I used my personal network to reach out to academic and professional contacts with relevant experience and expertise in each country; these contacts in turn introduced me to other professionals with expertise on term limit deviations. This purposeful sample of subject matter experts used a snowball approach that eventually resulted in a highly-qualified pool of interviewees with a range of perspectives on the electoral and institutional dynamics in the respective countries. Because I could not travel to Venezuela due to the current security situation, I realize that my sample of expatriate Venezuelans may skew more anti-Chavista and against the current regime. The names of the Venezuelan interviewees are omitted to protect against any possible political repercussions or reprisals. These interviews deepened my understanding of the Uribe and Chavez regimes and provided invaluable background, context, and analysis of salient events in both countries.
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\(^100\) To address this issue, I conduct two studies in separate papers: a large-N study of the effects of term limit deviations and a medium-N study of the factors that are likely to prevent term limit deviations.
In delving into the histories of these two cases, I will detail the process through which term limits were upheld in Colombia and abolished in Venezuela to highlight how this inflection point was a key juncture for the two countries, setting them on drastically different political and economic courses. Because of the initial similarities, we can at least in part attribute the different results to the influence of the independent variable under examination: presidential term limits. I will use the methodologies detailed herein to make the case that the retention of term limits in Colombia and their elimination in Venezuela was a critical determinant that led to the divergent fortunes of these two once-similar countries.
2.3 The History of Colombia and Venezuela Under Uribe and Chavez

Colombia and Venezuela at the turn of this century were more similar than they were different. While Venezuela traditionally boasted a higher per capita income, in part due to considerable oil revenues that were spread over a smaller population, Colombia had a better track record with democracy (Table 1). Comparing the two countries, the Head of the Political Science Department at Universidad del Rosario in Bogota observed that “in Colombia, you have a political elite that has been around forever. If you look at re-election rates in Colombia, you have a re-election rate around 50%. You have people who live professionally on politics.” Venezuela, on the other hand, she noted, has had “highly corporatist” regimes as result of the focus on the petroleum sector along with “a history of dictatorship and populism that is very strong.” However, governments of both the left and the right in these countries tended to protect the status quo and elite interests above all else; the liberal and conservative parties in Colombia even established alternating presidencies for three decades in the mid-late 20th century to ensure stability and two-party dominance. Rival parties in both countries talked about poverty reduction and development while enacting many of the same policies that perpetuated income inequality and generally poor governance. The appearance of political choice often substituted for true ideological alternatives.

Table 2.1: Colombia vs. Venezuela in 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Venezuela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>39,819,279</td>
<td>24,023,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>$86,186,156,584</td>
<td>$97,974,136,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>$2,164</td>
<td>$4,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
<td>$1,507,907,130</td>
<td>$2,890,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Expenditure as a % of GDP</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI Country Rank</td>
<td>.791 (75th)</td>
<td>.792 (74th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini Coefficient</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance (scale: -2.5 to 2.5)</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank Data and UNDP

This predictable state of affairs was upended in both countries by charismatic leaders who took power in 1999 and 2002, in Venezuela and Colombia respectively, and began to remake these
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countries in their own images. Hugo Chavez came to power in Venezuela three years before his Colombian counterpart, promising a socialist revolution that would invert the traditional hierarchy, placing poor and working-class interests at the forefront of his agenda. He used the state’s vast oil revenues to fund his expansive social programs and subsidies to the poorer segments of Venezuelan society. There were notably early improvements in key areas: from 1999 to 2009, unemployment dropped from 14.5% to 7.6%; GDP per capita rose from $4.1K to $10.8K, infant mortality decreased markedly; oil revenues boomed; and the poverty rate declined from 23.4% to 8.5%. However, Chavez’s legacy is clearly a mixed one as the Harvard Political Review points out: “As a result of his social programs, his political inclusion of the poor, and his assertions of Latin American independence from “imperialist powers,” Chávez gained the unwavering loyalty of millions of Venezuelans. Yet his bold, unique governing style came at the cost of the rights of his political opponents while fostering crime, corruption, and stifling government inefficiency." A direct legacy of the liberal spending policies and cronyism in government and state-owned enterprises has been simultaneous inflation and decreasing productivity. Inflation has been rampant in recent years and was projected at 720% in 2016. Meanwhile, the state’s oil revenues, which funded the boom years, dropped 34% in 2016 alone due to sharp declines in productivity and price, depriving the state of badly-needed fiscal resources.

Alvaro Uribe, himself elected in 2002 in Colombia, is linked to Chavez not only by geographic and regional ties and his charismatic approach, but by the near-diametric opposition of his philosophy toward tackling the problems he inherited. Rather than reject capitalism, Uribe cozied up to powerful domestic and international business interests alongside his American allies and aggressively targeted the domestic guerilla groups—most notably the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC)—that had made his country a near-failed state in the 1980s and 1990s. He used sweeping authority (some have claimed extrajudicially and illegally) to conduct counter-guerilla operations and empowered paramilitary units to persecute armed rebel factions as well. The results were largely positive but with important caveats: many macroeconomic indicators improved but income inequality initially worsened. The average annual growth rate during Uribe’s tenure was 4.3% while foreign direct investment increased five-fold
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during Uribe’s two terms.\textsuperscript{113} The principal successes of his time in office generally relate to the realms of security and stability whereas his detractors highlight transparency and human rights concerns:

“for the majority of Colombians, though, security has been the key issue, demonstrated in recent opinion polls giving the president 75% approval ratings. At the root of this popularity is one simple fact: President Uribe made Colombia a safer place…However, this success has not been without cost. Mr. Uribe's administration, particularly during his second term, was beset by a series of corruption and human rights abuse scandals.”\textsuperscript{114}

The chief difference between the two rivals and their countries is evident in the results of their successor administrations but also stems largely from their ability to extend their terms of office. A trend of “re-election fever”\textsuperscript{115} swept through Latin America in the 1990s and the 2000s in numerous countries; Argentina (1994), Peru (1995), Brazil (1998), the Dominican Republic (2002), Costa Rica (2003), Colombia (2004), Ecuador (2008), Bolivia (2009), Venezuela (2009), and Nicaragua (2010 and 2014) all changed their constitutions to allow for multiple presidential terms. Uribe himself had pursued and successfully obtained a previously-forbidden second term in Colombia in 2004. In the eyes of many political scientists, the widespread expansion of terms harmed democratic consolidation and resulted in the personalization of power in many of these countries.\textsuperscript{116} In this respect, 2009 proved to be a watershed year. Uribe pushed for a third term and was eventually denied in his bid by the Colombian Constitutional Court; in the wake of this decision, he agreed to step aside peacefully, and his defense minister succeeded him in what was perceived to be a fair, democratic contest. Chavez, denied a third term in a 2007 referendum, refused to acknowledge defeat and was eventually successful in 2009 in eliminating term limits and securing his continued rule until his death in 2013. The comparative results, just one year later (Table 2), are telling and offer a stark contrast from the 1999 figures:
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Table 2.1: Colombia vs. Venezuela in 1999 (repeated from above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Venezuela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>39,819,279</td>
<td>24,023,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>$86,186,156,584</td>
<td>$97,974,136,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>$2,164</td>
<td>$4,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
<td>$1,507,907,130</td>
<td>$2,890,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Expenditure as a % of GDP</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI Country Rank</td>
<td>.791 (75th)</td>
<td>.792 (74th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini Coefficient</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance (scale: -2.5 to 2.5)</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank Data and UNDP

Table 2.2: Colombia vs. Venezuela in 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Venezuela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>47,791,393</td>
<td>30,693,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>$377,739,622,866</td>
<td>$381,286,237,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>$7,904</td>
<td>$12,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
<td>$16,208,664,127</td>
<td>$6,927,000,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Expenditure as a % of GDP</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI Country Rank</td>
<td>.720 (97th)</td>
<td>.762 (71st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini Coefficient</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance (scale: -2.5 to 2.5)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank Data and UNDP

By 2014, Colombia had nearly caught Venezuela in terms of overall GDP, had surged well ahead of its neighbor in foreign direct investment (FDI), and continued to boast a strong rate of economic growth. While Colombia still lagged in GDP per capita and fell back in terms of the Human Development Index (HDI), Venezuela sunk into the economic doldrums as a direct result of the deleterious policies of Chavez and his successor, Nicolas Maduro. It is important to note that
Venezuela stopped reporting official economic information to the World Bank and other international institutions after 2014, and the estimated indicators have tilted even more decisively in Colombia’s favor in recent years. A former Venezuelan government official who worked in the Chavez regime in the Ministry of Interior and Justice saw it this way: “we’re brothers, Colombia and Venezuela, but were different. Colombia is more developed than Venezuela, but it used to be the opposite. It’s a more productive country. Colombia had their internal crisis, but they’ve passed it.”

A different scenario, in which Venezuela rejected Chavez’s bid to extend term limits, offers an interesting counterfactual. Had term limits been respected in Venezuela and the 2012 presidential election more fairly contested, a leader from a different party with a different vision may have been elected and chosen to reverse course on some of these harmful policies, thereby limiting their potential negative impact. A Colombian political science professor who is an expert on parallel institutions in Venezuela related that “the elimination of term limits was certainly a cause of the current economic failures. It permitted the re-election. It permitted all of this. Chavez told the people that Maduro was his choice. Maduro won the election in 2013, but everyone had Chavez on their minds. If he had to run on his own, he likely would not have won.” In a bit of tragic irony, Venezuelan economic refugees now spill into Colombia and the surrounding countries whereas the reverse was true just two decades ago. An American educator living in Caracas for the last several years observed that “the same Colombians that for 30 years had migrated to Venezuela to be maids and working class workers have returned to Colombia and now it’s Venezuelans moving to Colombia to be maids and factory workers and such.” In this reversal of fortune, Venezuela has become the borderline failed state with Colombia in the ascendancy. The pivotal year of 2009, in which one country embraced term limits while the other rejected them, has proved critical in setting these countries on their markedly divergent paths.
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2.4 The Critical Cases and the Role of Key Institutions

2.4.1 The Case of Colombia

Upon his election to the presidency in 2002, Alvaro Uribe inherited a state that was on the brink of collapse. The country was plagued with internecine violence and chronic insecurity, and an alarming rate of kidnappings and homicides continued unabated. In short, previous governments had demonstrated little success in exercising control over the entirety of sovereign Colombian territory with multiple guerilla groups posing a direct challenge to state authority. Numerous journalists and academics have described Colombia at the time as a near-failed state.\textsuperscript{121,122,123}

It is against this backdrop that the achievements of the Uribe Administration in stabilizing Colombia’s security situation must be judged. Uribe greatly increased the military budget—the size of the military doubled during his time in power with significant aid from the United States as a part of Plan Colombia—and began pursuing the armed Marxist factions in the country much more aggressively in a strategy billed as “Democratic Security”. With increased manpower, weaponry, and tolerance for casualties, his administration pushed the FARC back into the Amazonian jungles and out of the major towns and villages. During his two terms, kidnapping rates dropped by 84\% and the homicide rate by 70\%.\textsuperscript{124} The FARC, which numbered 20,000 fighters in 2002, had been thinned to 8,000 fighters by the end of his presidency (McDermott).\textsuperscript{125} As a direct result of these security gains, the country witnessed the aforementioned impressive improvements in economic growth and investment.

There remains, however, a “dark underside”\textsuperscript{126} to Uribe’s various successes. Perhaps unsurprisingly, these gains came at the cost of human rights and transparency. Numerous allegations of corruption have been levied against the Uribe administration including “illegal payoffs, wiretapping, and campaign-finance shenanigans.”\textsuperscript{127} The military has been widely accused of killing innocent civilians along with guerillas and then dressing them up in combat fatigues to inflate the number of kills and cover up any evidence of wrongful deaths. When brought to light, this episode became known as the “false positive” scandal and undermined the Uribe administration’s credibility at home and abroad.\textsuperscript{128} Additionally, this anti-guerilla campaign added to the already considerable amount of rural displacement, estimated at over 6 million people over
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the course of the conflict as Colombia continues to have one of the world’s largest populations of internally displaced persons (IDPs).

Despite these allegations, Uribe remained highly popular, and in 2009, with only one year remaining in office, he sought to change the constitution yet again to secure a third term to continue his security campaign and consolidate the gains made during his administration. He had already successfully amended the 1991 Colombian Constitution in his second year in office to include a previously-prohibited second presidential term, and he now sought an unprecedented third term. Despite his checkered record, Uribe remained steadfastly popular with the majority of Colombian people. He was re-elected by a wide margin in 2006 and enjoyed an unprecedented approval rating of 86% in 2008 after a successful rescue mission freed several high-profile kidnapping victims from the FARC including Ingrid Betancourt, a former senator and presidential candidate. Both houses of the Colombian Congress supported a proposed referendum that would have allowed the Colombian people to vote on whether to amend the constitution further to give Uribe a third term.

Given Uribe’s continued popularity, many domestic and foreign observers believed the initiative likely to pass, but the Colombian Constitutional Court ruled that the proposed referendum was unconstitutional. The 1991 constitution established the Constitutional Court as an independent body within the judicial branch—distinct from the Supreme Court of Justice—to review matters pertaining specifically to the interpretation of the constitution. While Colombia has had “a relatively independent judiciary since 1958,” the Constitutional Court, in its current incarnation, has been “one of the most activist high courts in the world since its creation in 1991,” regularly ruling against encroaching executive authority and declarations of emergency authority by different presidents, including Uribe himself. While the Constitutional Court upheld the electoral reform law that allowed Uribe the opportunity to seek a second term in 2005, its decision in 2010 denied him the chance for a third term. In defending their decision, the lead justice of the court, Mauricio Gonzalez, stated that the proposed referendum contained “substantial violations to the democratic principle.” Most of the Colombian political scientists interviewed for this paper felt that the Constitutional Court was in fact the key institution in preventing a third term.

In 2010, eight years and two terms after ascending to the presidency, Uribe accepted the court’s verdict as the final word and stepped down peaceably at the end of his term. A former Colombian military officer, commenting on Uribe’s legacy, had this to say:

---
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“Uribe was one of the best presidents in Colombian history. His administration was a success. He changed the perception of the country from a borderline failed state to one that is respected and has a positive perception in the international community. A lot of statistics have improved. It’s impressive. He changed the character of the country. One reelection was good. But only one. A maximum of two terms. His leaving maintained democracy. The Constitutional Court said it wasn’t legal, wasn’t constitutional. And Uribe accepted the decision. Democratic institutions prevailed. And so did the equilibrium of the branches of government.”

Uribe’s ability to consolidate his security gains and economic reforms depended greatly on his ability to secure a second term. This raises an important question about the ideal number of terms: is a one-term limit, as exists in several Latin American countries (Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Paraguay, and Colombia once again) too short a mandate to allow presidents to enact necessary change? Or might a two-term limit (or more) allow for the dangerous consolidation of power? This paper does not seek to answer this question, but a study that examines the ideal number of constitutionally-permitted presidential terms merits further consideration and inquiry. In Colombia, a third Uribe term may well have been a step too far and dangerous for democracy, but it seems apparent that a second term helped him to achieve his goals and set the country on a more stable, prosperous path.

On the back of Uribe’s still-considerable popularity, his defense minister Juan Manuel Santos was elected to the presidency in 2010, promising to continue the Democratic Security policies of his predecessor. Santos, however, has pursued a more conciliatory policy with armed factions, even negotiating a cease fire with the FARC in 2015 and signing a controversial peace treaty in 2017, much to Uribe’s dismay. He also allowed the prosecution of several high-profile figures from the Uribe administration for corruption. While Santos’ time in office has not been without its hiccups (the cease-fire and subsequent peace treaty with the FARC have been very unpopular and his approval rating dipped to 26% at one point), Colombia has remained on a steady path to development, and the economy grew at a solid 4.3% clip in 2014 and 3.0% in 2015. Income inequality, which grew worse in Uribe’s first term despite declining overall poverty, has been a continued point of emphasis and a sticking point in the negotiations with the FARC, which has maintained land redistribution as one of its central principles throughout its fifty-year insurgency. Colombia still has one of the highest concentrations of land ownership in the world, with estimates placing 80% of the land in the hands of 14% of the people, but Colombia’s Gini
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Coefficient has steadily decreased from its peak in 2006 with further reductions in the seven years of the Santos administration.  

Colombia in 2017 is far from a perfect democracy, but its cornerstone institutions remain intact, having withstood widespread insecurity in the 1990s and a challenge to term limits in the 2000s. The judiciary remains a bulwark against the consolidation of authority as the Constitutional Court has successfully “built alliances with three key communities – a set of academics, a subset of civil society, and the middle-class – through its jurisprudence” and “these alliances have helped to protect the Court against political attempts to weaken it.” Furthermore, a political science professor at Universidad del Rosario in Bogota, believed that safeguarding term limits “gave a feeling for the citizens, and the media reinforced this message, that we are a constitutional country. That we are not a banana republic. That was the message. The institutions have been respected. People thought it was good for their political self-image.” In 2015, during his second term, President Santos even supported successful legislation to prohibit consecutive presidential re-election and return to a one-term presidency.

Uribe’s legacy remains largely intact, even if opinions as to his intentions vary widely across different segments of society. One Colombian political scientist felt that “he was trying to buy his way through (to a third term). A lot of those people are in jail now for bribery for voting, for trying to buy the votes and appointing people who are related to Uribe people…I think he had the idea that he was the savior of the country. I think he saw himself like that. And probably a lot of people told him that. I saw a lot of people talking about him in a religious way.” Other academics, including the head of the Department of Political Science at Universidad del Rosario believed differently:

“I don’t think he wanted to stay for a third term. I don’t think he thought that was a possibility. If you know political institutions in Colombia, you know that was not possible. The Constitutional Court had been having a fight with President Uribe for a long time, and he had to know that it was very unlikely that they would accept a third term…President Uribe did not insist on this. If he had wanted to, he could have done so. He could have done something authoritarian. But he didn’t, he accepted the ruling…I don’t think Uribe was trying to become a dictator. I think he wanted to protect his legacy.”

---
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Whatever his true intentions, by respecting the Constitutional Court’s decision and stepping down peacefully at the end of his second term, Uribe ensured a smooth transition to his hand-picked successor and the continued stability of the Colombian political system.

In the meantime, the consistent upward trends of growth and investment augur well for the economic future of the country. Inequality and lasting peace remain the more difficult challenges but even those intransigent aims appear to be heading in the right direction. Given the signing of a peace treaty with the FARC in 2017, President Santos can focus squarely on social issues in his last year in office such as land redistribution, a more equitable division of resources, and urban poverty that continue to vex the country. As one voter best put it when Uribe was leaving office in 2010, “We needed security to be able to look at the other things. Now, with security, Santos can take care of the rest.”

2.4.2 The Case of Venezuela

Hugo Chavez came to power in 1999, elected to the Venezuelan presidency in the midst of political and economic turmoil, much like his Colombian counterpart Alvaro Uribe. As in Colombia, there was considerable disillusionment with the traditional parties and an appetite for change that fueled Chavez’s rise to power. Unlike Uribe’s pro-business/pro-US bent, Chavez promoted a new brand of leftist socialism that promised redistribution of resources, pro-nationalization policies to combat poverty and inequality, and strident anti-Americanism.

Chavez initially made good progress toward many of his stated goals, aided in no small part by a four-fold increase in state oil revenues over the course of his time in office (an offshoot of the substantial rise in the price of oil). In the first few years of his rule, the state-owned oil company, PDVSA, substantially increased production (though this would see a sharp turn-around in subsequent years), and Chavez used this oil wealth to fund generous subsidies to the poor and working classes to better wage his war on poverty. As Figure 1 shows, the poverty and unemployment rates both fell dramatically while living standards and oil exports rose.
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As with Uribe in Colombia, the gains wrought by Chavez did not come without considerable costs. Due to his lavish spending and expansionary fiscal policies, the inflation rate rose dramatically. At the same time, several successive currency devaluations drastically eroded Venezuelan purchasing power abroad. The country also became demonstrably more violent over this stretch, with the homicide rate nearly doubling. All of these trends are visible in Figure 1 above. Further exacerbating the fiscal situation was the proclivity of Chavez to buy influence and regional support through generous aid packages and shipments of cheap oil to like-minded regimes and potential allies. These attempts to export Chavismo to friendly regimes in Ecuador, Bolivia, Nicaragua, and Honduras, among others, while perhaps politically successful in the short term, resulted in the forfeiture of hundreds of millions of dollars of potential oil revenue for Venezuelans every year. A former government official who served in the Chavez Administration noted that “Argentina, among others, benefitted enormously from our romance with them. It benefitted Chavez’s regional diplomatic and political efforts for his project. He never thought about the long-term effects on his own country for his political project, on a national level.”
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cheapest domestic gasoline on the planet due to huge subsidies, and you have the makings of a severe fiscal crisis.\textsuperscript{147}

At several points during and even before his time in power, Chavez displayed a willingness to subvert the institutions of the Venezuelan government for political expediency. In 1992, he was arrested and jailed for his part in an attempted military coup. Once elected to the presidency in 1999, he successfully changed the constitution and was re-elected in 2000 to a ‘first term’ under the new constitutional regime. After an averted coup attempt in 2002 and a subsequent re-election in 2006, he immediately began pressing for the repeal of term limits. Chavez launched a referendum campaign to make significant alterations to the 1999 constitution, but voters narrowly rejected this initiative in 2007. Not one to be dissuaded by defeat, he re-launched a less ambitious reform just two years later and was successful in 2009 in repealing term limits. “It was easier to change the constitution because they had already changed it,”\textsuperscript{148} one Venezuelan observer noted. Chavez subsequently won a third term in office in 2012, a year before his death in 2013.

During this entire stint, Chavez persisted in eroding institutions and domestic opposition to his Bolivarian socialist program. Principles of limited government and rule of law fell by the wayside. A Venezuelan expatriate, who now works for an education non-profit in Bogota, described the process:

“He started with the reform (in 2001), then several law changes, then lastly with the term limitations elimination. It was like putting a stone in a wall. He was little by little building the destruction of the constitution. And these allowed him to violate the constitution without someone regulating him because they also had the Supreme Court on their side. The National Assembly was on their side. The Electoral Council was also on their side. They had all of the state machinery in their favor.”\textsuperscript{149}

A boycott of the 2005 congressional elections by the opposition and the insertion of loyalists into key positions in the judiciary had ceded Chavez almost complete power over all three of the branches of Venezuelan government.

Not content with subverting the different branches of government, Chavez also clamped down on independent media as well. In 2007, he refused to renew the broadcast license of the largest, oldest television network in the country, Radio Caracas Television, because it had been critical of his policies. In 2009, the government led a crackdown on radio stations and other private
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media in what has been described as a “blatant attempt to influence the electorate by controlling public media and limiting access to pluralistic information.”150

Chavez’s re-election to a third term in 2012 allowed his hand-picked successor, Nicolas Maduro, to take over as interim president in the wake of his unexpected death the very next year. Because Chavez had successfully asserted control over most key state institutions before his third term—including the Congress, the Supreme Court, the media, and the National Electoral Council—Maduro was able to slide into the presidency, despite a dubious succession process.

“They violated the constitution by naming Maduro interim president while they started a new election process. This election process was full of advantages for Maduro because he was acting president; he had all of the government resources to fund his campaign. He had also the favor of the Chavista people because he was appealing to their heart…If you saw Maduro’s campaign in Venezuela you saw no picture of Maduro, you were always looking at Chavez. And he was like, ‘I stand for Chavez. I will do what he told me to do.’ This was the campaign. People weren’t voting for Maduro. They were voting for Chavez.”151

Maduro, a former bus driver, has found himself completely out of his depth politically and economically, and the country has rapidly spiraled downward. Because Maduro’s legitimacy rests squarely on Chavez’s legacy and his status as the heir to Bolivarian Socialism, he either cannot or will not change course. Experts estimate that inflation is skyrocketing at rates over 1000% this year; the crime and murder rates remain at an all-time high; the economy has contracted by 32% since the beginning of 2014; and the Venezuelan Bolivar has lost 99.8% of its value in the last five years.152 The situation has become so tenuous that one Washington Post columnist openly speculated that “the only question now is whether Venezuela's government or economy will completely collapse first.” (O'Brien) (O'Brien) (O'Brien)153 In November 2017, Venezuela defaulted on its debt and had to restructure payments with its creditors. While it is difficult if not impossible to disentangle the effects of bad economic policy from the abolition of term limits, it seems clear that the two are inextricably linked.

2.4.3 The Role of Key Institutions

Despite the fact that both Uribe and Chavez were able to extend their initial terms in power, some key institutional differences emerge between the two countries upon closer examination. In evaluating the relevant literature and conducting interviews with the aforementioned academics, former government officials, and members of civil society, the critical role of certain crucial
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institutions becomes clear. In Colombia, institutions including the opposition party, civil society, and the judiciary stood up to Uribe, whereas in Venezuela, Chavez steadily and successfully removed impediments to his consolidation of power.

Several notable institutions played a critical role in preserving presidential term limits in Colombia when President Uribe sought a third term in 2009. In 2005, when Uribe was initially successful in changing the Colombian Constitution to allow re-election, he was only able to secure this change with the passage of a parallel electoral law that ensured certain guarantees for opposition candidates. Law 996, passed in 2005, mandated equal media coverage for opposition candidates, public funding and spending caps in presidential elections, and restrictions on public spending and public appearances by the president before an election; it also mandated that a sitting president provide at least six months’ notice of his intention to run for re-election. These reforms aimed directly at reducing the sizeable advantages of incumbency, highlighted earlier, in an attempt to level the electoral playing field in Colombia. While Uribe did enjoy considerable popular support, he only had the support of approximately 50% of senators and 60% of representatives during his first term. Contrast with Hugo Chavez’s complete domination of the Venezuelan Congress after the 2005 opposition boycott of legislative elections, the relative restraints on Uribe and the residual powers of the Colombian Congress become clearer. The fact that the legislature, and in particular the opposition party, were powerful enough to insist upon this law before allowing for the possibility of re-election in 2006 demonstrates the strength and efficacy of these institutions in promoting democratic norms.

The press and civil society also played important roles. During Uribe’s bid for a third-term, several notable and influential figures emerged in opposition to these proposed constitutional changes which swayed not only the opinions of the public but also those within government. Adriana Ramirez, a professor of government and political science at Universidad EAFIT in Medellin, believed that “there were many important voices in opposition. The critical voices had weight and had an important role in shaping public opinion. Especially in the written press and television…The fundamental part was that people heard and listened to these critical voices. And more resources were given to the Constitutional Court, so that they were not alone.” In addition to the press, Dr. Ramirez asserted that civil society played an important role: “NGOs like La Fundacion de Justicia and academics were all key voices contributing to the opposition to a third term…All of these people informed the debate around the third term.” The influence of these
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prominent voices helped to turn the intellectual and philosophical tide against Uribe and appears in part responsible for the Constitutional Court voting the way it did.

Finally, there was the key intervention of the judiciary itself. Unlike in Venezuela, the Constitutional Court was not beholden to the president and was in fact the decisive institution in ultimately denying Uribe’s bid for a third term. While the Congress had already approved legislation that would have allowed a national referendum on a constitutional amendment for a third term, the court’s decision (by a 7-2 vote) that such an amendment was unconstitutional forestalled the need for such a vote. Charges of corruption and vote-buying in the judiciary in relation to the bid for a third term still resonated throughout the Colombian press and civil society. But the fact remains that the judiciary retained enough independence to prevent the further extension of Uribe’s stint in power and preserve the rule of law.

Venezuela provides a stark contrast to Colombia, as its institutions failed to safeguard democracy. The opposition party never provided a viable alternative to Chavez’s vision for Venezuelan society. Launching an unsuccessful coup attempt in 2002 may have been their first mistake, but it was certainly not their last. An American educator living in Venezuela at the time had this to say: “the 2005 boycott was a horrible mistake, but the 2002 coup really set Chavez down a certain road. You could almost say he was not radical before 2002. Once they threw him out of power, that pushed him to Castro and radicalized him. The opposition didn’t even respect his full first term, and we are where we are today because of it.”

At the same time, Chavez effectively neutered the legislature, the judiciary, and the press. He systematically removed these potential obstacles and ensured that no prominent voices had a platform to oppose his agenda. Dr. Francesca Ramos, a political science professor at Universidad del Rosario and an expert on Venezuela, chronicled how “Chavez empowered these parallel institutions, which enabled the growth of his political project. He was able to co-opt all the key institutions. There was no equilibrium of power. He controlled the legislature and the courts since 2006. In 2007, he wanted to enshrine these changes constitutionally. When he wasn’t able to, he tried a less ambitious reform that passed in 2009.” The lesson Chavez apparently learned early on was that in order to ensure the success and survival of his Bolivarian revolution, he needed to monopolize the sources of state power.
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2.5 The Implications of Term Limit Deviations

2.5.1 Short-Term Implications of the Respect for and Elimination of Term Limits

In 2009, a watershed year for both countries, term limits were upheld in Colombia and eliminated in Venezuela; the divergent paths followed by the two countries in the intervening years are firmly rooted in the implications of these decisions. Colombia still faces myriad problems stemming from historical, systemic inequalities, but the macro-level trends are encouraging and augur continued growth, poverty reduction, and development. Venezuela, on the other hand, appears mired in a political and economic death-spiral from which it is unlikely to emerge anytime soon. Admittedly, these trends started well before 2009, but the constitutional imperative to change leadership forced healthy, necessary change in Colombia while the lack of such a structural impediment abetted continued profligacy in Venezuela.

![Figure 2.2: A Comparison of Colombian and Venezuelan GDP per Capita 2006-2014](source: Trading Economics)

The year 2009 is highlighted above (Figure 2) to illustrate the divergence of the two countries since that seminal year. Colombia’s peaceful, democratic transition to a new administration in 2010 cemented investors’ confidence in the country and its respect for constitutional norms and set the stage for sustained growth in living standards. Meanwhile, the continued rule of Hugo Chavez, followed by the tenuous, tumultuous transition to an unqualified leader in Nicolas Maduro in 2013 created uncertainty and volatility in Venezuela. Dr. Ramos provided a concise explanation: “the elimination of term limits was certainly a cause of the current economic failures. It permitted the re-election. It permitted all of this. Chavez told the people that Maduro was his choice. Maduro won the election in 2013, but everyone had Chavez on their minds. If he had to run on his own, he likely would not have won.”

---
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Figures 3 and 4 demonstrate the greater volatility of Venezuela in general but also highlight the very different fortunes of each country after 2009. Colombia continued its path of steady growth and investment with a predictable, stable political environment, whereas the continuing tumult and uncertainty in Venezuela led to a sharp decline in growth and continued volatility of investment. As the statistics cited previously highlight, these trends have only become more pronounced in the years since 2014, after which Venezuela ceased to provide data. The Venezuelan NGO worker offered this assessment: “as there is only one vision of a government or how things should be done, there is no change because there is no change of government. And because there is no change in government, it has taken the economy to the pain it is in. So the inflation has increased, horrendous hyperinflation that is skyrocketing. The worth of money is literally nothing.”163 While a different

163 (Stokes, 1999)
leader might have pursued different policies, Maduro remains determined to stay the course and
refuses to even admit that there is a crisis, going so far as to disallow medical and food aid to the
country. One of the former Venezuelan government officials offered an explanation for this
refusal to change course: “Maduro had to continue with the same policies. Because Maduro’s
support and legitimacy was entirely dependent upon Chavez’s legacy.”
In effect, Maduro is
handcuffed by Chavez’s former policies, even though Chavez himself may well have changed
course given the depth of the crisis. Chavez’s legacy, that of removing limitations and constraints
on power, has put the country in a policy straitjacket.

2.5.2 Long-Term Implications of the Respect for and Elimination of Term Limits

While the short-term implications of Colombia and Venezuela’s respective choices manifest
themselves clearly in the statistics cited above, the long-term implications may be subtler and
therefore more difficult to determine. From a political perspective, Colombia appears to have
reinforced the rule of law in upholding term limits whereas Venezuela has undermined it by
eliminating them. The comparative politics expert Dr. Ramos observed that in regard to “this theme
of re-election, democracy is in crisis on many fronts and in many countries. Democracy is
alternation. Colombia also had a crisis with this. But the courts maintained their independence and
an equilibrium. The courts in Venezuela weren’t independent.” What then, are the far-reaching
consequences for democracy in these two countries? Dr. Ramirez at Universidad EAFIT
summarizes the impact of upholding term limits on Colombian democracy:

“It was huge for the credibility of the Colombian political system. From the
international perspective, it demonstrated that we could change the perception of the
international community that we would respect the rule of law. It changed the perception
that we were a narco-state—that we had become a functioning democracy. Even with the
past problems of the narco-traffickers, guerillas, and paramilitaries, that we were a real
democracy. That the society started to listen to other voices. That we could be critical. It
showed us that Colombia had changed. That it cost us a lot of time and lives, but that things
had really changed.”

Venezuela, however, had a very different experience. Maduro, like Chavez before him,
continues to undermine institutions like the judiciary, the opposition party, the free press, and civil
society. In March of 2017, the Maduro-controlled Supreme Court moved to strip the opposition-
controlled National Assembly of its ability to create laws—the fundamental raison d’être of a
legislature—and instead assumed this power themselves. Maduro then supplanted the legislature
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through the election of a new National Constituent Assembly in July 2017 which quickly granted itself the power to draft and pass laws. The apparent success of the election of a National Constituent Assembly will allow Maduro to re-write the Venezuelan constitution and marks the country’s rapid descent into authoritarianism. No referendum was even put forth to ask the population if they even wanted a constituent assembly, in violation of the current constitution. Maduro increasingly relies on martial rule, and the normal organs of democracy have ceased to function. The American educator asserts that “there is very little democracy left. Term limits were definitely a factor. The government is basically writing its own rules at this point.”\textsuperscript{168} The Venezuelan NGO worker added the following:

“Chavez created this perception in the population that he could do whatever he wanted under the laws…And people in his government learned to rule like that. So it created a precedent when he managed to get rid of limitation of terms. He created a precedent in which everybody thought they can do what they want. And we as a government can do what we want. And that is what Maduro is doing right now. He is literally doing what he wants. “I want a National Constituent Assembly.” And that is what happened. I think in the long-term, people will not recover this sense of limits in regard to how to govern a country…When you teach people something, it is very difficult to go back.”\textsuperscript{169}

In addition to the long-term political repercussions, there are also sure to be economic consequences. Colombia, having successfully negotiated a peace agreement with the FARC under President Santos, appears primed for continued stability, investment, and growth. Unfortunately for Venezuela, the situation may not yet have reached the nadir. The humanitarian crisis worsens with every passing month with food, medicine, and other basic necessities increasingly difficult to come by. Several interviewees related stories of entire families routinely going through the trash in Caracas, looking for anything to eat. And even though it sits on the world’s largest reserves of oil, that potential revenue stream has also been compromised: “Venezuela has already forfeited 30 years of oil and mineral rights to the Chinese and the Russians. It’s tragically ironic, Chavez railed against the imperialist the Yankees and what he did was just trade them for the Russians and Chinese.”\textsuperscript{170}

2.5.3 A Counterfactual Exercise

How important then, were effective presidential term limits for both countries? Were their respective paths since 2009 inevitable? Would a third Uribe term have continued Colombia’s positive economic and governance trends? Would he have pursued a peace treaty with the FARC as aggressively as President Santos did? Would enforceable term limits have spared Venezuela the
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worst of its current suffering? Or would plunging oil prices and the very real prospect of a Maduro presidency have landed it in exactly the same place? Though we can never know for certain, counterfactual scenarios provide an illustrative intellectual exercise.

In the case of Colombia, the re-election of Alvaro Uribe to a third term seemed a near-certainty given his high approval ratings and track record on the paramount issue of security. While the national macroeconomic trends may have continued in the same vein during a third Uribe term, the worrying cases of corruption and the proven willingness of the administration to engage in bribery (during the first successful attempt to change term limits in 2003), deceit (the “false positives” scandal), and “skullduggery” (spying on politicians, journalists, human rights activists, and Supreme Court judges)\(^{171}\) boded poorly for the consistent application of the rule of law. Several former top Uribe aides ran afoul of the law during his time in office. His former intelligence chief was granted political asylum in Panama in 2010 at Uribe’s request rather than face prosecution in Colombia for the aforementioned spying campaign and subsequent cover-up. Were Uribe still in power, he may well have shielded these officials from prosecution or even investigation. The dangerous and intoxicating allure of continued power appeals strongly to those who have had demonstrable success in difficult environments and have the iron-clad strength of conviction to see their vision through to the end. The fact that Uribe remains active in Colombian politics—he ran for and was elected to the Senate in 2012—demonstrates this enduring sense of purpose and will. Uribe, by many indicators, set Colombia on a positive path during his two terms in office. Were he to have been granted a third term, it may have been perilous for Colombian democracy, rule of law, and continued progress. One need only look across the border to the witness the possible repercussions.

In the case of Venezuela, Hugo Chavez would have had to step down in 2012 at the end of his second full term had term limits remained in place. The election, sure to be contentious given Chavismo’s enduring popularity at the time, would have been between Nicolas Maduro and Henrique Capriles, the well-known governor of Venezuela’s second most populous state. Given that Capriles narrowly lost to Maduro in a 2013 special election marred by electoral fraud shortly after Chavez’s death, he may well have won that election. Certainly, the then-recent and unexpected death of Chavez and the desire of his countrymen to honor his legacy swayed these election results. Even had Capriles won the election, he would still have had to deal with the growing inefficiency of PDVSA and its production shortfalls, a precipitous drop in the international price of oil, a precarious fiscal crisis with massive budget shortfalls, and a national epidemic of crime and murder; there is no guarantee that a Capriles administration could have reversed these worrying trends. However, the alternation of power mandated by term limits could have allowed for a course correction and policy stabilization at an earlier date. This policy shift could have boosted investor confidence and dialed back the unchecked public spending that is at the root of the
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current hyperinflation (Figure 5), macroeconomic mismanagement, and civil strife that has characterized the Maduro administration.

**Figure 2.5: Venezuela’s Annual Budget Deficit 1995-2015**

![Graph showing Venezuela's annual budget deficit from 1995 to 2015.](image)

Source: Bloomberg View

While Venezuela’s profligate fiscal policies and turn toward authoritarianism began under Chavez, the situation has become steadily worse under Maduro. As previously mentioned, Maduro increasingly relies upon the military to enforce order and clamp down on free expression. The recent election of the new Constituent Assembly, condemned as a sham by many observer nations, promises a new, more autocratic constitution and further consolidation of authority under Maduro.\(^{172}\) As a result of this vote, Venezuela has been temporarily suspended from Mercosur, the South American regional trading bloc, and the US imposed new economic sanctions. Capriles or a different opposition leader does not represent a panacea, but these options may have offered a better, more stable solution for Venezuela’s many problems.

### 2.5.4 Alternate Hypotheses

It is important to note that there are plausible alternative explanations outside of term limits as to why Colombia rose and Venezuela fell during this period. The first and most obvious explanation is that the significant rise in commodity prices that lifted many Latin American economies in the early 2000s has reversed course in this decade. The decline in export revenues that resulted from the global recession and China’s relative slowdown took a heavy toll on commodity-dependent countries such as Venezuela, Brazil, and Peru. As one of the world’s biggest
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oil exporters, Venezuela benefitted considerably from the sharp rise in the price of oil in the early 2000s and has suffered directly from the plunge in its price earlier this decade.

Figure 2.6: Venezuelan GDP and the International Price of Oil

As seen in the graphs in Figure 6, the GDP of Venezuela is closely tied to the price of oil, since it accounts for 95% of export earnings and approximately half of federal budget revenues. Colombia boasts a significant petroleum sector, but oil revenues make up a much smaller share of its economy, therefore it would not have been as affected by the precipitous drop in international oil prices. Colombia undoubtedly benefitted from the prosperity of many of its key trading partners in the 2000s including Brazil, Chile, Peru, and others who did reap the rewards of the commodity boom. However, their continued positive performance in this decade would seem to point to a more balanced, diversified economy less dependent on a single commodity. The relative diversification of the Colombian economy and the lack thereof of the Venezuelan economy offers a compelling argument for the divergent performance of these economies. However, one could also argue that the ways in which these revenues were spent (or wasted, depending on your point of view) can be directly linked back to the quality of governance.

On the subject of government spending, another key dynamic at play during the Uribe and Chavez regimes was diplomacy and foreign aid. One of Uribe’s key backers was the United States, who pumped $8 billion into security aid and anti-drug trafficking as a part of Plan Colombia from 2000-2012. While this money overwhelmingly went to security, Uribe was able to lean on this funding to boost military spending, enhance security, and transfer fungible budget resources to other high-need areas. Chavez, to the contrary, doled out generous oil and financial support to sympathetic leftist governments in South America (Argentina, Ecuador, and Bolivia), Central America (Honduras and Nicaragua), and the Caribbean (Cuba and Haiti). Venezuela hemorrhaged
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sorely-needed petro dollars to peddle influence and buy off regional friends with money that could have been used at home to build infrastructure, combat crime, or alleviate poverty.

The issue of the questionable usage of oil revenues returns us to the bad policy argument articulated in a previous section. Instead of the divergence in the application of term limits causing the contrast in their respective fortunes, it could be that Venezuela merely suffered from bad policy while Colombia was the benefactor of sound policy. The South American economies that embraced Chavez’s brand of Bolivarian socialism (Venezuela, Ecuador, and Bolivia) have on the whole seen slower growth than those countries that embraced a more open, trade-oriented approach (Brazil, Colombia, Chile, and Uruguay).¹⁷⁵ This latter group of countries, more integrated into the global economy, took better advantage of growth opportunities afforded by international markets, and their economic stars rose accordingly. Those countries that focused inward, while sometimes successful in reducing inequality, grew at far slower rates and experienced less income growth per capita. What this argument conveniently ignores is the fact that bad policies persist specifically because certain regimes, often personalist and highly corrupt, are not bound by term limits. Myriad international examples exist of regimes that continue ill-conceived, counter-productive, or even destructive political and economic policy agendas because they are free of the constraints of term limits: Robert Mugabe’s Zimbabwe, Omar al-Bashir’s Sudan, and Idriss Deby’s Chad, to name but a few. While bad policies certainly played an outsized role in Venezuela’s current crisis, the fact that the same ill- advised policies remain in place despite disastrous results is in no small part a result of the elimination of presidential term limits.

¹⁷⁵ (Lustig, 2011)
2.6 Discussion

Term limits proved to be a critical factor in safeguarding democracy in Colombia while their elimination in Venezuela undermined democracy and helped usher in the current crisis. What then, are the essential take-aways from this comparative case study? What can we learn from the examples of Colombia and Venezuela in supporting the respect for term limits and avoiding the pitfall of their alteration or even elimination in other countries? The potential policy actions encompass both political and economic reforms and necessarily correspond with the time frame of the issues in question.

In comparing the two countries, the presence of a loyal opposition working within the established political system was a key difference. In Colombia, the opposition to Uribe (more broadly defined) used its political capital to encourage legislation to curb the advantages of incumbency and provide the intellectual and constitutional counter-arguments on behalf of term limits. Ultimately, it was the support for another internal pillar of the political system—the judiciary—that prevented a third term for Uribe. In Venezuela, however, the opposition chose extra-institutional strategies: the failed 2002 coup and the boycott of the 2005 congressional elections. The decisions to work outside of the political system undermined institutions and the credibility of the opposition, abetting Chavez’s efforts to eliminate term limits. In the short term, there are concrete actions that struggling or fragile democracies can take to shore up democratic norms and promote political competition within the confines of the established system. A multi-party system, with viable options for citizen choice, is a cornerstone of democracy. The rights of opposition parties and actors should be protected by ruling parties and where they are not, the international community should apply diplomatic pressure and/or economic sanctions. A loyal opposition is a lynchpin of competitive, healthy democracy. Opposition parties and actors, for their part, should work to strengthen democratic institutions, not weaken them, to promote greater accountability and adherence to democratic norms like presidential term limits.

Important differences in the macroeconomic structure and economic diversification of the two countries also manifested themselves in important ways. Colombia boasts a more diversified economy with a host of different sectors and industries. Since its economic resurgence under Uribe, the country has found success in courting foreign investment and promoting domestic entrepreneurship. As a result of this economic diversification and decentralization, economic capture remains difficult if not impossible. In Venezuela, oil is king, and the economy is almost completely dependent upon this one product. This resource dependence, which heightens volatility and susceptibility to economic shock, also allows for economic capture by political interests. By increasing his control of PDVSA and its oil revenue, Chavez was more easily able to bring the economy and thereby the country under his control. It should be obvious that no country can transform its economy overnight. However, if rentier states/mono-crop economies are more susceptible to political consolidation, democracies should seek to broaden their economic bases to avoid political capture. Those countries and international bodies seeking to promote democratic
norms should help fragile or developing democracies with their efforts toward economic diversification to promote more stable, resilient governments. Economic diversification is therefore a potentially effective medium-term strategy for combatting deviations from established constitutional term limits.

In studying the histories of Colombia and Venezuela and drawing upon the insights of the various academics interviewed, it is clear that these two countries have distinct political traditions. Colombia, with its stronger democratic and electoral tradition, along with its history of an entrenched political elite, possessed more built-in safeguards against the consolidation of power by an ambitious individual. Its bi-cameral legislature, with long-serving incumbents, was more difficult to co-opt, and the judiciary also displayed a history of independence. Venezuela, on the other hand, with its tradition of caudillos and a more vertically-integrated political structure, always seemed more likely to fall prey to the centralization of power or even authoritarian consolidation. While countries can do little to change their democratic traditions in the short or even medium term and may have limited immediate ability to shape and mold the character of institutions, there are long-term reforms that they can make. Neutral arbiters of political contests or conflict, like independent electoral commissions or truth-and-reconciliation commissions, can be established or strengthened. The independence of other key institutions, like the judiciary, opposition parties, the Central Bank, or the military, also merit support. Moreover, the international community, regional organizations, and powerful democratic countries in the international system can and should pay greater attention and give greater support to those countries with weak institutions and histories of authoritarianism, knowing that they can be more easily co-opted by strongmen. They can directly support critical institutions with funding or advisors or make aid or trade deals contingent upon their continued independence. Political history does matter, but a country’s political history and even its traditions can change over time (witness countries like Japan, Chile, or South Africa, among others) with the appropriate incentives and internal and external pressure. Presidential term limits, once seen as a mere inconvenience, can become enshrined into permanence and inviolability.

One potential solution to address all of these issues simultaneously is the continued use of and adherence to effective and inviolable presidential term limits. Term limits allow opposition parties the opportunity to contest elections and work from within the established political system. Term limits also help preserve judicial independence by preventing its cooptation by one person or party by promoting alternation in power. Moreover, they also allow for different macroeconomic policies to be proposed and implemented by alternating administrations. Because presidential term limits can help to ensure that the rights of opposition parties and the judiciary are safeguarded and that multiple policies are considered, they should be preserved and protected.

2.7 Conclusion

If the respect for the institution of presidential term limits has the profound impact that it appears to have, it is a practice worth protecting. In recent years, there has been an alarming trend
in Latin America and Africa to amend constitutions, hold referendums, or ignore existing statutes to allow executives to stay in power beyond their legally-appointed terms. Since 2000, term limits have been altered or abolished in the Latin American states of Ecuador, Bolivia, Honduras, and Nicaragua\textsuperscript{176} and in the African states of Uganda, Congo, Burundi, and, most recently, Rwanda.\textsuperscript{177} There have been some encouraging signs of late in Latin America, however, as a referendum failed in Bolivia in 2016 to allow Evo Morales a fourth term when his current term is up in 2019,\textsuperscript{178} and Rafael Correa peaceably stepped down in Ecuador in 2017 after previously prolonging his term in office.

If the Colombian and Venezuelan examples have taught us anything, it is that alternation in power is an essential element of the healthy functioning of democracy. Despite the popularity of certain transcendent leaders (or perhaps because of it), term limits should apply universally to all political figures. In a functioning democracy, no man or woman should be above the constitution. Term limits were enshrined in constitutions to protect the state from the leader but also to protect the people from themselves. For countries to grow democracy and continue to prosper, states and their leaders must internalize the value that presidential term limits offer in order to reap the benefits that they would bestow.
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3. Preventing Deviations from Term Limits in Low- and Middle-Income Democracies

Introduction

Deviations from presidential term limits are potentially damaging to democracies in low- and middle-income countries because they allow for the dangerous consolidation of authority. Though certain institutions, such as legislatures, judiciaries, and the media, among others, are designed to ensure democratic accountability and broad, consensus-based decision-making, the ability of one leader to maintain his or her grasp on power can erode the independence of these institutions over time and impair the ideal functioning of a constitutional democracy.

Previous empirical studies have established correlations between longer executive stints in office and the deterioration of governance, media freedom, political rights, and civil liberties.\textsuperscript{179} Additionally, an event analysis study that I recently conducted revealed that term limit deviations lead to decreases in political rights and civil liberties in countries that have experienced these deviations relative to similar countries that did not.\textsuperscript{180} Case studies have also documented the various ways in which presidential term limit deviations have been deleterious to democracy.\textsuperscript{181,182,183} Historically, once a president has successfully subdued other competing centers of power, democracy can give way to increasingly authoritarian rule, as witnessed in numerous countries such as Uganda, Chad, and Venezuela, where term limits were originally enshrined in the constitution but eventually removed by long-serving presidents. Because deviations from presidential term limits allow longer stints in power and can lead to indefinite or even imperial presidencies that in turn tend to restrict political rights and civil liberties and weaken accountability mechanisms, they present considerable cause for concern.

If we accept the premise that presidential term limit deviations are indeed harmful to democratic regimes, then it is important to try to prevent them. One potential way to approach this problem is to determine the most critical institutions that might prevent such deviations. By analyzing a set of relevant historical cases, we can determine which institutions have been associated with the successful prevention of deviations in the past so that we can prioritize the protection and strengthening of these institutions in potentially-vulnerable democracies going
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forward. The results of this analysis can then inform the actions of domestic actors and allow international actors to employ an evidence-based policy approach to better promote democracy and representative rule in countries around the world.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 1 discusses the relevant literature on the prevention of deviations from presidential term limits. Section 2 explains the qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) methodology used in the paper. Section 3 presents the data, explains the decisions behind the study data, and describes the approach to data collection and descriptive statistics. Section 4 discusses the results from the QCA as well as several robustness checks. Section 5 presents the discussion of the results and their policy implications for the prevention of presidential term limit deviations. Section 6 concludes the paper.
3.1 The Relevant Literature on the Prevention of Presidential Term Limit Deviations

The majority of studies on the subject of term limits addresses either the theoretical arguments for or against this constitutional feature or the economic and political consequences of deviations. While I detail the theoretical and empirical arguments for and against presidential term limits in another paper, I will focus exclusively on the literature that examines ways in which to prevent deviations from presidential term limits in this paper and the importance of institutions that underpin them.

In a wide-ranging 2011 dissertation on term limits, Dulani delves into the differing reasons behind the success and failure of presidents in removing term limits. Using a mixed methods approach that employs both regression analysis and case studies of African presidential regimes, he concludes that the following factors contributed to a president’s ability to successfully remove term limits: greater majorities of the president’s party in the legislature; the president having a military background; the willingness of a regime to use violence; political cohesion of the ruling party; and traditions of respect for authority. On the other hand, Dulani found that the following factors undermined a president’s ability to remove term limits: the precedent of prior presidential alternation in power; legislative fractionalization; greater dependency on foreign aid; social/ethnic fragmentation; and a vibrant civil society. When determining the rationale for which institutional factors I selected as most relevant to the president’s success or failure in deviating from term limits, I borrowed heavily from many of these established sources of influence.

Armstrong also tackles the topic of which institutions are most critical to preventing deviations from term limits in his 2011 dissertation. He states that “understanding what makes term limits stick is critical for the study of democratization. Enforcing term limits promotes party turnover, strengthening the rule of law, which is essential for political stability and democratic consolidation.” In his case study of six African countries in the 1990s and 2000s, two of which experienced deviations and four of which had unsuccessful challenges to presidential term limits, he cited the following domestic institutional factors as the critical differentiators: the strength of the opposition parties, legislatures, judiciaries and civil societies. Armstrong also mentioned the role of international activists and foreign pressure for democracy but concluded that these are less salient factors. Again, I drew upon several of these findings to determine the most relevant institutional factors to analyze in evaluating term limit deviation.
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As a part of my research into presidential term limit deviations, I conducted a comparative case study of Colombia and Venezuela in 2018 that examined the reasons behind the retention of term limits in the former and their elimination in the latter. In the same year (2009), Alvaro Uribe’s bid for a third presidential term was denied by the Colombian Constitutional Court while Hugo Chavez successfully persuaded the Venezuelan people to approve a referendum removing term limits. According to my research, the key differentiating factors were the effectiveness of the opposition, a more diversified macroeconomy, and the independence of the judiciary in Colombia relative to Venezuela. These results also influenced my thinking about key institutional factors to include in the eventual qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) study.

The final part of the relevant literature involves the importance of institutions to good, and in this case, democratic, governance and continued development. Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson established the importance of institutions to economic development in their landmark study on the impact of colonial legacies. They concluded that institutions that promote the broad-based distribution of resources have produced states with higher level of economic development; these states, not coincidentally, tend to be high-income democracies. Acemoglu and Johnson continued and deepened this research in a follow-up study, concluding that “the main determinant of differences in prosperity across countries are differences in economic institutions.” Economic institutions such as the contract enforcement and property rights are upheld by adherence to the rule of law. Armstrong has already established the connection between the rule of law and the enforcement of presidential term limits. If the rule of law (and therefore term limits) is to be upheld and respected, it follows that the institutions that support and protect it are also critical. The institutions examined in this paper, which include legislatures, judiciaries, electoral commissions, militaries, political parties, civil societies, and media, all actively contribute to promoting good governance in democratic societies.

The existing literature does provide several examples of different approaches to address the most effective methods of preventing term limit deviations, including the use of regression analysis and case studies, but an approach which combines quantitative rigor with the nuances and subtleties of a case-based qualitative approach remains to be conducted. This study employs just such an approach, using a mixed-methods tool known as qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) to draw upon a larger number of cases of actual and attempted term limit deviations in low- and middle-income democracies. The following section expands upon the way that QCA accomplishes this task to answer the question of which institutions are most likely to prevent term limit deviations based upon a set of relevant historical cases.
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3.2 Methods

The QCA method requires multiple inputs to support effective institutional analysis. The two key inputs are a set of historical cases to examine and a list of factors or conditions through which to evaluate them. I already had extensive data on low- and middle-income presidential democracies that had either deviated from term limits or had attempted to so unsuccessfully from a previous study.\textsuperscript{191} Using this larger dataset, I identified 53 relevant cases from 1989-2016 that fit the established criteria. The relevant literature provided an initial idea of which factors might help to prevent term limit deviations. Using this literature as a guide, I then chose eleven institutional factors to serve as the analytical lens through which to evaluate the different cases. I explain the rationale behind selecting each of these factors in data section.

3.2.1 Identification of Institutions

To identify those institutional factors which were most salient, I needed to have a sense of the key institutional dynamics that can affect the outcomes of these constitutional challenges. Dulani and Armstrong’s research highlighted several such key variables: independent judiciaries and legislatures, vibrant civil societies, divisions within ruling parties, and the influence of foreign aid. However, I felt that there were other potentially missing factors. In my study of Colombia and Venezuela, the role of the opposition emerged as a key factor, and therefore this was added to the list. In a case studies course taught by one of dissertation committee members, Christopher Paul, where I initially proposed this QCA study, we discussed the list of potential institutions, and factors such as corruption and the media revealed themselves to be impactful. Finally, I examined the different cases in the study and discovered that other institutions, like the military and electoral commissions had also played critical roles in certain countries to prevent or abet term limit deviations.

To further vet the list of key potential institutional factors, I sought the input of certain selected governance experts. Francis Fukuyama, Robert Klitgaard, and Stephen Knack, all governance experts, reviewed the list of potential factors and provided feedback. From this discussion, other factors including the possible connection between resource-dependent or rentier states and presidential term limit deviations emerged. This consultation ensured a broader, expert consensus regarding the key factors that may influence term limit deviations. While this additional step does not ensure that the list of institutional factors is exhaustive, it does indicate that the list is likely to include the most salient variables. Those factors that were determined to be the most critical were used as the 11 main criteria through which to examine the 53 cases of actual or attempted term limit deviations in the countries included in the study from 1989-2016. The full list of institutional factors is presented in the next section in Table 1.
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3.2.2 Selection of Methodology

To determine which institutional factors, or more specifically which combination of factors, are most likely to prevent term limit deviations, I decided to use qualitative comparative analysis, a tool that is uniquely suited to this type of investigation. The QCA methodology, pioneered by the sociologist Charles Ragin,\(^{192}\) relies on set theory and uses binary discriminators regarding set membership to determine if there are minimum sufficient patterns or configurations in the data that correspond to a specified outcome—in this case the prevention of term limit deviations (or, alternately, successful deviation from term limits in the negative case). This type of QCA analysis, which uses a Boolean algebra algorithm to analyze the assigned binary data, is known as “crisp set” qualitative comparative analysis because of the yes/no or present/not present categorization of each factor for every case. Using this binary data, the algorithm can determine if there is a factor or a set of factors that are necessary or sufficient conditions\(^{193}\) for this outcome, or, in the absence of necessary and sufficient conditions, the combination of factors most likely to achieve the outcome. In this study, the QCA methodology uses a series of cases—those countries that experienced actual and attempted deviations from term limits from 1989-2016—and evaluates them across the series of selected salient institutional factors previously developed. While other studies used regression analysis and case study methodology, I selected QCA because of the ability to employ a mixed-methods approach and draw upon a larger number of cases to identify the most critical institutional factors.

3.2.3 Completion of the Truth Table

To conduct the analysis, I scored each of these institutional factors for their presence or absence in each of the country cases to create a “truth table”. This truth table consists of the matrix of all scored cases for the relevant institutional factors. Each factor is assigned a score of 0 or 1, indicating that he factor was either absent (0) or present (1) during the year of the actual or attempted term limit deviation. Furthermore, each factor was designed so that a designation of present (or score of 1) would positively contribute to preventing term limit deviation, while a designation of absent (or a score of 0) would theoretically aid presidents in deviating from term limits.

Because of the subjective nature of the scoring assignments, I used quantitative demarcations where possible to pre-assign scores. For example, for the factor “foreign pressure for democracy,” I decided that countries with a higher percentage of foreign aid relative to gross
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\(^{193}\) If a factor is necessary, it must be present in the solution set in order to attain the desired outcome; if a factor is sufficient, that factor alone can result in the desired outcome.
national income (GNI) might be more susceptible to donor pressure to democratize. As such, any country in the study with an overseas development aid (ODA) to GNI ratio of greater than 10 percent qualified as susceptible (and was assigned a score of 1) whereas a country that had less than 10 percent was not as susceptible (and was therefore assigned a score of 0). The scoring decisions and justifications for each factor will be discussed in greater depth in the data section. These pre-populated scores provided for standardized measurement across the different study countries.

However, not all of the institutional factors lent themselves to facile quantification or measurement by an existing index. Therefore, I needed the input of subject matter experts who possessed detailed contextual political knowledge and could make informed judgments about the remaining factors. I reached out to experts who possessed the necessary expertise regarding each country during the time period when it experienced a deviation from or challenge to term limits. I specifically targeted respected academics, key members of civil society, or former government officials who possessed the requisite context knowledge. Through my own network and those of my current and previous colleagues, I reached out to experts in 39 of the 41 different countries that make up the study cases (I conducted the Colombia and Venezuela scoring assignments myself, based on the insights acquired in researching the case study of these countries’ experiences with term limit deviations). In many cases, direct contacts at the RAND Corporation, international organizations such as the United Nations, and NGOs such as Catholic Relief Services provided this input. In other cases, I requested that people in my network reach out to their contacts who possessed the necessary expertise. And finally, where I could not find experts in a particular country through these channels, I conducted internet searches for reputable academics in political science in these countries. Through this expert elicitation, I was able to obtain assessments for 42 of the 53 total cases from a total of 45 different experts. I was unable to obtain expert assessment for seven countries (Algeria, Cameroon, Congo Brazzaville, Gabon, Guinea, Malawi, and Namibia), therefore I conducted detailed research myself on these countries using Freedom House annual country reports, US State Department country reports, peer-reviewed journal articles, and other publicly-available sources to make the necessary scoring assignments. The full table of institutional factor scores for every case can be found in Appendix B. For those participants who agreed to be listed in this paper, the full table of country experts, their organizational affiliations, and their positions can be found in Appendix H.

After agreeing to participate in the study, each expert was asked to assign a score of 0 or 1 to each of the six institutional factors for which there were no available measures (independent legislature, independent judiciary, independent electoral commission, independent military, strong opposition party, division within ruling party). Furthermore, because the pre-assigned scores may not be able to capture the nuances or unique situations in each country, I allowed the experts to change the pre-assigned scores, provided that they offer a valid justification for having done so. Experts made such changes in only 15 instances, but this does provide a source of potential variation which will be further explored in the section on robustness checks.
To help with the scoring assignments for each factor and to assure standardization, I provided every expert with a user guide and scoring matrix (Appendix I). While there is inherent subjectivity in the assigned ratings, the use of quantitative demarcations for certain factors (where possible) and standard criteria for the other factors should make these judgments as clear and explicit as possible in order to make these determinations consistent and reliable. The additional allowance for experts to change pre-assigned scores also provided a necessary degree of flexibility to consider the individual or unique circumstances in different study countries. As an additional protection, all of the scoring assignments for the truth table were completed before beginning the QCA to insulate against possible bias of the scores toward certain conclusions. With a completed truth table of country cases for the key factors that may influence term limit deviations, I was then able to use the QCA software provided by Ragin on his website to analyze the data for patterns and trends. QCA indicates where there are necessary or sufficient conditions in the dataset. A condition is necessary if it must be present in order for the outcome (e.g., no deviation from term limits) to be achieved; a condition is sufficient if it can produce the outcome by itself. The software will also calculate a complex, parsimonious, and intermediate solutions that show the likelihood of different conditions leading to the desired outcome, based on the inputted data in the truth table. The output and analysis of the QCA tool for this study is provided in the data and results sections.
3.3 Data

To ascertain the institutional factors likely to prevent presidential term limit deviations, I first compiled and validated a list of the most salient factors which would serve as my analytical lens. I then sought out experts for each of the countries in the study who could score the selected institutional factors. This section details the data collection and data techniques employed to gather and analyze the relevant data.

3.3.1 Institutional Factors

The initial institutional factors emerged from the two previous dissertation papers on the subject of the prevention of term limit deviations. Other factors emerged from the broader literature review conducted for a previous paper or key cases, such as Colombia and Venezuela, that I studied in the course of my research. Several subject matter experts on governance, also mentioned beforehand, helped me to validate the selected factors to ensure that I was working with a comprehensive list. The following sections detail the selected institutional factors, their relationship to term limit deviations, and the method for scoring each factor. The full QCA User and Scoring Guide with all of the instructions provided to the country experts regarding the way in which to score the different institutional factors is provided in Appendix E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factor</th>
<th>Scoring Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent legislature</td>
<td>Expert assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent judiciary</td>
<td>Varieties of Democracy Index for Independence of Judiciaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent electoral commission</td>
<td>Varieties of Democracy Index for Independence of Electoral Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent military</td>
<td>Expert assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong opposition party</td>
<td>Expert assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division within ruling party</td>
<td>Expert assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant civil society</td>
<td>Freedom House Civil Liberties Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free press/media</td>
<td>Freedom House Press Freedom Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency/freedom from corruption</td>
<td>World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators Corruption Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resource dependent state</td>
<td>World Bank Percentage of Gross Domestic Product from Resource Rents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign pressure for democracy</td>
<td>World Bank Percentage of Gross National Income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.1.1 Independent Legislature

Independent legislatures comprise a key part of a balanced presidential system as they are usually the most significant counterweight to executive power and authority.\(^{194}\) In many Latin American and African constitutions, which are modeled on the American constitution, the legislature is assigned certain unique roles and responsibilities to ensure the separation of powers. In a functioning presidential system, the legislature is often the principal source of new laws and, importantly, controls the power of the purse. If a president is able to co-opt or effectively control the country’s legislature, this important check on their power is removed, and the roles of drafting and enforcing the law become centralized in the same person or branch of government.

Once a president effectively controls the legislature, they can alter or even eliminate constitutional term limits by proposing new laws or constitutional amendments that remove these restraints. With overwhelming legislative majorities, even the strictest constitutional requirements can often be skirted. Independent legislatures provide an important safeguard against the consolidation of presidential power and deviation from presidential term limits (Nigeria in 2007\(^{195}\)).

There was no good proxy measure or available index for the independence of national legislatures. As such, I relied on the judgment of the country experts to make this decision. The country experts were instructed to score this factor 1 if legislatures in the country in question generally had the power to draft and pass their own laws and could act to check the power of the president. If the experts considered that the legislature was significantly under the sway of the president or merely acted as a rubber-stamp body, this merited a score of 0.

3.3.1.2 Independent judiciary

Independent judiciaries represent another critical pillar of a democratic system.\(^{196}^{197}^{198}\) They provide the essential role of judicial review and oversight of the laws and policies that are designed and enacted by the other branches of government. The judiciary offers citizens a recourse against potentially unlawful government actions or government overreach. It is often the last line of defense for citizens or advocacy groups seeking redress of their grievances or perceived abuses of the system.

\(^{194}\) (Linz, 1990)
\(^{195}\) (Andreu et al., 2018)
\(^{196}\) (Larkins, 1996)
\(^{197}\) (Linz, 1990)
\(^{198}\) (Rosenn, 1987)
Critically for term limit deviations, the highest court in a country (often the supreme court but in certain countries there is a specific constitutional court) can rule on the constitutionality of altering the constitution to allow a president more or longer terms. Independent judiciaries then, can act and have historically acted as an important bulwark to presidential consolidation of power (Colombia in 2010199).

Initially, I could not find a measure or index for judicial independence so I left this score to the discretion of the country experts, offering the guidance that they should mark this factor present if the judiciary had the power to make its own decisions, free of presidential influence, and if the judiciary could effectively check the power of the other branches. Later in the process, I was directed by a fellow researcher to the V-DEM (Varieties of Democracy) database that does provide a measure for judicial independence by country.200 I then used their rankings to fill in this score for the countries that I rated myself, as well as verifying the experts’ respective judgments on this factor.

3.3.1.3 Independent electoral commission

Independent electoral commissions provide an essential function by ensuring that elections are conducted in a free and fair manner.201 In a fully-functioning democracy, this means that presidential candidates face a mostly level playing field (though incumbents in all countries enjoy certain built-in advantages and these advantages are often magnified in developing democracies) and that elections are conducted in a transparent manner, with a particular emphasis on the transparency of the voting process and the publication of the results.

In regard to term limit deviations, presidents who seek to consolidate power will endeavor to control the electoral commission, often by appointing those loyal to them. This influence can compromise the freedom and fairness of the election by barring certain candidates, ensuring that resources are disproportionately allocated, limiting or controlling voting spaces, or manipulating the electoral results. Electoral commissions can also manipulate the referenda that presidents call in order to gain popular support or legitimacy for their desire to remain in power (Burundi in 2018202), therefore it is essential that they operate in an independent and transparent manner if the democracy is to be protected.

As with judicial independence, I came upon the V-DEM measure for electoral commission independence later in the process, so I initially left this scoring assignment to the discretion of the country experts. However, I again used this measure for countries that I evaluated and verified the

---

199 (Gelfeld, 2018a)
200 (Coppedge, 2018)
201 (Lasham, 2005)
202 (Boateng, 2018)
experts’ ratings against those of V-DEM. I offered the guideline that if the electoral commission was mostly independent and generally followed election laws while ensuring free and transparent elections, that they should score it as present.

3.3.1.4 Independent military

Having a military that is not beholden to the president, but rather to the constitution and the rule of law, is essential in a democratic government.\textsuperscript{203} While it is common in many presidential regimes that a president serves as the civilian commander of the military forces, there are usually established guidelines in place for how that authority can be used and what other branches can do to check that authority. It can also be a problem for a democratic government if a military is too independent and becomes a source of power in its own right, as that authority may threaten the democratic nature of the state. But the greater threat is that presidents may use the military to impose martial law or as a police force within the state to forcibly impose their agenda or will.

An independent military can serve as a protection against presidential consolidation of power and can act to preserve the democracy in times of crisis,\textsuperscript{204} as when violations of term limits occur (as in Niger in 2010\textsuperscript{205}). If the president controls the military, they may feel that they have more latitude for action and enforcement of their desires and can therefore act with greater impunity. Militaries have in the past acted to remove presidents who sought to or did deviate from term limits. While militaries have also overthrown democratic governments, having this personal source of power allows the president a dangerous degree of authority and latitude.

If the military was sufficiently independent to act as a check or control on the president’s power, I counseled the country experts to rate it as present. If, however, the military was under the direct influence of the president, it may abet term limit deviations and should be marked absent.

3.3.1.5 Strong opposition party

The presence of multiple viable political parties competing for power is a hallmark of modern democratic systems.\textsuperscript{206} A strong opposition party can check the leader and the party in power and provides an ideological and functional alternative to the platform being espoused and implemented by the majority party.\textsuperscript{207} Ideally, there is alternation in power, and elections allow rival candidates and parties a chance to state their cases, giving citizens an electoral choice. A loyal opposition that will not seek to overthrow the government but will work within the system is vital to the success and survival of democracy. If the opposition is marginalized or muzzled, the dominant party offers

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{203} (Gosalbo-Bono, 2010) 
\item\textsuperscript{204} (Linz, 1990) 
\item\textsuperscript{205} ("Niger president to run for re-election," 2015) 
\item\textsuperscript{206} (Stokes, 1999) 
\item\textsuperscript{207} (Howard & Roessler, 2006) 
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the only ideas and, it bodes poorly for accountability and good governance. It can also lead to violence and instability if the opposition feels that it has no legal, electoral avenue to attain power.

Presidential term limits afford the opposition party the opportunity to run against a candidate who is not an incumbent and therefore does not have the built-in funding, publicity, and resource advantages previously referenced. Strong opposition parties can present a significant obstacle or roadblock to presidents seeking longer or additional terms, because it comes at the direct expense of their efforts to attain power. Opposition parties in numerous countries have prevented term limit deviations through legislative action, intellectual opposition, or the organization (along with civil society) of popular protest campaigns.

There was no measure or index available for strong opposition parties, therefore the scoring for this institutional factor was left to the discretion of the country experts. Experts were encouraged to score this factor as present if the opposition party in the country was perceived as strong and unified and presented a viable challenge to the president and the ruling party. If the opposition party was weak, fragmented, ineffective, or marginalized, the country experts were counseled to score this factor as absent.

3.3.1.6 Division within ruling party

Beyond the obstacle posed by opposition parties, there is often contention within the ruling party itself that can challenge the authority of a sitting president. Ruling parties may have competing individuals or centers of power that spread authority and responsibility for governing over different ministries throughout the government. The ministries of finance, defense, the interior, or foreign affairs may constitute such centers of power within the executive branch itself, or these people may reside in the legislature or judiciary. Whether the supremacy of the president is checked by rival ambition or a desire for a balance of power of individuals within the party (and the government more generally), democracy benefits by having power dispersed among several different nodes.208

When there is division within the ruling party, it becomes more difficult for presidents to extend their time in office and thereby establish personalist rule. These divisions may ensure that no one president overstays their appointed terms and that alternating rule, even though it may be within the same party, continues. The sanctity of term limits is thereby reinforced when these divisions within the ruling party exist.

There was no measure or index available for strong opposition parties, therefore the scoring for this institutional factor was again left to the discretion of the country experts. Experts were encouraged to score this factor as present if the ruling party was not unified, the president was

208 (Carothers, 2002)
unable to exercise control over their party, or there were substantial divisions within the party. If the ruling party was dominated or controlled by the president, experts were advised to score this factor as absent.

3.3.1.7 Vibrant civil society

A vibrant civil society comprised of interest and advocacy groups, academia, religious organizations, and other influential non-governmental organizations (NGOs) constitutes an essential part of a healthy democracy. These groups aggregate interests of popular concern and hold government officials and decision-making accountable. They publicize decisions or policies, analyze their impact, and take to the streets to protest when they deem it necessary.

Presidents who have sought to extend term limits in the past have been thwarted by civil society protests that opposed these actions (Benin in 2005). While military crackdowns on civil society have also accompanied attempted term limit deviations, these protests undermine the legitimacy of these attempts and bring vital international visibility and publicity.

There are several measures that could be useful proxies for the strength of civil society, but I selected Freedom House’s annual civil liberties index to assign scores for each country for this factor. I chose Freedom House because of their in-depth reporting on the specific political context of each country in each year which provided the most context-specific information available from the same source. Freedom House assigns a score of 1 (highest) to 7 (lowest) for the respect for civil liberties in a country. If a country rated a 3 or lower, it was scored as having a vibrant civil society; if it rated a 4 or higher, it was scored as absent. In five of the fifty-two cases (Bolivia twice, Costa Rica, Nigeria, and Zambia), country experts changed the pre-assigned score to reflect their perception of the reality in the country at the time. The expert justification for all changes in scoring can be found in Appendix G.

3.3.1.8 Free Press/ Media

A free press and media is vital to a vibrant democracy because it investigates and sheds light on the actions of the government and the public sphere more broadly as well as informing the public with news reporting and editorial pieces. A free press performs an essential watchdog function in this capacity and serves as a valuable accountability mechanism; it reports on those acts of fraud, waste, and abuse, nepotism, corruption, or malfeasance that governments may try to obscure.
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209 (Fukuyama, 2001)
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In a healthy democracy, the press often works with the government to publicize government programs or other public opportunities and inform citizens about elections and candidates.

A free and uncensored press is better able to report on the actions of presidents to secure additional terms, especially if that involves corruption or cronyism. Presidents that try to consolidate power by eliminating term limits may try to censor the free press or establish state-run media to boost their images and support their platforms (Venezuela in 2009).\textsuperscript{215} A free press can also better inform citizens of the consequences of term limit deviations in the case of public referenda or clandestine, behind-the-scenes political deals to ensure continued presidential rule.

To score each country for free press/media, I used Freedom House’s historical index for Press Freedom.\textsuperscript{216} Freedom House uses a broad classification scheme of free, party free, and not free, but this designation is accompanied by a score from 0-100 with 0 being the best score (free) and 100 being the worst score (not free). I used this score to make my judgment regarding press freedom: if the country scored below 50, free press was marked as present; if it scored above 50, it was marked as absent. In four of the cases (The Comoros, Niger, Uganda, and Zambia), the pre-assigned scores were changed by the country experts.

3.3.1.9 Transparency/Freedom from Corruption

Transparency and relative freedom from corruption are two features that are highly desirable in a democracy, as they generally lead to better, more accountable governance.\textsuperscript{217} When governments are more transparent about their actions, funding decisions, and general behavior, the citizens can better monitor their actions. In democracies, the press often performs this task, but this mantle is also taken up by interest groups and NGOs.

Presidents who seek to deviate from term limits may try to hide their intent to seek additional terms (Uganda 2005) or use patronage to try to buy the necessary votes in the legislature to seek approval for additional terms (Colombia 2010).\textsuperscript{218} If their intentions and actions are made more transparent to the public and if the process for altering term limits is clear and accessible to all, then public opinion can be more informed and the process itself more democratic. Furthermore, if civil society knows that a term limit deviation is imminent or likely, groups can take action to try to prevent it.

\textsuperscript{214} (Kasoma, 1995)
\textsuperscript{215} (Gelfeld, 2018a)
\textsuperscript{216} (Freedom of the Press, 2018)
\textsuperscript{217} (Pillay, 2004)
\textsuperscript{218} (Gelfeld, 2018a)
To measure transparency and freedom from corruption, I used the World Bank’s Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) Corruption Index. This index ranges from -2.5 to 2.5, with lower scores representing more corrupt governments and higher scores reflecting less corrupt governments. If a country scored above 0, then the factor was marked as present; if a country scored below 0, then it was marked as absent. No country experts deviated from the WGI pre-assigned ratings, but Argentina was not included in the database for the year in which it experienced a term limit deviation. In this case, I used a similar index from V-DEM to score Argentina.

3.3.1.10 Non-Resource Dependent State

The resource curse is a well-documented phenomenon whereby the presence of a certain valuable primary good (oil, diamonds, copper, etc.) makes a country’s economy dependent upon one product and diminishes investment, and diversification into other sectors. The presence of resource rents can also make a government less accountable to its citizens because of the independent source of wealth; not having to rely on its citizens for tax revenue, the argument goes, may in fact undermine democracy. The absence of significant domestic resources, ironically, may be better for a developing democracy, as it has to rely on its labor force and entrepreneurship to grow, as several of the Asian Tigers and more successful states in Africa have.

Presidents of resource-rich countries have used this wealth to consolidate their power by providing generous subsidies to their populations or supporters or by engaging in patronage to buy off influential individuals or factions. Presidents in several countries have claimed the need for additional terms in office because their unique program or agenda could only be carried out by them and their administration (Ecuador in 2008, Venezuela in 2009). This resort to personalism and the simultaneous use of resource rents to extend presidential stints in power link this factor to deviations from term limits.

To determine if resource dependence exists, I sought a reasonable threshold above which states could be considered to be dependent. I found a study by Jensen and Wantchekon stating that a country in which resources accounted for more than 25 percent of total exports could be considered dependent. Because the data that was available from the World Bank measures resource rents as a percentage of overall GDP (and not solely exports), I decided to use a threshold of 10 percent. If a country’s resources made up less than 10 percent of GDP, the factor was marked as
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present (non-resource dependent); if resources comprised more than 10 percent of GDP, it was marked absent (resource dependent).

3.3.1.11 Foreign pressure for democracy

Established democracies have endeavored to promote democracy in the developing world through both aid policy and diplomacy. Though the success of these efforts is fodder for considerable debate, aid funding nonetheless comprises significant parts of some countries’ budgets. The importance of this funding stream therefore imbues donor governments and international lending organizations such as the IMF, the World Bank, and the regional development banks considerable leverage to push for greater democratization or to resist efforts by different factions to undermine democratic gains. Countries that lean more heavily on bilateral aid from different countries or loans or grants from the international financial institutions, it stands to reason, would be subject to greater influence or pressure for democratization.

Presidents of countries that rely more heavily on aid may be more susceptible to foreign pressure for democracy promotion and consolidation. The European Union and the United States (under Barack Obama), the two biggest sources of international development aid, have both made their opposition to term limit deviations clear. While the extent to which these nations have pressured different leaders to avoid the pursuit of additional terms has varied according to the individual circumstances, their stated preferences remain clear. Presidents stand to compromise or potentially lose these important sources of funding should they attempt to alter term limits. The degree of their dependence on this aid funding may well be an important factor in the calculus of an incumbent president when weighing the costs and benefits of term limit deviation.

The extent to which countries rely on foreign aid seems a natural measure for this factor. I used the World Bank’s data for overseas development assistance (ODA) as a percentage of gross national income (GNI) as a proxy for aid dependence. In a study on foreign aid dependence, Brautigam concludes that countries in which aid comprises greater than 10 percent of gross national product can be considered intensely dependent upon aid.225 I selected the lower threshold of greater than 5 percent of GNI because even though countries with between 5 and 10 percent of aid may not be “intensely” dependent on aid, as characterized by Brautigam, they may well still be subject to foreign pressure which could influence presidential decision-making. For countries with greater than 5 percent of ODA as a percentage of GNI, foreign pressure for democracy was scored as present, while for countries with less than 5 percent, this factor was considered absent.

3.3.2 Summary Statistics

The following table (Table 2) provides the summary statistics for each of the eleven institutional factors. There were no deviations from term limits in 30 percent of the cases in the study (which

225 (Brautigam, 2000)
necessarily means that there were successful deviations from term limits in 70 percent of cases). While this rate of successful alteration to term limits may seem high, it matches up well with the larger data set from my previous study in which attempted term limit deviations were successful 67 percent of the time.\textsuperscript{226} The factors with the lowest frequency in these cases were freedom from corruption/transparency, which was present in just 9 percent of cases and division within the ruling party, present in just 17 percent of cases. At the other end of the spectrum, the most commonly present factors were non-resource dependent state (51 percent), independent military (38 percent), free press/media (36 percent), and independent legislature (36 percent).

\textsuperscript{226} (Gelfeld, 2018b)
Table 3.2. Summary Statistics for the Institutional Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum N</th>
<th>N Cases</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Deviation</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent legislature</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent judiciary</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent electoral commission</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent military</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong opposition party</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division within ruling party</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant civil society</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Press/ Media</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency/Freedom from Corruption</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resource Dependent State</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign pressure for democracy</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Results

Before running the models through the QCA algorithm, there are a few initial decisions that have to be made regarding consistency thresholds and prime indicators. Once the data has been imported, the QCA software generates a truth table that displays the number of times that each combination of factors appears as well as a score for its “consistency”. Consistency, as Ragin explains, measures “the degree to which solution terms and the solution as a whole are subsets of the outcome.” Generally, a consistency score of greater than 0.8 is desirable, which indicates that the same combination of present or absent factors yields the same result. The software tool allows the user to sort the different combinations by consistency and then delete those combinations of factors with a consistency below a certain selected threshold.

Though the default threshold is 0.8, I selected 0.5 as my threshold because I noticed that two cases displayed this consistency. This means that two of the exact same combinations of factors yielded different results: in one instance, there was no deviation while in the other there was a successful deviation. These cases both come from Colombia when Alvaro Uribe was initially able to secure a second term in 2005 by amending the constitution but was ultimately unsuccessful in seeking a third term in 2010. The user must reconcile this anomaly, and I indicated that these should be classified as no deviation, given the circumstances of the Colombian case: no elimination of term limits and the eventual rejection of the attempt to further deviate from them. Given the evidence from the Colombia cases, I ultimately decided that this combination of institutional factors was more likely to lead to no deviation. I will address this seeming anomaly more in the section on robustness checks. Once I had sorted and deleted the combinations that did not yield sufficient consistency or did not lead to an outcome of 0 or 1, I was able to conduct the QCA.

I ran several different QCA models, testing different assumptions and tweaking different settings to determine which factors, or more pertinently which combination of factors, yielded the best results for preventing presidential term limit deviations. There are different types of analysis that the program runs, and the recommended analysis—the standard analysis—yields three different solutions: complex solutions, parsimonious solutions, and intermediate solutions. The complex solution is the list of all possible combinations that can produce a desired outcome without considering counterfactuals or using minimization. This naturally produces longer, more extensive combinations of factors. The parsimonious solution takes into account all counterfactuals (e.g., if a set includes A, B, and not C, it can be represented solely by A). This allows for a whittled-down, simplified solution set that has fewer factors and can help determine which are the truly critical ones. For instance, if a series of solution sets include the factor “independent legislature,” then this factor alone can be used to represent this group. Finally, the intermediate solution provides a
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228 By selecting a lower threshold, more cases are included in the QCA. However, a lower threshold for consistency may lead to potentially incongruous results and lower overall solution consistency.
balance between the complete and parsimonious solutions and generates subsets of the necessarily narrower parsimonious solution (e.g., AB) and supersets of the broader complex solution. Therefore, if two or three of the factors (independent legislature, independent judiciary, and independent military) all appear in numerous solution sets, we can include these three factors as an intermediate solution. It is more extensive than the parsimonious solution and more condensed than the complex solution. The sub-sections that follow detail the efforts to select the appropriate model and interpret the subsequent results.

3.4.1 Model Exploration

When using the QCA software to perform the required analysis, a user has two additional choices to make: which “prime implicants” to select for analysis and whether each factor should contribute to the outcome (No Deviation) when that factor is present, absent, or present or absent. Ragin explains prime implicants as follows:

“Prime implicants are product terms that are produced using minimization rules (e.g. rules that combine rows that differ on only one cause if they have the same output value). For example: ABC combines with AbC to produce AC. AC, therefore, is the prime implicant that covers the two primitive Boolean expressions ABC and AbC. In other words, ABC and AbC are subsets of AC, or AC implies ABC and AbC.”

Presented with a list of prime implicants, a user can select all of them to be analyzed or can select the ones that they feel are most pertinent or impactful for the desired outcome. In my initial analysis, I selected all of the prime implicants to have a baseline case from which to work. Additionally, since all of the institutional factors were designed to contribute to the prevention of term limit deviations, I selected “present” for each of them regarding their contribution to the desired outcome in the intermediate solution (Figure 1). In a later iteration, I will use the results of the model with all prime implicants to select the factors that appear most directly relevant to the desired outcome.

---

229 (Ragin, 2017)
Each solution (complex, parsimonious, and intermediate) provides the list of included factors and scores for raw coverage, unique coverage, and consistency for each set as well as the overall solution coverage and consistency for that solution. Raw coverage measures “the proportion of memberships in the outcome explained by each term of the solution.” In other words, it shows what percentage of cases this combination accounts for or sorts for you. Unique coverage measures “the proportion of memberships in the outcome explained solely by each individual solution term (memberships that are not covered by other solution terms).” This solution, and the accompanying percentage, represent the only way to sort this set. If a user selects fewer prime implicants, they will have more combinations with unique coverage. This will be better for more parsimonious solutions. The overall solution coverage “measures the proportion of memberships in the outcome that is explained by the complete solution.” Ideally, this should be 1, meaning that the solution was able to resolve all patterns; a complete solution that does not yield a result of 1 might indicate that there are contradictory patterns in the case data from the truth table. Solution consistency, as previously mentioned, measures “the degree to which membership in the solution (the set of solution terms) is a subset of membership in the outcome.”
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3.4.1.1 Model with All Prime Implicants

When I selected all prime implicants, the QCA returned the complex solution seen in Table 3 below. There were no necessary or sufficient conditions present among the institutional factors included in this analysis (or in any of the subsequent analyses). Of the 11 different combinations of factors that produced the desired result—no deviation—most often, four (highlighted in yellow) stand out among the rest. Those combinations resulted in no deviation from term limits in 13 percent of the cases (raw coverage). The first and third sets, with unique coverages of 13 percent and a consistency of 1 seem to be the best results of these four. Looking for trends and commonalities across these four solution sets, we see the presence of only one factor in each set: an independent legislature. This factor, then, would seem to the most critical according to the complex solution. An independent military appears in three of the four solution sets. An independent judiciary and strong opposition party are both present in three of the four solution sets with the absence of these factors—signified by the symbol “~” in front of the factor name—in one of the solution sets. Non-resource dependent state follows the same pattern as judiciary and opposition, however, this factor was far more common among the cases, occurring in 51 percent of cases, therefore its case as one of the key institutional factors is somewhat weakened, though it should still be considered. Finally, the lack of transparency/freedom from corruption is also present in all of the solution sets, however, this is more likely due to the fact that the vast majority of these regimes suffer from corruption (91 percent of the cases in the study), rather than corruption actually helping to prevent term limit deviation.
Table 3.3. Complex Solution for All Prime Implicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors in the Solution Set</th>
<th>Raw Coverage</th>
<th>Unique Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency*~Nonresource</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency*~Nonresource</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency<em>~Nonresource</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency<em>~Nonresource</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency<em>~Nonresource</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency<em>~Nonresource</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em><del>Media</del>Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em><del>Media</del>Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.875
solution consistency: 0.933333

Note: Raw coverage measures the percentage of cases that this solution set accounts for or sorts for you. Unique coverage measures the percentage of cases of the outcome explained only by this particular solution set. Consistency measures the extent to which solution terms and the overall solution are subsets of the outcome.

For the parsimonious solution in which solution sets can be represented by simplified subsets, four solutions sets (highlighted in yellow) stood out among those produced by the
algorithm. The results of the parsimonious solution can be seen in Table 4 below. Again, as with the complex solution, the presence of an independent legislature stands out in the optimal solution set along with division within the ruling party. In the other three best solution sets, an independent electoral commission and foreign pressure for democracy are both present twice along with the absence of division in the ruling party. An independent military is present once. These are all factor candidates to be tested later through their inclusion in the reduced list of prime implicants.

Table 4. Parsimonious Solution for All Prime Implicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors in the Solution Set</th>
<th>Raw Coverage</th>
<th>Unique Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Division</em>~Transparency</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral*~Civilsociety</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral<em>~Division</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military<em>~Division</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Judiciary<em>Electoral</em>~Division</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Opposition</em>~Division*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Electoral</em>~Opposition*~Division</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Military</em>~Opposition*~Division</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Opposition</em>~Division*Civilsociety</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Opposition</em>~Division*Nonresource</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.875
solution consistency: 0.933333

Regarding the intermediate solution using all prime implicants and each factor set to present, five different reduced solution sets (highlighted in yellow) appear to be the best among the selected sets. Table 5 shows the results of the intermediate solution. An independent legislature is the only factor that appears in every optimal solution. Non-resource dependent state appears in four of the five optimal solutions, while independent judiciary, independent military, and strong opposition party each appear in three of the five solutions. These factors will again be the ones to further investigate in subsequent models.
Table 3.5. Intermediate Solution for All Prime Implicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors in the Solution Set</th>
<th>Raw Coverage</th>
<th>Unique Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Military</em>Opposition<em>Division</em>~Transparency*Nonresource</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>Division<em>Civilsociety</em>Media<em>~Transparency</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Electoral</em>Division<em>~Transparency</em>Nonresource</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>Electoral<em>Military</em>Opposition<em>~Civilsociety</em>Nonresource</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>Electoral<em>Military</em>Opposition<em>~Division</em>Nonresource*Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Electoral</em>Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>Nonresource</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>Electoral<em>Opposition</em>~Civilsociety<em>Media</em>Nonresource</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral<em>Military</em>Opposition<em>~Division</em>Civilsociety<em>Media</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral<em>Military</em>Opposition<em>~Civilsociety</em>Media<em>Nonresource</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>Electoral<em>Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>Civilsociety<em>Media</em>Nonresource</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>Electoral<em>Military</em>~Division<em>Civilsociety</em>Media<em>Transparency</em>Nonresource</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solution coverage: 0.875
Solution consistency: 0.933333

3.4.1.2 Model with Selected Prime Implicants

Based on the QCA with all prime implicants selected, the following institutional factors bear further examination in a model with a trimmed list including the most relevant prime implicants: independent legislature, independent judiciary, independent electoral commission, independent military, strong opposition party, division within the ruling party, and non-resource dependent state.
I began experimenting with different combinations of prime implicants, first selecting any sets that contained at least two of the factors listed above. Perhaps unsurprisingly, this iteration of the analysis yielded almost identical results to the previous one with all prime implicants selected. Other iterations using different combinations of solution sets for the prime implicants did not yield different results than the ones previously detailed.
3.4.2 Preventing Presidential Term Limit Deviations

Having conducted the analysis and tweaked the model to determine if a reduced model might yield different insights, I can now discuss the institutional factors that appear most critical to preventing term limit deviations in low- and middle-income democracies based on the cases in the study. The software allows users to conduct an analysis for a “normal” case, in which the outcome is positively determined: that is to say that we are seeking a particular outcome—in this case “No Deviation”—toward which our factors are oriented, whether through their presence or absence. In this study, I oriented all of the factors to contribute to No Deviation in the intermediate solution if they were present in each case. Therefore, the preceding analysis examines the normal case. The examination of the “deviant” case, in which the outcome is the undesirable result—“Deviation” in this particular case—shows which factors contribute to a negative result and follows the analysis of the results of the normal case.

3.4.2.1 Results of the Normal Case

From the analysis of the normal case, it appears that seven of the eleven factors are the most critical to preventing presidential term limit deviations. Those key institutional factors are independent legislature, independent judiciary, independent electoral commission, independent military, strong opposition party, division within the ruling party, and non-resource dependent state. Based on the analysis, some of these factors seem more critical than others.

The most important institutional factor to prevent term limit deviations that emerges from the QCA is an independent legislature. This factor was present in all of the optimal complex and intermediate solutions as well as the best parsimonious solution. Perhaps it should come as no surprise that an independent legislature represents the most significant impediment to presidents successfully altering term limits. In most constitutional designs, the legislature is the branch with powers most closely approximating that of the executive. In many countries, it controls the purse strings and must pass the laws that the president seeks to enact. Moreover, to secure additional terms, a president must often pass a constitutional amendment through the legislature that requires a supermajority. Attempts to secure additional terms were successfully resisted by legislatures in Burkina Faso, Kenya, Malawi, Nigeria, and Zambia in Africa alone during the last twenty years.234 Perhaps because of the sheer numbers of people involved in the legislature, it is necessarily more difficult to coopt.235 The evidence presented herein indicates that if a country possesses a strong, independent legislature that does not readily want to cede power to an ambitious president, that this institution represents a formidable road block standing in the way of the alteration of term limits and the consolidation of presidential power.

234 (Riedl, 2015)
235 (Dulani, 2011)
The presence of an independent judiciary, electoral commission, and military also emerge as highly salient institutional factors in preventing term limit deviations according to the QCA. These institutions can also act as checks on presidential ambition and consolidation of authority. The judiciary and electoral commission ensure fairness and equality in political representation but in the greater society as a whole as well. Costa Rica (2000)\(^2\) and Colombia (2010)\(^3\) offer examples where the judiciary safeguarded term limits by blocking presidential attempts to seek additional terms. Additionally, Haiti (2011) demonstrated the key role that an electoral commission can play in ensuring fair electoral processes as it thwarted the attempts of the incumbent party to rig the first-round election, with the head of the electoral commission intervening to prevent fraudulent results from standing.\(^4\) The military can also act as an effective counterbalance to executive authority when it is truly independent from the president, as it did in Niger in 2010\(^5\) and Turkey, throughout its history, until its recent subjugation by President Erdogan.

Strong opposition parties and division within the ruling party were also important factors in preventing deviations from term limits. Opposition parties that hold presidents accountable for their decisions, advocate for different policies, offer citizens a choice, and preserve the democratic balance are vital for the success of democracy in any country. In low-and middle-income democracies, they can be marginalized when the vast resources of the state are monopolized by the regime in power, but when they function effectively as a loyal opposition, the prevent the dangerous consolidation of power by the president and his/her party. Opposition parties played critical roles in preventing term limits deviations in Colombia (2010), Malawi (2002), Nigeria (2007), and others that may have never made it into the news due to the impediment that these parties posed. Division within the ruling party may be less common (occurring in 17 percent of the cases in the study), but the fracture caused by the term limit debate prevented deviations in Honduras (2009) and Zambia (2001) and potentially others as well. Without a united party behind them, a president would be much less likely or able to secure changes to term limits, especially if that process involves securing a legislative supermajority with a party in which there is open dissent.

Non-resource dependent state was another consistent factor that contributed to no deviation from term limits. While I previously mentioned the fact that the higher incidence of non-resource dependence among these cases (51 percent) undermines its salience to some degree, the connection between the consolidation of power and state control of key resources nonetheless remains a cause

\(^2\) (Wise, 2010) \\
\(^3\) (Gelfeld, 2018a) \\
\(^4\) (Taft-Morales, 2011) \\
\(^5\) ("Niger president to run for re-election," 2015)
for concern. The academic literature links lower accountability,\textsuperscript{240} greater corruption,\textsuperscript{241} higher likelihood of conflict,\textsuperscript{242} and poorer governance\textsuperscript{243} to greater resource dependence. With considerable resource rents at their disposal, presidents can use these funds as patronage to buy off key players in a state rather than courting broad support from the electorate.\textsuperscript{244} If presidents are less accountable to the public because of resource rents, it follows that decreasing resource dependence and diversifying a country’s macroeconomic base would likely be positive for democratic outcomes, including the preventing the dangerous consolidation of authority through term limit deviation. Encouragement of other sectors and a lessening dependence on resources leads to better economic results but also appears to pay political dividends for greater representation and governance as well.

3.4.2.2 Results of the Deviant Case

The results of the deviant case, in which the outcome is negated (i.e. set to Deviation) and all of the institutional factors are marked absent for their contribution to this outcome, did not yield very different results from that of the normal case. The three solutions all boasted greater solution coverage at 97 percent, but the institutional factors that were most important remained relatively unchanged. The optimal complex solution sets included too many factors to discriminate (10 of the 11 negated factors appeared in these sets). Meanwhile, the parsimonious and intermediate solutions highlighted the importance of many of the same factors as the normal analysis (independent legislature, independent judiciary, independent electoral commission, independent military, strong opposition party, and division within the ruling party). The only noteworthy result was the emergence of vibrant civil society on the list of salient variables alongside the disappearance of non-resource dependent state. The full results from the deviant case solutions are presented in Appendix I.

3.4.3 Robustness Checks

There were several robustness checks that merited consideration. The most obvious robustness check involved altering the setting for the minimum consistency threshold. As indicated previously, I changed the default setting from 0.8 to 0.5 to include more cases in the solution sets. When I allowed the default to remain at 0.8 and ran the analysis, I did not get significantly different results, with the same institutional factors emerging as significant that have already been discussed.

\textsuperscript{240} (Herb, 2005)
\textsuperscript{241} (Bhattacharyya & Hodler, 2010)
\textsuperscript{242} (Collier & Hoeffler, 2005b)
\textsuperscript{243} (Jensen & Wantchekon, 2004)
\textsuperscript{244} (Collier & Hoeffler, 2005a)
Because of the elimination of the one case in which the same scores led to a different outcome (Colombia in 2005), the overall solution consistency did improve to 1.

Two other, more substantial robustness checks involving alternate assumptions about the data needed to be conducted as well in order to account for potential differences in the resulting analysis. First, I allowed the country experts to change the scoring for certain factors with hard, quantitative break points if they felt that a different score was merited. It may be that the best scores result from a dispassionate assessment of these factors where possible. Second, I made no distinction among term limit deviations, classifying them all as the same, harmful political event. However, it may be that a change from a one-term to a two-term limit is benign or even beneficial while the total elimination of term limits is far more drastic and potentially more damaging to democracy. I examine the effects of a change in the classification of these specific instances of deviations on the overall QCA results.

3.4.3.1 Quantitative Measures vs. Expert Changes

One of the fundamental decisions that I made at the outset of the study was that the judgment of country experts was of critical importance to inform input data and the subsequent truth table. Because of this deference to expert assessment, I decided to allow these country experts to change any of the pre-assigned scores for the five institutional factors that lent themselves to quantitative cut-offs: vibrant civil society, free press/media, transparency/freedom from corruption, non-resource dependent state, and foreign pressure for democracy. A different assumption—that hard, quantitative cut-offs produce better, more dispassionate, and less biased results—is also a valid interpretation and a potential source of variance.

Given that this was an inherently subjective decision, I sought to examine the results of a truth table that contained only the quantitative scores without any changes from the experts to compare the two analyses. After reverting to solely quantitative-based scores from the different data sources (Freedom House and the World Bank), there were only minimal changes to the QCA results. The most noteworthy change was that “division within the ruling party” disappeared from the optimal complex solution sets (of which there were now only two instead of four) but remained an important factor in the parsimonious and intermediate solution sets.

3.4.3.2 Not All Term Limit Deviations Are Created Equal

While term limit deviations appear to have generally negative repercussions for the democracies in which they occur, there are many different variations of deviations with differing consequences for the different types. The complete elimination of term limits, for example, is not on par with a change that moves a country from a strict one-term limit to a two-term limit. The contrast of the
fates of Venezuela, in which Hugo Chavez eliminated term limits in 2009, and Colombia, where Alvaro Uribe secured a second term in 2005, cannot be starker. Therefore, I conducted two additional analyses: one that examined the difference between countries that eliminated term limits and those that did not and one that classified a change from a one-term limit to a two-term limit as no deviation.

Employing this different outcome distinction (no elimination vs. elimination of term limits), I did not see appreciably different results from the baseline analysis when I compared the 10 cases in which presidents were able to eliminate term limits entirely with the other 43 cases in which some sort of term limit was maintained. In this analysis, the complex solutions displayed far less raw coverage, with the optimal solution covering only 6 percent of the cases, while three factors (independent legislature, independent military, and free press/media) remained the most important across the three types of solutions. The key take-away from this analysis may simply be that two of these institutional factors (independent legislature and military) are among the several critical elements to preventing deviations in general, but the presence of these three factors is most essential for protecting against the extreme measure of eliminating presidential term limits entirely. I include the results of this analysis in Appendix J.

There were a few anomalous data points that emerged from the analysis, in particular the aforementioned case of Colombia. In analyzing what was unique about the Colombia case (the same combination of factors leading to a different result), it was a rare instance of a term limit deviation changing from a one-term limit to a two-term limit. I decided to explore this potential source of variance further. From a theoretical standpoint, a change from a one-term to a two-term limit may in fact be benign or even beneficial. There is a compelling argument to be made that allowing a maximum of only one term for a president does not provide adequate time for a leader to accomplish the necessary state-building and policy-making to enact real, meaningful change. Having two terms, on the other hand, allows a leader more time to gain experience and enact their platform or vision. Therefore, a change from a one-term limit to a two-term limit is not drastic and may not compromise democratic gains or norms, though it could be a slippery slope to further alterations to term limits. In reality, one-term limits are uncommon, with only six countries around the world still employing them: Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, the Philippines, and South Korea.

Examining the data set, I found four cases (out of the 53 total cases) where countries changed from a one-term to a two-term limit: Costa Rica (2003), the Dominican Republic (2004), Colombia (2005), and Honduras (2015). If it is true that this type of deviation is not harmful, then I should classify these four cases as no deviation (given that they are no longer considered either an actual deviation or an unsuccessful challenge) and remove them from the QCA study. When I

---
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conducted the analysis with the remaining 49 cases, the percentage of raw coverage for the optimal solution sets increases marginally, but the composition of the ideal solution sets remains unchanged. The overall solution consistency does increase to 1 for each of the three solutions (complex, parsimonious, and intermediate), due to the fact that the data anomalies have been eliminated by removing these contradictory cases from the study. The improvement in the solution consistency is important because it removes the previously unexplained inconsistency out of the model. Looking more closely at the scores for the four removed cases, they all had independent legislatures, electoral commissions, and militaries; among the different cases, it was rare to see countries with this combination of factors actually deviate from term limits, as these were three of the most salient variables. Therefore, their removal should explain the subsequent increase in overall consistency.
3.5 Discussion

The evidence from the QCA indicates that the most critical factor for preventing term limit deviations is an independent legislature, while independent judiciaries, independent electoral commissions, independent militaries, and strong opposition parties are also important institutions in preserving this constitutional safeguard. The conclusions from a parallel study that demonstrate that such deviations result in significant declines in political rights and civil liberties is also essential to keep in mind.246 Given that we know the importance of preventing term limit deviations and the key institutions that can protect against this phenomenon, domestic actors and international pro-democracy advocates should take concrete steps to protect and support these institutions.

The findings of this study suggest that governments in low- and middle-income democracies, as well as their high-income donors, should prioritize initiatives and programs designed to promote the independence and strength of national legislatures. Legislatures appear to be the most effective safeguard against term limit deviations that often result in the dangerous consolidation of executive authority. As an effective bulwark for democracy, this institution therefore merits increased protection and support. Civil societies in these developing democracies should work closely with legislatures to promote not only their effectiveness, through transparency and efficiency mechanisms, but also to protect their independence from the executive branch. Though international aid programs of this nature can be perceived as political and therefore sensitive in nature, the United States and the European Union have both conducted legislative assistance programs in the past in numerous countries. In the 1990s, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) supported such programs in the Philippines, El Salvador, Bolivia, Nepal, and Poland to promote legislative accountability, transparency, and effectiveness247 and has done so more recently in post-conflict countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq. USAID’s Center for Democracy and Governance also authored a report entitled “USAID Handbook on Legislative Strengthening”248 for this very purpose. The United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID), for its part, commissioned a similar report focused on parliamentary performance entitled “Parliamentary strengthening in developing countries.”249 All of these efforts aim toward a more robust body with the capability not only to better perform its law-making duties, but also to act as a counterweight to and check and balance on the executive. The evidence from this study indicates that domestic organizations or international agencies that support legislative independence should continue, revive, or augment these programs.
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Other programs that support independent judiciaries, effective and unbiased electoral commissions, rule of law-abiding militaries, and strong opposition parties also merit increased support. Global development institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) have supported initiatives to promote judicial independence alongside the aforementioned national aid agencies. Judiciaries are often the institution of last resort for citizens seeking justice or democracies seeking protection against authoritarian consolidation. Constitutional courts have intervened in numerous countries to prevent term limit deviations, and programs that designed to reinforce their independence can help to cement democratic consolidation in developing countries. The IMF recently cited judicial reforms in a recent report as a key factor in the democratic consolidation of several central and southeast European countries, with evidence highlighting the fact that judicial independence was positively correlated with better resource distribution, transparency and accountability, and state capacity. USAID works with individual countries on judicial strengthening projects. Again, based on the evidence from this study, these projects should receive increased funding and priority in the international donor democracy arsenal.

Election monitoring has been a primary concern and responsibility of the European Union (EU) throughout the developing world, but more attention should be paid to the training, capacity, and independence of electoral commissions, which help to ensure that the playing field is relatively level and oversee the tallying of votes and the publication of election results. This is a vital function in a healthy democracy that, if compromised or undermined, can lead to fraudulent outcomes or election-related violence. Many would-be autocrats routinely hold sham elections to confer legitimacy on their rule, and presidents seeking to alter term limits have rigged referenda in the past to secure additional terms in power (e.g., Azerbaijan, Chad, Republic of Congo, Guinea, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan), with the respective electoral commissions citing inflated voter turnout and margins of victory. Supporting independent electoral commissions is an important policy investment for developing and donor countries toward ensuring fair electoral outcomes and preventing electoral malfeasance.

An independent military that supports civilian rule and adheres to the rule of law is an invaluable asset for a developing democracy. Independent militaries, however, represent somewhat trickier propositions than other institutions given their control over the legitimate use of state violence; while they have served as bulwarks of democracy in some states (Burkina Faso, Niger, Turkey), ensuring that governments adhere to democratic norms, they have represented their own narrow political interests in others while overthrowing democratic regimes (Chile, Haiti, Sudan). Regarding the kind of bilateral policy initiatives that might be helpful toward promoting healthy, independent militaries, the US has sponsored cooperative programs to work with partner armed forces in developing countries in Latin America and Africa to offer courses on transparency, respect
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for human rights, anti-trafficking campaigns, and cooperation with civil society. These types of international efforts to increase military transparency and collaboration with civil society can enhance civilian confidence in the military and better safeguard democratic institutions.

While division with the ruling party and non-resource state were both salient factors, they are not institutions by the traditional definition and are therefore more difficult to target with specific policy remedies. Civil society organizations, and especially international actors, that work to foment divisions in the ruling party of a country would face potentially serious allegations of tampering and interference. These organizations may find themselves under attack by the dominant party or political figures in the target country, therefore it would be difficult to pursue this as a policy objective. If civil society organizations can promote multiple centers of power within dominant parties, to ensure that no one person gains complete control over the party, this would be a positive step toward promoting a less monolithic organization. Regarding resource dependence, these organizations can and should advocate for diversified macroeconomic policies that reduce reliance on one primary product. Weeing a country off resource depends not only makes long-term economic sense, but it may also reduce the control over state resources that allow presidents to stay in power. This kind of economic transformation, however, is not an easy or short-term one and should be seen as a long-term goal to achieve, rather than a quick fix or immediate solution to the issue of presidential term limit deviation.

Comparing my results with those of similar studies referenced earlier in the literature review, I found some important convergences regarding the most salient institutional factors. The studies conducted by Dulani and Armstrong both cited independent legislatures as a key factor in preventing term limit deviations, reinforcing my findings. Dulani also highlighted the influence of the military while Armstrong hit upon the influence of the judiciary and strong opposition parties. However, while both of these studies pointed to the importance of foreign aid and a vibrant civil society, my results did not find these factors to be among the most influential in preventing term limit deviations.

In the absence of any necessary and sufficient conditions, I have highlighted the institutional factors that appeared most consistently in the optimal solutions. Because of the lack of sufficient conditions, it means that these factors must work in conjunction with one another to achieve the desired outcome: no deviation from term limits. Given this interaction affect, it would be interesting to study the specific ways in which the factors played off each other. Democracies have multiple pillars upon which they rest, and there are certainly any number of contextual varieties of democracy. While country context undoubtedly matters, further medium and large-N studies that examine those combinations of institutional factors that best promote democracy could prove useful.
3.6 Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that certain key institutions have been instrumental in preventing term limit deviations in a series of relevant historical cases. The recommendations that emerge from this study suggest that governments and civil society organizations in low- and middle-income democracies, as well as their high-income donors, should prioritize initiatives and programs designed to promote the independence and strength of national legislatures, in addition to independent judiciaries, electoral commissions, and militaries and strong opposition parties. Political actors and political scientists have often criticized traditional aid and development programs for their inability to produce tangible results. Perhaps the organizations and countries that provide this assistance should shift money away from these established initiatives to specific programs targeted at those institutions that protect term limits. Preventing deviations from term limits should protect political rights and civil liberties and hopefully lead to better governance outcomes.
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### Appendix A

Paired T-Test Results for Countries with Term Limit Challenges vs. Those with No Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Treatment</th>
<th>Mean control</th>
<th>P-value of Difference</th>
<th>n treatment</th>
<th>n control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>21,882,601</td>
<td>24,906,853</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country size (land area)</td>
<td>870,097</td>
<td>951,449</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlocked***</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social fragmentation***</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty*</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of globalization***</td>
<td>61.81</td>
<td>82.35</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP***</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita**</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>1,612,141,12</td>
<td>1,764,387,93</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rights***</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Liberties**</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p<0.05                      ** p<0.01                    *** p<0.001
Paired T-Test Results for Countries with Unsuccessful Term Limit Challenges vs. Those with No Unsuccessful Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Mean Treatment</th>
<th>Mean control</th>
<th>P-value of Difference</th>
<th>n treatment</th>
<th>n control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,031,428</td>
<td>23,177,77</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country size***</td>
<td>399,843</td>
<td>1,031,833</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlocked</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social fragmentation***</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of globalization***</td>
<td>61.64</td>
<td>73.74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP**</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI**</td>
<td>876,638,871</td>
<td>1,974,463,548</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rights***</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Liberties***</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance***</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption***</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05  ** p<0.01  *** p<0.001
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Pre- and Post-Event Trends Graphs for Countries with and without Challenges to Term Limits
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Results: Unsuccessful Challenges to Term Limits

There were no statistically-significant differences among the seven dependent variables between countries that experienced unsuccessful challenges to term limits and those that did not. However, the strongest results showed that FDI actually decreased while governance and corruption worsened. FDI might have decreased as a result of the instability brought on by an unsuccessful challenge by the president or their party to constitutional term limits. Governance may have worsened because of the institutional paralysis and aforementioned uncertainty brought on by the challenge. Corruption is often rampant where there is little oversight or accountability, and a government in a state of flux or upheaval mirrors this scenario. Using the four-year lagged effect, governance did significantly decrease in states with unsuccessful challenges relative to those states that did not have them. One possible interpretation of this result is that the upheaval caused by the attempted, but eventually unsuccessful term limit deviation led to a decrease in government effectiveness over the next political cycle.
QUALITATIVE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS USER GUIDE

As a subject matter expert in your country, I am asking for your help in classifying different domestic institutional factors during the time in which it experienced a presidential term limit deviation or challenge. Please use the following steps and scoring guide to inform your score assignments.

1. Consider the context of your country during the year in which it experienced either a successful deviation from or an unsuccessful challenge to presidential term limits.
2. Feel free to consult any appropriate resources or discuss different factors with knowledgeable colleagues to inform your conclusions.
3. Using the scoring guide included below, assign each factor a 0 or 1* for the time period in question (note: this is not a score of current conditions in the country, just a score during the specific year indicated on the spreadsheet). A factor rates a 0 if it is relatively absent or weak and a 1 if it is relatively strong or present. Please use the attached scoring guide to make your score assignments as well your judgment and discretion—you are the expert.
4. If there is more than one year listed for your country, please score each year independently for the factors under consideration.
5. You will notice that the final five factors all have scores already populated. The scoring guide contains the criteria I used to assign these scores. If you disagree with the pre-assigned score, feel free to change it, but please highlight any changes in yellow to call it to my attention.
6. I would also appreciate a brief justification of your reasoning for any changes to pre-assigned scores in your reply e-mail to be able to answer any future queries or follow-up questions. Additionally, feel free to add explanations or context to any other factor scoring assignments if you would like in the far column to the right entitled “Explanations of qualifications for certain factors”.
7. Return your assigned scores to me by e-mail, either imbedded in the chart in the e-mail or in a saved version of the attached spreadsheet.
8. If you have any questions or would like clarification regarding the instructions or a particular factor, please do not hesitate to ask.

*I am asking you to assign a binary score of 0 or 1 for each factor because I intend to use Charles Ragin’s qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) technique, which relies on set theory and a Boolean algebra technique to determine if a necessary and sufficient set of conditions exists that is likely to achieve the desired outcome (in this case the prevention of presidential term limit deviations). Therefore, despite the blunt distinction of 0 and 1 (not present or present), I need binary discriminators regarding these set factors.
## Qualitative Comparative Analysis Scoring Guide for Preventing Term Limit Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Source of Score</th>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Legislature</td>
<td>Rater’s discretion/</td>
<td>Legislature is largely under the influence of the president and routinely</td>
<td>Legislature is relatively independent of the president and can craft and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>judgment</td>
<td>rubber stamps his/her laws. It does not offer a check on presidential</td>
<td>pass its own laws. It represents a check on presidential authority or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>authority or power.</td>
<td>power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Judiciary</td>
<td>Rater’s discretion/</td>
<td>Judiciary is largely under the influence of the president and routinely</td>
<td>Judiciary is relatively independent of the president and can act as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>judgment</td>
<td>rules in his/her favor. It does not offer a check on presidential authority</td>
<td>check or control on his/her authority or power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or power.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Electoral</td>
<td>Rater’s discretion/</td>
<td>Electoral commission is under the control of the president and may</td>
<td>Electoral commission is mostly independent. It ensures that electoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>judgment</td>
<td>restrict candidates. It does not ensure electoral laws are followed or</td>
<td>laws are generally followed and reliably supervises elections/results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reliably supervise elections/results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Military</td>
<td>Rater’s discretion/</td>
<td>The military is under the direct control of the president and often</td>
<td>The military is not directly under the control of the president and can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>judgment</td>
<td>enforces his/her policy directly through coercion or force.</td>
<td>act as a check on his/her authority or power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Opposition Party</td>
<td>Rater’s discretion/</td>
<td>Opposition party (or parties) is weak or somewhat fragmented and does</td>
<td>Opposition party (or parties) is strong and relatively unified and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>judgment</td>
<td>not pose a significant challenge or viable alternative to the president</td>
<td>offers a viable alternative or challenge to the president and his/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and his/her ruling party.</td>
<td>ruling party.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Source of Score</th>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division within Ruling Party</td>
<td>Rater’s discretion/ judgment</td>
<td>Ruling party is unified or dominated by the president. Offers little to no challenge to presidential authority from within the party.</td>
<td>Ruling party is not unified or has significant divisions within the party. Offers strong or substantial challenge to presidential authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant Civil Society</td>
<td>Civil Liberties Score</td>
<td>0 if &gt; 3</td>
<td>1 if &lt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom House (1 to 7)</td>
<td>The country limits the rights of expression and association and may hold political prisoners. They may allow a few civil liberties, such as some religious and social freedom and limited free private discussion.(^{251})</td>
<td>The country generally enjoys a range of civil liberties, including freedoms of expression, assembly, association, education, and religion. It has a generally fair legal system that ensures the rule of law (including an independent judiciary) and strives for equality of opportunity for everyone, including women and minority groups.(^{252})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Press/Media</td>
<td>Press Freedom Score</td>
<td>0 if &gt; 50</td>
<td>1 if &lt; 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom House (1 to 100)</td>
<td>The press/media is relatively restricted or even controlled by the state. Reporters are harassed or jailed, and the media is often censored. The press is not free to report the news according to their discretion.</td>
<td>The press/media is largely free to report on events according to their independent judgment or discretion. The media is not controlled or significantly influenced by the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency/Freedom from Corruption</td>
<td>Worldwide Governance Indicators</td>
<td>0 if &lt; 0</td>
<td>1 if &gt; 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption Index World Bank (-2.5 to 2.5)</td>
<td>The government is largely not transparent and is often characterized by corruption, patronage, and nepotism.</td>
<td>The government is largely transparent and mostly free of corruption, patronage, and nepotism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resource</td>
<td>% of GDP from Resource</td>
<td>0 if &gt; 10%</td>
<td>1 if &lt; 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{252}\) Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Source of Score</th>
<th>Score = 0</th>
<th>Score = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent State Rents</td>
<td>Rents World Bank (0 to 100)</td>
<td>The country relies on resource rents for a considerable portion of their revenues. Natural resources or one resource in particular tends to dominate the economy.</td>
<td>The country does not rely on resource rents as a primary source of revenue. Natural resources may or may not be present, but they do not represent a significant portion of the overall economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Pressure for Democracy</td>
<td>Overseas Development Assistance as a % of GNI World Bank (0 to 100)</td>
<td>0 if &lt; 5%</td>
<td>1 if &gt; 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The country does not rely on foreign aid as a large part of its operating budget and therefore is not as subject to foreign pressure and influence to democratize.</td>
<td>The country relies on foreign aid as a significant part of its operating budget and is therefore more subject to foreign pressure and influence to democratize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Independent legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Independent legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Independent legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score is different than that which was designated by the pre-assigned criteria
Score is populated from V-DEM
Appendix G

EXPLANATION OF/QUALIFICATIONS FOR EXPERT CHANGES TO PRE-ASSIGNED FACTOR SCORING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</th>
<th>Actual Deviation</th>
<th>Explanation of/Qualifications for Certain Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>There are two items where I think the answer is somewhere in the middle, but I chose to assign a 1: “Strong opposition party” and “Independent Legislature”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Independent Legislature</strong>: In our bipartisan country, legislatures often vote along party lines, and usually, and in particular in 1994, the president was the (strong) leader of the party. However, I chose to assign a 1 because I think that legislators have bargaining power and use it to not vote for everything that the president says.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strong Opposition Party</strong>: In terms of the opposition party, I believe it was weaker than it was historically, but still had a strong base and was able to get some laws voted as a result of the Pact that allowed for the Reform/Amendment to happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Vibrant Civil society</strong>: I am assigning 0 because the country holds political prisoners and free private discussion is limited. If you are vocal against government, they start threatening you and family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Vibrant Civil society</strong>: I am assigning 0 because the country holds political prisoners and free private discussion is limited. If you are vocal against government, they start threatening you and family. <strong>On Non-Resource Dependent State</strong>: I would assign a 0. Bolivia is still very dependent on export of gas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Division within Ruling Party</strong>: After reading a little bit about FHC government, I realized that I had to change two things. First, he was unanimous within the party, so I changed the component “Division within ruling party” to zero. <strong>Strong Opposition Party</strong>: Second, the Workers Party were noisy but relatively small (5 senators out of 81; and, 50 congressmen out of 513). Therefore, I changed to zero the component “strong opposition party”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Explanation of/Qualifications for Certain Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CNDD-FDD and President Pierre Nkurunziza are the dominant institutions of the state, especially the latter. Legislature not independent, so I changed score to &quot;0&quot;. Overwhelmingly CNDD-FDD--party of the President--at time of presidential deviation in 2015. Opposition parties had boycotted 2010 legislative elections, as well as those of 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>During my time pressure for democracy I would say wasn't vigorous. As a petro-state most of the interested parties (the US and France) were more interested in the cooperation of the local government. China as well applied no pressure as it is easier to deal with one dictator vs a functioning government. Freedom of press has improved since my time there but members are still regularly imprisoned but for slightly shorter periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Division of ruling party: there is always division of the ruling party close to the electoral campaign. Party members tend to join the party that will likely win based on the support of the ruling party since there is a rotational of the presidency among the three islands and parties are created close to the elections. Vibrant civil society: No such vibrant civil society exists in Comoros. Those denouncing injustice and defending the population tend to be isolated therefore many people are discouraged to pronounce themselves nor to join civil society groups. Free press/Media: not existing – there might be initiatives to have free press but then the press get punished by the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Independent Electoral Commission: The President must authorize elections and approve the budget. If elections are authorized by the President, the CENI organizes elections and oversees implementation and prepares after action reviews. The CENI is highly politicized and the President certainly has influence over the work of the CENI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Independent Legislature: Legislature in DRC is independent. The Presidents party is the ruling party in Parliament and the President controls the Presidential Guard police (ANR) and the Military with absolute authority. So even if the legislature says the President should step down from his seat, there is no enforcement mechanism. Division within Ruling Party: There is some division but the President manages patronage well. And when he can't manage patronage, he uses force to quell division. The example that comes to mind is the former governor from Lumbubashi, Moise Katumbi, who expressed plans to run for President, then was subsequently poisoned, left the country. He was later accused of crimes and he decided to stay out of country for at least a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Explanation of/Qualifications for Certain Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vibrant Civil Society</strong>: Civil Society is actually quite active. At the same time, those who protest risk reprisal and retaliation. For example, many times over the last few years groups, namely Lucha, have organized to protest the President's refusal to Presidential elections. These individuals have been arrested, wrongfully imprisoned, and sometimes tortured for speaking up. In sum, although civil society is vibrant, with respect to Presidential protests the messages are very tempered/watered down or the individuals take serious risks by speaking up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Press/Media: There is a free press but like civil society, the press must be careful about what it prints. If a paper is highly critical of the President, the paper might be shut down or journalists might risk reprisal. Finally, social media is hardly &quot;free&quot; and indeed there has been numerous cases in 2015, 2016, and 2017 when the President authorized cutting out internet in order to stymie communication over social media, in particular Facebook and Whatsapp Messenger and any sort of group chat which could be used to share ideas and organize protest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Pressure for Democracy: There is considerable foreign pressure for democracy however the Congolese government does not hesitate to completely ignore or respond aggressively to foreign pressure. This is the case for almost any politicized subject----i.e. corruption, human rights violations, and gender parity to name a few----not just Presidential elections. Donors have pulled funding from programs and the Congolese government does not seem to pay much attention. For example, in 2015 following a UN report regarding operation Lukofi, UKAID pulled almost 60MLN GBP from a security sector reform program because of alleged human resources abuses. UKAID asked the Congolese government for a formal response to the allegations, but the Congolese government did not even acknowledge receipt of the request for response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</th>
<th>Actual Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Actual Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Actual Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Nigeria   | 2007                              | 0                | Vibrant civil society: I am assigning 1 to this because the civil society in Nigeria has been the vanguard of activism against dictatorship all though the brutal military regimes and even to date. Examples are the National Association of Nigerian Students (NANS), National Democratic Coalition (NADECO) etc. Their influence has waned a bit since the fall of the last military regime, but they are still an important constituency that elected officials consider in making decisions.  
Free Press/ Media: The press/media in Nigeria is relatively free. Not as much as in the West, but in the African context, yes, I would argue free. The press is not controlled or restricted, but they can be harassed or intimidated or get solicitations (bribes) from the government. But, I think journalists still risk their lives though to do their jobs.  
Foreign pressure for democracy: The government gets a fair amount of aid from the West that it would not like to lose. There are also accumulated debts from past administrations that makes the government a bit vulnerable to foreign pressure. While the country has substantial oil revenues, this is not predictable and fluctuates due to external market conditions and widespread corruption. Hence, I would argue this should be scored “1”. |
| Peru      | 1995                              | 1                | Electoral commission: independence not really tested in 1995, but clearly was packed by government  
Civil society and Media are mixed cases. There was considerable independence in both, but also some restriction/harassment, especially of civil society in the countryside. |
| Philippines| 2016                              | 0                | Electoral commission: there have been past scandals involving the commission and alleged election rigging but none around 2016 to my knowledge. It is interesting to note that vote-buying is rampant in local elections, according to my Filipino colleagues, not sure how this applies to presidential elections but I would say it's a possibility.  
Civil Society: is very active and there are some outspoken groups, but in general I wouldn't describe Filipinos as being strong activists. People are fairly passive. The church has been quite outspoken on political matters but I feel many others are indifferent.  
Transparency/Corruption: Corruption is widespread in many aspects of life here, and political dynasties are very common.  
Freedom of Press: has been strong and independent but recently, critics of the administration have found themselves
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</th>
<th>Actual Deviation</th>
<th>Explanation of/Qualifications for Certain Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>facing a number of problems, i.e. possible loss of license.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rwanda    | 2015                              | 1                | **Strong Opposition Party:** Kagame seems to be the only political leader able to build consensus in the country. The ruling party apparently pushed Kagame to stay in power for this reason. There is considerable fear that if Kagame were to step down violence would ensue between Hutu and Tutsi populations. There have been numerous instances in which the country was divided on ethnic lines (classic example is relocation of Hutu populations to lands controlled by ruling Tutsi near Aigkara park. Kagame brokered the deal with Tutsis on behalf of Hutus. His leadership aggravated many wealthy Tutsi. At the same time, it demonstrated his commitment to finding solutions that bring people together to work toward cohabitation). More examples can be provided if useful.  

**Vibrant Civil Society:** Civil Society is quite vibrant however the envelop never gets pushed. The population seems generally content with the President and they do not want to create waves. At the same time, there are allegations of dissenters disappearing or being expelled from the country. Indeed, many refugees from the Rwanda refuse to return to the country because they fear reprisal unfair trial if they were to return.  

**Freedom of the Press:** The press/media are somewhat free. If they promote messages contrary to the President, they would risk reprisal and being shut down. Press can be critical of government and of the President, but not when it comes to respecting terms limits and following the constitution. There are definitely limits to the free press.  

**Foreign Pressure for Democracy:** Rwanda receives a significant percentage of its annual revenue through overseas development assistance. The country absolutely needs these funds to continue developing. At the same time, the donors need Rwanda because the county is a development success story in that the country has in some respects recovered from its genocide and successfully managed its reconstruction. The government manages development funds accountably, they've built roads,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</th>
<th>Actual Deviation</th>
<th>Explanation of/Qualifications for Certain Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>improved healthcare and education, electrified 25% of the country, and reinforced rule of law and security. When Rwanda has transgressions about human rights violations, donors slap Rwanda on the wrist but continue to pump in the ODA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tajikistan | 2006                              | 1                | **Foreign Pressure for Democracy:** Foreign aid money at the time (2006) was not contingent on democratization, especially considering that Russia was a source of much of the money, and that the US needed Tajikistan to continue with its support for its Afghanistan operations, and was therefore only giving lip service to democratization programs.  

**Non-Resource Dependent State:** As for resource dependency/rents, there's no oil/gas or productives mines, but the TALCO aluminum smelter (supplied by Tajik hydroelectricity) accounts for about 30%+ of the GDP yearly, depending on |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</th>
<th>Actual Deviation</th>
<th>Explanation of/Qualifications for Certain Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>prices and other sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RPT, party of Eyadema, in control of legislature at the time. Replacement of CENI (electoral commission) with seven-magistrate committee. Opposition was essentially a party in exile. Military under the thumb of Eyadema, who was a former high ranking military official. All government institutions, e.g. judiciary, legislature, in hock to President Eyadema.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Division with Ruling Party:</strong> Kizza Besigye, who is the main opposition leader in Uganda and the head of the Forum Democratic Change. He used to be a confident of the President, they were in the bush together (Besigye as Musevini's personal doctor). In 2001, he broke off and given that Uganda was still technically a one-party state, with the NRM being the only party), this represented a division within the party. In fact, in 2006 Besyige challenged the election outcome. <strong>Free Press/Media:</strong> Up until very recently Uganda has had quite an open press. There is the government paper, the New Vision, but there is also an independent paper, the Daily Monitor and a number of other smaller papers. It is only since the last election that there has been crack down on media. However, previously they could be quite critical of the regime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Vibrant civil society:</strong> OASIS Forum, a coalition of Mainstream Churches Bodies, NGOCC (Umbrella of women's organizations) and Law Association of Zambia (LAZ) are credited for halting Chiluba's Third Term. That would be an oversimplification (internal divisions within MMD definitely played an important role), but civil society at the time was definitely vibrant and influential. <strong>Free Press/Media:</strong> As was the independent media (most notably the Post newspaper and private radio stations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year of Potential/Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Actual Deviation</td>
<td>Explanation of/Qualifications for Certain Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Resource Dependent State: Zambia is also highly dependent upon copper exports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of Experts for QCA Country Factor Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name of Expert(s)</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Bill Gelfeld</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Florencia Jaureguiinery</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Gursel Aliyev</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Claude Messan Setodji</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Senior Statistician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Elke Groterhorst</td>
<td>FONPLATA</td>
<td>Head of Financial Programming and Capital Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Diogo Prosidocimi</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Brahim Bassané</td>
<td>The Palladium Group</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Steven Silverstein</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Bill Gelfeld</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Matthew Keller</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
<td>Former Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Assiata Chikuhwa</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>Member, Mali Program Team, Department of Political Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Dem. Rep.</td>
<td>Kevin Osborne</td>
<td>Search for Common Ground</td>
<td>Former Country Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>Bill Gelfeld</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Ilka Treminio</td>
<td>University of Costa Rica</td>
<td>Political Science Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Claire Metelits</td>
<td>American University</td>
<td>Lecturer in the School of International Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Amarilis Then Paulino</td>
<td>Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo</td>
<td>Professor/Researcher in the School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name of Expert(s)</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Paolo Moncagatta</td>
<td>Universidad San Francisco de Quito</td>
<td>Political Science Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Bill Gelfeld</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Bill Gelfeld</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Ilka Treminio</td>
<td>University of Costa Rica</td>
<td>Political Science Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Rouslan Karimov</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Bill Gelfeld</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Bill Gelfeld</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Ilka Treminio</td>
<td>University of Costa Rica</td>
<td>Political Science Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Kaocen Agalheir</td>
<td>Millennium Challenge Account</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Ifeanyi Edochie Adeyemi Okunogbe</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Steven Levitsky</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Political Science Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Brian MacDonald</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Bilyana Lilly</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Kevin Osborne</td>
<td>Search for Common Ground</td>
<td>Former Country Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Papa Sène</td>
<td>PS &amp; Associates - Seed Farm and Development Consulting Services</td>
<td>Independent Development Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Becca Owen</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>Partnership Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Atta El-Batatbani</td>
<td>University of Khartoum</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>Christian Bleuer</td>
<td>Australian National University</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Lemon</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Steven Silverstein</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name of Expert(s)</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>Anar Ahmadov</td>
<td>University of Leiden</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Political Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Rouslan Karimov</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Bill Gelfeld</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Assistant Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Marja Hinfelaar</td>
<td>Southern African Institute for Policy and Research</td>
<td>Director of Research and Programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix I

## Complex Solution for Deviant Case for All Prime Implicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors in the Solution Set</th>
<th>Raw Coverage</th>
<th>Unique Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency<em>~Nonresource</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Opposition</em>~Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency<em>~Nonresource</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em><del>Division</del>Media</em>~Transparency<em>~Nonresource</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>Electoral<em>Opposition</em>~Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em><del>Division</del>Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em><del>Division</del>Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em><del>Division</del>Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em><del>Division</del>Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em><del>Division</del>Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em><del>Division</del>Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em><del>Division</del>Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em><del>Division</del>Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>Division <em>Civilsociety</em>Media</em>~Transparency<em>~Nonresource</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>Electoral<em>Military</em>Opposition<em>Division <em>Civilsociety</em>~Media</em>~Transparency<em>Nonresource</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>Electoral<em>Military</em>~Opposition<em>Division <em>Civilsociety</em>Media</em>Transparency<em>Nonresource</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.972973

solution consistency: 0.947368
Parsimonious Solution for Deviant Case for All Prime Implicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors in the Solution Set</th>
<th>Raw Coverage</th>
<th>Unique Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~Electoral*~Division</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature*~Opposition</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>Civilsociety</em>Nonresource</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature*Division</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition<em>Civilsociety</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Judiciary<em>Division</em>Civilsociety</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Judiciary<em>Electoral</em>Military*Division</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Opposition</em>~Division<em>Civilsociety</em>Media</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary<em>Opposition</em>~Division<em>Civilsociety</em>Media</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition<em>~Division</em>Civilsociety<em>Media</em>Nonresource</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.972973

solution consistency: 0.947368
Intermediate Solution for Deviant Case for All Prime Implicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors in the Solution Set</th>
<th>Raw Coverage</th>
<th>Unique Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Opposition</em>~Division*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety*~Transparency</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety*~Media</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Judiciary<em>~Electoral</em>~Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Electoral</em>~Military<em>~Opposition</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Judiciary<em>~Electoral</em>~Military<em>~Opposition</em>~Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Transparency*~Nonresource</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Transparency*~Nonresource</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency*~Nonresource</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition<em>~Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Transparency</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency*~Nonresource</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Division<em>~Media</em>~Transparency</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Judiciary<em>~Opposition</em>~Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Judiciary<em>~Electoral</em>~Military<em>~Opposition</em>~Division*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.972973

solution consistency: 0.947368
Appendix J

Summary Statistics for the Institutional Factors with Outcome No Elimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum N</th>
<th>Maximum N</th>
<th>N Cases</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Elimination of Term Limits</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent legislature</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent judiciary</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent electoral commission</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent military</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong opposition party</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division within ruling party</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant civil society</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Press/ Media</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency/Freedom from Corruption</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resource Dependent State</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign pressure for democracy</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Factors in the Solution Set</td>
<td>Raw Coverage</td>
<td>Unique Coverage</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>Electoral<em>Military</em>Opposition**~Division<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>Nonresource</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>Military</em>Opposition<em>~Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>Military</em>Opposition<em>Division</em>~Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency*Nonresource</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>Military</em>Opposition<em>~Division</em>Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency<em>Nonresource</em>~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>Military</em>~Division<em>Civilsociety</em>Media<em>~Transparency</em>Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>Military</em>~Division<em>Civilsociety</em>Media<em>Transparency</em>Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>Military</em>~Division<em>Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em><del>Electoral</del>Military<em>~Opposition</em>~Division<em>Civilsociety</em>~Media<em>~Transparency</em>~Nonresource*~Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency<em>~Nonresource</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>~Judiciary</em>~Electoral<em>~Military</em>~Opposition<em>~Division</em>Civilsociety<em>~Media</em>~Transparency<em>~Nonresource</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parsimonious Solution for All Prime Implicants with Outcome No Elimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors in the Solution Set</th>
<th>Raw Coverage</th>
<th>Unique Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Division*Media</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresource*Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intermediate Solution for All Prime Implicants with Outcome No Elimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Factors in the Solution Set</th>
<th>Raw Coverage</th>
<th>Unique Coverage</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Division*Media</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Judiciary</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Media</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media<em>Nonresource</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency<em>Nonresource</em>Foreignpressure</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature<em>Electoral</em>Division*Nonresource</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

solution coverage: 0.697674
solution consistency: 1
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