

For Winter 2009: Substitute Geys (2005, Elect Studies) for Blais on turnout

PLSC 350: Theories of Comparative Politics Course Syllabus

TTH, 1:35 to 2:50 p.m.
Winter Semester 2008

Prof. Daniel Nielson
790 SWKT, 422-3417
Email: daniel_nielson@byu.edu
Office Hours: TTH 9:30-10:30, and whenever I am in my office.

Course Rationale

In important ways, comparative politics is the pivot of political science. It draws from and builds on the three other major subfields: political philosophy, American politics, and international relations. But it also serves as a reference point for all three. Comparative politics provides political philosophy a purpose, American politics a context, and international relations its constituent parts. Comparative politics' power thus lies in its expansiveness. Anything political in foreign countries is fair game. When they're feeling a bit frisky, comparativists think of comparative politics as the master subfield. But don't spread that around too much.

Comparative politics and international relations are often confused. Comparative politics treats the comparison of countries' polities; international relations deals with the interactions between and among polities. While analytical distinctions obviously persist, the fields have increasingly drawn more closely together in research applications. For many scholars, like me, there is no longer a practical distinction between research in the two fields. But, in general, questions like "Why do autocracies transition to democracies?" and "What causes corruption?" belong to comparative politics and "What causes war?" and "Do international organizations matter?" belong to international relations.

Comparative politics has been most heavily influenced by American politics, which is the dominant field in U.S. political science. This makes sense given that the United States might be considered a case within the context of comparative politics. So the theories and methods dominant in American politics, particularly rational choice and econometrics but also behavioralism and survey research, have easily crossed over to comparative politics. Comparative politics looks more like a science than international relations, though IR is catching up.

We will learn the major theoretical traditions of comparative politics thoroughly in this course. In my view, we cannot understand the world without theory – without ways of

filtering its complexities. The key is using theories that are systematic and logically sound. In this class we will evaluate theories that aspire to those traits.

Course Objectives

Students who complete this course successfully should:

- Learn to think more conceptually and theoretically;
- Understand the most important theoretical concepts in comparative politics as discussed by leading theorists;
- Learn to critique the ideas of the best scholars in the field;
- Learn to synthesize ideas into coherent wholes;
- Learn how to apply theory systematically to relevant cases;
- Improve their ability to write clear and engaging prose that is analytically sound.

Assignments and Grading:

Evaluations will consider the following elements (with weights included):

Class participation	10%
Email responses	15%
The “synthetic” essay	10%
Four peer reviews	8%
Midterm exam	12%
Final exam	20%
Final comprehensive essay	25%

Class Participation

Given that this is a small, discussion-based class, you must come prepared for each session ready to talk deeply about the day’s readings. You should have something meaningful to say about each reading we discuss, even if there is ultimately not time to raise each issue you have considered. Please avoid “big talking,” where you dominate the conversation or take longer than necessary to voice your ideas.

But you must speak up often. There is no room for “wallflowers” in a seminar, so we will cultivate that ethos here. I will be evaluating the quality of your participation – the degree to which your interventions advance the discussion and lead to fresh insights about the ideas under consideration. Since I expect you to learn much more from each other than from me, it is critical that all of you come ready to share so that you can enrich the experience for all of us.

Email Responses

I borrowed this idea from Prof. Wade Jacoby. For each reading in the course, each of

you is required to submit a short email of two paragraphs (500 words or less). I must receive the email before 9 a.m. of the day we meet in class to discuss the relevant reading. The first paragraph *must restate* the main **argument** of the reading – identifying both **independent and dependent variables** – and **summarize** the author’s **data** – **analyzing** how well it supports the author’s argument.

Two paragraphs are due for **every reading** we cover in class, but if there is more than one reading on a given day, please send your responses in a **single email**.

The second paragraph of the email needs to **connect** the assigned reading to a **new article or paper published or written since 2000** – and not included on the course syllabus – that you have discovered using appropriate research methods. I recommend the Social Science Citation Index or Google Scholar, with special attention to articles receiving citations by other scholars.

In this second paragraph you can reflect on how the new article or paper answers an unanswered question in the assigned reading, corrects a conceptual or empirical error, solves a puzzle created by the assigned reading, suggests an alternative or critique, or otherwise improves on what is known about the topic. You can reflect on anything interesting about the new article, provided you connect it to the assigned reading. Students in the past have found it most useful to search for readings that respond to unanswered questions in the assigned readings.

At the **top** of the email, please include a **full citation** of the new article or paper using appropriate **Turabian style**. Part of the grade for your emails will reflect the quality, novelty, and relevance of the article you chose and the insights you have in connecting it to the assigned reading. You do not need to select a new article for every assigned reading, although you should feel welcome to do so. One new article per class session/email will suffice. But you do need to **connect each assigned reading** to the one new article you chose.

Finding new articles frequently will help you learn how to answer unanswered questions and get up-to-date on the latest research. Hence, this assignment will help you become better researchers. Hint: you may find it helpful to find articles, if any are available, that cite the assigned readings.

Important Note: I sometimes receive more than 100 emails in a given day, and I will need you to help me sort yours out of the mix. In the email’s **subject line**, please **type “PLSC 350:” followed by** the last name(s) of the **author(s)** so that I can better keep track of your emails. If you do not do this, I may inadvertently fail to give you credit for your email. Do not put anything else in the subject line. That way, if you need to email me regarding something else, I won’t mistake it for an assignment email.

I will provide feedback on how you are doing on the emails at a few points in the semester, but a far better way to have them evaluated is to print them, bring them to class, and use them as the basis for our discussions. In addition to enriching our discussions,

they are a great way for me to prepare for class – they help me see which points came across well and which did not and need emphasis. Finally, they are also a chance to explore ideas without the pressure of expanding them into full papers, though it is likely that great papers may well get their start as smart emails.

You should submit emails for each reading assignment every day that we have a reading assignment, though each student can skip three emails without penalty. You should feel free to discuss the readings together before composing the emails. Collaboration and discussion is encouraged. However, you will be graded on your *independence* of thought in your analysis, so copying each other's work will be penalized severely.

The most important thing I am looking for is evidence of intelligent life. Engage the readings thoughtfully, critique them, ask questions of them, wonder what comes next – anything that demonstrates that you've expended intellectual energy on the ideas we're covering.

Synthetic Essay

You will be required to produce a “synthetic” essay analyzing, critiquing, and synthesizing theories from different segments of the class. The essay should be 7-10 pages in length, focusing on two or more theoretical approaches, and evaluating the contrasting approaches' logical and practical merits. The audience for the essays is the instructor and your peers.

The essay assignment is intended to be broadly conceptual, without empirical content, and should allow an evaluation of your analytical skills as well as your comprehension of chosen theoretical approaches. You should read additional theoretical material beyond the course readings (which, in addition to your own research, I can suggest in office hours or by appointment) to enrich your essay.

Innovation and fresh ideas in your theoretical analysis will be rewarded. The more creative the approach, the better. Essays covering well-trod conceptual territory must distinguish themselves through unique insight to be considered excellent. As earlier glimpses of your work, evaluating the synthetic essay will give me a chance to suggest areas of strength and weakness to which you can respond in your final comprehensive essay.

One possibility is to identify a question you find interesting, like “Does economic development cause democracy?” or “What factors lead to social revolution?” and then compare and contrast leading approaches to answering the chosen question. You would then finish the essay by making your own independent argument that addresses the question. Another approach might identify a pivotal argument in the literature, say, that social capital is necessary for good government. You might then amass and review critiques of the argument from the literature and then finish the essay with your own independent critique. But you should not feel constrained by these examples. Again, I am looking for evidence of intelligent life. My most important criteria in evaluating

these essays will be the independence and conceptual rigor of the thinking.

To summarize, there are only four criteria for the essays:

- They should not be empirical (no extended examples more than a sentence or two), but broadly conceptual;
- They must cover two or more of the approaches we examine in the course (employing readings beyond the course material);
- They must be analytically rigorous in critiquing the theories addressed; and
- They should be interesting, innovative, and engaging.

There are no other criteria for the essays. Experience has taught me that if I provide a formula for the essay, I get formulaic essays, which teach very little and are mind-numbing to read.

Late Assignments

Assignments should be submitted on the day they are due at the time specified. Papers submitted 5 minutes after the deadline will be penalized 5%. Projects submitted later that day will be penalized 10%. *Projects submitted after the due date will be penalized an additional 3% for each added day they are late.*

Peer Reviews

You will write four one-page peer reviews during the semester. You will write two peer reviews for two peers' synthetic essays, exchanging papers with other members of the class. You will also write two peer reviews for the early draft of the final essay. You are responsible for the exchange of papers.

Peer reviews should:

- (1) Restate the main point of the paper succinctly to make sure that it is understood.
- (2) Analyze and critique the paper's argument. (Points of analysis could include the paper's scope, quality of research question, clarity of ideas and expression, depth of inquiry, appropriateness to target audience, etc.)
- (3) Praise the paper's strengths.
- (4) Check the sources carefully.
- (5) Correct style errors.
- (6) Make recommendations for improvement. Authors should be able to use these reviews to make significant progress in their work.

Final Essay

You will all be much stronger theorists by the end of the course. The final essay will provide you an opportunity to begin finding your voice as a theorist. Think of the final essay as an introductory chapter to a dissertation or a research monograph.

You will pose a general research question, such as "Can appropriate constitutional design avoid ethnic conflict?" or "Is Islam anti-democratic?" And then you will develop your

own theoretical ideas in the context of a critique, synthesis, and reformulation of the existing literature on the subject, including some of the pivotal ideas we have discussed in the class. The models for this are the introductory chapters to the books we have read as “anchor texts” in this course.

You may recycle some of the writing from your synthetic essay, if it is relevant. But the overall final essay needs to be fresh in providing novel insights.

The essay should be 15-20 pages in length, and you will write it in two stages: an “earlier” draft (worth 5% of the final grade) and a final draft (worth 20%). You will receive feedback on the earlier draft from two peers and me, so you will have direction for revising the essay.

Exams

Exams will be strictly long essay, take-home questions with strict word limits on the answers. Both exams will ask you to synthesize and integrate the material across the multiple approaches we will be covering in class. Evaluations will focus on the clarity of thinking, the ability to synthesize ideas, and the capacity to identify questions that persist in comparative politics.

Analytical Approach

There are many ways to carve up the field of comparative politics. The way I think about political science, there are two major dimensions in the various debates: material vs. non-material motives and individual vs. group unit of analysis. Like most political science, these dimensions can be displayed on a 2x2 table.

		Unit of Analysis	
		Individual	Group
Actor Motives	Material	Rational Choice	Historical Institutionalism
	Non- Material	Behavioralism	Cultural theories

We will cover each of the four resulting approaches, focusing on “anchor texts” from each of the four major analytical camps in comparative politics.

Anchor Texts

There are 6 “anchor” texts for the course. They are listed in the course schedule below. Each anchor text is a seminal work in political science and has spawned a research program around it. We will delve deeply into the anchor texts and become familiar with the major streams of thought in the associated research programs.

Group Work

While we will not assign official study groups for the class, you are strongly encouraged to form them on your own. I recommend that you meet at least once per week outside our formal class period to discuss the readings and prepare for the upcoming seminar. This may be a chance to divide up the readings within the sub-groups (I also strongly recommend that *at least two people* cover each reading) and teach each other about the literature in the various research programs associated with the anchor texts.

I recommend that you not feel compelled to read each word of each text. I want you to understand the essence of the ideas presented and be familiar with the approach taken to evaluate or illustrate the ideas empirically. You can gain this understanding through judicious skimming and efficient collaboration with your peers. I strongly encourage the maximization of learning through efficient reading and teamwork.

Other Course Business

Plagiarism

A note on plagiarism. Plagiarism is intellectual theft. It will not be tolerated in this class. Full citations must be included for every source you utilize, including those you paraphrase even loosely. Quotation marks must be used for *directly quoted strings of three or more words*. Citations must be included if you paraphrase another author – if you use another’s ideas, even if not the exact words, you must cite the source. Please consult style manuals (Turabian or Chicago) for answers to specific citation questions.

Discrimination

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination against any participant in an educational program or activity that receives federal funds. The act is intended to eliminate sex discrimination in education. Title IX covers discrimination in programs, admissions, activities, and student-to-student sexual harassment. BYU’s policy against sexual harassment extends not only to employees of the university but to students as well. If you encounter unlawful sexual harassment or gender based discrimination, please talk to your professor; contact the Equal Employment Office at 422-5895 or 367-5689 (24-hours); or contact the Honor Code Office at 422-2847.

Access

Brigham Young University is committed to providing a working and learning atmosphere which reasonably accommodates qualified persons with disabilities. If you have any disability which may impair your ability to complete this course successfully, please contact the Services for Students with Disabilities Office (378-2767). Reasonable academic accommodations are reviewed for all students who have qualified documented disabilities. Services are coordinated with the student and instructor by the SSD office. If you need assistance or if you feel you have been unlawfully discriminated against on the basis of disability, you may seek resolution through established grievance policy and procedures. You should contact the Equal Employment Office at 378-5895, D-282 ASB.

Proviso

The guidelines above and the course schedule below are very likely to be followed, but I reserve the right to modify them as I see fit during the course of the term.

Readings

There are six required anchor textbooks for the class:

- Elinor Ostrom. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James Morrow, Randall Sieverson, and Alistair Smith. 2003. *The Logic of Political Survival*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ronald Inglehart. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Robert D. Putnam. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Theda Skocpol. *States and Social Revolutions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Paul Pierson. 2004. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions and Social Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

All six books are seminal works in political science and are thus among the most cited in the field. We will use them as “anchor texts” for our study this semester and will connect most of the other ideas we cover to these anchor texts. I believe that we best learn the pivotal ideas of a field by learning from the sources themselves.

We will also be covering many other journal articles as we reflect on the main approaches to comparative politics, as indicated below in the course schedule. These readings, unless otherwise indicated, will be available on Blackboard. Again, it is vital that you understand each of the ideas we cover, though you will likely be able to learn them without reading every word. I encourage you to work together to master these ideas.

Readings & Assignments Schedule

Date	Day	Topic	Readings
	Part I:	Theory & Science	

8-Jan	Tues.	What is theory?	
10-Jan	Thurs.	Philosophy of Science	<p>Required: Karl R. Popper. 1957. "Philosophy of Science: A Personal Report." In <i>British Philosophy in the Mid-Century: A Cambridge Symposium</i>, ed. C.A. Mace. London: George Allen and Unwin: 155-189.</p> <p>Required: Thomas S. Kuhn. 1963. "The Function of Dogma in Scientific Research." In <i>Scientific Change: Historical Studies in the Intellectual, Social and Technical Conditions for Scientific Discovery and Technical Invention, from Antiquity to the Present</i>, ed. A.C. Crombie. New York: Basic Books: 347-95.</p> <p>Required: Imre Lakatos. 1970. "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes." In <i>Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge</i>, eds. Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 91-196.</p>
Part II: Anchor Texts			
15-Jan	Tues.	Rational Choice I	<p>Anchor Text: Elinor Ostrom. 1990. <i>Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action</i>. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-3.</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Mancur Olson. 1965. <i>The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups</i>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Read excerpts on Blackboard.</p> <p>Green, Donald and Ian Shapiro. 1994. <i>The Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science</i>. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.</p> <p>Duncan Black. 1948. "On the Rationale of Group Decision-making." <i>The Journal of Political Economy</i>, Vol. 56, No. 1. (Feb.), pp. 23-34.</p> <p>Herbert A. Simon. 1955. "A Behavioral Model of Rational Choice." <i>The Quarterly Journal of Economics</i>, Vol. 69, No. 1. (Feb., 1955), pp. 99-118.</p>
17-Jan	Thurs.	Rational Choice I	Anchor Text: Ostrom 1990. Chapters 4-6.

Recommended:

Terry M. Moe. 1984. "The New Economics of Organization." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 28, No. 4. (Nov.): 739-777.

B.D. Jones. 1999. "Bounded Rationality." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2, pp. 297-321.

Paul F. Whiteley. 1995. "Rational Choice and Political Participation: Evaluating the Debate." *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 48, No. 1. (Mar.), pp. 211-23

22-Jan Tues. Rational Choice II **Anchor Text:** Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James Morrow, Randall Sieverson, and Alistair Smith. 2003. *The Logic of Political Survival*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Chapters 1-3.

Recommended:

James Steintrager. 1971. "Prediction & Control versus the Narcissus Trance of Political Science." *Polity*, Vol. 3, No. 3. (Spring), pp. 299-333.

William H. Riker. 1980. "Implications from the Disequilibrium of Majority Rule for the Study of Institutions." *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 74, No. 2. (Jun.), pp. 432-446.

George Tsebelis. 1995. "Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism and Multipartyism." *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 25, No. 3. (Jul.): 289-325.

24-Jan Rational Choice II **Anchor Text:** Bueno de Mesquita et al. 2003. Chapters 4-10.

Recommended:

Elinor Ostrom. 1998. "A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Choice Theory of Collective Action: Presidential Address, American Political Science Association, 1997." *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 92, No. 1. (Mar.): 1-22.

Robert Axelrod. 1986. "An Evolutionary Approach to Norms." *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 80, No. 4. (Dec.): 1095-1111.

James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin. 1996. "Explaining Interethnic Cooperation." *The American Political Science Review*. Vol. 90, Iss. 4. (Dec.) pp. 715-36.

29-Jan Tues. Behavioralism

Anchor Text: Ronald Inglehart. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press. Chapters 1-6.

Recommended:

John Zaller; Stanley Feldman. 1992. "A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science* Vol. 36, No. 3 (Aug.): 579-616.

G. Bingham Powell, Jr.; Guy D. Whitten. 1993. "A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context." *American Journal of Political Science* Vol. 37, No. 2 (May): 391-414.

31-Jan Thurs. Behavioralism

Anchor Text: Inglehart 1990. Chapters 7-13.

Recommended:

G. Bingham Powell Jr. 1986. "American Voter Turnout in Comparative Perspective." *The American Political Science Review*. Vol. 80, No. 1 (Mar.): 17-43.

Edward N. Muller and Mitchell A. Seligson. 1994. "Civic Culture and Democracy: The Question of Causal Relationships." *The American Political Science Review*. Vol. 88, No. 3 (Sep.): 635-652.

Matthew Gabel. 1998. "Public Support for European Integration: An Empirical Test of Five Theories." *The Journal of Politics* Vol. 60, No. 2 (May): 333-354.

John H. Aldrich. 1993. "Rational Choice and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science* Vol. 37, No. 1 (Feb.): 246-278.

5-Feb Tues. Culture

Anchor Text: Robert D. Putnam. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press. Chapters 1-3.

Recommended:

Margaret Levi. 1996. Social and Unsocial Capital: A Review Essay of Robert Putnam's *Making Democracy Work*. *Politics & Society* Vol. 24, No. 1 (Mar.): 45-55.

Sidney Tarrow. 1996. "Making Social Science Work Across Space and Time: A Critical Reflection on Robert Putnam's *Making Democracy Work*." *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 90, No. 2 (Jun.): 389-397.

Markus Freitag. 2006. "Bowling the State Back in: Political Institutions and the Creation of Social Capital." *European Journal of Political Research* Vol. 45, No. 1 (Jan.): 123-152.

7-Feb Thurs. Culture

Anchor Text: Putnam 1993. Chapters 4-6.

Recommended:

Aaron Wildavsky. 1987. "Choosing Preferences by Constructing Institutions: A Cultural Theory of Preference Formation." *The American Political Science Review* Vol. 81, No. 1. (Mar.): 3-22.

Harry Eckstein. 1988. "A Culturalist Theory of Political Change." *The American Political Science Review* Vol. 82, No. 3. (Sep.): 789-804.

Blackboard: Stephen Knack & Phillip Keefer. 1997. "Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-Country Investigation." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112, 4:

1251-1288.

12-Feb	Tues.	Historical Institutionalism I	<p>Anchor Text: Theda Skocpol. 1979. <i>States and Social Revolutions</i>. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press. Chapters 1-3.</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Terry Lynn Karl. 1990. "Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America." <i>Comparative Politics</i> 23, 1. (Oct.): 1-21.</p> <p>Timothy Mitchell. 1991. "The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics." <i>The American Political Science Review</i> 85, 1 (Mar.): 77-96.</p> <p>Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol. 1985. <i>Bringing the State Back In</i>. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.</p>
14-Feb	Thurs.	Hist. Institut. I	<p>Anchor Text: Skocpol 1979. Chapters 4-7.</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. "Historical institutionalism in comparative politics." <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 2 (June): 369-404.</p> <p>Peter A. Hall. 1993. "Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain." <i>Comparative Politics</i> 25, 3 (Apr.): 275-296.</p> <p>Alfred Stepan and Cindy Skach. 1993. "Constitutional Frameworks and Democratic Consolidation: Parliamentarianism versus Presidentialism." <i>World Politics</i> 46, 1 (Oct.): 1-22.</p>
19-Feb	Tues.	Monday Instruction	
21-Feb	Thurs.	Historical Institutionalism II	<p>Anchor Text: Paul Pierson. 2004. <i>Politics in Time: History, Institutions and Social Analysis</i>. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press. Chapters 1-3.</p>

			<p>Recommended:</p> <p>David Stark. 1991. "Path Dependence and Privatization Strategies in East Central Europe." <i>East European Politics and Societies</i> 6, 1 (Winter): 17-54.</p>
26-Feb	Tues.	Hist. Instit. II	<p>Anchor Text: Pierson 2004. Chapters 4-Conclusion.</p> <p>Paul Pierson. 1996. "The New Politics of the Welfare State." <i>World Politics</i> 48, 2 (January): 143-.</p> <p>Elisabeth Clemens and James Cook. 1999. "Politics and Institutionalism: Explaining Durability and Change." <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i> 25: 441-466.</p>
	Part III:	Topics & Questions	
28-Feb	Thurs.	Political Economy of Advanced Democracies	<p>Required: Carles Boix. 1999. "Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies." <i>American Political Science Review</i> 93, 3 (Sep.): 609-624.</p> <p>Required: Thomas R. Cusack, Torben Iversen and David Soskice. 2007. "Economic Interests and the Origins of Electoral Systems." <i>American Political Science Review</i> 101, 3 (August): 373-391.</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Evelyne Huber, Charles Ragin, and John D. Stephens. 1993. "Social Democracy, Christian Democracy, Constitutional Structure, and the Welfare State." <i>The American Journal of Sociology</i> 99, 3 (Nov.): 711-749.</p> <p>Stein Rokkan. 1970. <i>Citizens, Elections, Parties: Approaches to the Comparative Study of the Processes of Development</i>. New York: McKay.</p>
29-Feb	Fri.	Synthetic Essay Due	By 4 p.m., hard copy to Poli. Sci. Dept. Secretaries and electronic version by email.
4-Mar	Tues.	Democratization	<p>Required: Barbara Geddes. 1999. "What Do We Know About Democratization After Twenty Years?" <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 2 (June): 115-144.</p>

			<p>Required: Darren Hawkins. 2001. Democratization Theory and Nontransitions: Insights from Cuba. <i>Comparative Politics</i> 33, 4 (Jul.): 441-461</p> <p>Recommended: Terry Lynn Karl. 1990. "Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America." <i>Comparative Politics</i> 23, 1 (Oct.): 1-21.</p>
6-Mar	Thurs.	Policy Effects of Electoral Rules	<p>Required: Daniel L. Nielson. 2003. "Supplying Trade Reform: Political Institutions and Liberalization in Middle-Income Presidential Democracies" <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> 47, 3 (Jul.): 470-491.</p> <p>Required: Hicken & Simmons. 2007. "Particularism and Public Goods: The Effects of Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote on Education Spending and Performance." Forthcoming, <i>American Journal of Political Science</i>.</p> <p>Recommended: Ronald Rogowski. 1987. "Trade and the Variety of Democratic Institutions." <i>International Organization</i> 41, 2 (Spring): 203-223.</p>
7-Mar	Fri.	Midterm Exam Due	By 4 p.m., hard copy to Poli. Sci. Dept. Secretaries and electronic version by email.
11-Mar	Tues.	Islam & Democracy	<p>Required: Fareed Zakaria. 2004. "Islam, Democracy, and Constitutional Liberalism." <i>Political Science Quarterly</i> 119, 1 (Spring): 1-20.</p> <p>Required: Mark Tessler. 2002. "Islam and Democracy in the Middle East: The Impact of Religious Orientations on Attitudes toward Democracy in Four Arab Countries" <i>Comparative Politics</i>, 34, 3 (Apr.): 337-354.</p>
12-Mar	Weds.	2 Peer Reviews Due	By 4 p.m., hard copy to Poli. Sci. Dept. Secretaries and electronic version by email.
13-Mar	Thurs.	Ethnic Conflict	Required: Chaim Kaufmann. 1996. "Possible and Impossible Solutions to Ethnic Civil Wars." <i>International Security</i> 20, 4 (Spring): 136-175.

Required: James D. Fearon and David Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97 (Feb.): 75-90.

Recommended:

Indra De Soysa. 2002. "Paradise is a Bazaar? Greed, Creed, and Governance in Civil War, 1989-99." *Journal of Peace Research* 39, 4 (July): 395-416.

Stephen I. Wilkinson. 2004. *Votes and Violence: Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin. 1996. "Explaining Interethnic Cooperation." *The American Political Science Review* 90, 4 (Dec.): 715-735.

18-Mar Tues. Corruption

Required: Daniel Treisman. 2000. The causes of corruption: A cross-national study. *Journal of Public Economics* 76: 399-457.

Required: Daniel Lederman, Norman Loayza, and Rodrigo R. Soares. 2001. "Accountability and Corruption: Political Institutions Matter." (November). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 2708.

Recommended: Paolo Mauro. 1995. "Corruption and Growth." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 110, 3 (Aug.): 681-712

20-Mar Thurs. The Resource Curse

Required: Michael L. Ross. 1999. "The Political Economy of the Resource Curse." *World Politics* 51, 2 (January): 297-322.

Recommended: Michael L. Ross. 2001. "Does Oil Hinder Democracy?" *World Politics* 53, 3 (April): 325-361.

25-Mar Tues. Comparative Electoral Turnout

Required: André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Neil Nevitte. 2004. "Where Does Turnout Decline Come From?" *European Journal of Political Research* 43, 2: 221-236.

			<p>Recommended: John H. Aldrich. 1993. "Rational Choice and Turnout." <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> Vol. 37, No. 1 (Feb.): 246-278.</p> <p>Recommended: Robert W. Jackman. 1987. "Political Institutions and Voter Turnout in the Industrial Democracies." <i>American Political Science Review</i> 81, 2 (Jun.): 405-424.</p>
27-Mar	Thurs.	Democracy & Development	<p>Required: David L. Epstein, Robert Bates, Jack Goldstone, Ida Kristensen, and Sharyn O'Halloran. 2006. "Democratic Transitions." <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> 50, 3: 551-569.</p> <p>Recommended: Adam Przeworski and Fernando Limongi. 1997. "Modernization: Theories and Facts." <i>World Politics</i> 49, 2 (January): 155-183.</p>
28-Mar	Fri.	Essay Early Draft Due	By 4 p.m., hard copy to Poli. Sci. Dept. Secretaries and electronic version by email.
1-Apr	Tues.	Asian Development	<p>Required: Doner, Richard, Bryan Ritchie, and Dan Slater. 2005. "Systemic Vulnerability and the Origins of Developmental States: Northeast and Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective." <i>International Organization</i> 59: 327-361.</p> <p>Recommended: Robert Wade. 1990. <i>Governing the Market: Economic Theory and the Role of Government in East Asian Industrialization</i> (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press).</p>
3-Apr	Thurs.	Women's Representation	<p>Required: Andrew Reynolds. 1999. "Women in the Legislatures and Executives of the World: Knocking at the Highest Glass Ceiling." <i>World Politics</i> 51, 4 (July): 547-572.</p> <p>Recommended: Richard E. Matland and Donley T. Studlar. 1996. "The Contagion of Women Candidates in Single-Member District and Proportional Representation Electoral Systems: Canada and Norway." <i>The Journal of Politics</i> 58, 3 (Aug.): 707-733.</p>
4-Apr	Fri.	2 Peer Reviews Due	By 4 p.m., hard copy to Poli. Sci. Dept. Secretaries and electronic version by email.

8-Apr	Tues.	Islam & Women's Rights	<p>Required: Daniela Donno and Bruce Russett. 2004. "Islam, Authoritarianism, and Female Empowerment: What are the Linkages?" <i>World Politics</i> 56 (July): 582-607.</p> <p>Recommended: M. Steven Fish. 2002. "Islam and Authoritarianism." <i>World Politics</i> 55, 1 (Oct.): 4-37.</p>
10-Apr	Thurs.	Environmental Protection	<p>Required: David John Frank, Ann Hironaka, Evan Schofer. 2000. "The Nation-State and the Natural Environment over the Twentieth Century." <i>American Sociological Review</i> 65, 1 (Feb.): 96-116.</p> <p>Recommended: Detlef Sprinz and Tapani Vaahoranta. 1994. "The Interest-Based Explanation of International Environmental Policy." <i>International Organization</i> 48, 1 (Winter): 77-105.</p>
15-Apr	Tues.	Course Wrap-up	
16-Apr	Fri.	Essay Final Draft Due	By 4 p.m., hard copy to Poli. Sci. Dept. Secretaries and electronic version by email.
21-Apr	Mon.	Final Exam Due	By 4 p.m., hard copy to Poli. Sci. Dept. Secretaries and electronic version by email.

Motives

	Material	Ideational
Individual	Rational Choice (Comparative)	Behavioralism (Comparative)
Collective	Structuralism (Compar.) Neo-realism (IR) Neo-liberalism (IR)	Cultural (Compar.) Constructivism (IR)