SPS Accademia Fiesolana 2020

'(In)equality, democracy, and European solidarity'

SPS introduction program 2020-2021
23, 24 and 25 September, *online sessions*
13.00 – 15.00

Organised by Klarita Gërxhani

No registration required (compulsory seminar for all first-year researchers)

Contact: Claudia.Fanti@eui.eu

Description

As part of the introductory program for new reaserchers, the SPS department is organizing the "SPS Accademia Fiesolana 2020" on the topic of **(In)equality, democracy and European solidarity** on **23, 24 and 25 September from 13.00 pm to 15.00, online sessions.**

The EUI aims to be a vibrant space of academic intercourse, where a plethora of seminars, workshops, public lectures, book launches, thesis defences, and high-level workshops, staged each and every week throughout the academic year. The SPS department organizes the "SPS Accademia Fiesolana" to give its new researches a taste of this culture of discourse and introduce them to the research of some of its faculty members .

During the "SPS Accademia Fiesolana" we will exchange and discuss ideas, evidence and arguments on topical issues in the social sciences with a view not only to discuss this from a purely academic point of view, but also to deliberate about the issue(s) at hand from the perspective of political implications and policy relevance. The "SPS Accademia Fiesolana" takes place over three afternoon sessions.

The first session deals with the purported crisis of democracy in Europe. How real is it? What can be done about it? The second session addresses changing gender relations in modern economies. How much gender diversity is there in modern workspaces, and where? How can experimental methods help to investigate the causes, obstacles and consequences of such diversity? The third session turns to the European Union and investigates the policy demand for transnational solidarity and the social, political and normative bases of its (lack of) supply. More detailed descriptions of the sessions follow below. In preparation of the sessions, please read the indicated material and prepare questions and comments.

Session 1: Democracy in the 21 Century (Elias Dinas)

Democracy became the modal political regime in the world for the first time in 1994. Back then, there seemed to be no other trajectory apart from democracy's diffusion and undisputed dominance across the globe. By 2020, such widespread beliefs appear largely disproven. Democracy did spread across the globe throughout this period but the cost has been insuperable. New threats emerged, affecting democracy's nature and function, even in countries with rigid democratic institutions. Populist entrepreneurs on the one hand and unaccountable technocrats on the other pose serious challenges to democratic norms and principles. The ongoing pandemic as well as other issues that enter into the public agenda leave a lasting mark on the character of democratic regimes. How do these challenges shape the profile of contemporary democracies? What is their impact on public opinion attitudes towards democracy and how do they shape the longevity of democratic rule? How have contemporary democracies responded to these threats and why do some of them appear more solid than others? We will address these questions as well as questions about new forms of democratic backsliding through a combination of indicative examples, systematic evidence and in-depth look into specific cases.

Readings:

- Przeworski, Adam. Crises of democracy. Cambridge University Press, 2019, Ch. 5, 6, 8, 9.
- Graham, Matthew H., and Milan W. Svolik. "Democracy in America? Partisanship, Polarization, and the Robustness of Support for Democracy in the United States." American Political Science Review 114.2 (2020): 392-409.
- Gennaro, Gloria, Giampaolo Lecce, and Massimo Morelli. "Intertemporal Evidence on the Strategy of Populism." (2019).

Session 2: Gender (in)equality (Klarita Gërxhani)

Due to globalization, immigration and increasing participation of women in the labor market, organizations in modern societies face a dynamic environment that poses ever-changing pressures on their workplace arrangements. Increasing diversity has been continuously emphasized, especially by organizational psychologists, as highly beneficial for an organization's collective achievement. A diverse working environment allows for new ideas and perspectives, it enhances a sense of belonging and well-being, and it also increases an organization's revenues. This lecture will focus on gender diversity. Considering that women's participation in the labor market has increased, public opinion has changed, and that national-level initiatives like quotas have been imposed on female representation on corporate boards, one might expect that gender diversity in the workplace will have reached a fair representation of societal gender diversity by now. Is this the case? And what are the underlying mechanisms of the current (lack of) gender diversity? Besides giving an overview of the challenges of reaching gender diversity, the lecture will demonstrate how one can do empirical research on this topic by using experimental methods.

Readings:

- Barbara, R.F. and D. McBrier (2000). Why Not Ascription? Organizations' Employment of Male and Female Managers. *American Sociological Review* 65: 210-33.
- Correll, S.J. and Ridgeway, C.L. (2003). "Expectation States Theory." Pp. 29-51 in the *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by John Delamater. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York.
- Schram, A., Brandts, J., and Gërxhani, K. (2019). Social-Status Ranking: A Hidden Channel to Gender Inequality under Competition. *Experimental Economics* 22(2): 396-418.

Session 3: Solidarity in the EU? (Philipp Genschel)

European solidarity is in high demand but short supply. Following the global financial crisis 2008, the demand-supply gap has grown considerably, seriously fraying the social, economic, institutional and political cohesion of the European Union (EU). Just consider the following examples:

- The Eurozone crisis quickly turned into a blame game between creditor and debtor countries that left the burden of saving the Euro mostly to the (constitutionally inadequate) ECB.
- The refugee crisis led to finger-pointing between frontline states, transit states, host states, and unaffected bystanders while (not so) temporary border controls sprang up throughout the Schengen area.
- The Corona-crisis fueled expectations of European solidarity but also triggered unilateral border-closures that undermined it. In Italy especially, disappointment about 'la brutta Europa' is widespread.

Why is European solidarity so difficult? We discuss interest-based, identity-based and normative arguments and take a cursory look at the Corona-crisis to better understand the politics of European solidarity in the EU.

Readings:

- Sangiovanni, A. (2013), 'Solidarity in the European Union', *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 33: 213-41.
- Hooghe, L. and G. Marks (2009), 'A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus'. *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 39, No. 1, p. 1-23.
- Genschel, P. and M. Jachtenfuchs (2020), 'Postfunctionalism reversed: Solidarity and rebordering during the Corona-crisis,' Florence; unpubl. manuscript.