WHEN DO PRESIDENTS APPOINT POLICY EXPERTS TO SOCIAL AGENCIES?  
A STUDY OF BRAZIL’S NATIONAL INDIAN FOUNDATION, 1967-2018

CAMILA SCHEIDEgger FARIAS
Rio de Janeiro - 2018
When do presidents appoint policy experts to social agencies?

Dissertação para obtenção do grau de mestre apresentada à Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública e de Empresas

Área de Concentração: Instituições, Políticas e Governo

Orientador: Octavio Amorim Neto

Rio de Janeiro
2018
Farias, Camila Scheidegger


84 f.

Dissertação (mestrado) - Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública e de Empresas, Centro de Formação Acadêmica e Pesquisa.

Orientador: Octavio Amorim Neto.

Inclui bibliografia.


CDD – 351
CAMILA SCHEIDEgger FARIAS

"WHEN DO PRESIDENTS APPOINT POLICY EXPERTS TO SOCIAL AGENCIES? A STUDY OF BRAZIL'S NATIONAL INDIAN FOUNDATION, 1967-2018".

Dissertação apresentado(a) ao Curso de Mestrado em Administração do(a) Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública e de Empresas para obtenção do grau de Mestre(a) em Administração.

Data da defesa: 05/12/2018

ASSINATURA DOS MEMBROS DA BANCA EXAMINADORA

OCTAVIO AMORIM NETO
Orientador(a)

SÉRGIO RODRIGO MARCHIORI PRAÇA
Membro Interno

MANUEL LEÔNARDO WANDERLEY DUARTE SANTOS
Membro Externo
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my advisor, Professor Octavio Amorim Neto who I profoundly admire for his academic legacy, as well as for being a great mentor. I will always be grateful for the support and all the teachings over this process.

I thank CPNq and EBAPE, for their financial support.

To EBAPE’s staff for their helping hand and to EBAPE’s professors, who continue to inspire me.

To the kind employees at the Museu do Índio in Rio who were so open to receive me.

To my professors and colleagues at UFPE who motivated me to pursue an academic career, especially to Professors Carla Pasa Gómez, Mariana Falcão and Claudinetete Santos.

To my friends from EBAPE for true cooperation and friendship in good and hard times.

To all my friends from Recife and Rio who have stayed with me throughout this process. To Débora and Barbara, whose presence in Rio was a most welcomed and happy surprise. To Alessandra and Maggy, whose support was essential to me. To Naiara for being there for me always as a great friend no matter where we go.

To my aunts, uncles, and cousins who continue to provide me with a welcoming and loving home to return to.

To my brother Caio whom I love dearly. To my parents, who are the inspiration behind everything I do. Thank you for being the most incredible role models of empathy, hard work, and loyalty. Your support in all the journeys I embark on can never be thanked enough.

To my grandmothers, Inalda and Maria (in memoriam), brave women who are always with me in my heart.
RESUMO

Esta dissertação de mestrado aborda os fatores que levam à indicação de especialistas para órgãos sociais, através do estudo longitudinal da Fundação Nacional do Índio (doravante Funai), a organização pública brasileira para assuntos indígenas. Usando os princípios da Análise Comparativa Qualitativa, eu testo se as condições teorizadas para terem contribuído para a indicação de especialistas da área para a presidência da Funai nos 51 anos de existência (1967-2018) são fatores suficientes ou necessários. São eles: um regime democrático, a ideologia do chefe do executivo, a ausência de influência militar sobre esse, a ausência de crises econômicas e a pressão dos movimentos sociais. Com relação aos achados da análise configuracional, a democracia, os presidentes não de direita e a ausência de crises econômicas foram fatores que quando combinados foram suficientes para a indicação de especialistas para a Funai ao longo do tempo. No entanto, os dois primeiros itens foram as condições mais fortes. A democracia também é uma condição necessária para a nomeação de especialistas para a Funai. Além disso, seguindo a hipótese de causalidade assimétrica, as mesmas condições que levaram à indicação de especialistas não puderam ser extrapoladas para a indicação de não especialistas. A combinação de não-democracia, influência militar e presidentes de direita foi considerada suficiente para a indicação de não-especialistas. Os resultados sugerem durante o regime militar o Executivo tendia a fazer indicações dentro de suas prerrogativas – isto é, selecionar oficiais ou engenheiros alinhados com o paradigma desenvolvimentista da época. Além disso, os resultados deste estudo estão de acordo com as conclusões de Dargent (2014), que mostram que um desequilíbrio na constelação de partes interessadas facilita a interferência política nas instituições públicas. Além disso, os resultados sugerem que as diferenças ideológicas entre os militares e indigenistas excluíram estes últimos de seus quadros durante o regime militar.

Palavras-chave: Análise configuracional, QCA, fsQCA, Análise Comparativa Qualitativa, Funai, Indigenismo, Burocracia Brasileira, Indicações Políticas, Cargos de Confiança
ABSTRACT

This MSc thesis intends to address the factors that lead to the appointment of experts to social agencies, through the longitudinal study of the National Indian Foundation (henceforth Funai), the Brazilian national organization for indigenous affairs. Using the tenets of Qualitative Comparative Analysis, I test if the conditions theorized to have contributed to the appointment of policy experts as presidents across its 51 years of existence (1967-2018) are sufficient or necessary. These are: a democratic regime, the ideology of the incumbent, the absence of military influence over the incumbent, the absence of economic crises, and pressure from social movements. Regarding the findings of the configurational analysis, democracy, non-rightist incumbents and the absence of economic crises combined were sufficient factors for the appointment of policy experts to Funai over time. Moreover, the former two were the strongest sufficient conditions to expertise. Democracy is a necessary condition for the appointment of experts to Funai. Furthermore, following the assumption of asymmetric causation, the same conditions that led to the appointment of experts, could not be extrapolated to the appointment of non-experts. As for non-expertise the combination of non-democracy, military influence, and right-wing incumbents was deemed sufficient. The results suggest that during the military regime the Executive tended to opt for appointees within their prerogatives – that is, selecting officers or engineers aligned with the developmental paradigm of the time. Also, the results of this study are in line with Dargent’s (2014) findings that show that an unbalance in the constellation of stakeholders facilitates political meddling in public agencies. Furthermore, results suggest that ideological differences between the military and indigenists have excluded the latter from their cadres during the military regime.

Keywords: Configurational analysis, QCA, fsQCA, Qualitative Comparative Analysis, Funai, Indigenous Affairs, Brazilian bureaucracy, Political Appointments.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Why do presidents delegate authority to experts rather than appointing partisans, their own or coalition’s agents? Systematic research on these patterns of appointment of high-level management in Brazil and Latin America is flourishing since the 1990s (e.g., Geddes, 1994; Centeno; Silva, 1998; Amorim Neto, 2006; Praça, Freitas, and Hoeper, 2011; Dargent, 2014; Bersch, Praça and Taylor, 2017, 2017a; Kaplan, 2017).

The attributes of those who manage public agencies carry implications to the bureaucratic capacity of delivering public goods (BERSCH; PRAÇA; TAYLOR, 2017; MARENCO, 2017), its autonomy towards other agents and institutions (DARGENT, 2014; MELO; PEREIRA, 2013; SPECK, 2011) and governmental performance (LEWIS, 2007; RAUCH; EVANS, 2000). Nevertheless, most research focuses on the profile of those in economic state agencies (e.g., Rauch; Evans, 2000; Kaplan, 2017), whereas there’s a shortage of studies that aim to verify the combination of factors which drive the selection of experts – rather than political trustees – in social agencies.

This is puzzling since public agencies of the social sector are conceived as vulnerable with regard to political intrusion according to academia. For instance, Lopez, Bugarin and Bugarin’s (2014) findings suggest that compared to economic policy ministries, social policy ministries as the Health Ministry have a higher turnover of high-level commissioned positions.

Furthermore, Lopez and Praça (2015) argue that areas including social policies and infrastructure are among the most targeted for political meddling. The discretionary control of resources like land, make these target policy areas to political agents.

Thus, this MSc thesis intends to address the gap on the factors that lead to the appointment of experts to social agencies, especially those in charge of minorities’ policies, through the case study of the National Indian Foundation (henceforth Funai), the Brazilian national organization for indigenous affairs. Moreover, it aims to contribute to the body of work on the organization, which is far overlooked by the literature on political appointees. Studies of the agency remain anecdotal and scarce from public administration’s literature. So, the second goal of this thesis is to contribute to systematic and empirical analyses of Funai. Finally, it also aims to cover the shortage of longitudinal studies of political appointments and across different regimes (democratic vs. authoritarian).
Funai has long been driven by political interests, with many agents in its surrounding disputing posts over its history. Due to internal disputes or disagreements with the Executive, over its 51 years, Funai has had 41 presidents (ISA, n.d). The organization also is known for having a lower level of institutionalization, and formalization of its activities, factors which according to the bureaucratic autonomy and delegation literature is linked to the vulnerability to external meddling (BORGES; COELHO, 2015, DARGENT, 2014).

Funai’s activities are mostly concentrated around a specific public: Indigenous Peoples, only 0.5% of the Brazilian population (IBGE, 2010). Currently, besides the indigenous land demarcation process, Funai’s other services include the protection of isolated or recent contacted peoples, actions to promote overall welfare of indigenous groups (FUNAI, 2016), as well as advocating for their cultural, citizenship, and social rights. However, since colonial times, the history of indigenous affairs in Brazil is marked by great contradictions between the state and indigenous populations. It alternates phases of direct conflict and exploitation of labor and resources, to the tutelage of the state and paternalistic policies.

Thus, Funai being a pro-social agency targeted for a marginalized minority has raised strong (either positive or negative) positions from the parliament, the military and the Executive, and, consequently, went through different reforms and institutional phases.

Despite this institutional vulnerability, for periods of time it has been headed by indigenists (e.g., the administrations of anthropologists Márcio Meira, Mar/07–Apr/12 and Marta Maria Azevedo, Jun/12–Apr/13), that is, personnel with considerable experience or training in indigenous affairs, rather than pure political agents.

The president of Funai is a center piece in the Brazilian official indigenous affairs. During the trajectory of the organization, whenever indigenous groups faced critical land disputes or other important claims, indigenous leaders demand responses to the President of Funai himself. The power to alleviate (or aggravate) tension, between activists, governmental agents, indigenous groups, landowners and others involved is one of the critical attributes of the position. Also, the president as the main leader of the institution is also responsible for deploying appropriate to the well-being of indigenous groups, Funai’s primary objective. Moreover, disastrous policies have

---

1 The poverty gap between indigenous and non-indigenous people has increased by an alarming 99 percent in Brazil in only a decade (from the early 2000’s to the late 2000’s) according to the World Bank (2015).
led to the killings of indigenous as well as non-indigenous people over the years and, thus the importance of the position.

To address this issue, here I analyze the necessary and sufficient conditions that led to the appointment of experts using the fuzzy set variant of the Qualitative Comparative Method (QCA) proposed by Charles Ragin in 1987. The method is deemed appropriate to research like the present that has a limited number of observations – Funai since its creation has had only 41 presidents, 4 of these stayed in office for less than 100 days, hence not included in the analysis.

Also, it fits the objective of this present study, which is to find multiple paths, to presidential delegation to experts in Funai. The QCA analysis is complemented by a correlational assessment to verify the different findings which the methods produce.

Drawing from the political appointment literature and adapting for the contextual conditions, I hypothesize that among other factors that contributes to the appointment by the chief executive and his allies of an expert to Funai’s presidency are: having a democratic regime, the pressure from social movements, the military influence over the chief executive, the ideology of the president and experiencing a period economic crisis.

Results from the empirical study using biographical data from 36 presidents appointed to Funai from Dec/1967 (its creation) to Apr/2018 and contextual factors based on the literature show that regime and ideology plays a significant part of the explanation. First, a democratic regime is both a necessary and a sufficient (INUS condition) condition for appointing experts to high-level posts. Furthermore, ideology, explicitly having a non-rightist incumbent in office has shown to be an INUS condition for the appointment of experts.

These results dialogue with the work of Dargent (2014) that argues that the political costs of delegating to non-experts increases whenever incumbents can be held more accountable for the policy choices involved. This is the case of non-rightist presidents with social agencies that are more tied to a social agenda compared to rightist incumbents. Also, democratic presidents are more accountable to voters, societal and political agents than non-democratic regimes, and thus face greater incentives to appoint experts as well, rather than only cronies. However, I do not argue here that the appointments to high-level bureaucracy are free from partisan criteria, but that expertise is also a part of the equation. As for the role of societal pressure, while high levels of social mobilization by itself cannot be considered a sufficient condition for delegation to experts,
it was found that presidents with close ties with the military face greater pressure to appoint non-experts to pursue their agenda.

In this MSc thesis, first, I review the academic debate on state building, bureaucratic professionalization, and political appointment patterns, to capture where the theoretical discussion currently stands on the matter. Then, following the tenets of Qualitative Comparative Analysis, I address the contextual conditions seeking an evaluation based on case-knowledge. Hence, I proceed to the introduction of the object of my analysis: the National Indian Foundation (Funai), beginning by its predecessor, the Indian Protection Service (SPI), and then I address the political and managerial background of Funai’s administration. In the following sections, I discuss the conditions theorized to have contributed to the appointment of policy experts as presidents across its 51 years of existence (1967-2018): a democratic regime, the ideology of the incumbent, the absence of military influence over the incumbent, the absence of economic crises, and pressure from social movements. Then, I debate the methodological procedures of the empirical analyses using the Qualitative Comparative Method (QCA).

Finally, in the next section, I discuss the findings of the configurational analysis: democracy, the absence of economic crisis and non-rightist incumbents combined were sufficient factors for the appointment of policy experts to Funai across its history. Also, the former two seem the strongest conditions to expertise. Democracy is a necessary condition for the appointment of experts to Funai. Furthermore, following the assumption of asymmetric causation, the same conditions that led to the appointment of experts, could not be extrapolated to the appointment of non-experts. Regarding non-experts, the combination of non-democracy, military influence, and right-wing incumbents was presented as sufficient. Thus, here the supported conditions are the ones in hypothesis 2 (absence of military influence), hypothesis 3 (democratic regime) and 4 (non-rightist presidents). In the final section, I proceed to the conclusion, final remarks, and limitations.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. State building and bureaucratic professionalization in Brazil

Over the last couple of decades, scholarly work has emphasized the importance of promoting a professional bureaucratic environment to secure state resources from short-term
electoral or coalition goals (GEDDES, 1994). Moreover, the establishment of a professional cadre is now regarded as one of the essential pillars of state capacity (MARENCO, 2017; CENTENO et al., 2017; BERSCH; PRAÇA; TAYLOR, 2017, 2017a). Moreover, meritocracy has been associated with state development and bureaucratic performance (EVANS; RAUCH, 1999, RAUCH; EVANS, 2000), and esprit de corps, i.e., stronger career specialization, longevity, and wages, to lower levels of corruption (BERSCH; PRAÇA; TAYLOR, 2017).

State building literature has long criticized Brazil’s colonial inheritance of patronage and patrimonialism (e.g., Grindle, 2012; Faoro, 1958; Schwartzman, 1982). Notwithstanding, Brazilian bureaucracy is currently considered as one of the most professionalized among Latin America’s administrative apparatus (BID, 2007; ZUVANIC; IACOVIELLO, 2010; MARENCO, 2017). Furthermore, results from a study by Lopez, Bugarin e Bugarin (2014) suggest that there’s a growing occupation of career professionals in the national level force’s appointments.

It is noteworthy that the professionalization of the bureaucracy in Brazil was not a homogenous process as sometimes suggested in the literature. Geddes (1994) argues that universal reforms did not receive sufficient support in Congress since the ‘30s, the start of Brazilian modern state building for many. Thus, different presidents focused on the creation of agencies apart from the conventional bureaucratic structure. Usually development-centered, they were isolated politically and accountable to the Executive (GEDDES, 1994).

Most notably, are the cases of Getúlio Vargas’ second administration (1951-1954), and Kubitschek’s government (1956-1961). Despite being great vocals of Brazilian state modernization, they did not manage to forego the use of appointments as political tools. This meddling was especially true in agencies deemed secondary for the national developmental agenda - priority number one at the time (LOUREIRO; OLIVIERI; MARTES, 2010; GEDDES, 1994).

Referred by Geddes as a “compartmentalizing strategy” of the bureaucracy, it reflected the advancement of a professional cadre in priority areas, and the strengthening or creation of selected institutions, e.g., the Brazilian National Development Bank (BNDE), Petrobras, the Brazilian state oil company, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Simultaneously, others considered less fundamental remained with a low level of institutionalization, targets of patronage and political influence over agency appointments (BERSCH; PRAÇA; TAYLOR, 2017, 2017a; CENTENO; SILVA, 1998; FERNANDES et al., 2017; GEDDES, 1994). A similar
strategy was also observed in Collor’s administration (Mar/1990–Dec/1992), and in other democratic administrations in Argentina, Peru, Colombia, Chile and Venezuela from Geddes’ study.

This difference of resources and support across Brazilian Federal agencies rendered a phenomenon referred by scholars as “islands of excellence” in the Brazilian state: strong, insulated agencies that are considered the gold standard of state efficiency and performance in Brazil (BERSCH; PRAÇA; TAYLOR, 2017, 2017a).

State capacity has remained uneven across different agencies. For instance, results from a study of Brazilian Federal agencies by Bersch, Praça, and Taylor (2017a) suggest that sectors including economic policy, legal and foreign relations perform better in agency capacity (i.e., career strength, stability, and specialization) and autonomy from politics (i.e., partnership of staff) than health, security and social agencies, for instance. According to the study, Funai’s overall capacity score is even lower than the average of the health, social security and social public organizations.

As for the military regime in Brazil (1964-1985), according to Fernandes et al. (2017), during the period, state capabilities were also strengthened asymmetrically across agencies. The authors argue that the difference is that during the military regime, administrations were even more focused on economic development and less on building state welfare than Vargas and Kubitschek’s (GEDDES, 1994).

Moreover, military rulers defended the superiority of technical over political rule in government. Although, in practice, this meant that Brazilian bureaucracy became insulated from public control due to the authoritarianism of the regime, while private interests were negotiated by certain civil society groups (i.e., entrepreneurs, military and the middle class) directly with the government (ABRUCIO; LOUREIRO, 2018; LOUREIRO; OLIVIERI; MARTES, 2010; ABRUCIO; PEDROTI; PÓ, 2010).

After the end of the military regime, state capacity regarding meritocracy and professionalization of the bureaucracy went through significant changes culminating in the 1988 post-democratization Constitution (CAVALCANTE; LOTTA; OLIVEIRA, 2018).

Among the intentions of this new Constitution was the promotion of a decentralized, more transparent and open to participation government. Governance and shared participation advanced with the Constitution and fomented the inclusion of new agents in legitimized and
official channels of Brazil’s administration. Moreover, the 88 Constitution implemented the universal obligation of civil service exams for admission to public service while providing more stability to public agents, to protect bureaucracy from the authoritarian ruling, an imminent threat at the time.

However, some discretionary power was kept to appointments from the Executive, through cabinet formation, and NES\(^2\) (Special Nature) and DAS (Senior Management and Advising)\(^3\) positions. The latter two allow—within the percentage legally tolerated\(^4\)—nominees from outside the bureaucratic corps in Brazilian federal agencies (PRAÇA; FREITAS; HOEPERS, 2011; D’ARAUJO, 2007, 2009).

Political scientists have been emphasizing the important incentives that the Executive has to make government formation and coalition agreements with the Legislature in a fragmented system like the Brazilian multiparty presidentialism (AMORIM NETO, 2018; AMES; POWER, 2007; FIGUEIREDO; LIMONGI, 1999). According to coalition management studies, due to the lack of substantial congressional support, politicians engage in the exchange of state resources across parties (PRAÇA; FREITAS; HOEPERS, 2011). For Pereira and Bertholini (2018, p. 316), Brazilian “presidents have, with a high degree of discretion, a set of “exchange goods” that are part of the portfolio or “toolbox” of government management.” These include cabinet positions, the division of political appointments in public agencies, as well as budgetary allocation (LOPEZ, 2015; PEREIRA et al., 2015; MELO; PEREIRA; WERNECK, 2010).

Nevertheless, the decision regarding delegation (i.e., relegation appointments to other parties in favor of majority coalitions or to influence the policy-making process by appointing Executive’s trustees) and who is appointed carry significant reputational and electoral costs to the incumbent. So, at the intersection of public administration and political science, a stream of research is dedicated to finding the determinants of presidential political appointments, as discussed in the next section.

### 2.2. Political appointments patterns

---

\(^{2}\) *Cargo de Natureza Especial* in Portuguese.

\(^{3}\) *Grupo de Cargos de Direcção e Assessoramento Superiores* in Portuguese.

\(^{4}\) The 9021 presidential decree from 2017 establishes that 60% of the higher level DAS positions, that is DAS 5 and 6, and 50% of DAS positions from level 1 to 4, have to be occupied by career bureaucrats.
Political control over the bureaucracy can either be associated with clientelism and patronage or be seen as an essential managerial tool to either bring efficiency or to preserve the interests of voters (ABERBACH; ROCKMAN 1988; GALLO; LEWIS, 2011, LOPEZ, 2015). While scholarly opinion on political appointments to high-level bureaucracy is mixed, there’s a vast literature that focuses on understanding the motivations behind different patterns of appointments.

Geddes (1994) in her classical work *Politician's Dilemma: Building State Capacity in Latin America* suggests that incumbents face a dilemma which can be understood as the “conflict between their own need for immediate political survival and longer-run collective interests in economic performance and regime stability (p.18).” For Geddes (1994) officeholders with stability and strength – that is, without the threat of major rivals from their party, or party/coalition indiscipline – can opt to hire experts and invest in agencies’ competency.

Research on technocrats has highlighted that experts in Latin America enjoy some autonomy, being capable of acting independently from politicians and other interest groups (GEDDES, 1994; DARGENT, 2014). Different from previous instrumentalist theories that overemphasize the source of experts’ influence in Latin America to other agents including politicians, and interest groups, Dargent (2014) stresses the role of expertise itself. Knowledge itself is claimed to be a great source of autonomy and influence to key policy-making decisions over time, acting as a self-reinforcing mechanism. However, Dargent’s theory acknowledges that contextual factors change over historical processes, reshaping organizations’ staffing and influence.

Dargent (2014) claims that the decision to interfere or not in an agency’s policies and cadre depends on how much politicians can be held accountable for the consequence of policy errors by society. The author argues that politicians ponder upon questions of the type: What would be the magnitude of the potential damage? Would the damage be readily visible and linked to the incumbent? What would be the share of the affected population? Would there be mobilized or influential social classes among the affected?

Also, for the author, expert autonomy implies having a plural and balanced constellation of stakeholders (is the force of interest groups to influence the decision-making process well distributed?). Dargent (2014) states that “if there is only one prominent actor with interests in a policy sector, this actor has significant power to block technical policies affecting its interests,
but a balanced arrangement provides experts with more space to make their own choices (p. 7).” However, the competition of political parties alone, cannot account for the professionalization of the bureaucracy: socioeconomic and international agents (e.g., politicians, financial players, business associations, private companies) are also part of the explanation (DARGENT, 2014, p. 50).

Other macro factors that are linked to a different pattern of appointments in the literature are an expert consensus (DARGENT, 2014) – i.e., how much do experts agree on the course of a sector/area? – political competition (GEDDES, 1994, MELO; PEREIRA; WERNECK, 2010, MELO; PEREIRA, 2013), and a country’s economic situation (ALEXIDOU; GUNAYDIN, 2018; KAPLAN, 2017).

Another strand of the literature argues that institutional factors play a significant part in political meddling. The literature on bureaucratic autonomy and delegation suggests that the more professionalized and formalized is the bureaucracy, the lower the level of political meddling (MELO; PEREIRA; WERNECK, 2010, DARGENT, 2014; BORGES; COELHO, 2015).

Also among the factors theorized to play a part in the choice between an expertise or a political-based strategy for filling public agencies’ high-level posts are the nature of the agency and its policies, i.e., the level of policy complexity (how hard is it for the public/politicians to understand the implications behind the policy? (DARGENT, 2014), and the nature of the agency and the resources dealt (DARGENT, 2014; LOPEZ; PRAÇA, 2015; PRAÇA; LOPEZ, 2018).

However, these theories focus heavily on explaining economic agencies and little is said over political appointments to social agencies. D’Araujo and Petek (2018), recently have contributed to fill this academic gap in Brazil, by studying the attributes of high-level bureaucrat positions in the federal sector. More specifically they analyze DAS levels 5 and 6, Natureza Especial, or NES positions of two social ministries (Ministries of Health and Education) and compare it to the profile of two economic ministries (Ministries of Planning and Finance) from 1995 until 2012.

Among their findings is that appointees in high-level bureaucratic positions in the two social ministries have originated mainly from state and municipalities’ bureaucracy, compared to two other economic ministries who draw more civil servants from the federal level itself. Thus, regional politics seems to have a significant influence on the area, similarly to what was found by Praça and Lopez (2018).
Also, the authors find that the high-level appointments of the two social ministries have occupants with higher levels of education and partisanship (civil servants affiliated to parties) than the economic agencies. The authors theorize that this indicates that while the social sector is more educated, the public economic sector seems more insulated, with lower levels of “outsiders.”

Regarding the differences across the three administrations of the period, their results suggest that former President Lula had the highest level of union affiliates in high-level bureaucracy appointments. The pattern was discontinued in Dilma Rousseff’s administration, despite also being from the same worker’s party (PT). The authors speculate that Lula paid back the political capital earned in his trajectory as a union leader. Hence, D’Araujo and Petek’s (2018) findings suggest that not only agencies from different areas diverge in the pattern of appointments, but they are also conditional on the president’s agenda.

Abers and Oliveira (2015) argue that in the environmental policy sector, NGOs and the social movement, which are important stakeholders of the Environmental Ministry in Brazil, were relevant sources of “technical experts” to their cadres. Nonetheless, the authors argue that after a wave of professionalization during the PT government, the capacity of the agency was strengthened by hiring and training more civil servants through the traditional meritocratic process, who now occupy these commissioning slots as well.

Also on the appointment patterns of social agencies, based on interviews with 45 civil servants, political appointees, and politicians from 2012–2015, Praça and Lopez (2018) find that in the health, social security, and social policy sector, the main criteria for political appointments are party membership and regional politics. However, they argue that expertise in social policy agencies is also an important factor, especially in the education area (p. 367). Furthermore, using data from Freire et al. (2015) they show that 81% of political appointees (DAS 1 to 5) found that technical skills is a very important or important criterion for selecting public agents, ranking higher than the other criteria assessed (i.e., trust (77%); professional experience (73%) informal networks (55%); political affinity (19%)).

In line with the work of D’Araujo and Petek (2018) and Praça and Lopez (2018), a recent strand of the literature focuses more on the nuance that lies in between the polarization seen in public administration, rather than the dichotomy of appointing politicians versus bureaucrats. According to Bonis and Pacheco (2010), this duality is insufficient for the understanding of the
reality of contemporary public leadership. For the authors, another kind of agents is missing from the political appointment literature: a public leader, that is, an outsider from the bureaucratic agency who is a non-partisan (BONIS; PACHECO, 2010).

As stated by the authors, these public leaders that are already observed in countries including the United Kingdom, Canada and Chile operate in a more entrepreneurial logic, being possibly more strategic than bureaucrats. Incentives associated with their career would push a more risky and innovative behavior to stay in office or obtain recognition. Also, they would display great effort and motivation due to the uncertainty of their career. Another advantage listed by the authors is that they might belong to different networks, including links with NGOs, companies, or other governmental institutions.

For Aberbach and Rockman (1988), “the problem of government, in our view, the public interest is not to have one of these values (politics and management) dominate the other, but to create a dialogue or synthesis between the two (p. 608).” Furthermore, recent studies suggest that more often than not, Brazilian bureaucracy overall balances these two criteria for appointments (PRAÇA; FREITAS; HOEPERS, 2011; PRAÇA; LOPEZ, 2018).

Praça and Lopez (2018) summarize the criteria for political appointments debated in the literature in four categories: (1) informal networks, (2) party membership, (3) regional politics, and (4) competence and expertise. The scholars argue that Brazilian politicians draw both from the loyalist criteria (internal networks, party membership, and regional politics) as well as competence when selecting the candidates for political appointments.

Similarly, Lewis (2007) argues that it is important to determine the characteristics of the agent occupying the position (e.g., experience, and education levels). In his 2007 study, Lewis compares the background characteristics of careerists and appointees and its impact on federal program performance using data from George W. Bush Administration. Results from the study suggest that the management environment (e.g., budget size of the bureau and number of governmental programs managed) and the difference in characteristics from careerists and appointees (e.g., level of education, being a generalists vs. a specialists and experience in top bureaucratic positions) accounts for the difference in program performance.

Lewis’s finding aligns with the academic stream that advocates on the importance of having skilled workers in government to make better-informed decisions while keeping more autonomous institutions.
Here I argue that even if political and technical criteria are not necessarily contradicting, the latter has become far overlooked across the history of agencies like Funai. The weak institutional capacity and autonomy make it easier for the Executive to allocate their trustees in high bureaucratic positions to serve as agents or delegate this task to allies.

Additionally, recent Brazilian corruption scandals involving important names in politics, private and state companies unveiled by the Lava-Jato operation has motivated a congressional debate on the inclusion of technical criteria standards (the constitutional amendment project PEC 21/2017) (SENADO, 2017). Since politicians are not currently obliged by law to include technical criteria in their appointment assessment, what conditions might motivate this choice? Hence, this MSc thesis aims to shed more light on the contextual conditions behind the selection of skilled leadership in a controversial minority-oriented agency, through the assessment of Funai.

As aforementioned, most of the research so far on political appointments relate to economic agencies. While scholars traditionally consider social agencies as tending to receive political appointments based on other factors rather than expertise, little is said over the factors behind this. Furthermore, longitudinal studies of political appointments are scarce or cover only one type of regime. Here, I compare the patterns of appointments in the agency throughout 51 years, including regime transaction.

Therefore, here I intend to contribute to the study of the factors that might explain the appointments of experts and non-experts in social agencies like Funai. As it is a within-agency assessment, the institutional factors vastly debated in the literature seem not to contribute to the explanation. Thus, the next section discusses the political and institutional context of political appointments in Funai, addressing the relationship of different agents, and finally, the hypothesized causal conditions for the appointment of experts are presented.

3. CONTEXT

3.1. The Indian Protection Service – SPI

In Brazil policies for indigenous people are traditionally centered at Funai, the National Indian Foundation. The Brazilian government agency is in charge of carrying out and coordinating indigenous policies. Founded in 1967, during the Brazilian military regime, Funai
was created to substitute the Indian Protection Service (SPI). Here I start by addressing the context of the consolidation of indigenous affairs’ bureaucracy in Brazil, which has set the tone for the sector. Furthermore, it is argued that many of the SPI’s attributes remained in Funai – including organizational structure and its cadre, thus the relevance of starting by the organization.

The Brazilian government created the first official indigenous affairs public organization, Indian Protection and Localization of National Workers Service (SPILT) in 1910 (FUNAI, n.d.). Officially, its mission was to “assist and protect the Indians in their integration into national society (VIEIRA; QUACK, 2016, p. 389)”, which included land tenure affairs. However, the internal legislation of the SPILT guaranteed rights that only began to be formalized in the Constitution of 1934. It stipulated that only the Federal Government could legislate on the incorporation of indigenous people to the national communion, for instance (ANJOS FILHO, 2008).

The main activity of the SPI was the attraction (the contact) and pacification of indigenous peoples in areas of recent colonization. Using the technique of contact spread by Rondon, members of the SPI crew tried to establish a friendly relationship with the contacted natives and to conduct a pacification process, i.e., to establish a peace accord to cease violence between indigenous peoples and “civilians.” This practice was conducted by sertanistas, a formal position in Funai, but also considered an ideological tradition of explorers, who worked in the interiors of the country with indigenous peoples.

The goal was to stop the attacking and the killing of neighbors or workers who passed through a specific region. The pacified groups were aggregated and given to the care of officials of an indigenous post, responsible for providing primary health care, food and teaching them methods of agriculture of the “civilized” (VALENTE, 2017).

Additionally, the 1916 civil code, officially instituted the tutorship of autochthonous peoples by the Brazilian Government. The 1916 code – only updated in 2001 – established that:

Indians were considered relatively incapable of certain acts of civil life, assimilated to other Brazilians over the age of 16 and under 21 years of age, along with the prodigals, who need to be assisted by parents, guardians or tutors when they practice certain acts. Such relative incapacity would cease as the Indian was adapting, that is, integrating himself into the national society (evolutionary state) (ARAÚJO et al., p. 162).

However, this “tutorship” or assistance was first provided by religious missions. Throughout history, countless missions, both Catholic and evangelical, were active in indigenous
villages in Brazil, often providing medical and social assistance where the state was not present (VALENTÉ, 2017). Thus, the SPI (former SPILT) project aimed also to implement laic assistance to indigenous communities, seeking to alienate the Catholic Church from indigenous catechesis, following the Republican directive of the church-state separation (FREIRE, n.d).

Appointed by the then Minister of Agriculture, Industry and Commerce, the first to direct the institution was Colonel Cândido Mariano da Silva Rondon. He was a positivist military officer who gained notoriety with his work in the installation of telegraph networks in the interior of the country – the so-called Comissão de Linhas Telegráficas – with a non-aggression approach towards the contacted indigenous communities (BIGIO, 2007).

Oliveira and Souza Lima (1981, p. 277) argue that the guiding principles of the SPI’s work were delineated by military intellectuals, i.e., engineers, equipped with concepts and presuppositions of the positivist tradition, such as the rational and scientific procedures, or the general perspective of humanity's progress.

As for its cadre, from the very start of the SPI, there was a not an organic presence of anthropologists or other social scientists (OLIVEIRA; SOUZA LIMA, 1981). Also, the lack of participation of indigenous groups in key positions was another clear trend. The conception of indigenous peoples’ protagonism in their political and historical trajectory became salient in indigenous affairs in the 1990s but had little influence over the cadre of the SPI and later on over Funai’s (ALMEIDA, 2017).

Due to the diversity of activities executed by the SPI, a myriad of different positions were necessary, including agronomists, teaching assistants, clerks, servants, helpers, some of which were also occupied by indigenous peoples, as a strategy of the SPI to legitimize the service to the assisted population (NÖTZOLD; BRINGMANN, 2013). This same form of recruitment carried over to Funai, as a strategy to maintain clientelistic bonds with indigenous groups (POZZOBON, 1999).

Nötzold and Bringmann (2013) argue that the positions and functions within the SPI were occupied by people without great excitement for the indigenous cause, being a result of political transactions, similar to other agencies at the time. The result was a heterogeneous group ranging from positivist military officers to rural workers without any formation (FREIRE/FUNAI, n.d). This was expected since the push for the professionalization of the Brazilian bureaucracy only really started after the 1950s as previously mentioned and within selected areas.
As the indigenous presence in Brazil spread across a vast territory, the establishment of the SPI also meant the creation of numerous technical and administrative positions, as well as regional (*inspetorias regionais*) and local headquarters (*postos indígenas* located inside indigenous lands) (NÖTZOLD; BRINGMANN, 2013). However, this effort was deemed insufficient by many. For instance, Valente (2017) claims that, at the time of the military coup, the SPI had only eight hundred public servants scattered among 105 or 126 indigenous posts, at the headquarters and in the representations of the SPI in the capitals of the states (VALENTE, 2017, p. 9).

Among the factors attributed to the creation of the organization in the literature are: a) the need to settle land disputes between European in southern states of the country and the indigenous groups living there (BITTENCOURT, 2000); b) the international repercussion of the killing of indigenous groups Brazil (BITTENCOURT, 2000; BECKHAUSEN, 2014; RIBEIRO, 1993); and c) an alleged threat of a mass extermination of indigenous peoples (CPDOC, n.d.).

According to this latter version, from 1908 to 1910, civil society agents would have organized to force the state to institute an *apparatus* to protect indigenous communities. This articulation included intellectuals, especially the orthodox “activists” of the positivism, and military engineers of the so-called Rondon Commission (CPDOC, n.d.).

Nevertheless, Oliveira (2014) argues that these core principles of republican indigenous affairs were not based on the ideas of the Positivist Doctrine, but rather a part of the programmatic line of work of the Ministry of Agriculture, Industry and Commerce (MAIC) established in 1906. Turning indigenous groups in “productive” communities was part of a set of measures to increase the presence of national workers (rather than European settlers) in areas of remote access and limited economic development. Oliveira (2014) argues that is the reason behind the first name of the organization, i.e., The Indian Protection and Localization of National Workers Service.

From 1918 onwards, the organization began to deal only with indigenous issues, leaving other attributions, referring to the location of national workers to other organizations and was renamed Indian Protection Service (SPI) (BIGIO, 2007).

At least in the years prior to 1930, the SPI’s policies were, to a certain extent, considered adequate by society at large. Nonetheless, with the revolution of 1930 in Brazil, the SPI began to decay (BITTENCOURT, 2000). First, Rondon was dismissed from the SPI. Also, the
organization moved from the Ministry of Agriculture, Industry and Commerce to the newly created Ministry of Labor, Industry and Commerce, and shortly after to the Ministry of War (DINIZ, 1994).

Then in 1939, the National Council for the Protection of the Indians⁵ (henceforth CNPI) was established to act as an institution that would formulate and advise Brazilian indigenist policies. The CNPI should be composed of seven members designated by presidential decree. It was assumed then that the SPI would have only executive powers, which did not occur. Instead, the activities of the CNPI overlapped with the SPI’s (CPDOC, n.d).

From the early 1960s, in the final period of existence of the SPI, the CNPI was the instance in which the presence of anthropologists and indigenists committed to the idea of protection of native peoples were concentrated (CPDOC, n.d.).

In 1963, the SPI’s public image was very worn out due to the irregularities investigated during a Parliamentary Inquiry Commission (CPI) set up in the Chamber of Deputies. In an attempt to regain public support and defend the organization, José Maria da Gama Malcher, former director of the SPI (1951-1955) and member of the CNPI published the document *Por que fracassa a proteção aos índios*, or in English, *Why does the protection of Indians fail?*. In the document, Malcher denounced that not only the staff of the SPI – which were already corrupted by partisan interests with the exchange of posts as a political tool – but the appointees in crucial positions facilitated the deprival of land and indigenous heritage (BIGIO, 2007).

Furthermore, the dedicated cadre of Rondon’s administration in the SPI and the CNPI (including retired employees from *Comissão de Linhas Telegráfricas*, the SPI and from the National Museum – the most relevant institution until today in Brazilian anthropology – who were still serving Rondon) was not able to develop successors. Hence, for Malcher, since the beginning, the agency was scarce in able employees (BIGIO, 2007).

Malcher also argued that the SPI had faced several crises due to the lack of support from municipal, state and federal governments that did not understand indigenous politics or to political persecution. The former director claims that all these attempts to destroy the organization have not been successful, because of the idealism from Rondon and his companions (MALCHER, 1963 *apud* BIGIO, 2007).

⁵ CNPI or *Conselho Nacional de Política Indigenista* in Portuguese.
The many Parliamentary Inquiry Commissions from 1963 to 1967 set to investigate the wrongdoings of SPI agents culminated in the 1967 *Jader Figueiredo report* written by the namesake public attorney at the behest of the Minister of the Interior General Albuquerque Lima (SOUZA LIMA, 2015). The report which documented systematic abuses and violence perpetrated by agents of the SPI against indigenous groups recommended the suspension of 17 and the dismissal of 33 SPI employees (MILANEZ, 2015). Notwithstanding, these efforts backfired due to the decision by the Minister General Albuquerque Lima to hold a press conference in March 1968 to present the main findings of the report. At the occasion “several national and international reporters were present, and some others flew into Brazil in its aftermath to investigate the findings,” and so, the results reverberated internationally (VIEIRA; QUACK, 2016, p. 389).

In 1968, a few months after the creation of Funai, the then President, General Costa e Silva created a working group to diagnose the indigenist action of the SPI during the 55 plus years it ran (BIGIO, 2007). According to Bigio (2007) the report of the working group which included representatives of several ministries claimed that the then SPI lacked the capacity to carry out indigenous policy due to the limited outreach (poor distribution of agencies in indigenous lands), as well as a lack of qualified servants to carry out the administrative function (BIGIO, 2007, p. 67).

These SPI investigations, including the CPIs and the working group of 1968 dialogued with the efforts of the military to increase the rationalization of the bureaucracy while eliminating corruption and leftist infiltration in bureaucratic staff (GARFIELD, 2001 *apud* VIEIRA; QUACK, 2016).

It was amidst (national and international) public turmoil over the allegations of omission and complicity in the corruption and genocidal scandals involving the SPI that the military administration of General Costa e Silva created the National Foundation of the Indian (Funai). The same bill – the 5.371 decree dated as for December 5, 1967 – also extinguished the SPI, the CNPI, and the National Xingu Park (ALBERT, 1991).
3.2. The Brazilian National Indian Foundation – Funai

According to Jorge Pozzobon’s classic 1999 article, The Low-grade Indigenism of the Brazilian State, similar to the SPI, Funai’s administration carries a history of great internal issues ranging from clientelism to inefficiency, as well as a lack of political will from the government to support the organization’s policies and structure.

Funai started with many aspects inherited from the SPI, including most of its cadre despite all the scandals. For Pozzobon (1999) by absorbing in the structure of the new organization a large part of the SPI employees, the organization inherited its assistance model with several of its original issues, such as fostering the dependency of indigenous communities’ on Funai’s resources and the political manipulation of indigenous leaders.

Also, similarly to the SPI, Funai’s early documents report the lack of qualified servants to manage the indigenous posts and regional provinces. According to its managers, the inadequate training associated with the poor remuneration can be considered as one of the leading causes of the lack of efficacy of the bureau’s policies (BIGIO, 2007).

As for the renewal in Funai’s cadres, it came only from officials with no experience of working with indigenous communities, coming from other agencies that were being transferred to other parts of the country. Araújo et al. (2006) argue that this was the case, for example, of many who worked in the National Department of Drought Works (DNOCS), which was being relocated to the state of Ceará. Thus, the officials who wanted to escape from the transfer had Funai as a choice (p. 31).

However, Funai operated over broader legal jurisdiction, infrastructural capacity and financial strength compared to the SPI. These improvements were fostered by the military’s centralizing reforms of the 1967 Brazilian Constitution, which strengthened the federal (over the sub-national sphere) and the Executive (over the legislature) (GARFIELD, 2000, POZZOBON, 1999). According to Garfield (2000, p. 546), the military interest over Funai can be explained by the fact that “Funai embodied the growing hegemony of the state over the Amazonian frontier (and the countryside in general), and its efforts to foster capitalist growth and social consensus through bureaucratic administration,” similarly to other federal agencies charged with rural development, colonization, and road building. Also, Funai saw an improvement in the institutional procedures.
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6 Funai’s Head of Cabinet and Substitute President between September 1995 and February 1996.
for the land tenure process. By federalizing the responsibility of land claims, the Constitution of 1967 also diminished the influence of local politicians and consequently, their clientelistic practices.

Comparatively to the SPI, the military promoted a vigorous push towards the professionalization of Funai’s cadre, following the efforts of their agenda in Brazil of forming a technocrat public administration. For instance, from 1970 until 1985, ten formation courses for indigenist technicians have been organized first by Funai, then by the University of Brasilia, and finally by the National School of Public Administration (ENAP) (BIGIO, 2007).

Nonetheless, a strong characteristic of the military rule in the SPI that continued in Funai was the exclusion of activists, anthropologists and indigenists, allegedly the experts in the field, from the high levels and decision-making process of the official institution of indigenous affairs. Across the authoritarian regime years in Brazil, presidents have repeatedly expelled them from Funai’s force or limited their influence. Many of them only returned to Funai after the end of the military regime in 1985.

For instance, before leaving office, the journalist José de Queirós Campos (Dec/1967–Jun/1970), Funai’s first president denounced that Funai, three years after its creation, lacked experts like linguists and anthropologists (Valente, 2017). Another example was when João Carlos Nobre da Veiga, a retired Colonel (president from November 1979 to October 1981), after coming to office pledged to implement more discipline into Funai and dismissed 39 indigenist and anthropologists due to a letter they sent to the Minister of the Interior criticizing Funai's policies (CEDI, 1986).

Only a few exceptions, like the General Ismarth Araújo de Oliveira, Funai’s third president (Mar/74–Mar/79), sought some level of cooperation with anthropologists and social scientists (CEDI, 1981; CPDOC, n.d.; TRINIDAD, 2016). Nevertheless, as soon as the military realized they had significant control over the land demarcation process, they acted through the decree 88.118, dated February 23, 1983. It kept the task of conducting identification studies to Funai’s technicians, but now a commission composed of members of other organizations and ministries had to approve their work (ARAÚJO et al., 2006).

Thus, it is noteworthy that Funai faces controversy, not only with outside agents but with insiders, what increases the complexity of running the agency. Pozzobon (1999), for instance, has described that the inner politics has greatly influenced political appointments. Many presidents
have left office due to disagreements over the use of other high-level political positions of Funai in regional posts by the ministers and the Executive (e.g., sertanistas, Apoena Meireles, Nov/1985–May/1986 and Sydney Possuelo, Jun/1991–May/1993 and more recently General Franklimber Freitas, May/2017–Apr/2018).

Even though Brazil was in its third year under the authoritarian regime, the first president was the civilian José de Queirós Campos who ruled from December 1967 until June 1970. Queirós Campos, a nationalist and a conservative, when the military took over, he was a councilman by the National Democratic Union (UDN), in the interior of Minas Gerais state (VALENTE, 2017). Moreover, Queirós, a journalist without previous experience in indigenous affairs was responsible for dismantling the SPI and reassembling the organization as a foundation (CPDOC, n.d).

Nonetheless, according to Valente (2017), the minister of interior General Albuquerque Lima appointed military officers to various high-level placements in local posts (e.g., the so-called chefias das inspetorias). The author argues that the military occupied eight out of the eleven existing positions, the exact opposite of what experienced indigenists were advocating. Also, along with the minister of interior, Campos had to face the criticism over Brazilian indigenous policies after the launch of the Jader Figueiredo report.

Under the administration of the Brazilian president Emílio Médici (Oct/69–Mar/74), a hardliner, Oscar Jeronymo Bandeira de Mello, became the first general appointed to command Funai. Bandeira de Mello’s rule marked the face of the following administrations under the military regime.

Bandeira de Mello was a former National Intelligence Service (SNI) officer, and also a former head of Funai’s security division. He was in charge of aligning Funai work with the development ideals in the National Integration Plan (PIN) created in 1970 mainly to guide the state's operations in the Amazon region (CPDOC, n.d.) Moreover, his administration targeted a quick integration of indigenous peoples into society, so that they would not hinder the occupation and colonization of the Amazon. Also, under his command in Funai, the area of community development was created in an attempt to make the indigenist enterprise self-sustaining: the costs of governmental protection should be paid by what could be generated through the exploitation of indigenous patrimony (CEDI, 1986).
Furthermore, from the appointment of Bandeira de Mello and until the democratization in 1985, Funai was led almost exclusively by military leaders, as the civilian rulers did not last longer than a year in office. The military presence during the authoritarian state differs from those early years of the SPI: the military chairs of Funai had no previous experience with indigenous affairs and lacked the “humanist” principles advocated by Rondon and his followers. Also, the military presence in an authoritarian state represented a consequence of the regime, and it was spread across different realms of the government (OLIVEIRA, 1988 *apud* BIGIO, 2007).

Therefore, under military direction, Funai’s policies were consolidated according to the principles of the authoritarian regime, including the promotion of defense, economic development, and the cultural integration of indigenous groups to the Brazilian society.

It is not surprising that the military kept a close eye on Funai’s activities, as they were key pieces during the period marked by great undertakings aiming to explore and develop Brazilian frontiers and the Amazon. The military’s agenda in Funai involved mainly 1) getting indigenous peoples away from military endeavors through the practices of attraction and pacification, 2) making sure that indigenous communities complied with the national agenda by “transforming” them in national workers, and 3) preventing parallel indigenous organizations in order to preserve their notion of national sovereignty.

Nevertheless, the developmental principles of the military implied in contradictory roles for Funai. According to Vieira and Quack (2016, p. 384),

> the indigenist bureaucracy was supposed to provide fraternal protection to the Indians by protecting them from the brutality of the development frontier. At the same time, it was to ensure the expansion of that very frontier. Caught between these contradictory goals, the bureaucracy intervened by removing the Indians from their territories and transferring them into small plots of land called indigenous reservations.

For instance, amidst, the construction of great endeavors in the Amazon Region, as the Trans-Amazonian highway, one of the largest ones in Brazil, General Bandeira de Mello claimed that Funai’s mission was to protect the highway’s construction work and to avoid possible clashes between workers and indigenous peoples (VALENTE, 2017).

At the same time that military pressure to direct Funai’s goals, has received praised by some sectors of society which claimed that the eminent military undertakings – especially in the Amazon – have brought better access to governmental services and infrastructure to remote
populations, the period also fostered social mobilization that opposed the military developmental policies in Funai.

The first organized reactions from civil society to Funai’s policies date from the early ‘70s. It includes the July of 1971 manifest, signed by 80 professionals from the social sciences field, against the considered guidelines adopted and the proposal of the Indian Statute (CPDOC, n.d). The document is considered the main guideline for indigenous legislation. Authors argue that when it was later ratified in 1973, it expanded the state of domination over the rights of indigenous populations, as well as assimilative policies that tried to eventually erase indigenous ethnicity (RODRIGUES, 2002; KYRILLOS, 2015). The statute got translations to English and French to be distributed within and outside of the country, but the bill has never been translated to any one of the 200 existing indigenous languages in Brazil (OLIVEIRA, 1985 apud VIEIRA; QUACK, 2016)

The movement included not only missionaries, but academics, indigenists, and a myriad of agents motivated to defend indigenous rights to land, as well as to oppose and report government, landowners, and industries’ wrongdoings such as violence, land invasions and other perverse practices against indigenous peoples. Another landmark of the indigenous movement at the time was the creation of the Missionary Indigenous Council (CIMI) in 1972, a Catholic organization, very active in indigenous rights promotion until today (CPDOC, n.d).

Skidmore (1990, p. 182) argues that clashes between the hardliner government of Médici (1969-1974) and Catholic activists – who defended indigenous peoples and small farmers, menaced by the large land speculators and landowners – went to a point where the later were tortured and arrested. Also, the Médici government attempted to ban Catholic missionaries from working with the indigenous groups, due to conflicts breaking out over land claims and indigenous rights. Skidmore (1990, p. 182) argues that these arrests and the move against the missionaries dialogued with the “hardliner strategy to strengthen the new government’s hand, and at the same time demonstrate a de facto commitment to toughness toward the Church.”

Many authors (e.g., Vieira; Quack, 2016; Bigio, 2007; Oliveira, 2012) emphasize an episode that marked the intensification of the incipient indigenous rights movement: the announcement by the then minister of the interior Maurício Rangel Reis in February 1978 that Brazilian Head of State, President Ernesto Geisel would sign a decree to instate the feared emancipation of indigenous people. The emancipation of indigenous people meant the end of the
indigenous’ welfare *apparatus* including the right to land tenure. Consequently, a plethora of NGOs was formed in the context of opposing this measure (e.g., *Comissões Pró-Índio* – CPIs, the *Grupo de Apoio ao Índio* – GAI) and from then on, remained present in the official indigenous affairs’ debates (CPDOC, n.d).

Also, during General João Carlos Nobre da Veiga’ administration (Nov/79–Oct/81), the third military president of Funai, tension rose not only with anthropologists – leading to the firing of many of them, as previously mentioned – but also with indigenous groups. As a result of the frustration at Funai’s policies considered too controlling by some, indigenous groups joined forces in several indigenous assemblies, but all repressed by the military regime.

For instance, based on the opinion of Funai’s Indigenist Council, the Minister of the Interior, Mario Andreazza, forbids indigenous leader Juruna, whom later decided to run for Congress in November 1982, from attending the Russell Court in the Netherlands in 1980, an event to publicize human rights violations around the world. This episode represents the force of the tutorship that indigenous people lived under (VALENTE, 2017, CEDI, 1981). As a consequence, Juruna and a group of 40 indigenous protesters at Funai’s headquarters in Brasilia, demanded the resignation of Funai’s president and two other colonels (CEDI, 1981).

Another example of this tension between Funai and indigenous groups is that of the 1980 mobilization to the creation of a national organization, The Union of Indigenous Nations (UNI). UNI aimed to bring indigenous groups together to join forces and articulate politically and socially their demands. Nevertheless, the organization was criticized by many inside Funai, which did not recognize the movement, considering it a threat to national unity (CEDI, 1981).

Pozzobon (1999) claims that clientelistic “factions” have always run Funai. Hence even when conflict with outside actors does not break, Funai leadership has to deal with the multiple groups and opinions inside Funai. This makes office endurance a difficult task for potential candidates. In 1985, among the democratization process, Funai faced a great succession crisis, where in a year, five presidents occupied the position: the police officer Néelson Marabuto Domingues (Sep/84–Apr/85), former Director of the National Agrarian Reform Institute of Brazil (Incra), Ayrton Carneiro de Almeida (18/4/1985) – who lasted only one day at the position due to the pressure of indigenous actors – Sergeant and former Funai bureaucrat Géerson da Silva Alves (Apr/85–Sep/85), the *sertanistas* Álvaro Vilas Boas (Sep/85–Nov/85) and Apoena Meireles (Nov/85– May/86). The short terms and diverse profiles of the appointees demonstrate the
internal crisis between the various factions and their indigenous allies, disputing the hegemony within the organization (CPDOC, n.d).

Also, during the first democratic presidency, José Sarney’s (Mar/85–Mar/90) – who was yet governing under a great military influence due to the regime transition – the *Calha Norte* Project was created. The project’s goal was to increase the military occupation and promote the development of the Amazonian region, to protect it from the international greed and the misuse of Brazilian strategic natural resources. As one of the consequences of the Project, the National Security Council (CSN) began to influence the demarcation processes of indigenous land directly.

It is important to highlight that Funai’s cadre also went through a process of expansion, especially due to Romero Jucá’s (May/86–Sept/88) leadership which began to articulate with CSN policies in the *Calha Norte* Project. He gained notoriety for trying to enlarge Funai’s structure and actuation: the number of employees increased from 3,300 to 4,200 in the first five months of its management (CPDOC, n.d; GARFIELD, 2000; CEDI, 1991).

The three subsequent presidents followed Jucá’s and CSN’s footsteps: the lawyer and former president of a branch of the National Security Council (CSN), Iris Pedro de Oliveira (Sept/88–Mar/89); Colonel Aírton Alcântara (Mar/90–Aug/90); and the retired sergeant of the Air Force, former advisor to Iris Pedro de Oliveira and ally of Romero Jucá, Cantídio Guerreiro Guimarães (Aug/90–July/91). Their administrations are known for hindering the demarcation process of indigenous lands, and for signing agreements that allowed the economic exploitation of these areas (CPDOC, n.d).

Notably, Colonel Airton Alcântara was the first military president of Funai in the democratic regime – the last one was Colonel Paulo Moreira Leal who stepped down in 1983. Alcântara was appointed to office by the new Brazilian President Fernando Collor de Mello (Mar/1990–Dec/1992). Highlighting once more the agency’s inner conflict between indigenists and the military, Colonel Alcântara prepared a list of 880 Funai employees that became “available” for allocation in other public agencies – many of these anthropologists and indigenists (CEDI, 1991).

However, this push for a more militarized Funai coincided with a critical period for the indigenous movement: the constitutional process. Between 1987 and 1988 there was a constant presence of indigenous groups and manifestations in the National Congress to demand the
acknowledgment of their rights in the new Constitution. Also at the time, several institutions (i.e., the main author of the chapter on “Indians”, the Union of Indigenous Nations - UNI, supported by the Brazilian Association of Anthropology - ABA, the National Coordination of Geologists - Conage, the Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Science - SBPC, and the Missionary Indigenous Council - CIMI ) lobbied the Subcommittee on Black people, Indigenous Populations, Disabled people and Minorities, so that the chapter on indigenous rights would pass the voting (CEDI, 1991).

Regarding land, identity, education, and health, the Constitution of 1988 is known for providing groundbreaking legislation towards these areas in Brazil, following a transnational trend of improvement of social security in Latin America. Authors like Yashar (1998, 1999) argue that in Latin America the round of democratization has coincided with a considerable expansion of social rights, including indigenous’. For Yashar (1999, p. 77) “the regions’ third-wave democracies have experienced increasing politicization of indigenous identities and organization of indigenous movements, phenomena that appear to reverse the region’s comparative historical record of weakly politicized ethnic cleavages.” Furthermore, Yashar (1999) complements that the indigenous movement did not aim the overthrow of the state but to claim their rights democratically with “mass mobilizations, roadblocks, electoral campaigns, and policy negotiations (p. 77).”

As a result, Brazil, along with Colombia and Bolivia has been considered to have a “Superior Legal Framework” in indigenous land tenure according to Ortega’s (2004) typology of Latin American indigenous legal regimes. With the Constitution of 1988, Indigenous rights have greatly been expanded (for a review see Luciano, 2006; Ortega, 2004 and Uprimny, 2010). In parallel, initiatives such as the Convention 169 from the International Labor Organization in 1989 pressured countries to update their legal framework towards indigenous peoples, through the ratification of the agreement.

This changing context reshaped the guidelines of Funai’s activities. In indigenist legislation, as well in official documents a new discourse started to appear about the recognition of indigenous forms of social organization, as well as the respect for their customs, languages, beliefs, and traditions. Moreover, the Brazilian state was increasingly more accepting of the idea of a multiethnic state, leaving behind the commitment to the forced integration of indigenous peoples to the national society.
In the ‘90s, along with other decentralization reforms in Brazil by former President Fernando Collor de Melo, Funai had its services’ portfolio significantly reduced. Several presidential decrees from February 4, 1991, delegated Funai’s activities in the sectors of health, education, rural development and the environmental protection to the Ministries of Health, Education, Agrarian Development and Environment, respectively (SOUZA LIMA, 2015).

Funai’s reduction of scope has raised both concerns and praise from scholars and advocates. An immediate consequence the emergence of a higher number of actors now involved with the official indigenous affairs – before centralized in Funai – including not only other public agencies but NGOs to which activities were increasingly more outsourced. However, the effects of these structural changes in indigenous lives are yet to be formally assessed.

From 1990 onwards, Funai’s amnesty commission readmitted, together with officials that the military had dismissed for political reasons, as well as many officials fired for corruption. However, the readmission of officials who were genuinely committed to the defense of the indigenous groups had a positive effect according to Pozzobon (1999). This readmission helped Funai save face, especially about the demarcation of indigenous lands. In the first two years of the 1990s, Funai promoted an unprecedented demarcation campaign in the country's history (POZZOBON, 1999).

Also, in the same period, the Earth Summit (or Eco 92 in Portuguese), a UN conference on environmental and developmental issues held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, has put the Brazilian government in the spotlight for their practices with traditional peoples. Thus, the appointment by Fernando Collor de Melo of sertanista Sydney Ferreira Possuelo (Jun/91– May/93) to chair Funai is attributed to the need for improving Brazil’s image on sustainable practices. Nevertheless, Possuelo was later dismissed by the Justice Minister Maurício Correia for opposing the clientelistic distribution of posts by the Minister of the Civil Cabinet, Henrique Hargreaves, and also due to pressure from the military and mining companies (CPDOC, n.d).

After Possuelo, all presidents appointed to Funai were civilians. However, only in Lula’s government, two anthropologists have successfully stayed in office for a prolonged period: Mercio Pereira Gomes (Sep/03–Mar/07) and Márcio Meira (Apr/07–Apr/12). This was also a period of less social unrest due to the country’s booming economy, associated with the broad social coalition formed by worker’s party Lula da Silva (Jan/03–Dec/10). In total, the Brazilian worker party (PT) has ruled Brazil for 13 years, first with Lula da Silva and then with (the
impeached) Dilma Rousseff (Jan/11–Aug/16). Their administration was marked by the appointment of public leaders associated with social movements and unions (D’ARAUJO, 2009; D’ARAUJO; PETEK, 2018). Also, they received considerable criticism over the slowness of land demarcation processes, perhaps due to the same incredibly large governmental base, which prioritized agribusiness development in exchange for political support. Nevertheless, the scarcity of studies on the impacts of the PT’s left-wing government in Funai is surprising.

Recently, political controversy over the role of the military in Funai has been featuring in media outlets again. For instance, under President Lula’s government, the Office of Institutional Security, led by General Jorge Armando Felix created a working group with the mission of proposing a new indigenist policy. However, this working group did not go forward. After the negative repercussion of the creation of this group, a new one was instituted by the Brazilian government, this time through an inter-ministerial ordinance (ARAÚJO et al., 2006).

A second example includes the protests from organizations like the Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil (APIB) that published an open letter to condemn the appointment of a military officer by Michel Temer’s (Aug/2016–present) allies from the conservative Social Christian Party (PSC). Despite the criticism, Michel Temer – who maintains a close relationship with the military – went through with the appointment of the first military president in 17 years. To make amends for the public discontent, General Franklinberg Freitas (May/2017–Apr/2018) was highly publicized as the first president of Funai with an indigenous origin.

Nowadays Funai’s main activities center around studies of land identification and delimitation, as well as the regularization process of lands traditionally occupied by indigenous peoples. Among Funai’s other tasks are the coordination and implementation of policies to protect isolated and newly-contacted people and the promotion of “sustainable development of indigenous populations,” (i.e., the conservation and recovery of the environment in indigenous lands). In addition, Funai is responsible for establishing inter-institutional articulations to guarantee differentiated access to social and citizenship rights for indigenous peoples (e.g., social security, indigenous schooling, community participation, and social control).7

It is noteworthy that current controversies suggest that the *de jure* situation is very different from *de facto*’s. The media and sectors of academia, claim that indigenous affairs in Brazil is at critic stages, suggesting that Funai organizational capacity is in increasing decline due
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to the scarcity of financial resources and trained staff. Since 2013 the organization has been experiencing major cuts in its budget and personnel.\textsuperscript{8}

As for the politicization of its cadre, data from Praça, Freitas, and Hoepers (2011) show that in December 2010 almost all DAS positions available were occupied by partisans. However, a recent push for meritocracy was seen with the Decree 9010, dated March 23, 2017, when over 300 lower level posts got turned into career positions and their occupants fired (BRAZIL, 2017). In December, over 213 new civil servants were nominated.

Using indicators of agency capacity (i.e., career strength, stability, specialization) and political autonomy (i.e., the partnership of the staff) in Brazilian agencies’ cadres, studies by Bersch, Praça and Taylor (2017) suggest that Funai underperforms in both of these points. Currently, Funai has 2,289 employees, where 305 occupy DAS positions, leadership posts (e.g., presidents, regional directors, coordinators) that can be occupied either by civil servants or outsiders (BRAZIL, 2018). 75% of which is filled with other agencies’ or non-public servants, another sign of low agency insulation.

As for the current situation of the indigenous movement, it is argued that similarly to Funai, the dynamic mobilization from the ‘80–‘90s is now seen as more and more deflated. It is noteworthy that the inspection and protection of indigenous rights are also shared with Brazilian Public Prosecutor’s Office (MPF) that has a subsection on indigenous peoples and traditional communities.

Moreover, only occasional and isolated events have gained great national and international attention. Ten years later from the C19 ratification, the ILO accused the Brazilian government of violating the convention during the controversial construction of the Belo Monte Dam and in early 2018. Likewise, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) condemned Brazil for violating the right to collective property of the Xucuru indigenous people due to the slowness of the judicial process to return their lands (IACHR, 2018).

Pro-indigenous organizations speculate that the violence against indigenous mobilization also adds to the difficulty of maintaining the relevance of contemporary activism. A ranking by the Global Witness organization (2017) puts Brazil in the first place among 22 countries with a higher number of deaths of environmental activists (GW, 2017).

\footnote{\textsuperscript{8}From 2015 to 2016, there was of $ 66.9 million, or 37\% in discritionary expenses in Funai (FUNAI, 2017).}
In sum, Funai’s line of work has dramatically shifted across the years. Until today, the very existence of the agency surrounds great discussion. Moreover, there’s a great debate on what experts should be or how to act. The concept of experts to Funai is still examined among anthropologists themselves, showing a lack of expert consensus, as seen in the writings of social anthropologist and academic Antônio Carlos de Souza Lima (1994, 2012).

Furthermore, there is not only one, but many indigenous leaders, communities, and ethnicities. Those involved in indigenous affairs face severe disagreements over the moral, cultural and legal aspects of indigenist policies, resulting in great contradictions. Inside the bureau, more than one indigenism model coexisted, for instance (TRINIDAD, 2016). Thus, the consensus of experts as suggested by Dargent (2014) cannot fully explain Funai’s high-level appointments.

Also, its faulty institutionalization is observed since the emergence of the SPI. Funai’s presidents have denounced the lack of resources, patterns of conduct and skilled workers. As an example, the Indian Statue, the main document which guides indigenous affairs since its ratification in 1973, has never managed to be updated, despite several attempts.

Drawing from Dargent (2014), I argue that in social agencies, the influence of key agents is vital to the decision of whom to appoint. This is especially true since the sector has been argued more vulnerable to political interference than others (DARGENT, 2014; D’ARAUJO; PETEK, 2018).

Traditionally, high-level appointments of the agency, such as the presidency of Funai, are attributions of the Executive. Since 2003 the responsibility of these appointments was delegated from presidents to the presidential chief of staff. While it cannot be disregarded that appointments can be handed over to other actors (e.g., the ministry under which Funai resides, currently the Ministry of Justice) and allies – as many posts are in coalitional governments – here for academic purposes, the main political agent under study are presidents, representing his cabinet and other parts of his government.

Here I analyze the influence of two pivotal groups, considering the context of Funai’s history previously addressed: the strength of social movements and military influence over the incumbent. The former is composed mainly by societal agents (national and international NGOs, indigenous groups, intellectuals, partisans from left-wing parties, civil servants, among others) who act through different channels to bring notoriety of the pro-indigenous cause. As for the
latter, the military is a central agent of the Brazilian state *apparatus*, having considerable influence on the country’s politics over the years (see Stepan, 1988; Amorim Neto, 2015).

Also, these agents are here theorized to have different influences on Funai’s presidential appointments. While social mobilization has pushed for leadership tied to the indigenous cause in many public manifestations, military presence in Funai has a history of being rather centralizing and frequently have signaled their preference for loyalists that address their national security agenda.

Here, international and national mobilization (societal repercussion pressing for indigenous rights) are considered for this study a unique “factor,” since the effect of one cannot be separated from the other. Over the years an international network of pro-indigenous activism was formed, as discussed by Vieira and Quack (2016). Therefore, my first and second and hypotheses are the following:

**Hypothesis 1:** International and national social mobilization contributed to the appointment of experts to Funai.

**Hypothesis 2:** Military influence over presidents did not contribute to the appointment of experts to Funai.

Another factor deemed key for political appointments in the literature is the cost of making bad policy choices due to electoral costs in democratic regimes (Dargent, 2014). In authoritarian regimes, these electoral risks do not apply, whereas in democratic regimes by default, there is at least more than one party, or election results cannot be fully anticipated due to the possibility that different candidates can be elected. Also, the incumbent is more responsive to societal and stakeholders’ demands in social agencies more than in authoritarian regimes, as the power across agents is more evenly distributed (Dargent, 2014). Thus, following these assumptions, here I hypothesize that in democratic regimes there will be more incentives to delegate to experts of the field, rather than choosing loyalists without any expertise, leading to my third hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 3:** The democratic regime contributed to the appointment of experts to Funai.
The fourth factor considered is ideology. Presidents do not act only based on electoral goals, but also to maximize policy interests (AMORIM NETO, 2006a). Thus, it is puzzling that, in a country like Brazil where presidents have extensive constitutional power little is said over the effects of their agenda on high-level appointments of public agencies.

I argue that presidents will act differently regarding appointment patterns, not only due to contextual conditions, as argued by many scholars but also to their interest in particular sectors. In areas that presidents have a more strategic interest, they will tend to delegate to experts, to legitimize their agenda (by signaling to the voters), as well as to guarantee that no bad consequence will arise in that area that they can be accounted for.

More specifically, I argue that non-right-wing incumbents – centrists or leftists – will contribute to the appointment of experts to public agencies like Funai, as their agenda is more bound to social policies than right-wing politicians.

Nevertheless, in less strategic areas to the president, there is more room to use positions as political tools. For right-wing politicians, it becomes less costly to have an agent as the head of the public institution to implement their agenda or to use it as "political resource" and delegate the decision to others. This leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 4:** Non-rightist presidents in office appointed experts to Funai.

Scholars have also argued that one of the most important factors for political appointments is economic shocks, especially in Latin America where the economy is highly unstable. Kaplan (2017) finds that in Latin America, during a crisis, leftist parties will switch appointment pattern of finance ministers to signal to the market their commitment with fiscal reforms. Hence, the author finds that the distinction related to policy preferences motivate the pattern of appointments, but it is conditional on partnership and economic fluctuations.

While, economic crises seem minor to indigenous affairs, compared to finance ministries, since the agency has little influence on the country’s economic faith, it is possible that the contextual pressure that a country is under has a connection to appointments in Funai. More specifically, it is expected that in times of economic crisis, presidents will have to appoint less on
the ability to conduct indigenous affairs, but on other criteria (e.g., partisanship, loyalty, commitment to fiscal austerity measures).

**Hypothesis 5:** Absence of economic crises contributed to the appointment of experts to Funai.

In summary, these five hypotheses translate into five causal conditions plugged in my Fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Model (QCA) which aims to test the necessary and sufficient conditions for the appointment of experts to Funai. These are international and national social mobilization; military influence over presidents; a democratic regime; right-wing administrations; and economic crises. In the following section, the methodology used in this study is discussed.

4. METHODOLOGY

In social sciences, the concept that there is one best method is continuously losing strength. Traditionally methods have been divided between quantitative and qualitative studies. However, more recently, authors have tried to reconcile quantitative and qualitative studies, by promoting how they can best complement each other (see Goertz 2017). Thus, it is becoming more widely accepted in social sciences that for each empirical puzzle, there might be more than one appropriate method to address it.

Statistical methods have been argued as superior by many, including in the influential work of King, Keohane, and Verba (1994), due to aspects like the level of formalization and replicability of the method and the attention to scientific rigor. However, methodologists like Mahoney (2010, 2015), George and Bennett (2005) and Goertz (2006) have contributed to “a new” and more resourceful qualitative toolset, which includes a broad range of procedures for case studies, controlled comparison, set-theoretic analysis, concept formation, among others. They advocate that research design and analysis in qualitative studies should not be only more transparent but also generate appropriate inferences.

This so-called new qualitative approach has emphasized the use of historical events since they too influence social sciences. Thus, the explicit focus on the context in the analysis differentiates – not necessarily in a superior fashion – from most basic econometric models that
control for background conditions, to assess the effect of a potential explanatory variable on the outcome.

Moreover, in the comparative-historical tradition (see Amorim Neto; Rodriguez, 2016), the context is the most important variable for questions of the type: under what conditions a phenomenon manifests itself? Which conditions can be assumed sufficient and necessary for it? Studies that have boosted the field, like Skocpol’s (1979) are based on Mill’s methods of agreement and difference. The method of agreement as conventionally used, suggests that for all the cases that share the presence of a given outcome, one can eliminate the potential causal factors not shared between all these cases. The remaining factors would be necessary conditions. As for the method of difference, by matching cases where the outcome is absent to cases in which it is present if these cases share common features, these cannot be considered an explanatory factor, and thus are insufficient for the outcome (Falletti; Mahoney, 2015).

In order to advance the field with a more robust comparative-historical method, than traditional case studies or Mill’s methods, Charles Ragin in 1987 suggests a set-theoretic technique based on Boolean algebra that formalizes this assessment while bridging together quantitative and qualitative analyses. The Qualitative Comparative Analysis (henceforth QCA) is thought for both small and medium $N$ and is the chosen method of this thesis.

Since it first emerged, it has much evolved, with the improvements of the measures of fit by Ragin (2008), the creation of specific statistical software packages to generate the truth table analysis, and the expansion of variants of QCA (from crisp-set QCA to more complex techniques such as multi-value QCA, fuzzy-set QCA and temporal QCA).

QCA has been used traditionally by sociology and political science. For instance, Wickham-Crowley (1991) uses it to assess the conditions for the success of revolutionary movements in Latin America, Santos, Pérez-Liñan and Montero (2014) to study the factors behind presidential control of Latin America’s legislative agenda, and Mello (2014) uses in his book *Democratic Participation in Armed Conflict – Military Involvement in Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq*. The expansion of the method to other social science fields is recent and remains incipient, as highlighted in the work of Betarelli Junior and Ferreira (2018). Betarelli Junior and Ferreira’s book (2018), published by the National School of Public Administration (ENAP) can be considered the first real attempt to increase the notoriety of the method in Brazil, by offering a didactic guide on QCA for Brazilian social scientists and policy-makers.
Being a set-theoretic method, QCA analyses social phenomena by assessing factors by means of set relations, through the examination of their membership scores (SCHNEIDER; WAGEMANN, 2012). QCA applies formal logic, and Boolean algebra in truth tables analysis and its main objective is to assess which factors (variables) are necessary or sufficient conditions for a particular outcome. These assessments are based on parameters of fit (consistency and coverage), considered a methodological leverage compared to other set-theoretic techniques.

Among the contributions of the method lies the recurring emphasis on the importance of context and on mobilizing case knowledge, all characteristics of set-theoretic methods (COLLIER, 2014). Also, QCA addresses the problem of “limited diversity,” since counterfactual cases can be included in the analysis. That is, cases that could have existed, as they can still bring important contributions from a theoretical perspective (MELLO, 2014). For Mello (2014) the complex causation is considered the main strength of the method, and it comprises three methodological premises: equifinality, conjunctural causation, and causal asymmetry.

Ragin (2008) stresses that asymmetry is a pivotal aspect of causal connections in QCA. Unlike correlation connections, the explanation for the non-occurrence of the outcome (~Y) cannot be extrapolated from the explanatory factors that led to the manifestation of the outcome (Y). Thus, in the qualitative comparative analysis, it is advised to conduct separate analyses of the sufficient and necessary conditions that lead to the Y and the ~Y.

Rihoux and Marx (2013) and Mello (2014) emphasize that QCA allows for conjunctural causation and equifinality, which is fit for social sciences, where rarely factors can be isolated from their context. QCA centers on testing which causal path or paths lead to an outcome. As a result, often it is found that a combination of conditions, rather than a single factor generates the phenomenon to be explained (conjunctural causation). Also, QCA allows the identification of more than one condition or combination of conditions (equifinality) that produce a single outcome.

Another factor considered a benefit of the method, is that it was thought for a modest number of observations that often are not recommended for econometric analyses while maintaining measures of fit that contribute to the academic rigor when compared to other low N techniques. Here in this present study, similarly to what is discussed by Santos, Pérez-Liñan and Montero (2014, p. 522), the use of an intermediate number of cases hinders the application of statistical methods.
Thus, its ability to address research questions like the one of this thesis which has a limited number of observations, i.e., here the number of past presidents of Funai, and to approach equifinality and conjunctural causation are the main reasons for having chosen the method. As seen in the literature on patterns of appointments, authors converge on the fact that there are multiple possible paths to select bureaucratic cadres.

While the method has received praise for its innovative approach, it has also generated much criticism and fostered a heated debate in multi-method research. For Seawright (2005) while academic production on QCA has had a positive effect on social science methodology since it has addressed the importance of interaction terms in causation, QCA cannot be perceived as an advance over statistical techniques. Also, the author alerts that QCA results are very sensitive to model miss-specification, hence assumptions claimed by scholars using QCA should not be too loose. Even though Seawright’s (2005) discussion was prior to the amelioration of fit measures and they have been addressed – at least partially – by the increase in the rigor of criteria for claims of necessity and sufficiency, his alerts remain relevant.

Hug (2013, p. 255) for instance, argues that using a QCA “as an inductive theory-generating tool contradicts its original purpose.” The author considers it problematic since, in the absence of theoretical hypotheses, QCA can only yield a description of the data. Similarly to Seawright (2005), the author alerts against the omission of other explanatory factors and argues that authors should address the risk of measurement error when conducting QCA.

QCA software packages, including the one used here, fs/QCA uses the Quine–McCluskey algorithm to perform the logical minimization of the sufficiency statements of the truth table. Thus, another criticism is how heavily QCA has relied on the software and the algorithm, instead of validity-proofing results through other possible algorithms, for instance (ROHLFILNG; SCHNEIDER, 2014; COLLIER, 2014).

Also, the method has been criticized for the highly complex results yielded by the algorithm, and consequently not easily interpretable by policy-makers, for example (TANNER, 2014). In addition to that, results do not necessarily gain strength with a higher number of cases, but rather more observations might interfere with the instability of the results (TANNER, 2014; KROGSLUND; MICHEL, 2014). Furthermore, authors bring to attention that QCA might suffer
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9 For the complete debate, refer to the Qualitative & Multi-Method Research, the newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research, Fall 2014, Vol. 12, part 1 and 2.
a “larger-n, fewer variables” issue. Thus this should be kept in mind both by scholars in their
design and readers.

Therefore, it is important to stress the possibility of measurement error and model miss-
specification (as most studies do). To address these issues, the variables are calibrated
qualitatively based on theoretical and empirical evidence and the hypothesis drawn from the
literature, as suggested by Schneider and Wagemann (2012), rather than from the available
mechanical algorithms.

Also, the provision of results that are context, and case-sensitive remains both a limitation
and a contribution of the method. While it is important that knowledge reflects the data in hand, it
is also necessary to proceed with caution when generalizing the results.

However, the QCA conducted in this study does not intend to establish the ultimate causal
recipe for expertise, but to test conditions that seem more conducive to the appointments of
experts to Funai according to the literature. Also, it is important to state that QCA is very context
sensitive, so, while I seek to contribute to future studies on similar appointments in pro-social and
minority agencies, the generalization of the findings remains to be tested with cross-agency
analyses.

In addition to that, a correlation assessment is also conducted to complement the analysis,
so the results of the different methods can be compared, and the robustness of the findings
checked, as suggested by Rohlfing and Schneider (2014).

4.1 QCA empirical strategy and coding

For the case selection, it comprises all Funai’s presidents from its creation in December of
1967 until April 2018 that stayed in office more than 100 days, resulting in 36 in total, from the
universe of 41. The presidents of Funai are also the unity of analysis.

Here, I argue that in less than 100 days, a president has not had the time to act as a chair
of the organization. However, while ideally, this cutoff should be higher, this was established
considering the own nature of Funai, which is known for the high turnover of leadership
positions, as previously discussed.

The four presidents not included in the analysis are: Wallace Moreira Bastos (Apr/18-), Otacílio Antunes Reis
Filho (Jun/02-Jul/02), Roque de Barros Laraia (Apr/00-May/00), and Ayrton Carneiro de Almeida (18/4/1985-
Since expertise can be a complex matter to examine, as presidents have various backgrounds with some characteristics compensating for others, the chosen strategy was to adopt the Fuzzy Set QCA calibration for the outcome of interest. Fuzzy set QCA are sets that attribute values ranging from 0 (cases are fully out the set), 0.5 (indifference) to 1 (cases are fully in the set) based on a qualitative or quantitative marker.

As for crisp sets – the QCA variant with a dichotomous membership used for all causal conditions here theorized to contribute to the outcome – cases either score 1, that is, full membership or 0, for full non-membership.

These factors theorized to contribute to the appointment of experts are: international and national social mobilization (social mobilization); a democratic regime (democracy); the military influence over presidents (military influence); a right-wing president (right-wing) and economic crises (crisis). It is important to stress that the three later conditions (military influence, right-wing, and crisis) are expected to influence the appointment of an expert to Funai whenever absent and the former two, whenever present (social mobilization and democracy).

The membership scores represent how much a case is an instance of that condition or the outcome. These factors are referred to as “sets” in the set-theoretic literature. Below the calibration of the outcome and each condition is detailed. In order to calibrate the data of the contextual conditions here used, these were matched with the data on presidents (the unit of analysis) based on the date of appointment of each president to Funai. The final membership calibration is seen in Table 1, and the full reasoning of the coding is displayed in Appendices C and D.

**Expertise: the outcome of interest**

In this MSc thesis, I define expertise, as agency expertise, as discussed by Barberia and Praça (2014, p. 6), that is “background in main policies formulated and implemented by a certain agency.” This includes on-the-job training (e.g., Funai employees), as well as academic training (e.g., in anthropology). The engagement on indigenous right causes as “indigenists” is also considered practical experience with indigenous affairs (e.g., engaging in NGOs and other civil society organizations).

Dialoguing with the literature on political appointments that recently has shifted from the dichotomy of appointing partisans and technicians to the attributes and background of leaders, as
suggested by Lewis (2007), the focus here is not to investigate expertise separately from partisanship, but to differentiate complete strangers to indigenous affairs, from those acknowledged well-trained or experienced leaders.

Anthropologists, as well as sociologists in Brazil, are mostly known for being left-wing, similarly to what Amorim Neto and Santos (2005) argue about Brazilian political scientists. However, it is important to stress that while the ideology of the experts under scrutiny might also be a part of the explanation for their appointment what is considered here is if they have a substantial professional background in indigenous affairs, as partisanship and expertise are not incompatible attributes. To illustrate, Márcio José Brando Santilli (Sept/95-Mar/96) chosen by Fernando Henrique Cardoso (PSDB) was both a former state representative from the PMDB (1982-1986), and an experienced indigenist, and thus, was classified as an expert. While in Congress, Santilli was one of the leaders of the commission on indigenous affairs and an active representative of indigenous peoples in the constitutional process (1987-1988). Furthermore, he was the founder of a pro-indigenous NGO, **Núcleo de Direitos Indígenas (NDI)** predecessor of **Instituto Socioambiental (ISA)** (CPDOC, n.d).

To code the condition, biographic information on all the presidents of Funai was reviewed by the author. A compilation of Funai’s history by Fundação Getulio Vargas’ center of research and documentation of Brazilian Contemporary history CDPOC was used as a source (i.e., CPDOC, n.d). The biographies in the publications “**Povos Indígenas no Brasil**” by the Centro Ecumênico de Documentação e Informação – CEDI (1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1986, 1991) and then by the **Instituto Socioambiental – ISA** (n.d., 1996, 2000, 2005, 2010) were used to complement the data. Furthermore, the calibration of the condition was based on theoretical and case-knowledge, as suggested by Schneider and Wagemann (2012).

The coding for the appointment of experts to Funai was given as follows: 0 fully out – was set for those with no training or expertise in the field, e.g., Funai’s first President, José de Queirós Campos (Dec/67–Jun/70).

The qualitative anchor of 0.3 – mostly out – was attributed for those that have only very little experience in the bureaucracy related to Funai or indigenous affairs. E.g., the retired sergeant and accountant Gerson da Silva Alves (Apr/85–Sept/85) who worked at bureaucratic functions at Funai.
The 0.6 mark stands for those are more in than out, that is, experience in peripheral areas, e.g., former President Flávio Chiarelli (Oct/2014–Jun/2015), a lawyer whose on-the-job experience was obtained as the National Chief Attorney of Funai. The 0.5 fuzzy set score which stands for maximum ambiguity (cases are nor in nor out of the set), here was avoided as recommended by Schneider and Wagemann (2012). This is due to an important consequence of a mathematical property of the method: whenever a case holds a membership score of exactly 0.5 in one or more of the constitutive conditions, then it cannot be assigned to any of the truth table rows.

The 0.8 mark sets the cases that are mostly in, in other words, have superior practice in the indigenous affairs field e.g., Antonio Fernandes Toninho da Costa (Sept 2016 – Jan 2017) despite being a dentist, has worked with indigenous peoples in the Special Secretariat of Indigenous Health (Sesai) and the Caiuá Evangelical mission.

As for the 1 mark (fully in) was attributed to those cases where individuals had relevant training and considerable practice in the indigenous affairs (e.g., applied in NGOs, on-the-job in Funai), as are the cases of the so-called *sertanistas*, indigenists, and anthropologists, for instance. e.g., Funai employee and anthropologist Artur Nobre Mendes (Aug/02–Jan/03 and Jun/16–Sept/16).

**Social mobilization**

For this study, here social mobilization is considered a dichotomous condition. Based on the work of Vieira and Quack (2016) I use a broad definition of pro-social movements which argue that they can be expressed through various channels (i.e., protests, riots, judicial action, lobbying government) and by multiple agents (i.e., national and international NGOs, indigenous groups, intellectuals, partisans from left-wing parties, civil servants). Also, like Vieira and Quack (2016), I consider that pro-indigenous social mobilization manifests itself through international linkages or networks, and therefore, the impact of national from international pressure cannot be fully separated.

Appointments made during the period of higher pro-indigenous social mobilization (protests, the formation of organizations, and transnational activism) received a 1 in the factor “social mobilization.” As for appointments made during periods when the pro-indigenous social movement had little influence – lack of leading agents backing up the movement, with only
occasional manifestations, and little recognition by media outlets – translate into a membership score of 0 in the condition.

The period here marked by having international and national social mobilization presence goes from 1978 until 1992. In 1978, under the menace of the emancipation of indigenous peoples, activism on the indigenous cause got organized, with the formation of many institutions, culminating in the 1987-1988 Constitutional assembly that managed to pass a considerably superior legal framework for indigenous affairs. In 1992, chief of states from all over the world came to Brazil to attend the summit that addressed sustainable environmental development, and that of course, tackled the indigenous mobilization cause. After 1992, what was observed is occasional and mostly regional (instead of national) riots, open letters, lawsuits and protests and warnings from international organizations like the International Labor Organization and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of major human rights violations against indigenous groups. Recent examples include the protests and lawsuits against the construction from 2011 on of the Belo Monte Dam11 in traditionally occupied lands and the mobilization for the (lengthy) land demarcation process of the indigenous land Raposa Sera do Sol12 during which a national debate has sparked on a possible revision of constitutional land tenure rights.

Sources to the coding included the following readings, as well as case-knowledge of this author: Vieira; Quack (2016), Rodrigues (2002); Valente (2017) Yashar, (1998, 1999); Bigio (2007); CEDI (1981, 1991); Jackson, Warren (2005); Abers; Von Bülow (2011, 2018) and Luciano (2006).

**Democracy**

Here I use a dichotomous calibration of the membership scores for the condition “democracy.” Democracy is here defined as periods when rulers were elected directly or indirectly through free elections, that is, with a political competition. Appointments made during periods with a democratic regime code 1 for democracy, and 0 for non-democracy. Hence, here non-democracy comprises the period ranging from Costa e Silva’s presidency (when Funai
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started) until Figueiredo’s administration (the last non-democratic president until today). All subsequent administrations were classified as democratic.

**Right-wing**

The condition “Right-wing” stands for the ideology of the president. Drawing from Amorim Neto (2006), I adopt the definition that the ideology of a president is that of his or her party. Therefore, presidents with a party that identifies as conservative are considered right-wing. The dichotomous calibration of the membership scores is the following: 1 for right-wing presidents; 0 otherwise (center-left, center-right or left-wing parties).

During the military regime (1964 to 1985), the ruling party, ARENA (National Renovating Alliance), was a conservative party, and therefore presidents of the regime also were classified as full members of the right-wing set (membership score=1). During Figueiredo’s administration it was replaced by the Partido Democrático Social (PDS), with few changes, but a different name (POWER; RODRIGUES-SILVEIRA, 2018).

As for Fernando Collor’s (Mar/1990–Dec/1992) National Reconstruction Party (PRN\(^{13}\)) it self-identified as a full right-wing party, as supported by Power and Zucco (2009). Thus, for the duration of Collor’s administration, the condition right-wing received a membership score of 1.

However, it is important to stress that across the years the position of parties has shifted, as argued by Power and Rodrigues-Silveira (2018), and Power and Zucco (2009, 2012). For instance, the PSDB (Brazilian Social Democratic Party) during Fernando Henrique Cardoso administration (Jan/1995–Dec/1998; Jan/1999–Dec/2002) was a centrist party, and thus classified here as non-rightist. However, over the years the PSDB went further to the right of the ideology spectrum (POWER; RODRIGUES-SILVEIRA, 2018). Similarly, even though Michel Temer’s (Aug/2016–present) Brazilian Democratic Movement (MDB) has shifted to the right recently, the party remains a “heterogeneous, decentralized, catchall support party for virtually all presidents since 1985 (POWER; RODRIGUES-SILVEIRA, 2018, p. 257).”

Therefore, here I classify as non-rightist, rather than full right-wing, or conservative presidencies those of Itamar Franco (Dec/92–Jan/95), and Michel Temer’s (Aug/2016–present). One exception was José Sarney (Mar/85–Mar/90) who had just left the conservative PDS to join

PMDB right before running for the presidency in the first democratic election after the end of the military regime. Thus, Sarney was considered here a rightist.

Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (Jan/03-Dec/10) and Dilma Rousseff’s (Jan/11–Aug/16) PT (Workers’ Party) is one of the “leftmost party on the Brazilian ideological spectrum,” and thus, they were also coded as “non-rightists” (POWER; ZUCCO, 2012, p. 9).

**Economic Crisis**

Economic crises, as argued by Giambigi et al. (2010) are periods where external and internal shocks caused a problematic growth or macroeconomic conditions in the Brazilian economy. Periods with economic crises according to either by Giambigi et al. (2010) or more recently by Barbosa e Filho (2017) received a membership score of 1 in the condition (1981–83; 1985–1989; 1990–1992, 2002; 2009; 2014–2018), and 0 otherwise.

**Military influence**

The theorized condition of military influence captures the leverage that the armed forces had over presidents. Presidents considered highly dependent of the military received a membership score of 1: José Sarney (Mar/85–Mar/90), Itamar Franco (Dec/92–Jan/95) and Michel Temer (Aug/2016–present). All other presidents that had a more distant relationship or less dependent relationship with the military received a membership score of 0.

Sarney, being the first civilian chief of state after 21 years has had to cooperate with the military during the democratic transition, due to the risk of being overthrown. Also, he had six ministries ran by military officers, a high investment on defense, and an overall high dependence on the armed forces (as demonstrated by the measures of Amorim Neto, 2015; Bruneau; Tollefson, 2014; Stepan, 1988).

As for Itamar Franco, facing an important economic crisis, lack of popular support and a political turmoil after the impeachment of Collor, he turned to the military for support, a similar strategy employed by presidents prior to 1946 (AMORIM NETO, 2015). This strategy is shown by the great percentage of appointments of military officers to ministries which were expected to

---

14 According to Giambigi et al. (2010, p.155), in 1993 and 1994, the economy showed expressive growth rates (4.9%, in 1993, and 5.9% 1994), and thus, despite the hyperinflation, these years were considered as “no-crisis”.
be run by civilian ministers, as seen in Amorim Neto (2015). More recently, Michel Temer has strengthened its bond with the armed forces – which had become shaken with Franco’s successors.

Similar to Franco, Temer also experience very little popular support, having stepped into office after an impeachment process as well (PT’s Dilma Rousseff). One of the actions that signaled an approximation to the military was the recreation of the agency responsible for direct assistance and advice to the president on military and security matters: The Office of Institutional Security of the Presidency of the Republic (GSI). Another key event was set in February 2018, when Temer appointed the General Joaquim Silva e Luna to head the Ministry of Defense. General Luna – who was an interim until June when he was turned into a “full minister” by Temer – was the first military to command the portfolio since 1999, when the ministry was created.

5. RESULTS OF THE FUZZY SET QCA FOR EXPERTISE AND NON-EXPERTISE

First, the previously raw data matrix was imported to the software fs/QCA 3.0 by Ragin and Davey (2017). The membership scores of each condition and the outcome, calibrated as previously debated and detailed in Appendices C and D is seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Membership scores of the five causal factors and the outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campos (Dec/67-Jun/70)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandeira de Mello (Jun/70-Mar/74)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araújo de Oliveira (Mar/74-Mar/79)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribeiro da Silva (Mar/79-Nov/79)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobre da Veiga (Nov/79-Oct/81)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leal (Oct/81-Jul/83)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferreira Lima (Jul/83-May/84)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Fonseca (May/84-Sept/84)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marabuto (Sept/84-Apr/85)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alves (Apr/85-Sept/85)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meireles (Nov/85-May/86)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jucá (May/86-Sept/88)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Oliveira (Sept/88-Mar/90)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcântara (Mar/90-Aug/90)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimarães (Aug/90-Jun/91)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possuelo (Jun/91-May/93)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romero (May/93-Sept/93)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeiro (Sept/93-Sept/95)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santilli (Sept/95-Mar/96)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaiger (Mar/96-Jul/97)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvestre (Aug/97-Feb/99)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Lacerda (Feb/99-Nov/99)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marês (Nov/99-Apr/00)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvarez (May/00-Jun/02)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendes I (Aug/02-Jan/03)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeida (Jan/03-Aug/03)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomes (Sep/03-Mar/07)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meira (Mar/07-Apr/12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azevedo (Apr/12-Jun/13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assirati (Jun/13-Oct/14)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiarelli (Oct/14-Jun/15)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonçalves da Costa (Jun/15-Jun/16)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendes II (Jun/16-Sept/16)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do Nascimento Netto (Sept/16-Jan/17)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toninho Costa (Jan/17-May/17)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freitas (May/17-Apr/18)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Conditions Military Influence [M], Right-wing[R], Crisis[C], Democracy [D], and Social Mobilization[S] code: Yes=1; No=0. Expertise [E] codes 0=fully out; 0.3=mostly out; 0.6=more in than out; 0.8=mostly in; 1=fully in.

To assess the criteria deemed fundamental to the appointment of experts, I start by the analysis of necessary conditions which was performed for all factors individually. The full results are seen in Table 2.

The notion of necessity in set theory means that a necessary condition is one without which the outcome is absent. The concept tries to capture if the outcome can be considered a subset of the condition, that is: “whenever the outcome is present, the condition is also present, but there can be cases that are members of the condition but not the outcome (SCHNEIDER; WAGEMANN, 2012, p. 330).”

To test the necessity of the conditions, Ragin (2008) suggests a measure of fit, the consistency score and one of empirical relevance, the coverage. Schneider and Wagemann (2012) argue that in fuzzy sets like the present, the consistency of a necessary condition measures how each case’s membership in the condition is equal to or greater than their
membership in the outcome.

As for the coverage yielded by the fs/QCA, it aims to capture if the conditions deemed necessary are too trivial or not. The coverage of the condition captures the degree that occurrences of the condition are matched with instances of the outcome (RAGIN, 2008).

Following Legewie’s (2013) suggestion, here it is considered that necessary conditions are those that reach a high consistency score, ideally as a high as 0.9, while its coverage should not be under the 0.5 mark.

Results from the necessary assessment show that a democratic regime is a necessary condition for appointing experts (consistency=0.96; coverage=0.61). Also, another almost necessary condition was the absence of a right-wing president (consistency=0.81; coverage=0.69). These findings corroborate hypothesis 3 (democratic regimes contribute to the appointment of experts to Funai) and 4 of this study (non-rightist presidents in office contribute to the appointment of experts in Funai) while the other conditions were not necessary conditions for the appointments of experts to Funai (military influence over the president, lack of economic crisis and social mobilization).

This seems to indicate that a) political regime and b) the incumbents’ agenda are more important than the pressure of some groups – perhaps especially due to the low institutionalization and insulation of the agency. So, similar to what Dargent (2014) has found, having a context where multiple agents in power can proceed as checks and balances of others seems to increase the costs of opting for solely partisan or loyalist criteria. In other words, a certain degree of expertise might be needed to legitimize the commissioning in front of agencies’ stakeholders. These implications dialogue with D’Araujo and Petek’s (2018) findings on high-level bureaucracy in Brazil: appointments to social agencies do not necessarily imply in less trained individuals, despite their overall high levels of partisanship.
Table 2 – Results from the necessity assessment for expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions Tested</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~Military Influence</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Right-wing</td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.69</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Crisis</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td><strong>0.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.61</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Mobilization</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Outcome used: Expertise. Items in bold met the standards of a 0.9 consistency score and a 0.5 coverage, as suggested by Legewie (2013). The symbol “~” indicates the absence of a condition.

Then, using the fs/QCA software, the raw data matrix was organized in a truth table. The full truth table yielded by the fs/QCA has 2k rows (where k represents the number of causal conditions) and reflects all possible combinations of causal conditions including those with no cases in the raw matrix (see Appendix A). Each row represents a unique combination of conditions.

Next, the distribution of cases in the truth table was analyzed, and a rule of thumb was defined to classify the combinations, that is, the rows, based on their relevance to the analysis. Regardless of how many fuzzy sets are combined, each case has a membership of higher than 0.5 in only one of the 2k logically possible combinations, and therefore can only be considered a member of that row combination of conditions represented in the truth table.

Ragin (2010) claims that researches should define relevance according to the frequency and consistency of the solutions. Specifically, regarding frequency, Ragin (2010) suggests that when the number of cases to be analyzed is small, the advised frequency threshold is one or two. So, following Ragin’s recommendation, here the adopted minimum is 2.

A cutoff of 0.75 for the set-theoretic consistency was selected based both on the minimum suggested by Ragin (2008, 2010) and on the distribution of cases. However, it is important to stress that authors suggest that a higher threshold should be used whenever possible (SCHNEIDER; WAGEMANN 2012, LEGEWIE, 2013).

Consistency is a parameter of fit and “provides a numerical expression for the degree to which the empirical information deviates from a perfect subset relation (SCHNEIDER; WAGEMANN, 2012, p. 129).”

Choosing a consistency threshold implies setting a 1 for rows that met the 0.75 threshold, and 0 otherwise, for the configuration of the logical minimization process (see Table 3). The first
and second rows in Table 3 were covered by the threshold and thus received a 1 that is, were set as sufficient conditions for the outcome Y (SCHNEIDER; WAGEMANN 2012).

Table 3 – Truth table analysis with consistency cutoff set as 0.76 and frequency set at 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Influence</th>
<th>Right-wing</th>
<th>Crisis</th>
<th>Democracy</th>
<th>Social Mobilization</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Raw consist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Expertise refers to whether the cases of the combination or row are above the consistency cutoff, that is, they are set as a subset of the outcome “Expertise” (No=0; Yes=1).

The logical minimization of the sufficiency statements of the truth table, fs/QCA uses the Quine–McCluskey algorithm. For so, the fs/QCA software provides three solutions with regard to the simplifying assumptions used in the minimization process: 1) the complex; 2) the intermediate; 3) the parsimonious.

Schneider and Wagemann (2012) argue that these can be seen in a continuum that one end (the complex solution), no counterfactuals are allowed in the analysis of the truth table, and in another, both easy and difficult counterfactuals are allowed (the parsimonious solution).

The intermediate solution allows for the selection of simplifying assumptions to reduce complexity of the results based on the empirical knowledge of the researcher. It translates to the selection whether conditions are theorized to contribute to the outcome whenever present or absent for preventing or allowing counterfactuals for these conditions. Thus, here I focus on the intermediate solution that only allows for counterfactuals based on the hypothesized relationship of this thesis. The assumptions set were: military influence (absent); right-wing (absent); crisis (absent); democracy (present); social mobilization (present). The results of the three solutions are displayed in Table 4 below.
Table 4 – Results from the necessity and sufficiency assessments for expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary condition</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>←E</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimonious solution</td>
<td>-R*C</td>
<td>→E</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-R*C</td>
<td>→E</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate solution</td>
<td>-R<em>C</em>D</td>
<td>→E</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-R<em>C</em>D*S</td>
<td>→E</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: D=Democracy; R=Right-wing; C=Crisis; S=Social Mobilization; E=Expertise. The symbol “†” denotes the logical operator OR; “#” denotes logical AND; “~” indicates the absence of a condition. Necessity is represented as “←” and sufficiency as “→.” Cases with greater than 0.5 membership in all three terms are: Assirati, Azevedo, Meira, Gomes, Almeida, Alvarez, Marés, de Lacerda, Silvestre, Gaiger, Santilli, Madeiro, and Romero.

It is possible to verify that the three solutions yield a very similar path drawing from the same pool of cases: 13 observations were assigned as sufficient, out of the total of 36. The 13 with greater 0.5 membership, that is comprised in each of the three paths are: Assirati (Jun/13–Oct/14), Azevedo (Apr/12–Jun/13), Meira (Mar/07–Apr/12), Gomes (Sept/03–Mar/07), Almeida (Jan/03–Aug/03), Alvarez (May/00–Jun/02), Marés (Nov/99–Apr/00), de Lacerda (Fev/99–Nov/99), Silvestre (Aug/97–Fev/99), Gaiger (Mar/96–Jul/97), Santilli (Sept/95–Mar/96), Madeiro (Sept/93–Fev/93), and Romero (May/93–Sept/93). This is due to the low consistency of the other combination of solutions as displayed in Table 3.

As a result, the consistency and coverage did not vary. The consistency across solutions was 0.8 and the coverage 0.61, which indicates a good overall fit: few cases contradict the paths (assessed by the consistency). However, the coverage of 0.61 suggests that the empirical relevance (linked to the number of cases that support the assessment) falls short: path’s coverage scores lie under the 0.75 minimum suggested by Legewie (2013).

An unexpected finding was the neat solutions with few factors and causal paths generated compared to usually complex results produced by the Qualitative Comparative Analysis algorithm. Also, the truth table analysis only showed one path that contradicts the hypothesis, (i.e., in path 3, the condition social mobilization with the opposite sign), as seen in Table 4, contributing to the robustness of the findings.
Among the five explanations tested, three showed in the sufficient conditions yielded by the logical minimization in the intermediate solution, the one I focus here, as it allows only for counterfactuals that are in line with the hypothesized relations, as previously mentioned. The yielded path is the combination of the following conditions: 1) non-rightist presidents; 2) the absence of economic crisis; 3) a democratic regime. Individually, these are INUS conditions: an insufficient but necessary part of a condition which is itself unnecessary but sufficient for the result” (MACKIE, 1965 apud MAHONEY; KIMBAL; KOIVU, 2009, 125).

The path yielded by the intermediate solution (~R*~C*D) indicates that the combination of having a non-rightist president, with the absence of an economic crisis, and a democratic regime are the conditions considered sufficient for the appointment of experts (E) to social agencies like Funai. As for the complex solution, it repeated the other conditions INUS from the intermediate analysis, with the inclusion of social mobilization with the opposite sign of what was predicted, i.e., the absence of social mobilization.

The path of the parsimonious solution “~R*~C,” in good prose suggests that the combination of having a non-rightist president, combined with the absence of an economic crisis are sufficient conditions for the appointment of experts to Funai.

Also, the consistency and coverage of the solutions as well of the terms in each path showed to be rather stable (consistency=0.8; raw coverage =0.61).

Social mobilization and the military influence over the incumbent were not present in any of the solutions, and thus cannot be considered sufficient conditions for promoting the appointment of experts. As for democracy, besides being a necessary condition, the results suggest that it is also a sufficient factor for the appointment of experts to Funai.

To verify the empirical distribution of cases, the membership scores of the cases in the intermediate solution (~R*~C*D) is plotted against the scores of the outcome as suggested by Mello (2014) and Schneider and Wagemann (2012) in Figure 1. Cases above or on the diagonal line of the x-y plot support the sufficiency claim of the solution term (Zones 1, 5, 6). This means that the cases’ membership in the outcome set – expertise, shown in the vertical axis – is equal to or lower than their membership score of the solution, complying with the sufficiency assumption.
While ideally, the number of cases which are members of the solution should be higher, there are only four that contradict the solution: Assirati (Jun/13–Oct/14), Gaiger (Mar/96–Jul/97), de Lacerda (Fev/99–Nov/99), and Silvestre (Aug/97–Fev/99). Thus, 32 out of the 36 cases support the intermediate solution term.

In Zone 1 are the so-called “typical cases” for the intermediate path “−R∗−C∗D, that is, the appointment of experts in a context where the following conditions coincided: a non-rightist president, the absence of an economic crisis, and a democratic regime. In this cluster, lies the cases like Geologist Glênio Alvarez, a Funai employee of 14 years and hence, considered an expert in indigenism. Alvarez was nominated in May 2000 by a non-rightist president, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, in a democratic regime, during a period with no major economic crises in Brazil (CPDOC, n.d).

Also, the first two cases are located in Zone 2 and can be considered “uncharacteristic” since they still show the outcome (y>0), but in a lesser extent than those in Zone 1. Only the latter two, De Lacerda and Silvestre can be considered actual deviant cases since they held membership in the intermediate solution but did not present the expected outcome (MELLO, 2014).
Júlio Gaiger (Mar/96–Jul/97) was appointed during a period of a democratic regime, no significant economic shocks and during a non-rightist presidency, Fernando Henrique Cardoso considered a centrist in this study based on his party’ position at the time (the PSDB). He is an almost typical case: while his scoring in expertise (0.8) was lower than the membership score in the solution (1), the 0.8 mark shows that Gaiger is mostly in the “expertise set.” He has superior practice in indigenous affairs, having worked in the Missionary Indigenous Council (CIMI), and directed the National Association of Support for Indians (ANAI).

Similarly, Maria Augusta Boulitreau Assirati (Jun/13–Oct/14), appointed during Rousseff’s administration to fill the position after the resignation of Marta Maria Azevedo (Jun/12 – Apr/13). Her training is in peripheral areas (law and public policy), and she has occupied positions in different ministries and no significant background in indigenous affairs rather than an experience in Funai’s Department of Sustainable Development. Therefore, the membership score of 0.6 (more in than out) does not contribute to the theory formally, while one cannot say that she’s fully a non-expert.

As previously mentioned, the appointments of the lawyer Sulivan Silvestre (Aug/97–Fev/99) and of the career politician José Márcio Panoff de Lacerda (Fev/99–Nov/99) are deviant cases. In the first case, scholars argue that he represents a peculiar appointment by Minister of Justice Iris Rezende member of Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s first term administration (Jan/1995–Dec/1998), who managed to show his “gunpowder” power by appointing a “loyalist and a complete stranger” to indigenist policies, despite the discontent of Funai employees and NGOs (CPDOC, n.d; ISA, 2000).

As for José Márcio Panoff de Lacerda (Fev/99–Nov/99), the former congressman and vice governor of Mato Grosso by the PMDB party came to office to substitute for Silvestre after his sudden death in a plane accident during work at Funai. He stayed in office shortly and resigned due to the pressure of indigenous communities and NGOs for what they called a lack of managerial skills in Funai (ISA, 2000).

As recommended in the Qualitative Comparative Analysis’ literature (e.g., Mello, 2014; Schneider; Wagemann, 2012), the sufficiency and the necessary assessments for non-experts was also conducted using fsQCA and the same data shown in Table 2. Unlike statistical methods, in QCA, one cannot claim or expect a symmetric effect of the factors on the non-outcome. Instead, another separate analysis must be conducted.
*Non-expertise*

The necessary fsQCA test showed that no condition by itself is a necessary condition for appointing non-experts (see Table 5). So non-democracy cannot be formally considered a necessary condition for appointing non-experts. Relaxing the assumptions of the test by conducting a paired assessment of conditions, it was found that the combination with higher consistency and coverage was the presence of social mobilization OR having a right-wing incumbent. Separately, social mobilization and right-wing incumbents are SUIN conditions: “a sufficient, but unnecessary part of a factor that is insufficient, but necessary for an outcome” (MACKIE, 1965 *apud* MAHONEY; KIMBAL; KOIVU, 2009, 126). The findings suggest that within the context of an absence of social mobilization or right-wing incumbents, non-experts to social agencies are more likely to become appointed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions Tested</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~Social Mobilization+Right-wing</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Social Mobilization+Military Influence</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Democracy+Crisis</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Influence+Crisis</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-wing+Crisis</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Social Mobilization+Crisis</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Democracy+~Social Mobilization</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Democracy+Military Influence</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Influence</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Democracy+Right-wing</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-wing</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Social Mobilization</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Democracy</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Outcome used: Non-expertise. Items in bold met the standards of a 0.9 consistency score and a 0.5 coverage, as suggested by Legewie (2013). The symbol “~” indicates the absence of a condition and + stands for the logical operator OR.

Proceeding to the analysis of the sufficient conditions for non-expertise, a similar process to the one used in the evaluation of expertise was conducted. In order to investigate the causes behind the appointments of non-experts, the fuzzy set of expertise is reversed (1-membership
score), here also called as the “~expertise” set or “~E.” The same five hypothesized conditions were employed in the model: social mobilization, right-wing, military influence, democracy, and crisis.

First, the distribution of cases as seen in Table 6 was analyzed, and the minimum number of cases selected as a parameter for the evaluation was 2, similarly to what was conducted in the test for expertise. The full truth table with all logical reminders is shown in Appendix B. Considering the raw consistency of the combinations, the threshold employed for the truth table analysis was 0.85, covering the 9 cases of the first three rows: Marabuto (Sep/84–Apr/85), da Fonseca (May/84-Sept/84), Ferreira Lima (Jul/83-May/84), Leal (Oct/81-Jul/83), Nobre da Veiga (Nov/79-Oct/81), Ribeiro da Silva (Mar/79-Nov/79), Araújo de Oliveira (Mar/74-Mar/79), Bandeira de Mello (Jun/70-Mar/74), and Campos(Dec/67-Jun/70).

Table 6 – Truth table analysis with consistency cutoff set as 0.85 and frequency set at 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Expertise refers to whether the cases of the combination or row are above the consistency cutoff, that is, they are set as a subset of the outcome “~Expertise” (No=0; Yes=1).

Results from the logical minimization of the fsQCA model comprising the five conditions for “non-expertise,” suggest that there are four different paths to non-expertise, as shown in Table 7. The intermediate solution here was also chosen to be further analyzed since it assumes that the counterfactuals used in the logical minimization do not contradict the hypothesis of this thesis. That is, the factors that contribute to the outcome (non-expertise) whenever present are: military influence, right-wing, and crisis. As for democracy and social mobilization, they can only contribute to the outcome whenever absent.

The intermediate, the parsimonious and the complex solution yielded by the Quine–McCluskey algorithm had an identical fit: consistency of each of the solutions=0.93; raw coverage=0.44. While the solutions present considerable consistency (>0.9), they fall short in the
coverage (<0.75), most likely also due to the small number of cases comprised in the solutions that passed the threshold to be considered in the analysis (9 out of 36), as previously mentioned.

Three out of the five theorized conditions showed up as INUS conditions in the solutions, and in the correct direction (the opposite as hypothesized for the appointment of experts) in paths 2, 3 and 4: military influence (M), right-wing (R), non-democracy (~D). It is noteworthy that the three INUS conditions of the intermediate solution (path 2), are in line with the theorized conditions of hypothesis 2 (military influence), 3 (democratic regime) and 4 (rightist presidents). The absence of social movements (S) did not show up in any solutions, and the absence of a crisis (~C) appeared in path 3 with an opposite sign.

In three out of the four paths (2, 3, 4), the absence of democracy, right-wing and military influence are present, and thus it corroborates the strength of the hypothesized condition for the appointment of non-experts. Moreover, democracy was displayed as the single sufficient condition in the parsimonious solution (path 1).

While the absence of democracy (~D) is not a necessary condition for the appointment of non-experts, it is sufficient: that is, more factors can lead the appointment of non-experts to Funai, and non-democracy is only one of the explanations since it is a subset of the outcome.

Over Funai’s history it is visible that during the authoritarian regime in Brazil, political costs to appoint loyalist to the government instead of focusing solely on technical criteria became too low. Also, it makes sense that both non-democracy and having a right-wing president emerged as conditions in the sufficiency assessment, as they are closely linked: non-democratic period coincided with a right-wing administration.

The occurrence of crises is a rather weak condition, as it also appeared as an INUS condition to the appointments of non-experts. (No) right-wing and (no) democracy seem important factors: they appear in the appropriate direction in the sufficient tests of expertise and non-expertise. With regard to social mobilization in the fourth path, the opposite sign to what was predicted perhaps indicates a deficient measure.
Table 7 – Results from the necessity and sufficiency assessments for non-expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary condition</td>
<td>~S+R</td>
<td>←~E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimonious solution</td>
<td>~D</td>
<td>→~E</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate solution</td>
<td>M<em>R</em>~D</td>
<td>→~E</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex solution</td>
<td>M<em>R</em>-C*-D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M<em>R</em>-D*S</td>
<td>→E</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: D=Democracy; M=Military Influence; R=Right-wing; C=Crisis; S=Social Mobilization; E=Expertise. The symbol “+” denotes the logical operator OR; “*” denotes logical AND; “~” indicates the absence of a condition. Necessity is represented as “←” and sufficiency as “→.” Cases with greater than 0.5 membership in each path are: 1) Marabuto, da Fonseca, Ferreira Lima, Leal, Nobre da Veiga, Ribeiro da Silva, Araújo de Oliveira, Bandeira de Mello, and Campos; 2) Marabuto, da Fonseca, Ferreira Lima, Leal, Nobre da Veiga, Ribeiro da Silva, Araújo de Oliveira, Bandeira de Mello, and Campos; 3) Marabuto, da Fonseca, Nobre da Veiga, Ribeiro da Silva, Araújo de Oliveira, Bandeira de Mello, and Campos; 4) Marabuto, da Fonseca, Ferreira Lima, Leal, Nobre da Veiga, and Ribeiro da Silva.

Figure 2 below demonstrates the distribution of cases visually according to the membership score in the intermediate solution: having military influence over the president, combined with a right-wing president and non-democracy.

Figure 2 – Distribution of empirical cases in the intermediate solution for non-expertise
As seen in the x-y plot, only two cases contradict the intermediate solution term \((M*R-D)\) as they are below the diagonal line: Marabuto and Da Fonseca (Zone 2). Nélsong Marabuto Domingues (Sep/84–Apr/85) was a police officer before his appointment to Funai’s presidency during João Figueiredo’s (March/79–March/85), the last president of the military regime in Brazil. He cannot be considered a full member of the non-expertise set, due to his previous role as the chief of Funai’s security advising office. Marabuto was the one in charge of the democratic transition from João Figueiredo’s administration to José Sarney’s. This was exactly during the succession crisis due to the disputes between sections of indigenism in Brazil which were happening in the background of the regime transaction: from November 1984 to November 1985, five presidents have been appointed to the position, as previously mentioned.

In Zone 1 lie the typical cases: non-experts appointed during the period of non-democracy, right-wing presidents with great military influence, and thus support the path “M*R~D.” Two rather illustrative cases are the previously discussed appointments of Queirós Campos and Bandeira de Mello. José de Queirós Campos (Dec/67-Jun/70), a journalist and a former councilman by the National Democratic Union (UDN) without previous experience in indigenous affairs was appointed as Funai’s first president. As for Jeronymo Bandeira de Mello, he was the first general appointed to command Funai, and he has set the tone for his successors’ administrations, who were mainly military officers like him (CPDOC, n.d). Both were appointed during the (right-wing) military regime, considered a non-democratic period of Brazilian politics. Hence, they were put in place by right-wing presidents with high military influence (Costa e Silva and Médici, respectively).

Due to the high correlation among the factors here assessed (three of them are related directly to the president: right-wing, democracy, and military influence), as well as to the low number of observations (36), the possibility of testing the hypothesis through traditional econometrics is hindered by design. To further check the robustness of the findings, the correlation coefficients are displayed in Table 8.
It is possible to verify that while one cannot claim causation from correlation only, the correlations corroborate the results found. Military influence and right-wing incumbents are negatively and significantly correlated to expertise, while democracy is positively and significantly correlated to the appointment of experts to Funai. Economic crisis – that is not significantly correlated – and social mobilization – which showed an opposite sign than the one expected – appeared as the weakest measures of the assessment once more.

In summary, based on the 36 presidencies of Funai here analyzed, a democratic regime is both a necessary and an INUS condition for the appointment of experts. The other condition that was deemed sufficient as INUS factors for the appointment of experts to Funai was a non-rightist president. These findings corroborate hypothesis 3 (the democratic regime contributed to the appointment of experts), and 4 (non-rightist presidents contributed to the appointment of experts). While present in the intermediate term of sufficiency test of expertise, the absence of economic crisis was also present in the assessments of non-expertise, and thus, showed a weak explanatory power.

It seems that non-democracy and right-wing carry a symmetric effect as these are present with the opposite signs, as INUS conditions for non-expertise as well. However, an asymmetric impact is that military influence over the incumbent only showed in the assessment of non-experts. This is expected as causal asymmetry is one of the main assumptions of the method (RAGIN, 2008, MELLO, 2014). So, while the absence of influence of the military is not sufficient for the appointment of experts, having a president in office with strong ties with the armed forces might increase the pressure to distribute high-level positions based on loyalty or other criteria, above and beyond policy expertise. Thus, it corroborates indirectly with hypothesis 2: Military influence over presidents did not contribute to the appointment of experts to Funai.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Military Influence</th>
<th>Right-wing</th>
<th>Crisis</th>
<th>Democracy</th>
<th>Social Mobilization</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-wing</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>-0.55*</td>
<td>-0.64*</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Mobilization</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.84*</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>-0.37*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expertise</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.36</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.53</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.51</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>-0.37</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<0.05
6. CONCLUSION, FINAL REMARKS AND LIMITATIONS

In this MSc thesis, my goal was to address the gap in the literature regarding political appointment patterns in social agencies, more specifically to uncover under which conditions the Executive appoints policy experts to leadership positions.

To address this question, I used Qualitative Comparative Analysis. I examined which were the sufficient and necessary factors for the appointment of policy experts as presidents to Funai – officials with technical experience and training – during the period from 1967 to 2018.

I expected that the following features contributed to the appointment of policy experts as presidents: a democratic regime, the ideology of the incumbent, the absence of military influence over the incumbent, the absence of economic crises, and pressure from social movements.

Following fuzzy-set analysis good practices, two separate fsQCA procedures were conducted — one for the analysis of the outcome (expertise) and another for its negation (non-expertise). Non-rightist presidents and a democratic regime, when combined, and democracy by itself are two of the paths that promote the appointment of experts to Funai. The absence of economic crisis has shown to be a week measure and therefore cannot be claimed as having promoted the appointment of experts. As for the absence of military influence and social mobilization, results have shown that they were not as important to the promotion of expertise as predicted.

Related to the commissioning of someone to the office that cannot be considered a policy expert in indigenous affairs, the absence of democracy, strong ties between incumbents and the military, and right-wing incumbents were among the conditions shown sufficient – when in conjunction with each other. The absence of social mobilization showed dubious effects. Therefore, further investigation is needed to untangle how social mobilization affects the pattern of appointments.

Thus, the main contributions of this study are showing that important political attributes like ideology and large institutional factors such as regime matter. They have shaped the incentives of incumbents to select their cadres. Here, democracy coincides with the openness of the Brazilian government to more agents (e.g., number of parties, as discussed by Mainwaring, 1999; Mainwaring et al., 2000). This intensification of the political arena also coincides with a tendency to select political appointees from the pool of technical experts, rather than partisans or cronies. Thus, it implies that it becomes too costly to the incumbent to ignore the context his inserted in a democratic regime.
As for appointments during the authoritarian regime, the results suggest that the Executive tended to opt for appointees within their prerogatives – that is, selecting officers or engineers aligned with the developmental paradigm of the time. This corroborates Dargent (2014) findings that the risk of committing policy errors, as well a more balanced constellation of stakeholders greatly influence the decision of presidents whenever interfering in public agencies.

The fact that a non-democratic regime was a sufficient condition for the appointment of non-experts dialogues with Dargent’s (2014) findings which show that an important unbalance in the constellation of stakeholders carries important implications. If among the public of interest of a policy agency lies only one agent with significant more policy-making influence than the others, it becomes easier for him to meddle in technical policies that affect his interest.

Ideology also showed to be an important factor, especially right-wing vs. non-rightists. This corroborates the findings of D’Araujo and Petek (2018), Kaplan (2017) and Alexidou and Gunaydin (2018), which show that the attributes of the appointees also depend on the agenda of the incumbent. In the case of Funai, for right-wing incumbents, matters like national territory development and security have shown to be key elements. Thus, they selected presidents that would carry on their preferred policies and would signal to the community of interest the line of work they would do in the field, similarly to what was suggested by Kaplan (2017) and Alexidou and Gunaydin (2018).

Also, the results of the configurational analysis showed that the combination of authoritarianism, military influence, and rightist incumbents are sufficient for the appointment of non-experts. Throughout the authoritarian regime, the three conditions, in fact, were present and are closely linked to ideology (it was a rightist military regime). Hence, the mismatch between the military and indigenists which shaped Funai’s history also reflected in the absence of the latter class in Funai’s presidency during the authoritarianism regime, and it seems to be linked to the ideological differences between these two groups. While there’s no systematic research that maps anthropologists’ political ideology across time, for instance, just by observing the Brazilian anthropological association’s website (ABA)\(^\text{17}\), one can perceive that the themes debated by the professional cluster are predominantly associated with a leftist orientation, and thus, very differently from those that resonate with the military which are mostly rightist themes.

However, it is important to stress that the mechanism of the relationships here discussed between regimes, ideology and appointments remain speculative. Hence, subsequent studies with other techniques more appropriate to cover this puzzle like process tracing as discussed by Mahoney (2015) is encouraged. Also, future inquiries might also focus on untangling the motivations behind political appointments. For instance, how much the appointment of experts can be attributed to the loyalty of the appointees and to which extent is a matter of signaling to voters their policy commitment?

This study also dialogues with the asymmetry of policy-making capacity across agencies, as seen in the work of Bersch, Praça and Taylor (2017, 2017a). Even though here in this thesis I only evaluate the conditions for policy expertise of one social agency, it contributed to the body of work on selective insulation during the non-democratic regime: a technical cadre was present in many agencies like Petrobras and BNDES as argued in the literature, but it was not the case of Funai as shown here. This suggests greater evidence that the military regime in Brazil followed a technocratic ruling only in agencies more deeply aligned with economic and developmental goals (FERNANDES et al., 2017).

The weak performance of the social mobilization condition must be confronted with the ambiguity of the concept itself and the biases of the social movements’ literature add to the difficulty of properly evaluating the social movements, especially new forms of social mobilization (e.g., inside the bureaucracy, during the PT government), as debated by Abers and Van Bülow (2011, 2018). Thus, it is important to stress that more systematic and longitudinal research on pro-indigenous mobilization is in order to assess the intensity of the movement in the national arena throughout the years. Capturing the intensity of social movements and measuring its outcomes are no easy tasks and require further attempts to further “lapidate” the measure here employed.

As for economic crisis, the presence in both expertise and non-expertise solution, show that the condition cannot be transported to political appointment theories of other sectors less influential on the economic situation of the country, further corroborating the importance of adapting to each sector the conditions that can be considered necessary or sufficient for political appointments.

Furthermore, the external validity of the findings remains a limitation of this study. In order to generalize the findings, future research is needed to compare the pattern of appointments with
other social agencies. Also, the shortage of more systematic and longitudinal data on Funai’s cadres remains as one of the shortcomings of this study, which hindered the possibility of conducting more robustness checks with a higher number of observations through mix-methods techniques, for instance.

Furthermore, the relatively modest coverage of the solutions yielded from the QCA analysis also indicates that other factors might account for the explanation of appointing experts to Funai’s presidency. Thus, future studies can also investigate this empirical gap shown in the data.

The implications of this study involve further showing to policy-makers the necessity of creating political appointment criteria, more than just focusing on quotas of career employees so that more vulnerable agencies like Funai can have in its cadres appropriately trained personnel, despite the changes in the political context.

As for future research questions, comparative studies with indigenous public agencies across the globe like Canada’s (Indigenous Services Canada and Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada), and Mexico’s (Comisión Nacional para el Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígena) are important to verify if this is a national question, or these agencies carry the same peculiarities concerning political appointments. Here I also suggest that subsequent research focus on the legislative influence over patterns of appointments to Funai and social agencies: how does the ideology of the Congress affect it? Moreover, how does the legislature affect agencies’ capacity and turnover?
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### APPENDIX A – Full truth table for expertise

#### Table 9 – Truth table for expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: R=Logical Remainders. ?=Cannot be defined.
APPENDIX B – Full truth table for non-expertise

Table 10 – Truth table for non-expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: R=Logical Remainders. ?=Cannot be defined.
APPENDIX C – Detailed coding of the five hypothesized causal factors for each appointment

Table 11 – Detailed coding of the five hypothesized causal factors for each appointment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Military Influence</th>
<th>Right-wing</th>
<th>Crisis</th>
<th>Democracy</th>
<th>Social Mobilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ismarth A. de Oliveira (Mar/74-Mar/79)</td>
<td>Yes = José Sarney's (Mar/85–Mar/90) administration</td>
<td>Yes = José Sarney's (Mar/85–Mar/90) administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Carlos Nobre da Veiga (Nov/79-Oct/81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo M. Leal (Oct/81-Jul/83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouávio Ferreira Lima (Jul/83-May/84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurandy M. da Fonseca (May/84-Sept/84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Márcio Marabuto (Sept/84-Apr/85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerson da Silva Alves (Apr/85-Sep/85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Apoena Meireles (Nov/85-May/86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romero Jucá (May/86-Sept/88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Pedro de Oliveira (Sept/88-Mar/90)</td>
<td>Yes = Itamar Franco's (Dec/92–Jan/95) administration</td>
<td>No = Itamar Franco's (Dec/92–Jan/95) administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ailton Alcantara (Mar/90-Aug/90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantidio G. Guimarães (Aug/90-Jun/91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney F. Possuelo (Jun/91-May/93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudio dos Santos Romero (May/93-Sep/93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinarte Nobre Madeiro (Sept/93-Sep/95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Márcio J. B. Santilli (Sept/95-Mar/96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Júlio Gaiger (Mar/96-Jul/97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullvan Silvestre (Aug/97-Feb/99)</td>
<td>No = Fernando Henrique Cardoso's (Jan/95-Jan/03) administration</td>
<td>No = Fernando Henrique Cardoso's (Jan/95-Jan/03) administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José M. Panoff de Lacerda (Feb/99-Nov/99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Frederico Marêa (Nov/99-Apr/00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glênio Álvarez (May/00-Jun/02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artur Nobre Mendes I (Aug/02-Jan/03)</td>
<td>No = Lula da Silva's administration (Jan/03-Jan/11)</td>
<td>No = Lula da Silva's administration (Jan/03-Jan/11)</td>
<td>Yes = Crisis of 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>No = 1993 on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Aguiar de Almeida (Jan/03-Aug/03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercio Pereira Gomes (Sept/03-Mar/07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mário Meira (Mar/07-Apr/12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta M. da A. Azevedo (Apr/12-Jun/13)</td>
<td>No = Dilma Rousseff's (Jan/11–Aug/16)*</td>
<td>No = Dilma Rousseff's (Jan/11–Aug/16)*</td>
<td>Yes = Crisis of 2014–2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Augusta B. Assirati (Jun/13-Oct/14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flávio Chiarelli (Oct/14-Jun/15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>João Pedro Gonçalves da Costa (Jun/15-Jun/16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artur Nobre Mendes II (Jun/16-Sept/16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agostinho do Nascimento Netto (Sept/16-Jan/17)</td>
<td>Yes = Michel Temer's administration (Aug/16–)*</td>
<td>No = Michel Temer's administration (Aug/16–)*</td>
<td>Yes = Crisis of 2014–2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Toninho Costa (Jan/17-May/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklimberg Ribeiro Freitas (May/17-Apr/18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *While Michel Temer was only sworn in officially in August 2016, he was already acting as an interim in May 2016, during the impeachment process of President Dilma Rousseff. So, the appointments made from June on, are attributed to his government. No was calibrated to 0 in the final QCA coding as seen in Table 1, and yes to 1.
### APPENDIX D – Detailed coding of the expertise set for each appointment

#### Table 12 – Calibration for the expertise set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th>Professional Background and coding</th>
<th>Expertise calibration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>José de Queiroz Campos (Dec/67-Jun/70)</td>
<td>Fully out = A journalist and former councilman by the National Democratic Union (UDN).</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar J. Bandeira de Mello (Jun/70-Mar/74)</td>
<td>Fully out = A retired general, former head of the Security and Information Division of Funai and former SNI agent. He has participated in the investigation that extinguished the SPL.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismarth A. de Oliveira (Mar/74-Mar/79)</td>
<td>Fully out = A retired general, before being appointed president he had been superintendent of the newly founded Funai.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhemar Ribeiro da Silva (Mar/79-Nov/79)</td>
<td>Fully out = A professional engineer, former director-general of the National Road and Railroad Department (DNER).</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Carlos Nobre da Veiga (Nov/79-Oct/81)</td>
<td>Fully out = A retired colonel.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo M. Leal (Oct/81-Jul/83)</td>
<td>Fully out = A colonel-aviator, former member of the National Security Council and former advisor to Funai during the Nobre da Veiga administration.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otávio Ferreira Lima (Jul/83-May/84)</td>
<td>Fully out = An economist and a former employee of the Ministry of the Interior.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurandy M. da Fonseca (May/84-Sept/84)</td>
<td>Mostly out = A lawyer, he was Funai's chief of staff in the Bandeira Mello and Ismarth Araújo de Oliveira administrations. The release of the announcement of his appointment stated that he had been born in an Indian village and that his father had been a member of the Rondon Commission and had worked for SPL.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nélson Marabuto (Sept/84-Apr/85)</td>
<td>Mostly out = A police officer, former head of Funai’s Information and Security Department and former superintendent of the Federal Police in São Paulo.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerson da Silva Alves (Apr/85-Sept/85)</td>
<td>Mostly out = A retired sergeant and an accountant, Alves had worked in Funai for 14 years, in bureaucratic positions.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Apoena Meireles (Nov/85-May/86)</td>
<td>Fully in = A sertanista, son of the former employee of the SPI and renowned sertanista Francisco Meireles.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romero Jucá (May/86-Sept/88)</td>
<td>Mostly out = A retired general, he has directed the Rondon Project.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Íris Pedro de Oliveira (Sept/88-Mar/90)</td>
<td>Fully out = He worked as a lawyer from 1980-1983 and has headed the Land Group of Araguaia / Tocantins (GETAT), seen as an organ of repression and policing.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aírton Alcântara (Mar/90-Aug/90)</td>
<td>Fully out = A former colonel.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantídio G. Guimarães (Aug/90-Jun/91)</td>
<td>Fully out = A retired sub-officer of the Air Force (where he served as a sergeant in the maintenance and repair of aircraft), he was Funai's regional superintendent in Cuiabá from 86 to 87.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney F. Possuelo (Jun/91-May/93)</td>
<td>Fully in = The sertanista was initiated in the tradition by Claudio and Orlando Vilas Boas and by Francisco Meireles. A member of Funai since 1972, he had led countless fronts of attraction and headed the Funai Isolated Indian Coordination at the time of his appointment.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudio dos Santos Romero (May/93-Sept/93)</td>
<td>Fully in = A Funai's career officer since the early 1970s, his past posts include former management's director of assistance, former coordinator of the Xavante Project and former director of the Xingu National Park.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinarte Nobre Madeiro (Sept/93-Sept/95)</td>
<td>Fully in = A Funai employee of 23 years. Before stepping into office, he was the adviser to the president of Funai for the North and the Northeast region.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Márcio J. B. Santilli (Sept/95-Mar/96)</td>
<td>Fully in = A philosopher, former deputy for the PMDB party of São Paulo (1982-1986) and former member of the political group of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso. His experience in indigenism includes participating of the Indian Commission in the Chamber of Deputies and being the main articulator, in Congress of the National Coordination of Indigenous Peoples in the Constituent Assembly (1987-1988). He was also the founder and executive secretary of NDI (whom later became Instituto Socioambiental - ISA).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td>Professional Background and coding</td>
<td>Expertise calibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Júlio Gaiger (Mar/96-Jul/97)</td>
<td>Mostly in = Formally a lawyer, his background in indigenous affairs started in 1977, when he directed the National Indian Support Association (ANAI) in Porto Alegre. Gaiger served as a legal advisor to the Indian Missionary Council (CIMI) until 1991 and worked as advisor to the Commission for the Defense of the Consumer, Environment and Minorities of the Chamber.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan Silvestre (Aug/97-Fev/99)</td>
<td>Fully out = A former attorney of the state of Goiás, he was considered a complete stranger in the indigenous affairs field.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José M. Panoff de Lacerda (Feb/99-Nov/99)</td>
<td>Fully out = A former deputy, senator and deputy governor of the Mato Grosso state.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Frederico Marés (Nov/99-Apr/00)</td>
<td>Fully in = His background includes being a Professor of Agrarian and Environmental Law at PUC-PR. He has also worked as an attorney of the state of Paraná between 1991 and 1994, and as the Secretary of Culture of the city of Curitiba, between 1983 and 1988. He collaborated in the National Constituent Assembly (1987-88), in the formulation of the chapter on indigenous peoples and advocating the presence of indigenous peoples in the process. In 1989, he founded the Indigenous Rights Nucleus (NDI) and, in 1994, the Instituto Socioambiental (ISA) where he has held the positions of president and advisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glênio Alvarez (May/00-Jun/02)</td>
<td>Fully in = A geologist and a Funai employee of 14 years. In 1994 he was the regional administrator of the agency in Boa Vista (RR), during the demarcation process of the Yanomami territory.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artur Nobre Mendes I (Aug/02-Jan/03)</td>
<td>Fully in = A Funai's career official and anthropologist.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Aguiar de Almeida (Jan/03-Aug/03)</td>
<td>Fully in = A journalist and founding member of the Brazilian society of indigenists, Almeida had already worked at Funai as an advisor to the presidency between January and August 2000.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mércio Pereira Gomes (Sept/03-Mar/07)</td>
<td>Fully in = His previous professional experience includes being a professor of anthropology at Unicamp, UERJ (Rio de Janeiro State University), Macaé (Brazil) and UFF (Federal Fluminense University). He was also an effective member of the State Board of the PPS party, an ally of the PT party during Lula’s government. He also has directed the IPARJ (Institute of Anthropological Research of Rio de Janeiro).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Márcio Meira (Mar/07-Apr/12)</td>
<td>Fully in = His work in the area of indigenous affairs can be traced back from his participation as an advocate for indigenous rights during the constitutional process (1987-1988). He was also responsible for the Funai Working Group that identified the indigenous lands of the &quot;Medito Rio Negro.&quot; He has an undergraduate degree in History from the Federal University of Pará (UFPA) and a Masters in Anthropology from the University of Campinas (Unicamp).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta M. do A. Azevedo (Apr/12-Jun/13)</td>
<td>Fully in = An anthropologist, demographer, and author of the first research papers on the demography of indigenous peoples. In 1980, she joined the Indigenous Education group of the Pro-Indio Commission of São Paulo (CPI-SP) and served as a collaborator of the Indigenous Peoples Program in Brazil of the Ecumenical Documentation and Information Center (CEDI). She also collaborated with ISA, the Indigenous and Indigenous History Center of the University of São Paulo, the Indigenous Missionary Council (CIMI) and IBGE on indigenous affairs-related projects.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Augusta B. Assirati (Jun/13-Oct/14)</td>
<td>More in than out = A lawyer, and former director of Funai's Department for the Promotion of Sustainable Development (DPDS). She was in the office on an interim basis.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flávio Chiarelli (Oct/14-Jun/15)</td>
<td>More in than out = A lawyer whose on-the-job experience was obtained as the National Chief Attorney of Funai. He stepped into office on an interim basis.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>João Pedro Gonçalves da Costa (Jun/15-Jun/16)</td>
<td>Fully out = A former state deputy, city councilor and senator from the state of Amazonas. He also served as state superintendent at the National Institute of Colonization Agrarian Reform in the Amazonas state.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artur Nobre Mendes II (Jun/16-Sept/16)</td>
<td>Fully in = Funai's career official, the anthropologist had been Funai's president between 2002 and 2003 and when appointed was the director of the Department for the Promotion of Sustainable Development (DPDS).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agostinho do Nascimento Netto (Sept/16-Jan/17)</td>
<td>Fully out = A special advisor to the Ministry of Justice since June 2016, he was unknown to the pro-indigenous movement.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Toninho Costa (Jan/17-May/17)</td>
<td>Mostly in = The dentist and evangelical pastor of Luiziania (Goiás) has already served as a parliamentary advisor for the PSC party. Costa has worked with indigenous peoples in the Special Secretariat for Indigenous Health (Sesai) and in the Cauiú Evangelical Mission which operates in several Special Health Indigenous Districts (DSEIs) through an agreement with Sesai.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklimberg Ribeiro Freitas (May/17-Apr/18)</td>
<td>Fully out = A retired military, he joined the Armed Forces in 1976. Before being appointed to Funai, he held the position of institutional relations adviser for the CMA (Military Command of the Amazon), based in Manaus (AM).</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>