Project description: Conflict and Democratization (CODE), revised February 2, 2015

1. Summary

Two of the most important goals of Danish (and Western) foreign policy are to support democratization and to prevent violent conflicts. Research indicates that conflict onset and escalation are especially likely during elections, political reform, and democratization processes. Faced with this reality, how do policymakers and International Non-governmental Organizations (INGOs) walk the line between promoting democracy and preventing conflict? CODE sets out to analyse non-military policies that hold the potential to prevent violent conflicts without undermining democratization. Although considerable work has been done on the intersection of democratization and conflict, this project breaks new ground in two ways. First, we analyze how processes of democratization and conflict escalation are connected at four different levels: the international level, the institutional level, the group level, and the individual level. This approach allows us to identify the specific circumstances under which democratization may provoke conflict rather than relying on general patterns. Second, we ask new questions about what outsiders can do to push for democracy while avoiding conflict. Using different data sources and methods, and working in tandem with a panel of practitioners, CODE aims to identify the cases and situations in which Western governments and INGOs can make a difference for peace and democracy and to shed light on the limits of what outsiders can do. Against this background, we evaluate the effectiveness of corresponding policy tools. This knowledge is translated into practical guidance about when to become involved, when not to, and when to invest more, which will be disseminated to academia, policymakers, INGOs, and the public.

2. Objective of the project

The main objective of CODE is to improve the ability of outside actors to walk the line between promoting democracy and preventing conflict. We do so by honing in on the way political openings can trigger instability and violent civil conflicts (henceforth conflicts). This issue has not been addressed head-on by the scientific community due to the gap between research on conflict resolution and research on the causes of conflict and democratization (Ohlson 2008). CODE focuses on four different levels of the nexus between conflict and democratization, with particular attention to features that outsiders can influence. CODE aims to identify when Western governments and INGOs can make a difference for peace and democracy, what concrete policy tools are needed to do so, and when it makes more sense to avoid becoming involved. Based on a multi-method, interdisciplinary approach, CODE investigates two related research questions: 1) Why is democratization often associated with violent conflict? 2) To what extent and in which ways can we prevent non-violent political conflicts from turning violent without compromising democratization? Building on our findings and in cooperation with practitioners, we aim to develop and communicate tools for democracy promotion and mediation efforts by state actors and INGOs.

3. The main results of the project

CODE breaks new ground with respect to the conflict-democratization nexus by combining multidisciplinary perspectives (political science, psychology, history, and ethnography) and adopting a triangular methodological approach of experiments, large-N analysis, and case studies. This ambitious approach is necessary to produce a coherent body of research that—in the context of democratization—ties together the micro-foundations of conflicts, the ways in which group dynamics might reinforce conflicts, the extent to which institutions temper or facilitate such conflicts, and the ability of external actors to either fuel the flames or defuse the tensions. More particularly, CODE is expected to produce the following results:

- New data measuring relevant aspects of democratization and conflict on four different levels of analysis
- New findings on the relationship/interconnection between particular processes of democratization and conflict on four different levels of analysis
- Evaluation of the effectiveness of some of the most common policy tools for non-military intervention in conflicts and democratization processes
- Evidence-based information on the limits to outside intervention
- Broad dissemination to practitioners, the public, and the scholarly community through a wide variety of channels (see Section 10)
- Training of young researchers by integrating one PhD and four postdocs in the project
- Establishing a young, internationally integrated conflict research group in Denmark
- Internationalizing Danish conflict research and strengthening ties to external research networks
- Creation of better links between researchers and practitioners of conflict prevention and democracy promotion in Denmark

4. Background and hypothesis/research questions of the project

Recent events in Ukraine illustrate the potential tension between two key goals of Western foreign policy. Had Western governments solely been concerned with preventing conflict, the rational response to the months-long protest against the regime that began in November 2013 would have been to help deter it, thereby avoiding the escalation that now threatens to tear Ukraine apart and involve the West in a new, possible long standing conflict with Russia. However, such actions would have sacrificed the potential for democratization in favor of stability and left millions of people trapped in semi-authoritarian rule on the very doorstep of Western Europe.

Faced with this reality, CODE investigates two related research questions across four work packages: 1) Why is violent conflict associated with democratizing regimes? 2) To what extent and in which ways can we prevent non-violent political conflicts from turning violent without compromising democratization? (see Section 6 for full definitions of non-violent and violent conflicts).

Figure 1: Project overview

STAGE I: Causes of violent conflicts	**Work package A** International level	**Work package B** Institutional level	**Work package C** Group level	**Work package D** Individual level
STAGE II: Tools for preventing violent conflicts				

Stage I: Disentangling the link between democratizing regimes and conflict

Building on the literature on "root causes" of civil conflict (reviewed in Dixon 2009), Stage I hones in on the relationship between democratization and conflict escalation (see Hegre 2014; Höglund 2009; Møller and Skaaning 2013, chap. 12), with particular attention to features that can be manipulated in the short to medium term. To identify the specific circumstances under which democratization may provoke conflict, we discern broader conflict patterns and focus on particular aspects connected to four different levels, all known, or hypothesized, to trigger conflict. The results of these investigations will form the basis for assessing and developing tools for conflict prevention.

WP A(I): International level. Despite the end of bipolarity and the onset of liberal hegemony at the end of the Cold War, the external actors that seek to influence developments in democratizing regimes are still legion. Consequently, attempts to promote democracy and prevent conflict across the globe are likely to be resisted by other external actors pursuing very different goals. To capture these oppositely directed external influence attempts, this work package focuses on the actions of what has been termed *black knights*, i.e., external challengers of democracy (Levitsky and Way 2010; Tolstrup 2014; Brownlee 2012). In spite of emergent research documenting the importance of this international factor, we still know only little about the extent and impact of black knight interventions against democratization (one recent example is Saudi Arabia's assistance to Bahrain during anti-regime protests in 2011), how they may shape the emergence and escalation of political conflicts (as Russia has done lately in Ukraine), and how Western countries can respond when trying to promote democratization without sparking or intensifying conflicts.

WP B(I): Institutional level. While research has identified a heightened risk of conflict in democratizing regimes (Mansfield and Snyder 2008; Cederman, Hug, and Krebs 2010), we know little about how specific characteristics of political regimes influence the risk of violent conflict (Basedau 2011; Hegre 2014). By disaggregating political regime developments into their components parts, including the development of political parties and the timing, administration, and monitoring of elections (see Elklit and Reynolds 2002), the aim is to get a clearer grasp of the mechanism potentially driving the association without losing the ability to capture more general patterns.

WP C(I): Group level. Research on regime type and conflict has typically focused on institutional factors at the center. Yet democracy rarely advances evenly across different social groups or regions. Instead, it often fuels pre-existing group inequalities, provoking dominant groups to defend the status quo (Stewart 2008) and thereby contributing to conflict (e.g., Cederman, Weidmann, and Gleditsch 2011). We move beyond state-centered approaches and assess how political change in general and democratization in particular affects key social groups. These processes also interact with nation-building, as key groups need to agree on who the demos is for democratization to be successful (Rustow 1970). Using historical and contemporary analyses, we focus on conflict-inducing effects of uneven political transformation across gender, ethnic, region-based, and religious groups.

WP D(I): Individual level. Many conflicts in democratizing regimes involve atypical levels of popular participation. To understand how democratic transitions allow for such mobilization, WP D traces the effects of the factors addressed in WPs A-C down to the individual level. Research from sociology, economics, and psychology has shown that prolonged oppression fosters strong emotions of revenge (McCullough, Kurzban, and Tabak 2013; Petersen, Sell, Tooby, and Cosmides 2010) and that these emotions often override rational cost-benefit analyses (de Quervain et al. 2004). This could explain much of the seemingly "irrational" use of violence during political openings—even when alternative (non-violent) options exist. Specifically, we examine how motivation for revenge is fostered under autocratic regimes (e.g., due to oppression or inequalities, cf. WP C) and is released during political openings.

Stage II: Preventing violent conflict while still promoting democracy

On the basis of the findings in Stage I, CODE will evaluate non-military policy tools and development strategies that are within the reach of the Danish government and INGOs and that hold the potential to prevent violent conflicts without undermining democratization.

WP A(II): International level. Apart from standard mediation efforts (see Wallensteen and Svensson 2014), one conflict prevention (and democracy promotion) tool is smart sanctions: targeted or selected sanctions, such as visa bans and asset freezes, meant to hit primary decision makers and their cronies (Morgan and Schwebach 1995; Cortright and Lopez 2002). The US and the EU are increasingly using smart sanctions, but the study of how they work is still in its infancy (Bapat et al. 2013). For instance, we do not know what the black knights under scrutiny in WP A(I) can do in terms of sanction-busting, i.e., through various forms of support to the targeted regime undermining the impact of the sanctions (Early 2011). CODE will evaluate how smart smart sanction are across a wide variation of contexts, positioning Denmark and partners to make better-informed choices about when and how to use smart sanctions in conflict and conflict-prone settings.

WP B(II): Institutional level. The "engineering" of political institutions to support peaceful democratization has received much international attention in recent decades, exemplified by the international community's attempts at designing formal institutions in Bosnia, Afghanistan, and Iraq (Reilly 2001; Lijphart 2004). Dilemmas are legion, as certain democratic institutions might reify or even spark ethnic or political cleavages, whereas others might defuse them. However, concrete suggestions often rest on shaky foundations and focus on formal institutions (Waldner 2009). We direct attention to other forms of international support for domestic capacity building that have recently been argued to dampen democratization-related conflicts (Savun and Tirone 2011). Building on the results from Stage I, we attempt to provide guidelines on how to prioritize support for election administration, political parties, and civil society groups in democratizing countries. We also analyze the effects of supporting domestic election observers relative to direct, international monitoring, which has frequently been questioned as an efficient tool (Kelley 2012; Daxecker 2012; Hyde 2011).

WP C(II): Group level. This package develops policy tools that might help advance democracy more evenly across different social groups, lowering the risk of conflict. For instance, we focus on politically inclusive institutional settings that channel the concerns of various social groups, as seen in the "peace-making regimes" in post-Pinochet Chile or South Africa under Mandela (Stewart 2002). As political inclusiveness is not an automatic outcome of an inclusive institutional setting, we also focus on the potentially crucial role of NGOs in facilitating the political empowerment of women and ethnic and religious minorities (Nilsson 2012). Likewise, we direct attention to the ways civil society groups can contribute in nation-building efforts. Which parts of civil society to support and the consequences of such support is itself a thorny issue, which we attempt to elucidate in cooperation with selected practitioners as spelled out in Section 11 below. Finally, building on the historical analysis of Stage I, we provide specific information about the kinds of regional upheavals and intergroup violence that state centralization or political openings are likely to trigger.

WP D(II): Individual level. Using experimental conflict games (see Section 6 below), WP D will evaluate a number of interventions aimed at preventing psychologically driven violence. These games place individuals at the center. Specifically, building on our findings from Stage I and insights from revenge literature, we evaluate a number of tools (e.g., empowerment of previously oppressed or discriminated groups cf. WP C) at the individual level, focusing, in particular, on their effectiveness in countering individuals' drive to (violent) revenge. Psychological research shows that expression of remorse is one of the most effective means of reducing feelings of revenge (McCullough et al. 2014; Tabak et al. 2012). Against this background, WP D will also examine likely social initiatives (or institutions) through which remorse and apologies could successfully be expressed.

5. Innovative value, impact and relevance of the project

CODE is theoretically innovative by, first, addressing the sizable gap between research on conflict resolution and research on the causes of conflict and democratization and, second, by focusing on features of conflict that outsiders can affect. CODE's expected impact on conflict research and foreign policy is also grounded in its innovative combination of methods. As we explain in Section 6, case studies and large-N analysis are used to gain deep and broad knowledge, respectively, of the causes of conflict on the four dimensions, while experiments are used to uncover the hitherto unknown psychological mechanisms that motivate the individual's engagement in conflict. Finally, field experiments are employed to evaluate the effect of selected policy tools on conflict prevention during democratization processes. This multi-methods research strategy is embedded in a more general interdisciplinary approach, which combines tools and insights from political science, psychology, economics, history, and anthropology.

The theoretical and methodological innovativeness underwrites the societal impact of CODE. Specifically, CODE achieves societal impact and relevance through:
- Disseminating an awareness of the intricacies of processes of political change and conflict to the broader public and to practitioners in the field. Key Performance Indicators (KPI): articles in Danish newspapers, regular seminars with practitioners, and a monograph in Danish.
- Evaluating the effectiveness of selected policy tools that can directly affect the strategies of NGOs and the Danish government. KPI: scientific articles that evaluate, *inter alia*, smart sanctions, concrete forms of democracy support, and election monitoring. Seminars with practitioners.
- Contributing to the fields of conflict and democratization with ground-breaking research, for instance on the psychological dynamics of conflicts and on the effect of much-debated policy tools. KPI: scientific articles in top-tier journals, conferences with top international scholars.
- Creating a scientific environment devoted to conflict research in Denmark, located at the Department of Political Science and Government in Aarhus. KPI: produce internationally recognized research, host international conferences, teach PhD seminars, successful completion of four postdoc research projects, one PhD projects, and project management training of a senior scholar (Møller) and junior scholar (Tolstrup).

6. Project's methodology and results

In line with extant research (Gleditsch et al. 2002; Small and Singer 1982), we define (civil) conflict as contested incompatibility over government and/or territory between two or more politically organized actors—one of which is a government of a state. Further, we define violent conflict as contested incompatibility that involves systematic use of armed force, and non-violent conflict as contested incompatibility that does not involve systematic use of armed force. Conflict escalation is defined as the turn from non-violent to violent conflict. Finally, we define democratization as any move from less democratic regime forms toward more democratic regime forms. A "democratizing regime" is thus one that is experiencing a political opening that pushes it toward the democratic pole.

To develop efficient tools for preventing violent conflicts in democratizing regimes, we must first understand the causes of conflict. We hold that external actors have a greater impact on conflict prevention if they target political institutions and actors' decisions rather than structural, hard-to-manipulate variables. However, it is also obvious that the structural constraints must first be understood to establish the limits to human agency. Some extant work on imposed democratic regimes has produced remarkably optimistic assessments (e.g., Peceny 1999); other works have been much more skeptical about the long-term viability of

such imposed regimes (e.g., Enterline & Grieg; Downs & Bueno de Mesquita 2006). Some of the dilemmas involved are obvious. For instance, excessively overt interventions can decrease the legitimacy of a regime, and even less intrusive interventions risk supporting fragile states that invite violent challenges (e.g., Hironaka 2005).

To assess the possibilities for outside intervention in the face of these dilemmas, we argue that a triangulation of methods and approaches is necessary. Historical analysis is valuable as certain contextual aspects of, for example, the post-Cold War world might disguise important conditional relationships (Boix 2011). At the same time, an understanding of the psychological micro foundations of individual and group behavior is needed to identify triggers and possible responses to violence. We therefore supplement our focus on contemporary processes of conflict and democratization with a number of historical investigations, which serve to explore the extent to which our findings can travel to other contexts, and we combine our analysis of observational data with laboratory and survey experiments to delve into the mental processes guiding individual behavior. The following section lays out the research design for each work package and lists the researchers and practitioners involved.

The purpose of WP A is, first, to scrutinize how black knights hamper democratization processes and spur conflict and, second, to improve our knowledge of how smart sanctions can be used to prevent conflict and promote democracy in hybrid regimes, including how they can best be used to counter black knights. Addressing the first problem, we conduct a number of in-depth case studies of black knight interventions across a wide variation of contemporary and historical conflict-prone hybrid regimes. The idea is to study black knight interventions during easily observable crisis events such as popular uprisings, coups, and early mobilization of armed rebellions, which are known to potentially trigger civil conflict. To fully understand the impact of and conditions for such interventions, we supplement these in-depth studies with systematic comparisons to parallel cases without, or at least with less, black knight support, in an attempt to minimize the risk of selection bias. We intend to choose historical cases based on existing databases of such events (NAVCO 2.0, see Chenoweth and Lewis 2013; the Global Instances of Coups Dataset, see Powell and Thyne 2011; and the Uppsala/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset, see Gleditsch et al. 2002). Among more contemporary black knight cases, we include Russian interventions in Ukraine during the popular uprisings in 2013-2014 and the violent conflict following it, South African backing of crisis-prone neighbor states such as Zimbabwe, and external interventions during and following the Arab Spring (e.g., Russia/Iran in Syria; Saudi Arabia in Bahrain; and the US in Egypt). This first step is led by Jakob Tolstrup, an expert on black knights and the post-Soviet region, in collaboration with Morten Valbjørn (expert on the MENA region), Anne Mette Kjær (Africa expert), and Jørgen Møller.

To improve our knowledge of the (successful) use of smart sanctions, we follow a two-pronged strategy. First, we aim to collect and employ a new global dataset on the imposition of smart sanctions. Today, some data on smart sanctions are available in the TIES dataset (Morgan, Bapat, and Kobayashi 2014), but it only covers a little more than half of the post-Cold war years (the period in which the use of smart sanctions grew rapidly) and it does not provide detailed information on the regimes and groups targeted, nor of whether black knights responded with so-called sanction busting as discussed above. With a more detailed mapping of the contexts of smart sanction interventions, we can use various statistical methods to identify the conditioning factors relevant for engaging in successful (and avoiding harmful) interventions. Second, based on the results from analyses of this dataset, we choose a number of pathway cases (see Gerring 2007) for further substantiating the conditions under which smart sanctions succeed and fail. The data collection and the large-N analysis of smart sanctions events as well as the in-depth studies of successful and unsuccessful cases will be carried out by PhD1 in collaboration with Jakob Tolstrup. Judith Kelley will assist with the data analysis of the smart sanctions dataset.

WP B relies on a multi-method design and proceeds in three steps. In the first step, five cases (Egypt, Kenya, Uganda, Nepal, and Sri Lanka) are selected for exploratory study. Since the main purpose is theory development, we focus on cases where the mechanisms of interest are likely to operate, i.e., cases of violent conflict during democratization processes in which active democracy promotion has taken place. The cases selected are from regions targeted by

Scandinavian foreign policy efforts, where the research team has special knowledge and local contacts. In addition to the hypothesis-generating aim of these case studies, they are also meant to provide an overview of the policy tools that external actors have employed to balance efforts of promoting democracy and preventing conflict. This first step will be led by Jørgen Elklit (expert on Nepal and Kenya), who has many years of experience in conducting case studies, advising practitioners, and evaluating policies on democratization and conflict prevention. It will furthermore involve Anne Mette Kjær (expert on Uganda), Morten Valbjørn (expert on Egypt), and Kristine Höglund (expert on Sri Lanka).

The second step interrogates the propositions generated in the first step. In doing so, we take advantage of pre-release access to the path-breaking Varieties of Democracy dataset (www.v-dem.net; Coppedge and Gerring et al. 2011), which provides data on hundreds of disaggregate indicators capturing different features of political regimes from 1900 onwards. The V-Dem data will be used in statistical analyses to unravel the links between political institutions (including various aspects of elections and political parties) and conflict escalation. This process will be led by Svend-Erik Skaaning, who is one of the principal investigators of the V-Dem project, and will also involve Håvard Hegre and Postdoc1.

While Steps One and Two relate to the causes of conflict in democratizing regimes, the third step evaluates policy tools that can be aimed at the exact institutions identified as most relevant. Research on the effectiveness of tools for democracy promotion and conflict prevention has been criticized for being unable to properly evaluate the effect of such policies, leaving advice for policymakers ungrounded (Waldner 2009). Field experiments are a new, promising tool in this regard. By randomizing which units (villages, groups, or countries) are exposed to the "treatment," i.e., the policy, researchers can evaluate the effect of that policy with a high degree of internal validity (Gerber 2011). Depending on which parts of the democratization process were identified in Stage I as particularly prone to sparking conflicts, Stage II will conduct a field experiment on the effect of a policy tool related to that phase of democratization. Two potential areas of interest are election monitoring (either national or international) and support for political parties. This project will be carried out by Postdoc1 in collaboration with Judith Kelley, who has worked intensively on the effect of various democracy promotion tools.

WP C requires that we move beyond standard state-level analysis and hone in on the group dynamics that spark conflict during political openings (Cederman and Gleditsch 2009). We do this in two distinct steps. First, we use historical analysis to get a more general understanding of the political causes of civil conflicts. While the classical literature on civil war was much informed by a historical perspective (Tilly, Gurr, Skocpol), the more recent literature has had a tendency to ignore the quarry of pre-World War II history. Yet there are a number of reasons to use historical analysis. For instance, the way state-builders attempted to consolidate power in early modern Europe resembles some of the processes that we see in today's developing countries. More generally, interchangeably analyzing different historical periods presents a way of achieving variation on contextual factors that might suppress relevant relationships. We will carry out a congruence analysis of 15th and 16th century civil wars in Europe to interrogate how the consolidation of political power at the center created push-back from regional elites, a cocktail that spurred repeated civil conflicts (see Møller 2014). Congruence analysis establishes the extent to which a particular theoretical mechanism or set of mechanisms can be corroborated empirically. The challenges of state-building from the center outwards in a situation where power was initially decentralized resembles the challenge faced in contemporary processes taking place in developing countries (Cederman, Wimmer, and Min 2010; Centeno 2003; Herbst 2000)—as do many of the consequences, in the form of civil wars and repression. This historical part will be directed by Jørgen Møller, who is an expert on historical patterns of European state formation and regime change, and involve Svend-Erik Skaaning, who has also done work on this subject.

In a second step, we use the knowledge about the historical causes of conflict to shed light on contemporary processes of uneven political transformation. Marshaling disaggregated data on relevant ethnic groups (Cederman, Wimmer, and Min 2010), female status ("The Woman Stats Database" 2014), and regional wealth differentials (Nordhaus 2006), we account

for potential effects of uneven democratization within countries in the contemporary era. This part of the project will be led by Kristian Gleditsch and involve Postdoc2, Jørgen Møller and Håvard Hegre. The quantitative studies will be supplemented with pilot projects on involving women and minorities in democratization and peace-building, conducted by Anne Mette Kjær and Morten Valbjørn. We plan to pay particular attention here to countries such as Uganda, Egypt, and Nepal, where the research team—as mentioned above—has good contacts and expert knowledge.

WP D employs key methods from political science, psychology, and economics designed to pinpoint the causes and effects of individual motivations (Druckman et al. 2011). Specifically, WP D combines two laboratory experiments with a survey in a post-conflict zone. The experiments will build on the war-game methodology developed by McDermott and colleagues and take the form of computerized conflict simulations (Johnson et al. 2006; McDermott and Cowden 2001; McDermott, Cowden, and Rosen 2008). The first experiment will simulate conditions present in democratizing states (prolonged oppression followed by changes in the balance of power that open for revenge) and assess the extent to which revenge motivations hinder subjects' rational calculations when considering "violent" versus "non-violent" paths. The second experiment will similarly simulate a setting of a latent conflict and juxtapose a number of interventions aimed at reducing the drive to revenge. The experiments will take place at the Cognition and Behavioral Lab (Aarhus University), which provides all the needed facilities and equipment, and each involve approximately 200 students from Aarhus University.

To validate the experimental findings in a natural setting, we will implement a survey in Egypt, focused on the participation in and support for the Egyptian Revolution of 2011. The survey will build on available survey research, in particular that of researchers at Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), who have extensive experience in conducting fieldwork in conflict and post-conflict settings. The Egyptian Revolution has been selected as our focal case due to both its recency (which increases the accuracy of the respondents' memories) and its status as a prototype of democratization-conflict phenomena. Furthermore, feasibility of the study is high due to the area expertise of Morten Valbjørn.

To construct the actual survey instrument, we build on an established instrument by Humphreys and Weinstein (2008). This allows us to account for potential confounders in the form of conventional socioeconomic indicators linked to support for and participation in civil violence. Issues specific to WP D will be assessed using three question batteries: one focused on feelings of revenge; one focused on people's support for and direct involvement in violent action during the Egyptian Revolution (and the subsequent events); and one focused on people's experience with institutions of apology and empowerment (cf. Stage II). Together, these batteries will enable us to reliably assess whether people support or take part in violence out of individual motivations for revenge (resonating with the first experiment), as well as factors that reduce the drive for revenge (resonating with the second experiment).

7. Project plan

CODE's two-stage structure and its methodology are reflected in the timetable for the project. Completion of data gathering and data analysis in Stage I is a precondition for Stage II. The first two and a half years of the project are mainly devoted to Stage I, as illustrated in the Gantt Chart below, which lists the involvement of the affiliated researchers in the different work packages. WPs A to C commence with the exploratory case studies described in the methodology section above. These are then followed up by the work with either the integration of extant datasets (WP B), outright construction of datasets (WP A), or field work (WP C). WP D differs in that it is commenced with lab experiments which are then followed by survey-based data gathering. In this phase of the project, the practitioners' panel will be involved in various ways to guide the analytical work, in particular in the case studies.

The work on Stage I will continue throughout the four-year project period. That said, the last one and a half years of the project are mainly devoted to Stage II. A large part of this work will consist of translating the findings of Stage I into concrete policy tools, the results of which we will then communicate to practitioners and the public. This stage also contains a number of new scientific analyses, with a specific focus on policy tools, and with heavy involvement of the practitioners' panel in planning and executing the analyses. For instance, in WP B we will carry out a field experiment on either the influence of election monitoring or external support for political parties. The findings promise both to contribute to the scientific literature and to provide the kind of contextual knowledge that election observers and the policymakers who emphasize election observation can benefit from. Likewise, in our analyses of the effect of smart sanctions, we will provide hands-on knowledge about which formats have a greater effect on target states.

The Gantt chart also list persons associated with each of the different phases of the four work packages. Tolstrup will be responsible for all phases of WP A. With respect to the case studies, Møller, Valbjørn, and Kjær will also take part. Valbjørn's network in and knowledge of the Middle East and Kjær's ditto in Sub-Saharan Africa will prove especially valuable here, whereas Møller will mainly assist with matters of methodology and theory. Tolstrup will, given that he advances to a position of associate professor, direct PhD1's attempt to construct a dataset on smart sanctions. Working with Tolstrup and Kelley, PhD1 will also do the main work of analyzing this dataset. Besides contributing to CODE, the two-step work of gathering and then analyzing data should ensure that a coherent PhD dissertation comes out of this work. Finally, Tolstrup and PhD1 will work on the policy implications of both the case studies and the interrogation of the dataset on smart sanctions, ensuring that the PhD student gains experience in analyzing both causes and consequences of sanctions.

Skaaning is responsible for directing WP B. Elklit will be in charge of the case studies, assisted by Kjær, Valbjørn, and Höglund. This team has expert knowledge of all the countries selected for initial study (Egypt, Kenya, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Uganda) and will further draw on practitioners involved in these countries. Assisted by Hegre and Postdoc1, Skaaning will be in charge of the statistical analysis of the relationship between regime characteristics and conflict while Postdoc1, drawing on Kelley's experience, will implement the field experiment on election monitoring. Finally, Skaaning will work on the implications for policy tools with Postdoc1. By the end of the project, Postdoc1 will have independently carried out a research project on evaluating select policy tools through the novel method of field experiments, and at the same time have significantly contributed to the overall project.

Møller is in charge of WP C, and will, assisted by Skaaning, carry out the historical analysis that is part of this work package. Møller will be involved in all other phases of WP C, except one. This is the field studies of minority involvement in democratization and peace-building, which will be the responsibility of Kjær and Valbjørn. Regarding the other two phases, Gleditsch will take charge of the main body of statistical work on uneven democratization and conflict, assisted by Postdoc2, Hegre and Møller. Finally, Møller and Postdoc2 will work on the policy tools.

Petersen will be responsible for the overall direction of WP D, and, along with Thomsen, will design and supervise the two experiments. Petersen and Thomsen both have extensive experience in conducting laboratory experiments addressing political phenomena. Postdoc3 and Postdoc4 will take part in the implementation of both experiments, and will be in charge of the survey. The survey will be designed in collaboration with Valbjørn, who has significant area expertise with respect to Egypt, in particular the Egyptian Revolution of 2011. Petersen and Thomsen, who have worked extensively with psychological survey research, will also contribute to this work. By taking part in the implementation of the two experiments and leading the design and execution of the survey, by the end of the term, Postdoc3 and Postdoc4 will have carried out both collaborative and independent work, eventually resulting in individual and co-authored publications.

Gantt Chart

WP	Stage I: Causes of violent conflicts				Stage II: Conflict prevention tools			
	2015S	2015F	2016S	2016F	2017S	2017F	2018S	2018F
A **JT**	Case studies of the influence of black knights on conflict development in hybrid regimes (Russia, Saudi Arabia, Iran, South Africa) (**JT**, JM, MV, MK)			Construction of dataset on smart sanctions and statistical analyses of their impact on conflict development (**PhD1**, JT, JK)				Translate findings into concrete policy tools (**JT**, PhD1)
B **SS**	Case studies of hybrid regimes and conflict Egypt, Kenya, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Uganda (**JE**, MK, MV, KH)		Time-series cross-national analyses of relationship between disaggregated political regime components and conflict (**SS**, HH, Postdoc1)			Field experiment on the influence of election monitoring and support for political parties (**Postdoc1**, JK)		Translate findings into concrete policy tools (**SS**, Postdoc1)
C **JM**	Case studies of civil wars in 15th and 16th century Europe (**JM**, SS)		Field studies of the involvement of women and minorities in democratization and peace-building in Eastern Africa (**MK**, MV) Statistical analyses on the influence of uneven democratization on conflict (**KG**, Postdoc2, JM, HH)			Translate findings into concrete policy tools (**JM**, Postdoc2)		
D **MP**	Laboratory experiments on individual motivations to engage in violence and interventions to counter that (**MP**, LT, Postdoc3, Postdoc4)		Survey in Egypt on individual motivations to take part in or support the Egyptian Revolution of 2011 (and the subsequent events) (**Postdoc3**, **Postdoc4**, MV)			Translate findings into concrete policy tools (**MP**, Postdoc3, Postdoc4)		

8. Project's international dimension

CODE is an international undertaking organized around a hub in Aarhus. We see the international dimension as key to the success of the project. We have enlisted top scholars from American, British, and Scandinavian universities and practitioners such as the International Foundation for Electoral Systems as international partners. As illustrated in the Gantt Chart above, the external scholars will take part in all phases of CODE.

The institutional home in Aarhus will facilitate the entire group coming together at regular workshops and conferences. More specifically, we plan to arrange three to four smaller workshops during each year of the project, as well as two large workshops and two international conferences during the four-year project period. The international conferences will signal that the Department of Political Science in Aarhus has emerged as a new center for conflict studies, adding to the strong Scandinavian environment presently concentrated in Norway (PRIO) and Sweden (Uppsala). Facilitated by the involvement of the external scholars, CODE is likely to be complimentary to already-existing long-term collaborative relationships between Essex and PRIO and between PRIO and Uppsala, including the gathering of conflict data and common publications on conflict and democratization.

The international conferences are meant to bring together top scholars and practitioners, to stimulate the kind of dialogue between research and politics that is greatly needed in dealing with 21st century conflicts. The workshops will be more focused undertakings. In Stage I we will mainly bring the CODE team—or, in the smaller workshops, selected parts of the CODE team—together to intensively discuss papers, data collection, and the way forward. Sometimes additional experts, drawn from the networks of CODE's researchers, will be enlisted to provide input or collaboration. In the second phase, the emphasis of the workshops will be on the way that findings about conflict prevention tools can be translated into practical advice

and how to disseminate this advice to practitioners. Finally, the PhD student and the four postdocs will have extended stays at the external partners' institutions.

9. Legal and ethical aspects

We do not expect to encounter any legal or ethical problems while conducting our research. The experiments and surveys will require written informed consent from all subjects/respondents and ensure their anonymity. The studies will also be subjected to the approval of The Central Denmark Region Committees on Health Research, which is a prerequisite for conducting experiments in the Cognition and Behavior Lab (see above). Furthermore, before conducting the studies, our researchers will complete the National Institutes of Health course "Protecting Human Research Participants," after which they will be issued an ethics certification mandatory for researchers conducting studies at the Cognition and Behavior Lab.

10. Publication and promotional strategy and use of results

Throughout both phases of CODE, we aim to produce the kind of top research that will serve to give the findings the recognition that is needed to fulfill the aim of Stage II: the successful dissemination of ways of preventing violence during democratization processes. Several members of the Danish part of the CODE team regularly publish in top-tier journals of political science (see attached CVs). The involvement of international top scholars will further ensure that the publications coming out of CODE are appropriately tailored and ambitious enough to get into such journals. Furthermore, by involving practitioners we aim to produce research that is both cutting-edge within the literature and has nontrivial practical implications. This means that it is important to present our findings not only in peer-reviewed articles but also in comprehensive book treatments, including at least one book aimed at the broader public. Finally, we will disseminate important findings in newspaper articles and policy briefs, co-authored with relevant practitioners where possible. The publication strategy can be summed up as follows:

- The postdocs are expected to write at least three peer-reviewed articles each, at least one of which—possibly co-authored with other members of the CODE team—should go into a top-tier journal.
- The PhD dissertation that results from CODE will include at least three peer-reviewed articles, some of which might be co-authored with the main investigators.
- The main investigators will publish a total of about fifteen articles, out of which at least five should go into top-tier journals, with the rest in other internationally recognized journals. Most of these articles will be co-authored with the external researchers and/or the postdocs and the PhD.
- The main investigators will publish a two-volume book in English at one of the leading university presses that wraps the different parts of the project together. The first volume is to deal with Stage I, the second volume with Stage II. The external researchers will be included as co-authors of the first volume and selected practitioners will be involved in the work on the second volume. Finally, the main investigators will publish a popular version in a Scandinavian language, the aim of which is to disseminate both findings about causes of conflict during political openings and about prevention tools.
- The main investigators will publish an edited volume in English with contributions from all project participants and selected people affiliated with the project. The main aim of this book is to create interest about the findings that come out of CODE.

- The CODE team will produce a series of 1- to 2-page policy briefs, which summarize findings and their implications for policy tools.
- CODE members will offer lectures on conflict and democratization to Danish high schools (Gymnasiums).
- Finally, CODE will contribute to ongoing dialogue projects, organized by members of the practitioners' panel, between civil society organizations in some of the target states.

11. The participating parties, project management and – if relevant – a description of the centre function or the alliance function

CODE's institutional home and main co-financer (app. 7 million DKK) is the Department of Political Science and Government, Aarhus University. Most of CODE's researchers, including the principal investigator, will also be based here. This will facilitate day-to-day cooperation and make it easier to attract international partners and involve participants in regular meetings and workshops.

CODE's principal investigator is Møller, who will be in charge of coordinating the research, contacts with partners, public dissemination, and organizing workshops, and who will head WP C. Møller has published extensively on democratization, the rule of law, and state formation, has had leadership functions in several prior research projects, and has much experience in public dissemination of social science research.

The core group of CODE is made up by six experienced scholars, all based at the Department of Political Science and Government, Aarhus University. Tolstrup enters the project in two different capacities. First, Tolstrup has an important coordinating role to play, as he will assist Møller in directing CODE. Second, as a specialist on the post-Soviet region who is well-versed in the international dimension of democratization, he is affiliated with WP A. WP B will be headed by Skaaning, who has published extensively on issues related to democratization and human rights, and who belongs to the core group behind the V-Dem project. Kjær, specialized in political reforms in Africa and a key figure in the Danish foreign aid community, and Elklit, a leading expert on electoral integrity, political institutions, and ethnic conflicts, will also be connected to WP B. Valbjørn, a Middle East specialist who has published extensively on issues related to conflict and regime change, will be affiliated with WPs A, B and C. WP D will be led by Petersen, a leading expert on political psychology and psychological experiments, who has published extensively in top journals in various disciplines. We will involve young talents by attaching one PhD student to WP A, one postdoc each to WPs B and C and two postdocs to WP D. These positions will be filled via competitive recruiting but we already know of several relevant candidates, most of which we are confident we can attract to Aarhus.

On a practical level, the Aarhus hub will facilitate the day-to-day interactions of the CODE team. The permanent members of the CODE team will, except for research stays described below, all be based in Aarhus. This not only makes the day-to-day management of the project much easier but also allows for weekly lunch seminars at which participants will interact, coordinate, and present work in progress. In addition, the strong research environment already in existence in Aarhus, and in particular the regular paper presentation series that exist in both the Section for International Relations and the Section for Comparative Politics (to which most CODE participants belong), will also allow CODE researchers to regularly present work to colleagues in neighboring fields of research. Furthermore, Aarhus will be the base for conducting international workshops and practitioners' seminars, and for hosting international members of the CODE team for short- and long-term stays. Aarhus University provides excellent facilities and practical support for organizing such gatherings. The main investigators all have prior experience with arranging conferences and workshops. What is more, the Department has a lot of experience in hosting large research projects – several of which are ongoing at the moment – and offers administrative support to everything from budgeting to revising manuscript and planning events.

To supplement the Aarhus team, we have enlisted a number of international top scholars. We will cooperate with the strong Scandinavian research environments at PRIO and Uppsala University, represented by Gleditsch (Essex/PRIO), Hegre (PRIO/Uppsala), and Höglund (Uppsala). All of these researchers have done cutting-edge research on elections, democratization, and conflict. Moreover, Gleditsch and Hegre have expertise in a variety of different methodologies. In addition, we have attached Thomsen (Oslo), a psychologist specialized in intergroup relations and multi-methods research, and Judith Kelley (Duke), who has published path-breaking works on how international actors can promote domestic political reforms. Gleditsch, Kelley, and Thomsen will have research stays in Aarhus during the project period and Hegre and Hoglund will participate in all CODE workshops and conferences (see below). All of the involved international scholars are capable of communicating in a Scandinavian language. This means that, if relevant, it will also be possible to include them in some of the dissemination efforts directed at a Danish or Scandinavian public. More generally, CODE is well-placed to reap synergies with the work taking place at the established conflict study environments in PRIO and Uppsala. Besides the individual collaboration of the attached researchers from these two institutions, there should be ample opportunities for working together on edited volumes, data gathering efforts, and research education. For instance, CODE aims to co-teach a PhD seminar with researchers from PRIO and/or Uppsala, preferably located in Aarhus.

As mentioned in Section 7 and 8 above, the CODE project includes research education of one PhD and four Postdocs. The aim is not only to educate new and promising scholars at the Department in Aarhus but also to further their education and integration into relevant international research networks. Both the PhD and the Postdocs will therefore be affiliated with the partners' institutions during research stays. More particularly, PhD1 will have an extended stay with Gleditsch at University of Essex and a shorter stay with Kelley at Duke University, both of whom will be critical in supporting the construction of a dataset on smart sanctions. Similarly, Postdoc1 will have an extended stay at Duke to conduct work on the field experiment in collaboration with Judith Kelley and Postdoc2 will spend time at PRIO and/or Uppsala. Finally, Postdoc3 and possibly also Postdoc4 will have an extended research stay at the Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences at the University of California, Santa Barbara (with whom members of our team have collaborated on several projects), enabling us to develop and appraise the design of the two experiments and the survey for WP D among top international psychologists.

To ensure the relevance and feasibility of the policy tools and the efficient spread of the knowledge generated, CODE contains a practitioners' panel of Danish and international organizations (all have agreed). These include, among others, the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Danish Institute for Parties and Democracy (DIPD), the International Foundation for Electoral Systems, ActionAid Denmark, Danish-Egyptian Dialogue Institute in Cairo (DEDI), KVINFO, MENA-Netværket (Mellemfolkeligt Samvirke), the Danish Institute for Human Rights, the Royal Danish Defence College, and the Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network. CODE will organize a series of workshops and conferences for researchers and practitioners. Practitioners will guide research by pointing to problem areas and will evaluate the feasibility of the suggested policy tools, while the researchers can inspire evidence-based policy strategies by presenting research related directly to democracy promotion and conflict prevention. Beyond the workshops, researchers will work closely with parts of the practitioners' panel in Stage II to run pilot projects of selected policy tools, as described in Section 6. Also, if relevant, practitioners will be drawn in as co-authors on scientific articles.

To illustrate some of the capacities that the panelists bring to CODE, one might highlight DEDI. DEDI has experience carrying out dialogue projects between Danish and Egyptian and Egyptian and Egyptian civil society organizations. DEDI has also had surveys carried out in Egypt and has an intimate knowledge of the Egyptian civil society landscape. DEDI can thus provide vital input on which kinds of civil society cooperation work and which do not, and which civil society groups to foster ties with when seeking to create political inclusion or nation-building or to avoid crowding out local NGOs. Furthermore, DEDI has numerous contacts in Egypt and can thus offer an entry point for CODE researchers.

Another example is the expertise of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, DIPD and IFES, which will be key when conducting a field experiment to evaluate the effect of a selected policy tool. Whereas DIPD and René Taus Hansen of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs can assist with access to concrete cases of, for instance, support for political parties, Staffan Darnolf at IFES will be CODE's main access to processes of domestic election observation.

More generally, regarding field work, a number of members of the CODE team have extensive contacts in the conflict zones that we focus on in this part of the research. This will facilitate access to key decision-makers and observers in relevant countries such as Uganda and Egypt and the practical realization of surveys in these areas.

Some closing reflections on the interdisciplinary dimension of the project are pertinent. Interdisciplinarity has the potential of both massive advantages and presents potential problems. On the one hand, the ability to interrogate research problems from different angles and with different approaches and tools probably represents the only way to adequately deal with a subject as complex as the intricacies of democratization and conflict. On the other hand, the stories of research projects that have ended up falling between different disciplinary chairs or with project members from different traditions unable to work together are legion. To reap the advantages and avoid most of the problems, two things are needed: first, a disciplinary core that ensures the coherence of the project; second, the ability of individual researchers to work in interdisciplinary teams. CODE fulfills both of these criteria. On the one hand, CODE has a strong core of political scientists. On the other hand, the CODE team cuts across disciplines both with respect to affiliation and independent of affiliation. For instance, Gleditsch and Hegre have published in journals in Economics, Sociology, and Geography, Petersen has published in Economics, Psychology, and Biology journals, Møller and Skaaning have competences in historical studies, and Tolstrup, Valbjørn and Kjær are well-versed in area studies and have published in area studies journals. Most other CODE members also have experiences with interdisciplinary work. CODE is therefore well-placed to reap the rewards of interdisciplinarity while avoiding the most obvious pitfalls.

12. Key references

Bapat, N et al. 2013. "Determinants of Sanctions Effectiveness." *International Interactions* 39 (1): 79–98.

Bueno de Mesquita, B, and G Downs. 2006. "Intervention and Democracy." *International Organization* 60 (03): 627–49.

Cederman, L, and K Gleditsch. 2009. "Introduction to Special Issue on 'Disaggregating Civil War.'" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53 (4): 487–95.

Cederman, L et al. 2010. "Democratization and Civil War." *Journal of Peace Research* 47 (4): 377–94.

Cederman, L et al. 2011. "Horizontal Inequalities and Ethnonationalist Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 105 (03): 478–95.

Cederman, L et al. 2010. "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel?" *World Politics* 62 (01): 87–119.

Coppedge, M, and J Gerring et al. 2011. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy." *Perspectives on Politics* 9 (2): 247–67.

Cortright, D, and G Lopez. 2002. *Smart Sanctions: Targeting Economic Statecraft*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Daxecker, U. 2012. "The Cost of Exposing Cheating: International Election Monitoring, Fraud, and Post-Election Violence in Africa." *Journal of Peace Research* 49 (4): 503–16.

De Quervain et al. 2004. "The Neural Basis of Altruistic Punishment." *Science* 305 (5688): 1254–58.

Dixon, J. 2009. "What Causes Civil Wars?" *International Studies Review* 11 (4): 707–35.

Early, B. 2011. "Unmasking the Black Knights: Sanctions Busters and Their Effects on the Success of Economic Sanctions." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 7 (4): 381–402.

Elklit, J, and A Reynolds. 2002. "The Impact of Election Administration on the Legitimacy of Emerging Democracies." *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 40 (2): 86–119.

Enterline, A, and M Greig. 2005. "Beacons of Hope? The Impact of Imposed Democracy on Regional Peace, Democracy, and Prosperity." *The Journal of Politics* 67 (4): 1075–98.

Hegre, H. 2014. "Democracy and Armed Conflict." *Journal of Peace Research* 51 (2): 159–72.

Hironaka, A. 2005. *Neverending Wars*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Höglund, K. 2009. "Electoral Violence in Conflict-Ridden Societies." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 21 (3): 412–27.

Johnson, D, R et al. 2006. "Overconfidence in Wargames." *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 273 (1600): 2513–20.

Kelley, J. 2012. *Monitoring Democracy*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

Levitsky, S, and L Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mansfield, E, and J Snyder. 2008. "Democratization and Civil War." *Occasional Papers of the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies.*

McCullough, M, R Kurzban, and B Tabak. 2013. "Cognitive Systems for Revenge and Forgiveness." *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 36 (1): 1–15.

McCullough, M et al. 2014. "Conciliatory Gestures Promote Forgiveness and Reduce Anger in Humans." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111 (30): 11211–16.

McDermott, R, J Cowden, and S Rosen. 2008. "The Role of Hostile Communications in a Crisis Simulation Game." *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 14 (2): 151–67.

Møller, J. 2014. "Why Europe Avoided Hegemony." *International Studies Quarterly*, 58 (4): 660-70.

Møller, J, and S Skaaning. 2013. *Democracy and Democratization in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Routledge.

Morgan, C, and V Schwebach. 1995. "Economic Sanctions as an Instrument of Foreign Policy." *International Interactions* 21 (3): 247–63.

Nilsson, D. 2012. "Anchoring the Peace." *International Interactions* 38 (2): 243–66.

Peceny, M. 1999. *Democracy at the Point of Bayonets*. Penn: Penn State University Press.

Petersen, M et al. 2010. "Evolutionary Psychology and Criminal Justice." In *Human Morality & Sociality*, edited by H Høgh-Olesen, 72–131. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Powell, J, and C Thyne. 2011. "Global Instances of Coups from 1950 to 2010." *Journal of Peace Research* 48 (2): 249–59.

Savun, B, and D Tirone. 2011. "Foreign Aid, Democratization, and Civil Conflict." *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (2): 233–46.

Stewart, F. 2002. "Horizontal Inequalities." Queen Elizabeth House Working Paper Series No. 81.

Stewart, F, ed. 2008. *Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Tabak, B et al. 2012. "Conciliatory Gestures Facilitate Forgiveness and Feelings of Friendship by Making Transgressors Appear More Agreeable." *Journal of Personality* 80 (2): 503–36.

Tolstrup, J. 2014. *Russia vs. the EU: External Actors in Competition for Influence in Post-Soviet States*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Wallensteen, P, and I Svensson. 2014. "Talking Peace." *Journal of Peace Research* 51 (2): 315–27.