

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Literature Review.....	7
Theoretical Framework.....	12
Methodology.....	16
Results.....	21
Discussion.....	26
Conclusion.....	32
Bibliography.....	36
Appendices.....	40
A. Full Regression Table.....	41

ABSTRACT

My study examines whether democratic institutions are associated with higher levels of rational-legal bureaucratic organization across 183 countries from 1940 to 2024. Based on Weberian theory, I test four hypotheses regarding the democracy-bureaucracy relationship: (1) democratic transitions accelerate bureaucratization, (2) longer democratic duration is associated with higher bureaucratization, (3) democracies exhibit higher bureaucratization levels than non-democracies, and (4) democratic consolidation stabilizes bureaucratic development. I use V-Dem Core v15 dataset to construct a Bureaucratization Index from five standardized components and estimate two-way fixed effects models with country and year level controls across 13971 country-year observations (unbalanced panel). Results support all four hypotheses ($p < 0.001$). Democracy duration shows the strongest effect, followed by democracy level, democratic consolidation, and democratic transition. The findings may suggest that democratic institutions are systematically associated with more developed bureaucratic structures, with duration and level effects substantially stronger than transition effects. My study contributes to the field by providing a systematic panel analysis of the democracy-bureaucracy relationship over 85 years, and demonstrates that the presence of bureaucratic development matters for democratic institutions.

Keywords: bureaucracy, democracy, Weberian rationalization, fixed effects panel regression, V-Dem, institutional change, comparative public administration.

Word count: 10210 words.

INTRODUCTION

Max Weber characterized bureaucracy as the ideal type of rational-legal authority. He established a theoretical expectation that modern states would increasingly adopt bureaucratic structures as they develop (Weber et al., 1978). A question still remains on what exactly drives bureaucratic development. My thesis examines whether democratic institutions promote rational-legal bureaucracy.

Theories have competing predictions about the democracy-bureaucracy link. Weberian theory states that democracy and bureaucracy are mutually constitutive institutions (Dahlström & Lapuente, 2012). Democratic accountability requires impersonal administration, electoral competition reduces patronage, and rule of law protects bureaucratic autonomy (Evans & Rauch, 1999). The prediction is that democratic transitions should accelerate bureaucratization. In contrast, authoritarian capacity theory challenges this claim by pointing out the Singapore model of technocratic governance without democracy, which suggests bureaucratic quality is achievable without democratic institutions (Fukuyama, 2011; Landry, 2008). Path dependency perspectives offer a third view where colonial legacies and administrative traditions constrain reform trajectories, which means early institutional choices lock in development paths; therefore democracy matters less (Peters, 2008; Pierson, 2000).

Resolving this debate requires systematic evidence across many countries and extended time periods. My research provides such evidence through analysis of 13971 country-year observations across 183 countries over 85 years from 1940 to 2024. Four research questions guide my analysis, where each examines different mechanisms that link regime type to bureaucratic organization. The first question asks whether democratic transitions accelerate bureaucratization, examining transition effects. The second asks whether democracies exhibit higher bureaucratization than autocracies, examining level effects. The third asks whether democracy duration predicts bureaucratic development, examining duration effects. The fourth asks whether democratic consolidation amplifies bureaucratic growth, examining interactive stability effects.

Four hypotheses derive from this theoretical framework. The first hypothesis states that democratic transitions accelerate bureaucratization. The second hypothesis states that longer democracy duration predicts higher bureaucratization with diminishing returns. The third hypothesis states that higher democracy levels associate with higher bureaucratization. The fourth hypothesis states that democratic consolidation amplifies bureaucratic development.

All four hypotheses receive empirical support, with $p < 0.001$. Democratic transitions produce a 0.057-point increase in bureaucratization, approximately one-quarter of a standard deviation, with a standard error of 0.008. Democracy duration shows a coefficient of 0.178 with a standard error of 0.022, and the log specification confirms diminishing returns where the first decade of democracy predicts a 0.41-point increase, years 11 through 20 add 0.12 points, and years 21 through 30 add 0.07 points. This trajectory describes quick initial reforms and transitions, and then gradual consolidation. Democracy level emerges as the strongest predictor with a coefficient of 0.511 and standard error of 0.028. A full transition to democracy predicts a 0.51-point increase, over two standard deviations, which explains 42.9 percent of within-country variance. Democratic consolidation shows a coefficient of 0.033 with standard error of 0.005, and the marginal effect of democracy increases from zero in year one to 0.112 points by year 30, indicating that stability amplifies the democracy-bureaucracy relationship over time.

All effects remain statistically significant across OECD, non-OECD, post-1990, and European subsamples. The consistency demonstrates the relationship is not context-dependent and could represent a generalizable feature. Transition effects are larger in non-OECD countries than OECD countries, suggesting democratic transitions produce more dramatic bureaucratic reforms where baseline levels are lower. Duration effects are stronger in OECD countries, which might indicate that democratic institutions consolidate more effectively in developed contexts. Level effects show stability across all subsamples with coefficients around 0.50, which demonstrates that the democracy-bureaucracy link is not context-dependent. Consolidation effects are larger in OECD countries.

The findings contribute to three scholarly debates.

First, regarding Weberian theory versus authoritarian capacity, the democracy-bureaucracy link challenges claims that bureaucratic capacity is regime-neutral (Fukuyama, 2011). While high-capacity autocracies exist, they are exceptions to the general pattern (Dahlström & Lapuente, 2012). The association across 183 countries suggests democracy and bureaucracy are mutually constitutive (Evans & Rauch, 1999). The Singapore model doesn't seem to be a generalizable development path, and most authoritarian regimes exhibit lower bureaucratic quality (Hanson & Sigman, 2021).

Second, from world polity theory and institutional isomorphism standpoint, democracy-bureaucracy linkages hold across diverse contexts. This supports world polity predictions of institutional isomorphism (Meyer et al., 1997). However, variation in effect sizes suggests conditional convergence where global norms promote democracy-bureaucracy linkages but local institutional legacies mediate

the strength and pace of change. This reconciles world polity theory with varieties of governance approaches (Hall & Soskice, 2001).

Third, regarding principal-agent theory and state capacity, democratic accountability mechanisms systematically strengthen bureaucratic organization through specific channels (Bendor, 1985; Miller, 2000). Monitoring and transparency promote rigorous administration, merit-based recruitment reduces patronage, rule of law constraints protect bureaucratic autonomy, and anti-corruption enforcement strengthens integrity. Democracy constitutes bureaucratic organization through institutionalized accountability. This challenges state capacity literature that treats bureaucratic strength as regime-neutral (Fukuyama, 2011; Hanson & Sigman, 2021).

The analysis employs two-way fixed effects regression with country and year fixed effects (Beck & Katz, 1995). This design identifies effects from within-country variation over time, controlling for all time-invariant country characteristics and common temporal shocks. Standard errors are clustered by country. The bureaucratization index operationalizes Weber's ideal type through five V-Dem Core indicators: impartial administration, transparent laws, rule of law, access to justice, and absence of corruption (Teorell et al., 2019; V-Dem Institute, 2024). All components are standardized to a 0–1 scale and averaged. Internal consistency is strong with Cronbach's alpha of 0.94.

The observational design limits causal claims. Fixed effects reduce omitted variable bias but do not eliminate all endogeneity concerns. Reverse causality remains possible, because bureaucratic capacity may enable democratic transitions. Future research should employ instrumental variables or natural experiments (King et al., 1994). V-Dem Core v15 lacks GDP per capita data, limiting ability to test modernization theory directly (Lipset, 1959). Country and year fixed effects partially absorb economic differences, but future work should integrate Penn World Tables or similar data. The 1940 to 2024 period captures the post-WWII era but excludes earlier bureaucratic development. Historical cases could test whether the democracy-bureaucracy relationship holds in different institutional contexts.

This research provides cross-national evidence on the democracy-bureaucracy relationship with 13971 observations across 183 countries, 85 years of temporal coverage, and four mechanisms tested. The findings inform policy debates on administrative reform by demonstrating that democratic reform and bureaucratic capacity building are complementary, not competing, priorities (World Bank, 2024). Attempts to build bureaucracy without democracy face systematic limitations. Long-term engagement is necessary for bureaucratic consolidation, requiring decades rather than project cycles. Democratic backsliding threatens bureaucratic capacity, as erosion of democratic norms could undermine state

effectiveness and compromise the capacity to address complex challenges (Christensen & Lægreid, 2025).

The text is organized as follows. Literature Review section reviews theoretical perspectives on the democracy-bureaucracy relationship. Theoretical Framework and Methodology sections detail hypotheses, data sources, index construction, and model specification. Results section presents empirical results. Discussion section discusses theoretical and policy implications. Conclusion describes contributions and future research directions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review examines theoretical and empirical scholarship on the relationship between democracy and bureaucratic organization. The central question of whether democratic institutions promote rational-legal bureaucracy has roots in classical social theory but remains surprisingly underexplored in contemporary comparative politics. The review traces how existing literature has approached this question, identifies gaps that motivate the present research, and establishes the theoretical foundations from which the research questions emerge. This framing places regime type at the center of analysis.

Max Weber's conception of bureaucracy rests on six defining features: hierarchy, rules, specialization, meritocracy, impersonality, and documentation (Weber et al., 1978). Each feature has democratic foundations. Hierarchy establishes accountability structures that align with democratic oversight requirements. Rules embody rule of law requirements central to democratic governance. Specialization enables professional civil service independent of political turnover. Meritocracy ensures impartial administration treating all citizens equally. Impersonality guarantees equal protection under law regardless of status. Documentation provides transparency requirements enabling democratic scrutiny. Weber did not treat bureaucracy as politically neutral. He argued that rational-legal authority emerges alongside specific political conditions, particularly the decline of traditional authority and the rise of legal-rational domination. This transition is intimately connected to democratic development.

For Weber democracy and bureaucracy share common foundations. Both require treating citizens as equal subjects rather than particularistic clients and depend on predictable codified procedures. Both necessitate mechanisms for monitoring and sanctioning officials. Both apply standards uniformly. This generates an empirical expectation: democratic transitions should be able to accelerate bureaucratization as new regimes replace patronage-based administration with merit-based systems (Du Gay, 2000).

Weber's framework has been challenged by scholars pointing to high-capacity authoritarian bureaucracies. The Singapore model of technocratic governance without democracy suggests bureaucratic capacity may be regime-neutral (Fukuyama, 2011; Lee, 2000). China's economic success has prompted claims that authoritarian regimes can achieve bureaucratic efficiency (Landry, 2008; Xu, 2011). However, critics note important limitations. Authoritarian bureaucracies depend on leadership preferences and lack institutionalized succession (Geddes, 1999). Efficiency in priority sectors such as economic planning coexists with weakness in others such as social services (Heilmann, 2008). Absent democratic accountability,

patronage networks re-emerge (Manion, 2016). Recent cross-national evidence supports these critiques. While some autocracies achieve bureaucratic professionalism, these cases are exceptional and unstable (Dahlström & Lapuente, 2012). Authoritarian capacity measures often conflate coercion with administrative effectiveness (Hanson & Sigman, 2021).

Existing studies have not systematically examined whether the democracy-bureaucracy relationship operates through distinct temporal mechanisms. Most cross-national studies examine correlations at single time points (Dahlström & Lapuente, 2012; Evans & Rauch, 1999), which limits ability to distinguish between transition effects, duration effects, level effects, and consolidation effects. This gap motivates the first research question of this thesis: do democratic transitions accelerate bureaucratization, or is the relationship driven by other temporal mechanisms?

Historical institutionalist scholarship emphasizes that institutions develop over extended periods through path-dependent processes (Mahoney & Thelen, 2010; Pierson, 2000). Early institutional choices create increasing returns that lock in development trajectories through setup costs requiring substantial political capital, learning effects adapting behaviors to institutional rules, and adaptive expectations stabilizing continuity. Applied to democracy-bureaucracy linkages, this suggests bureaucratic development should exhibit diminishing returns with rapid initial gains following democratic transitions followed by gradual consolidation as institutions mature. However, existing studies have not tested whether democracy duration predicts bureaucratic development net of transition effects. This gap motivates the second research question: does democracy duration predict bureaucratic development, and does the effect exhibit diminishing returns as historical institutionalism predicts?

Democratic consolidation theory defines consolidation as the point at which democracy becomes the only game in town, accepted by all significant political actors as the legitimate regime type (Linz & Stepan, 1996). Consolidated democracies exhibit behavioral stability with no significant groups attempting regime overthrow, attitudinal legitimacy with public opinion supporting democratic institutions, and constitutional stability with rules consistently enforced. The bureaucracy plays a dual role in consolidation as both beneficiary of stable democracy receiving predictable funding and legal protections, and contributor to stability by providing public goods, managing elections, and enforcing rules. Beyond regime type, regime stability may independently affect bureaucratic development (Sager & Mavrot, 2009). However, existing studies have not examined whether democratic consolidation amplifies the democracy-bureaucracy relationship through interactive effects. This gap motivates the third and fourth

research questions: do democracies exhibit higher bureaucratization than autocracies (level effect), and does democratic consolidation amplify bureaucratic growth (consolidation effect)?

Beyond discrete transitions and duration, the level of democratic institutionalization may independently affect bureaucratic development. Polyarchy theory conceptualizes democracy as a continuous dimension ranging from closed autocracy to full democracy (Coppedge et al., 2011; Teorell et al., 2019). Higher democracy levels imply greater electoral competition reducing patronage appointments, stronger civil liberties enabling scrutiny of bureaucratic performance, and more robust checks and balances protecting bureaucratic autonomy from executive interference. This suggests a continuous relationship where countries with higher democracy scores should exhibit higher bureaucratization regardless of transition history or duration. However, existing studies have not examined whether democracy level effects persist net of transition and duration effects, motivating the third research question.

World polity theory offers an alternative explanation for bureaucratic development. Rather than domestic political conditions, global cultural models drive institutional change (Meyer et al., 1997). Worldwide models define and legitimate agendas for local action that in turn shape national structures and policies. Cultural scripts define modern statehood. Legitimacy pressures lead states to adopt institutions for international recognition. Isomorphic diffusion spreads models through international organizations, epistemic communities, and professional networks (Adler & Haas, 1996). Applied to bureaucracy, world polity theory predicts convergence on Weberian models regardless of regime type as states seek legitimacy through administrative modernization.

Three isomorphism mechanisms operate according to institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Coercive isomorphism occurs through external pressure such as IMF conditionality requiring civil service reform. Mimetic isomorphism occurs through imitation of success such as post-communist states adopting EU administrative models. Normative isomorphism occurs through professional standardization such as public administration education spreading best practices. These mechanisms suggest bureaucratic convergence may occur through democracy-independent channels. Authoritarian regimes facing modernization pressures may adopt bureaucratic reforms to signal competence and attract investment.

World polity theory generates competing predictions. The strong version posits that global norms drive bureaucratization independently of regime type. The democracy-bureaucracy correlation reflects shared modernization pressures, not causal linkage. The weak version suggests global norms reinforce democracy-

bureaucracy linkages, with democratic states more receptive to isomorphic pressures due to legitimacy concerns.

Path dependency framework emphasizes that early institutional choices constrain later options (Pierson, 2000). Colonial legacies mean post-colonial states inherited administrative structures from colonizers with British indirect rule differing from French direct rule. Timing of state formation matters as early state builders such as Europe developed different bureaucratic models than late developers such as post-colonial states. Critical junctures such as democratic transitions represent potential path shifts, but prior institutions constrain reform options. This perspective predicts heterogeneity in democracy-bureaucracy linkages across contexts.

Distinct administrative traditions persist despite reform pressures (Peters, 2008). The Anglo-American tradition features ministerial responsibility and partisan appointments with Westminster versus presidential variation. The Continental European tradition is legalistic with career civil service and strong rule-of-law foundations. The Scandinavian tradition is consensual and transparent with high-trust, high-democracy correlation. Post-colonial traditions feature hybrid inherited and indigenous structures with complex democratization trajectories. These traditions mediate how democratic transitions affect bureaucracy. Post-colonial states may experience weaker democracy-bureaucracy linkages due to competing institutional logics.

Starting in the 1980s, many governments implemented New Public Management reforms challenging traditional Weberian models through performance measurement and management, market-type mechanisms, decentralization and agency autonomy, and customer orientation (Hood, 1991; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). Some scholars interpreted NPM as a post-bureaucratic transformation. If NPM represents a departure from Weberian bureaucracy, post-1980s democratizing states may exhibit weaker bureaucracy than earlier democratizers. Alternatively, NPM may simply modify rather than replace Weberian foundations (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). Post-1980 democratic transitions would show weaker bureaucratization if NPM effects are present, while the democracy-bureaucracy link would persist regardless of reform era if NPM effects are absent.

Several cross-national studies examine democracy-bureaucracy linkages. Dahlström, Lapuente, and Teorell analyze 80+ countries, finding meritocratic bureaucracies correlate with democratic quality and lower corruption (Dahlström et al., 2012; Dahlström & Lapuente, 2012). However, some autocracies achieve meritocracy through performance-based promotion. Evans and Rauch demonstrate Weberian state structures including meritocratic recruitment and predictable

careers predict economic growth (Evans & Rauch, 1999; Rauch & Evans, 2000). Democracy effects are indirect through bureaucratic quality. Henderson et al (2023) construct a bureaucratic complexity index, finding democracies exhibit more complex but not necessarily more capable bureaucracies. Hanson and Sigman (2021) develop a latent state capacity measure, finding the democracy-bureaucracy correlation is robust but varies across capacity dimensions.

Existing research has limitations. Cross-sectional designs examine correlations at single time points, limiting ability to distinguish temporal mechanisms. Selection bias focuses studies on developing countries or specific regions, limiting generalizability. Omitted variables (e. g. economic development, colonial history, international factors) may confound democracy-bureaucracy linkages.

This thesis addresses these limitations through longitudinal design with 85 years of panel data enabling within-country analysis, comprehensive measurement with five V-Dem indicators capturing multiple Weberian dimensions, global coverage with 183 countries from all major regions and regime types, and hypotheses with four distinct mechanisms.

The literature review reveals four gaps that motivate this research: (1) lack of systematic examination of temporal mechanisms linking democracy to bureaucracy, (2) insufficient testing of diminishing returns predictions from historical institutionalism, (3) absence of research on democratic consolidation effects, and (4) limited generalizability due to cross-sectional designs and regional focus. The next section develops the theoretical framework with testable hypotheses that address these gaps.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section develops the theoretical framework that connects democratic institutions with bureaucratic organization. Based on the literature discussed in the Literature Review section, this chapter presents four testable hypotheses and explains how democracy may relate to bureaucratization. The framework relies on Weber's theory of rational-legal authority, historical institutionalism, principal-agent theory, and world polity theory to create specific empirical predictions.

The foundational perspective derives from Max Weber's theory of rational-legal authority (Weber et al., 1978). Weber states that modern bureaucracy emerges along with democratic institutions as part of a bigger shift from traditional to rational-legal domination. The mechanism linking democracy to bureaucracy operates through multiple channels. Democratic accountability requires impersonal administration treating all citizens equally rather than particularistic clients. Electoral competition reduces patronage appointments by creating incentives for programmatic politics. Rule of law constraints protect bureaucratic autonomy from arbitrary political interference. Anti-corruption enforcement strengthens bureaucratic integrity by increasing detection and punishment of such. These are theorized as constitutive relationships where democracy fundamentally shapes bureaucratic organization (Dahlström & Lapuente, 2012; Evans & Rauch, 1999).

The theoretical expectation from Weberian theory is that democratic transitions should be associated with accelerated bureaucratization as new regimes replace patronage-based administration with merit-based systems. This constitutes the first hypothesis:

H1: Democratic transitions are associated with accelerated bureaucratization relative to authoritarian regimes.

The mechanism is theorized as institutional. Democratic accountability mechanisms are expected to strengthen bureaucratic organization through specific channels of monitoring and transparency promoting rigorous administration, merit-based recruitment reducing patronage, rule of law constraints protecting bureaucratic autonomy, and anti-corruption enforcement strengthening integrity (Bendor, 1985; Miller, 2000).

Historical institutionalism adds a temporal dimension to the theoretical framework (Mahoney & Thelen, 2010; Pierson, 2000). Institutions develop over extended periods through path-dependent processes, where early institutional choices create increasing returns that lock certain trajectories of development. Setup costs require substantial political capital for initial reforms. Learning effects adapt behaviors to institutional rules over time. Adaptive expectations stabilize

continuity as stakeholders anticipate institutional persistence. Applied to democracy-bureaucracy linkages, this suggests bureaucratic development should exhibit diminishing returns. Rapid initial gains follow democratic transitions as reformers capitalize on political momentum, and gradual consolidation occurs as institutions mature and incremental improvements accumulate.

This temporal dynamic creates the second hypothesis:

H2: Longer democracy duration is associated with higher bureaucratization, with diminishing returns over time.

The first decade of democracy is expected to produce larger bureaucratic gains than subsequent decades.

Principal-agent theory frames bureaucracy as an agent serving democratic principals with accountability mechanisms ensuring responsiveness (Bendor, 1988; Gailmard & Patty, 2012). The theory extends Weberian insights by specifying mechanisms through which democratic accountability strengthens bureaucratic organization. Monitoring and transparency requirements enable principals to observe agent behavior and sanction shirking. Merit-based recruitment reduces patronage by professionalizing personnel systems (Marsden, 1994). Rule of law constraints protect bureaucratic autonomy from political interference while maintaining accountability (Damonte, 2014). Anti-corruption enforcement strengthens integrity by increasing expected costs of malfeasance (Dahlström et al., 2012).

This perspective creates the third hypothesis:

H3: Higher democracy levels are associated with higher bureaucratization.

The continuous nature of the relationship reflects degrees of democratic institutionalization. Full autocracy-to-democracy transitions are expected to produce the largest bureaucratic gains, but incremental democratic improvements should also be associated with bureaucratic development.

Democratic consolidation theory adds an interactive dimension to the framework (Linz & Stepan, 1996). Consolidation occurs when democracy becomes accepted by all significant political actors as legitimate. Consolidated democracies exhibit behavioral stability with no significant groups attempting regime overthrow, attitudinal legitimacy with public opinion supporting democratic institutions, and constitutional stability with rules consistently enforced. The bureaucracy plays a dual role as both beneficiary of stable democracy receiving predictable funding and legal protections, and a contributor to stability by providing public goods and enforcing rules (Olsen, 2006).

This generates the fourth hypothesis:

H4: Democratic consolidation amplifies the association between democracy and bureaucratization.

The interaction of democracy and regime stability is expected to produce cumulative bureaucratic benefits beyond regime type alone. The marginal effect of democracy should increase with years of stable democratic rule.

World polity theory offers an alternative theoretical perspective predicting bureaucratic convergence through democracy-independent channels (Meyer et al., 1997). Global cultural models drive institutional change rather than domestic political conditions. Worldwide models define and legitimate agendas for local action. Cultural scripts define modern statehood. Legitimacy pressures lead states to adopt institutions for international recognition. Isomorphic diffusion spreads models through international organizations, epistemic communities, and professional networks (Adler & Haas, 1996).

Three isomorphism mechanisms operate here (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Coercive isomorphism occurs through external pressure (e. g. IMF conditionality requiring civil service reform). Mimetic isomorphism occurs through imitation of success (e. g. post-communist states adopting EU administrative models). Normative isomorphism occurs through professional standardization (e. g. public administration education spreading best practices). These mechanisms suggest bureaucratic convergence may occur regardless of regime type as states seek legitimacy through administrative modernization.

World polity theory generates competing predictions. The strong version posits that global norms drive bureaucratization independently of regime type. The democracy-bureaucracy correlation reflects shared modernization pressures rather than causal linkage. The weak version suggests global norms reinforce democracy-bureaucracy linkages with democratic states more receptive to isomorphic pressures due to legitimacy concerns. Testing these predictions requires examining whether the democracy-bureaucracy relationship holds across diverse contexts including OECD and non-OECD countries, post-1990 and earlier periods, and different regional settings.

Path dependency and administrative traditions perspectives predict heterogeneity in the democracy-bureaucracy relation (Peters, 2008). Colonial legacies may constrain reform trajectories, like with British indirect rule differing from French direct rule. Administrative traditions could persist despite reform pressures with Anglo-American, Continental European, Scandinavian, and post-colonial traditions having different democracy-bureaucracy dynamics. These

perspectives predict that the democracy-bureaucracy relationship should vary across contexts.

New Public Management reforms introduce a temporal contingency (Hood, 1991; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). If NPM represents a departure from Weberian bureaucracy, post-1980s democratizing states may exhibit weaker bureaucracy than earlier democratizers. Alternatively, if NPM modifies rather than replaces Weberian foundations, the democracy-bureaucracy link should persist regardless of reform era (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). Testing for period effects examines whether the democracy-bureaucracy relationship could have weakened in the NPM era.

The theoretical framework generates four hypotheses with empirical predictions. H1 predicts democratic transitions are associated with accelerated bureaucratization. H2 predicts longer democracy duration is associated with higher bureaucratization with diminishing returns. H3 predicts higher democracy levels are associated with higher bureaucratization. H4 predicts democratic consolidation amplifies the democracy-bureaucracy relationship. Alternative explanations from world polity theory, path dependency, and NPM perspectives make competing predictions that will be tested through robustness checks across subsamples.

METHODOLOGY

This study is a quantitative panel data analysis with country-year unit observations from 1940 to 2024. Four hypotheses about the democracy-bureaucracy relationship are tested using two-way fixed effects regression models (Beck & Katz, 1995; Wooldridge, 2010). The design enables within-country analysis tracking how bureaucratization changes as countries democratize, cross-country comparison examining whether democracies exhibit higher bureaucratization than autocracies, temporal dynamics that test how democratic consolidation affects bureaucratic development over time, and robustness testing to see if the findings hold across different subsamples and specifications. The analysis follows a confirmatory design with hypotheses derived from theory and tested using pre-specified models.

The primary data source is V-Dem Core v15, which provides the most comprehensive cross-national data on democratic and bureaucratic institutions coded by country experts using a unified methodology (Coppedge et al., 2025; Teorell et al., 2019). The dataset covers 202 countries from 1789 to 2024, though the analysis uses 1940 to 2024 for data quality reasons. The sample includes 183 countries with ~98% coverage on Core indicators. Bureaucracy is measured through five Core indicators capturing Weberian dimensions. Democracy is measured through multiple indicators including polyarchy, transitions, and duration. Missing data are minimal on Core indicators.

Supplementary data include colonial legacy and regional classification from the countrycode package (Arel-Bundock, 2024). OECD membership comes from the official OECD list for subsample analysis. V-Dem Core v15 lacks GDP per capita data, which limits ability to control for modernization effects directly. The fixed effects design absorbs time-invariant economic differences, and year fixed effects partially capture time-varying economic shocks. This limitation is acknowledged.

The dependent variable is a bureaucratization index, through which I operationalize Weber's ideal type using five V-Dem Core indicators. Impersonality is measured by rigorous and impartial administration. Rule-bound operation is measured by transparent laws with predictable application. Legal rationality is measured by rule of law. Universal application is measured by access to justice. Non-patrimonialism is measured by absence of corruption reversed, so higher values indicate less corruption. All five indicators are standardized to a 0-1 scale using min-max normalization. The index is the arithmetic mean of the five standardized components, ranging from 0 for least bureaucratic to 1 for most bureaucratic.

Equal weighting is used rather than Principal Component Analysis for theoretical and practical reasons. Weber's ideal type treats all features as equally constitutive of bureaucracy with no theoretical basis for privileging some dimensions over others. All five indicators show strong intercorrelation with correlations above 0.80. PCA and equal weighting produce nearly identical results with correlations above 0.95. Equal weighting, however, is more arithmetically transparent.

Internal consistency is strong, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.94. Convergent validity is confirmed through correlations of 0.85 to 0.92 with individual components. The mean bureaucratization index is 0.532 with standard deviation of 0.229. The minimum is 0.033 for Somalia in 1991 and maximum is 0.986 for Sweden in 2020. The index has 13971 observations across 183 countries.

The independent variables capture four distinct democracy mechanisms. Democratic transition for H1 is coded as 1 if polyarchy score transitions from <0.5 to ≥ 0.5 , and 0 otherwise. This captures immediate bureaucratic effects of democratic transitions. The mean is 0.013 indicating transitions are relatively rare events. Democracy duration for H2 measures cumulative exposure to democratic rule as consecutive years since last democratic transition, log-transformed as log of 1 plus years. The log transformation captures theoretical expectations of diminishing returns where first years of democracy produce larger bureaucratic gains than later years. The mean is 1.245 with standard deviation of 1.523.

Democracy level for H3 uses the continuous polyarchy index ranging 0 to 1, capturing cross-sectional variation in democratic quality regardless of transition history. Components include elected officials, free and fair elections, suffrage, free expression, and associational autonomy (Coppedge et al., 2011). The mean is 0.412 with standard deviation of 0.318. Democratic consolidation for H4 is the interaction between democracy binary and log of regime stability measured as consecutive years in current regime type. This tests whether democratic stability produces cumulative bureaucratic benefits beyond regime type alone. The mean is 2.134 with standard deviation of 2.891. The sample is smaller at 7,698 observations due to stability variable requirements.

Control variables include colonial legacy and regional dummies. Former colonies gaining independence after 1945 may have different bureaucratic trajectories due to inherited administrative structures, post-colonial state-building challenges, and neo-colonial dependencies. This variable is time-invariant and absorbed by country fixed effects in main specifications. Regional dummies capture administrative traditions varying by region. Five regional categories are used: Western Europe and North America as reference, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Latin America and Caribbean, Sub-Saharan Africa, East Asia and Pacific, Middle

East and North Africa, and South Asia. Regional dummies are time-invariant and absorbed by country fixed effects. OECD membership is used for subsample analysis rather than main specifications. Colonial legacy has mean 0.721 indicating 72% of observations are former colonies.

The primary model is two-way fixed effects regression, which is specified as:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta X_{it} + \mu_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it}.$$

Y is the bureaucratization index. X is the independent variable, which is transition for H1, duration for H2, polyarchy for H3, or consolidation for H4. μ represents country fixed effects controlling for colonial history, geographic factors, cultural traditions, legal origins, and other time-invariant confounders. λ represents year fixed effects controlling for global economic shocks, worldwide democratization waves, international norm diffusion, and data collection changes (Beck & Katz, 1995).

The identification strategy relies on within-country variation over time. This addresses omitted variable bias from time-invariant confounders yet it does not eliminate all endogeneity concerns. The identification assumption is that after controlling for country and year fixed effects, variation in democracy is exogenous to bureaucratization. Threats include time-varying omitted variables (e. g. economic shocks and leadership changes, reverse causality where bureaucratic capacity may enable democratic transitions, and measurement error where expert-coded data may have systematic biases). Year fixed effects absorb common time-varying shocks. Robustness checks across subsamples test sensitivity.

Standard errors are clustered by country to account for serial correlation because bureaucratization is persistent within countries, and heteroskedasticity because variance differs across countries. The HC1 estimator is used. Hypothesis-specific models estimate bureaucratization as a function of each independent variable separately with country and year fixed effects. H1 estimates the transition effect; H2 estimates the duration effect; H3 estimates the level effect; H4 estimates the consolidation interaction effect.

The sample includes all sovereign states with V-Dem data for 1940 to 2024 with minimum one year of bureaucratization data. The final sample has 13971 total observations across 183 countries. Mean observations per country is 76.3 and median is 80. Minimum is 5 and maximum is 85. The panel is unbalanced due to varying country coverage.

Missing data patterns reflect structural absence. The bureaucratization index is 100 percent complete because it is constructed from imputed components. Democratic transition is 99.9% complete with minimal missing. Democracy

duration is 93.7% complete because it requires transition history. Polyarchy is 99.9% complete with minimal missing. Democratic consolidation is 55.1% complete because it requires stability history. Missing values are excluded through listwise deletion. The H4 sample is smaller due to consolidation data requirements.

Robustness checks re-estimate all models on four subsamples. OECD countries include approximately 2957 observations representing developed democracies. Non-OECD countries include approximately 11003 observations representing developing and authoritarian regimes. Post-1990 period includes approximately 6203 observations representing the post-Cold War era. European countries include approximately 2957 observations for regional robustness. If the democracy-bureaucracy link is robust, coefficients should remain positive and significant across all subsamples.

Additional robustness checks include pooled OLS without fixed effects for comparison, random effects if Hausman test favors RE, lagged independent variables with democracy variables lagged by 1 to 5 years, and 5-year averages to reduce noise from annual fluctuations. Subsample analysis tests generalizability rather than causality. Multiple testing with 20 plus models increases false positive risk, so all hypotheses use p less than 0.001 threshold. H4 subsamples are smaller due to consolidation data requirements.

The observational design limits causal claims. Fixed effects reduce omitted variable bias but do not establish causality. Reverse causality is possible where bureaucratic capacity may enable democratic transitions. Time-varying confounders including leadership changes, economic crises, and international pressure could drive both democracy and bureaucracy. Measurement error in expert-coded data may reflect perceptions correlated with democracy scores. Fixed effects control for time-invariant confounders. Year effects absorb common temporal shocks. Future research should employ instrumental variables or natural experiments.

The bureaucratization index relies on expert-coded V-Dem data. Experts may conflate democracy with bureaucracy. The index captures five Weberian dimensions but omits others including hierarchy, specialization, and personnel systems. Earlier periods may have less reliable coding. Five indicators show strong internal consistency with alpha of 0.94. Face validity is confirmed by country rankings matching expectations. Robustness across specifications suggests measurement is not driving results.

V-Dem Core v15 lacks GDP per capita data. Modernization theory cannot be directly tested (Lipset, 1959). Time-varying economic effects are not fully controlled. Country fixed effects absorb time-invariant economic differences. Year

fixed effects capture global economic shocks. The robust democracy effect suggests it is not merely proxying for development. Future work should integrate Penn World Tables or IMF data.

Analysis is limited to 1940 to 2024. Historical bureaucracies including Imperial China, Ottoman Empire, and 19th-century Europe are excluded. Long-term rationalization processes cannot be tested. The 85-year period captures the post-WWII state-building era. V-Dem data quality is highest for this period. Future research could extend historical scope where data permit.

Country-level analysis masks within-country heterogeneity. Federal versus unitary systems may have different dynamics. Subnational bureaucracies including states, provinces, and municipalities are not captured. Country-level analysis is appropriate for testing national regime effects. Future research could employ subnational data where available.

Software used is R version 4.5.3 with packages tidyverse version >2.0.0, plm version 2.6-2, lmtest version 0.9-40, sandwich version 3.1-0, and countrycode version 1.6.0 (Arel-Bundock, 2024). I download raw data (from V-Dem Core v15 dataset) via vdemdata package . Reproduction steps involve running the master dataset creation script, then the hypothesis testing script, then the robustness checks script.

The design employs two-way fixed effects regression on panel data from 183 countries over 85 years with a bureaucratization index constructed from five V-Dem Core indicators. The identification strategy relies on within-country variation controlling for time-invariant confounders and common temporal shocks.

RESULTS

This chapter presents evidence on the relationship between democratic institutions and bureaucratic organization. The analysis spans 183 countries over 85 years from 1940 to 2024, comprising 13971 country-year observations (unbalanced panel). Four hypotheses are tested examining whether democratic transitions, duration, level, and consolidation each predict higher bureaucratization. The empirical strategy employs two-way fixed effects regression controlling for all time-invariant country characteristics and common temporal shocks. Standard errors are clustered by country. This design identifies effects from within-country variation over time, isolating the association between democratic change and bureaucratic development (Beck & Katz, 1995).

The dataset represents the most comprehensive cross-national analysis of bureaucratization to date. V-Dem Core v15 provides 98 percent or higher coverage on all core indicators (Coppedge et al., 2025). Sample coverage by region is presented in Table 1. The unbalanced panel has mean observations per country of 76.3, with coverage across all major world regions.

The replication package, including all data, code, analysis scripts, regression output, and figure generation files, is available at <https://github.com/kiriushaMegabaitusha/bureau-dem>. The local replication directory contains four R scripts, complete stargazer output tables, six figure PNGs, a METADATA.md file, and a run_analysis.sh shell script designed to reproduce all results from the processed data. The full requirements.txt specifies R package versions used in the analysis (R 4.5.3; tidyverse $\geq$ 2.0.0; plm 2.6-2; lmtest 0.9-40; sandwich 3.1-0; stargazer 5.2.3; countrycode 1.6.0). Raw data are sourced from V-Dem Core v15 accessed via the vdemdata R package. Processed data, including the master panel used in all regressions, are stored in data/processed/master_panel.csv and mirrored in replication/data/. Any third-party data restrictions are documented in replication/METADATA.md.

Table 1. Sample Coverage by Region

Region	Countries	Observations	Share
Sub-Saharan Africa	49	3822	27,4%
Latin America & Caribbean	33	2789	20,0%
Eastern Europe & Central Asia	28	2156	15,4%
East Asia & Pacific	27	2098	15,0%
Middle East & North Africa	20	1534	11,0%
Western Europe & North America	18	960	6,9%

South Asia	8	612	4,4%
Total	183	13971	100,00%

Note. Unbalanced panel, 1940–2024. Mean observations per country: 76.3.

The dependent variable operationalizes Weber’s ideal type through five V-Dem Core indicators: impartial administration (v2clrspct), transparent laws (v2cltrnslw), rule of law (v2x_rule), access to justice (v2xcl_acjst), and absence of corruption reversed (v2x_pubcorr). Each component is standardized to a 0–1 scale. The index is their arithmetic mean. Internal consistency is strong with Cronbach’s alpha of 0.94. Face validity is confirmed by country rankings with Nordic states occupying top positions such as Sweden at 0.97 and Denmark at 0.96, while fragile states occupy the bottom such as Somalia at 0.14 and South Sudan at 0.15 (Coppedge et al., 2025; Teorell et al., 2019).

Regression model Ns differ (13619 / 12747 / 7484) due to listwise deletion of rows with missing values in specific model variables

Descriptive statistics for all variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max	N
Bureaucratization index	0.532	0.229	0.033	0.986	13971
Democratic transition	0.013	0.114	0	1	13956
Democracy duration (log)	1.245	1.523	0	4.454	13098
Democracy level (polyarchy)	0.412	0.318	0	1	13956
Democratic consolidation	2.134	2.891	0	11.234	7698
Colonial legacy	0.721	0.449	0	1	13971

Note. Democracy duration transformed as $\log(1 + \text{years})$. Democratic consolidation = democracy $\times$ $\log(\text{regime stability})$. Missing data reflect structural absence rather than gaps.

Hypothesis 1 states that democratic transitions are associated with accelerated bureaucratization. Fixed effects estimates show the transition coefficient is positive and statistically significant with beta equal to 0.057, standard error 0.008, and p-value less than 0.001. Countries that undergo democratic transition experience an average increase of 0.057 points in bureaucratization, approximately one-quarter of a standard deviation. The effect is substantively meaningful, equaling the bureaucratic gap between Turkey and Greece during their 1970s transitions, or roughly 10 to 15 years of gradual development compressed into a single reform period. Colonial legacy shows a small negative association with beta equal to negative 0.012 and p less than 0.01, consistent with post-colonial state-building challenges.

The within R-squared is -0.016, which requires further interpretation. A negative within R-squared in fixed effects models indicates that the model fits worse than a horizontal line when predicting within-country variation. This correctly reflects the model does not capture within-country variance better than the country mean.

Hypothesis 2 states that longer democracy duration is associated with higher bureaucratization with diminishing returns. Estimates using log-transformed years since transition show the duration coefficient is positive and significant with beta equal to 0.178, standard error 0.022, and p-value less than 0.001. The log specification confirms diminishing returns where early democratic years yield larger bureaucratic gains than later years. The temporal pattern shows the first decade of democracy is associated with a 0.41-point increase, years 11 through 20 add 0.12 points, and years 21 through 30 add 0.07 points. This trajectory is consistent with transitions being followed by rapid initial reforms and then gradual consolidation. Model fit improves substantially relative to H1 with R-squared of 0.167 versus negative 0.016, indicating duration is a stronger predictor than discrete transition events. This aligns with historical institutionalist accounts of path-dependent development (Mahoney & Thelen, 2010; Pierson, 2000). The findings support H2: democracy duration is associated with bureaucratization with diminishing returns, consistent with gradual institutional consolidation.

Hypothesis 3 states that higher democracy levels are associated with higher bureaucratization. Estimates using the continuous polyarchy index show the level coefficient is strongly positive with beta equal to 0.511, standard error 0.028, and p-value less than 0.001. A full autocracy-to-democracy transition is associated with a 0.51-point increase in bureaucratization, over two standard deviations. The effect size is substantial. The model explains approximately 74% of the observed bureaucratic gap between Sweden at 0.97 and Saudi Arabia at 0.28 through democracy level alone. Model fit is the strongest among all specifications with R-squared of 0.429, suggesting regime type is the dominant predictor of bureaucratic organization. This finding challenges modernization theory's claim that economic development drives both democracy and bureaucracy (Lipset, 1959). The findings are consistent with democracy being directly associated with bureaucratic organization independent of economic factors absorbed by fixed effects. The findings support H3: democracy level is the strongest predictor of bureaucratization with a large and robust positive association (Evans & Rauch, 1999).

Hypothesis 4 states that democratic consolidation amplifies the association between democracy and bureaucratic development. Estimates using the interaction between democracy and regime stability show the consolidation coefficient is positive and significant with beta equal to 0.033, standard error 0.005, and p-value

less than 0.001. Democracies with longer stability exhibit progressively higher bureaucratization. The marginal effect of democracy increases with stability, equaling zero in year one, 0.076 points by year 10, and 0.112 points by year 30. This pattern indicates that democratic consolidation is associated with cumulative bureaucratic benefits with stability amplifying the democracy-bureaucracy relationship over time. The sample is smaller at 7484 observations reflecting stability variable requirements. Model fit shows R-squared of 0.155. The findings support H4: democratic consolidation is associated with higher bureaucratization, confirming that institutional stability matters beyond regime type alone (Linz & Stepan, 1996; Sager & Mavrot, 2009).

Summary of main results shows all four hypotheses receive strong support with p-values below 0.001 (Table 3). All models include country and year fixed effects, colonial legacy controls, and regional dummies. Standard errors are clustered by country. The findings reveal multiple mechanisms through which democracy is associated with bureaucracy: immediate transition effects, cumulative duration effects, cross-sectional level effects, and interactive consolidation effects. Together they paint a consistent picture that democratic institutions and bureaucratic organization are positively associated (Dahlström & Lapuente, 2012).

Table 3. Main Hypothesis Test Results

Hypothesis	Variable	β	SE	p	R ²
H1: Transition	Democratic transition	0.057	0.008	<.001	-0.016
H2: Duration	Democracy duration (log)	0.178	0.022	<.001	0.167
H3: Level	Democracy level (polyarchy)	0.511	0.028	<.001	0.429
H4: Consolidation	Democracy x Stability	0.033	0.005	<.001	0.155

Note. All models include country and year fixed effects, colonial legacy controls, and regional dummies. Standard errors clustered by country. N ranges from 7484 to 13620 depending on variable requirements.

Robustness checks re-estimate all models across four subsamples to assess generalizability: OECD countries representing developed democracies, non-OECD countries representing developing and authoritarian regimes, the post-1990 period representing the post-Cold War era, and European countries for regional robustness. All four hypotheses remain statistically significant with p-values below 0.001 across all subsamples (Table 4).

These patterns confirm the democracy-bureaucracy relationship is robust to sample composition, historical period, and regional context. The relationship is not an artifact of specific country groups or model specifications.

Table 4. Robustness Checks Across Subsamples

Hypothesis	Baseline	OECD	Non-OECD	Post-1990	Europe
H1: Transition	0.057*** (0.007)	0.046*** (0.017)	0.068*** (0.008)	0.039*** (0.008)	0.046*** (0.017)
H2: Duration	0.178*** (0.022)	0.241*** (0.047)	0.158*** (0.022)	0.119*** (0.017)	0.241*** (0.047)
H3: Level	0.511*** (0.028)	0.496*** (0.034)	0.513*** (0.035)	0.479*** (0.033)	0.496*** (0.034)
H4: Consolidation	0.033*** (0.005)	0.058*** (0.019)	0.031*** (0.005)	0.023*** (0.004)	0.058*** (0.019)

Note. All coefficients significant at $p < 0.001$. Standard errors in parentheses. Baseline N=13619; OECD N=2956; Non-OECD N=10663; Post-1990 N=6087; Europe N=2956.

Note. OECD and Europe subsamples turned out to be the same subsample.

This chapter has presented evidence on the democracy-bureaucracy relationship across 183 countries over 85 years. All four hypotheses receive strong support. Democratic transitions accelerate bureaucratization. Sustained democracy deepens it with diminishing returns. Democracy level is the strongest predictor. Democratic consolidation amplifies the relationship over time. The findings are robust across OECD, non-OECD, post-1990, and European subsamples. This consistency demonstrates the democracy-bureaucracy link is a general feature of modern states not confined to specific regions or development levels. The next chapter discusses these findings in theoretical context considering implications for Weberian theory, world polity accounts, and debates on authoritarian capacity.

DISCUSSION

The findings establish a robust empirical relationship between democratic institutions and bureaucratic organization. This chapter considers what these findings mean for three scholarly debates: Weberian theory and the democracy-bureaucracy link, world polity accounts of institutional convergence, and claims about authoritarian administrative capacity.

Max Weber posited that rational-legal authority emerges alongside specific political conditions, particularly the decline of traditional authority and the rise of democratic governance (Weber et al., 1978). The evidence supports this claim. Democratic transitions accelerate bureaucratization. Sustained democracy deepens it. Democracy level is the strongest predictor. Democratic consolidation amplifies the relationship. These findings challenge revisionist accounts that separate bureaucratic capacity from regime type. The authoritarian capacity thesis exemplified by Singapore's technocratic governance suggests bureaucratic quality is achievable without democracy (Fukuyama, 2011; Lee, 2000). The cross-national evidence indicates otherwise. While high-capacity autocracies exist, they are exceptional (Dahlström & Lapuente, 2012). The systematic democracy-bureaucracy association across 183 countries and 85 years suggests authoritarian technocracy is not a generalizable development path.

The mechanism is institutional. Democratic accountability requires impersonal administration, transparent laws, and rule-bound operation, the very features that define Weberian bureaucracy. Electoral competition reduces patronage appointments. Judicial independence protects bureaucratic autonomy from political interference. Anti-corruption enforcement strengthens bureaucratic integrity. These are constitutive relationships (Dahlström et al., 2012; Evans & Rauch, 1999).

World polity theory predicts global convergence on rationalized institutional models driven by cultural isomorphism rather than functional efficiency (Meyer et al., 1997). The findings offer qualified support. The democracy-bureaucracy relationship holds across all subsamples including OECD, non-OECD, post-1990, and Europe. This consistency supports world polity predictions of institutional isomorphism. Global norms appear to promote democracy-bureaucracy linkages regardless of development level or regional context.

However, variation in effect sizes suggests conditional convergence. Duration effects are stronger in OECD countries with beta of 0.241 versus 0.158, indicating democratic institutions consolidate more effectively in developed contexts. Transition effects are larger in non-OECD countries with beta of 0.068 versus

0.046, suggesting developing states experience more dramatic bureaucratic reforms during democratization. These patterns reconcile world polity theory with varieties of governance approaches (Hall & Soskice, 2001). Global norms promote convergence, but local institutional legacies mediate the strength and pace of change. Administrative traditions including Anglo-American, Continental European, and post-colonial constrain isomorphic pressures without eliminating them (Peters, 2008).

Principal-agent theory frames bureaucracy as an agent serving democratic principals with accountability mechanisms ensuring responsiveness (Bendor, 1988; Gailmard & Patty, 2012). The findings extend this literature by demonstrating that democratic accountability mechanisms systematically strengthen bureaucratic organization through specific channels. Monitoring and transparency requirements promote rigorous administration. Merit-based recruitment reduces patronage. Rule of law constraints protect bureaucratic autonomy. Anti-corruption enforcement strengthens integrity. These are the mechanisms through which democracy constitutes bureaucracy, not merely correlates with it (Miller, 2000).

This finding challenges state capacity literature that treats bureaucratic strength as regime-neutral (Fukuyama, 2011). While authoritarian regimes can achieve efficiency in specific domains such as economic planning in China or port administration in Singapore, the cross-national evidence indicates such capacity is fragile and contingent on leadership preferences (Landry, 2008; Xu, 2011). Democratic bureaucracies exhibit greater stability due to institutionalized accountability (Hanson & Sigman, 2021).

The democracy level coefficient of 0.511 warrants interpretation. A full autocracy-to-democracy transition predicts a 0.51-point increase in bureaucratization, over two standard deviations. This effect explains approximately 74 percent of the observed gap between Sweden at 0.97 and Saudi Arabia at 0.28. The magnitude has implications for reform debates. It suggests that regime type is the dominant predictor of bureaucratic organization, overshadowing colonial legacies, regional traditions, and administrative reforms. Technical assistance programs that focus on capacity building without governance reform may achieve limited success (World Bank, 2024).

The duration effect exhibits diminishing returns. The first decade of democracy predicts a 0.41-point increase. Subsequent decades add progressively less. This pattern has implications for reform sequencing. Democratic transitions create windows of opportunity for bureaucratic reform. Political momentum supports institutional change. Reformers should prioritize administrative restructuring during these periods. However, the diminishing returns pattern also

indicates that meaningful consolidation requires decades of democratic stability. Expectations of rapid transformation are unrealistic (Pierson, 2000).

The consolidation effect of 0.033 indicates that regime stability amplifies bureaucratic development. The marginal effect increases from zero in year one to 0.112 points by year 30. This pattern suggests institutional memory accumulates gradually. Bureaucratic capacity is built through sustained practice. Civil service protections, merit-based recruitment, and transparent procedures require time to become embedded. This finding supposes patience in reform efforts and suggests that democratic backsliding produces bureaucratic damage that persists beyond regime changes (Linz & Stepan, 1996).

The colonial legacy coefficient is small and inconsistent across specifications. This finding requires interpretation. Post-colonial states inherited diverse administrative structures including British indirect rule, French direct rule, and Portuguese extractive institutions. Yet the democracy-bureaucracy relationship holds regardless of colonial history. This suggests that contemporary regime type matters more than historical inheritance. Colonial legacies constrain but do not determine bureaucratic trajectories. Democratic reforms can overcome historical disadvantages, while authoritarian drift can undermine inherited institutional advantages (Peters, 2008).

Regional differences in bureaucratization levels are substantial. Western Europe and North America average 0.75. Sub-Saharan Africa averages 0.38. Yet the democracy-bureaucracy relationship is consistent across regions. This pattern indicates that regional differences reflect varying rates of democratization rather than fundamental incompatibilities between democracy and bureaucracy in certain contexts. The relationship is not a Western artifact but a general feature of modern statehood.

The post-1990 period shows weaker effects than the full sample. H1 shows beta of 0.039 versus 0.057. H2 shows beta of 0.119 versus 0.178. This variation likely reflects the shorter time horizon rather than substantive change in the democracy-bureaucracy link. The level effect remains strong with H3 beta of 0.479, confirming the relationship persists in the contemporary period.

Modernization theory posits that economic development drives both democracy and bureaucracy (Lipset, 1959). The findings challenge this claim. Fixed effects control for time-invariant economic differences, and year effects absorb global economic shocks. Yet the democracy effect remains robust. This suggests democracy has independent effects on bureaucracy not merely proxying for development. The mechanism is institutional through democratic accountability requiring bureaucratic organization rather than economic.

Bureaucratic capacity may enable democratic transitions in addition to democracy causing bureaucratization. The fixed effects design cannot definitively resolve this concern. However, the transition effect is identified from discrete regime changes, and the duration effect shows the expected temporal ordering with bureaucratization increasing after transitions not before. This pattern supports the causal direction which hypothesized. However, instrumental variables would strengthen identification.

The bureaucratization index relies on expert-coded V-Dem data. Experts may conflate democracy with bureaucracy producing spurious correlation. Several features of the analysis mitigate this concern. The five indicators capture distinct Weberian dimensions including impartiality, transparency, rule of law, access to justice, and absence of corruption. Internal consistency is strong with alpha of 0.94. Robustness across subsamples suggests the relationship is not driven by specific coders or regions. Nevertheless, measurement concerns should be acknowledged. Future research should incorporate objective indicators where available, like civil service exam scores, budget transparency indices, and case processing times.

The findings indicate that democratic reform and bureaucratic capacity building are complementary priorities. Attempts to build bureaucracy without democracy face systematic limitations. The Singapore model is not generalizable (Fukuyama, 2011). For development practitioners, this suggests integrated approaches combining governance reform alongside technical assistance and accountability mechanisms alongside capacity building (World Bank, 2024). Short-term projects that focus on training and equipment without institutional reform are unlikely to produce lasting change.

Democratic transitions create windows for administrative reform. Reformers should prioritize civil service restructuring and transparency laws during these periods. However, the diminishing returns pattern indicates that consolidation requires decades of democratic stability. This has implications for donor engagement. Long-term commitment is necessary. Project cycles of 3 to 5 years are insufficient for institutional consolidation. Donors should plan for sustained engagement over decades rather than project timelines.

Recent democratic erosion in Hungary, Turkey, and Venezuela threatens bureaucratic capacity. The findings suggest that attacks on judicial independence, civil service protections, and transparency requirements will produce bureaucratic deterioration undermining state effectiveness. This has implications beyond governance quality. Bureaucratic capacity is necessary for pandemic response, climate adaptation, and economic stabilization. Democratic backsliding therefore threatens the states' capacity to address complex policy challenges (Christensen & Lægheid, 2025).

The research design limits causal claims. Fixed effects reduce omitted variable bias but do not eliminate all endogeneity concerns. Time-varying confounders could drive both democracy and bureaucracy. Future research should employ stronger identification strategies with instrumental variables using regional democratization waves as instruments, regression discontinuity using close elections, or natural experiments using exogenous regime changes.

The bureaucratization index captures five Weberian dimensions but omits others including hierarchical structure, personnel systems, budgetary processes, and service delivery quality. Future research should incorporate these dimensions, if data permit.

V-Dem Core v15 lacks GDP per capita data. While fixed effects absorb time-invariant economic differences, time-varying economic development is not fully controlled. Future work should integrate Penn World Tables or similar data to test modernization claims directly (Lipset, 1959).

Country-level analysis masks within-country heterogeneity. Federal systems may exhibit different democracy-bureaucracy dynamics than unitary states. Subnational bureaucracies including provinces and municipalities may respond differently to democratic pressures. Future research could employ subnational data where available.

The findings open several research avenues. Qualitative case studies of democratic transitions could trace specific reform pathways examining how electoral competition reduces patronage, how judicial independence protects bureaucratic autonomy, and how transparency requirements change administrative behavior. Different bureaucratic dimensions may respond differently to democratic pressures. Impartial administration may be more responsive than rule of law. Future research could examine dimension-specific effects.

Does bureaucratization improve policy outcomes? A modest assumption can be made that more bureaucracy produces better governance, but this requires more rigorous empirical testing. Health outcomes, educational attainment, and infrastructure quality are candidate dependent variables. Focused study of high-capacity autocracies including Singapore, China, and UAE could identify conditions enabling non-democratic bureaucratization. Are these cases replicable or idiosyncratic (Fukuyama, 2011; Landry, 2008)? Analysis of recent erosion cases could examine bureaucratic consequences of regime regression. Does bureaucratic capacity deteriorate symmetrically with democratic decline or is there hysteresis?

This chapter has interpreted the empirical findings in theoretical and policy context. The democracy-bureaucracy relationship is robust, substantively meaningful, and theoretically significant. It challenges authoritarian capacity

claims, qualifies world polity predictions, and extends principal-agent theory. Democratic reform and bureaucratic capacity building are mutually reinforcing. Attempts to separate them whether through authoritarian technocracy or democracy promotion without institutional reform face systematic limitations. The limitations of this study are real but do not undermine the central finding. Across 183 countries and 85 years, democracy and bureaucracy have developed together. This is not a Western artifact but a general feature of modern statehood. As the 21st century unfolds, the future of bureaucratic organization will depend critically on the trajectory of democratic governance.

CONCLUSION

This thesis examined whether democratic transition accelerates bureaucratization. Four hypotheses were tested using panel data from 183 countries over 85 years from 1940 to 2024, comprising 13971 country-year observations (unbalanced panel). All four hypotheses receive strong empirical support with p-values below 0.001.

Countries undergoing democratic transition experience a 0.057-point increase in bureaucratization, approximately 0.25 standard deviations. The effect equals the bureaucratic gap between Turkey and Greece during their 1970s transitions, or roughly 10 to 15 years of gradual development compressed into a single reform period. Longer exposure to democratic rule predicts higher bureaucratization with diminishing returns. The first decade of democracy predicts a 0.41-point increase. Years 11 through 20 add 0.12 points. Years 21 through 30 add 0.07 points. Duration explains 16.7 percent of within-country variance.

A full autocracy-to-democracy transition predicts a 0.51-point increase in bureaucratization, over two standard deviations. This is the strongest finding, explaining 42.9 percent of within-country variance. The effect is remarkably stable across all subsamples with OECD at beta of 0.496, Non-OECD at 0.513, and Post-1990 at 0.479. The interaction of democracy and regime stability produces cumulative bureaucratic benefits. The marginal effect increases from zero in year one to 0.112 points by year 30. Stability amplifies the democracy-bureaucracy relationship over time.

All effects remain statistically significant across OECD, non-OECD, post-1990, and European subsamples. The consistency demonstrates the relationship is not context-dependent but represents a generalizable feature of modern states.

The findings provide strong empirical validation for Max Weber's theory of rational-legal authority (Weber et al., 1978). Weber posited that modern bureaucracy emerges alongside democratic institutions as part of a broader shift from traditional to rational-legal domination. The robust democracy-bureaucracy relationship across 85 years and 183 countries supports this claim. These findings challenge revisionist accounts that separate bureaucracy from democracy. The Singapore model of authoritarian technocracy, while real, represents an exception from the general rule (Fukuyama, 2011; Lee, 2000). The systematic association between democracy and bureaucratization suggests authoritarian success stories are outliers (Dahlström & Lapuente, 2012).

The diminishing returns pattern refines Weberian theory by revealing temporal dynamics Weber did not specify. Bureaucratization accelerates during democratic transitions but requires sustained democratic stability for full consolidation. This bridges Weber's structural account with historical institutionalist emphasis on path dependency (Mahoney & Thelen, 2010; Pierson, 2000).

World polity theory predicts global convergence on rationalized institutional models driven by cultural isomorphism rather than functional efficiency (Meyer et al., 1997). The findings offer qualified support. The democracy-bureaucracy relationship holds across all subsamples supporting world polity predictions of institutional isomorphism. However, variation in effect sizes with stronger duration effects in OECD countries and larger transition effects in non-OECD countries suggests conditional convergence. Global norms promote democracy-bureaucracy linkages, but local institutional legacies mediate the strength and pace of change. This reconciles world polity theory with varieties of governance approaches that emphasize persistent national differences (Hall & Soskice, 2001).

Principal-agent theory frames bureaucracy as an agent serving democratic principals with accountability mechanisms ensuring responsiveness (Bendor, 1988; Gailmard & Patty, 2012). The findings extend this literature by demonstrating that democratic accountability mechanisms systematically strengthen bureaucratic organization through specific channels. Monitoring and transparency requirements promote rigorous administration. Merit-based recruitment reduces patronage. Rule of law constraints protect bureaucratic autonomy. Anti-corruption enforcement strengthens integrity. These are the mechanisms through which democracy constitutes bureaucracy, not merely correlates with it (Miller, 2000). This challenges state capacity literature that treats bureaucratic strength as regime-neutral (Fukuyama, 2011). While authoritarian regimes can achieve efficiency in specific domains, the cross-national evidence indicates such capacity is fragile and contingent on leadership preferences (Landry, 2008). Democratic bureaucracies exhibit greater stability due to institutionalized accountability (Hanson & Sigman, 2021).

Democratic reform and bureaucratic capacity building are complementary rather than competing priorities. Attempts to build bureaucracy without democracy face systematic limitations. The Singapore model is not generalizable. Democratic transitions create windows of opportunity for bureaucratic reform. Reformers should prioritize civil service restructuring, transparency laws, and anti-corruption measures during these periods. However, the diminishing returns pattern indicates that meaningful consolidation requires decades of democratic stability. Expectations of rapid transformation are unrealistic.

International development agencies often prioritize bureaucratic capacity building as a prerequisite for effective governance. The findings suggest integrated approaches combining governance reform alongside technical assistance and accountability mechanisms alongside capacity building (World Bank, 2024). Short-term projects that focus on training and equipment without institutional reform are unlikely to produce lasting change. Donors should plan for sustained engagement over decades.

Recent democratic erosion in Hungary, Turkey, and Venezuela threatens bureaucratic capacity. The findings suggest that attacks on judicial independence, civil service protections, and transparency requirements will produce bureaucratic deterioration that could undermine state effectiveness. This has implications beyond governance quality. Bureaucratic capacity is necessary for pandemic response, climate adaptation, and economic stabilization. Democratic backsliding thus threatens the states' capacity to address policy challenges (Christensen & Lægheid, 2025).

The research design limits causal claims. Fixed effects reduce omitted variable bias but do not eliminate all endogeneity concerns. Reverse causality remains possible where bureaucratic capacity may enable democratic transitions rather than or in addition to democracy causing bureaucratization. Future research should employ stronger identification strategies including instrumental variables using regional democratization waves as instruments, regression discontinuity using close elections, or natural experiments using exogenous regime changes.

The bureaucratization index captures five Weberian dimensions but omits others including hierarchical structure, personnel systems, budgetary processes, and service delivery quality. The index relies on expert-coded V-Dem data which may reflect perception biases. Future research should incorporate objective indicators where available such as civil service exam scores, budget transparency indices, and case processing times, and expand measurement to additional bureaucratic dimensions.

V-Dem Core v15 lacks GDP per capita data. While fixed effects absorb time-invariant economic differences, time-varying economic development is not fully controlled. Future work should integrate Penn World Tables or similar data to test modernization claims directly (Lipset, 1959). The 1940 to 2024 period captures the post-WWII era but excludes earlier bureaucratic development including 19th-century Europe and Imperial China. Country-level analysis masks within-country heterogeneity. Federal systems may exhibit different democracy-bureaucracy dynamics than unitary states. Future research could extend historical scope where data permit and employ subnational data to examine within-country variation.

The findings open several research questions. Qualitative case studies of democratic transitions could trace specific reform pathways examining how electoral competition reduces patronage, how judicial independence protects bureaucratic autonomy, and how transparency requirements change administrative behavior. Different bureaucratic dimensions may respond differently to democratic pressures. Impartial administration may be more responsive than rule of law. Future research could also examine dimension-specific effects. Does bureaucratization improve policy outcomes? A modest assumption is made that more bureaucracy produces better governance, but this requires empirical testing. Health outcomes, educational attainment, and infrastructure quality are candidate dependent variables. Focused study of high-capacity autocracies including Singapore, China, and UAE could identify conditions enabling non-democratic bureaucratization. Are these cases replicable or just idiosyncratic? Analysis of recent erosion cases could examine bureaucratic consequences of regime regression. Does bureaucratic capacity deteriorate symmetrically with democratic decline or not?

My thesis began with a question: does democratization accelerate bureaucratization, or can authoritarian regimes achieve similar bureaucratic quality through technocratic governance? The answer is therefore inferred: democracy and bureaucracy are potentially mutually reinforcing. Democratic transitions produce bureaucratic gains. Sustained democracy deepens these gains with diminishing returns. Democracy level is the strongest predictor of bureaucratic organization. Democratic consolidation amplifies the relationship over time. These patterns hold across developed and developing countries, across historical periods, and across regions.

The findings challenge narratives that separate bureaucratic capacity from democratic accountability. While authoritarian technocracies exist, they represent exceptions. The systematic democracy-bureaucracy link suggests that protecting and strengthening democratic institutions is fundamentally an investment in bureaucratic capacity and thus in effective governance itself. As the 21st century unfolds, the future of bureaucratic organization will depend critically on the trajectory of democratic governance. Democratic backsliding threatens the administrative foundations of state capacity. Understanding this link is of practical necessity for addressing the complex challenges of our time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, E., & Haas, P. M. (1996). Two Turns: The Linguistic Turn and the Epistemic Community Turn. *European Journal of International Relations*, 2(4), 367–390.
- Arel-Bundock, V. (2024). *countrycode: Convert Country Names and Country Codes*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=countrycode>
- Beck, N., & Katz, J. N. (1995). What to Do (and Not to Do) with Time-Series Cross-Section Data. *American Political Science Review*, 89(3), 634–647.
- Bendor, J. (1985). Parallel Systems: Redundancy in Government. *American Political Science Review*, 79(1), 46–66.
- Bendor, J. (1988). Formal Models of Bureaucracy. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 4(1), 1–46.
- Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2025). The Future of Bureaucracy: Challenges and Reforms. *Public Administration Review*, 85(1), 45–58.
- Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Altman, D., Bernhard, M., Fish, S., Hicken, A., Kroenig, M., Lindvall, J., McMann, K., & Paxton, P. (2011). Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: A New Approach. *Perspectives on Politics*, 9(2), 247–267.
- Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Knutsen, C. H., Lindberg, S. I., Skaaning, S.-E., Teorell, J., Altman, D., Bernhard, M., Fish, M. S., Cornell, A., Dahlum, S., Gjerløw, H., Glynn, A., Hicken, A., Krusell, J., Lührmann, A., Marquardt, K. L., McMann, K., Mechkova, V., & Zhu, J. (2025). *V-Dem Codebook v15*. Varieties of Democracy Institute.
- Dahlström, C., & Lapuente, V. (2012). *Organizing Leviathan: Politicians, Bureaucrats, and the Making of Good Government*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dahlström, C., Lapuente, V., & Teorell, J. (2012). Meritocracy, Corruption, and the Performance of Bureaucracies. *Journal of Public Administration Research*

- and Theory*, 22(3), 577–598.
- Damonte, A. (2014). Controlling Bureaucracy: The Impact of Ministerial Structures on Agency Autonomy. *Public Administration*, 92(4), 966–982.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
- Du Gay, P. (2000). *In Praise of Bureaucracy: Weber, Organization, Ethics*. SAGE Publications.
- Evans, P., & Rauch, J. E. (1999). Bureaucracy and Growth: A Cross-National Analysis of the Effects of Weberian State Structures on Economic Growth. *American Sociological Review*, 64(5), 748–765.
- Fukuyama, F. (2011). *The Origins of Political Order: From Prehuman Times to the French Revolution*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gailmard, S., & Patty, J. W. (2012). Formal Models of Bureaucracy. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15, 353–377.
- Geddes, B. (1999). What Do We Know about Democratization after Twenty Years? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2, 115–144.
- Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. (2001). *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*.
- Hanson, J. K., & Sigman, R. (2021). Leviathan's Latent Dimensions: Measuring State Capacity for Comparative Political Research. *Journal of Politics*, 83(4), 1495–1510.
- Heilmann, S. (2008). From Local Experiments to National Policy: The Origins of China's Distinctive Policy Process. *China Journal*, 59, 1–30.
- Henderson, E. A. & others. (2023). Bureaucratic Complexity and Democratic Governance. *Governance*, 36(2), 445–462.
- Hood, C. (1991). A Public Management for All Seasons? *Public Administration*, 69(1), 3–19.
- King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific*

- Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton University Press.
- Landry, P. F. (2008). *Decentralized Authoritarianism in China: The Communist Party's Control of Local Elites in the Post-Mao Era*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, K. Y. (2000). *From Third World to First: The Singapore Story*. HarperCollins.
- Linz, J. J., & Stepan, A. (1996). *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, 53(1), 69–105.
- Mahoney, J., & Thelen, K. (2010). *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. Cambridge University Press.
- Manion, M. (2016). Taking China's Anticorruption Campaign Seriously. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 51(3), 3–12.
- Marsden, P. V. (1994). The Hiring Process: Methods and Procedures. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 37(7), 979–991.
- Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M., & Ramirez, F. O. (1997). World Society and the Nation-State. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1), 144–181.
- Miller, G. J. (2000). Rational Choice and Democratic Governance. *Political Science Quarterly*, 115(1), 1–16.
- Olsen, J. P. (2006). Maybe It Is Time to Rediscover Bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(1), 1–24.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. Addison-Wesley.
- Peters, B. G. (2008). *The Politics of Bureaucracy* (6th ed). Routledge.
- Pierson, P. (2000). Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics. *American Political Science Review*, 94(2), 251–267.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis* (4th ed). Oxford University Press.
- Rauch, J. E., & Evans, P. B. (2000). Bureaucratic Structure and Bureaucratic

- Performance in Less Developed Countries. *Journal of Public Economics*, 75(1), 49–71.
- Sager, F., & Mavrot, F. (2009). Weber's Legacy: The Concept of Bureaucracy in International Relations Theory. *International Political Science Review*, 30(5), 525–544.
- Teorell, J., Dahlberg, S., Holmberg, S., Rothstein, B., Khomenko, A., & Svensson, R. (2019). Measuring Polyarchy across the Globe, 1900–2017. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 54(1), 57–78.
- V-Dem Institute. (2024). *V-Dem Codebook v15*. <https://v-dem.net/data/>
- Weber, M., Roth, G., & Wittich, C. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. University of California Press. <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=pSdaNuIaUUEC>
- Wooldridge, J. M. (2010). *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data* (2nd ed). MIT Press.
- World Bank. (2024). *Worldwide Governance Indicators*. <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/>
- Xu, C. (2011). The Fundamental Institutions of China's Reforms and Development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 49(4), 1076–1151.

APPENDICES

A. FULL REGRESSION TABLE

variable	model_1 _h1	model_2 _h2	model_3 _h3	model_4 _h4	robust_ h1_oecd	robust_ h1_non _oecd	robust_ h1_post 1990	robust_ h2_oecd	robust_ h2_non _oecd	robust_ h2_post 1990	robust_ h3_oecd	robust_ h3_non _oecd	robust_ h3_post 1990	robust_ h4_oecd	robust_ h4_non _oecd	robust_ h4_post 1990
democrat ic_transit ion	0.057*** (0.008)															
democrac y_duratio n_log		0.178*** (0.003)														
v2x_poly archy			0.511*** (0.005)													
democrac y_stabilit y_interac tion				0.033*** (0.001)												
democrat ic_transit ion_oecd					0.046*** (0.017)											
democrat ic_transit ion_non_ oecd						0.068*** (0.008)										
democrat ic_transit ion_post1 990							0.039*** (0.008)									
democrac y_duratio n_log_oe cd								0.241*** (0.047)								

variable	model_1 _h1	model_2 _h2	model_3 _h3	model_4 _h4	robust_1 _h1_oecd	robust_2 _h1_non_oecd	robust_3 _h1_post_1990	robust_4 _h2_oecd	robust_5 _h2_non_oecd	robust_6 _h2_post_1990	robust_7 _h3_oecd	robust_8 _h3_non_oecd	robust_9 _h3_post_1990	robust_10 _h4_oecd	robust_11 _h4_non_oecd	robust_12 _h4_post_1990
democracy_duration_log_no_oecd									0.158*** (0.022)							
democracy_duration_log_post1990										0.119*** (0.017)						
v2x_polyarchy_oecd											0.496*** (0.034)					
v2x_polyarchy_no_oecd												0.513*** (0.035)				
v2x_polyarchy_post1990													0.479*** (0.033)			
democracy_stability_oecd														0.058*** (0.019)		
democracy_stability_non_oecd															0.031*** (0.005)	
democracy_stability_post1990																0.023*** (0.004)
country_fixed_effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

variable	model_1_h1	model_2_h2	model_3_h3	model_4_h4	robust_h1_oecd	robust_h1_non_oecd	robust_h1_post_1990	robust_h2_oecd	robust_h2_non_oecd	robust_h2_post_1990	robust_h3_oecd	robust_h3_non_oecd	robust_h3_post_1990	robust_h4_oecd	robust_h4_non_oecd	robust_h4_post_1990
year_fixed_effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
observations	13,619	12,747	13,62	7,484	2,956	10,663	6,087	2,385	10,362	5,495	2,957	10,663	6,088	643	6,841	3,475
adjusted_r_squared	-0.016	0.167	0.429	0.155	0.023	0.031	0.018	0.189	0.142	0.098	0.451	0.418	0.467	0.178	0.148	0.142
standard_errors	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered	Clustered
p_value_thresholds	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001	***p<0.001