

**Q 1: Explain the relationship between coups and democratization.**

A coup may happen from below or above, this is the seizure of power through violence or non violence. Coups influence democratization by making elites choose sides, and the side they choose is determined by their political gains. Haggard and Kauffmann suggest that rivals are ousted by elites within the regime, this is sudden as opposed to institutional transitions. GFW suggests that taking down a dictatorship likely leads to renewed autocracy or chaos other than democratization this is shown by how when president Anwar was assassinated he was replaced with another military officer, this coup attempt failed to change the regime.

Violent action against a regime may solidify the use of force by the government, and may turn away potential supporters. Marino and Goemans concluded that coups may hinder democratization because the actions of a coup are extra-constitutional meaning such use of force and disregard of rule of law may be used against the newly formed regime. A coup is authoritarian by nature, so after a coup there is no democracy. (marinov). Some coups may lead to military intervention which sometimes breakdown and transition to democracy. Thyne and Powell argue that coups may urge leaders to make meaningful changes to avoid a potential coup.

**Q 2: Why is democratization difficult in personalist regimes?**

A personalist regime concentrates power into one place, such as Jean Bedel Bokassa which treated the treasury like his personal bank, promoted family members, and rewarded elites with material rewards. In a personalist regime there is frequent shuffles and purges, and losing power has massive repercussions. Democratization is difficult because a personalist regime gets rid of institutions, and control the economy. Cheibub argues that since a personalist regime does not have institutions in place the leader must rely heavily on using financial incentives to serve his purpose.

**Q 3: What factors influence whether a transition to multiparty elections produces consolidated democracy or electoral authoritarianism?**

Multiparty elections may lead to consolidated democracy if an authoritarian regime had democratic attributes, has strong opposition parties with free and fair elections, civilian control over the military, high levels of economic development, ability to address conflict or poverty. According to Huntington electoral authoritarianism may arise due to inability to reduce military involvement in politics, punishing former officials for crimes committed, and failing to reform institutions.

The history a country is a factor that may determine whether a country produces a consolidated democracy. If country has a colonial history which according to Teorell is generally underdeveloped and has high levels of social fractionalization, such problems may create an electorate authoritarian regime if not properly address. The problems facing a country while an authoritarian regime may not cease to exist once the country has transitioned to a democracy.

According to Dahl a democracy should have the freedom to organize, freedom of expression, and institutions must abide with the voters. If independent democratic institutions have been established such as the legislatures that are not beholden to those in power, for example Federal Election Institute's control over elections in Mexico. Powerful organizations with opposing views and freedom of expression create a civic culture necessary to maintain democracy.

According to Schmitter and Karl democracy is not just about electoralism. Huntington claims that by holding elections leads to greater democratization as this creates civic culture. Dahl claims that there must be contestation and inclusion this means a transition of power is necessary unlike Botswana which was labeled a dictatorship due to its lack of transition of power.

If institutions such as the legislature that are controlled by the ruling power or heavily influenced by the military this may cause internal problems which may lead to an electorate authoritarian regime. If a civilian control over the military is successful may weaken the number of coup attempts by making sure the military has limited functionality (Huntington) . If there is a competitive legislature buying legislative support is difficult and in turn decentralizing power and diminishing corruption.

According to Teorell high economic growth encourages democratic consolidation. If there is an economic downturn there may be elite splits and political mobilization. In a multiparty election high economic growth may also sustain electorate authoritarianism if those in power are able to buy the legislature, elections, or by using funds to keep elites from opposing the regime by giving them incentives.

In multi party elections candidates must have the ability to oppose and address problems faced by the country such as poverty or social problems. In order to do this there must a free media and freedom of speech.