



V-Dem Lunch Seminars Fall 2018 Detailed Schedule

The Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Institute is hosting several leading scholars on democratization and democracy during Fall 2018. Please find below information about the scholars, research, duration of stay and scheduled seminars.

Time: 12.00-13.00

Room: Stora Skansen (B336), Sprängkullsgatan 19, Gothenburg, Sweden

10 September: David Delfs Erbo Andersen (visiting scholar 10-12 September)

Title: Why Kinder and Gentler? Scandinavian Democratizations in Comparative Perspective

Abstract: The process of democratic development in Sweden, Denmark, and Norway during the 19th and early 20th centuries was characterized by remarkably low levels of revolutionary violence. This stands in contrast to a leading proposition that in Europe revolutionary violence was a prerequisite for liberalization and a permanent feature of subsequent democratization. This is all the more puzzling considering that the Scandinavian countries were sharply different and each had its own apparent disadvantage for future democratization when the era of mass politics took hold in the decades after the French Revolution: Denmark (and Norway) was ruled by one of Europe's strongest absolutist monarchies, and Norway later had to struggle for nationhood under parliamentary rule, while in Sweden the land-owning nobility, democracy's traditional enemy number one, was extraordinarily powerful. In this talk, I will introduce my idea for a larger project aiming at explaining why, in contrast to most of the rest of Europe, Scandinavian democratizations were relatively peaceful. The main hypothesis is that the Scandinavian countries indeed took a uniquely peaceful path to democracy because of the impartial administration of, first, rural disputes and, in a second sequence, demands for democracy. The project will examine the hypothesis in comparative-historical studies of the Scandinavian countries, England, Prussia, and France. However, I will focus my talk on the part of the project that examines the hypothesis statistically by drawing on indicators of rural and income inequality and V-Dem as well as Historical V-Dem indicators of the degree of meritocracy and impartiality in the administration and the gradual extension of political rights, government accountability, and suffrage. I hope to get feedback on the project as a whole and the use of V-Dem and Historical V-Dem to examine the dual sequential hypothesis.

Bio: I am a second-year postdoc at the Department of Political Science, Aarhus University, where I also took my BA, MA, and PhD. My research primarily focuses on the determinants of democratic transitions and stability, in particular aspects of state capacity and bureaucratic quality more specifically. I am also highly interested in the political dilemmas that surround the building of strong states and legitimate nations. I use a multiple quantitative and qualitative methods, but in particular qualitative methods such as comparative history, causal process observations, and process tracing. My research has been published in *Democratization*, *Government and Opposition*, *Social Science History*, and the *APSA Comparative Democratization Newsletter*. I have been a visiting scholar at the University of Florida and the Quality of Government Institute at the University of Gothenburg.

12 September: Anita Gohdes (visiting scholar 10-12 September)

Title: Explaining the Killings of Journalists by State Authorities

Abstract: Journalists play an important role in society by providing different views, divergent sources of information and transparency through investigative research. For this they are frequently targeted, harassed, and even killed. We ask why and under what conditions journalists are killed by state authorities. We specify the conditions under which killing journalists can serve as a low-cost and short-term strategy of local politicians to prevent the spread of unfavourable information. Building on previous research, we theorise that corruption within state institutions significantly shape the risks attached to killing members of the press. However, only in countries with democratic institutions that make political power conditional on electoral support will state authorities have an incentive to silence journalists. Therefore, democratic countries with high levels of institutional corruption and low levels of accountability are more likely to see journalists killed through state authorities than other regimes. To test our theoretical expectations, we present new global data on the killing of journalists between 2002-2016. Our findings consistently show that more democratic regimes when combined with corruption and lack of judicial accountability significantly increase the risk for journalists to be killed by state authorities. Independent of corruption, democratic institutions do not help to improve the safety of journalists, even in the case of well-established democratic regimes.

Bio: Anita Gohdes is an Assistant Professor of International Relations at the University of Zurich. Her work focuses on communication technology and contentious politics, with a current emphasis on large-scale quantitative analyses of state behavior. She is currently completing a book project that theoretically and empirically investigates how governments use digital communication technology to inform their strategies of violent repression. Previously, she held a post-doctoral appointment within the Harvard Kennedy School's Belfer Center International Security Program. Since 2009, she has worked for the California-based non-profit organization Human Rights Data Analysis Group. Her work has appeared in the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, the *Journal of Peace Research*, and *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, among other outlets.

26 September: Lee Morgenbesser (visiting scholar 24-28 September)

Title: Election Turnout in Authoritarian Regimes

Abstract: An extensive body of research has investigated the forms, functions and effects of elections under authoritarianism. The implicit approach has been to employ a standardized notion of citizen participation, which neither permits variation nor accounts for its effects on the political outcomes under investigation. This is symptomatic of the distinct lack of theory building on voter turnout in authoritarian regimes. Using a comprehensive dataset of 402 elections in 88 countries between 1960 and 2010, we build an argument around the role of vote buying and voter intimidation as explanatory variables. This theory is tested within the context of both regime choices (competitive versus hegemonic authoritarianism) and opposition strategies (boycott versus participate). The findings are pertinent to existing theories of authoritarian politics and the practice of liberal peacebuilding.

Bio: Lee Morgenbesser is a lecturer with the School of Government and International Relations at Griffith University and recipient of a Discovery Early Career Research Award from the Australian Research Council (2018-2020). His most recent book is *Behind the Façade: Elections under Authoritarianism in Southeast Asia* (New York: SUNY Press, 2016) and he has currently writing a new book entitled *The Rise of Sophisticated Authoritarianism in Southeast Asia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, under contract). His research areas are authoritarianism, dictators, democratization, flawed elections and Southeast Asian politics.

17 October: Michael Coppedge (visiting scholar 15-19 October)

Title: Eroding Regimes: What, Where, and When?

Abstract: The political world lately seems to be filled with unexpected erosions of democracy. What is the most useful way to describe these phenomena? Do they all belong to a common syndrome? Certainly there are different degrees of erosion, but are there also different types? How common are such erosions in the world today? Is this a new phenomenon, or are there close parallels with events in the past? If we detect early warning signs of erosion, how concerned should we be that it will continue and culminate in the breakdown of democracy? This paper argues that there are two distinct erosion paths. First, there is a classic path of growing repression of speech, media, assembly, and civil liberties, combined with deteriorating political discourse. The second path involves the concentration of power in the executive at the expense of the courts and the legislature, similar to what Guillermo O'Donnell called "delegative democracy," which entails the erosion of horizontal accountability. Venezuela emerges as the most extreme and most fully articulated instance of erosion along this second path.

Bio: Michael Coppedge is professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame, where he is a faculty fellow of the Kellogg Institute for International Studies. His research interests include democratization and the quality of democracy; Latin American parties and party systems; Venezuelan politics; and comparative politics methodology. Coppedge is one of the principal investigators for the Varieties of Democracy project (V-Dem), which has measured hundreds of attributes of democracy and governance for most countries since 1900 and won the APSA Comparative Politics Section's 2016 "Best Dataset" prize. He argues for the complementarity of large- and small-sample research and qualitative and quantitative methods and is now using V-Dem data to analyze dimensions of democracy and the diffusion of democracy. The author of *Democratization and Research Methods* (Cambridge University Press, 2012) and *Strong Parties and Lame Ducks: Presidential Partyarchy and Factionalism in Venezuela* (Stanford, 1994), he has published numerous articles in journals such as the *Journal of Politics*, *Perspectives on Politics*, *Comparative Politics*, *Comparative Political Studies*, *Party Politics*, and in various books. Coppedge, who holds a PhD from Yale University, taught at Johns Hopkins-SAIS, Princeton University, and Yale before coming to Notre Dame.

24 October: Michael Bernhard (visiting scholar 22-26 October)

Title: Democracy and Social Forces

Abstract: Popular struggles occupy a prominent place in our understanding of regime change. It is often argued that social forces play an important role in the process of democratization. Democratic transitions are often thought to come about through mass mobilization for the incorporation of previously excluded groups. To a lesser extent, scholars also contend that after the installation of democracy, an active citizenry leads to democratic stability and greater government responsiveness. Finally, in a Gramscian framework, insurgent civil society could have a dark side – authoritarian movements can cause democratic breakdown if they become mainstream. In this paper, we attempt to generalize the role of social forces in the process of democratization. The impact of different social forces on democracy and democratization is difficult to study in a large-n framework. Comparable cross-national data available for large numbers of countries over time, until now, has been quite hard to come by, and the classic, comparative historical literature on social forces operates according to a radically different ontology than most large-n research. While we cannot track and measure social forces like small-n researchers, we draw upon the concept of civil society as a proxy. Using new data collected by the Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) and the Nonviolent and Violent Campaigns and Outcomes (NAVCO), we jointly measure and use organizational capacity and protest activity to gauge the extent to which social forces are successful in political organization.

Bio: Michael Bernhard holds the Raymond and Miriam Ehrlich Chair in Political Science at the University of Florida. His work centers on questions of democratization and development, both globally and in the context of Europe. Among the issues that have figured prominently in his research agenda are the role of civil society in democratization, institutional choice in new democracies, the political economy of democratic survival, and the legacy of extreme forms of dictatorship.

07 November: Joseph Wright (visiting scholar 5-9 November)

Title: Personalization of Power and Repression in Dictatorships

Abstract: This article leverages new data measuring gradations of personalism in authoritarian regimes to evaluate the relationship between concentration of power and patterns of state-led repression. Using both null-hypothesis tests and predictive models, the paper shows that as dictatorships move towards more personalized systems, repression increases. Given the global rise in personalism, the findings imply that repression is likely to increase in authoritarian contexts.

Bio: Wright is a political scientist at Pennsylvania State University. He studies comparative political economy with a particular interest in how international factors — such as foreign aid, economic sanctions, human rights prosecutions, and migration — influence domestic politics in autocratic regimes. His first book (with Abel Escriba-Folch), *Foreign Pressure and the Politics of Autocratic Survival* (Oxford University Press) examines how foreign policy tools destabilize dictatorships. It won the Stein Rokkan Prize for Comparative Social Science Research. A second book, with Barbara Geddes and Erica Frantz, entitled *How Dictatorships Work: Power, Personalization, and Collapse*, is forthcoming with Cambridge University Press.

21 November: Robert Brathwaite (visiting scholar 19-23 November)

Title: Measuring Religious Violence: Conceptual and Empirical Issues Utilizing Natural Language Processing for Religious Violence Event-Data

Abstract: Why are some states more prone to religious violence than others? What issues appear when measuring religious violence in different countries and contexts? Numerous countries exhibit violent conflicts that have religious dimensions because of issues associated with long-standing sectarian grievance, but we also find religiously inspired violence in contexts where social and political tensions created by these dynamics are not prevalent. This study is particularly focused on understanding the theoretical, empirical, and methodological implications when measuring religious violence in different contexts. Specifically, we are interested in determining whether there are unique dynamics that influence the reporting of religious violence in contexts that experience more religious violence in comparison to those that have less reported incidents. In addition, we are interested in determining whether event-data of reported incidents of religious violence exhibits any sensitivity to collection from English or non-English language sources. This study builds upon previous attempts at measuring religious violence with particular focus given to the measurement of this concept at the sub-national level, providing more detailed indicators that measure acts of violence that are religiously motivated but are non-lethal in character, and utilizing different data sources (media reports) to generate observations of reported incidents of religious violence. We examine these issues by utilizing machine-coded event data through natural language processing (NLP) to examine incidences of religious violence in a number of different countries from 2000-2015. We do this by parsing local and international media sources in both English and non-English to generate indicators of religiously motivated violence as well as identify potential actors involved in these activities.

Bio: Robert Brathwaite is an Assistant Professor at Michigan State University with a specialization in international relations. He has a Ph.D. and MA in Political Science from the University of Notre Dame. Robert's

teaching and research interests include international security, terrorism, religion and democracy, religious violence, and the conduct of civil wars.

5 December: Laura Maxwell, Richard Morgan, and Juraj Medzihorsky

Title: Failing and Successful Sequences of Democratization: A New Way To Study Regime Change

Abstract: How do we determine when a democratization process begins and how and when it ends? In the study of comparative democratization this is a critical question that must be answered in order to systematically compare democratization efforts across time and space. The goal of this paper is to conceptualize and identify *democratization episodes*: sustained periods of institutional reform that move an autocratic regime closer to becoming democratic. A democratization episode can either result in a consolidated democracy (successful episode) or not (failed episode). After establishing the conceptual dimensions of democratization episodes, we then identify the appropriate procedures and data necessary for operationalization. By maintaining a consistent conceptualization of democratization episodes and properly mapping the conceptual dimensions to empirical data, we uncover the set of failed and successful democratization episodes that occurred between 1900-2016 in 178 countries. We can then use the component-level Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) data to determine whether distinct patterns or sequences exist in successful and failing democratization episodes.

Bios:

Laura's research focuses on political parties and elections with an emphasis on European states. Specifically, she has conducted research on party competition and pre-electoral coalition formation, mass ideology in Europe, and the determinants of roll call votes in parliaments in Europe. She relies on the use of Item Response Theory and Bayesian Statistics, among other quantitative methods to conduct her research. At V-Dem, Laura joined the team to work on the FASDEM project, focusing on understanding the dynamic dependencies between democratic institutions over time.

Richard received his PhD in political science at Emory University with a focus on state power and popular support in insurgencies. Rich's technical skills and the proposals he brings are outstanding and fits perfect with the type of need the new FASDEM-project is in need of: causal inference techniques and experience with using these methods trained by Adam at Emory, as well as forecasting, machine learning, Bayesian Markov Chain Monte Carlo procedures and Bayesian nonlinear dynamic systems. His experience with item-count, endorsement, and conjoint survey experiments will also supplement V-Dem's current expertise on the experiment-agenda funded under the Wallenberg Academy Fellowship. Finally, Rich's excellent research on conflicts and insurgencies is a great asset in the current efforts to build a collaboration with the Uppsala Conflict Database project, something which he has confirmed an interest in supporting.

Juraj received his PhD from Central European University in 2015 with a focus on substantive inferences in comparative politics with categorical data analysis methods that correspond closely to theories. His expertise in Bayesian modeling of mixture models where he is the author of several R packages, some written in *pistar* for general application to comparative politics, is quite unique and highly relevant for rater aggregation of the type we do in V-Dem, as well as for differential item functioning diagnostics of the kind we have yet to explore. Importantly, he is also very experienced with Bayesian inference models, modeling floor and ceiling associations and exploring this from the perspective of stochastic dominance. This area is highly and directly relevant to solving the key methodological challenges in the FASDEM-project.

For any questions, please contact Natalia Stepanova at natalia.stepanova@v-dem.net

Website: <https://www.v-dem.net>