

POL 9600: Introduction to Comparative Politics

University of Missouri

Fall 2013

W 3:00-5:30PM, Professional Building 104

Laron K. Williams

Office location: 203 Professional Building
Phone: 573-882-2820
Email: williamslaro@missouri.edu
Office hours: M W 10:00-11:00am (or by appointment)

Course Description

This is a graduate level seminar in comparative politics. The purpose of this seminar is to provide an introduction to the study of comparative political systems. We will discuss a wide variety of topics dealing with political institutions and behavior. The readings will expose you to the main paradigmatic approaches in comparative politics—in particular, to structural, sociological, and rational-choice explanations of political behavior. The readings will allow you to assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of the various methodological approaches used in comparative politics—e.g., formal theoretic models, historical narratives, and cross-national statistical research. A secondary goal of this course is to provide a solid foundation upon which you can build to begin your studying for comprehensive examinations.

Course Requirements

Class Participation and Attendance (20%)

This course is a seminar, not a lecture series. It is your responsibility, as well as mine, to come to class prepared to discuss the information and claims found in the readings and explore related research possibilities. If any of us shirk, we all lose. I expect no absences in the course, and I encourage you to discuss any circumstances with me that will preclude you from attending class. I also expect you to arrive on time. If you do need to miss class, please contact me ahead of time to let me know that you will not be able to attend and to make arrangements to complete an alternate assignment. A large portion of my overall evaluation of your performance in the course will depend on the quality of your seminar participation.

Keep in mind that the purpose of the seminar is to engage in informed group discussion: we are not interested in uninformed opinion. This means that students should closely and critically read each book or article on the reading list, and spend time thinking about what each contributes to the topic that week and to comparative politics in general. Class discussion will focus on such issues as the theoretical arguments being made (both explicitly and implicitly), the empirical evidence that is marshaled to test these arguments, weaknesses of the work, and potential directions for future study.

Grades for participation (including discussion questions and attendance) will be assigned at the end of the semester, but you may ask for feedback on your performance at any time. If you have concerns about the quality and quantity of your participation in the course, I hope you will speak to me. Remember, this is a seminar, so just showing up to class is not enough. You must come to class prepared to participate in an informed discussion of the issues raised by the week's readings. If you just show up to class every week, but never say a word, you can expect to receive a D or lower for class participation (20% of your grade).

The following general grading scale will be used for participation and preparation:

- A: The student made a very strong contribution to the course. Class discussion, comments, and presentations reflected understanding and analysis of the material, and were constructive. Constructive means that a student does not simply identify a weakness or problem. Rather, constructive comments identify a problem and offer suggestions for how to address the weakness or problem.
- B: The student contributed meaningfully to the course. Class participation and/or presentations went beyond repeating the assigned material, perhaps identifying weaknesses in the current literature, but did not make many constructive suggestions about how weaknesses might be overcome or how the literature might be usefully extended in the future.
- C: The student did not contribute meaningfully to the seminar. Class participation and/or presentations were limited to repeating the assigned material rather than making connections or extensions.
- D or lower: The student attended class, but did not participate in discussions or present meaningful questions for academic debate.

Finally, because we will engage in vigorous academic debate during class, classroom etiquette is vital. Please work to ensure that you make comments in ways that invite discussion. Our classroom contains members with various life experiences, divergent perspectives, varying levels of experience with political science research, and different strategies for defending their views. Please state your opinions constructively and respectfully, listen carefully when your colleagues are speaking, and speak to me if you are offended by something that is said in class. If you do not follow these guidelines, your participation grade will be adversely affected.

Talking Points (25%)

For each class (excluding the Mini-Conference and classes where the student is writing an Analysis Paper), the student will email me (by the Tuesday before class at 9:00am) three “talking points” about the readings. I will arrange these talking points and have students read them aloud. The talking points should be in the form of a short paragraph outlining the question or argument.

These questions are intended to improve understanding of the material and inspire discussion, so they should be the most interesting questions or arguments that the student has identified based on the week’s readings. Questions can be related to a single reading, a set of readings, or the week’s selections as a whole. Each talking point should refer to a different chapter or article from the weekly readings. You may also include questions of clarification if there are areas in the reading that you find difficult to understand. However, keep in mind that I will evaluate the quality of your questions as a critical part of this grade component. Given the size of the class, and the amount of material covered, not everybody gets an opportunity to ask every question they have. Consider this your opportunity to get your questions on record. The talking points will be given an overall grade of either “check minus”, “check”, or “check plus”.

This is an example of an effective talking point:

McClosky believes that economics should be more literary in its writings so that it tells a story to its readers. This argument fits with Kuhn’s point that scientists write to an audience of other scientists. Obviously, audience is important, but how important? Has the field of political science suffered from the same use of scientific jargon in the same manner as economics? Has the language that political scientists use hindered the field in accomplishing its goals of explanation and prediction of social phenomenon?

This example highlights the main argument of the author (*economics should be more literary*) and relates it to readings from previous weeks (*Thomas Kuhn*). The talking point then presents a question that pits the

two arguments against one another, thereby creating points for discussion. Note that this is only one of the many ways to produce a quality talking point.

Weekly Analysis (25%)

At 5 points throughout the semester, students should write a 2-3 page analysis of the week's readings and email them to me (by the Tuesday before class at 9:00am). Each paper will be worth 5%. The primary goal of the papers is not to earn grades but to provide you with an opportunity to reflect on the readings and develop critical thinking and writing skills. Feel free to use these papers as an aid in class discussion. **Late papers will not be accepted.**

Keep the following questions in mind when crafting your analysis paper:

- *Theory*: Does the work make original contributions to the current state of theory on the topic being addressed? Are the assumptions and causal mechanisms elaborated clearly? Are the assumptions plausible? Is the theory internally consistent? Do the hypotheses follow logically from the theory?
- *Empirical Design*: Is the research design used by the author(s) suitable for testing the theoretical hypotheses? If not, how might this problem be resolved? Are there other relevant empirical issues the work has failed to consider?
- *Data*: Do the measures of the dependent and independent variables adequately correspond to the theoretical concepts of interest? Are better measures possible? Are more reliable data available to test the hypotheses? Are the data and construction of measures described in sufficient detail so as to permit replication?
- *Findings*: Have the results been interpreted correctly? Are the interpretations substantively interesting? How well do the findings fit with theoretical expectations? Are there other possible explanations of the phenomenon of interest that need to be considered? Are there other testable implications arising from the theory that might give us greater leverage on the posited relationships?

Be sure that your analysis is a coherent whole. In other words, you should not haphazardly offer answers to all of these questions, but use them as a guide to develop an original argument for your paper. You should have an introduction that sets out the thesis or primary argument of your analysis paper, a body that develops your thesis/argument citing the readings as needed to support your points, and a conclusion that rounds out your analysis paper. This is an opportunity to go beyond restating key points from the readings and think intelligently and originally about what they mean, what they tell us about comparative politics, and what concerns you about them. The best papers will be those that take up a single point or small issue and develop a thoughtful analysis of that point. Do not try to cover too much in the paper.

Research Design (30%)

Another requirement is the development of an original research design, involving the development of one or more hypotheses on one of the broad substantive topics that we cover in the seminar. This paper may be quantitative or qualitative in nature, depending on the nature of the question and the student's methodological training, but in any case it must be analytical and theoretical in nature rather than descriptive. While there is no requirement for the actual testing of these hypotheses (students can test their hypotheses if they choose), all students must present a detailed research design section that explains how the student might test these hypotheses. In essence, this project is what a front half of a manuscript would look like (without the Empirics/Findings section). The research proposal is a preliminary version of a full paper that focuses on the theory and provides only a conceptual discussion of the empirical analysis. The research proposal

should discuss the theoretical motivation for the proposed research, citing the relevant literature (at least 20 sources) to which the research seeks to contribute. It should clearly explain the original theoretical argument made and explicitly posit the key testable hypotheses derived from this theory. The proposal should also discuss the dependent variable(s) and central explanatory variables that would be employed in an empirical investigation of these hypotheses. In addition to submitting a written version, students will make a 15 minute presentation of their research proposal to the class.

The final paper must be 15-20 pages in length, and should be comparable to an academic journal article in style. Please note that this must be an original paper for this course, and can not overlap in any substantial way with a paper written for another course; if there is any question please talk to me about it and bring me a copy of the other paper.

There will be four components of research design:

1. A 3-4 page proposal that is due by the beginning of class on Wednesday, October 23 (worth 5% of the course grade). An effective proposal will include the following sections: *Background/literature* in which the student identifies gaps in the literature and introduces the research question, *Theory and Hypothesis* where the student identifies the credible mechanism, develops the theory and derives testable hypotheses, *Research Design* where the student discusses possible data sources and potential methods, and finally *Potential Problems/Obstacles* where the student can discuss areas in which he/she needs help.
2. A final version of the paper emailed to me (which I will then distribute to the rest of the class) by 3:00pm on Wednesday, November 27 (worth 15% of the course grade).
3. Participation in the Mini-Conference on Wednesday, December 4 and 11 (5%). Each student will make a 15 minute presentation and serve as a discussant/reviewer for two other student presentations. These 1-2 page reviews should follow the format of journal reviews and will be collectively worth 5%. I will provide more in-depth description of the requirements for the Reviews at a later date, but they should include an overall summary and then comments/criticisms arranged into three topics: aesthetics, empirical and theoretical. An effective presentation will include the following elements:
 - introduce research question
 - place your research in the context of the literature
 - derive hypotheses
 - describe your research design

The paper will be graded on the clarity and contribution of the theory as an addition to the literature on international conflict, as well as on the appropriateness of the empirical analysis proposed to test the theory. These papers will be expected to conform to the submission standards of the *American Journal of Political Science*.

Grammatical mistakes in the talking points, weekly analysis papers or in the research design will NOT be tolerated. Any student turning in an assignment with grammatical mistakes have the assignment returned without a grade. The student will have one opportunity to improve and resubmit the work with a grade penalty in a time frame decided by me.

Final class grades will be assigned with the following grading scale:

A+ = 97.0 - 100
A = 90.0 - 96.99
B+ = 87.0 - 89.99
B = 80.0 - 86.99

C+ = 77.0 - 79.99
C = 70.0 - 76.99
D+ = 67.0 - 69.99
D = 60.0 - 66.99
F = 0 - 59.99

There are no required textbooks. All required readings will be available on electronic course reserves or through jstor.

Other Considerations

Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is fundamental to the activities and principles of a university. All members of the academic community must be confident that each person's work has been responsibly and honorably acquired, developed, and presented. Any effort to gain an advantage not given to all students is dishonest whether or not the effort is successful. The academic community regards breaches of the academic integrity rules as extremely serious matters. Sanctions for such a breach may include academic sanctions from the instructor, including failing the course for any violation, to disciplinary sanctions ranging from probation to expulsion. When in doubt about plagiarism, paraphrasing, quoting, collaboration, or any other form of cheating, consult the course instructor.

Plagiarism (or cheating in any way) will not be tolerated. Any student plagiarizing will receive an automatic "F" in the course, no exceptions!

ADA Statement

If you anticipate barriers related to the format or requirements of this course, if you have emergency medical information to share with me, or if you need to make arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please let me know as soon as possible.

If disability-related accommodations are necessary (for example, a note taker, extended time on exams, captioning), please register with the Office of Disability Services (<http://disabilityservices.missouri.edu>), S5 Memorial Union, 573- 882-4696, and then notify me of your eligibility for reasonable accommodations. For other MU resources for students with disabilities, click on "Disability Resources" on the MU homepage.

Class Schedule:

We will spend as much time as necessary on each topic for this course. Because I am unable to predict in advance how long each topic will take, the schedule below is only a rough guideline.

Methodological and Theoretical Foundations

August 21: Introduction

August 28: Theories of Comparative Politics

- Almond, Gabriel A. 1956. "Comparative Political Systems". *Journal of Politics* 18: 391-409.
- Easton, David. 1957. "An Approach to the Analysis of Political Systems." *World Politics* 9: 383-400.
- Almond, Gabriel A. 1965. "A Developmental Approach to Political Systems." *World Politics* 17: 183-214.
- Kohli, Atul, Peter Evans, Peter J. Katzenstein, Adam Przeworski, Suzanne Hoerber Rudolph, James C. Scott, and Theda Skocpol. 1995. "The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium." *World Politics* 49: 1-49.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1995. "The Uses and Limitations of Rational Choice." In *Latin America in Comparative Perspective: New Approaches to Method and Analysis*, ed. P. Smith. Boulder: Westview Press, 81-108.

September 4: Research Design

- Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review* 65: 682-93.
- Jackman, Robert. 1985. "Cross-National Statistical Research and the Study of Comparative Politics." *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 161-82.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapters 1-3.
- Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review* 99:435-452.
- Bates, Robert H. 2008. "From Case Studies to Social Science: A Strategy for Political Research" in *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds. (172-185)
- Wood, Elisabeth. 2008. "Field Research" in *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds. (123-146)

Research Areas

September 11: Comparative Political Behavior

- Kitschelt, Herbert P. 1986. "Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest." *British Journal of Political Science* 16: 57-85.

- Norris, Pippa, Stefaan Walgrave, and Peter Van Aelst. 2005. “Who Demonstrates?” *Comparative Politics* 37: 189-205.
- Gurr, Ted R. 1968. “A Causal Model of Civil Strife.” *American Political Science Review* 62: 1104-1124.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1 (pp. 3-43).
- Fearon, James, and David Laitin. 1996. “Explaining Interethnic Cooperation.” *American Political Science Review* 90: 715-35.

September 18: Democracy and Democratization

- Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1959. “Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy” *American Political Science Review* 53(1): 69-105.
- Almond and Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Chapter 1: 1-44).
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Evelyne Huber Stephens, and John D. Stephens. 1992. *Capitalist Development and Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Chapters 2-3: 12-78).
- Chilcote, Ronald H. 1994. *Theories of Comparative Politics: The Search for a Paradigm Reconsidered* (2nd edition). Boulder: Westview Press. (Chapter 7: 215-249 and 262-269).
- Przeworski, Adam and Fernando Limongi. 1997. “Modernization: Theories and Facts” *World Politics* 49(2): 155-183.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson and James A. Robinson. 2001. “The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation” *The American Economic Review* 91(5): 1369-1401.

September 25: Political Culture

- Mishler and Rose. 2001. “What are the Origins of Political Trust? Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-Communist Societies.” *Comparative Political Studies* 34 (1):30-63.
- Anderson, Christopher J. and Christine Guillory. 1997. “Political Institutions and Satisfaction with Democracy: A Cross-National Analysis of Consensus and Majoritarian Systems.” *American Political Science Review* 91 (1):66-81.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1988. “The Renaissance of Political Culture.” *American Political Science Review* 82: 1203-30.
- Jackman, Robert W., and R. A. Miller. 1996. “A Renaissance of Political Culture?” *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 632-59.
- Duch, Raymond M., and Harvey D. Palmer. 2004. “It’s Not Whether You Win or Lose, But How You Play the Game: Self-Interest, Social Justice, and Mass Attitudes toward Market Transition.” *American Political Science Review* 98: 437-52.

October 2: Democratic Institutions

- Mainwaring, Scott, and Matthew Soberg Shugart. 1997. *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Read chapters 1, 2, 4 & 6.
- Lupia, Arthur and Kaare Strom. 1995. "Coalition Termination and the Strategic Timing of Parliamentary Elections." *The American Political Science Review*. 89.3: 648-665.
- Tsebelis, George. 1999. "Veto Players and Law Production in Parliamentary Democracies: An Empirical Analysis" *The American Political Science Review* 93(3): 591-608.

October 9: Party Systems

- Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Stein Rokkan. 1967. "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments: An Introduction." In Seymour Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan (eds.), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*, New York: Free Press, pp. 1-64.
- Dalton, Russell, Scott Flanagan, and Paul Allen Beck, eds. 1984. *Electoral Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies: Realignment or Dealignment?* Princeton: Princeton University Press. chapter 1
- Amorim Neto, Octavio and Gary W. Cox. 1997. "Electoral Institutions, Cleavage Structures, and the Number of Parties." *American Journal of Political Science* 41: 149-74.
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 2000. "Linkages between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Polities." *Comparative Political Studies* 33: 845-79.
- Boix, Carles. 2007. "Emergence of Parties and Party Systems" in *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Carles Boix and Susan Stokes, eds. (499-521)

October 16: Party Competition

- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Chapters 2, 7 & 8.
- Budge, Ian. 1994. "A New Spatial Theory of Party Competition: Uncertainty, Ideology and Policy Equilibria Viewed Comparatively and Temporally." *British Journal of Political Science*. 24.4: 443-467.
- Strom, Kaare and Wolfgang C. Muller. 1999. "Political Parties and Hard Choices." In *Policy, Office, or Votes? How Political Parties in Western Europe Make Hard Decisions*. Eds: Wolfgang C. Muller and Kaare Strom. Chapter 1
- Adams, James. 2001. *Party Competition and Responsible Party Government*. Chapters 1 & 2
- Meguid, Bonnie M. 2005. "Competition between Unequals: The Role of Mainstream Party Strategy in Niche Party Success." *The American Political Science Review*. 99.3: 347-359.

October 23: Elections and Voting Behavior

- **Research design proposal due**
- Jackman, Robert. 1987. "Political Institutions and Voter Turnout in the Industrial Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 81: 405-24.

- Lijphart, Arend. 1990. "The Political Consequences of Electoral Laws, 1945-1985." *American Political Science Review* 84: 481-96.
- Remmer, Karen. 1991. "The Political and Economic Impact of Economic Crisis in Latin America in the 1980s." *American Political Science Review* 85:777-800.
- Powell, G. Bingham, and Guy D. Whitten. 1993. "A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context." *American Journal of Political Science* 37: 391-414.
- Iversen, Torben. 1994. "Political Leadership and Representation in West European Democracies: A Test of Three Models of Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 38: 45-74.
- Roberts, Kenneth, and Erik Wibbels. 1999. "Party Systems and Electoral Volatility in Latin America: A Test of Economic, Institutional, and Structural Explanations." *American Political Science Review* 93 (3):575-590.

October 30: Political Economy in the Developing World

- Bates, Robert. 1981. *Markets and States in Tropical Africa: The Political Basis of Agricultural Policies*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Chapter 1 (pp. 1-29).
- Remmer, Karen L. 1993. "The Political Economy of Elections in Latin America, 1980-1991." *American Political Science Review* 87: 393-407.
- Diamond, Jared. 1999. *Guns, Germs, and Steel*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapters 4 & 14.
- Bates, Robert H. 2001. *Prosperity and Violence: The Political Economy of Development*. New York: W.W. Norton. Entire book (pp. 17-115).
- Weyland, Kurt. 2002. *The Politics of Market Reform in Fragile Democracies*, Chapters 2 and 3 (18-70).

November 6: Political Economy in the Developed World

- Hibbs, Douglas A. 1979. "The Mass Public and Macroeconomic Performance: Dynamics of Public Opinion toward Unemployment and Inflation." *American Journal of Political Science*. 23.4: 705-731.
- Hibbs, Douglas A., R. Douglas Rivers and Nicholas Vasilatos. 1982. "On the Demand for Economic Outcomes: Macroeconomic Performance and Mass Political Support in the United States, Great Britain, and Germany." *The Journal of Politics*. 44.2: 426-462.
- Alesina, Alberto and Nouriel Roubini. 1997. *Political Cycles and the Macroeconomy*. Chapter 6.
- Barro, Robert J. 1997. *Determinants of Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Empirical Study*. Chapter 1.
- Garrett, Geoffrey. 1998. *Partisan Politics in the Global Economy*. Chapters 1 & 2.
- Huber, Evelyne and John D. Stephens. 2001. *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State*. Chapters 1-3.

November 13: Professionalization I

- Maldonado, Claudia, Carlos I. Gutierrez, and Erin Urquhart. 2005. "Dissertations in Comparative Politics, 1985-2004." *APSA-CP Newsletter* 16 (2):24-29.
- Comparative Politics Organized Section. 2005. "Syposium: Should Everyone Do Fieldwork?" *APSA-CP Newsletter* 16 (2):8-18.
- Comparative Politics Organized Section. 2008. "Big, Unanswered Questions in Comparative Politics." *APSA-CP Newsletter* 19 (1):6-16.
- Blyth, Mark. 2006. "Great Punctuations: Prediction, Randomness, and the Evolution of Comparative Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100: 493-98.

November 20: Professionalization II

- Klass, Gary M. 2008. "Creating Good Charts." Chapter 3 in *Just Plain Data Analysis: Finding, Presenting, and Interpreting Social Science Data*.
- Good, Phillip I. and James W. Hardin. 2009. "Graphics". Chapter 10 in *Common Errors in Statistics (and How to Avoid Them)*.
- Good, Phillip I. and James W. Hardin. 2009. "Reporting Your Results". Chapter 8 in *Common Errors in Statistics (and How to Avoid Them)*.
- Good, Phillip I. and James W. Hardin. 2009. "Interpreting Reports". Chapter 9 in *Common Errors in Statistics (and How to Avoid Them)*.
- Kastellec, Jonathan P. and Eduardo L. Leoni. 2007. "Using Graphs Instead of Tables in Political Science." *Perspectives on Politics* 5.4: 755-771.
- Salmond, Rob and David T. Smith. 2011. "Cheating Death-by-Powerpoint: Effective Use of Visual Aids at Professional Conferences." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44.3: 589-596.

November 27: No Class: Thanksgiving

- **Research design due via email by 3:00pm**

December 4: Mini-Conference: Week I

December 11: Mini-Conference Week II