

Apolte, Thomas; Gerling, Lena

Working Paper

Youth bulges, insurrections, and politico-economic institutions: Theory and empirical evidence

CIW Discussion Paper, No. 3/2015

Provided in Cooperation with:

University of Münster, Center for Interdisciplinary Economics (CIW)

Suggested Citation: Apolte, Thomas; Gerling, Lena (2015) : Youth bulges, insurrections, and politico-economic institutions: Theory and empirical evidence, CIW Discussion Paper, No. 3/2015, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Centrum für Interdisziplinäre Wirtschaftsforschung (CIW), Münster

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/108970>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.


Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



WESTFÄLISCHE
WILHELMS-UNIVERSITÄT
MÜNSTER



Münster School of
Business and Economics

Center for Interdisciplinary Economics Discussion Paper

3/2015

Youth Bulges, Insurrections, and Politico-Economic Institutions

Theory and Empirical Evidence

Thomas Apolte / Lena Gerling

Center for Interdisciplinary Economics
Discussion Paper Series

**Center for Interdisciplinary Economics
Discussion Paper
3/2015**

March 2015

ISSN 2191-4419

**Youth Bulges, Insurrections, and Politico-Economic Institutions
Theory and Empirical Evidence**

Thomas Apolte / Lena Gerling

Abstract

We develop a model of insurrection markets and integrate the youth bulge as measured by the relative youth cohort size. As youth-specific characteristics we define the young person's attitude toward revolutionary groups and the government, the degree of risk aversion and the relative productivity of young people on the insurrection market as compared to the official labor market. We find that, apart from certain spontaneous outbreaks of violence or riots, youth bulges alone are not a good predictor for political violence. Nevertheless, deliberate insurrection activities that aim at changing political and economic power positions are indeed affected by youth bulges, but indirectly so, and their intensity is driven by the characteristics of the respective underlying set of politico-economic institutions. We test our implications in an empirical model based on cross-country panel data and find that the effect of the relative youth cohort size on insurrection outbreaks is moderated by changes in the underlying institutional setting, and more precisely changes in the labor-market conditions as approximated by unemployment rates.

JEL-Codes: H56; J10; J22; P16

www.wiwi.uni-muenster.de/ciw/forschen/downloads/DP-CIW_03_2015.pdf

University of Münster
CIW – Center for Interdisciplinary Economics
Scharnhorststrasse 100
D-48151 Münster

phone: +49-251/83-25329 (Office)
e-Mail: clementine.kessler@uni-muenster.de
Internet: www.wiwi.uni-muenster.de/ciw

1 Introduction

When watching news reporting insurrection activities, riots, or demonstrations, one is hardly ever surprised to see most activists to be particularly young, and whenever violence is associated with the respective scenery, it also comes as no surprise that most activists are male. It hence appears straightforward when Goldstone (2002) claims historical periods of political violence to have always been closely related with periods of demographically young societies. Nevertheless, a large youth share in the population has only recently become under somewhat closer inspection in the social sciences. Since Graham Fuller used the term “youth bulge” in 1995 in a CIA conference report (Fuller, 1995; see also Fuller, 2003; Niang, no year: 8) in order to pinpoint a potential demographic source of conflict, the phenomenon has been picked up by newspaper commentators (Heinsohn, 2007; 2009; Caldwell, 2007; Whelton, 2007), and, somewhat hesitantly, by scholarly researchers as well (see overviews by Goldstone, 2002; Urdal, 2006; Niang, no year).

But no earlier than in 2006, a first systematic empirical investigation of the demographic impact of the youth bulge on political violence has been published (Urdal, 2006; see also Urdal 2004). And up to then, sophisticated speculation rather than scholarly theorizing has dominated the search for theoretical answers to the question as to what the causal relations between youth bulges and political conflict may be. While economic explanations have been part of many, if not most, of these sophisticated speculations, there has as yet no consistent theory been provided that captures the main ideas, systematically relates them and works out testable empirical implications. In particular, there is a lack in a theory explaining why young people in a youth-bulge situation should be particularly prone to political violence in general and to insurrection activities in particular.

When it comes to political violence, it makes sense to distinguish spontaneous outbreaks of violence or riots on the one hand from deliberate insurrection activities that aim at changing political or economic power positions on the other hand. In this paper, we are interested in the latter and we will generally refer to them as insurrection activities. In order to become convincing, then, a theory of insurrections and the youth bulge needs to provide for a link between a youth-bulge phenomenon with collective-action problems of insurrection activities.

Since insurrection activities as defined here aim at shifting economic and/or political power, they direct collective action to a certain, and at least allegedly common, goal.

A theory of youth bulges and insurrections, then, needs to show how the existence of a youth bulge affects the difficulties in the formation and effectiveness of insurrection groups with respect to the (alleged) common goal in a consistent manner. This is how this paper aims at adding to the literature. It develops a theoretical framework in the tradition of Grossman (1991; 1999; see also Wall, 2006) that integrates the most important characteristics of youth bulges into a theory of insurrection activities.

Our common goal is derived by the assumption of a kleptocratic society to start with. This kleptocratic society presumably forms the basis for potential grievances by those who do not belong to the kleptocratic elite in general and by the respective youth cohort in particular. We then introduce a demographic factor, representing the youth bulge as well as two hypothesized characteristics of relatively young persons, namely a certain attitude to risk and a relation of their productivity on “insurrection markets” on the one hand and that on traditional labor markets on the other. We then derive a number of testable empirical implications.

We then test our implications regarding the interaction between youth-cohort effects and labor-market institutions on the occurrence of political violence in an empirical framework exploiting cross-country panel data. Despite some technical concerns regarding the quality of employment data for developing countries, the empirical findings confirm our theoretical predictions: The effect of a youth bulge is indeed moderated by the underlying institutional setting of the official labor market, and more precisely by *changes* in this setting that are measured by changes in overall as well as specific male youth unemployment rates.

In the following section, we briefly clarify some fundamental definitions and concepts and we relate them to the literature. Based on this groundwork we develop our theoretical model in section 3. In section 4, we test our theoretical conclusions in a logistic regression model based on a broad cross-country panel data set. In section 5 we discuss the implications of our results, suggest further empirical and theoretical research and conclude.

2 Some basic concepts and definitions

Urdal (2004; 2006) as well as Staveteig (2007) claim that simply relating the size of some youth cohort to the total population may be misleading since, in their view, a

youth bulge has broader implications than a specifically flat form of the population pyramid. To be precise, a youth bulge represents no less than a historical transition phenomenon of a society on its path into a modern society. At a certain point in time, both dropping mortality rates and rising per-capita income tend to drive down birth rates, which leads to a long tail of adult and older people on the one hand and to dropping sizes of succeeding children cohorts, so that the respective youth cohort tends to form a bulge in the overall age structure of the respective society on its way of modernization. Over time, then, this bulge works itself all the way through the age structure until it eventually disappears.

Viewed in that way, it makes sense to follow Urdal (2006) by measuring a youth bulge by the relative youth cohort size (*RYCS*) rather than simply by the share of the youth cohort in total population. Hereby, the *RYCS* is defined as the youth cohort in percent of the respective older cohorts of the economically active population. Hence, the *RYCS* is what we refer to in the rest of this paper when dealing with the size of a youth bulge.

A youth bulge may have its merits for a society, as it can, for example, be associated with Samuelson's (1956) biological interest rate. Hence, relatively low per-capita contributions of the youth cohort to common-pool consumption loan systems like social security are associated with relatively high per-capita allowances to older cohorts which lead to particularly wealthy cohorts of pensioners in some industrialized countries.

However, for the respective youth-bulge cohorts themselves, these advantages do hardly materialize. To the contrary, forming a demographic bulge implies a relative abundance of the respective cohort's members, which starts at birth and works its way through the life cycle. At some time, then, the "bulge" cohort forms a youth bulge, and here it potentially faces bottlenecks (Urdal, 2006: 615) in search for opportunities in education and on job markets. Depending on the characteristics of the respective economic and political institutions, this tentatively leads to either real-wage drops or underemployment as well as to general lacks in career opportunities (Easterlin, 1987). What is more, in light of rising competition by members of the succeeding youth cohort, the older cohorts might be inclined to limit the access to economic positions and possibly also to political participation and the like. Depending on the institutional background, this implies potentials for grievances on the side of such a youth cohort's member, and it might, once again depending on the underlying institutional setting, turn out to be a supporting factor for political violence (Niang, no year: 12; Staveteig, 2007: 7).

To put it in economic terms: While the bottleneck hypothesis of youth bulges implies that an abundant youth cohort faces dropping relative prices for whatever its members supply to the society they live in, the resulting economic and political effects are manifold but obviously dependent on numerous determinants within the politico-institutional setting of a society. A flexible, market oriented setting in some ideal form that does not privilege incumbent persons in both political and economic positions of all sorts whatsoever would, as far as such a society ever existed, have implications particularly different from a society that systematically privileges persons that have already been successful in occupying such positions in the past. As a result, if young potential successors in political and economic positions face open markets but falling supply prices they may still find taking opportunities relatively advantageous as compared to organizing themselves in insurrection organizations that aim at breaking up power positions in both economic and political terms.

This is different when a relatively abundant youth cohort faces closed shops in that both economic and political positions are occupied by members of older cohorts and defended by them by administrative means. In such a case intruding into the sphere of these privileges by simply working hard, by being better as well as by providing better ideas and services to society may not be of much help for the youth cohort's members. Still, while the ensuing grievance may be a necessary condition for the youth cohort for proceeding to insurrection activities, it is not a sufficient condition, and the reason is the collective-action problem of revolutions (Tullock, 1971; Lichbach, 1995; Apolte, 2012). Hence, while spontaneous outbursts of political demonstrations and even of riots and violence might be explained by the development of a youth bulge in a closed-shop society alone, deliberate activities that aim at changing political power positions call for more than just that, namely for an integration of the determinants discussed so far in a more comprehensive approach, and such an approach has to take collective action into account.

In order to fix ideas, we assume a society that is characterized by a particularly privileged politico-economic elite that controls both the political and the economic sphere. While markets are used to a certain extent in order to coordinate economic activities, all productive assets are finally owned and conducted by members of this particular elite. It is then hypothesized that such an underlying setting may induce potential political entrepreneurs to enter the market for economic and political power by way of forming insurrection groups. These entrepreneurs, then, provide solutions for the collective-action

problem of insurrection activities, but they are of course driven by personal interests and that is by the motive to redistribute power and wealth away from the incumbent elite to themselves. In doing so they hire young potential insurrection activists, and here is where the effects of the youth bulge step in.

3 An economic model of insurrections and the youth bulge

3.1 Basic Model

Consider a society consisting of a ruling elite, which we refer to as the government elite G or simply the government, a competing elite, which we refer to as the revolutionary elite R , and a group of citizens. Both elite groups consist of some leading individuals plus a relatively narrow clientele. G is modelled as a kleptocratic elite that not only runs the government but that also owns the shares of the entirety of the economy's productive assets. Hence, while these assets are formally in private hands, the private owners stem from group G , and all formal profits flow into their purse. Finally, the government elite imposes labor-income taxes on the citizens which their members also use for own consumption.

The revolutionary elite R seizes resources from that part of the economy that it has informally brought under its control; it uses these resources for own consumption as well as for hiring insurgents which they compensate for their activities on the basis of a broadly understood compensation rate w_I , paid either in cash or in kind. Finally, we have a number N of citizens that are neither part of G nor of R .

While governmental control over all economic activities formally rests with the government elite, this group has effective control only over those parts of the economy that are not under the informal control of the revolutionary elite. To be precise, we model the respective control capacities of the government and the revolutionary elite as shares A^G and A^R of the total productive assets in the economy. We normalize the total value of productive assets to unity, so that $A^G + A^R = 1$. While the share A^G is formally as well as effectively under the control of the government, the share A^R is only formally under the control of the government but effectively controlled by the revolutionaries.

There are two income-generating activities available for the citizens, one is work on the regular labor market and the other is insurrection. We normalize the time each individual citizen devotes to each of the income-generating activities to unity. Hence, we assume the citizens to allocate a fraction l to labor and another fraction i to insurrection, such that the disposable time is $l + i \leq 1$ on the level of a representative individual, and $L + I \leq N$ with $L = lN$ and $I = iN$ on the level of the society as a whole. As the full-time portfolio of the citizens is, in principle, devoted to either work or insurrection, any situation $l + i < 1$ would be due to some sort of involuntary unemployment.

Labor time is supplied to a private firm that utilizes all assets A . The private firm is run by a management that is appointed by members of the government elite and that is itself part of the government elite. Insurrection activities are supplied to the members of the revolutionary elite R .

At this point, we build the youth bulge into our model, considering the following aspects:

- Employees between 15 and 24 years of age have, on average, not yet reached the level of productivity that employees of an age above 24 years have. While a part of 15 to 24 year old may have already run through some sort of a formal education, all of them will at best be in the beginning of a process of gathering professional experience, and that will drive up their productivity over a longer time to come. We hence assume that employees between 15 and 24 are, on average, less productive on the labor market than employees above 24.
- Young people are typically more volatile in their judgments and attitudes in general and in their judgments and attitudes toward governments and potential revolutionaries in particular.
- Young people are typically less risk averse than older people.

In order to consider these aspects within the structure of our model, we define a youth-bulge ratio $r \in [0, 1]$ as the share of those who belong to the potential of economically active young persons that are between 15 and 24 years of age to those who are still active, but older 24.

The private firm utilizes all productive assets A as well as labor L as inputs and maximizes profits under conditions of perfect competition. We assume a production function $F(L^e, A)$ with L^e being effective labor supply. The production function is assumed to

satisfy the *Indada* conditions in the two arguments L^e and A . In order to consider the productivity effect of the youth bulge, we define effective labor supply as $L^e = \delta r^{-1}L$ with $\delta \in (0, 1)$. The economy's output Y is then:

$$Y = F(\delta^{-1}L, A) \quad (1)$$

Next, we model A^R as being linearly dependent on the total time I that the citizens allocate to insurrection activities:

$$A^R = \beta I \quad \text{with } \beta > 0. \quad (2)$$

We assume the government to tax labor income by a nominal tax rate t^G on the wage sum. However, as the government's effective control over the economy is limited by the revolutionaries' share in power, the government can effectively tax only that part of labor income that is generated under both its formal and its effective control. Since we assume a homogenous production technology, the share A^G in the assets effectively controlled by the government is also both the share in employment and the part of the wage sum that is effectively under the government's control. The government's effective labor-income tax rate is hence $A^G t^G$. As we focus our attention on the citizens' allocation of time between labor and insurrection and in order to keep the analysis simple, we assume the government's decision on the tax rate t^G as exogenous. On top of the unequal distribution of property rights, the tax rate t^G is an indicator of how the government oppresses the citizens. The income Y^G of the government's elite is hence:

$$Y^G = \pi + t^G A^G w_L L \quad (3)$$

were π are profits of the firm since they are assumed to stream into the purse of the share owners who are in their entirety members of the government's elite, w_L is the wage rate on the labor market, and L is total labor employed.

The revolutionary elite, in turn, "asks" the management of the share A^R of capital that is under their effective control for contributions t^R on the basis of the capital value, which is also A^R . The revolutionaries' incomes can thus be written as:

$$Y^R = t^R A^R - w_I, \quad \text{with } t^R A^R \leq \tau^R A^R Y, \quad \text{or } t^R \leq \tau^R Y, \quad (4)$$

where w_I is the compensation rate for insurrection activities, and $\tau^R \in (0, 1)$ is an upper bound of what can maximally be taxed away from the capital owners under the power of the revolutionary elite, determined by formal or, obviously more important, informal institutions. The private firm's profit π is:

$$\pi = F(\delta r^{-1}L, A) - w_L L \quad (5)$$

Utility U of an individual and representative citizen depends on effective net labor income as well as on the compensations for insurrection activities. We assume an additively separable utility function where regular net effective labor income ¹ adds one-to-one to total utility U . For reasons of simplicity, we ignore utility or disutility from regular work, but not from insurrection activities.

We are particularly interested in both the compensations the citizens receive from the revolutionary elite and in the differences in the way insurrection activities affect their personal utility level. For that matter, we introduce a variable μ that captures the properties of the citizens' relation to both the government and the revolutionary elite by measuring two interacting aspects. One is the degree of grievance against or loyalty to the government; and the other aspect is the degree of credibility of the revolutionary elite with respect to the payments of compensations for insurrection activities. The latter is important since there is naturally no formal institutional setting that enforces promised payments by the revolutionary elite (Gates, 2002; Apolte, 2012). Hence, a value of $\mu = 0$ indicates either perfect loyalty to the incumbent government or zero credibility of the revolutionary elite's compensation payment promise.

Finally, we assume younger people to have more pronounced attitudes toward both grievance against the government and trust in a revolutionary group than have older people. Moreover, we assume them to be less risk averse. We capture these aspects by weighting the variable μ with the youth-bulge ratio r in order to measure the total effect of grievance and trust on the extent to which compensations for insurrection activities enter the citizens' utility function. Summing up, the citizens maximize the following utility function:

$$U = (1 - A^R t^R)w_L l + ((1 + w_I)^{r\mu} - 1)i. \quad (6)$$

¹That is gross labor income $w_L l$ minus effective labor income tax, defined by the effective tax rate $t^G A^G$.

Note that, for $\mu = 0$, we get $(1 + w_I)^{r\mu} - 1 = 0$, so that insurrection activities do not yield any utility to the citizens in such a case. For insurrection activities to generate utility to the citizens, we will need to have both some degree of grievance against the government and some credibility of the revolutionary elite. Given both, the value of a positive μ will be magnified by rises in the youth-bulge ratio r . Note further that (6) implies some risk aversion with respect to the compensation rate w_I , where $r\mu$ gives the degree of risk aversion in the way that higher values of the youth-bulge ratio are associated with lower degrees of risk aversion.

The final element of our model is a simple labor-market imperfection. In particular, we assume a restriction on the side of the labor suppliers in the form of a probability ε of being unemployed. Since each citizen's time devoted to either work or insurrection is normalized to unity and since the only legal way of spending time for income generation is labor on the regular labor market, the official level of full employment on the labor market is simply N . Our relevant labor-market restriction will hence be $L \leq \varepsilon N$. On the individual citizen's level, then, labor supply will be restricted by a demand restriction $l \leq \varepsilon$. Within the framework described above, the firm, the revolutionary elite, and the citizens will maximize their respective objective functions.

The management of the firm takes $F(\delta r^{-1}L, A)$ and w_L as given and maximizes net profits. Given (5), the first-order condition is:

$$w_L^* = \delta r^{-1} F'(L). \quad (7)$$

As we assume competition on both the labor market and the market for insurrection activities, the revolutionary elite maximizes $t^R A^R - w_I I$, subject to $t^R \leq \tau^R Y$. Given (2) and (4), the Kuhn-Tucker conditions² for a maximum of Y^R with respect to L imply:

$$w_I^* = t^R \beta \text{ for } I > 0; \quad w_I^* \geq t^R \beta \text{ for } I = 0; \quad \text{and } t^R = \tau^R Y \text{ for } \lambda > 0 \quad (8)$$

The condition $w_I^* \geq t^R \beta$ for $I = 0$ is of no relevance for both the citizens and the revolutionaries, so that we do not need to consider that case any further. The condition

²See the appendix for details.

$t^R = \tau^R Y$ for $\lambda > 0$ simply says that the revolutionaries will take whatever the upper bound τ^R allows them whenever the restriction $t^R \leq \tau^R Y$ is binding.

Finally, the citizens maximize (6) subject to their time restriction $l + i \leq 1$ and subject to the labor-market restriction $l \leq \varepsilon$. The Lagrangian, then, is as follows:³

$$\mathfrak{F} = (1 - t^R A^R) w_L l + ((1 + w_I)^{r\mu} - 1)i + \lambda_1(1 - l - i) + \lambda_2(\varepsilon - l). \quad (9)$$

If both restrictions in (9) were non-binding, so that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$, then this would imply (by equation (27) in the appendix) that either $w_L = 0$ or $l = 0$ since both are nonnegative. Note, however, that $l = 0$ is ruled out by the *Inada* conditions for the production function, while $w_L = 0$ is ruled out by both the *Inada* conditions and by $\delta r^{-1} > 0$ in combination with the firm's first-order maximization condition (7); this is at least true as long as the effective tax-rate is not fully confiscatory, i.e. as long as $t^G A^G < 1$. A non-binding time restriction of the citizens, i.e. $l + i < 1$ and hence $\lambda_1 = 0$, is nevertheless possible, but that presupposes the labor-market imperfection to induce a binding constraint, so that $\lambda_2 > 0$. Both restrictions to be non-binding, however, is not possible as long as $t^G A^G < 1$.

Given $\lambda_2 > 0$, however, a non-binding time constraint of the citizens remains possible, but this would, according to equation (28) in the appendix, be associated with either $i = 0$, or with $(1 + w_I)^{r\mu} - 1 = 0$, or both. The implication is this: Should $\lambda_2 > 0$, so that the citizens are rationed in their labor-market supply, and should the marginal utility from insurrection activities $(1 + w_I)^{r\mu} - 1$ be zero, then the citizens are unable to fully employ their disposable time for income generation: On the market for insurrection, they have no incentive for being active because of $(1 + w_I)^{r\mu} - 1 = 0$; and on the labor market, they would want to be active to the full extent of their time devoted for income-generating activities, but they cannot do so because of the positive chance $\varepsilon > 0$ of being unemployed.

Finally, combinations of $\lambda_1 > 0$ with $\lambda_2 = 0$ or with $\lambda_2 > 0$ are also possible. In the former case, we have a cleared labor market, whereas in the latter case all unemployed time left from the labor market will be supplied to the revolutionary elite.

³The full set of the *Kuhn-Tucker* conditions is given in the appendix.

3.2 Equilibria

In what follows, we focus on two cases: In case A, the time restriction is non-binding (i.e. $\lambda_1 = 0$) while the labor-market restriction is binding (i.e. $\lambda_2 > 0$); and in case B, the time restriction is binding (i.e. $\lambda_1 > 0$) while the labor-market restriction may or may not be binding, so that $\lambda_2 > 0$.

Case A: $\lambda_1 = 0; \lambda_2 > 0$

From equation (27) and from $\lambda_1 = 0$, we have $l((1 - t^G A^G)w_L - \lambda_2 = 0$. Since the *Inada* conditions of the production function $F(\delta r^{-1}L, A)$ rule out $L = lN = 0$, we have $(1 - t^G A^G)w_L = \lambda_2 > 0$. The non-negativity of $(1 + w_I)^{r\mu} - 1$ in combination with equation (23) in the appendix implies $(1 + w_I)^{r\mu} - 1 = 0$ because of $\lambda_1 = 0$. Substituting the compensation rates w_L and w_I by the marginal productivities from (7) and (8), and considering the labor-market restriction in (30) as well as the assumption of case A that $\lambda_2 > 0$, the equilibrium in case A is:

$$(1 - t^G A^G)\delta r^{-1}F'(L) - \lambda_2 = (1 + t^R \beta)^{r\mu} = 0; \quad \text{or} \quad (1 - t^G A^G)\delta r^{-1}F'(L) - \lambda_2 > 0 \quad (10)$$

Note that, because of $\lambda_2 > 0$, employment L in equilibrium is lower than N and the wage rate in equilibrium $w_L = \delta r^{-1}F'$ is higher than its market-clearing value. We define the latter as $w_L^e = w_L(L = N)$.

Figure 1 depicts case A. $\delta r^{-1}F'(L)$ represents marginal productivity on the regular labor market and at the same time marginal utility of regular work derived by the citizens. The prevailing net wage rate $w_L > w_L^e$ determines an employment level $L \leq N$, while the market-clearing wage rate w_L^e would lead to full employment if it were not for the labor-market restriction. Because of the latter, however, employment falls short of N , leaving an amount $(1 - \varepsilon)N$ of labor unemployed. However, as long as $(1 + t^R \beta)^{r\mu} = 0$, so that there is no utility that the citizens could generate by insurrection activities, the $(1 - \varepsilon)N$ unemployed labor will not be reallocated to the market for insurrections.

Case A is a very simple case in which the citizens supply labor only on the regular labor market, either because marginal productivity on the market for insurrections is zero, or the promise of the revolutionary elite to compensate citizens for insurrection activities is not credible, or because the citizens are fully loyal to the government. For the latter




Figure 1: Case A

cases, $\mu = 0$ applies. However, the labor-market imperfection in combination with the lack of opportunities on the market for insurrection activities deters the citizens from allocating their entire time designated for income generation into either regular work or insurrection activities. The latter is different in case B.

Case B: $\lambda_1 > 0; \lambda_2 \geq 0$

From (29) in the appendix and from the assumption $\lambda_1 > 0$ in this case, we get $1 = l + i$. Furthermore, from condition (27), $\lambda_1 > 0$, and $l > 0$, we get $(1 - t^G A^G)w_L - \lambda_2 = \lambda_1$. Combining this with condition (23) leads to $(1 - t^G A^G)w_L - \lambda_2 \geq (1 + t^R \beta)^{r\mu} - 1$. After having inserted the marginal productivities from (7) and (8), we can finally consider two subcases B1 and B2. We define subcase B1 as:

$$(1 - t^G A^G)\delta r^{-1}F'(L) - \lambda_2 > (1 + t^R \beta)^{r\mu} - 1 \quad (11)$$

which, according to (28), is associated with $i = 0$.⁴ as in case A. This case, however, requires $\lambda_2 = 0$, since any $\lambda_2 - 1 > 0$ would make the labor-market restriction binding, so that $l < 1$, which would, in combination with $i = 0$, violate $1 = l + i$. The reason is straightforward: If the citizens were restricted in their labor supply to $l < 1$, and if the supply of insurrection activities could yield any additional utility, then the citizens would

⁴This is so since $i=0$ whenever $(1 + t^R \beta)^{r\mu} - 1 = 0$, since insurrection would not yield any utility in that case. If, however, $(1 + t^R \beta)^{r\mu} - 1 > 0$, then condition (28) in the appendix directly requires $i = 0$.

take that opportunity, given their utility function (6) and given that $(1+t^R\beta)^{r\mu} - 1 > 0$. But this, in turn, would be incompatible with $1 > l + i$. Hence, $i = 0$ requires the effective net wage to be higher than the utility of insurrection activities even in a case of full employment on the regular labor market. As a result, there is no supply of insurrection activities in case B1 since the utility derived from insurrection activities is simply too low, as compared to the utility derived by regular work. By contrast, we define case B2 as:

$$(1-t^G A^G)\delta r^{-1}F'(L) - \lambda_2 = (1+t^R\beta)^{r\mu} - 1 \quad (12)$$

which, according to (28), is associated with $i \geq 0$. Subcase B2 is the basis for cases A and B1 since it gives the condition for an optimal time allocation for all situations where the marginal utility from insurrection activities is sufficiently attractive for the citizens in order to set $i > 0$ and hence for allocating at least some time into these activities. The difference between cases A and B1 is that in case A, any positive marginal utility of insurrection activities is sufficient for allocating time away from regular labor and into insurrection activities because of the labor-market restriction; in case B1, by contrast, there is no labor market restriction and marginal utility of insurrection activities is strictly below the net effective wage rate even with full employment on the regular labor market, so that it never pays for the citizens to allocate time into insurrection activities. Hence, whenever the labor-market restriction is binding and/or whenever marginal utility of insurrection activities climbs to a level above the net effective wage rate at full employment, insurrection activities become paying to the citizens; and that is what case B2 is about.

There are hence two major driving forces for insurrection activities that both directly stem from the official labor market: One is the effective net wage rate as compared to marginal utility derived from insurrection activities, and the other is a binding labor-market restriction with $\lambda_2 > 0$, and hence unemployment.

Case B2 is depicted in figure 2. It shows the marginal utility lines of the citizens for labor-market activity (i.e. $(1-t^G A^G)\delta r^{-1}F'(L)$) on the one hand and for insurrection activities (i.e. $(1+t^R\beta)^{r\mu} - 1$) on the other. Insurrection activities i and labor-market activities l always add up to one for each citizen in case B2, so that we have $L + I = N$ on the macro level. If the labor-market restriction were non-binding, that is if $\lambda_2 = 0$, an equilibrium were reached at L^{**}, I^{**} , where the marginal utility levels derived from the




Figure 2: Case B

respective activities are equal. With a binding labor-market restriction, though, that is with $\lambda_2 > 0$, the activity levels on the respective markets in equilibrium are L^*, I^* with lower regular work and higher insurrection activities as compared to L^{**}, I^{**} , although marginal utility of insurrection activities falls short of the net effective wage rate on the regular labor market. Note that an increase in the youth-bulge rate r shifts the marginal-utility line of the labor market downwards and the marginal-utility line of the market for insurrections upwards. Hence, an increase in the youth bulge will reallocate time away from work on the regular labor market and into insurrection activities.

Case B2 can be used for directly fixing the central empirical implications of our model. Assume, for simplicity, a *Cobb-Douglas* production function on the labor market with α as the production elasticity. Then the equilibrium condition (12) turns into $(1 - t^G A^G)\delta r^{-1}\frac{\alpha}{L^{1-\alpha}} - \lambda_2 = (1 + t^R\beta)^{r\mu} - 1$ and, because of $N = L + I$, into:

$$I = N - \left(\frac{(1 - t^G A^G)\delta\alpha}{r((1 + t^R\beta)^{r\mu} - 1) + r\lambda_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \quad (13)$$

Generally speaking, the term in brackets on the right-hand side indicates the opportunity costs of working time on the regular labor market in terms of foregone utility from insurrection activities. As these opportunity costs rise, insurrection activities will rise, too.

4 Empirical Evidence

The model presented in the previous section has a number of empirical implications both in general and with respect to the youth bulge. The general implications are:

1. Productivity on the regular labor market, relative to productivity of insurrection activities, is a key factor for the allocation of time between regular labor and insurrection. Consequently, a decrease in either δ or α or both and an increase in $t^R\beta$ tend to raise insurrection activities. Hence it is not low productivity or, for that matter, low wages and poverty as such that drive people into insurrection activities, but it is the ratio of utility between the two income-generating activities labor or insurrection that counts. This is very much in line with now established findings of the economic theory of terrorism according to which terrorist activists are by no means recruited from groups of persons with low income and poor education (Krueger 2007). What rather counts for potential insurrection activities is the relative attractiveness of activities in the official or in the insurrection sector (Collier & Hoeffer, 2004; Krieger & Meiericks, 2011; Sagemann, 2004).
2. Unemployment is another key factor for the allocation of time between insurrection and work on a regular labor market. An increase in the labor-market restriction, as indicated by λ_2 , raises insurrection activities simply by restricting career options in the official labor market.
3. The degree of oppression exercised by the government, as indicated by the government's effective tax rate $t^G A^G$, lowers the opportunity costs of insurrection activities and hence raises their level. Note that for this effect to materialize, no irrationality with respect to the production of the (perceived) public good associated with insurrections is necessary. Rather, oppression changes the opportunity costs of one activity in terms of the other, and that changes the citizens' allocation of time.

With respect to the youth bulge, we have further implications. Formally, it can easily be shown from (13) that $l'(r) > 0$, so that a rise in the youth-bulge ratio tends to drive people away from the regular labor market into insurrection activities. There are three main effects behind that:

1. The youth-bulge ratio changes the degree of risk aversion with respect to the utility derived from insurrection activities via $r\mu$ in (13).
2. The youth-bulge ratio changes the relation between the utility derived from work on

the one hand and from insurrection activities on the other. This is given by the first r below the fraction bar in (13).

3. Finally, the youth-bulge ratio directly interacts with the labor-market restriction, as can be seen by the term $r\lambda_2$ in (13). Hence, a rise in the youth bulge, in combination with poor perspectives on the labor market, once again lowers the opportunity costs of insurrection activities.

The labor-market restriction appears to be of particular importance. It suggests that it is not the youth bulge as such that magnifies the threat of insurrection activities. It is rather the interaction of a high share of the youth cohort—and in societies with a traditionalist division of sexes, the share of young male people—in percent of the rest of the economically active population, with poor perspectives on the labor market. If the official labor market does not offer opportunities for young (male) citizens, and if there are non-official groups in search of people that support them in their extra-constitutional activities, then it is not particularly astonishing when young people allocate their time budget accordingly. Our empirical implications are thus not that the youth bulge as such counts for insurrection activities. What rather counts is the youth bulge in interaction with the underlying politico-economic structure, in particular the labor-market conditions.

4.1 Data and Empirical Strategy

In the following section, we focus on the empirical implications regarding the interaction between youth bulges, the labor-market constraint and insurrection activities. To this end, we develop an empirical framework that aims at explaining the likelihood of a country to experience an insurrection onset taking into account the demographic structure as well as the official labor-market prospects of the country. Our analysis is based on an asymmetric panel data set with the country-year as the unit of analysis, including all independent countries recognized in the international system with at least 500,000 inhabitants and covering a maximum period from 1951 to 2012.

Following existing studies on civil war (Collier & Hoeffler, 2004; Fearon & Laitin, 2003; Urdal, 2006), data on internal conflicts are drawn from the Uppsala/PRIO armed conflict data set (Themner & Wallensteen, 2013). Accordingly, our dependent variable *insurstart* refers to the outbreak of a "contested incompatibility that concerns 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 per year" (Gleditsch, Wallensteen, Erikson, Solenberg & Strand, 2002: 618f)⁵. The binary variable is coded one in that year where the threshold of 25 battle-related deaths is reached for the first time during the conflict episode, given that there is no other conflict ongoing in the previous or current year⁶. All country-years that do not experience any type of conflict activity are coded zero, while country-years of ongoing conflict or with overlapping conflicts are coded missing. The chosen procedure controls for potential endogeneity problems that might stem from feedback effects of ongoing insurrection activities on the economic and demographic variables included in the model.

With regard to the youth-bulge ratio we define the relative youth cohort size (*RYCS*) by calculating the ratio of the male youth cohort (men aged between 15 and 24) to the total working population (men and women aged between 15 and 64). This approach appears justified on theoretical grounds because young men entering the labor market compete with the total working population for available job positions. From an empirical perspective we acknowledge that ratios including total population might be distorted due to changes in fertility rates as argued by Urdal (2004, 2006). Population data is taken from the UN World Population Prospects (UN WPP 2014).

In order to investigate the interaction between the youth-bulge ratio and the labor-market constraint, we rely on employment data as provided by the World Bank (World Development Indicators (WDI) 2014). In particular, we focus on the overall unemployment rate and the specific male youth unemployment rate defined as the number of unemployed males aged between 15 and 24 relative to the total male working population of that age group. Referring back to our theoretical model, we compute annual *changes* in unemployment rates as our indicator for a binding labor-market constraint. We rely on changes in, rather than levels of, unemployment since we aim to explain vio-

⁵The Uppsala/PRIO data set differentiates between four types of conflict: internal armed conflict, internationalized armed conflict (intervention or support from abroad), extrasystemic or colonial conflicts and interstate conflicts (Themner & Wallensteen, 2013). Since our approach focuses on the determinants of *internal* violent conflicts, we only include internal as well as internationalized armed conflicts. While our theoretical predictions could be applied to insurgencies against colonial powers as well, we exclude these conflicts due to data problems regarding the explanatory variables and consider only sovereign country-years.

⁶Even though the Uppsala/PRIO project sets a relatively low violence threshold of 25 battle-related deaths per year we argue that this threshold is sufficiently high in order to capture only insurrection onsets that are the result of a deliberate organization of activities aimed at changing political power positions rather than spontaneous outbursts of political demonstrations and riots (see Gleditsch et al. (2002) and Sambanis (2004) for a discussion of different definitions and thresholds of internal conflicts).

lent insurrection outbreaks rather than ongoing conflicts. However, in order to observe the transition from a conflict-free situation to an insurrection onset at the aggregate country level, there must be some triggering event that changes the initial labor-market equilibrium in such a way that a latent conflict potential is transformed into an effective insurrection movement that has the capacity to erode existing power relations (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2001; Apolte, 2012).

It follows directly from our theoretical model that changes in the labor-market constraint, i.e. changes in unemployment, will induce a shift in the initial labor-market equilibrium. Thus, what triggers the occurrence of a conflict onset is a change in, rather than the mere level of, unemployment. A sharp increase in unemployment will force more people out of the official labor market and at the same time make it more difficult especially for young people to enter this market. This will induce individuals to reallocate their disposable time away from official work and towards insurrection activities. At the aggregate level, the increase in unemployment (translating into a larger labor market constraint λ_2) will shift the labor-market equilibrium as indicated in figure 2, thereby raising the aggregate labor supply for insurrections, all else being equal. Overall, changes in the unemployment rate can be assumed to translate into changes of the allocation of labor supply between labor markets and insurrection activities on the level of the society as a whole, thereby triggering the occurrence of violent conflict onsets.

In contrast, with regard to youth bulges we include the levels of the relative youth cohort size. As depicted in figure 2, youth bulges influence the position of the marginal-utility lines of both, the labor market and insurrection activities. Since the demographic structure changes slowly over time, we should assume that youth bulges influence the general disposition of a society to supply a larger share of disposable time to insurrection activities. Hence, the relative values of the youth cohort size appear to be an adequate measure of demographic pressures.

Based on these considerations, our logistic regression model is specified as follows:

$$p(\text{insurstart}_{it} = 1 | \mathbf{x}) = \Lambda(\beta_0 + \beta_1 ptc_{it-1} + \beta_2 \ln pop_{it-1} + \beta_3 imr_{it-1} + \beta_4 anoc_{it-1} + \gamma_1 RYCS_{it-1} + \gamma_2 \Delta UE_{it-1} + \gamma_3 (RYCS_{it-1} * \Delta UE_{it-1}) + \mathbf{z} \boldsymbol{\beta_z}) \quad (14)$$

where Λ is the standard logistic cumulative distribution function:

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{exp(\mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta})}{[1 + exp(\mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta})]}$$

Following Hegre and Sambanis (2006), our model incorporates four main determinants of internal armed conflict onset that are always included in the regressions, namely the natural logarithm of total population (*lnpop*), infant mortality (*imr*) as a proxy for the overall level of development and a measure of political instability that is based on Fearon and Laitin (2003): *anoc* takes the value one for all country-years for which the composite polity2-score of the Polity IV Project lies between -5 and +5 (Marshall, Gurr & Jaggers, 2014). The theoretical rationale is that while both, consolidated democracies and strong autocracies, have the capacity to ensure a high level of political stability that renders internal unrest less likely, political systems in the intermediate range of the polity-scale, so-called "anocracies", should be expected to face higher levels of internal instability since neither democratic institutions nor autocratic suppression are fully effective. In addition, proximity to conflict (*ptc*) measures the number of years without violent activity that have passed since the last conflict, which is discounted by the factor four. The formula is $exp[(-\text{years in peace})/4]$ following Urdal (2006) and Hegre, Ellingsen, Gates and Gleditsch (2001). We assume that the risk of an insurrection outbreak is high immediately after a conflict episode, but diminishes as time passes and is halved approximately every 3 years⁷.

Our explanatory variables of interest are the relative youth-cohort size *RYCS*, which we refer to as the *youth-bulge ratio*, changes in the (male youth) unemployment rate reflected by ΔUE and the interaction of these two variables⁸. Moreover, the vector \mathbf{z} includes further control variables that might be associated with both, insurrection onsets as well as our demographic and economic covariates. Except for time-invariant regressors, all explanatory variables are lagged by one year in order to account for potential reverse causality. An overview of all variables and data sources as well as descriptive statistics is given in the appendix (see tables A.1, A.2 and A.3).

Our data set includes 169 countries that have experienced 238 insurrection onsets according to the above specified criteria, of which 224 onsets are included in the baseline estimation (see table 1, model 1). This corresponds to 3% of all observations. Since employment data is available only from 1992 onward, the sample size is approximately

⁷Regressions with alternative discount rates for *ptc* do not change the results substantially.

⁸We will denote changes in total unemployment rates by ΔUE_{tot} and changes in male youth unemployment rates by ΔUE_{ym} .

reduced to one third upon the inclusion of unemployment rates.

4.2 Results

The results of our benchmark pooled logit estimation are consistent with the findings of Urdal (2006) and others (see column 1, table 1). We find that *proximity to conflict* is an important determinant of the propensity of an insurrection onset. The threat of a conflict outbreak is high immediately after a violent conflict episode but diminishes as time passes which is indicated by the significant positive coefficient. This suggests that conflict-specific capital depreciates over time thereby reducing the opportunity for insurrection activities (Fearon & Laitin, 2003). A larger total population increases the likelihood of insurrection activities. On the one hand, a large population size might be associated with ethnic and religious heterogeneity that could spur grievances among the members of (discriminated) minorities (Collier & Hoeffer, 2004). On the other hand, a large population (density) might be associated with institutional crowding, especially when urbanization takes place. We follow Urdal (2006) and choose infant mortality as our proxy for the level of development of a country in order to avoid potential confusion of the effects of a more direct economic measure like GDP per capita and our unemployment variables. The positive and significant coefficient of *infant mortality rate* confirms that the threat of an armed conflict is higher in countries with lower levels of socio-economic development. With regard to the impact of political instability on insurrections the results also confirm that *anocracies* are confronted with a higher risk of insurrection activities, presumably due to a lack of institutional capacities to either efficiently suppress political unrest or provide non-violent channels of political participation like free elections.

Finally, when it comes to our central explanatory variable of interest, the *youth-bulge ratio*, we find that larger youth cohorts indeed change the relation between utility derived from work and from insurrection activities. As a result, (young male) people reallocate time away from the official labor market towards insurrection activities. On the aggregate country-level, this effect materializes into a higher risk of internal armed conflict onsets as reflected by the positive and significant coefficient.

Table 1: Baseline Results

Dep. Variable: Insurrection onset	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
proximity to conflict	1.124*** (0.203)	1.410*** (0.312)	1.410*** (0.315)	1.411*** (0.311)	1.416*** (0.315)
total population (ln)	0.270*** (0.046)	0.387*** (0.081)	0.393*** (0.082)	0.384*** (0.081)	0.402*** (0.082)
infant mortality rate	0.005*** (0.001)	0.012*** (0.004)	0.013*** (0.004)	0.012*** (0.004)	0.013*** (0.004)
anocracy	0.614*** (0.148)	0.590** (0.250)	0.586** (0.252)	0.592** (0.250)	0.602** (0.252)
youth bulge ratio	13.458*** (3.054)	7.180 (5.149)	7.138 (5.270)	7.123 (5.154)	8.355 (5.367)
post 1990 dummy	0.247 (0.160)				
change in total unemployment rate		0.123 (0.082)	-0.986** (0.394)		
youth bulge ratio x change in total unemployment rate			6.360*** (2.206)		
change in male youth unemployment rate				-0.002 (0.057)	-0.683*** (0.184)
youth bulge ratio x change in male youth unemployment rate					4.274*** (1.109)
Constant	-9.050*** (0.711)	-9.461*** (1.150)	-9.555*** (1.173)	-9.399*** (1.149)	-9.865*** (1.204)
Observations	7,088	2,757	2,757	2,757	2,757
Log likelihood	-903.090	-325.289	-321.544	-326.255	-320.607
LR chi ²	182.288	121.989	129.480	120.058	131.353
Prob.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Pseudo R ²	0.092	0.158	0.168	0.155	0.170

Notes: All columns are logit regressions with logit coefficients reported. The time-varying explanatory variables are lagged by one year. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Though the reasoning of institutional bottlenecks imposed by large youth cohorts is present in the literature, only few studies have attempted to integrate labor-market indicators directly in an empirical framework aimed at testing the demography-insurrection

nexus (e.g. Campante and Chor, 2012). One reason apparently concerns data constraints since estimates for employment indicators are available only since 1990 at a broad cross-country level. A second concern relates to the quality of unemployment data in developing countries that are particularly prone to insurrection activities. Official statistics in these countries tend to underestimate the dimension of unemployment since conventional concepts of seeking work are of limited relevance in countries with large agricultural and informal sectors where the labor force is largely self-employed (ILO, 2013). In these sectors, underemployment is still prevalent due to very low earning levels and segmented labor markets (Fields, 2012). These concerns in mind, we are still convinced that a profound analysis of the relationship between the existence of a youth-bulge phenomenon and insurrections needs to take into account the moderating role of politico-economic institutions such as labor markets. As our theoretical model demonstrates, what counts is not the existence of a youth bulge as such, but the interaction of a large young generation with poor economic prospects. Since comparable measures of informal sector shares and underemployment are not available for most countries, conventional unemployment statistics represent the only available data source to investigate the interrelations between demography, labor markets and insurrections.

We therefore include annual changes in unemployment rates in our model (table 1, column 2 to 5). The sample size is reduced to 2,757 observations and spans a period from 1993 to 2012. Three percent or 87 of all observations contained in the sample are insurrection outbreaks which is proportional to the larger benchmark model. In order to account for the different time periods covered, we include the dummy variable *post90* in our benchmark specification without unemployment (column 1, table 1). Yet, the insignificant coefficient does not indicate that there are structural differences in the occurrence of conflict onsets that can be related to the different time spans covered.

The stepwise inclusion of either changes in total or male youth unemployment rates leads to comparable results. The parameter estimates of the main effects of the youth-bulge ratio and unemployment are not significant in column 2 and 4. Even though collinearity among socio-economic covariates could always be an issue in empirical research, the correlation table does not indicate that it should be a severe problem in this context (see table A.3). Rather, the results might support our theoretical prediction that neither a large youth bulge nor high unemployment *per se* are sufficient to explain why countries face internal conflicts. Indeed, when we include the product of both variables in columns 3 and 5, the interaction effect of the relative youth cohort size and changes in (male

youth) unemployment is highly significant with a large positive coefficient. Hence, only a combination of both, demographic pressures *and* a labor-market shock in terms of rising unemployment actually translates the violent potential of a youth-bulge phenomenon into an increased likelihood of an internal armed conflict onset.

Table 2: Marginal Effects

	(1)		(2)		(3)
at	ME of <i>RYCS</i>	at	ME of <i>RYCS</i>	at	ME of ΔUE_{tot}
$\Delta UE_{tot} = -4.4$	-0.365 (0.276)	$\Delta UE_{ym} = -8.3$	-0.551* (0.284)	$RYCS = 0.08$	-0.00462* (0.00265)
$\Delta UE_{tot} = -0.4$	0.0728 (0.0815)	$\Delta UE_{ym} = -0.8$	0.0763 (0.0804)	$RYCS = 0.12$	-0.00283 (0.00179)
$\Delta UE_{tot} = 0.0$	0.112 (0.0796)	$\Delta UE_{ym} = 0.0$	0.126 (0.0766)	$RYCS = 0.16$	0.000532 (0.00132)
$\Delta UE_{tot} = 0.3$	0.141* (0.0791)	$\Delta UE_{ym} = 0.7$	0.166** (0.0746)	$RYCS = 0.18$	0.00304** (0.00139)
$\Delta UE_{tot} = 4.8$	0.524*** (0.186)	$\Delta UE_{ym} = 9.3$	0.514** (0.215)	$RYCS = 0.21$	0.00817*** (0.00315)
Observations	2,757		2,757		2,757

Notes: Marginal effect of the focal variable conditional on the moderating variable. Column (1) displays the effect of a marginal change in *RYCS conditional* on the 1., 25., 50., 75., and 99. percentile of the distribution of changes in the total unemployment rate (ΔUE_{tot}). Column (2) displays the marginal effects of *RYCS conditional* on corresponding changes in the male youth unemployment rate (ΔUE_{ym}). Column (3) shows the marginal effects of changes in the total unemployment rate conditional on *RYCS*. All other covariates are set to their means. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

In addition, while the parameter coefficients of *RYCS* are not significant when including unemployment in table 1, table 2 shows that the marginal effects of *RYCS* are significant but depend on the magnitude of changes in unemployment. In particular, the effect of a marginal increase in the relative youth cohort size is positive and significant only in the presence of negative labor-market shocks, in other words rising unemployment. In contrast, a reduction in unemployment neutralizes the violent potential of a higher youth bulge and leads to insignificant marginal effects of *RYCS* (except for very high cuts in male youth unemployment rates, showing the expected negative sign). Similarly, a worsening in the labor-market situation leads to a higher propensity of violent conflict

outbreaks only in the presence of high youth bulges of 0.18 and more⁹.

Overall, the results confirm our theoretical predictions: It is not the demographic structure as such that causes insurrection outbreaks but whether large youth cohorts are confronted with a decline in income prospects in the official labor market that aggravate existing institutional bottlenecks and render alternative activities like insurrections more attractive. In other words, an increase in unemployment will hit young males disproportionately, driving them toward insurrection activities and triggering the outbreak of internal political violence.

4.3 Sensitivity of Results

There are several relevant concerns related to the robustness of our results. First, the pooled logit approach does not account for unobserved heterogeneity across countries such as geographic location, ethnic diversity or historical background. We therefore apply a conditional logit fixed effects estimation based on our preferred specification from model 3 (table 1) including changes in the total unemployment rate¹⁰. The results are presented in table 3. Overall, the parameter estimates are robust to the inclusion of country and year fixed effects. In particular, the interaction term of youth bulges and unemployment is highly significant across specifications.

A second concern regards the potential problem of reverse causality. We account for the fact that internal armed conflicts will influence both, economic as well as demographic factors due to economic devastation, deaths and refugees, by omitting all country-years of ongoing conflict episodes. Still, identifying the exact start date of a conflict onset can be difficult (Sambanis, 2004). If insurrection activities started before the recorded year in our sample, there is still the possibility that causality runs in the opposite direction. In order to account for this potential caveat, we test higher lags of our explanatory variables in column 3 of table 3. All coefficients display the expected signs. However, whereas our interaction term is no longer significant, the youth-bulge ratio becomes marginally significant.

⁹See also figure A.1 in the appendix for a visual presentation of the marginal effects.

¹⁰Even though changes in male youth unemployment are likely to reflect the effective labor-market constraint of young people more adequately than overall unemployment and collinearity does not appear to be an obvious problem here, we still seek to minimize potential confusion between the relative youth cohort size and unemployment measures. Therefore, we rely on the more general measure of total unemployment as our preferred proxy for a binding labor-market constraint.

Table 3: Sensitivity Analysis

Dep. Var.: Insurrection onset	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
proximity to conflict	-2.227*** (0.539)	-2.248*** (0.544)	1.682*** (0.304)	1.478*** (0.319)	1.176*** (0.386)	1.031* (0.587)
total population (ln)	0.738 (1.336)	-0.671 (2.485)	0.374*** (0.089)	0.331*** (0.082)	0.533*** (0.111)	0.613*** (0.172)
infant mortality rate	0.021* (0.012)	0.022* (0.012)	0.011*** (0.004)		0.018*** (0.005)	0.033** (0.014)
anocracy	0.965** (0.389)	1.036** (0.412)	0.247 (0.266)		0.875*** (0.304)	0.426 (0.445)
youth bulge ratio	15.131 (17.915)	18.571 (20.325)	9.907* (5.489)	8.353* (4.824)	5.614 (6.835)	1.458 (11.700)
change in total unemployment rate	-0.767* (0.454)	-0.813* (0.442)	-0.315 (0.580)	-0.845** (0.403)	-1.085** (0.475)	-0.579 (0.906)
youth bulge ratio x change in total unemployment	5.474** (2.781)	5.657** (2.773)	1.392 (3.388)	5.215** (2.306)	6.825** (2.728)	3.484 (5.767)
Regime type				-0.006 (0.023)		
Regime type squared				-0.022*** (0.005)		
GDP p.c. growth rate				2.526** (1.060)		
Islam dummy					0.007* (0.004)	0.010 (0.006)
ethnic fractionalization					6.675** (2.757)	12.956** (5.057)
ethnic frac. squared					-6.999** (2.783)	-14.991*** (5.595)
military expenditure (% of GDP)					0.072** (0.029)	0.013 (0.102)
former British colony					-0.698* (0.382)	-0.463 (0.579)
former French colony					-0.176 (0.380)	-0.252 (0.726)
oil exports					0.006 (0.008)	
secondary schooling					-0.002 (0.017)	
dependency ratio					-0.656 (2.495)	
Constant				-9.774***	-7.408***	-12.519***
						-13.519***

Table 3: Sensitivity Analysis (continued)

Dep. Var.: Insurrection onset	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
			(1.278)	(1.283)	(1.726)	(3.969)
Observations	713	713	2,486	2,540	2,273	1,479
Country FE	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Time FE	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Lags	1 YEAR	1 YEAR	3 YEARS	1 YEAR	1 YEAR	1 YEAR
Log likelihood	-169.633	-165.191	-284.600	-299.754	-233.886	-118.475
LR chi ²	35.306	44.191	117.482	118.047	136.471	71.689
Prob.	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Pseudo R ²	0.094	0.118	0.171	0.165	0.226	0.232

Notes: All columns are logit regressions with logit coefficients reported. In model (3), the time-varying covariates are lagged by three years; in all other models, 1-year-lags are included. Information on definitions and data sources of the additional control variables are given in table A.1. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

In column 4 to 6, we compare different estimations with additional determinants that have been discussed in the literature on internal armed conflicts (Collier & Hoeffer, 2004; Fearon & Laitin, 2003; Hegre & Sambanis, 2006). Again, our main result regarding the moderating role of labor-market conditions is robust to the inclusion of alternative measures of political instability or level of development, and when we account for further control variables such as religion, ethnic fractionalization or military expenditure. Given the limited sample size and rising correlations among the covariates when adding further socio-economic factors such as secondary school enrollment, the dependency ratio or oil exports, most explanatory variables loose statistical significance, including our interaction effect (column 6, table 3).

A final concern regards the definition of our dependent variable, *insurrection onset*. Sambanis (2004) discusses several limitations regarding the coding rules of armed conflicts applied in the PRIO data set such as the battle-related death-threshold, finding the precise start and end date of a conflict, and problems related to the distinction between intrastate, interstate and extrastate conflicts. For our research purpose, the third aspect is of particular relevance for two reasons: First, it is generally difficult to identify the origin of recruited rebels when armed disputes concern border areas and opposition groups belong to ethnic minorities spread across various countries. Second, we observe rising activity of rebel groups that operate in different countries such as al-Qaida, the Islamic State or Boko Haram. If the rebels involved in an insurrection are largely recruited from foreign countries rather than the domestic society, the ascribed relationship between

cohort sizes, labor markets and conflict potentials will not suffice to explain the occurrence of internal armed conflicts. In such cases, we would question the purely internal dimension of the conflict. As a consequence, the lack of statistical significance of the youth-bulge ratio might be driven by those conflicts that mainly involve internationally recruited rebels among the opposition side.

Table 4: Outlier Analysis

Dep. Variable: Insurrection onset	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
proximity to conflict	1.119*** (0.208)	1.413*** (0.333)	1.396*** (0.336)	2.504*** (0.382)	2.552*** (0.389)
total population (ln)	0.284*** (0.048)	0.442*** (0.090)	0.450*** (0.091)	0.765*** (0.118)	0.776*** (0.120)
infant mortality rate	0.005*** (0.001)	0.013*** (0.004)	0.014*** (0.004)	0.025*** (0.005)	0.026*** (0.005)
anocracy	0.668*** (0.151)	0.757*** (0.272)	0.751*** (0.273)	1.133*** (0.320)	1.146*** (0.325)
youth bulge ratio	15.289*** (3.273)	10.654* (6.013)	10.932* (6.192)	14.554* (7.924)	14.304* (8.256)
post 1990 dummy	0.133 (0.164)				
total unemployment rate (annual change)		0.153* (0.084)	-1.105** (0.448)	0.319*** (0.087)	-1.605*** (0.621)
youth bulge ratio x total unemployment (annual change)			7.044*** (2.468)		10.638*** (3.379)
Constant	-9.505*** (0.756)	-10.893*** (1.356)	-11.063*** (1.391)	-16.501*** (2.042)	-16.681*** (2.108)
Observations	6,939	2,653	2,653	2,702	2,702
Outliers excluded	AZE, ERI, GEO, MKD, SRB, USA			1st and 99th percentile of std. Pearson residuals	
Log likelihood	-857.271	-277.981	-274.416	-191.478	-186.437
LR chi ²	188.874	133.853	140.982	192.591	202.673
Prob.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Pseudo R ²	0.099	0.194	0.204	0.335	0.352

Notes: In column (1) to (3) outliers are identified based on two criteria: First, standardized Pearson residuals of 7 or higher, and second, the type of conflict has a dominant international dimension concerning territorial sovereignty in border areas with heavy intervention from abroad (e.g. Georgia 2008), and/or where we suspect that rebel recruiting has predominantly taken place in foreign countries (e.g. USA 2001). For consistency, we exclude all observations of the suspicious countries from our sample. In column (4) and (5) we exclude all observations that fall in the 1st or 99th percentile of the distribution of the standardized Pearson residuals. Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Indeed, when investigating potential outliers we find that most of these observations reflect a specific type of conflict concerning border areas and/or involving internationally active militant opposition groups. In table 4 we therefore exclude those countries that fulfill two criteria, very high standardized Pearson residuals¹¹ and the involvement in violent disputes that have an obvious international dimension as in the case of the terrorist attacks in the U.S. in 2001 and/or because conflicts concern territorial sovereignty in border areas where the domestic origin of recruitment is highly questionable (e.g. Azerbaijan 2005, 2012). The analysis of the specific outlier cases leads to the exclusion of six countries, namely Azerbaijan, Eritrea, Georgia, Macedonia, Serbia and the U.S.¹². The results confirm our suspicion that the effect of the youth-bulge ratio might be blurred by some few conflicts with distinct characteristics that cannot be explained based on our theoretical framework. Upon the exclusion of these cases the signs and magnitudes of the explanatory variables do not change, but the youth-bulge ratio as well as unemployment changes become statistically significant in all specifications.

Again, the results point to the need of a deeper understanding of the interdependence of demographic factors and the politico-institutional setting not only at the national level but also at a regional and global scale. This becomes even more important in the presence of internationally operating terrorist networks. To this end, taking into account regional rather than national measures of socio-economic and demographic pressures might be a promising research agenda. Still, our results also emphasize that the domestic dimension of youth bulges in combination with institutional constraints should not be neglected by policy-makers who aim to understand the nature of armed conflict and give advice on future conflict potentials.

5 Concluding Remarks

This paper provides a theoretical and empirical analysis of the interplay of a specific demographic phenomenon, namely a youth bulge, and basic politico-economic institutional structures and their impact on the risk of insurrection activities. To this end, we have modeled as a benchmark what can be called a kleptocracy in which productive wealth is

¹¹The standardized Pearson residuals measure the (weighted) deviation of the estimated probability that $y=1$ from the actual observation of y . The formula is given by (see Backhaus, Erichson, Plinke Weiber, 2006: 458): $stdresid_k = \frac{y_k - p(y_k=1)}{\sqrt{p(y_k=1)*(1-p(y_k=1))}}$

¹²See table A.5 in the appendix gives a detailed explanation of the exclusion decisions.

concentrated in the hands of a certain elite (the "governmental elite") that, at the same time, holds all important positions in the government. This concentration of both political and economic power positions provokes the appearance of political entrepreneurs of some type that hire insurrection activists in order to redistribute power and wealth away from the government elite. This ensuing market for insurrections has been related to the relative youth cohort size in that it shows how changes in this youth-bulge ratio affect the allocation of time of potential insurrection activists from the youth cohort.

Our central theoretical finding implies that whether or not the phenomenon of a youth bulge actually translates into outbreaks of political violence at an aggregate scale depends on the surrounding politico-economic institutions. In particular, whether (young) individuals reallocate time towards insurrections activities crucially depends on the income prospects in the official labor market. Thus, what counts for the realization of insurrection onsets is thus not the demographic phenomenon as such, but the interaction of a youth bulge with the underlying politico-economic institutional structure:

- If the economic and political institutions do not have closed-shop character, then there is nothing to gain from insurrection activities on the side of the revolutionary elite R which has been modeled as violent political entrepreneurs in this paper. In such a case the insurrection market does not supply opportunities for insurrection activists.
- If the official labor market offers comparatively attractive career opportunities and if an education system prepares young people for these career opportunities, "employment" offers by insurrection entrepreneurs, even as far as they exist, loose relative attractiveness from the point of view of the youth-bulge cohort.

Our findings refine the youth-bulge discussion insofar as they relate the simple demographic phenomenon with the underlying politico-economic institutional setting. In doing so they do not only point to the potential of political violence that the phenomenon of a youth bulge implies but isolate the institutional conditions under which such an empirical phenomenon may actually translate into political violence and under which this is not to be expected.

The theoretical predictions concerning the link between youth bulges and labor-market conditions are tested by exploiting cross-country panel data. The empirical model aims at investigating the moderating role of a binding labor-market constraint, i.e. unemployment, on the impact of the relative youth cohort size on the threat on an insurrection

onset at the aggregate country level. Overall, the empirical results confirm that the insurrection risk associated with the phenomenon of a youth bulge is aggravated in the presence of declining income prospects in the official labor market as reflected by rising unemployment. More precisely, the findings indicate that it is indeed the interaction of both, a large youth cohort *and* a change in the labor-market conditions, rather than the mere presence of a youth bulge, that determines the occurrence of political violence. This outcome is in line with our theoretical prediction concerning the individual's decision to reallocate time between formal work and insurrection activities.

While our empirical investigation has focused on unemployment as a reasonable indicator of a binding labor-market constraint, further determinants of the politico-economic structure and its moderating role on the youth-bulge-insurrection nexus should be tested. In particular, factors like education opportunities, indicators of institutional barriers to entry into economic and political markets, the extent of informal sector employment as a "poverty trap" for young people as well as indicators of political competition should be related to the relative youth cohort size in order to test the relative attractiveness of insurrection markets as compared to official labor markets. Furthermore, indicators relating to the degree of fiscal oppression and red tape as well as the distribution of wealth are likely to shape the incentives for young people to join insurrection activists.

When it comes to further theoretical work, it may be desirable to integrate commitment problems of the insurrection entrepreneurs, that is with the revolutionary elite, vis à vis the potential insurrection activists they hire. Different from employers on official labor markets, insurrection entrepreneurs do not have access to legal systems that serve as commitment devices for the mutual liabilities that follow from their contracts (Gates, 2002). We have taken account for that problem only by the exogenous variable μ that also measures the degree of loyalty to the government. However, commitment problems form the way labor-market contracts are shaped and enforced, and they restrict the types of activities on labor markets. This may be taken into account for a more flexible model setup in further theoretical work.

6 References

- Acemoglu, D.; J. A. Robinson (2001), A theory of political transitions, *The American Economic Review* 91 (4): 938-963.
- Apolte, Th. (2012), Why is There No Revolution in North-Korea, *Public Choice* 150: 561 – 578.
- Backhaus, K.; Erichson, B.; Plinke, W.; Weiber, R. (2006), “Multivariate Analysemethoden. Eine anwendungsorientierte Einführung”, Berlin: Springer.
- Caldwell, C. (2007), “Youth and War, a Deadly Duo”, *The Financial Times*, January 6, 2007.
- Campante, F. R.; D. Chor (2012), Why was the Arab World poised for Revolution? Schooling, Economic Opportunities, and the Arab Spring, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 26 (2): 167-188.
- Collier, P.; A. Hoeffler (2004), Greed and Grievance in Civil War, *Oxford Economic Papers* 56: 563 – 595.
- Easterlin, R. A. (1987), “Birth and Fortune. The Impact of Numbers on Personal Welfare,” Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fearon, J. D.; D. D. Laitin (2003), Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War, *American Political Science Review* 97(1): 75-90.
- Fields, G. S. (2012), “Working Hard, Working Poor”. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fuller, G. E. (1995), “The Demographic Backdrop to Ethnic Conflict: A Geographic Overview.” In: Central Intelligence Unit, ed., *The Challenge of Ethnic Conflict to National and International Order in the 1990s*, Washington, D.C.: CIA (RTT 95-10039), pp. 151 – 154.
- Fuller, G. E. (2003), The Youth Factor: The New Demographics of the Middle East and the Implications for U. S. Policy, draft.
- Gates, S. (2002), Recruitment and Allegiance. The Microfoundations of Rebellion, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46: 111 – 130.
- Gleditsch, N. P.; Wallensteen, P.; Erikson, M.; Solenber, M.; Strand, H. (2002), Armed

- Conflict 1946-2001. A New Dataset, *Journal of Peace Research* 39(5): 615-637.
- Goldstone, J. A. (2002), "Population and Security." In: P. F. Diehl; N. P. Gleditsch, eds. Environmental Conflict, Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Golud, S.; Hayat, F. (2014), Employment, Unemployment, and Underemployment in Africa, *World Institute For Development Economics Research Working Paper* 2014/014.
- Grossman, H. (1991), A General Equilibrium Model of Insurrection, *American Economic Review* 81: 912 – 921.
- Grossman, H. (1999), Kleptocracy and Revolutions, *Oxford Economic Papers* 51: 267 – 283.
- Hegre, H.; Sambanis, N. (2006), Sensitivity Analysis of Empirical Results on Civil War Onsets, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50(4): 508-535.
- Hegre, H.; Ellingsen, T.; Gates, S.; Gleditsch, N. P. (2001), Toward a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816-1992, *American Political Science Review* 95(1): 33-48.
- Heinsohn (2007), "Why Gaza is Fertile Ground for Angry Young Men," *The Financial Times*, June 21, 2007.
- Heinsohn (2009), "Afghanistan's Disposable Sons", *The Wall Street Journal*, September 17, 2009.
- International Labour Organisation (ILO) (2013): Measuring Informality: A statistical Manual on the Informal Sector and Informal Employment, Geneva. URL: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/-dgreports/-dcomm/-publ/documents/publication/wcms_22979.pdf[17.01.2015]
- Krieger, T.; Meiericks, D. (2011), What Causes Terrorism, *Public Choice* 147: 3 – 27.
- Krueger, A. B. (2007), "What Makes a Terrorist? Economics and Roots of Terrorism", Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lichbach, M. I. (1995), "The Rebel's Dilemma," Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Marshall, M. G.; Gurr, T. R.; Jaggers, K. (2014), "Polity IV Project. Political Regime Characteristics ad Transitions. Dataset Users' Manual", Vienna, Center for Systemic

Peace.

Niang, S. R. (no year), “Terrorizing Ages. The Effects of Youth Demographics and the Relative Youth Cohort Size on the Likelihood and Pervasiveness of Terrorism”, draft, Purdue University.

Sagemann, M. (2004), “Understanding Terror Networks.” Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sambanis, N. (2004), What is Civil War? Conceptual and Empirical Complexities of an Operational Definition, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(6): 814-858.

Staveteig, S. (2007), “The Increased Incidence of Civil Wars in sub-Saharan Africa: Assessing the Effects of Democratization and Age Structure.” University of California Berkeley, Department of Demography.

Samuelson, P. A. (1956), An Exact Consumption-Loan Model of Interest with or without the Contrivance of Money, *Journal of Political Economy* 66: 467 – 482.

Themnér, L.; Wallensteen, P. (2013), Armed Conflicts, 1946-2012, *Journal of Peace Research* 50(4): 509-521.

Urdal, H. (2004), “The Devil in the Demographics: The Effect of Youth Bulges on Domestic Armed Conflict, 1950-2000.” Social Development Papers. Conflict Prevention and Re-construction No. 14, July 2004.

Urdal, H. (2006), A Clash of Generations? Youth Bulges and Political Violence, *International Studies Quarterly* 50: 607 – 629.

Wall, E. (2006), “The Terrorism Labor Market,” College of Holy Cross, Economics Department Honors Thesis, Worcester, MA.

Whelton, C. (2007), “A Demographic Theory of War,” *The Weekly Standard*, October 2009.

A Appendix

The revolutionary elite's maximization problem

Considering (4) in combination with (2), the maximization problem of the revolutionary elite is:

$$\mathfrak{S} = t^R \beta I - w_I I + \lambda(\tau^R Y - t^R).$$

The *Kuhn-Tucker* conditions are then:

$$\mathfrak{S}_I = t^R \beta - w_I \leq 0; \quad (15)$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_{t^R} = \beta I - \lambda \leq 0; \quad (16)$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_\lambda = \tau^R Y - t^R \geq 0; \quad (17)$$

$$I, t^R, \lambda \geq 0; \quad (18)$$

$$I \mathfrak{S}_I = I(t^R \beta - w_I) = 0; \quad (19)$$

$$t^R \mathfrak{S}_{t^R} = t^R(\beta I - \lambda) = 0; \quad (20)$$

$$\lambda \mathfrak{S}_\lambda = \lambda(\tau^R Y - t^R) = 0. \quad (21)$$

The citizens' maximization problem

Given the Lagrangian in equation (9), the Kuhn-Tucker conditions of the citizens' maximization problem are:

$$\mathfrak{S}_l = (1 - t^G A^G)w_L - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \leq 0; \quad (22)$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_i = ((1 + w_I)^{r\mu} - 1) - \lambda_1 \leq 0; \quad (23)$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\lambda_1} = 1 - l - i \geq 0; \quad (24)$$

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\lambda_2} = \varepsilon - l \geq 0; \quad (25)$$

$$l > 0; i, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0; \quad (26)$$

$$l \mathfrak{S}_l = l((1 - t^G A^G)w_L - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2) = 0; \quad (27)$$

$$i \mathfrak{S}_i = i((1 + w_I)^{r\mu} - 1) - \lambda_1 = 0; \quad (28)$$

$$\lambda_1 \Im_{\lambda_1} = \lambda_1(1 - l - i) = 0; \quad (29)$$

$$\lambda_2 \Im_{\lambda_2} = \lambda_2(\varepsilon - l) = 0; \quad hence : \quad \lambda_2 \Im_{\lambda_2} = \lambda_2(\varepsilon N - N) = 0. \quad (30)$$

Table A.1: Variable Description and Data Sources

Variable Name	Description	Source
<i>Insurrection onset</i>	= 1 if an internal armed conflict starts in country i in year t, given that there is no conflict ongoing in the previous or current year.	UCDP/PRIO, version 4-2013
<i>Youth bulge ratio</i>	Relative youth cohort size. Proportion of young males aged between 15 and 24 relative to the total working population (15-64, both sexes).	WDI (2014)
<i>Total unemployment rate (annual change)</i>	Annual change in share of unemployed persons to total labor force.	WDI (2014)
<i>Male youth unemployment rate (annual change)</i>	Annual change in male youth unemployment rate. The male youth unemployment rate is measured as the number of unemployed males aged 15 to 24 relative to the total male working population of that age group.	WDI (2014)
<i>proximity to conflict</i>	Years passed since the end of the last internal conflict in country i, weighted according to $\exp[-(\text{years in peace})/4]$.	UCDP/PRIO, version 4-2013
<i>total population (ln)</i>	Natural logarithm of total population.	UN WPP (2014)
<i>Infant mortality rate</i>	Infants dying before reaching one year of age (both sexes combined) per 1,000 live births.	WDI (2014)
<i>Anocracy</i>	= 1 if the combined POLITY2-score for country i in year t is in the range between -5 and +5.	Polity IV Project (2014)
<i>Regime type</i>	Score of combined POLITY2-indicator for country i in year t, ranging from +10 (full democracy) to -10 (full autocracy).	Polity IV Project (2014)
<i>GDP p.c. growth rate</i>	GDP per capita growth rate, converted to purchasing power parity (PPP) levels at 2005 constant international dollars per person.	Penn World Tables, version 7.1

Table A.1: Variable Description and Data Sources (continued)


Variable Name	Description	Source
<i>Islam dummy</i>	Percentage of Muslims in total population (time invariant).	Fearon and Laitin (2003)
<i>Ethnic fractionalization</i>	Share of population belonging to the largest ethnic group (time invariant).	Fearon and Laitin (2003)
<i>Military expenditure</i>	Military expenditure as % of GDP	WDI (2014)
<i>former British colony</i>	= 1 if the country is a former British colony.	Fearon and Laitin (2003)
<i>former French colony</i>	= 1 if the country is a former French colony.	Fearon and Laitin (2003)
<i>Oil exports</i>	Fuel exports as % of total merchandise exports.	WDI (2014)
<i>Secondary schooling</i>	Ratio of total secondary school enrollment, regardless of age, to the population of the age group that officially corresponds to the level of education shown.	WDI (2014)
<i>Dependency ratio</i>	Sum of dependent persons aged between 0 and 14 and aged 65 or older relative to total working population aged between 25 and 64.	UN WPP (2014)
<i>post90</i>	= 1 if the year of observation is 1990 or later.	

Table A.2: Summary Statistics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Dependent variable insurrection onset	7316	.033	.177	0	1
Youth bulge ratio					
<i>Full sample</i>					
youth bulge ratio	8352	.16	.033	.074	.262
<i>Employment sample</i>					
youth bulge ratio	3367	.153	.037	.074	.227
Unemployment variables					
total unemployment rate (annual change)	3367	-0.023	1.412	-12.4	18.2
male youth unemployment rate (annual change)	3367	0.053	2.779	-19.1	26.7
Control Variables					
proximity to conflict	8449	.227	.38	0	1
total population (ln)	8352	9.015	1.561	4.781	14.135
infant mortality rate	8352	67.073	54.832	1.813	373.043
anocracy	8449	.237	.425	0	1
post90	8449	.437	.496	0	1
Regime type	8320	.624	7.476	-10	10
GDP p.c. growth rate	7124	.022	.071	-.644	1.154
Islam dummy	8054	26.805	37.695	0	100
ethnic fractionalization	7996	.468	.267	.002	1
military expenditure (% of GDP)	3304	2.611	3.356	.001	90.134
former British colony	8054	.297	.457	0	1
former French colony	8054	.18	.384	0	1
oil exports	4982	16.765	32.768	0	722.763
secondary schooling	4626	59.401	34.049	0	160.619
dependency ratio	8352	.635	.237	.159	1.15

Table A.3: Correlation Matrix

v	Variables	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5	v6	v7	v8	v9	v10	v11	v12	v13	v14	v15	v16	v17	v18	
v1	insurrection	1.000																		
v2	onset		1.000																	
v2	youth bulge		0.083	1.000																
v3	ratio			0.002	-0.030	1.000														
v3	total				0.002	-0.030	1.000													
v4	unemployment					rate (change)														
v4	male youth						-0.000	-0.054	0.799	1.000										
v4	unemployment							rate (change)												
v5	proximity to							0.671	0.233	-0.008	-0.018	1.000								
v5	conflict																			
v6	total population							0.070	-0.133	0.003	0.000	0.286	1.000							
v6	(ln)																			
v7	infant mortality								0.071	0.521	-0.007	-0.030	0.126	-0.121	1.000					
v7	rate																			
v8	anocracy									0.103	0.255	0.001	-0.018	0.194	-0.002	0.142	1.000			
v9	Regime type										-0.047	-0.462	-0.002	0.016	-0.068	0.105	-0.510	-0.049	1.000	
v10	GDP p.c.											-0.042	-0.078	-0.125	-0.119	-0.051	0.017	-0.074	-0.017	0.031
v10	growth rate																		1.000	
v11	Islam dummy												0.074	0.347	-0.001	-0.012	0.151	-0.042	0.292	0.050
v11																			0.000	
v12	ethnic fractionalization																		0.000	
v12	ethnic																		1.000	
v13	military expenditure																		1.000	
v13	former British colony																		1.000	
v14	former French colony																		1.000	
v15	oil exports																		1.000	
v16	secondary schooling																		1.000	
v17	dependency ratio																		1.000	
v18																				



Note: Marginal effects with 95% confidence interval for RYCS *conditional* on the 1., 25., 50., 75., and 99. percentile of ΔUE_{total} (figure 3a), and ΔUE_{youth} (figure 3b). Figure 3c reports the marginal effects for ΔUE_{total} *conditional* on the corresponding percentiles of the distribution of RYCS.

Figure A.1: Marginal Effects of the youth bulge ratio and total unemployment

Table A.4: Conflict List

Country	Start-year of conflict period	End-year of conflict period	Full sample	Employment sample
Afghanistan	1978	2001	*	
Afghanistan	2003	?	*	*
Angola	?	2002		
Angola	2004	2004	*	*
Angola	2007	2007	*	*
Angola	2009	2009	*	*
Argentinien	1955	1955	*	
Argentinien	1963	1963	*	
Argentinien	1974	1977	*	
Azerbaijan	1991	1995		
Azerbaijan	2005	2005	*	*
Azerbaijan	2012	?	*	*
Burundi	1965	1965	*	
Burundi	1991	1992	*	
Burundi	1994	2006	*	*
Burundi	2008	2008	*	*
Burkina Faso	1987	1987	*	
Bangladesh	1975	1991	*	
Bangladesh	2005	2006	*	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	1992	1995		
Bolivia	1952	1952	*	
Bolivia	1967	1967	*	
Central African Republic	2001	2002	*	*
Central African Republic	2006	2006	*	*
Central African Republic	2009	?	*	*
Chile	1973	1973	*	
China	1950	1950		
China	1956	1956	*	
China	1959	1959	*	
China	2008	2008	*	*
Ivory Coast	2002	2004	*	*
Ivory Coast	2011	2011	*	*
Cameroon	?	1961		
Cameroon	1984	1984	*	
DR Congo (Zaire)	1960	1962		
DR Congo (Zaire)	1964	1965	*	
DR Congo (Zaire)	1967	1967	*	

Table A.4: Conflict List (continued)

Country	Start-year of conflict period	End-year of conflict period	Full sample	Employment sample
DR Congo (Zaire)	1977	1978	*	
DR Congo (Zaire)	1996	2001	*	*
DR Congo (Zaire)	2006	2008	*	*
DR Congo (Zaire)	2012	?	*	*
Congo	1993	1993	*	*
Congo	1997	1999	*	*
Congo	2002	2002	*	*
Colombia	1964	?	*	
Comoros	1989	1989	*	
Comoros	1997	1997	*	*
Cuba	1953	1953	*	
Cuba	1956	1958	*	
Cuba	1961	1961	*	
Djibouti	1991	1994	*	
Djibouti	1999	1999	*	
Dominican Republic	1965	1965	*	
Algeria	?	1962		
Algeria	1991	?	*	
Egypt	1993	1998	*	*
Eritrea	1997	1997	*	*
Eritrea	1999	1999	*	*
Eritrea	2003	2003	*	*
Spain	1978	1982	*	
Spain	1985	1987	*	
Spain	1991	1992	*	
Ethiopia	1960	1960	*	
Ethiopia	1964	1996	*	
Ethiopia	1998	?	*	*
France	1961	1962	*	
Gabon	1964	1964	*	
United Kingdom	1971	1991	*	
United Kingdom	1998	1998	*	*
Georgia	1991	1993		
Georgia	2004	2004	*	*
Georgia	2008	2008	*	*
Ghana	1966	1966	*	
Ghana	1981	1981	*	
Ghana	1983	1983	*	
Guinea	2000	2001	*	*
Gambia	1981	1981	*	
Guinea-Bissau	1998	1999	*	*
Guatemala	1954	1954	*	

Table A.4: Conflict List (continued)

Country	Start-year of conflict period	End-year of conflict period	Full sample	Employment sample
Guatemala	1963	1963	*	
Guatemala	1965	1995	*	
Croatia	1992	1993		
Croatia	1995	1995	*	*
Haiti	1989	1989	*	
Haiti	1991	1991	*	
Haiti	2004	2004	*	*
Indonesia	1950	1950		
Indonesia	1953	1953	*	
Indonesia	1958	1961	*	
Indonesia	1965	1965	*	
Indonesia	1967	1969	*	
Indonesia	1975	1992	*	
Indonesia	1997	2005	*	*
India	?	1951		
India	1956	1959	*	
India	1961	1971	*	
India	1979	?	*	
Iran	1966	1968	*	
Iran	1979	1988	*	
Iran	1990	1993	*	
Iran	1996	1997	*	*
Iran	1999	2001	*	*
Iran	2005	2011	*	*
Iraq	1958	1959	*	
Iraq	1961	1970	*	
Iraq	1973	1996	*	
Iraq	2004	?	*	*
Kenya	1982	1982	*	
Cambodia (Kampuchea)	?	1953		
Cambodia (Kampuchea)	1967	1975	*	
Cambodia (Kampuchea)	1978	1998	*	
Laos	1959	1961	*	
Laos	1963	1973	*	
Laos	1989	1990	*	
Lebanon	1958	1958	*	
Lebanon	1975	1976	*	
Lebanon	1982	1986	*	
Lebanon	1989	1990	*	

Table A.4: Conflict List (continued)

Country	Start-year of conflict period	End-year of conflict period	Full sample	Employment sample
Liberia	1980	1980	*	
Liberia	1989	1990	*	
Liberia	2000	2003	*	*
Libya	2011	2011	*	*
Sri Lanka	1971	1971	*	
Sri Lanka	1984	2001	*	
Sri Lanka	2003	2003	*	*
Sri Lanka	2005	2009	*	*
Lesotho	1998	1998	*	*
Morocco	?	1958		
Morocco	1971	1971	*	
Morocco	1975	1989	*	
Moldova	1992	1992	*	*
Madagascar (Malagasy)	1971	1971	*	
Mexiko	1994	1994	*	*
Mexiko	1996	1996	*	*
Macedonia, FYR	2001	2001	*	*
Mali	1990	1990	*	
Mali	1994	1994	*	*
Mali	2007	2009	*	*
Mali	2012	?	*	*
Myanmar (Burma)	?	2003		
Myanmar (Burma)	2005	?	*	*
Mozambique	1977	1992	*	
Mauritania	1975	1978	*	
Mauritania	2010	2011	*	*
Malaysia	?	1960		
Malaysia	1963	1966	*	
Malaysia	1974	1975	*	
Malaysia	1981	1981	*	
Niger	1991	1992	*	
Niger	1994	1995	*	*
Niger	1997	1997	*	*
Niger	2007	2008	*	*
Nigeria	1966	1970	*	
Nigeria	2004	2004	*	*
Nigeria	2009	2009	*	*
Nigeria	2011	?	*	*
Nicaragua	1977	1979		
Nicaragua	1982	1990	*	
Nepal	1960	1962	*	
Nepal	1996	2006	*	*

Table A.4: Conflict List (continued)

Country	Start-year of conflict period	End-year of conflict period	Full sample	Employment sample
Oman	1957	1957	*	
Oman	1969	1975	*	
Pakistan	1971	1971	*	
Pakistan	1974	1977	*	
Pakistan	1990	1990	*	
Pakistan	1995	1996	*	*
Pakistan	2004	?	*	*
Panama	1989	1989	*	
Peru	1965	1965	*	
Peru	1982	1999	*	
Peru	2007	2010	*	*
Philippines	?	1954		
Philippines	1969	?	*	
Papua New Guinea	1989	1990	*	
Papua New Guinea	1992	1996	*	*
Paraguay	1954	1954	*	
Paraguay	1989	1989	*	
Romania	1989	1989	*	
Russia (Soviet Union)	?	1950		
Russia (Soviet Union)	1990	1991	*	
Russia (Soviet Union)	1993	1996	*	*
Russia (Soviet Union)	1999	?	*	*
South Vietnam	1955	1964		
Rwanda	1990	1994	*	
Rwanda	1996	2002	*	*
Rwanda	2009	?	*	*
Saudi Arabia	1979	1979	*	
Sudan	1963	1972	*	
Sudan	1976	1976	*	
Sudan	1983	?	*	
Senegal	1990	1990	*	
Senegal	1992	1993	*	*
Senegal	1995	1995	*	*
Senegal	1997	1998	*	*
Senegal	2000	2001	*	*
Senegal	2003	2003	*	*
Senegal	2011	2011	*	*
Sierra Leone	1991	2001	*	
El Salvador	1972	1972	*	
El Salvadair	1979	1991	*	
Somalia	1982	1984	*	
Somalia	1986	1996	*	

Table A.4: Conflict List (continued)

Country	Start-year of conflict period	End-year of conflict period	Full sample	Employment sample
Somalia	2001	2002	*	*
Somalia	2006	?	*	*
Serbia (Yugoslavia)	1991	1991		
Serbia (Yugoslavia)	1998	1999	*	*
South Sudan	2011	?		
Suriname	1987	1987	*	
Syria	1966	1966	*	
Syria	1979	1982	*	
Syria	2011	?	*	*
Chad	1966	1972	*	
Chad	1976	1984	*	
Chad	1986	1987	*	
Chad	1989	1994	*	
Chad	1997	2003	*	*
Chad	2005	2010	*	*
Togo	1986	1986	*	
Thailand	1951	1951	*	
Thailand	1974	1982	*	
Thailand	2003	?	*	*
Tajikistan	1992	1996	*	*
Tajikistan	1998	1998	*	*
Tajikistan	2010	2011	*	*
Trinidad and Tobago	1990	1990	*	
Tunisia	?	1956		
Tunisia	1980	1980	*	
Turkey	1984	?	*	
Uganda	1971	1972	*	
Uganda	1974	1974	*	
Uganda	1979	1992	*	
Uganda	1994	2011	*	*
Uruguay	1972	1972	*	
United States of America	1950	1950		
United States of America	2001	2002	*	*
United States of America	2004	?	*	*
Uzbekistan	1999	2000	*	*
Uzbekistan	2004	2004	*	*
Venezuela	1962	1962	*	
Venezuela	1982	1982	*	
Venezuela	1992	1992	*	*

Table A.4: Conflict List (continued)

Country	Start-year of conflict period	End-year of conflict period	Full sample	Employment sample
Vietnam (South)	?	1975		
North Yemen	1962	1970		
North Yemen	1979	1982		
Yemen	1994	1994	*	*
Yemen	2009	?	*	*
South Yemen	?	1967		
South Yemen	1986	1986		
South Africa	1966	1988	*	
Zimbabwe (Rhodesia)	1967	1968	*	
Zimbabwe (Rhodesia)	1973	1979	*	

Notes: Start-year (end-year) refers to the first (last) year of a conflict period in which at least 25 battle-related-deaths occur given that there is no violent activity in the previous (subsequent) year of observation. A question mark for start-year indicates that the conflict period started before the first year of observation, while a question mark for end-year indicates that the conflict period was still ongoing in the last year of observation. The column *full sample* shows whether a conflict period is included in the benchmark estimation in model 1, table 1. In contrast, *employment sample* refers to the specifications including our unemployment variables that cover a shorter time horizon.

Table A.5: List of Excluded Outliers

Country	Year	$RYCS$	ΔUE_{tot}	Std. Residual	Case Description
Azerbaijan	2005	0.152	-0.1	7.974	Incident in the context of the enduring conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorno-Karabakh. Secession aspirations of the region are heavily supported by Armenian forces. Dominant cross-border dimension of conflict identified, national origin of recruits unclear.
Azerbaijan	2012	0.141	-0.2	7.85	See above.
Eritrea	1997	0.196	0	7.212	Internal conflict between government and opposition groups is dominated by interstate conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia.

Table A.5: List of Excluded Outliers (continued)

Country	Year	<i>RYCS</i>	ΔUE_{tot}	Std. Residual	Case Description
Georgia	2004	0.121	-1.1	7.696	Georgian-Ossetian conflict. Ossetian separatists are heavily supported by Russian forces. Dominant cross-border dimension identified, national origin of separatists unclear.
Georgia	2008	0.123	-0.3	8.846	Georgian-Ossetian conflict culminates in Russo-Georgian war. Interstate character of conflict.
Macedonia	2001	0.122	-0.2	15.251	Conflict between Macedonian government and Albanian minority taking place mainly in regions near the border with FR Yugoslavia (Kosovo). Internal tensions and a downturn in economic development are largely influenced by preceding Kosovo conflict.
FR Yugoslavia	1998	0.12	0.6	10.37	Kosovo war. Border lines and recruitment of Albanian and Serb militant groups not clear. Regional dimension of conflict dominates.
United States of America	2001	0.109	-0.2	6.347	Terrorist attacks by the Islamic terrorist group al-Qaeda. Recruited rebels are citizens of Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Egypt and Lebanon. International dimension of conflict dominates.

Center for Interdisciplinary Economics Discussion Papers

- DP-CIW 1/2011:** Die Gemeinschaft der Lehrenden und Lernenden: Festvortrag zur Promotionsfeier der Wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Fakultät am 24. November 2010 in der Aula des Schlosses
Alexander Dilger
January 2011
- DP-CIW 2/2011:** Plädoyer für eine problemorientierte, lerntheoretisch und fachlich fundierte ökonomische Bildung
Gerd-Jan Krol, Dirk Loerwald und Christian Müller
February 2011
- DP-CIW 3/2011:** Gefangen im Dilemma? Ein strategischer Ansatz der Wahl und Revolutionsteilnahme
Marie Möller
April 2011
- DP-CIW 4/2011:** Overconfidence and Team-Performance: An Analysis of NBA-Players' Self-Perception
Hannah Geyer, Hanke Wickhorst
April 2011
- DP-CIW 5/2011:** Kompetenzziele für das allgemein bildende Fach „Wirtschaft/Ökonomie“ in der Sekundarstufe I
AGOEB – Arbeitsgruppe Ökonomische Bildung
May 2011
- DP-CIW 6/2011:** Coping with Unpleasant Surprises in a Complex World: Is Rational Choice Possible in a World with Positive Information Costs?
Roger D. Congleton
June 2011
- DP-CIW 7/2011:** Warum der Baseler Ausschuss für Bankenaufsicht mit seinem antizyklischen Kapitalpuffer falsch liegt
Björn Ludwig
July 2011
- DP-CIW 8/2011:** Bestimmungsgründe für die Beschäftigung und Rekrutierung von Älteren sowie für das Angebot an altersspezifischen Personalmaßnahmen
Christian Lehmann
August 2011
- DP-CIW 9/2011:** Das „Bruttonationalglück“ als Leitlinie der Politik in Bhutan - eine ordnungspolitische Analyse
Tobias Pfaff
September 2011
- DP-CIW 10/2011:** Economic Voting and Economic Revolutionizing?
The Economics of Incumbency Changes in European Democracies and Revolutionary Events in the Arab World
Marie Möller
October 2011

- DP-CIW 11/2011:** Geschlechtsspezifische Verdienstunterschiede und Diskriminierung am Arbeitsmarkt
Nele Franz
 November 2011
- DP-CIW 1/2012:** Toward a More General Approach to Political Stability in Comparative Political Systems
Thomas Apolte
 January 2012
- DP-CIW 2/2012:** An Empirical Study of the Limits and Perspectives of Institutional Transfers
Marie Möller
 February 2012
- DP-CIW 3/2012:** Wie (un-) fair sind Ökonomen? Neue empirische Evidenz zur Marktbewertung und Rationalität
René Ruske, Johannes Suttner
 September 2012
- DP-CIW 1/2013:** Zur Ethik von Rankings im Hochschulwesen
 Eine Betrachtung aus ökonomischer Perspektive
Harry Müller
 February 2013
- DP-CIW 2/2013:** Which Qualifications Does a Minister of the German Federal Government Need to Be Reoccupied?
Katrin Scharfenkamp
 March 2013
- DP-CIW 3/2013:** Unkonventionelle Geldpolitik – Warum die Europäische Zentralbank ihre Unabhängigkeit nicht verloren hat
Carsten Schwäbe
 March 2013
- DP-CIW 4/2013:** Testing the Easterlin Hypothesis with Panel Data: The Dynamic Relationship Between Life Satisfaction and Economic Growth in Germany and in the UK
Tobias Pfaff, Johannes Hirata
 April 2013
- DP-CIW 5/2013:** Income Comparisons, Income Adaptation, and Life Satisfaction: How Robust Are Estimates from Survey Data?
Tobias Pfaff
 May 2013
- DP-CIW 6/2013:** The Supply of Democracy: Explaining Voluntary Democratic Transition
Thomas Apolte
 October 2013
- DP-CIW 1/2014:** Maternity Leave and its Consequences for Subsequent Careers in Germany
Nele Franz
 January 2014
- DP-CIW 2/2014:** Youth Bulges, Insurrections, and Politico-Economic Institutions
Thomas Apolte
 February 2014

- DP-CIW 3/2014:** Sensitivity of Economists during Market Allocation
Johannes R. Suttner
March 2014
- DP-CIW 1/2015:** Abused Rebels and Winning Coalitions: Regime Change under the Pressure of Revolutions
Thomas Apolte
February 2015
- DP-CIW 2/2015:** Gordon Tullock's Theory of Dictatorship and Revolution
Thomas Apolte
March 2015

University of Münster
CIW – Center for Interdisciplinary Economics
Scharnhorststrasse 100
D-48151 Münster
phone: +49-251/83-25329
fax: +49-251/83-28429
www.wiwi.uni-muenster.de/ciw