

**POLS620 - Core Seminar in Comparative Politics  
Fall 2004**

Dr. Michelle Taylor-Robinson  
Thursdays 9:00-11:50  
ALLN 2064

Office hours: T/Th 2-3 & by appt.  
845-2674, ALLN 2104  
e339mt@polisci.tamu.edu

**Course description:**

This course is designed to introduce various methods for conducting research in comparative politics, and consider how to deal with the challenges of conducting comparative research. We will also explore these approaches as they have been used in various substantive research areas that have occupied the interest of comparativists in the past or present. This course has been described as a "meat-and-potatoes offering for students of comparative politics" and as "boot camp for the comparative sub-field." For this reason the reading load is heavy as we have much to cover to delve into the methodological concerns that underlay the comparative field as well as to even begin to explore some of the substantive interests of the field.

This course is not intended to provide definitive coverage of all the literature on a particular topic, as would a course with a particular topical emphasis. It also is not possible to even touch on all the topics that are currently important in the comparative field. Instead, a small number of substantive topics have been chosen which will be used to illustrate the various methods of comparative research, how the topic evolved over time, and the pros and cons of different methods in terms of their ability to build a body of knowledge.

By the end of the semester, students should be familiar with the terminology, methods, problems, and most-sited classic literature of comparative politics. Such understanding is essential. To be an excellent comparative political scientist, you must be able to think systematically about what theoretical approach you are pursuing, to compare your approach (at least implicitly) with the other main approaches in the field, and to think about alternative hypotheses that derive from the competing approaches. This does not mean that you must settle on one theoretical approach that you will use for the rest of your career, but rather that you should be able to identify different approaches and reflect on how they would address the problem you are analyzing.

**Course requirements:**

- 20% - Leading the seminar discussion 2 times, for which you will have to turn in a critical review of the required readings (plus some of the suggested further readings of your choosing) and discussion points in advance. The literature summary and evaluation should be 3-5 pages in length (double spaced) plus a bibliography and list of discussion points (see further instructions at end of syllabus). The essay and your discussion points must be e-mailed to your professor by 10am on Tuesday. The (possibly revised) essay and list of discussion points must be e-mailed to your professor and to all the members of the class by noon on Wednesday. In class, the discussion leader will present the readings briefly, as well as their comments and questions for class discussion.
- 20% - participation in seminar discussions. This means that every student must engage in the discussion of the readings every week. Remember that it is easier to speak throughout the course if you start speaking early. All students are expected to read the required readings, as well as the critical review essay and discussion points prepared by the week's discussion leader, before class.
- 30% - research design essay. After reading works from a particular topic of interest in the comparative politics literature, this essay explores how different research designs contribute to the cumulation of knowledge on that topic. This essay must include 3

different types of research designs (e.g., large N statistical, small N comparison, single country study, experimental) in the literature presented, preferably utilizing more than one example from the selected literature of each type of research design. In addition to assessing the contributions each type of research makes to overall knowledge in the field, explain how the utilization of different research designs evolved in the field and why. The paper should be 8-9 pages in length (double spaced), plus a bibliography. Consult with your professor before choosing a topic. **All students must have selected their paper topic by Oct.7. Papers are due on Oct.28 in class.**

- 30% - literature review essay providing an *extensive* review of the literature on a particular area of interest within comparative politics. After reading deeply in one area, you should analyze the state of the literature in that field. This literature review essay should not be a simple annotated bibliography. Rather, you should discuss the major unanswered questions, the major misconceptions, the major advances, the major controversies in the field, and you should end your paper with a short discussion of what should be done next in this field. Emphasis in this paper is on the literature review and on an original synthesis and interpretation; it should not involve original data analysis or research. The literature review should be extensive, showing that you have mastered a large body of literature. Most importantly, your essay should then integrate this large body of readings, making intellectual sense not only of single pieces at a time, but of a whole literature. Your review should therefore cover more than only the current research on a topic; rather you should delve into the historical development of research in the area, discuss how and why it developed, and where it should go next. The paper should be 8-9 pages in length (double spaced), plus a bibliography. Consult with your professor before choosing a topic. **All students must have selected their paper topic by Nov.4. Papers are due on Dec.9 by noon.**

#### **Course schedule:**

Sept. 2 NO CLASS – American Political Science Association meetings

Sept. 9 Part 1: organizing the course (sign up for weeks to lead discussion, discuss course requirements)  
Part 2: History of the Comparative Politics field  
Part 3: Early attempts at global theory: systems theory, structural-functionalism, and political development

#### Required readings:

Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (chapters 1 & 13) (also 1965 and 1989 editions)

Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba (eds.). 1980. *The Civic Culture Revisited*. Boston: Little, Brown. (chapter by Verba pp.394-409)

Easton, David. 1957. "An Approach to the Analysis of Political Systems." *World Politics* 9: 383-400.

Flanigan, William and Edmin Fogelman. 1967. "Functional Analysis." In James C. Charlesworth (ed.). *Contemporary Political Analysis*. New York: Free Press. (pp.72-85)

Needler, Martin C. 1968. "Political Development and Socioeconomic Development: The Case of Latin America." *American Political Science Review* 62: 889-897.

Przeworski, Adam and Fernando Limongi. 1997. "Modernization: Theories and Facts." *World Politics* 49: 155-183.

Wiarda, Howard J. 1991. "Comparative Politics: Past and Present." In Howard J. Wiarda (ed.). *New Directions in Comparative Politics*. (rev.ed.) Boulder, CO: Westview. (pp.3-30)

Verba, Sidney. 1991. "Comparative Politics: Where Have We Been, Where Are We Going?" In Howard J. Wiarda (ed.). *New Directions in Comparative Politics*. (rev.ed.) Boulder, CO: Westview. (pp.31-42)

Suggested additional readings:

Almond, Gabriel A. 1960. "Introduction: A Functional Approach to Comparative Politics." In James S. Coleman and Gabriel Almond (eds.). *The Politics of Developing Areas*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (pp.3-64)

Almond, Gabriel A. and G. Bingham Powell, Jr. 1966. *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach*. Boston: Little, Brown. [Also published in 1978 as *Comparative Politics: System, Process, and Policy*. (2nd.ed.)]

Apter, David E. 1987. *Rethinking Development: Modernization, Dependency, and Postmodern Politics*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Arat, Zehra F. 1988. "Democracy and Economic Development: Modernization Theory Revisited." *Comparative Politics* 21: 21-36.

"'Area Studies' and the Discipline." 2001. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34: 787-811. (articles by Valerie Bunce, Rachel Dubin, John Harbeson, Goran Hyden, Michael C. Hudson, Peter J. Katzenstein, Cynthia McClintock, Guillermo O'Donnell, and Lucian Pye)

Bates, Robert. 1997. "Area Studies and the Discipline: A Useful Controversy?" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30: 166-169.

Chilcote, Ronald H. 1984. *Theories of Development and Underdevelopment*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

DeSchweinitz, Karl. Jr. 1970. "Growth, Development, and Political Modernization." *World Politics* 22(4): 518-540.

Deutsch, Karl. 1985. "The Systems Theory Approach as a Basis for Comparative Analysis." *International Social Science Journal* 37: 5-18.

Dogan, Mattei and Dominique Pelassy. 1990. *How to Compare Nations: Strategies in Comparative Politics*. (2nd.ed.). Chatham, NJ: Chatham House (chapters 1&2)

Elkins, D.J. and Richard Simeon. 1979. "A Cause in Search of its Effect, or What Does Political Culture Explain?" *Comparative Politics* 11: 127-144.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1968. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. (pp.1-92, 344-461)

Huntington, Samuel P. 1971. "The Change to Change: Modernization, Development, and Politics." *Comparative Politics* 3: 283-322.

Kaufman, Robert R. 1974. "The Patron-Client concept and Macro-Politics: Prospects and Problems." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(3): 284-308.

Laitin, David D. 1995. "Disciplining Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 89: 454-456.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1960. *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday. (chapter 2) (also 1963)

Mayer, Lawrence C. 1983. "Practicing What We Preach: Comparative Politics in the 1980s." *Comparative Political Studies* 16: 173-194.

Pye, Lucian W. 1965. "The Concept of Political Development." *American Academy of Political and Social Science* vol.358.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 1991. "Different Methods -- Contradictory Results?: Research on Development and Democracy." In Charles C. Ragin (ed.). *Issues and Alternatives in Comparative Social Research*. Leiden: E.J.Brill.

Sigelman, Lee and George Gabois. 1983. "Contemporary Comparative Politics: An Inventory and Assessment." *Comparative Political Studies* 16: 275-305

Winham, Gilbert R. 1970. "Political Development and Lerner's Theory: Further Test of the Causal Model." *American Political Science Review* 64: 810-818.

### **Part I: Methodological questions**

Sept. 16 The research design debate: experimental, statistical, comparative method, case study, rational choice

(NOTE - Rosh Hashanah - Sept. 16)

#### Required readings:

Collier, David. 1993. "The Comparative Method." In Ada W. Finifter (ed.). *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*. Washington D.C.: APSA. (pp.105-120)

Frendreis, John P. 1983. "Explanation of Variation and Detection of Covariation: The Purpose and Logic of Comparative Analysis." *Comparative Political Studies* 16: 255-272.

Geddes, Barbara. 1995. "Uses and Limitations of Rational Choice." In Peter H. Smith (ed.). *Latin America in Comparative Perspective: New Approaches to Methods and Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Westview. (pp.81-108)

Levi, Margaret. 1997. "A Model, a Method, and a Map: Rational Choice in Comparative and Historical Analysis." In Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman (eds.). *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (pp.19-41)

Lijphart, Arend. 1975. "The Comparable Cases Strategy in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 8: 158-177.

Meckstroth, Theodore. 1975. "Most Different Systems and Most Similar Systems." *Comparative Political Studies* 8: 132-157.

Przeworski, Adam and Henry Teune. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: Wiley Interscience (chapters 1 & 2)

Suggested additional readings:

Alt, James E. and Kenneth A. Shepsle (eds.). 1990. *Perspectives on Positive Political Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collier, David. 1991. "The Comparative Method: Two Decades of Change." In Dankwart A. Rustow and Kenneth Paul Erickson (eds.). *Comparative Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives*. New York: HarperCollins. (pp.7-31).

Collier, David. 1998. "Comparative Method in the 1990s." *APSA-CP* (Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section in Comparative Politics) 9: 1-2, 4-5.

Cook, Karen S. and Margaret Levi (eds.). 1990. *The Limits of Rationality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dogan, Mattei and Dominique Pelassy. 1990. *How to Compare Nations: Strategies in Comparative Politics*. (2nd.ed.). Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

Geddes, Barbara. 2003. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Holt, Robert T. and John E. Turner. 1970. "The Methodology of Comparative Research." In Robert T. Holt and John E. Turner (eds.). *The Methodology of Comparative Research*.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1993. *Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Macridis, Roy and Bernard Brown. 1996. "Comparative Analysis: Method and Concept." In Bernard E. Brown and Roy C. Macridis (eds.). *Comparative Politics: Notes and Readings*. (8th.ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing. (pp.1-15).

Mill, John Stuart. 1846. "How We Compare." In *A System of Logic* (Book VI, chapter 10). New York: Harper.

Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tsebelis, George. 1990. *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sept. 23 What is a concept, conceptual stretching, degrees of freedom, Galton's problem

Required readings:

Campbell, Donald T. 1975. "Degrees of Freedom and the Case Study." *Comparative Political Studies* 8: 179-193.

Chandler, William M. and M.A. Chandler. 1974. "The Problem of Indicator Formation in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 7: 26-46.

Collier, David and James E. Mahoney. 1996. "Insights and Pitfalls, Selection Bias in Qualitative Research." *World Politics* 49: 56-91.

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2: 131-150.

Rogowski, Ronald. 1995. "The Role of Theory and Anomaly in Social-Scientific Inference." *American Political Science Review* 89: 467-470.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64: 1033-1053.

Suggested additional readings:

Caporaso, James A. 1995. "Research Design, Falsification, and the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide." *American Political Science Review* 89: 457-460.

Collier, David. 1995. "Translating Quantitative Methods for Qualitative Researchers: The Case of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review* 89: 461-466.

Collier, David and James E. Mahoney. 1993. "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 87: 845-855.

Coppedge, Michael. 1999. "Thickening Thin Concepts and Theories: Combining Large N and Small in Comparative Politics." *Comparative Politics* 32: 465-476.

Locke, Richard and Kathleen Thelen. 1998. "Problems of Equivalence in Comparative Politics: Apples and Oranges, Again." *APSA-CP* (Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section in Comparative Politics). 9: 9-12.

Naroll, Raoul. 1973. "Galton's Problem." In Raoul Naroll and Ronald Cohen (eds.). *A Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. New York: Columbia University Press. (pp.974-989)

Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64: 1033-1053.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1991. "Comparing and Miscomparing." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 3: 243-257

Wallerstein, Michael. 2000. "Trying to Navigate between Scylla and Charybdis: Misspecification and Unidentified Models in Comparative Politics." *APSA-CP* (Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section in Comparative Politics) 11(2): 1-2, 4, 21.

**Part II: Examples of the major research design approaches**

Sept.30 Large-scale empirical studies

Required readings:

Jackman, Robert W. 1985. "Cross-National Statistical Research and the Study of Comparative Politics." *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 161-182.

Read two or more of the following:

Arat, Zehra F. 1988. "Democracy and Economic Development: Modernization Theory Revisited." *Comparative Politics* 21: 21-36.

Bernhard, William T. 1998. "A Political Explanation of Variations in Central Bank Independence." *American Political Science Review* 92(2): 311-328.

Boix, Charles. 1999. "Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 93(3): 609-624.

- Brown, David S. and Wendy Hunter. 1999. "Democracy and Social Spending in Latin America, 1980-92." *American Political Science Review* 93(4): 779-790.
- Davis, Darren W. and Christian Davenport. 1999. "Assessing the Validity of the Postmaterialism Index." *American Political Science Review* 93: 649-664
- Gasiorowski, Mark J. 2000. "Democracy and Macroeconomic Performance in Underdeveloped Countries: An Empirical Analysis." *Comparative Political Studies* 33(3): 319-349.
- Heller, William B. 1997. "Bicameralism and Budget Deficits: The Effect of Parliamentary Structure on Government Spending." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 22: 485-516.
- Hug, Simon and Pascal Sciarini. 2000. "Referendums on European integration: Do Institutions Matter in the Voter's Decision?" *Comparative Political Studies* 33(1): 3-36.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald and Paul R. Abramson. 1999. "Measuring Postmaterialism." *American Political Science Review* 93: 665-677.
- Jackman, Robert. 1987. "Political Institutions and Turnout in the Industrialized Democracies." *American Political Science Review*. 81: 405-424.
- Laver, Michael and Norman Schofield. 1990. *Multiparty Government*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Martin, Lanny W. and Randolph T. Stevenson. 2001. "Government Formation in Parliamentary Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science* 45(1): 33-50.
- Norris, Pippa. 1997. *Passages to Power: Legislative Recruitment in Advanced Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shugart, Matthew S. and John Carey. 1992. *Presidents and Assemblies: Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Silver, Brian D. and Kathleen M. Dowley. 2000. "Measuring Political Culture in Multiethnic Societies: Reaggregating the World Values Survey." *Comparative Political Studies* 33(4): 517-550.
- Triesman, Daniel S. 2000. "The Causes of Corruption: A Cross-National Study." *Journal of Public Economy* 76: 399-457.
- Tsebelis, George. 1999. "Veto Players and Law Production in Parliamentary Democracies: An Empirical Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 93(3): 591-608.

Oct. 7 Small-N country studies

Required readings:

Skocpol, Theda and Margaret Somers. 1980. "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22: 174-197.

Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (also 1965 and 1989) (skim entire book)

**Read one or more of the following:**

Cain, Bruce, John Ferejohn, and Morris Fiorina. 1987. *The Personal Vote*. New York: Cambridge University Press. (read intro, chaps 8 & 9)

Carey, John M. 1996. *Term Limits and Legislative Representation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Crisp, Brian F., Maria Escobar-Lemmon, Bradford Jones, Mark Jones, and Michelle M. Taylor-Robinson. 2004. "Vote-Seeking Incentives and Legislative Representation in Six Presidential Democracies." *Journal of Politics* 66: 823-846.

Collier, Ruth Berins and David Collier. 1991. *Shaping the Political Arena*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Coppedge, Michael. 1997. "District Magnitude, Economic Performance, and Party-system Fragmentation in Five Latin American Countries." *Comparative Political Studies* 30: 156-185.

Hall, Peter A. 1986. *Governing the Economy: The Politics of State Intervention in Britain and France*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Katzenstein, Peter J. 1985. *Small States in World Markets: Industrial Policy in Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Haggard, Stephen. 1990. *Pathways from the Periphery: The Politics of Growth in the Newly Industrializing Countries*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Levine, Daniel H. 1981. *Religion and Politics in Latin America: The Catholic Church in Venezuela and Colombia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Luong, Pauline Jones. 2000. "After the Break-up: Institutional Design in Transitional States." *Comparative Political Studies* 33(5): 563-592.

Moraski, Bryon and Gerhard Loewenberg. 1999. "The Effect of Legal Thresholds on the Revival of Former Communist Parties in East-Central Europe." *Journal of Politics* 61: 151-170.

Muller, Edward N. and Mitchell A. Seligson. 1994. "Civic Culture and Democracy: The Question of Causal Relationships." *American Political Science Review* 88: 635-652.

Munck, Gerardo L. and Carol Skalnik Leff. 1999. "Modes of Transition and Democratization: South America and Eastern Europe in Comparative Perspective." In *Transitions to Democracy*. Lisa Anderson (ed.). New York: Columbia University Press. Pp.193-216 (originally published in Comparative Politics vol.29 (April 1997), Pp.243-62)

O'Donnell, Guillermo A. 1973. *Modernization and Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics*. Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley.

Scott, James C. 1976. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Weyland, Kurt. 1996. "Risk Taking in Latin American Economic Restructuring: Lessons from Prospect Theory." *International Studies Quarterly* 40: 29-52.

**Read one of the following: (using edited volumes to produce small-n comparisons)**

Berger, Suzanne D. (ed.). 1981. *Organizing Interests in Western Europe: Pluralism, Corporatism, and the Transformation of Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bermeo, Nancy (ed.). 1992. *Liberalization and Democratization in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Carey, John and Matthew S. Shugart (eds.). 1998. *Executive Decree Authority: Calling Out the Tanks, or Filling Out the Forms?* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Robert E. (ed.). 1966. *Political Oppositions in Western Democracies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Higley, John and Richard Gunther (eds.). 1992. *Elites and Democratic Consolidation in Latin America and Southern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laver Michael and Kenneth A. Shepsle (eds.). 1994. *Cabinet Ministers and Parliamentary Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linz, Juan J. and Alfred Stepan (eds.). 1978. *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Linz, Juan J. and Alfred Stepan (eds.). 1978. *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Latin America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mainwaring, Scott and Matthew Soberg Shugart. (eds.). 1997. *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgenstern, Scott and Benito Nacif (eds.). 2002. *Legislative Politics in Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Donnell, Guillermo, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead (eds.). 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Latin America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. (for theory underlying this work, also see O'Donnell, Guillermo, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead (eds.). 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives and Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.)

O'Donnell, Guillermo, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead (eds.). 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Southern Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. (for theory underlying this work, also see O'Donnell, Guillermo, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead (eds.). 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives and Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.)

Shugart, Matthew Soberg and Martin P. Wattenberg (eds.). 2001. *Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: The Best of Both Worlds?* New York: Oxford University Press.

Suleiman, Ezra (ed.). 1984. *Bureaucrats and Policy Making: A Comparative Overview*. New York: Holmes and Meier.

Widner, Jennifer (ed.). 1994. *Economic Change and Political Liberalization in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Oct. 14 Case studies -- building theory with one case?

Required readings:

Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review* 65: 682-693.

Gerring, John. 2004. "What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for?" *American Political Science Review* 98(2): 341-354.

Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press.

Read two or more of the following:

Ames, Barry. 2001. *The Deadlock of Democracy in Brazil*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Baldez, Lisa and John M. Carey. 1999. "Presidential Agenda Control and Spending Policy: Lessons from General Pinochet's Constitution." *American Journal of Political Science* 43(1): 29-56.

Bawn, Kathleen. 1993. "The Logic of Institutional Preferences: German Electoral Law as a Social Choice Outcome." *American Journal of Political Science* 37(4): 965-989.

Benoit, Kenneth and Jacqueline Hayden. 2004. "Institutional Change and Persistence: The Evolution of Poland's Electoral System, 1989-2001." *Journal of Politics* 66(2): 396-427.

Converse Philip E. and Roy Pierce. 1986. *Political Representation in France*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Coppedge, Michael. 1994. *Strong Parties and Lame Ducks: Presidential Partyarchy and Factions in Venezuela*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cox, Gary W. and Michael F. Thies. 2000. "How Much Does Money Matter? 'Buying' Votes in Japan, 1967-1990." *Comparative Political Studies* 33(1): 37-57.
- Crisp, Brian F. and Scott W. Desposato. 2004. "Constituency Building in Multimember Districts: Collusion or Conflict?" *Journal of Politics* 66(1): 136-156.
- Crisp, Brian F. and Rachael E. Ingall. 2002. "Institutional Engineering and the Nature of Representation: Mapping the Effects of Electoral Reform in Colombia." *American Journal of Political Science* 46: 733-748.
- Desposato, Scott W. 2001. "Legislative Politics in Authoritarian Brazil." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 26: 287-317.
- Eckstein, Harry. 1966. *Division and Cohesion in Democracy: A Study of Norway*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gunther, Richard. 1989. "Electoral Laws, Party Systems, and Elites: The Case of Spain." *American Political Science Review* 83(3): 835-858.
- Huber, John D. 1992. "Restrictive Legislative Procedures in France and the United States." *American Political Science Review* 86(3): 675-687.
- Jones, Mark P. 1997. "Legislator Gender and Legislator Policy Priorities in the Argentine Chamber of Deputies and the United States House of Representatives." *Policy Studies Journal* 25(4): 613-629.
- Karl, Terry Lynn. 1986. "Petroleum and Political Pacts: The Transition to Democracy in Venezuela." In Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead (eds.). *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Latin America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Laitin, David D. 1986. *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change among the Yoruba*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1968. *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- MacKerras, M. and I. McAllister. 1999. "Compulsory voting, party stability and electoral advantage in Australia." *Electoral Studies* 18: 217-233.
- Manion, Melanie. 1996. "The Electoral Connection in the Chinese Countryside." *American Political Science Review* 90(4): 736-748.
- Matland, Richard E. 1993. "Institutional Variables Affecting Female Representation in National Legislatures: The Case of Norway." *Journal of Politics* 55: 737-755.
- Popkin, Samuel L. 1979. *The Rational Peasant: The Political Economy of Rural Society in Vietnam*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Putnam, Robert. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rahat, Gideon and Mario Sznajder. 1998. "Electoral Engineering in Chile: The Electoral System and Limited Democracy." *Electoral Studies* 17: 429-442.

Remington, Thomas F. and Steven S. Smith. 1998. "Theories of Legislative Institutions and the Organization of the Russian Duma." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(2): 545-572.

Siavelis, Peter. 2000. *The President and Congress in Post-Authoritarian Chile: Institutional Constraints to Democratic Consolidation*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Taylor, Michelle M. 1992. "Formal versus Informal Incentive Structures and Legislator Behavior: Evidence from Costa Rica." *Journal of Politics* 54: 1055-1073.

Weyland, Kurt. 1996. *Democracy without Equity: Failures of Reform in Brazil*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

### **Part III: Evaluating literatures**

Oct. 21 Typologies of regimes: totalitarian, authoritarian, democratic, and also corporatism

#### Required readings:

Collier, David. 1979. "Overview of the Bureaucratic-Authoritarian Model." In *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America*. David Collier (ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Pp. 19-32.

Dahl, Robert. 1971. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (Chapter 1)

Linz, Juan J. 1964. "An Authoritarian Regime: Spain." In Erik Allardt and Yrjo Littunen (eds.). *Cleavages, Ideologies, Party Systems*. Helsinki, Finland: Academic Bookstore. pp.291-341.

Friedrich, Carl J. and Zbigniew K. Brzezinski. 1969. *Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy*. (2<sup>nd</sup>.ed.). New York: Praeger. (Chapter 2)

O'Donnell, Guillermo. 1994. "Delegative Democracy." *Journal of Democracy* 5: 55-69.

#### Suggested additional readings:

Alvarez, Michael, José Antonio Cheibub, Fernando Limongi, and Adam Przeworski. 1996. "Classifying Political Regimes." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 31: 3-36.

Bollen, Kenneth. 1980. "Issues in the Comparative Measurement of Political Democracy." *American Sociological Review* 45: 370-390.

Collier, Ruth Berins and David Collier. 1979. "Inducements versus Constraints: Disaggregating Corporatism." *American Political Science Review* 73: 967-986.

Jagers, Keith, and Ted Robert Gurr. 1995. "Tracking Democracy's Third Wave with the Polity III Data." *Journal of Peace Research* 32(4): 469-482.

Lijphart, Arend. 1977. *Democracy in Plural Societies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Malloy, James M. (ed.). 1977. *Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Schmitter, Philippe C. 1974. "Still the Century of Corporatism?" In Frederick B. Pike and Thomas Stritch (eds.). *The New Corporatism: Social-Political Structures in the Iberian World*. Notre Dame: IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Schmitter, Philippe, and Terry Lynn Karl. 1991. "What Democracy Is ... and What It Is Not." *Journal of Democracy* 2: 75-88.

Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1942. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Oct.28 Visiting speaker

**Research design essay due (in class)**

Required readings: TBA

Nov. 4 Study of democracy: conditions of democracy vs. democratization

Required readings:

Cutright, Philips. 1963. "National Political Development: Its Measurement and Social Correlates." In Nelson Polsby, Robert A. Dentler, and Paul A. Smith (eds.). *Politics and Social Life*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. (pp.569-582)

Karl, Terry Lynn. 1990. "Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America." *Comparative Politics* 23: 1-22.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1959. "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy." *American Political Science Review* 53: 69-105.

Valenzuela, J. Samuel. 1992. "Democratic Consolidation in Post-Transitional Settings: Notion, Process and Facilitating Conditions." In *Issues in Democratic Consolidation*. Scott Mainwaring, Guillermo O'Donnell and J. Samuel Valenzuela (eds.). Notre Dame, IN: University of Indiana Press. (pp.57-104)

Neubauer, Deane E. 1967. "Some Conditions of Democracy." *American Political Science Review* 61: 1002-1009.

O'Donnell, Guillermo and Philippe C. Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Przeworski, Adam. 1991. *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (pp.51-99)

Rustow, Dankwart A. 1970. "Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model." *Comparative Politics* 2:337-63.

Suggested additional readings:

- Bermeo, Nancy G. 1992. "Democracy and Lessons of Dictatorship." *Comparative Politics* 24: 273-91.
- Bermeo, Nancy. 1997. "Myths of Moderation: Confrontation and Conflict during Democratic Transitions." *Comparative Politics* 29: 305-322.
- Gibson, James L. 2001. "Social Networks, Civil Society, and the Prospects for Consolidating Russia's Democratic Transition." *American Journal of Political Science* 45: 51-69.
- Hagopian, Frances. 1996. *Traditional Politics and Regime Change in Brazil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Higley, John and Richard Gunther (eds.). 1992. *Elites and Democratic Consolidation in Latin America and Southern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Linz, Juan J. 1978. *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Crisis, Breakdown, and Reequilibration*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mainwaring, Scott, Guillermo O'Donnell and J. Samuel Valenzuela (eds.). 1992. *Issues in Democratic Consolidation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Indiana Press.
- Power, Timothy J. and Mark J. Gasiorowski. 1997. "Institutional Design and Democratic Consolidation in the Third World, 1930-1995." *Comparative Political Studies* 30(2): 123-155.
- Stepan, Alfred and Cindy Skach. 1993. "Constitutional Frameworks and Democratic Consolidation." *World Politics* 46: 1-22.

Nov.11 Representation and Accountability in Democracy

Required readings:

Mainwaring, Scott and Christopher Welna (eds.). 2003. *Democratic Accountability in Latin America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (chapters 1 & 2)

Mansbridge, Jane. 2003. "Rethinking Representation." *American Political Science Review* 97: 515-528.

Pitkin, Hanna F. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Przeworski, Adam, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin (eds.). 1999. *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (chapters 1-4)

Weyland, Kurt. 1996. "Obstacles to Social Reform in Brazil's New Democracy." *Comparative Politics* 29(1): 1-22.

Suggested additional readings:

Chalmers, Douglas A., Carlos M. Vilas, Katherine Hite, Scott B. Martin, Kerianne Piester, and Monique Segarra (eds.). 1997. *The New Politics of Inequality in Latin America: Rethinking Participation and Representation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jewell, Malcolm E. 1983. "Legislator-Constituency Relations and the Representative Process." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 8: 303-337.

Laver, Michael and Kenneth A. Shepsle. "Government Accountability in Parliamentary Democracy." 1999. In Przeworski, Adam, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin (eds.). *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Powell Jr., G. Bingham. 1989. "Constitutional Design and Citizen Electoral Control." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 1(2): 107-130.

Sapiro, Virginia. 1981. "Research Frontier Essay: When Are Interests Interesting? The Problem of Political Representation of Women." *American Political Science Review* 75: 701-716.

Stokes, Susan C. 1997. "Democratic Accountability and Policy Change: Economic Policy in Fujimori's Peru." *Comparative Politics* 29: 209-226.

Weyland, Kurt. 1996. *Democracy without Equity: Failures of Reform in Brazil*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Nov. 18 State autonomy and capacity

Required readings:

Skocpol, Theda. 1985. "Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research." In Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol (eds.). 1985. *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (pp.3-37)

Geddes, Barbara. 1994. *Politician's Dilemma: Building State Capacity in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (chapters 2 & 4)

Tsebelis, George. 1995. "Decision-Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism Parliamentarism, Multicameralism, and Multipartyism." *British Journal of Political Science* 25(3): 289-325.

Suggested additional readings:

Ames, Barry. 1987. *Political Survival: Politicians and Public Policy in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weaver, Kent and Bert Rockman (eds.). 1993. *Do Institutions Matter? Government Capabilities in the United States and Abroad*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

Nov. 25 NO CLASS – Thanksgiving Holiday

Dec. 2 Comparative study of institutions

Required readings:

Carey, John M. and Matthew Soberg Shugart. 1995. "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: A Rank Ordering of Electoral Formulas." *Electoral Studies* 14: 417-439.

Neto, Octavio Amorim and Gary W. Cox. 1997. "Electoral Institutions, Cleavage Structures, and the Number of Parties." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(1): 149-174.

Jones, Mark P. 1995. *Electoral Laws and the Survival of Presidential Democracy*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press. (chapters 1, 3&6)

Scott Mainwaring and Matthew Soberg Shugart (eds.). 1997. *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press. (chapter 1)

Shugart, Matthew Soberg. 1998. "The Inverse Relationship between Party Strength and Executive Strength: A Theory of Politician's Constitutional Choice." *British Journal of Political Science* 28: 1-29.

Suggested additional readings:

Carey, John M. 2000. "Parchment, Equilibria, and Institutions." *Comparative Political Studies* 33: 735-761.

Carey, John M. and Matthew Soberg Shugart (eds.). 1998. *Executive Decree Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coppedge, Michael. 1994. *Strong Parties and Lame Ducks: Presidential Partyarchy and Factionalism in Venezuela*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cox, Gary. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crisp, Brian F. 2000. *Democratic Institutional Design: The Powers and Incentives of Venezuelan Politicians and Interest Groups*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Helmke, Gretchen and Steven Levitsky. 2003. "Informal Institutions and Comparative Politics: A Research Agenda." paper presented at the Informal Institutions and Politics in Latin America conference. Kellogg Institution for International Studies. University of Notre Dame, 24-25 April 2003.

Linz, Juan and Arturo Valenzuela (eds.). 1994. *The Failure of Presidential Democracy: Comparative Perspectives*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mainwaring, Scott and Matthew Soberg Shugart (eds.). 1997. *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mainwaring, Scott. 1999. *Rethinking Party Systems in the Third Wave of Democratization: The Case of Brazil*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen. 1989. *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: Free Press.

North, Douglass. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shugart, Matthew Soberg and John M. Carey 1992. *Presidents and Assemblies: Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Siavelis, Peter. 2000. *The President and Congress in Post-Authoritarian Chile: Institutional Constraints to Democratic Consolidation*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Tues. Dec.7 Comparative study of political participation

Required readings:

Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (chapters 1-3)

Stokes, Susan. 1995. *Cultures in Conflict: Social Movements and the State in Peru*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (skim all)

Verba, Sidney, Norman Nie and Jae-On Kim. 1978. *Participation and Political Equality: A Seven Nation Comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (chapters 1-4 & 14)

Suggested additional readings:

Barnes, Samuel H., Max Kaase, et.al. 1979. *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Dalton, Russell J. and Manfred Kuechler. 1990. *Challenging the Political Order: New Social and Political Movements in Western Democracies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Denardo, James. 1985. *Power in Numbers: The Political Strategy of Protest and Rebellion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hirschman, Albert. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jackman, Robert. 1987. "Political Institutions and Turnout in the Industrialized Democracies." *American Political Science Review*. 81: 405-424.

Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Powell, G. Bingham, Jr. 1982. *Contemporary Democracies: Participation, Stability, and Violence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shi, Tianjian. 1997. *Political Participation in Beijing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

**Dec. 9 Literature Review essay due (by noon)**

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Policy Statement:** The Americans with Disabilities Act is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please contact the Department of Student Life, Services for Students with Disabilities in Room 126 of the Koldus Building, or call 845-1637

**Definition of plagiarism:** As commonly defined, plagiarism consists of passing off as one's own the ideas, words, writing, etc., which belong to another. In accordance with the definition, you are committing plagiarism if you copy the work of another person and turn it in as your own, even if you should have the permission of the person. Plagiarism is one of the worst academic offenses, for the plagiarist destroys the trust among colleagues without which research cannot be safely communicated. If you have any questions regarding plagiarism, please consult the Aggie Honor System Office website (<http://www.tamu.edu/aggiehonor>) or the latest version of the Texas A&M University Student Rules, under the section "Scholastic Dishonesty."

**Academic Dishonesty:** Students should be aware that academic dishonesty involves acts other than plagiarism. Please consult the Aggie Honor Code, which takes effect September 1, 2004 at the Aggie Honor System Office website (<http://www.tamu.edu/aggiehonor>) for more information.



## More about the Core Course in Comparative Politics

This syllabus is the product of a close review of related courses at universities with top programs in comparative politics, along with the instructor's own thinking about what "basic training" in comparative politics entails. There is much philosophy of science involved in this course, as comparative politics, possibly more than some other sub-fields in political science, requires conscious consideration of "how do we know that we know something?"

The main objective of the course is to introduce methods of doing comparative research, and key methodological questions and controversies. In addition, an important goal is to familiarize the student with the "classics" of comparative politics research so that you will better understand why the field is where it is today. As such, for many topics the focus is on "the canon" -- not the most current articles, and not a set of facts about cases.

### Reading:

The course requires a lot of reading. There is no way to get around that, given the number of necessary objectives that this course must achieve. In addition, much of the reading is difficult the first time through, particularly because it often makes reference to other works, with which the student is likely not yet familiar. Bear with it -- as you build a base of knowledge, the reading will get easier.

The reading may prove overwhelming at times. Remember that *skimming* is an important professional skill. You need to read purposively and strategically, with the goal of identifying the following in the readings:

- The main question the author wants to answer
- The definition of the "dependent variable," or what the author wants to explain
- The main "independent variables" the author thinks are important
- The "story" that knits the variables together into a causal explanation
- The author's research design and the main types of evidence the author uses to test his or her ideas
- The way the evidence was obtained

### How to write the paper for the weeks you are seminar discussion leader:

The purpose of this paper is not only to provide a brief summary of each reading, but also your own assessment of the literature -- your "spin" on reviewing the literature. Some weeks your paper may focus on research design, other weeks on a synthesis of the literature on a substantive topic. Reviewing, boiling down the literature and pointing to new directions for work is something you will do throughout your career as a political scientist, in every conference paper, journal article, or book manuscript you write.

For the purposes of this course, you should first aim to distill the theory in each assigned reading and grasp the research design, if any, and the adequacy of the evidence. To do this, you want to draw out the independent variables (causes) and dependent variables (effects) and ask whether they are adequately conceptualized and operationalized. Are the concepts clear? What is the theory (or story) that links the variables? If the author tries to test the theory, or part of the theory, how does the author go about doing so? In your view, was the choice of research design appropriate (acceptable?), or could you recommend a better way to test the theory (and if so, why)? Were the measures chosen to evaluate concepts adequate?

Next, you will want to line up two or more of the theories for the week and assess which is most adequate and why for answering the question you want to answer. An important thing to keep in mind is that it is not incumbent on you to say that one author is right and another wrong. Instead it is often more useful to assess the circumstances under which a theory is useful, and when it is likely to not apply. Keep in mind that theories are frequently historically specific, and

they may be region specific. Criticism is an obvious thing to include in your essays, but criticism must be constructive and professional in tone.

Writing should be clear, concise, and professional in tone. Do not adopt a casual or light-hearted writing style, although the occasional comment is OK. It is better to show that you can make a theory clear -- even if an author did not -- and that you can think up embellishments or new approaches on your own, including where research on the topic should go from here. This is how you turn a literature *review* into an original essay.

The quality of your writing counts. Clear, careful, and concise writing is a necessary professional skill, and lowers the amount of time the reader has to invest to "get your message," thus keeping the reader happier. You should check syntax, grammar, word choice, spelling and neatness in your paper, which obviously means more than just running spell-check. Because clear writing is an essential professional skill, clarity of writing will be part of the grade on these short essays.