

The Ups and Downs of Democracy: A Comparative Study of Democratic Deepening and Regression

Research goals and contribution

We are living in a great age of democracy. Following the end of the Cold War, a massive wave of democratization swept the world, and ideologically democracy has had no challengers of note since the demise of communism (Berg-Schlosser 2009). However, processes of democratization have usually been messy, with lots of movement back and forth. In a long-term perspective this bumpy road has led to a more democratic world, but it has done so haltingly and with more than occasional setbacks. The one-and-a-half decades after 1989 – showing a remarkable increase in the number of democracies – thus stand out as relatively exceptional. Seen in this light it is not too surprising that this trend has recently sagged. According to the Freedom House's *Freedom in the World Survey* we have witnessed democratic setbacks for six years in a row (2006-2011). This phenomenon is not confined to developing countries (Schmitter 2010). Just note how several European democracies such as Hungary, Greece, and Italy have recently experienced severe political and economic challenges, which according to many observers indicate that Europe is teetering on the edge of democratic decline (Freedom House 2012; Krugman 2011).

But what causes democratic declines, and what makes it possible for democracies to develop further? With this project, we set out to identify the most important causes of what we term democratic deepening and regression, i.e., movements from less democratic to more democratic regime types and vice versa. To do this, we use a novel theoretical framework, we enlist new, fine-grained data covering more than a century, and we combine cross-national data analysis with case studies to provide a nuanced understanding of political regime developments. We are thereby able to make contributions to the field in three significant ways.

First, we venture beyond the search for independent causes of political regime development which has dominated in the literature (see Grugel 2002; Haerpfer et al. 2009; Møller & Skaaning, forthcoming). Instead, we argue that the interaction among four explanatory factors (civil society, the party system, stateness, and the international system) is critical. Civil society has been repeatedly argued to be important for democracy (Putnam 1993, 2000; Warren 2001). However, a viable civil society can lead to the mobilization of anti-democratic forces if it is not linked with an institutionalized party system. Moreover, stateness and civil society arguably stand in an interactive relationship. For instance, increases in coercive intrusions into society by the state are liable to provoke contentious civil society actions that can expand the space for protected

consultation between state and society; and such expanded consultation is likely to raise demands for state intervention, leading to an increase in state capacity (Tilly 2004: 35-36). Accordingly, we expect high quality democracies with low risks of setbacks to be strongly associated with high levels of state capacity and viable civil societies. Finally, the structure of the international system also has to be taken into account. This factor works as a kind of scope condition by influencing how and how much great powers influence the incentives and capabilities of domestic actors through external support and pressure (Boix 2011; McFaul 2010). Using a configurative approach, we plan to systematically assess how interaction between these conditions is related to democratic deepening and regression.

Second, we argue that a long-term historical approach is necessary to avoid getting biased snap-shots of such patterns. If we only analyze, say, the Cold War period, we might derive misleading conclusions about democratic deepening and regression for the simple reason that domestic relationships were affected by the bipolar international system in particular ways (compare Przeworski et al. 2000 and Boix & Stokes 2003). Only by including periods in which our core variables show significant variation, can we get an adequate grasp of the causal relationships. Accordingly, we first examine our framework on the entire period in which modern democracy (including universal suffrage) has been in existence, 1900-2012, and subsequently zoom in on different historical periods and regions of particular interest. The temporal aspects of our project is meant both to facilitate robust results and to assess the extent to which the patterns characterizing past periods are relevant for our understanding of movements to and away from democracy today.

Third, while extant studies impose a uniform, and often binary, definition of democracy that is generally focused on the electoral dimension (e.g. Acemoglu & Robinson 2005; Berg-Schlosser & Mitchell 2003; Boix 2003; Teorell 2010), we take a multifaceted view of democracy. We first do this by creating a conceptual typology, which includes an electoral dimension, a civil liberties dimension, and a rule of law dimension, to assess the respective propensity for deepening and regression on these dimensions. We are thereby able to assess various stages and phases of deepening and regression rather than just transitions to and from a uniform and/or dichotomous understanding of democracy and autocracy. More particularly, we enlist data from the Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) project (www.v-dem.net), which allows us to distinguish between no less than seven principles of democracy – electoral, liberal, consensus, majoritarian, participatory, deliberative, and egalitarian – and numerous subcomponents (Coppedge & Gerring et al. 2011). Ultimately, we hope to identify *syndromes* and *sequences* of democratization and de-democratization – that is, aspects of democracy that tend to go together, or follow one another,

when a regime slips away from, or moves in the direction of, the democratic ideal. This rich, descriptive part of the project is the first attempt to capture political regime developments in such a detailed fashion. Crucially, our conceptual and theoretical framework allows us to investigate whether causal relationships differ when different definitions of democracy are applied. It is conceivable that different sorts of democratic deepening and regression have different causes; a possibility we attempt to explore. In a nutshell, we suspect conceptual differences may underlie some of the seemingly contradictory claims about political regime dynamics in the literature (e.g. Inglehart & Welzel 2005; Przeworski et al. 2000; Rueschemeyer et al. 1992; Collier 1999), meaning that systematic conceptual distinctions should allow us to bridge some of these disagreements.

Our project thereby contributes to a number of ongoing scholarly debates in democratization studies: the historical turn (Capoccia & Ziblatt 2010), the conceptualization and measurement of democracy (Coppedge & Gerring et al. 2011; Møller & Skaaning 2011), the relative importance of structures vs. actors (Mahoney & Snyder 1999; Morlino 2012), and international vs. domestic conditions (Levitsky & Way 2010; Boix 2011). In summary, the general research goals are:

- 1) To provide a detailed overview of political regime developments from 1900 to 2012
- 2) To explain patterns of democratic deepening and regression from 1900 to 2012
- 3) To reveal similarities and differences in developments and determinants across different periods and regions

The relevance of our configurative, multifaceted, historical approach is nicely illustrated by some recent events. A series of political upheavals – which quickly became known as the ‘Arab Spring’ or ‘Arab Uprisings’ – broke out in the Middle East and Northern Africa (MENA) in early 2011. In Tunisia and Egypt, long-time autocrats were forced out of office, in neighbouring Libya a civil war produced similar results, and the uprisings are still ongoing in Syria. However, several other political regimes in the region responded by tightening the screws, and at the moment it seems that all Arab countries are in some respect changing, either in the direction of more genuine electoral competition and pluralism or further away from it (Way 2011). Similar patterns were seen among the post-Soviet countries after the so-called Colour Revolutions in Georgia, Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan in the early 2000s as undemocratic elites in countries such as Belarus and Uzbekistan attempted to pre-empt a diffusion of the upheavals by further repression (Way 2008), and as some of the countries that experienced political openings soon saw setbacks occur.

The recent developments in the MENA and the post-Soviet space indicate that distinct dimensions of democracy are affected by political contention and that it is difficult to identify singular causes of regime change. Although many commentators have offered predictions, we simply do not have a solid basis for assessing the most likely outcomes of, say, the Arab Uprisings. These are moving targets and to elucidate such processes, we need to delve into the experiences of other countries and periods.

The historical turn in democratization studies

We are not alone in envisaging a historical approach to regime change. Most recently, Capoccia & Ziblatt (2010: 931) have attempted to lay “the theoretical and methodological foundations of a new historically minded approach to the comparative study of democratization.” They convincingly show two things. First, that since the breakdown of communism the historical focus has been downplayed because the magnitude of democratization over the latest generation has tended to crowd out attention to developments in prior periods. Second, that the consequent ‘ahistorical’ analyses suffer from an assumption of causal homogeneity, a lack of micro foundations for causal relationships, and problems of circular causality (Capoccia & Ziblatt 2010: 935-938). More concretely, Capoccia & Ziblatt direct attention to short-term episodes of democratization, other conditions than social class constellations, and actor choices and contingency during critical junctures.

Our project partakes in this historical turn, both regarding the general call for historical analysis and with respect to attention to other factor than class structures. That said, we also challenge Capoccia and Ziblatt’s trenchant emphasis of contingency and voluntarism. This focus simply does not square with systematic variations in political regime developments in, for instance, interwar Europe and present-day developing countries. As any convincing explanation must be able to account for the existence of such manifest patterns, it is very difficult to see that such clear-cut clustering can be caused by the contingent choices of actors in the specific cases. If such were indeed decisive, we would expect a much more random variation in political regime types (cf. Kitschelt 2003; Møller & Skaaning 2009; Møller, forthcoming). At the very least, adequate theoretical approaches need to combine the macro-level and the micro-level (Mahoney & Snyder 1999). The ambition to tackle both levels in an iterative way is reflected in our research strategy. More succinctly, we argue that the historical turn is precisely where democratization studies should be heading. But exactly for that reason, it is crucial that this new research agenda

does not throw out the baby (structural explanations of regime change) with the bath water (contemporary snap-shots).

Mapping democracies and autocracies

As outlined above, our first research goal is to map patterns of democratic deepening and regression across the period 1900-2012. We anchor the attempt to do so in a typology of democratic regimes, we have established in prior work (Møller & Skaaning 2010, 2011). The basic merit of this typology is that it builds upon an appraisal of different conceptions of democracy used in empirical democratization research (see Collier & Levitsky 1997) and that it establishes a theoretically embedded distinction between four different types of democracy: minimalist democracy (Schumpeter (1974[1942])), electoral democracy (Diamond 1999), polyarchy (Dahl 1989), and liberal democracy (O'Donnell 2007; Diamond 1999). These four types of democracy can be placed along a ladder of abstraction (cf. Sartori 1970; Goertz 2006), meaning that thicker categories subsume their thinner counterparts and that the defining attributes of each type are treated as individually necessary and jointly sufficient. As a part of this research project we will expand the typology so that it also covers the most important types in the autocratic spectrum, including closed authoritarianism, hegemonic authoritarianism, and electoral authoritarianism (see Diamond 2002; Levitsky & Way 2010; Schedler 2002). This conceptual edifice makes it possible to further spell out our dependent variable, democratic deepening and regression.

To operationalize these regime types, we will utilize the framework established by the V-Dem project for which John Gerring serves as a co-principal investigator and Svend-Erik Skaaning serves as a project manager. While extant work is based on highly aggregated measures (such as Freedom House and Polity) or binary measures of democracy, V-Dem offers a highly disaggregated set of indicators, to be collected for all sovereign and semi-sovereign countries/colonies from 1900 to the present. The coding schemes and data collection procedures, including expert surveys, have been carefully developed by some of the most distinguished scholars in the field (see Coppedge & Gerring et al. 2011). Our affiliation with this grand data collection project means that we can get early access to the database (that also includes several indicators for most of our explanatory factors), which enables us to make consistent comparisons over time. The data also allow us to assess our models based on more fine-grained distinctions between the various components of democracy captured by our typology. This will pave the way for identifying aspects of democracy that tend to go together or part ways during democratic deepening and regression.

Sponsors, such as development aid agencies, have shown a great interest in funding the V-Dem data collection efforts with regard to developing and post-communist countries but less so for coding the OECD countries. As these countries are also important for our project, we apply for funding to pay for expert coding of OECD countries for the period 1900-2000. This data will then be integrated into the general V-Dem database and made publicly available.

Theoretical framework

Regarding our explanatory endeavours, we will first carry out a general analysis of the entire period 1900-2012 (cf. Bernhard et al. 2001; Gates et al. 2006; Svobik 2008). Subsequently, we scrutinize whether the same factors are relevant (in similar ways) when breaking down these 113 years into different periods and world regions (cf. Boix & Stokes 2003; Mainwaring & Pérez-Liñán 2007). We here argue that one should search for relatively general and ‘deep’ explanations (Kitschelt 2003; Møller, forthcoming). On this basis, four explanatory factors merit particular attention. Other relevant variables will of course be included to control for possible confounders to the model, but these four conditions make up our theoretical model.

First, scholars have argued that a strong civil society plays an important role in supporting democratic stability, based on its potential to hold elites and state agents accountable through organized opposition and high levels of civic virtue and trust among citizens (Putnam 1993, 2000; Warren 2001). Second, this relationship is arguably stronger given experience with institutionalized competition between political parties (Ertman 1998). However, although a number of studies have emphasized one or the other factor (e.g. Rakner & van de Walle 2009; Tusalem 2007; Randall & Svåsand 2002; Mainwaring 1998), the combination of the strength of civil society and nature of political representation has not been treated systematically so far.

Third, we introduce stateness – the extent to which the state is characterized by a monopoly on the means of violence, an efficient administrative apparatus, and a basic agreement about citizenship – to our model. Other scholars have also emphasized the importance of this factor (e.g. Linz & Stepan 1996; Fukuyama 2005; Møller & Skaaning 2011). However, their discussion has barely gone beyond suggesting that it seems to co-vary strongly with the regime outcomes, which reflects that the emphasis on stateness as a crucial explanation has neither been supported by elaborate theorizing nor rigorous analysis (Munck 2011: 10). Stateness directly impacts democratic deepening (and regression) via its effects on rights violations and open conflict (Englehart 2009; Fearon & Laitin 2003), the creation and implementation of policies (Hellman et al. 2003) and, hence, the general satisfaction with regime performance (Bratton & Chang 2006; Mainwaring 2006;

Rothstein 2011). But even more crucial is the way it interacts with the civil society (Mann 1993; Weiss 1998; Tilly 2004), as reflected in Carothers's (2004: 104) claim that, "Nothing cripples civil society development like a weak, lethargic state." This plus-sum understanding of state capacity and civil society suggests that democracy depends on both to thrive. Yet, this assertion still needs to be subjected to systematic empirical assessment.

Fourth, we attempt to investigate in more detail to what extent the structure of the international system has supported or undermined democratic developments by mediating the impact of the domestic factors highlighted above. We expect international factors to play a different role in different periods (cf. Levitsky & Way 2010: 19; McFaul 2010; Boix 2011). To exemplify, in the very first years after World War I, the victory of the Entente Powers and the dissolution of empires sparked democratization in major parts of Europe. But quickly struggles between great powers representing conflicting ideologies broke out, meaning that the international system generally did not work in support of democracy.

In contrast, the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1989-1991 has been followed by a Western liberal hegemony in international affairs where democracy is considered to be the only legitimate form of rule by the population in virtually all countries of the world (Klingemann 1999; Norris 2011), and where the Western powers have actively used their leverage for democracy promotion (Burnell 2011; Carothers 2004; Levitsky & Way 2010). In our general model, the international pressure thus works as a shifting scope condition. However, we will also analyse international influences in depth in selected periods using comparative case studies. For this work, we plan to attach a post.doc. An important aspect here is the question of whether we are currently observing a shift on this variable, away from the Western liberal hegemony which has characterized the international system in the latest decades.

Research design in the explanatory analyses

Rather than only examining each causal factor as independent, we will thus look closely at their interdependence in accounting for democracy. Consequently, we employ methods geared to test the importance of configurations of causal factors to achieve a better grasp of both historical and contemporary patterns of democratic deepening and regression. It follows from our criticism of the present version of the historical turn in democratization studies that the proper approach to understand regime change is one that appreciates both macro-level structures and micro-level actors' choices. Our explanatory inquiry will, accordingly, be based on a nested analysis strategy (Lieberman 2005; Gerring & Seawright 2008) where we utilize the respective advantages of broad

comparisons to reveal systematic patterns and in-depth case studies to identify the links between cause and effect.

In the first step, we employ configurational comparative methods, such as fuzzy-set QCA (Rihoux & Ragin 2008) to establish alignment between theory and methods (see Skaaning 2011; Møller & Skaaning 2011). The competitive edge of these methods is exactly their ability to systematically assess complex relationships, such as the syndrome of factors that constitute our explanatory framework. To assess the plausibility of theoretical assumptions, the results will be compared with those based on standard statistical tools, such as history event analysis. We will also use IV-analysis and Granger causality tests in case of potential problems of endogeneity, which could, for instance, be relevant regarding the relationship between stateness and democracy (cf. Bäck & Hadenius 2001). In a second step, we change analytical level and trace developments in individual countries through in-depth studies of deviant and typical cases from different periods (pre-World War I, interwar, Cold War, and post-Cold War).

Regarding the selection of cases for this endeavour, it will largely follow from the results of the broad comparisons. Based on a nested analysis framework, we thus select well-predicted (typical) cases to investigate causal mechanisms and outliers (deviant cases) to search for missing variables. Accordingly, for each period of interest we will choose a typical rollback case, a typical case of stability, a deviant case of stability, and deviant rollback case. This brings us back to the questions about democratization we set out to interrogate, namely, when are elites constrained to follow the rules of the game that they have laid out?

As usual in social science, most plausible causes are probably correlated with each other, meaning that it is hard to piece together a clear narrative for a single case. However, by accessing the decision-making process within a regime it might be possible to tell which forces pulled in which direction, even if one cannot tease apart a determinate cause of a specific outcome in a specific case. For example, in looking for evidence of the influence of international-system factors one could read biographies of elites to see whether there were external forces constraining their choices. The benefit of the case studies will be to generate this sort of process-tracing evidence which should add up to something more than idiosyncratic stories. To carry out these kinds of case studies, we need to delve into and process a large historical material on individual countries (country monographs, biographies, descriptive statistics, etc.). Some of the buyout we are applying for is meant to provide the time and resources for this kind of qualitative data gathering and analysis.

International contacts, workshops, and conferences

Besides a number of people at the Department of Political Science, Aarhus University, working on related topics (e.g. Jørgen Elklit, Georg Sørensen, and Jakob Tolstrup) and the people involved in the V-Dem project (www.v-dem.net/contact), we are in regular contact with the following group of leading scholars in the field of democratization research: Gerardo Munck, Lise Rakner, Christian Welzel, Herbert Kitschelt, and Francis Fukuyama. We plan to invite some of these scholars and additional experts to an initial workshop to discuss the results of the categorization of political regimes and how to proceed with the explanatory endeavour. A second workshop is planned to take place at the end of the third year where the project participants will present their tentative findings and have these discussed.

In the context of the research project we will also arrange two PhD courses, one on comparative research design and one on political regime change, co-sponsored by the department in Aarhus and taught by Svend-Erik Skaaning, Jørgen Møller, and John Gerring. We do this to stimulate the development of talents as part of a more general strategy about recruiting PhD students (funded by ordinary scholarships) who will work on issues tangential to our general research project.

Next, in order to develop the project with the help of leading experts, Svend-Erik Skaaning is expected to spend one or two semesters at the Center for European Studies at Harvard University where Daniel Ziblatt has agreed to sponsor the stay. Ziblatt, who has collaborated with John Gerring before, is one of the most important scholars working on the historical dimension of democratization, and he has expressed great interest in our project. Besides Ziblatt, we hope to interact with other scholars at Harvard, such as Steven Levitsky, who has worked on the relationship between international and domestic conditions of democracy, Pippa Norris, who has studied the impact of political institutions on democratic performance, and Robert Putnam, the leading scholar on civil society and democracy. During the period covered by our project, Putnam is distinguished visiting professor at Aarhus University under the auspices of the so-called Matchpoints seminars. On top of this, Møller will spend a shorter period at either a British or German University to interact with scholars working on democratization in a historical perspective.

Finally, we will present parts of the project at international conferences, such as the APSA annual meetings and the ECPR joints sessions of workshops. Regarding the latter, we plan to hand in applications to chair a workshop on the historical turn in democratization studies. If the project receives funding, we also have an agreement with scholars at the German Institute of Global and Area Studies in Hamburg about co-hosting an international conference on democratic stability

and quality in cooperation with the IPSA research sections on the Quality of Democracy and Concepts and Methods in the second year of the project. This will facilitate both disseminating our findings and getting critical feedback on our research.

Project coordination and work packages

The project is to be headed by Svend-Erik Skaaning, who will be in charge of coordinating the research, organizing the workshops and PhD courses, and who will take part in four out of five work packages described below. Skaaning has extensive prior experience with data collection and assessment (e.g. Skaaning 2008, 2009, 2010), and he has worked extensively on the conceptualization, measurement, and explanation of political regimes (e.g. Skaaning 2006, 2011, Møller & Skaaning 2011, forthcoming; Jensen & Skaaning, forthcoming).

The remaining project team has been (or will be) chosen with a view to the prior experience with the three components of the research project: conceptualizing and measuring political regimes, comparative (large-N) analyses of regime change, and in-depth case (small-N) studies of regime change. Møller has worked on the conceptualization and explanation of political change and state formation in different settings (e.g. Møller 2007, 2009, 2012). Gerring is a specialist on research design, i.e., conceptualization, measurement, theorizing, case selections, and testing, with a substantial emphasis on studies of democracy and development (e.g. Gerring 2007; 2012; Coppedge & Gerring et al. 2011; Gerring et al. 2011; Gerring & Thacker 2008).

The three-year post.doc affiliated with the project will – through an open call – be partly selected based on his/her ability to handle case study research and his/her acquaintance with issues of democratization, particularly the connection between domestic and international factors. Finally, we will affiliate a junior scholar well-versed in quantitative methodology for four months. This position will also be filled through an open call, but we already have contacts with a promising, interested candidate, Jacob Hariri, who will commence on a post.doc later this year shared between Department of Economics and Department of Political Science at Copenhagen University.

To facilitate a division of labour and coordination, the project is divided into five work packages, the content and timetables of which we describe below.

Work package I. Mapping political regime types: Skaaning, Møller & Gerring

This work package covers the descriptive part of the project: the mapping regimes in a comprehensive typology of regime forms, 1900-2012. We anchor the mapping exercise in a

coherent and comprehensive conceptual framework. As regards data, we rely on the data collection efforts of the V-Dem project that offers a great number of relevant, disaggregated indicators. We enlist this data both to measure the relevant regime types and to provide a more general disaggregated mapping of sequences and syndromes of democratic deepening and regression. As this descriptive work is the basis for the subsequent causal analyses, it will be carried out in the first of the four years of the project. The conceptual spadework should be finished by the second quarter of the first year so that we can convene the first workshop, organized to carefully discuss the regime typology as well as the measurement of the different types.

Work package II. Comparative analyses of democratic deepening and regression: Skaaning & short-term affiliated junior scholar

Using various comparative research strategies, this work package sets out to analyze the determinants of democratic deepening and regression in different periods. We first do this across the board, i.e., in a global analysis of the entire period 1900-2012. Subsequently, we hone in on different periods and world regions of special interest, such as Europe in the interwar years and Sub-Saharan Africa and the post-communist setting in the post-Cold War era, to assess how context-dependent the general relationships are. Our theoretical model will serve as the point of departure but we are of course prepared to either expand or reduce it based on the empirical findings. This work will commence in the second quarter of the second year and is set to be finished by the first quarter of the fourth year.

Work package III. Case studies of democratic deepening and regression: Skaaning & Møller

This work package includes case studies of the development in particular countries. Through process-tracing and longitudinal analysis we will analyze and identify the role of actors and structures at critical junctures in the process, and furthermore try to identify the causal mechanisms that help trigger a country's movement away from democracy or the way in which it deepens democracy. This can be understood as an attempt to probe the plausibility of the causal mechanisms of our theoretical model. As the case selection is largely dependent on the findings of the comparative analyses, this part of the research project will begin in the first quarter of the second year and is to be finished in the second quarter of the fourth year.

Work package IV. The international dimension of political regime change: three-year post.doc

This work package asks how the structure of the international system has affected patterns of democratic deepening in different periods and in particular countries. Whereas the international dimension only enters as a scope condition in our other more general comparative analyzes, the post.doc will treat the influences in a more detailed way. First, s/he will have to elaborate on the theoretical interaction between national and international factors, i.e., how the impact of the domestic conditions outlined above is mediated by the structure of the international system. Which factors are relevant? What is their mutual relationship? And what are the potential mechanisms connecting them with each other and the outcome of interest?

Second, building on previous attempts (e.g. Boix 2011; Levitsky & Way 2010), the post.doc should develop a framework for the measurement of the direction and intensity of the impact of the international-system. Third, the post.doc is expected to carry out a number of in-depth case studies of deviant and typical cases from different periods with special attention to the impact of international factors on domestic regime developments. During the three years that the post.doc will be affiliated with the project, we expect her/him to spend at least a semester at a leading university. The department in Aarhus will cover the post.doc's salary for one year in return for teaching obligations, meaning that the post.doc will be able to achieve the teaching experience needed for a tenured position. This work package will commence in the first quarter of the first year and be finished by the fourth quarter of the third year.

Work package V. Comparisons across time and regions: Skaaning, Møller & Gerring

By utilizing the findings of work packages I-V, we aim to identify structural factors that have an effect on democratic deepening and regression across time and space, as well as the importance of various causal mechanisms as triggers at certain points in the process. Investigating these issues, we will raise both methodological and empirical aspects of cross-temporal comparisons, including the use of historical analogies. This last work package will commence in the third quarter of the third year. Around this time we will convene a workshop to discuss the tentative findings of the project, including which additional questions the project has raised and how to best pursue these issues in new research projects.

Publication plans

The publication strategy can be summed up as follows:

- The post.doc is expected to write at least four peer-reviewed articles
- The other investigators will publish about ten peer-reviewed articles out of which at least four should go into top-tier journals and the rest in other internationally recognized journals
- Skaaning and Møller will publish a book in English at one of the leading university presses that wraps the different parts of the project together, and a more popular version in Danish
- The Danish researchers will regularly disseminate findings via newspaper articles in Danish weeklies and dailies

References

- Acemoglu, D. & J. Robinson (2005). *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bäck, H. & A. Hadenius (2001). "Democracy and State Capacity: Exploring a J-Shaped Relationship." *Governance* 36.
- Berg-Schlosser, D. (2009). "Long Waves and Conjunctures of Democratization." In C. Haerpfer; P. Bernhagen; R. Inglehart & C. Welzel (eds.), *Democratization*. Oxford University Press.
- Berg-Schlosser, D. & J. Mitchell (2003). *Authoritarianism and Democracy in Europe, 1919-1939*. Macmillan.
- Bermeo, N. (2003). *Ordinary People in Extraordinary Times*. Princeton University Press.
- Bernhard, M; T. Nordstrom & C. Reenock (2001). "Economic Performance, Institutional Intermediation, and Democratic Survival." *Journal of Politics* 63.
- Boix, C. (2003). *Democracy and Redistribution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Boix, C. (2011). "Democracy, Development, and the International System." *American Political Science Review* 105.
- Boix, C. & S. Stokes (2003). "Endogenous Democratization." *World Politics* 55.
- Bratton, M. & E. Chang (2006). "State Building and Democratization in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Comparative Political Studies* 39.
- Burnell, P. (2011). *Promoting Democracy Abroad*. Transaction Publishers.
- Capoccia, G. & D. Ziblatt (2010). "The Historical Turn in Democratization Studies." *Comparative Political Studies* 43.
- Carothers, T. (2004). *Critical Mission: Essays on Democracy Promotion*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Collier, R (1999). *Paths toward Democracy: The Working Class and Elites in Western Europe and South America*. Cambridge University Press.
- Collier, D & S. Levitsky (1997). "Democracy with Adjectives." *World Politics* 49.
- Coppedge, M. & J. Gerring with D. Altman; M. Bernhard; S. Fish, A. Hicken; M. Kroenig; S. Lindberg; K. McMann; P. Paxton; H. Semetko; S. Skaaning; J. Staton & J. Teorell (2011). "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy." *Perspectives on Politics* 9.
- Dahl, R. (1989). *Democracy and Its Critics*. Yale University Press.
- Diamond, L. (1999). *Developing Democracy*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Diamond, L. (2002). "Thinking about Hybrid Regimes." *Journal of Democracy* 13.

- Englehart, N. (2009). "State Capacity, State Failure, and Human Rights." *Journal of Peace Research* 46.
- Ertman, T. (1998). "Democracy and Dictatorship in Interwar Western Europe Revisited." *World Politics* 50.
- Fearon, J. & David Laitin (2003). "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97.
- Freedom House (2012). *Freedom in the World Survey 2012*. www.freedomhouse.org
- Fukuyama, F. (2005). "Stateness First." *Journal of Democracy* 16.
- Gates, S.; H. Hegre, M. Jones & H. Strand (2006). "Institutional Inconsistency and Political Stability." *American Journal of Political Science* 50.
- Gerring, J. (2007). *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, J. (2012). *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. (2nd ed.) Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, J & J. Seawright (2008). "Case-selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options." *Political Research Quarterly* 61.
- Gerring, J. & S. Thacker (2008). *Good Government: A Centripetal Theory of Democratic Governance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, J.; D. Ziblatt; J. Gorp & J. Arevalo (2011). "An Institutional Theory of Direct and Indirect Rule." *World Politics* 63.
- Goertz, G. (2005). *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton University Press.
- Grugel, J. (2002). *Democratization: A Critical Introduction*. Palgrave.
- Haerpfer, C.; P. Bernhagen; R. Inglehart & C. Welzel (eds.), *Democratization*. Oxford University Press.
- Hellman, J.; G. Jones & D. Kaufmann (2000). "Seize the State, Seize the Day." *Journal of Comparative Economics* 31.
- Inglehart, R. & C. Welzel (2005). *Modernization, Cultural, Change, and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jensen, C. & S. Skaaning (forthcoming). "Modernization, Ethnic Fractionalization, and Democracy." *Democratization*.
- Kitschelt, H. (2003). "Accounting for Postcommunist Regime Diversity: What Counts as a Good Cause?" In G. Ekiert & S. Hanson (eds.), *Capitalism and Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe: Assessing the Legacy of Communist Rule*. Cambridge University Press.

- Klingemann, H.-D. (1999). "Mapping Political Support in the 1990s: A Global Analysis." In P. Norris (ed.), *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Governance*. Oxford University Press.
- Krugman, P. (2011). "Depression and Democracy." *New York Times*, December 12.
- Levitsky, S. & L. Way (2010). *Competitive Authoritarianism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lieberman, K. (2005). "Nested Analysis as a Mixed Methods Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review* 99.
- Linz, J. & A. Stepan (1996). *Problems of Democratic Transitions and Consolidation*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mahoney, J. & R. Snyder (1999). "Rethinking Agency and Structure in the Study of Regime Change." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 34.
- Mainwaring, S. (1998). "Party Systems in the Third Wave of Democratization." *Journal of Democracy* 9.
- Mainwaring, S. (2006). "The Crisis of Representation in the Andes." *Journal of Democracy* 17.
- Mainwaring, S. & A. Pérez-Liñán (2007). "Why Regions of the World are Important: Regional Specificities and Region-Wide Diffusion of Democracy." In G. Munck (ed.), *Regimes and Democracy in Latin America: Theories and Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Mann, M. (1993). "Nation-States in Europe and Other Continents: Diversifying, Developing, Not Dying." *Daedalus* 122.
- McFaul, M. (2010). "The Missing Variable: The International System as the Link between Third and Fourth Wave Models of Democratization." In Valery Bunce; Michael McFaul & Kathryn Stoner Weiss (eds.), *Democracy and Authoritarianism in the Postcommunist World*. Cambridge University Press.
- Morlino, L. (2012). *Changes for Democracy: Actors, Structures, Processes*. Oxford University Press.
- Munck, G. (2011). "Democratic Theory after Transitions from Authoritarian Rule." *Perspectives on Politics* 9.
- Møller, J. (2007) "Wherefore the Liberal State? Post-Soviet Democratic Blues and Lessons from Fiscal Sociology." *East European Politics & Societies* 21.
- Møller, J. (2009). *Post-communist Regime Change: A Comparative Study*. Routledge.
- Møller, J. (2012). *Statsdannelse, regimeforandring og økonomisk udvikling*. Hans Reitzels Forlag.

- Møller, J. (forthcoming). "When One Might Not See the Wood for the Trees: The 'Historical Turn' in Democratization Studies, Critical Junctures, and Cross-Case Comparisons." *Democratization*.
- Møller, J. & S. Skaaning (2009). "The Three Worlds of Post-Communism: Revisiting Deep and Proximate Explanations." *Democratization* 16.
- Møller, J. & S. Skaaning (2010). "Beyond the Radial Delusion: Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy and Non-Democracy." *International Political Science Review* 31.
- Møller, J. & S. Skaaning (2011). *Requisites of Democracy*. Routledge.
- Møller, J. & S. Skaaning (forthcoming). *The Long Journey of Democracy: Conceptions, Conjectures, Causes, and Consequences*. Routledge.
- Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic Deficit*. Cambridge University Press.
- O'Donnell, G. (2007). *Dissonances: Democratic Critiques of Democracy*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Przeworski, A.; M. Alvarez; F. Limongi & A. Cheibub (2000). *Democracy and Development*. Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. Simon & Shuster.
- Rakner, L. & N. van de Walle (2009). "Opposition Weakness in Africa." *Journal of Democracy* 20.
- Randall, V. & L. Svåsand (2002). "Party Institutionalization in New Democracies." *Party Politics* 8.
- Rihoux, B. & C. Ragin (2008). *Configurational Comparative Methods*. Sage.
- Rothstein, B. (2011). *The Quality of Government*. Chicago University Press.
- Rueschemeyer, D.; E. Stephens & J. Stephens (1992). *Capitalism and Democracy*. Chicago University Press.
- Sartori, G. (1970). "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64.
- Schedler, A. (2002). "The Menu of Manipulation." *Journal of Democracy* 13.
- Schmitter, P. (2010). "Twenty-Five Years, Fifteen Findings." *Journal of Democracy* 15.
- Schumpeter (1974[1942]). *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. Unwin University Books.
- Skaaning, S. (2006). *Democracy besides Elections: An Inquiry into the (Dis)Respect for Civil Liberty in Latin American and Post-Communist Countries after the Third Wave*. Department of Political Science, Aarhus University.

- Skaaning, S. (2008). "The Civil Liberty Dataset: Conceptualization and Measurement." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Politikwissenschaft* 2.
- Skaaning, S. (2009). "Measuring Civil Liberty: An Assessment of Standards-Based Data Sets." *Revista de Ciencia Política* 29.
- Skaaning, S. (2010). "Measuring the Rule of Law." *Political Research Quarterly* 63.
- Skaaning, S. (2011). "Assessing the Robustness of Crisp-Set and Fuzzy-Set QCA." *Sociological Methods & Research* 40.
- Svolik, M. (2008). "Authoritarian Reversals and Democratic Consolidation." *American Political Science Review* 102.
- Teorell, J. (2010). *Determinants of Democratization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C. (2004). *Contention and Democracy in Europe, 1650-2000*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tusalem, R. (2007). "A Boon or Bane? The Role of Civil Society in Third and Fourth Wave Democracies." *International Political Science Review* 28.
- Warren, M. (2001). *Democracy and Association*. Princeton University Press.
- Way, L. (2008). "Color Revolutions." *Journal of Democracy* 19.
- Way, L. (2011). "Comparing Arab Revolts." *Journal of Democracy* 22.
- Weiss, L. (1998). *The Myth of the Powerless State*. Cornell University Press.