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PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

Research shows that a majority of armed conflicts involve actors that mobilize on the basis of ethnic identity and oftentimes conflict issues are related to ethnic groups’ quest for territorial self-determination, minority rights, or access to central power. However, within this literature there is a lack of consensus regarding definitional issues, such as how to view ethnicity and what specifically constitutes an ethnic group. This in turn impairs on our ability to draw conclusions on what makes ethnic groups politically active and what can account for a group ending up in violent conflict.

At present, a number of different research projects and programs are working on collecting data on ethnic groups and their involvement in organized conflict. When doing comparative research on the link between ethnicity and organized conflict, a number of issues typically arise, partly due to the definitional difficulties raised above. Thus, an important purpose of the workshop was to bring together representatives from the major data collection projects, along with a group of other ethnic conflict scholars, to discuss these issues.

For instance, how do we best identify the relevant ethnic cleavages in a country, without introducing bias (which arises when groups are considered relevant as a consequence of political mobilization)? What is the relevant marker for a given ethnic group, and at what level of aggregation? In addition to this, the workshop yielded an opportunity to discuss new techniques for collecting and analyzing data on ethnic groups and conflict, including the use of GIS software, survey data, experiments, etc. Lastly, the workshop also explored avenues for future collaboration. With several data collection projects in the pipeline, it is important to discuss how we can avoid doing the same work twice as well as ensuring that data is compatible across different projects. In sum, by bringing together a group of informed scholars, the workshop was able to generate new knowledge as well as new questions.

ORGANIZING THE WORKSHOP

The workshop on ethnicity and conflict was hosted by the Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, and supported by grants from the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet) and The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation (Riksbankens Jubileumsfond). The workshop was planned and coordinated by Assistant Professor Erika Forsberg with the assistance of the organizing committee, consisting of Professor Peter Wallensteen and Associate Professor Magnus Öberg. For the purpose of taking notes and writing this summary report, Allard Duursma and Laura Grant were employed.
DATA COLLECTION PROJECTS ON ETHNICITY AND ORGANIZED CONFLICT

The conference opened with presentations from the data collection projects represented at the workshop: the Minorities at Risk Project, Ethnic Power Relations, the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, and Database Developing World. These projects are summarized below.

Minorities at Risk (MAR) (University of Maryland)

The Minorities at Risk project (MAR), developed by Ted Robert Gurr and James Scarritt in 1986, was the first comprehensive dataset to collect information on politically active ethnic and religious minorities. The dataset was created to identify communal groups at risk of conflict, termed “minorities at risk”. The criteria for inclusion of a group in the dataset are that the group collectively suffers, or benefits from, systematic discriminatory treatment vis-à-vis other groups in a society and/or collectively mobilizes in defense or promotion of its self-defined interests. The selection criteria of discrimination and/or mobilization have led to concerns of selection bias when the dataset is used to study ethnic conflict generally. As the dataset was not intended to capture information on all minority or communal groups, it cannot detect all of the underlying relationships necessary to explain ethnic conflict.

In response to this concern, a new dataset called All-Minorities at Risk (A-MAR), designed to provide a comprehensive list of all ethnic groups for the study of ethnic conflict, is currently being developed at the University of Maryland. Unlike the need for engagement with the state in the MAR definition and political relevance in the EPR definition, the criteria for inclusion of a group in the A-MAR list does not reference any political factors. Excluding factors of discrimination and/or mobilization from the selection criteria means the A-MAR data could be used to identify conditions under which groups become politically relevant or targeted.

Furthermore, no single ethnic markers are used for the identification of ethnic groups in the A-MAR dataset; groups are identified according to the salient markers in each country. A-MAR has a population threshold criterion of at least 100,000 members or one percent of a country’s population. Approximately 900 groups are identified as meeting the A-MAR criteria, over 450 of which were not present in either the MAR dataset or Fearon’s data.

Within each country, ethnic groups and subgroups are identified. Acknowledging that ethnicity changes over time, a forum has been established where people can petition to have the lists modified to reflect such changes. Both the MAR and A-MAR datasets are coded by using publicly available sources, such as newspaper articles, books, and government reports.

Once the group lists have been compiled, they are checked by experts and revised accordingly. Over time the MAR dataset has become quite cumbersome, identifying 400 variables. The A-MAR dataset has been streamlined to code 40 key variables under four groups: Group Characteristics, Group Status, Group Conflict Behavior, and External Support. The data is available from 1980 until the present. Both MAR and A-MAR do not use a death threshold as an indicator of violence, and thus are able to capture variation in low-levels of violence from year to year at a finer level of detail than other datasets.

Another development within the MAR family is the **Minorities at Risk Organizational Behavior (MAROB)** dataset. The dataset was developed to identify factors that motivate some members of ethnic minorities to become radicalized, to form organizations, and to move from conventional means of politics and protest into violence and terrorism. The project initially focuses on the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, collating data from 12 MENA states between 1980 and 2004. 112 ethno-political organizations are captured, representing 22 of the MAR ethnic groups. The dataset is now expanding to cover post-Communist states, and updating to 2009. Unlike MAR and A-MAR, MAROB uses organizations as the units of analysis rather than groups. Both violent and non-violent actors are included, providing relevant comparisons. Variables captured in the dataset include organizational characteristics, grievances and ideologies, relationship between the state and the organization, and external support provided to the organization.

**Ethnic Power Relations (EPR) (ETH Zürich/UCLA)**

The **Ethnic Power Relations dataset (EPR)** is a collaborative effort between researchers at the ETH Zürich and the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA). The EPR dataset identifies all politically relevant ethnic groups and codes their access to state power. The dataset captures all politically relevant ethnic groups, regardless of minority or majority status. This broad focus acknowledges that majority groups holding governmental power may also have an ethnic character, and thus allows a close examination of ethnic politics at the political power center. The dynamic nature of the EPR dataset means that changes in ethnic power configurations over time are also captured.
The EPR dataset identifies 733 politically relevant ethnic groups in all 156 sovereign states with a population of at least one million people and a surface area of at least 50,000 square kilometers, as of 2005. The dataset covers the period from 1946 to 2009. Ethnicity is defined as any subjectively experienced sense of commonality based on the belief in common ancestry and shared culture. An ethnic group is politically relevant if at least one significant political organization claims to represent its interest in the national political arena, or if its members are significantly discriminated against in the domain of public politics. Access to state power is defined as the degree to which the group’s representatives hold executive-level state power in any particular year, measured on a scale from total control of government to overt political discrimination and exclusion. The dataset is based on information from regional and country experts, as well as independent research. Researchers can access data in both country-year and group-country-year format.

A number of other projects have grown out of the original EPR dataset. The ACD2EPR dataset links EPR groups with the armed groups in the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP), thus identifying when an armed conflict is fought in the name of a particular ethnic group. A fully geo-coded version of the EPR dataset, called GeoEPR, identifies settlement patterns of politically relevant ethnic groups over space and time. In the most recent development, the EPR data has been integrated into GROWup (Geographic Research on War: Unified Platform), a new online platform based on cooperation between conflict researchers from ETH Zürich, Uppsala University, University of Essex, and the Peace Research Institute Oslo. GROWup seeks to overcome limitations of existing datasets that can be used to study ethnic conflict in three key ways. First, GROWup improves the compatibility of existing datasets by merging data from different data collecting institutions. Secondly, building upon GeoEPR, the data includes both spatial and temporal dimensions and finally, the data is made more transparent with the aid of software and visualization techniques.

The Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) (Uppsala University)
The UCDP developed out of the States in Armed Conflict report series, which began in the 1970s and released its first yearly report in 1987. The UCDP collects data broadly on armed conflicts, which are defined as contested incompatibilities concerning government and/or territory where the use of armed force between two parties, of which at least one is the government of a state, results in at least 25 battle-related deaths in one calendar year. The UCDP covers all armed conflicts from 1946 until the present. The dataset is collated by full-time researchers using predominantly publicly available source material.
The UCDP also draws upon a network of country experts to check and fill gaps in information, provide documentation, and interpret source materials. In addition to the dataset, UCDP has developed a conflict encyclopedia, providing in-depth information on all the conflicts included in the dataset and links to full-text versions of peace agreements.

A number of datasets with more specific points of focus have developed under the UCDP umbrella. Three are particularly relevant to the study of armed conflict. First, the One-Sided Violence Dataset collects data on violence where the perpetrator is an organized group, including governments and rebel groups, and there is no armed resistance from the victims of the violence. The Non-State Conflict Dataset shifts the focus from state-based actors to non-state organized actors, such as rebel groups and communal groups, and collects data on violence between non-state actors. Both the One-Sided Violence Dataset and the Non-State Conflict Dataset cover data from 1989 to 2010. Finally, in 2012, the UCDP launched its Georeferenced Event Dataset (UCDP GED). This dataset collects event data on organized violence, including state-based conflicts, non-state conflicts and one-sided violence since 1989 and is updated annually. Each event is coded with a temporal and spatial coordinate. Researchers can disaggregate the data down to individual days, and each event is accompanied by a precision code to indicate the certainty of the data. The data is currently available for Africa, while other regions of the world are progressively being coded. UCDP GED is completely compatible with all other UCDP datasets on organized violence.

Researchers at the Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, have also been developing datasets relevant to the study of ethnic conflict. Erika Forsberg has worked on a project to code the ethnic constituency of all the UCDP rebel groups that mobilize primarily along ethnic lines. This project is detailed in a 2008 article published in the Journal of Peace Research. Presently, the dataset is unpublished and is in the process of being updated. Magnus Öberg has studied ethnic challenges to government authority between 1990 and 1998, building upon the MAR data with the addition of UCDP coding. As part of this project Öberg developed a complementary dataset entitled “Minorities Not ‘at Risk’”, providing a control group for use with the MAR data. Erika Forsberg and Hanne Fjelde are working on a project that will link the UCDP Non-State Conflict Dataset with the GeoEPR dataset; the coding is underway for Africa and will expand to other regions of the world. Finally, Emma Elfverson is researching government intervention in communal conflicts for her PhD dissertation, and is using the EPR dataset to code government bias.

Jeroen Smits at the Nijmegen Center for Economics, Radboud University has developed a database with information on individuals and households in over 100 developing and transitional countries called **Database Developing World (DDW)**. DDW does not collect raw data but rather brings together data from pre-existing sources, such as Demographic and Health Surveys, World Health Surveys, and UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys. DDW makes the data from these projects compatible and accessible for scientific and policy-oriented research. Data is available on many variables, including basic demographic information, socio-economic factors such as education, occupation, and income, and ethnicity factors, including language and religion. Recently, Smits started a new project together with Radboud’s conflict studies center called Ethnic Stratification, Social Cohesion and Conflict, focused on the determinants of ethnic conflict escalation. The researchers have built a multilevel model for analyzing ethnic conflicts that includes conflict inducing factors, cohesion increasing factors, and escalation promoting factors and are testing the model using two databases they have developed from DDW.

First, the **Ethnic Group Database** was developed using the individual/household level data of DDW. It includes data on more than 300 ethnic groups within 60 developing and transitional countries. A broad concept of ethnicity is employed, including linguistic, racial, and religious groups, and ethnicity is measured by self-identification. For each group, a large number of individual/household variables are aggregated to the ethnic group level. Variables include socio-economic indicators such as levels of education and literacy, employment, wealth, inequality, and urbanization, health indicators, and demographic indicators including age distribution, average household size, fertility rates, marriage traditions and migration patterns.

Secondly, the **Ethnic Dyad Database** collects data at the level of ethnic dyads rather than ethnic groups. This database contains conflict inducing (e.g. differences between groups) and cohesion increasing (e.g. intermarriage) factors derived from DDW for each relevant combination of two ethnic groups, and is supplemented by information from other conflict datasets. This database adds essential information on the differences and connections between ethnic groups within the same region, and thus allows for exploration of the relationship between conflict potential and conflict outbreak, among other things.
THEMES OF PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Throughout the course of the workshop, five major themes emerged: (1) the relationship between theory and data (2) the most appropriate units of analysis (3) methods (4) the quality of existing data and (5) future questions for the study of ethnicity and conflict. The discussion around these major themes is captured below.

Linking Theory and Data: What do we want to study and why?

A recurrent theme of the workshop was the need for researchers to get better at the why question. At present, it seems that the data on ethnic conflict is outpacing theory, with excessive data available relative to ideas about what to do with the data. The theory on ethnic conflict, as for many other questions in peace and conflict research, tends towards over-simplification and is unable to capture the highly complex and endogenous phenomena of ethnic conflict. There is a strong practice of hypothesis testing in ethnic conflict research, but comparatively limited research dedicated to theory development. Recent improvements in data collection, and especially the ability to capture data at increasingly disaggregated levels, present new opportunities for theory development within the field of ethnic conflict.

The questions of interest to ethnic conflict researchers are growing to cover a broader range of social phenomena. Traditionally, a field focused on the study of political violence, recent ethnic conflict scholarship has begun to expand the field’s parameters. Several participants at the workshop emphasized the need to devote further attention to studying non-violent political action, and the factors relevant to the transition from non-violent to violent action, and also from non-political to political violence. Others mentioned that the academic community needs to develop better capacities to study and advice on latent state conflicts, such as the increasing urban violence and instability in Mexico. Other areas highlighted as needing further study include the mechanisms of mobilization within communities and the relevance of the historical trajectories of political groups to their current situations and their involvement in conflict.

Participants at the workshop considered whether the current ethnic conflict theory is infected by selection bias. The predominant challenge to existing theories is that they are drawn from data that largely omits latent groups, and instead focuses upon groups already in existence and politically active.

3 Following the Chatham House rules, no reference is made to individual participants in this summary. A complete list of workshop participants is found on page 19.
Most participants considered that this population of groups is not problematic so long as researchers are only studying them to explain ethno-nationalist conflict, and not conflict generally. One participant argued that researchers can draw better conclusions by focusing upon a more limited population of groups, such as secessionist groups. Many participants contended that selection bias only becomes a problem when researchers attempt to use the data to answer questions that are beyond the scope of questions the data was developed to address. Consequently, researchers must take care to work with data in an informed manner to ensure the data is appropriate for the questions they want to answer.

The participants also considered the persistent question of whether there is a relevant distinction to be made between ethnic conflict and other types of conflict, which warrants the study of ethnic conflict as a phenomenon in itself. There was strong agreement that the relationship between ethnicity and conflict is so salient that it is unlikely to be a random effect of selection bias. Still, it was acknowledged that researchers should better specify the mechanisms linking ethnicity and conflict, taking particular care with respect to matters of endogeneity and selection bias. Sequenced actions (claims and counter-claims) are particularly useful for avoiding problems of endogeneity. Furthermore, researchers must remember that focusing only on ethnic groups necessarily bounds the scope of resulting theories.

Units of Analysis: How do we determine the most appropriate focal points?

The question of the most appropriate unit of analysis was raised repeatedly during the workshop. At present, the most common unit of analysis for the study of ethnic conflict is ethnic groups that are active or known, as opposed to latent, and most commonly minority rather than majority groups. This focus is directly relevant to the question of selection bias discussed above. First, one must question whether the current approach is appropriate given that the majority rather than the minority may better explain the outbreak of ethnic conflict. One participant noted that ethnic conflict is in essence the result of failures of the state project. Something about ethnic conflict is embedded within the state, yet researchers often overlook the role of the state in the study of ethnic conflict. Modeling the interaction between the state and political organizations is thus a fundamental question for ethnic conflict research.

The study of latent groups, in addition to groups that are presently active and/or known, is important to be able to model the formation of groups. With more data on latent groups and mechanisms of community mobilization, researchers will be better able to answer the question, what are groups before they are groups? However, the major challenge with collecting data on latent groups is their infinite nature. One possible way proposed to overcome this challenge is to compare latent and active groups in terms of political and social cleavages.
Another potential avenue for research put forward is to examine when patronage networks become ethnic, as patronage networks have the additional advantage of being an easier universe to identify.

Another extension of the discussion on the most appropriate unit of analysis concerned the relevant time horizon for studying ethnicity and conflict. Several participants expressed that one of the most significant current challenges when studying ethnic conflicts is that all datasets start after 1945, a time frame that many participants considered too limited to observe the development of ethnic identities. There was a consensus among the participants that ethnicity is stickier in some cases than others, and there is a need to understand why. Looking further back in time with data from before 1946 will allow researchers to analyze deeper fundamentals, as for example the integration of minority groups into states. One participant suggested that the Middle East may be a good place to start for pre-1945 data collection, since the decolonization process started earlier in this region.

Methods: How should we study the phenomenon of ethnic conflict?

Throughout the workshop, participants elaborated on various methodological approaches that are employed in the study of ethnic conflict. The merits and challenges of experimental methods were discussed at length. Some participants advocated the use of experimental methods as the only way to truly study causality. Other participants raised concerns about whether experiments measure what the researcher wants to measure, although it was acknowledged that similar considerations apply when using proxy variable in multivariate analysis. Other participants cautioned that the ‘experiment label’ is thrown around too quickly. Another point of contestation regarding experiments was their external validity. While some participants emphasized that experimental work always has problems with external validity, others considered that this problem can be easily resolved through further experiments.

With respect to the use of quantitative methods, one participant commented that single equation econometrics dominates the field of conflict studies, rendering accounting for endogeneity problematic. Another participant agreed that there are flaws with single equation models, but contended that these methodological models may not be the worst place to start, since the alternative is to have no systematic reference.

Other participants emphasized that the strong focus on quantitative data in the field of ethnic conflict research has led to a general under-valuation of the merits of case studies. Case studies have a very important role to play with respect to establishing causality; statistical analysis alone cannot uncover causal mechanisms.
Finally, the use of surveys and their ability to accurately measure individual attitudes and perceptions was discussed. Several participants stressed the importance of studying attitudes in the lead-up to conflict, and the kind of attitudes that exist between ethnic groups after conflict. Participants agreed that surveys and interviews need to be triangulated with other sources, due to the potential for answers to be influenced by the person posing the questioning and the difficulties subjects face in accurately commenting upon earlier, and even current, attitudes and perceptions. Where possible, other speeches or the general behavior of interview subjects could be used to triangulate or compare their responses to questions posed in interviews and surveys.

Data: How compatible, credible, and useful is our data?

Most participants agreed that researchers are making progress in terms of data collection, as data is increasingly disaggregated, from years to months, to weeks, and even to days. Disaggregation is occurring at the geographic as well as the temporal level: the ability to track events in different locations over time opens up many potential avenues for future research. Data is becoming increasingly relational – with different sources, different levels of analysis, and differential temporal periods – which means researchers need good tools to deal with the complexity. Databases must be relational, combining multiple types of entities, and should be equipped with a spatial model.

Participants also noted the inclusion of latent or non-violent groups in some datasets as another positive development in data collection. Participants identified that there is an important role for further disaggregated data at the unit of analysis, moving from ethnic groups, to organizations, and even to individuals.

The need for cooperation between researchers was emphasized throughout the workshop. Where cooperation is lacking, and researchers are unaware of data resources developed by others, the capability of the data cannot be fully exploited. The current trend of linking and creating synergies between databases was highlighted as an example of the benefits of cooperation. However, moving towards greater integration is not without its challenges, especially as each dataset is a moving part and it is difficult to maintain links between datasets while each dataset continues to develop. In this regard, focusing on improving the compatibility of datasets will greatly improve the potential for future cooperation.

Besides further cooperation between academics, one participant emphasized the benefits of further cooperation with NGOs. Many NGOs collect masses of data that would be of interest to researchers, yet most researchers do not know what is being collected. Thus, there is space for greater communication and cooperation between researchers and practitioner bodies.
Finally, the issue of data transparency was raised. Being more open about background material allows for flexibility regarding interpretation of data, which is especially important in relation to ethnicity.

*Future questions and data collection: Where to from here?*

The role of the state in ethnic conflict was raised repeatedly as a question deserving of further study. Several participants remarked that the state is often unquestioningly treated as a neutral actor in ethnic conflict, when in fact the state can be seen as the cause of much ethnic conflict. Another participant cautioned that the state should not be too readily treated as capable of producing solutions: the power of states must be constrained before one can reasonably look to them to produce solutions. Although data does exist on state behavior, for instance the inclusion of data on state repression in the MAR dataset, participants generally agreed that data on the state is lacking and more attention should be paid to state behavior and the mechanisms that connect the state, ethnic political organizations and ethnic conflict.

Another interesting area for further research is studying the phenomena of conflict in urban areas. Traditionally, most research has focused on rural areas, however the increasing trend towards urbanization needs to be considered in future research. Although urban violence in general has been put on the backburner in conflict research, several participants expressed that it should not continue to be overlooked. Similarly, on an international level, migration has resulted in diasporas living abroad, but the effects of international ethnic relations on armed conflicts is understudied. There seemed to be consensus that both urbanization and migration will have implications for future data collection. One participant noted that several initiatives are starting to address these shortcomings, for example, increasing data collection in Baghdad and Jerusalem. However, not all participants agreed on the urgent need to focus on urban areas when studying ethnicity and conflict, arguing that migration to cities does not necessarily change the ethnic landscape.

Commenting on future data collection efforts, one of the participants noted that data collection is extremely expensive and if researchers do not have a clear research question, they should not collect it. Looking into the data to find questions is ineffective.

As a response to the comment of data collection being expensive, several participants voiced their confidence in the role of new information and communication technology regarding future data collection efforts. Researchers are now able to extract a lot of data that would not have been available before in a relatively short time period and without excessive cost.
As more and more data becomes available, we must consider whether it is time to take a further shift away from manual data processing. Other participants, however, raised concerns about the accuracy of the computational algorithms software currently available for automatic data processing.

Satellite technology, cell phones, and social media were all recognized as creating new possibilities for data collection. Examples of the use of satellite technology are the use of remote sensing by Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch. Some researchers are starting to access to cell phone databases. Collaboration between scholars from the computer sciences and social sciences is increasingly taking place to analyze this data. A potential role for social media is studying Twitter exchanges that may have ethnic markers, for example communication between the homeland and the diaspora. Data from Twitter exchanges or other social media sources can collected on the web using data miming and are very large-n sources. The release of the Wikileaks material also provides a wealth of data that can be exploited by researchers. Some participants voiced concerns about possible data overkill from new media sources, with the potential for the abundance of data to obscure the relevant material. However, others argued that the research is in the early stages of working with new forms of data and methods are being developed to recognize and screen out irrelevant data.
WORKSHOP PROGRAM

Thursday 26 April, 2012

8.30
Registration (outside conference rooms K3/K4)

9.00
Welcome address
Erika Forsberg

9.15-10.00
Project presentation: GROWup “Geographic Research On War: Unified Platform”
Lars-Erik Cederman

10.00-10.45
Project presentation: Uppsala Conflict Data Program
Erik Melander

10.45-11.00
Coffee break

11.00-11.45
Project presentation: Minorities at Risk Project
Johanna Birnir

11.45-12.15
Micro and Macro-Level Determinants of Conflict Escalation in a Globalizing World
Jeroen Smits
Discussant: Julian Wucherpfennig

12.15-13.30
Lunch (UKK, top floor)

13.30-14.00
Grounds for Separation: Comparing Recruitment to Separatist Rebel Groups
Ragnhild Nordås (co-authors: Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham, Scott Gates, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch)
Discussant: Kristine Eck
Roundtable I: Systematic Comparison: Context-specific or General Coding Rules?
Participants: Johanna Birnir, Lars-Erik Cederman, Michael Hechter, and Will H. Moore
Chair: Peter Wallensteen

Coffee break

Non-State Actors in Civil Wars: a New Dataset
David E. Cunningham (co-authors: Kristian Skrede Gleditsch and Idean Salehyan)
Discussant: Erin Jenne

Peace walk with Peter Wallensteen

Dinner at Hodja, Sysslomansgatan 13

Friday 27 April, 2012

Cultural Histories and Diacritica: Extensions of the Ethnic Power Relations Dataset
Andreas Wimmer
Discussant: David E. Cunningham

Understanding Organizational Behavior in Social Movements
Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham
Discussant: Andreas Wimmer

Guided tour of Uppsala (from the top floor of UKK) – Destination Uppsala
Coffee is served

Roundtable II: The Future of Data Collection of Ethnicity and Conflict: Prospects for Cooperation and the Use of New Techniques
Participants: Christian Davenport, Agatha Hultquist, Monica Duffy Toft, Nils Weidmann, and Julian Wucherpfennig
Chair: Magnus Öberg
12.15-13.15
Lunch (UKK, ground floor restaurant)

13.15-14.45: Session on Ethnicity and Conflict in Africa

13.15-13.45
When Competition Turns Violent: The Rise and Impact of Ethnic Parties in Sub-Saharan Africa
Manuel Vogt
Discussant: Will H. Moore

13.45-14.15
Political Trust, Ethnic Divisions and Regime Success in Africa
Tanja Ellingsen (co-author: Maria Elena Sandovici)
Discussant: Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham

14.15-14.45
Luke N. Condra
Discussant: Lisa Hultman

14.45-15.15
Coffee break

15.15-15.45
Nested Security as a Prerequisite for Ethnoterritorial Conflict Resolution: A Data Analysis of Terminated Civil Wars, 1946-2009
Erin Jenne
Discussant: Peter Wallensteen

15.45-16.15
Violence in the Caucasus: Global Jihad or Local Grievance?
Monica Duffy Toft (co-author: Yuri M. Zhukov)
Discussant: Christian Davenport

19.00
Dinner at Peppar Peppar, Suttungs gränd 3
Saturday 28 April, 2012

9.00-9.30
Power Sharing and Institutional Confidence: The Case of Bosnia-Herzegovina
Karin Dyrstad (co-authored with Helga Malmin Binningsbo, CSCW PRIO)
Discussant: Hanne Fjelde

9.30-10.00
Militant and Democratic? A Study of Violent Ethno-Political Minority Organizations in the Middle East
Agatha S. Hultquist
Discussant: Tanja Ellingsen

10.00-10.30
Biases in Event Data: Some Preliminary Results
Nils Weidmann
Discussant: Magnus Öberg

10.30-11.00
Coffee break

11.00-11.30
Territorial Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict: The Settling and Unsettling of the Gaza Strip
Alma M. Gottlieb-McHale
Discussant: Paul Huth

11.30-12.00
Principles of Group Formation and Varieties of Political Violence
Michael Hechter
Discussant: John McCauley

12.00-12.30
Modeling Spoiler Dynamics in Civil Wars
Julian Wucherpfennig
Discussant: Monica Duffy Toft

12.30
Lunch/End of workshop (UKK, ground floor restaurant)
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