

The Democracy Alarm

Research and political reasoning



Democratic backsliding, conceptual validity, aggregation and institutional implementation

Created by Yoav Duman

Purpose

The module develops concept-to-indicator reasoning, document-based causal conclusion, transparent aggregation and justified revision. Students must preserve a positive component finding while distinguishing an implemented loss, measurement-process change and unknown electoral consequences. The charter and independent municipal transfer require operational choices that someone else could apply. The real articles inform the conclusion; fictional local cases do not settle their worldwide dispute. Module authorship: Yoav Duman.

Prepare the assignment

Use the simplified explanations inside the activity during class. The primary articles and further reading are optional for students. Give students time to read, ask questions and return to a passage while answering. Keep the primary sources available for your own checks.

Read the Bellara, charter and municipal keys. Separate learner materials from later records and instructor solutions. Decide the commitment and reveal points so students generate an account, rival and prediction before learning the follow-up.

Check Class mode and the source, data, decision, transfer, workspace and justification settings. Preserve the required three-indicator charter, two-rule applications, unit/weight/time card and unfamiliar inquiry. State which optional organizers or frontier work are assigned.

Test saving, backup restoration and print/export on the likely devices. Confirm Canvas's requested file format and any separately configured hosted-class workflow. Plan a continuity route if browser storage is unavailable.

Prepare discussion around competing justified concepts and rules rather than a preferred regime label. Keep personal and family political views private. Plan further work after the core seminar and pilot actual time for reading, operational design, calculations and export.

A first class session with in-app reading

This suggested first class session starts with the in-app explanations. No advance reading is required. It is a planning example, not a measured completion time; use further sessions for the rest of the inquiry.

Phase	Min	Teaching move
Opening question	5	Begin from the fictional notice and save a first idea. No advance reading is assumed.
Learn from the explanations	15	Read the two in-app explanations together. Ask students to say in their own words what was compared, what was found and one limit. Use the vocabulary help.
First evidence inquiry	15	Write an explanation and alternative, predict a new observation, then inspect the next record. Return to the explanations when needed.
Discuss the analysis	10	Compare evidence and reasons in pairs or small groups. Resolve unclear instructions before evaluating the argument.
Save and plan continuation	5	Save progress and a backup. Continue remaining data, decision, new-case and final-record tasks in further sessions.

Continue the complete inquiry

Continue the full inquiry from the saved stopping point. Read explanations during the activity whenever needed. Keep the data, decision, new-case prediction and reasoned revision, allowing time for questions and discussion. No human student completion time has been measured.

Teaching moves

Ask students to name a condition, actor, authority, action and affected opportunity, with dates. Mark each link as observed or predicted. A proposal, a court order, compliance and usable access are distinct records.

Require two political processes for the same outcome and a different predicted observation. Broad labels such as 'bias' or 'pressure' need an actor, operation and timing. Compatible processes can both contribute.

Make a partner apply each indicator using the published categories or threshold. Check exactly three concept-linked indicators, current evidence, nonnegative weights with positive total, scale, cutoffs and explicit unknown/carry-forward policies.

Separate source bundle, written question, interpretation and aggregation in rating disputes. Little and Meng favor a changing-judgment account without measuring its contribution; Knutsen and colleagues test specified pessimism patterns without clearing every possible bias.

When reviewing the municipal test, ask what officials knew before acting, which offices enter the comparison and why. Require three pre-action variables, a negative/control observation and a selection concern. Preserve lawful access; future-election outcomes remain unmeasured.

Respond to misconceptions

An easily reproduced measure is valid, while an expert judgment is invented.

Reproducibility concerns agreement about a measurement procedure; validity concerns coverage of the chosen concept. Ask what each measure captures, misses and tests. Expert questions, uncertainty and bias checks also need scrutiny.

No turnover proves authoritarianism, or earlier turnover proves every present protection is safe.

MC-02 supplies competition and popularity alongside repeated victories. Earlier transfers in other cases do not authenticate current access or post-amendment counting. Require dated evidence for the specified component.

An unchanged written question means every lower score was caused by common expert pessimism.

In MC-04, K and M retain both bundles and scores; L adds information and changes score. This small pattern does not identify a common standards shift or eliminate it. Ask for blind fixed-source re-ratings and a larger sample.

A population-weighted improvement means every resident gained democratic protection.

The exercise weights national scores by residents. It does not measure individual experience or erase Country A's decline. Both means require the stipulated comparability of score points and further component or subgroup evidence.

No grant was withheld, so sanctions cannot explain compliance and all lost opportunities were recovered.

Distinguish anticipated costs from imposed costs, and notice from deadline. NT-04 does not identify prior private expectations; later issuance does not restore missed dates or establish who participated in replacement events.

Debrief questions

Which authenticated Bellara component finding remains after you correct or defend a specific earlier statement?

Which procedure or finding from each article changes your conclusion, and what does neither article establish about this local case?

Could another reader reproduce each of your three indicators and both rules, including unknown and older evidence?

Which same inputs make your rules disagree, and which defended concept or priority explains that disagreement?

What does each numerical summary count, what comparability assumption does it require, and what protection does it leave invisible?

How did the municipal chronology change your explanation or warning, and what pre-action record would separate the remaining accounts?

Assessment within six scoring homes

Score six distinct criteria once each, 0–3, for a maximum of 18: Source contribution; Positive warranted finding; For the same result rival discrimination; Lawful feasible decision; Numerical interpretation; Unfamiliar transfer. Zero is missing or materially inaccurate, one is emerging, two is developed, and three is convincing, specific and bounded. Record supporting evidence and a reason for each score. Within Numerical interpretation, inspect both the operational charter and the unit/base/calculation/political-meaning work without creating separate scores. Source notes reused in the brief remain the same source product, and the complete municipal inquiry is scored once under transfer. Detailed task descriptors support feedback; word floors, completed cells and fluent caution do not establish mastery. Political agreement, grammar, help use and a change of mind are not criteria. Reasoned retention can receive full credit.

Source contribution

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: sourceA/sourceB/crossInference; deliberately reused evidenceA/evidenceB source notes are the same evidence, not a second award. Check a real procedure/finding from each

paper and how it changes one inference. Require accurate source units, periods and limits; distinguish the favored changing-judgment explanation from a measured bias contribution and a tested pessimism pattern from every possible bias. Local case facts do not settle a worldwide trend. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: sourceA/sourceB/crossInference; deliberately reused evidenceA/evidenceB source notes are the same evidence, not a second award. Check a real procedure/finding from each paper and how it changes one inference. Require accurate source units, periods and limits; distinguish the favored changing-judgment explanation from a measured bias contribution and a tested pessimism pattern from every possible bias. Local case facts do not settle a worldwide trend. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Positive warranted finding

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: the core provisional and post-follow-up Bellara actor-authority-action-access account, document reasons and final revised core inference. Assess the stated condition and dates, observed versus predicted links and local/global scope. Require an authenticated positive component finding and correction or defense of a specific earlier statement, retaining the initial account as the comparison. A supported retention can earn full credit; generalized caution cannot replace a finding. Source reconstruction is scored under Source contribution, and calculations/operational charter under Numerical interpretation. Fictional anonymous calibration, unrelated library case: Response A, 'A new evening-hours rule proves nobody can use the library anymore,' ignores remaining daytime access and unobserved attendance. Response B, 'The June register establishes evening access loss while daytime access remains; attendance consequences are still unmeasured,' preserves a positive finding and bounds the claim. These invented practice snippets are not human submissions or Bellara model answers. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: the core provisional and post-follow-up Bellara actor-authority-action-access account, document reasons and final revised core inference. Assess the stated condition and dates, observed versus predicted links and local/global scope. Require an authenticated positive

component finding and correction or defense of a specific earlier statement, retaining the initial account as the comparison. A supported retention can earn full credit; generalized caution cannot replace a finding. Source reconstruction is scored under Source contribution, and calculations/operational charter under Numerical interpretation. Fictional anonymous calibration, unrelated library case: Response A, 'A new evening-hours rule proves nobody can use the library anymore,' ignores remaining daytime access and unobserved attendance. Response B, 'The June register establishes evening access loss while daytime access remains; attendance consequences are still unmeasured,' preserves a positive finding and bounds the claim. These invented practice snippets are not human submissions or Bellara model answers. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Same-outcome rival discrimination

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: core claim/rival/prediction, revised core comparison, next-study design and comparison/ruling rationales. Require two credible processes for one defined outcome, a differing link or timing prediction, a pre-action comparison and a possible confounder. A second pressure label without a differing observation is insufficient; compatible causes may coexist. Judge what record could favor or weaken each account. Municipal rival/test work is scored once under Unfamiliar transfer, not again here. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: core claim/rival/prediction, revised core comparison, next-study design and comparison/ruling rationales. Require two credible processes for one defined outcome, a differing link or timing prediction, a pre-action comparison and a possible confounder. A second pressure label without a differing observation is insufficient; compatible causes may coexist. Judge what record could favor or weaken each account. Municipal rival/test work is scored once under Unfamiliar transfer, not again here. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Lawful feasible decision

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: choice/defense public action and resource allocation. Check actual council powers, fictional work + independent-checking hours ≤ 60 , deferred work, the strongest feasible alternative, safeguards and a specific priority-revision trigger. Election timing or irreversibility must not be invented. Any justified project, rule or index deferral can earn credit; source reconstruction and operational measurement have separate scoring homes. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: choice/defense public action and resource allocation. Check actual council powers, fictional work + independent-checking hours ≤ 60 , deferred work, the strongest feasible alternative, safeguards and a specific priority-revision trigger. Election timing or irreversibility must not be invented. Any justified project, rule or index deferral can earn credit; source reconstruction and operational measurement have separate scoring homes. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Numerical interpretation

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: three-indicator charter, two-rule applications, optional sensitivity notes, unit/weight/time card, data explanation and data-infer/data-design rationales. Inspect each subpart within this single scoring home: exactly three concept-linked signs with actual categories/pass thresholds, dated evidence and errors; nonnegative weights with positive total; common score scale, compensatory equation/result cutoff, necessary prerequisite/cutoff, and an explicit unknown/carry-forward policy; reproducible same-input differing results with any hypothetical components labeled fictional. Then check requested unit, included population, time, weight, numerator/base, arithmetic and representation. Score arithmetic/base accuracy and political meaning separately within this criterion; require the comparability assumption, limits of national-score/resident/request summaries and a needed subgroup/component observation. Respect any defended concept/cutoff/rule. Fluent caution or correct arithmetic alone is insufficient; project feasibility is scored under

Lawful feasible decision. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: three-indicator charter, two-rule applications, optional sensitivity notes, unit/weight/time card, data explanation and data-infer/data-design rationales. Inspect each subpart within this single scoring home: exactly three concept-linked signs with actual categories/pass thresholds, dated evidence and errors; nonnegative weights with positive total; common score scale, compensatory equation/result cutoff, necessary prerequisite/cutoff, and an explicit unknown/carry-forward policy; reproducible same-input differing results with any hypothetical components labeled fictional. Then check requested unit, included population, time, weight, numerator/base, arithmetic and representation. Score arithmetic/base accuracy and political meaning separately within this criterion; require the comparability assumption, limits of national-score/resident/request summaries and a needed subgroup/component observation. Respect any defended concept/cutoff/rule. Fluent caution or correct arithmetic alone is insufficient; project feasibility is scored under Lawful feasible decision. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Unfamiliar transfer

0 Missing or materially incorrect reasoning for this criterion.

1 A relevant response is present, but a key comparison, link, unit or institutional constraint remains unsupported.

2 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: committed municipal mechanism/rival/prediction, two-city rule lines, late revision and feasible test. Score this product once: generated actors/institution/actions, differing same-outcome link/timing predictions, exact notice/deadline chronology, prior expectations and anticipated costs, full issuance versus missed opportunities, unknown online overlap and future election outcomes, and a reasoned warning/rule revision for each city. Require a rights-preserving pre-action test with prior-knowledge evidence, three comparison variables, a negative/control observation and a selection process tied to pressure and compliance. Both studies must inform the inquiry without estimating this fictional effect. Retain an authenticated time-specific finding; later certification does not identify prior beliefs or force one motive. Do not award the same transfer again under core rival, source or positive-finding criteria. The argument is mostly correct and bounded; an important uncertainty or feasible rival needs development.

3 Human scoring: use the shared 0–3 rubric, equal weight; six distinct criteria total 18 possible points. Record evidence and a reason, not a completion mark. Home: committed municipal mechanism/rival/prediction, two-city rule lines, late revision and feasible test.

Score this product once: generated actors/institution/actions, differing same-outcome link/timing predictions, exact notice/deadline chronology, prior expectations and anticipated costs, full issuance versus missed opportunities, unknown online overlap and future election outcomes, and a reasoned warning/rule revision for each city. Require a rights-preserving pre-action test with prior-knowledge evidence, three comparison variables, a negative/control observation and a selection process tied to pressure and compliance. Both studies must inform the inquiry without estimating this fictional effect. Retain an authenticated time-specific finding; later certification does not identify prior beliefs or force one motive. Do not award the same transfer again under core rival, source or positive-finding criteria. The account uses specific evidence, distinguishes a credible rival or limit, and defends a feasible conclusion without overclaiming.

Worked data and case interpretation

Instructor reference. Keep these calculations and case interpretations separate from learner commitments until the corresponding work has been attempted. All local case data and added teaching examples are fictional; article findings retain their stated sources, units and uncertainty.

Country changes on the stipulated common scale

Records

Fictional data workshop: fixed guide, constant borders and fixed population weights; 2020 to 2026. A: 80 to 60, population 20 million; B: 50 to 55, 100 million; C: 70 to 70, 100 million.

Calculation

A: $60 - 80 = -20$ score points. B: $55 - 50 = +5$ score points. C: $70 - 70 = 0$ score points. Equal-country mean change = $(-20 + 5 + 0)/3 = -5$ score points.

Interpretation

This gives each country one equal weight. The common score-point meaning is a teaching assumption that a real index would need to defend; these are not scores from either article.

Population-weighted national-score change

Records

The same three-country exercise, with population weights held constant across both years.

Calculation

Total weight = $20+100+100 = 220$ million. Weighted change = $(20 \times -20 + 100 \times 5 + 100 \times 0)/220 = 100/220 \approx +0.4545$ score points. Weighted 2020 mean = $13,600/220 \approx 61.8182$; weighted 2026 mean = $13,700/220 \approx 62.2727$.

Interpretation

The opposite signs of the two means are arithmetically consistent because they answer different questions. The resident-weighted national average is not a survey of each resident's rights and does not remove A's recorded decline.

Residents grouped by country direction

Records

Only fictional Country A declines in the three-country dataset.

Calculation

Share of countries declining = $1/3 \approx 33.33\%$. Share of residents living in a declining country = $20/220 \times 100 \approx 9.09\%$.

Interpretation

The first numerator counts countries; the second counts residents grouped by national direction. Neither is the share of people whose own experience worsened. Require a component or subgroup observation for that stronger claim.

Office-week rates and changing bases

Records

Independent fictional graph practice: Harbor and Ridge requests received 1–7 and 8–14 April 2026; timely means completed within seven days. Harbor: 18 of 30, then 24 of 60. Ridge: 30 of 50, then 27 of 30.

Calculation

Harbor: $18/30 = 60\%$; $24/60 = 40\%$; change -20 percentage points despite six more timely requests. Relative share change = $(40-60)/60 \times 100 \approx -33.33\%$. Ridge: $30/50 = 60\%$; $27/30 = 90\%$; change $+30$ percentage points despite three fewer timely requests.

Interpretation

Use each office-week's full request base. Requests are not unique people; requester overlap and case complexity are unknown. Counts and within-group rates answer different questions, and these records do not identify a cause or a political-rights effect.

Verification projects within the resource limit

Records

Measurement-charter instructions: fictional 60 staff-hours before publication and one six-week verification project.

Calculation

Permit audit: 45 work + 15 independent checking = 60 hours. Register audit: 40+20 = 60 hours. Unchanged-rubric archive audit: 50+10 = 60 hours. Any pair exceeds the 60-hour allowance.

Interpretation

Each offered project is feasible on the stipulated resource arithmetic. Students must choose and defend informational value against an equally costed alternative and state left for later work. The council may publish, request voluntary records and correct reports; it cannot compel legal reform or establish future-election effects through these projects.

Conditional rule-disagreement illustration

Records

MC-03 authenticates removal of one quarter of the stipulated baseline adult electorate. This instructor-only example adds hypothetical current organizing and counting values that the supplied record does not establish.

Calculation

Eligibility share = $100\% - 25\% = 75\%$. For an explicitly hypothetical three-indicator profile [eligibility 75, organizing 100, counting 100], use a common 0–100 scale and equal weights: $(75+100+100)/3 \approx 91.67$. A compensatory pass cutoff of 90 passes; a necessary eligibility prerequisite of 100 fails.

Interpretation

These cutoffs are an illustration of declared choices, not preferred module thresholds. The two added values are fictional stipulations, not authenticated Celyna observations. Without such current evidence, apply the declared unknown policy rather than silently filling components; for example, suspend the overall classification while reporting the authenticated eligibility loss.

Unchanged-question archive arithmetic

Records

MC-04's fictional 0–4 information-access question: K 4 to 4 on the same bundle; L 3 to 2 with new information; M 2 to 2 on the same bundle.

Calculation

Release mean: $(4+3+2)/3 = 3$, then $(4+2+2)/3 = 8/3 \approx 2.67$; mean change = $-1/3$ item points. All of this small archive's score change is in L.

Interpretation

The calculation does not identify a common synchronized interpretation shift: L's evidence changes, while the fixed-bundle files do not change score. It also cannot rule out all standards drift or estimate global prevalence. Do not call these percentages, V-Dem data or a national regime score.

Review the workspace products

Your three operational indicators

Require exactly three indicators mapped to the student's stated concept and electorate. Each needs an observable sign, actual complete categories or pass threshold, dated evidence, possible errors and a nonnegative intended weight; the total weight must be positive. Test whether another reader could apply the instrument. Inspect coverage, scale comparability and unknown components. Judge this charter within Numerical interpretation; numeric cell completion does not validate the concept.

Two rules applied to dated cases

Check the compensatory equation, score scale, weight normalization and pass cutoff, then the necessary prerequisite and threshold. Both need explicit unknown and carry-forward policies. Require reproducible applications to Aster, Brin and Celyna and one demonstrated same-input disagreement, with all added values labeled hypothetical. An older transfer does not authenticate current post-amendment counting or accepted defeat. Preserve the observed exclusion even if the aggregate is suspended. Any defensible rule or cutoff can earn credit.

Unit, weight, time and calculation card

Read each operation with its population, dates, unit, numerator, denominator and weight. Check fixed 2020/2026 population weights and the score-point comparability assumption in the country exercise; check office-week request bases in the new display. Distinguish score points, percentage points and relative change. Assess correct arithmetic and political meaning as separate subparts of Numerical interpretation, including an omitted subgroup/component and the record needed for a stronger conclusion.

All seven evidence check keys

Which observation tests an account?

Check comparison. Which additional record set best separates these two accounts of the same stable electoral outcome?

Supported option A: Compare dated volunteer and outreach records before/after restrictions across places matched on prior organizing and access, while also recording online participation and other changes.

This records the proposed outreach link and the simultaneous online channel on a common time line with pre-action comparisons. Different patterns could favor the accounts, although restrictions, outreach and online adoption may still be selected rather than assigned.

Rationale to inspect: Use the fictional record to explain which link and timing comparison your choice observes. State a pre-action difference or simultaneous change that could still confound the comparison.

Fictional mechanism practice. The papers motivate the question; this is not a result estimated by either study.

Which public question does the mean serve?

Check scope. Which interpretation respects the different questions these averages answer?

Supported option C: Both summaries describe valid patterns: countries' changes balance equally, while the loss occurs where many more people live.

The two weighting rules summarize the same country scores for different questions. Keep country-level scores, residents grouped by those scores and individual experiences separate.

Invented regional example. Both core articles discuss population weights; neither average alone describes each resident.

Which record distinguishes authority from access?

Check transfer. Which evidence is needed to establish that this intervention restored the recorded information access?

Supported option D: A dated release record and evidence that requesters could actually obtain the files covered by the order.

The order establishes an obligation; release and usable access establish the implementation outcome. Keep their dates separate and assess the files the order covers.

Fictional information-access comparison. No published effect is implied.

What would challenge the inferential bridge?

Check ruling. Which finding would most directly challenge a simple conclusion from unchanged turnover to unchanged democratic conditions?

Supported option B: Independent records show lost organizing access, comparable records show increased opposition outreach, and election outcomes remain stable.

Authenticated access loss and a plausible measured offset challenge the simple inferential link. They preserve stable turnover as an observation while leaving causal effect size and global prevalence unestablished.

Rationale to inspect: Identify the institutional and electoral observations your choice supplies. Explain the particular conclusion they bear on and a conclusion about the wider dispute they cannot establish.

Reconstruction of the published argument with a fictional counterexample; not a global estimate.

Calculate both summaries

Check data-read. Which pair follows from the same country changes?

Supported option B: Equal-country change -5 ; population-weighted change about $+0.45$.

The country mean is $(-20+5+0)/3$. The weighted mean is $(20 \times -20 + 100 \times 5 + 100 \times 0)/220$, about $+0.45$ score points.

The display is a teaching exercise, not an estimate from either published paper.

Change the question and the denominator

Check data-infer. An editor asks what share of the listed residents lived in a country whose recorded score decreased. Which calculation answers that question?

Supported option D: About 9.1%, from 20 million out of 220 million residents.

Only A has a lower later score. Its 20 million residents are $20/220 \approx 9.1\%$ of the listed population. This groups people by their country's score direction; it does not measure their personal satisfaction or prove identical experiences.

Rationale to inspect: Write the numerator group and denominator in residents, show the calculation, and distinguish grouping by a country's score direction from a measured individual experience.

The display is a teaching exercise, not an estimate from either published paper.

Choose the axis and changing base

Check data-design. Which display and description answers that question with the correct office, base and unit?

Supported option C: A percent axis shows Harbor at 60% then 40%: report a 20 percentage-point fall using each week's total requests.

Harbor's shares are $18/30=60\%$ and $24/60=40\%$. Later minus earlier is -20 percentage points. The base is all requests in that office-week; no requester-level or causal rights finding follows.

Rationale to inspect: Name the axis unit and each relevant denominator. Show Harbor's two fractions and later-minus-earlier change, and explain why a count or another office's change would answer a different question.

Additional fictional teaching display; not data or an estimate from either article.

Instructor controls and the 5907 panel

Open Instructor controls and enter 5907 for this activity. This opens the local workbench, including task keys and check answers. To manage online classes, connect the saving service and enter 5907 again in the server workbench. Canvas remains a separate login and assignment.

Set the default Class or Fun route and which routes are available. Assignment switches cover research notes, political decision, data, unfamiliar transfer, structured workspaces, written justifications, the representation check and optional frontier availability or requirement. Select full or core response guidance; choose unlimited retries or first recorded answers, and feedback after submission or on request. Method hints, unrelated worked examples, badges and deliberate note reuse can also be assigned.

Save and export the assignment settings, or import a compatible settings file and inspect the staged changes before saving. Learner preferences include reading size, high contrast, reduced motion, art visibility and guided responses. Settings, learner work and display preferences are separate records.

Review the six human criteria and task key separately from completion. Load the learner record or an explicitly submitted snapshot to record a score and evidence for each criterion; do not treat word floors, mechanical checks or supported factual choices as a semantic grade.

The private instructor recovery key is separate from 5907; use it to reopen your owned classes. Instructor sessions and class ownership remain isolated. The server workbench can save defaults, create owned classes, update assignment switches and view explicitly

submitted snapshots. Private personal drafts are not silently turned into submissions. Keep local progress and settings backups as well.

Private drafts consent and submission

Online saving is optional. Connecting to a saving service does not upload or submit the device draft. Use Save online personal draft only when you want to create or update that personal copy; keep its private recovery key and your local JSON backup.

A personal online draft is not an instructor submission. To submit through a configured hosted class, find the class with its student submission code, review the destination, apply the assignment switches if requested, complete the Class record and save the current version online. Tick the explicit consent box and use Submit this response snapshot.

Submission sends that version to the identified class. Later edits stay personal until you explicitly submit again. This hosted-class route is separate from the Canvas assignment and its upload confirmation.

Device backups and Canvas

Keep compatible progress JSON and settings backups. A readable TXT or PDF export supports review; the JSON preserves continued work. Saving in the player, saving a personal online draft and explicitly submitting to a hosted class are different actions. Canvas remains a separate assignment upload; verify its requested format and submission receipt.

Research sources

Andrew T. Little and Anne Meng (2024). Measuring Democratic Backsliding. PS: Political Science & Politics. 57(2): 149–161 · DOI 10.1017/S104909652300063X

[Complete primary text](#)

Carl Henrik Knutsen, Kyle L. Marquardt, Brigitte Seim, Michael Coppedge, Amanda B. Edgell, Juraj Medzihorsky, Daniel Pemstein, Jan Teorell, John Gerring, and Staffan I. Lindberg (2024). Conceptual and Measurement Issues in Assessing Democratic Backsliding. PS: Political Science & Politics. 57(2): 162–177 · DOI 10.1017/S104909652300077X

[Complete primary text](#)