

**Political Science 850**  
**Seminar in Comparative Politics**

Instructors: John Kennedy  
Classroom: 114 Blake  
Time: W 1:00-4:00 pm  
Office: 521 Blake

Office hours: Tues/Thurs: 3:00-5:00 pm  
Office Number: 864-9025  
E-mail: kennedy1@ku.edu

**Course Description:**

This course will provide an overview of the Comparative Politics field. We will examine the main topic such state formation, democratization, political parties, elites, corruption, political behavior and comparative methods. In addition, we will cover the key debates on the field such as economic development and democratization, state centered approaches versus state society, ethnic identity and nationalism as well as institutional versus cultural influences on public opinion and elite behavior. The objective of the course is to introduce students to the theories, methods and empirical research in comparative politics.

The readings for this course are both theoretical and empirical. In our class discussion, we will attempt to connect the theoretical framework with the empirical findings in order to understand political development and behavior as well as institutional and regime change that may or *may not* lead to democratic transitions.

**Course Requirements:**

Grading:

Participation: 15%  
Summary/analysis Presentations: 35%  
Research Paper: 35%  
Paper Presentation: 15%

Participation and Summary Presentation (50%):

In this seminar, students will be expected to participate in weekly discussions. In the first week of the course we will focus on the comparative method. Starting with the substantive approaches to Comparative Politics, we will assign specific readings (weeks) for student presentations. Each of you will have about two presentations this semester. In preparation for the presentations, students will provide a summary and analysis of the readings for that week (about 3-4 pages). The analysis portion of the assignment consists, first, of identifying the key difference among readings and, second, to evaluate the merits of each argument and perspective. Finally, each presenter memo will conclude by suggesting three questions regarding the readings that the seminar should address. *The presenter must send an e-mail copy (or attachment) of the analysis and the three questions to the whole class the Monday (5pm) before the seminar meets.*

Additionally, for those who do not present the reading material in a presenter's memo, you are to write a 1-2 page response to the assigned reading material. The response should raise conceptual questions; critique the readings, raise methodological issues--in short, make suggestions which aspect of the reading material you would like to see addressed by seminar participants. This memorandum is also due Monday afternoon, 5pm, and is to be distributed to every seminar participant by that time via e-mail.

#### Paper Appointment, Research Paper and Presentation (50%)

You will be required to write a 18-20 page research paper on any topic related to political institutions. The structure of the paper must follow the Caltech Rules (see attached "Structuring Your Paper (Caltech Rules)"). The paper must have a clear research question that can be answered on 18-20 pages. On May 4<sup>th</sup>, each student will make a professional 15 minute presentation of their research design and analysis to the class. The papers are due on stop day Wednesday, May 11<sup>th</sup> by 5:00 pm. One of the requirements for the paper is that you make an appointment to see both instructors. We will organize the meeting during the first seminar meeting.

Due dates of paper sections (see "Final Paper Outline" for the class):

**Week of February 22** (individual appointments scheduled in class): Meetings with instructors

**March 23** (electronically by 5pm): Sections 2 and 3, plus research question

**April 20** (electronically by 5pm): Sections 4 and 5.

#### Week 1: Introduction

We will discuss the goals and expectations for the course as well as assignments and important dates.

#### Week 2, January 27: Comparative Methods

##### Objective and Debates:

The objective this week is to understand the role of theory and how we apply theory to empirical analysis. We will discuss the difference between midrange theories and general (broader) theories in comparative politics. In addition, we will examine the causal inference and the comparative methods. The debates include definition of the comparative method. What is the comparative method? What is the relationship between method and causal inference?

##### Readings:

Kohli, Atul, et al. (1995), "The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium," *World Politics* 48(1), pp. 1-49

Lijphart, Arend (1971), "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method," *American Political Science Review*, 65(3), pp. 682-693

Collier, David (1993), "The Comparative Method," in Ada W. Finifter, ed. *Political Science: the State of the Field II*. (Washington DC: American Political Science Association), pp105-119

Lieberson, Stanley (1991), "Small N's and Big Conclusions: an Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases," *Social forces* 70(2), pp. 307-320

Mahoney, James (2000), "Strategies of Causal Inference in Small-N Analysis," *Sociological Methods & Research* 28(4), pp. 387-424

*Suggested Readings:*

- Munck, Gerardo L., and Richard Snyder (2007), "Debating the Direction of Comparative Politics: An Analysis of Leading Journals," *Comparative Political Studies*, 40(1), pp. 5-31
- Wibbels, Erik (2007), "Response to Munck and Snyder: No Method to the Comparative Politics Madness," *Comparative Political Studies*, 40(1), pp. 39-44
- Geddes, Barbara (2003), *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press)
- Przeworski, Adam (2007). "Is the Science of Comparative Politics Possible?" in Susan Stokes and Carles Boix (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, (New York: Oxford UP)
- Jackman, Robert W. (1985), "Cross-national statistical research and the study of comparative politics," *American Journal of Political Science*, 29(1), pp. 161-182
- Lieberman, Evan S (2005), "Nested analysis as a mixed-method strategy for comparative research," *American Political Science Review* 99(3), pp. 435-452

Week 3, February 3: States

Objective and Debates:

The objective this week is to understand the concept of the state. What is the state? How does the definition of the state influence our analysis? Scholars have conceptually defined the state as either a unitary actor separate from society or a set of institutions that is influenced by societal groups. Thus the debate is between state-centered versus state-society approach. How does the definition of the state influence research in comparative politics? Is there a middle approach between state-centered and state-society? If so, then how do we apply this approach? If not, then why?

*Readings:*

- Read Weber (1921) pages 1-5: Weber, Max (1921), "Politics as a Vocation" in H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Translated and edited), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946) pp. 77-128. Published originally as "Politik als Beruf," *Gesammelte Politische Schriften* (Muenchen, 1921), pp. 396-450.
- North, Douglas (1990)
- Skocpol, Theda (1985), "Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research," in Skocpol, Theda, Peter Evans, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer ed. *Bringing the State Back In* (Cambridge University Press).
- Krasner, Stephen D. (1984), "(Review) Approaches to the state: Alternative conceptions and historical dynamics." *Comparative Politics* 16(2), pp. 223-246
- Bratton, Michael (1989), "(Review) Beyond the state: Civil society and associational life in Africa," *World Politics* 41(3), pp. 407-430.

*Suggested Readings:*

- Mitchell, Timothy, (1991), "The limits of the state: beyond statist approaches and their critics,"

*American Political Science Review* 85(1), pp. 77-96

(Response to Mitchell) Bendix, John, et al. (1992), "Going beyond the state?," *American Political Science Review* 86(4), pp. 1007-1021.

Almond, Gabriel A. (1988), "The return to the state," *American Political Science Review* 82(3), pp. 853-874

(Response to Almond) Nordlinger, Eric A., Theodore J. Lowi, and Sergio Fabbrini (1988), "The return to the state: critiques," *American Political Science Review* 82(3), pp. 875-901

Nettl, John P. (1968), "The state as a conceptual variable," *World Politics: A Quarterly Journal of International Relations* 20(4), pp. 559-592.

Mann, Michael (1984), "The autonomous power of the state: its origins, mechanisms and results," *European journal of sociology* 25(2), pp. 185-213

Scott, James C. (1998), *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*, (Yale University Press)

Skocpol, Theda, Peter Evans, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer ed. (1985), *Bringing the State Back In* (Cambridge University Press)

#### Week 4, February 10: Modernization

Objective and Debates: What is the connection between economic and political development? What shape does the relationship adopt? If it exists, and some dispute this, is it linear, curvilinear, or what?

#### *Readings:*

Lipset, Seymour Martin (1959), "Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy," *American Political Science Review* 53(1), pp. 69-105

Huntington, Samuel P (1965), "Political development and political decay," *World Politics* 17(3), pp. 386-430

Przeworski, Adam, and Fernando Limongi (1997), "Modernization: Theories and Facts," *World Politics* 49(2), pp.155-183

Carles, Boix and Susan C. Stokes (2003), "Endogenous Democratization," *World Politics*, 55(4) pp. 517-549

Acemoglu, Daron, and James A. Robinson (2005), *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (Cambridge University Press), Chapters 1-2, pp. 18-64

#### *Suggested Readings:*

Kennedy, Ryan (2010), "The contradiction of modernization: A conditional model of endogenous democratization," *The Journal of Politics* 72(3), 785-798

Acemoglu, Daron, et al. "Reevaluating the modernization hypothesis." *Journal of Monetary Economics* 56.8 (2009): 1043-1058.

Arat, Zehra F. "Democracy and economic development: Modernization theory revisited." *Comparative Politics* (1988): 21-36.

Rostow, Walt Whitman. *The stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- Huntington, Samuel P. "The change to change: Modernization, development, and politics." *Comparative politics* (1971): 283-322.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson and James A. Robinson (2001), "The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation," *The American Economic Review*, 91(5), pp. 1369-1401
- Bollen, Kenneth A., and Robert W. Jackman (1985), "Economic and noneconomic determinants of political democracy in the 1960s," *Research in Political Sociology* 1(1), pp. 27-48
- Bollen, Kenneth A. (1979), "Political Democracy and the Timing of Development," *American Sociological Review*, 44(4), pp. 572-587
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Evelyne Huber Stephens, and John D. Stephens (1992), *Capitalist development and democracy*, (Cambridge, University Press)

### Week 5, February 17: Varieties of Democracies

#### Objective and Debates:

What distinguishes liberal democracies from authoritarian systems? What types of democracies exist? Are proportional regimes "gentler and kinder" as Lijphart suggests? Then, how does one operationalize the concept of democracy? What is an appropriate measure for a "liberal democracy" and how do existing measures fall short of the ideal?

#### Readings:

- Lijphart, Arend (1969), "Consociational Democracy," *World Politics*, 21(2) pp.207-25
- Lijphart, Arend (1999), *Patterns of Democracy*, (Yale University Press), chs. 1-5 and ch. 10.
- Powell, B. (2000) *Elections as Instruments of Democracy* (Yale University Press), Chapters 1-2
- Munck, G. L. and J. Verkuilen (2002), "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices," *Comparative Political Studies* 35(1), pp. 5-34.
- Coppedge, M., et al. (2011), "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: A New Approach," *Perspectives on Politics* 9(2), pp. 247-267.

#### Suggested Readings:

- Powell, B. G. (1982) *Contemporary Democracies* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press)
- O'Donnell, Guillermo (1994) "Delegative Democracy" *Journal of Democracy* 5, pp.55
- Francisco Panizza "Beyond 'Delegative Democracy': 'Old Politics' and 'New Economics' in Latin America" *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 32: 737-763
- Dahl, Robert (1961), *Who governs?: Democracy and power in an American city* (Yale University Press)
- Dahl, Robert (1973), *Polyarchy: participation and opposition* (Yale University Press)
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1993), *The third wave: Democratization in the late twentieth century*. (University of Oklahoma press)
- Przeworski, Adam (1991), *Democracy and the market: Political and economic reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*, (Cambridge University Press)

## Week 6, February 24: Varieties of Authoritarianism

### Objective and Debates:

The objective this week is to understand the usefulness of authoritarian regime types and categories with respect to democracies and democratization. How useful are these various categories, such as “semi-democratic”, “semi-authoritarian”, “illiberal democracy”, when evaluating non-democracies? How do these categories advance our knowledge of political development and comparative politics?

One key debate is how we approach the study of authoritarian regimes. Some scholars view authoritarian regimes from a democratization perspective where all regimes fall within a democratic trajectory from non-democracy to semi-democratic then democratic. However, other scholars tend to view authoritarian regimes as separate institutional forms with non-democratic trajectories. Which approach do you think advances our understanding of authoritarian regimes?

### *Readings:*

- Barbara Geddes (1999), “What Do We Know About Democratization After Twenty Years?” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2: 115–44
- David Art, (2012), “What Do We Know About Authoritarianism After Ten Years?” *Comparative Politics*, 44(3)
- Jennifer Gandhi and Adam Przeworski (2007) “Authoritarian Institutions and the Survival of Autocrats,” *Comparative Political Studies*, 40, pp. 1279 - 1301
- Diamond, Larry Jay (2002), “Thinking about hybrid regimes,” *Journal of democracy* 13(2), pp. 21-35
- Eva Bellin (2005) “Coercive Institutions and Coercive Leaders” in Marsha Posuney and Michele Angrist ed. *Authoritarianism in the Middle East*, (London, Lynne Rienner)

### *Suggested Readings:*

- Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan Way, (2002), “The rise of competitive authoritarianism,” *Journal of democracy*, 13(2), pp. 51-65.
- Ottaway, Marina (2003) “The Challenge of Semi-Authoritarianism: An Introduction” pages 3-27, “Egypt: Institutionalized Semi-Authoritarianism” pages 31-50 in *Democracy Challenged: The Rise of Semi-Authoritarianism* Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
- P. Brooker, *Non-Democratic Regimes: Theory, Government and Politics* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000)
- J. Linz, *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2000)
- Beatriz Magaloni and Ruth Kricheli (2010), “Political Order and One-Party Rule,” *Annual Review of Political Science* Vol. 13: 123-143
- Fareed Zakaria (1997), “The rise of illiberal democracy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Nov/Dec vol. 76, no. 6
- Kamrava, Mehran (2010), “Preserving non-democracies: leaders and state institutions in the Middle East,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 46.2: pp. 251-270.

- Carothers, Thomas (2002), "The end of the transition paradigm," *Journal of democracy* 13(1), p. 5-21
- Pye, Lucian W. (1990), "Political science and the crisis of authoritarianism." *American Political Science Review* 84(1), pp. 3-19

### Week 7, March2: Voters and Parties

#### Objective and Debates:

This week focuses on a crucial actor in democratic and authoritarian politics—political parties. What are the key features of parties in mature democracies? How relevant are Parties in older and newer democracies? Do parties follow the same developmental logic regardless of context?

#### Readings:

- Seymour Lipset and Stein Rokkan (1967), "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments," in Lipset and Rokkan, eds., *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives* (NY: Free Press), pp.1-56.
- Dalton, R. J. and S. Weldon (2007), "Partisanship and Party System Institutionalization," *Party Politics* 13(2), pp. 179-196
- Herbert Kitschelt, Zdenka Mansfeldova, Radoslaw Markowski, and Gabor Toka, *Post-Communist Party Systems: Competition, Representation, and Inter-Party Cooperation* (NY: Cambridge U. Press, 1999), Chapter 1.
- Weghorst, K. R. and M. Bernhard (2014), "From Formlessness to Structure? The Institutionalization of Competitive Party Systems in Africa," *Comparative Political Studies* 47(12), pp. 1707-1737
- Rohrschneider, Robert and Stephen Whitefield, *The Strain of Representation* (NY: Oxford U. Press, 2012), Chapter 1, pp. 1-12

#### Suggested Readings:

- Dalton, R. J. (1984). "Cognitive Mobilization and Partisan Dealignment in Advanced Industrial Democracies." *Journal of Politics* 46: 264-284.
- Dalton, R. J. (2000). "Citizen Attitudes and Political Behavior." *Comparative Political Studies* 33(6): 912-940.
- Dalton, R. J. and M. P. Wattenberg, Eds. (2000). *Parties without partisans : political change in advanced industrial democracies*. Oxford ; New York, Oxford University Press.
- Franklin, M., et al. (1992). *Electoral change : responses to evolving social and attitudinal structures in western countries*. Cambridge England ; New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, R., Ed. (1974). *Electoral Behavior*. New York, Free Press.
- Stokes, D. (1963). "Spatial Models of Party Competition." *American Political Science Review* 57: 531-546.

## Week 8, March 9: Elections and Institutions

### Objective and Debates:

While the previous week explains the relevance of parties, this week focuses on how electoral regimes shape the nature of party competition. How do different institutions determine outcomes of elections? What kind of centrifugal and centripetal forces do various institutions unleash? Do elections matter in authoritarian institutions?

### *Readings:*

- Cox, Gary W. (1997), *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), Chapter 1 and 2
- Lijphart, Arend (1994), *Electoral Systems and Party Systems: a Study of 27 Democracies*, (Oxford University Press), Chapter 1 and 2
- Boix, Carles (1999), "Setting the rules of the game: the choice of electoral systems in advanced democracies," *American Political Science Review* 93(3), pp. 609-624
- Valerie Bunce and Sharon Wolchik, (2010), "Defeating Dictators: Electoral Change and Stability in Competitive Authoritarian Regimes," *World Politics*, 63(1), pp.43-86
- Ferree, Karen E., G. Bingham Powell, and Ethan Scheiner, (2014), "Context, Electoral Rules, and Party Systems," *Annual Review of Political Science* 17, pp. 421-439

### *Suggested Readings:*

- Norris, Pippa, (1997), "Choosing electoral systems: proportional, majoritarian and mixed systems," *International Political Science Review* 18(3), pp. 297-312
- G. Bingham Powell, Jr. (2009), "The Ideological Congruence Controversy: The Impact of Alternative Measures, Data, and Time Periods on the Effects of Election Rules" *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 42, no. 12
- Shugart, Matthew and John Carey (1992) *Presidents and Assemblies: Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Chapters 1-3 (pages 1-54)
- Sarah Birch (2007), "Electoral Systems and Electoral Misconduct" *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 40
- Powell, Bingham (2000) *Elections as Instruments of Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Alt, James E. 1994. "The Impact of the Voting Rights Act on Black and White Voter Registration in the South." in Davidson and Grofman ed. *Quiet Revolution in the South: The Impact of the Voting Rights Act, 1965-1990*. pp.352-354

## Week 9: SPRING BREAK



## Week 10, March 23 Logics of Collective Action

### Objective and Debates:

What kinds of Civil Society does democracy Require? Why would rational citizens participate? Are our political views predetermined by our genetic make-up?

### Readings:

- Mancur Olson, *The Logic of Collective Action* (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1971), chapter 1.
- Finkel, S. E. and E. N. Muller (1998). "Rational choice and the dynamics of collective political action: Evaluating alternative models with panel data." *American Political Science Review* 92(1): 37-49.
- Finkel, S. E. and A. E. Smith (2011). "Civic Education, Political Discussion, and the Social Transmission of Democratic Knowledge and Values in a new Democracy: Kenya 2002." *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2): 417-435.
- Humphreys, M. and J. M. Weinstein (2006). "Handling and manhandling civilians in civil war." *American political science review* 100(3): 429-447.
- Kuran, T. (1991). "Now Out of Never: The Element of Surprise in the East European Revolution of 1989." *World politics* 44(1): 7-48.

### Suggested Readings:

- Cornell, A. and M. Grimes. 2015 "Institutions as Incentives for Civic Action: Bureaucratic Structures, Civil Society, and Disruptive Protests." *The Journal of politics* 77(3): 664-678.
- Barnes, S. H. and M. Kaase (1979). *Political action : mass participation in five Western democracies*. Beverly Hills, Calif., Sage Publications.
- Blattman, C. (2009). "From Violence to Voting: War and Political Participation in Uganda." *American Political Science Review* 103(2): 231-247.
- Dahl, R. A. (1971). *Polyarchy; participation and opposition*. New Haven., Yale University Press
- Letki, N. (2004). "Socialization for Participation? Trust, Membership, and Democratization in East-Central Europe." *Political Research Quarterly* 57(4): 665-679.

## Week 11, March 30: Elites—Contingency, Leadership

### Objectives and Debates:

This week focuses on the key individual actors within systems—political elites. There are several issues. Does there have to be a consensus among elites over basis liberal democratic values for liberal democracies to remain stable? What role does ideology play? How do elites develop democratic values in the first place? Is this individual-level perspective helpful in explaining the stability or fragility of political systems?

*Readings:*

- Robert D. Putnam (1971), "Studying Elite Political Culture: The Case of 'Ideology,'" *American Political Science Review*, 65(3), pp.651-81
- Higley, J. and G. Moore (1981), "Elite Integration in the United States and Australia," *American Political Science Review* 75(3), pp. 581-597
- Higley, J. and M. G. Burton (1989), "The Elite Variable in Democratic Transitions and Breakdowns," *American Sociological Review* 54(1), pp. 17-32
- Blaydes, L. and D. A. Linzer (2012), "Elite Competition, Religiosity, and Anti-Americanism in the Islamic World," *The American political science review* 106(02): 225-243.
- Hooghe, L. (1999). "Images of Europe: Orientations to European Integration among Senior Officials of the Commission." *British journal of political science* 29(2): 345-367.

*Suggested Readings:*

- Aarts, K. H. v. d. K. (2006). "Understanding the Dutch "no": The Euro, the East, and the Elite." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39(2): 243-246.
- Aberbach, J. D., et al. (1981). *Bureaucrats and politicians in western democracies*. (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press).
- Blaydes, L. and D. A. Linzer (2012). "Elite Competition, Religiosity, and Anti-Americanism in the Islamic World." *American Political Science Review* 106(02): 225-243.
- Druckman, J. N., et al. (2013). "How Elite Partisan Polarization Affects Public Opinion Formation." *American Political Science Review* 107(01): 57-79.
- Hooghe, L. (2003). "Europe Divided? Elites vs. Public Opinion on European Integration." *European Union Politics* 4(3): 281-304.
- Pharr, S. J. (2000). Officials' Midconduct and Public Distrust: Japan and the Trilateral Democracies. *Disaffected Democracies. What's Troubling the Trilateral Countries?* S. J. Pharr and R. D. Putnam. (Princeton, Princeton University Press):173-201.
- Putnam, R. D. (1973). *The beliefs of politicians: ideology, conflict, and democracy in Britain and Italy*. (New Haven, Yale University Press).
- Putnam, R. D. (1976). *The comparative study of political elites*. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall).

Week 12, April 6: Individuals—Behavior/Values/Psychology/Genetics

Objective and Debates:

How do individuals form opinions? Do mass publics follow the cues provided by political elites? How much do mass publics shape the behavior of elites? How rational are mass publics? Are attitudes and values grounded in biology?

*Readings:*

- Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman (1981), "The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice," *Science*, 211(4481), pp. 453-458
- Smith, K., et al. (2012), "Biology, ideology, and epistemology: how do we know political attitudes

are inherited and why should we care?" *American Journal of Political Science* 56(1), pp. 17-33

Zaller, John (1991), "Information, Values, and Opinion," *The American Political Science Review* 85(4), pp. 1215-1237

Heath, A., et al. (2005), "The globalization of public opinion research," *Annual Review of Political Science* 8, pp. 297-333

#### *Suggested Readings:*

Berelson, B. (1954). *Voting: a study of opinion formation in a presidential campaign*. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press).

Dalton, R. J. and C. Anderson (2011). *Citizens, context, and choice : how context shapes citizens' electoral choices*. (Oxford ; New York, Oxford University Press).

Dalton, R. J., et al., Eds. (1984). *Electoral change in advanced industrial democracies: realignment or dealignment?* (Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press).

Franklin, M., et al. (1992). *Electoral change : responses to evolving social and attitudinal structures in western countries*. (Cambridge England ; New York, Cambridge University Press).

Sniderman, P. and L. Hagendoorn (2007). *When Ways of Life Collide*. (Princeton, Princeton University Press).

Sniderman, P. M., et al. (1991). *Reasoning and choice : explorations in political psychology*. (Cambridge England ; New York, Cambridge University Press).

Zaller, J. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. (Cambridge England ; New York, Cambridge University Press).

#### Week 13, April 13: Cultural/Informal Institutions and Political Development (influence on types)

##### Objective and Debates:

The objective this week is to understand the concept and definition of political culture. What is political culture? How do we measure the influence of political culture on political development? Is there an Asian (or Middle Eastern) political culture that is less inclined towards democracy and democratic values? The debate within the literature is whether or not there are cultural determinants that shape national values and political institutions (or regime types).

##### *Readings:*

Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba (1963), "An Approach to Political Culture," from *Civic Culture*, (Little, Brown), pp. 1-44

Geertz, Clifford (1973) "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (NY: Basic Books,), pp.3-30

Inglehart, Ronald (1988), "The Renaissance of Political Culture," *American Political Science Review* 82(4), pp. 1203-1230

Jackman, Robert W. and Ross A. Miller (1996), "A Renaissance of Political Culture?" *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(3), pp. 632-659

- Neher, Clark D. (1994), "Asian Style Democracy," *Asian Survey* 34(11), pp. 949-961
- Dalton, Russell J., and Nhu-Ngoc T. Ong. (2005), "Authority Orientations and Democratic Attitudes: A Test of the 'Asian Values' Hypothesis," *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 6(2), pp. 211-231

*Suggested Readings:*

- Robert Putnam (1995), "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital" *Journal of Democracy* vol. 6, no. 1 (Jan), 65-78
- Boix, Carles, and Daniel N. Posner (1998), "Social capital: Explaining its origins and effects on government performance," *British Journal of Political Science* 28(4), pp. 686-693
- Robert Jackman and Ross Miller (1998), "Social Capital and Politics" *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 1: 47-73
- Weber, Max (1904), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*
- Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba (1963), *Civic Culture* (Little, Brown)
- Inglehart, Ronald (1997), *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)
- Inglehart, Ronald, and Pippa Norris (2003), *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change Around the World* (Cambridge University Press)
- Putnam, Robert D., Robert Leonardi, and Raffaella Y. Nanetti (1994), *Making Democracy Work: Civic traditions in modern Italy* (Princeton university press)
- Wilson, Richard W. (2000), "Review: The many voices of Political Culture: Assessing different approaches," *World Politics* 52(2), pp. 246-273
- Dalton, Russell J. (2006), *Citizens, democracy, and markets around the Pacific Rim: Congruence theory and political culture* (Oxford University Press)
- David Elkins and Richard Simeon (1979), "A Cause of Its Effect, or What Does Political Culture Explain?" *Comparative Politics*, 11, pp.127-43.

Week 14, April 20: Politics of Identity—Nationalism and Ethnicity

Objective and Debates:

The objective this week is to examine the nationalism and identity. Much of this literature has focused on ethnicity, but there are also gender and religious implications as well. The debates regarding nationalism involve the distinction between shared historical memory or experiences (whether they are myths or real) bottom up nationalism versus state lead nationalism with top down approach. In addition, there are also some scholars that believe institutional design and democratization can resolve ethnic division, while others find that greater liberalization of the media and political system can exacerbate ethnic tensions.

*Readings:*

- Newman, Saul (1991), "Does modernization breed ethnic political conflict?" *World Politics* 43(3), pp. 451-478
- Snyder, Jack, and Karen Ballentine (1996), "Nationalism and the Marketplace of Ideas,"

*International Security* pp. 5-40

Mala Htun (2004), "Is gender like ethnicity? The political representation of identity groups," *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 2, no. 3

Gries, Peter Hays (2005), "Chinese nationalism: challenging the state?" *Current history: A journal of contemporary world affairs* 683, pp. 251-256

Zhao, Suisheng (1998), "A state-led nationalism: The patriotic education campaign in post-Tiananmen China," *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 31(3), pp. 287-302

Magnarella, Paul J. (2005), "The Background and Causes of the Genocide in Rwanda," *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 3(4), pp. 801-822

#### *Suggested Readings:*

Ernest Gellner (1983), *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press)

Donald Horowitz (1985), *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* (Berkeley: University of California Press)

Ted Robert Gurr (1993), *Minorities at Risk: A Global View of Ethnopolitical Conflicts* (Washington University Press)

Zachary Elkins, John Sides "Can Institutions Build Unity in Multiethnic States?"

*The American Political Science Review* (Nov 2007) Vol. 101, Iss. 4; 16 pages

de Figueiredo Jr, Rui JP, and Barry R. Weingast. "Rationality of fear: political opportunism and ethnic conflict." *Military intervention in civil wars* (1997).

Brubaker, Rogers, and David D. Laitin. "Ethnic and nationalist violence." *Annual Review of sociology* (1998): 423-452.

Reilly, Ben. "Electoral systems for divided societies." *Journal of Democracy* 13.2 (2002): 156-170.

Joel Selway and Kharis Templeman (2012), "The Myth of Consociationalism? Conflict Reduction in Divided Societies," *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 45, no. 12

Fjelde, Hanne, and Kristine Höglund (2014), "Electoral Institutions and Electoral Violence in Sub-Saharan Africa," *British Journal of Political Science*, pp. 1-24

#### Week 15, April 27 Comparative Methods and Empirical Analysis

##### Objective and Debates:

We return to the comparative methods and assess the advantages and pitfalls of various approaches to comparative politics. While week 2 discusses the "range" problem, this week deals with issues like concept formation and stretching, how comparisons can be used to address causal relationships, and how qualitative and quantitative perspectives complement each other in achieving scientific progress.

Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1994), pp.1-63

James Mahoney (2010), "After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research," *World Politics*, 62(1), pp.120-47

Robert Adcock and David Collier, "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research," *American Political Science Review*, 95(3), pp.529-546

Collier, David, and James E. Mahon (1993), "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis," *American Political Science Review* 87(4),

pp. 845-855

*Suggested Readings:*

- Geddes, Barbara (1990), "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics," *Political Analysis*, 2(1), pp.131-50
- Brambor, Thomas, William Roberts Clark, and Matt Golder (2006), "Understanding interaction models: Improving empirical analyses," *Political analysis* 14(1), pp. 63-82
- David Collier and James Mahoney, "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research," *World Politics*, v.49, October 1996, pp.56-91.
- Bennett, Andrew, and Colin Elman (2006), "Qualitative research: Recent developments in case study methods," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9, pp. 455-476
- Gerring, John (2004), "What is a case study and what is it good for?" *American Political Science Review* 98(2), pp. 341-354

Week 16, May 4: In Class PPT Presentations of the Final Paper

Final Papers Due May 11<sup>th</sup>