**SP20: Meeting with Advisor**

Date: 1/23/2020, Starts from 13:00 ~

1. **Research: Authoritarian Welfare State Paper: Write a Note here.**

* **MPSA conference: Registered**
* **IRCP Presentation scheduled: 19th Feb.**
* **Dahlum, Knutsen and Wig. 2019. “Who Revolts? Empirically Revisiting the Social Origins of Democracy.” *The Journal of Politics*. 81(4): 1494-1499.**
  + Read thoroughly during the weekends.
  + Q for justifying the class group:
  + The key groups I think
    - Agrarian elites, party elites, local elites, the military, urban working classes, rural working classes
    - How about grouping like:  
      "Agrarian Local elites" = Agrarian elites + local elites  
      “Party elites,  
      "The military",  
      "Working classes" = Urban + Rural working classes
* **Previous Discussion**
  + **Hypotheses modification**
    - H1: The more party institutionalized, it is associated with more emcompassingness, and less university.
    - H2: How are classes associated with the different programs of welfare?
    - H3: H1 + H2
    - Only interacted: PI and CI \* each groups (reference: other groups which is not included in cores)
* **Questions**
  + If I want to sample my data limited to authoritarian regime, how to deal with the sample size? (which criteria is good to use? If I use GWF, then my sample would be limited to the time span of GWF (~2010).
  + Does the size of supporting group matter? Or “reliable?”
  + ~~Figure 1 삭제, Figure 2 ~ 4: Appendix, Figure 5 for plotting indicators by regime type or class-coalition~~
  + ~~Data에서 Authoritarian regime type 은 core supporting group에 관한 내용으로 대체.~~
  + ~~Table 1 살리되 전체 PI 변수 (model 1), models by indicators (5)~~
  + Table 2 에 집중, Table 3는 각각의 변수랑 class 간 interaction을 서로 다른 programs에 대한 연구로. + Show full model.