

COMPARATIVE POLITICAL RESEARCH
MA Core Course, Winter Term, AY 2019/20
4 CEU credits, 8 ECTS

Carsten Q. Schneider

September 11, 2019

Instructor

Carsten Q. Schneider, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Political Science
Central European University

Room: Nador u. 9, FT 903
E-mail: schneiderc@ceu.edu
Phone: +36 1 327-3086

Teaching assistant

???

Classes

???

Office Hours

Instructor

NB: Please sign up beforehand at <http://carstenqschneider.youcanbook.me>.

Teaching Assistant

???

Course Description

The aims of this course consist in making students familiar with the basic rules of doing comparative research and introducing the most influential approaches and salient topics in comparative political science. The course, thus, will help students to evaluate the methodological merits of those political science publications that use a comparative approach, to recognize which intellectual tradition they belong to, and to design their own comparative research strategy. The course is structured into three parts of different lengths. In the first part, we introduce the basic rationale of comparing in political science. Furthermore, we extensively discuss crucial research design and methodological issues in comparative social research, such as the logic of theory testing, the processes of concept formation and data aggregation, and differences of so-called qualitative and quantitative research. During the shorter second part, participants will be exposed to the 'meta'-theoretical paradigms in comparative research. In part three, we will deal with some of the major themes in comparative social research, paying specific attention to

the most salient political institutions and to the issues of varieties of democracies. The course meets twice a week. Most of the time, the first meeting of each week will be predominantly organized as a lecture, the second predominantly as a seminar.

Learning Outcomes

During the course work, students are asked to write small position papers, several written exercises, to actively participate during in-class discussions, and to prepare in-class presentations. The position papers are expected to help develop the ability to synthesize the information gathered from the mandatory readings, determine a focus point, and to develop a coherent line of argumentation. The written exercises are expected to improve the ability to generate logical, plausible, and persuasive arguments, to compare and contrast, and to derive theoretical conclusions from comparative empirical observations. The emphasis on in-class participation and in-class presentations is meant to foster the skills of expressing informative reflections 'on the spot' and to decrease potential fears of speaking in front of others.

Learning Activities and Teaching Methods

Teaching methods consist of lectures, seminars, group work, and student presentation. The following teaching activities will take place.

Presence

Students are expected to be actively present at all lectures and seminars. In case you are unable to attend, you need to inform both instructors via email prior to the meeting you are going to miss. During the seminars you are expected to reflect critically on the mandatory readings and to engage in discussions with your fellow students and the instructor(s). Questions and stimulating interaction during the lectures will be positively evaluated as well. As some might be more shy than others and because our class might be bigger than average, everybody is encouraged to send questions, suggestions, and comments via email to the instructors prior to the meetings. These emails will count towards the participation grade. In general, for the grade the quality of participation prevails over its quantity, but if quantity is zero, quality is zero, too. Feedback on the class performance (including grade) will be provided if and when students sign up for an appointment during the office hours. Unexcused missed classes count with 0 points for participation on that specific day.

Group presentation

Each student will have to take part in one 50 minutes presentation in a group of 2-3 persons, depending on the number of participants in the course. The presentation needs to be accompanied by a 1-page(!) handout to be distributed to all course participants. Structure, content, and function of this handout will be discussed in the beginning of the course. The presentation is usually delivered during the second meeting of each week. The presentation needs to be on the topic of the week and should be based on more than the material covered by the mandatory readings. Grade-relevant features of the presentation are: adherence to time limit, meaningful hand-out, coherence between different presenters within group, factually adequate representation of the literature processed, and critical/ innovative/ interesting/ stimulating/ thought-provoking own thoughts. Feedback on the presentation (including a grade) will be provided if and when presenters sign up for an appointment during the office hours.

Position papers

Throughout the course you will have to write two position papers. The position papers should briefly summarize the content of the readings for that particular week (NB: not session!) and then critically reflect on them relying on previous readings and lectures. You are free to choose for which topic to write the position paper, as long as the following conditions are fulfilled: (a) the two papers must be written on topics that stem from two different parts of our course; (b) none of the position papers can be written on the same topic as your presentation; (c) none of the position papers can be written on the same topic as the take-home exercise. The position paper must be between 750-800 words and be uploaded to the course's e-learning website prior to the first meeting of the week. Deadline is one minute before the start of the session on which you write the position paper. As their name suggest, position papers are meant to explain what your position on a specific issue is. Therefore, keep mere summaries to a necessary minimum and spend most effort on developing your own thoughts. Papers that do that will receive a better grade than those that limit themselves to correct summaries of the texts read.

Take-home exercises

Each participant will have to submit one take-home exercise. The exercise aims at testing the student's mastery of the methodological issues addressed in Part I of our course, by applying it to the evaluation of published research on topics that we discuss during weeks 8-11. The exercise consists of answers to a list of questions on an extra reading that will be sent out after the second class of the week, to be submitted the day prior to our first seminar of the week at noon. For the topics with a take-home exercise assigned, no position paper can be written. The submitted text needs to be between 1400 and 1500 words long, reference list excluded.

Auditing

Students who audit the class are expected to be present at all sessions, to do the mandatory readings, and to actively participate in class discussions. Auditing students do not have to submit any written assignment, nor take part in the group presentation.

Assessment

Grade composition

In-class Participation	10%
One group presentation	20%
Two position papers	40%
One take-home exercises	30%

The grading follows the standard scale adopted by the Department of Political Science:
A: 100-94; A-: 93-87; B+: 86-80; B: 79-73; B-: 72-66; C+: 65-59; F: 58-0

Late submission

In case of late submissions, three grade points from the final grade of the assignment are deducted for every 12 hours of delay. For instance, submitting 15 hours late leads to a deduction of six points.

Word-limit violation

A violation consists in writing more words than the upper limit or less than the lower limit. In case of violations of word limits, one grade point from the final grade of the assignment is deducted for every 5% of word limit violation. For instance, if the lower limit is 3000 and somebody writes 2400 words (= 20% below word limit), four points are deducted.

Use of laptop and electronic devices

The use of laptops and electronic devices in the classroom is not allowed. Students who insist in reading and taking notes in electronic format should come and see us and we can accommodate this request. The use of electronic devices for anything else than strictly course related matters will lead to a participation grade of 0 points for the particular session.

Useful books and sources of information

The following books are particularly relevant for this course.

1. Henry Brady and David Collier. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, 2 edition, 2010
2. David Collier and John Gerring. *Concepts and Methods in Social Sciences. Giovanni Sartori and His Legacy*. Routledge, London, 2008
3. Hans Daalder. *Comparative European Politics: the Story of a Profession*. Pinter, London, 1997
4. Jon Elster. *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989
5. John Gerring. *Social Science Methodology: a unified framework*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012a
6. Gary Goertz and James Mahoney. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2012
7. Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sydney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry. Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1994
8. Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, editors. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997
9. Gerardo Munck and Richard Snyder. *Passion, Craft and Method in Comparative Politics*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2007b
10. Paul Pennings, Hans Keman, and Jan Kleinnijenhuis. *Doing Research in Political Science: an Introduction to Comparative Methods and Statistics*. Sage Publications, London, 1999
11. P. Guy Peters. *Comparative Politics: Theory and Methods*. Macmillan, London, 1998
12. Ingo Rohlfing. *Case Studies and Causal Inference: An Integrative Framework*. Palgrave Macmillan, Houndsmille, 2012
13. Charles Ragin. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1987
14. W. Philipps Shively. *The Craft of Political Research*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2001

15. Howard Wiarda. *Introduction to Comparative Politics: Concepts and Processes*. Hancourt College Publishers, Fort Worth, 2000
16. Stephen Van Evera. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Cornell University Press, Itaca, 1997

Some journals to regularly look at include *American Journal of Political Science*; *American Political Science Review*; *Comparative Political Studies*; *Comparative Politics*; *European Journal of Political Research*; *European Political Science Review*; *Political Studies*; *Socio-Economic Review*; *West European Politics*; *World Politics*

Course outline

Part 1 – Introduction and the Nuts and bolts of comparing

Why do political scientists compare cases? And what are “cases” to start with? In this part of the course we introduce the logic of comparative research and discuss some core issues of such designs, paying particular attention to trade-offs and some common pitfalls and biases. This part will help students to better evaluate published work of applied comparative social research and to perform better designed comparative research of their own.

Week 1: The Rationales of Comparative Political Research

Mandatory readings:

Todd Landman. *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: an Introduction*. Routledge, London, 3 edition, 2008, chapter 1

Peter Mair. Comparative Politics: An Overview. In Robert E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, editors, *A New Handbook of Political Science*, pages 309–35. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996

Recommended readings:

David Collier. The comparative method: two decades of change. In Dankwart Rustow and Kenneth Paul Erickson, editors, *Comparative Political Dynamics. Global Research Perspectives*, pages 7–31. Harper Collins, 1991

Charles Ragin. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1987, chapters 3, 4, 5, 9

Charles Ragin and Howard Becker. *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992

Week 2: Concept Formation and Measurement

During this week, we learn about some core ingredients of sound concept formation and measurement. We will pay specific attention to the vices and virtues of “mere description” and the logic of typologies

Mandatory readings:

John Gerring. *Social Science Methodology: a unified framework*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012a, chapter 5

Peter Mair. Concepts and Concept Formation. In Donatella Della Porta and Michael Keating, editors, *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*, pages 177 – 197. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008

Recommended readings:

Robert Adcock and David Collier. Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative. *American Political Science Review*, 95(3):529–546, 2001

D. Collier, J. LaPorte, and J. Seawright. Putting Typologies to Work: Concept Formation, Measurement, and Analytic Rigor. *Political Research Quarterly*, 65(1):217–232, 2012

David Collier and Robert Adcock. Democracy and Dichotomies: A Pragmatic Approach to Choices about Concepts. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2(1):537–565, 1999

David Collier and Steven Levitsky. Democracy with Adjectives: conceptual innovation in comparative research. *World Politics*, 49(3):430–51, 1997

Raymond Duncan Gastil. The Comparative Survey of Freedom: Experiences and Suggestions. In *On Measuring Democracies: Its Consequences and Concomitants*, pages 21–46. Trans-

action Publishers, New Brunswick, 1991

John Gerring. Mere Description. *British Journal of Political Science*, 42(04):721–746, 2012b

Gary Goertz. *Social Science Concepts. a User's Guide*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2006, 95-127

Gerardo Munck and Jay Verkuilen. Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices. *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(1):5–34, 2002

Gerardo Munck. *Measuring Democracy: a Bridge between Scholarship and Politics*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2009

Paul Pennings, Hans Keman, and Jan Kleinnijenhuis. *Doing Research in Political Science: an Introduction to Comparative Methods and Statistics*. Sage Publications, London, 1999, 85-113

Giovanni Sartori. Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics. *The American Political Science Review*, 64(4):1033–1053, 1970

Giovanni Sartori. *Social Science Concepts: a Systematic Analysis*. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 1984, 15-85

Week 3: Theories and Hypotheses

What are hypotheses? How should they be formulated in order to be testable? What counts as a cause? And what is a good research puzzle, to start with?

Mandatory readings:

Christopher Day and Kendra L Koivu. Finding the Question: A Puzzle-Based Approach to the Logic of Discovery. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 0:1–10, 2018

Karl Gustafsson and Linus Hagström. What Is the Point? Teaching Graduate Students How To Construct Political Science Research Puzzles. *European Political Science*, pages 1–15, 2017. ISSN 16820983. doi: 10.1057/s41304-017-0130-y

Recommended readings:

Michael Coppedge. Theory Building and Hypothesis Testing: Large- vs. Small-N Research on Democratization. In Gerardo Munck, editor, *Regimes and Democracy in Latin America: Theories and Methods*, pages 163–78. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007

John Gerring. *Social Science Methodology: a unified framework*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012a, chapters 8-12

Stephen Van Evera. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1997, chapter 1

Week 4: Different Methodological Approaches to Comparing

This week provides an overview of different approaches to doing comparative social science research. Among the many different ways in which the different practices can be classified, two seem particularly powerful and salient (though sometimes misleading). In the first session, we discuss some contrasts between qualitative and quantitative approaches. In the second session, we learn about the experimental template and how it contrasts with studies based on observational data.

Mandatory readings:

Kendra L. Koivu and Erin Kimball Damman. Qualitative variations: the sources of divergent qualitative methodological approaches. *Quality and Quantity*, 49(6):2617–2632, 2015

John Gerring. *Social Science Methodology: a unified framework*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012a, chapter 1

Recommended readings:

Gary Goertz and James Mahoney. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2012, chapter 17

Week 5: New Developments, Pitfalls, and Trade-Offs

In the first half, we briefly discuss new methodological tools for data generation and analysis in comparative politics, such as (field) experiments, automated text analysis, or web scraping. In the second half, we discuss research design issues such as Galton's problem and ecological fallacy/individualistic fallacy. As some sort of conclusion of Part 1 of our course, we also revisit the trade-offs that comparative social scientists unavoidably encounter when trying to design their research.

Mandatory readings:

Todd Landman. *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: an Introduction*. Routledge, London, 3 edition, 2008, chapter 2

Christopher Lucas, Richard A. Nielsen, Margaret E. Roberts, Brandon M. Stewart, Alex Storer, and Dustin Tingley. Computer-assisted text analysis for comparative politics. *Political Analysis*, 23(2):254–277, 2015

Recommended readings:

Dietmar Braun and Fabrizio Gilardi. Taking Galton's problem seriously. towards a theory of policy diffusion. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 18(3):298–322, 2006

Daniel Brinks and Michael Coppedge. Diffusion Is No Illusion: Neighbor Emulation in the Third Wave of Democracy. *Comparative Political Studies*, 39(4):463–489, May 2006. ISSN 0010-4140

John Gerring. *Social Science Methodology: a unified framework*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012a, chapter 2

Detlef Jahn. Globalization as "Galton's Problem": the missing link in the analysis of diffusion patterns in welfare state development. *International Organization*, 60:401–30, 2006

Raul Naroll. Galton's problem: The logic of cross cultural research. *Social Research*, 32: 428–51, 1965

John F. Padgett and Christopher K. Ansell. Robust Action and the Rise of the Medici, 1400-1434. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(6):1259–1319, 1993

Mitchell Seligson. The renaissance of political culture or the renaissance of the ecological fallacy. *Comparative Politics*, 34(3):273–292, 2002

Barbara Geddes. How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics. *Political Analysis*, 2(1):131–150, 1990

Part 2 – Meta-approaches

This part introduces the major meta-theoretical paradigms in comparative social research, discusses their core assumptions, strengths, and weaknesses and possibilities for combining approaches.

Week 6a: Functionalism

Mandatory readings:

Gabriel Almond. Introduction: a functional approach to politics. In Gabriel Almond and James Coleman, editors, *The Politics of Developing Areas*, pages 3–64. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1960

Recommended readings:

Gabriel Almond and Sydney Verba. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes in Five Nations*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1963, 1-44

David Easton. The New Revolution in Political Science. *The American Political Science Review*, 63(4):1051–1061, 1969

Robert Inglehart. *Modernization and Postmodernization Cultural, Economic and Political*

Change in 43 Societies. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1997

Max Kaase. Democracy and Political Action. *International Political Science Review*, 31(5): 539–51, 2010

Talcott Parsons. *Essays in Sociological Theory*. Free Books, New York, 1964

Susan J Pharr, Robert D Putnam, and Russell J Dalton. A Quarter-Century of Declining Confidence. *Journal of Democracy*, 11(2):5–25, 2000

Week 6b: Rational Choice, Game Theory, and Comparative Politics

Mandatory readings:

Gerardo Munck. Game Theory and Comparative Politics: New Perspectives and Old Concerns. *World Politics*, 53(2):173–204, 2001

Recommended readings:

Hans-Peter Blossfeld and Gerald Prein, editors. *Rational Choice Theory and Large-Scale Data Analysis*. Westview Press, Boulder, 1998

Keith Dowding. The compatibility of behaviouralism, rational choice and 'new institutionalism'. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 6(1):105–117, 1994

Jon Elster. *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989, 13–41

Timothy Frye. A politics of institutional choice: Post-Communist presidencies. *Comparative Political Studies*, 30(5):523–52, 1997

Michael Hechter. The future of rational choice theory and its relationship to quantitative macro-sociological research. In Hans-Peter Blossfeld and Gerald Prein, editors, *Rational Choice Theory and Large-Scale Data Analysis*, pages 281–290. Westview Press, Boulder, 1998

Edgar Kiser. The Revival of Narrative in Sociology: Why Rational Choice Can Contribute. *Politics & Society*, 17:489–509, 1996

James Mahoney. Rational choice theory and the comparative method: an emerging synthesis. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 35(2):83–94, 2000

B. Guy Peters. *Institutional Theory in Political Science: the 'New Institutionalism'*. Pinter, London, 1999, chapter 3

William Riker. Political science and rational choice. In James E. Alt and Kenneth A. Shepsle, editors, *Perspectives on Positive Political Economy*, pages 163–181. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990

Fritz Scharpf. *Games Real Actors Play*. Westview Press, Boulder, 1997

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

Week 7: Institutionalism

Mandatory readings:

Peter A. Hall and Rosemary C. R. Taylor. Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms. *Political Studies*, 44:936–57, 1996

Recommended readings:

Sascha Becker, Katrin Boeckh, Christa Hainz, and Ludger Woessmann. The Empire is Dead, Long Live the Empire! Long-Run Persistence of Trust and Corruption in the Bureaucracy. *The Economic Journal*, forthcoming, 2014

E. M. Immergut. The Theoretical Core of the New Institutionalism. *Politics & Society*, 26(1):5–34, 1998

Fiona Makay, Meryl Kenny, and Louise Chappell. New Institutionalism Through a Gender

Lens: Towards a Feminist Institutionalism? *International Political Science Review*, 31(5):573–588, 2010

James G. March and Johan P. Olsen. The new institutionalism: organizational factors in political life. *American Political Science Review*, 78:734–749, 1984

B. Guy Peters. *Institutional Theory in Political Science: the 'New Institutionalism'*. Pinter, London, 1999, 1-24

Jon Pierre, Guy Peters, and Gerry Stoker. *Debating Institutionalism*. Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2008

Paul Pierson. Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics. *American Political Science Review*, 94(2):251–267, 2000

Giovanni Sartori. *Comparative Constitutional Engineering: an Inquiry into Structures, Incentives, and Outcomes*. Macmillan, London, 1994

Part 3 – Core Political Institutions and Their Causes and Consequences

This part of the course aims at familiarizing students with the debates on the most important institutional variations among political systems and the consequences they may trigger.

Week 8: Types of Political Regimes

What are the differences between democratic and non-democratic forms of government? How can those be measured in a comparative fashion? What are the varieties among autocratic regimes?

Mandatory readings:

Michael Coppedge, I Lindberg, Svend-Erik Skaaning, and Jan Teorell. Measuring High Level Democratic Principles using the V-Dem Data. *International Political Science Review*, 37(5): 580–593, 2016

Seva Gunitsky. Democratic Waves in Historical Perspective. *Perspectives on Politics*, 16(3): 634–651, 2018

Recommended readings:

Matthijs Bogaards. Where to draw the line? From degree to dichotomy in measures of democracy. *Democratization*, 19(4):690–712, aug 2012. doi: 10.1080/13510347.2011.613563

Barbara Geddes, Joseph Wright, and Erica Frantz. Autocratic Breakdown and Regime Transitions: A New Data Set. *Perspectives on Politics*, 12(02):313–331, jul 2014. doi: 10.1017/S1537592714000851

Wolfgang Merkel. Embedded and defective democracies. *Democratization*, 11(5):33–58, 2004

Week 9: Executive Formats and Types of Parliaments

Mandatory readings:

José Antonio Cheibub, Zachary Elkins, and Tom Ginsburg. Beyond presidentialism and parliamentarism. *British Journal of Political Science*, 44(3):515–544, 2014. doi: 10.1017/S000712341300032X

Robert Elgie. From Linz to Tsebelis: three waves of presidential/parliamentary studies? *Democratization*, 12(1):106–122, 2005

Recommended readings:

Jean Blondel. *Comparative Government: an Introduction*. Prentice Hall, London, 1995, 248–66, and 267–97.

José Antonio Cheibub. *Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007

Thomas A. Baylis. Presidents versus prime ministers. shaping executive authority in Eastern

Europe. *World Politics*, 48(3), 1996

Jose Antonio Cheibub and Fernando Limongi. Democratic Institutions and Regime Survival: Parliamentary and Presidential Democracies Reconsidered. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5:151–179, 2002

Arend Lijphart, editor. *Parliamentary Versus Presidential Government*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1992

Juan Jose Linz. The Perils of Presidentialism. *Journal of Democracy*, 1(1):51–69, 1990a

Juan Jose Linz. The Virtues of Parliamentarism. *Journal of Democracy*, 1(1):84–91, 1990b

Scott Mainwaring and Matthew S Shugart. Juan Linz, Presidentialism, and Democracy: A Critical Appraisal. *Comparative Politics*, 29(4):449–471, 1997

Scott Mainwaring. Presidentialism, Multipartism, and Democracy: A Difficult Combination. *Comparative Political Studies*, 26(2):198–228, 1993

Scott Mainwaring. Multipartism, Robust Federalism and Presidentialism in Brazil. In Scott Mainwaring and Matthew S Shugart, editors, *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America*, pages 55–110. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997

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

Alan Siaroff. *Comparative European Party Systems*. Garland, New York, 2000

Alan Siaroff. Varieties of parliamentarianism in advanced industrial democracies. *International Political Science Review*, 24(4):445–464, 2003

Raymond Taras. Separating powers: keeping presidents in check. In Raymond Taras, editor, *Post-Communist Presidents*, pages 15–37. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997

Young Hun Kim. A Troubled Marriage? Divided Minority Government, Cohabitation, Presidential Powers, President-Parliamentarism and Semi-Presidentialism. *Government and Opposition*, 50(4):652–681, 2014. ISSN 14777053. doi: 10.1017/gov.2014.23

Week 10: Territorial Organizations of State Power

Mandatory readings:

Dawn Brancati. Decentralization: Fueling the Fire or Dampening the Flames of Ethnic Conflict and Secessionism? *International Organization*, 60(03):651–685, 2006

Arend Lijphart. *Patterns of Democracy: Government forms and performance in thirty-six countries*. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1999, 185–215

Recommended readings:

Kathleen O’Neil. Decentralization as an electoral strategy. *Comparative Political Studies*, 36(9):1068–1091, 2003

Jonathan Rodden. Comparative federalism and decentralization. on meaning and measurement. *Comparative Politics*, 36(4):481–500, 2004

Aaron Schneider. Decentralization: conceptualization and measurement. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 38(3):32–56, 2003

Alfred Stepan. Federalism and democracy: beyond the U.S. model. *Journal of Democracy*, 10(4):19–34, 1999

Ronald L. Watts. Federalism, federal political systems, and federations. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 1:117–137, 1998

Daniel Ziblatt. Rethinking the Origins of Federalism: Puzzle, Theory, and Evidence from Nineteenth- Century Europe. *World Politics*, 57(1):70–98, 2004

Week 11a: Electoral Systems

Mandatory readings:

André Blais and Louis Massicotte. Electoral systems. In Lawrence LeDuc, Richards Niemi, and Pippa Norris, editors, *Comparing Democracies. Elections and Voting in a Global Perspec-*

tive, pages 49–81. Sage Publications, London, 1996

Recommended readings:

Josep Maria Colomer. It's Parties that Choose Electoral Systems (or, Duverger's Laws Upside Down). *Political Studies*, 53:1–21, 2005

Maurice Duverger. Which is the best electoral system? In Arend Lijphart and Bernard Grofman, editors, *Choosing an Electoral System. Issues and Alternatives*, pages 31–39. Praeger, New York, 1984

Arend Lijphart. Trying to have the best of both worlds: semi-proportional and mixed systems. In Arend Lijphart and Bernard Grofman, editors, *Choosing an Electoral System. Issues and Alternatives*, pages 207–215. Praeger, New York, 1984

Matthew M Singer. Was Duverger Correct ? Single Member District Election Outcomes in Fifty three Countries. *British Journal of Political Science*, 43(1):201–220, 2013

Week 11b: Party Systems

Mandatory readings:

Zsolt Enyedi and Fernando Casal Bértoa. Institutionalization and de-institutionalization in post-communist party systems. *East European Politics and Societies*, 32(3):422–450, 2018. doi: 10.1177/0888325417736808

Giovanni Sartori. A Typology of Party Systems. In Peter Mair, editor, *The West European Party System*, volume 112, pages 316–349. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1990

Recommended readings:

John Aldrich. *Why Parties? the Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1995, 28-61

Jack Bielasiak. The Institutionalization of Electoral and Party Systems in Postcommunist States. *Comparative Politics*, 34:189–210, 2002

Fernando Casal Bértoa and Peter Mair. Two Decades on: How Institutionalized are Post-Communist Party Systems. *EUI Working Papers, SPS 2010/3*, pages 1–32, 2010

Daniel Bochsler. When Two of the Same Are Needed: A Multilevel Model of Intragroup Ethnic Party Competition. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 18(2):216–241, 2012

Josep Maria Colomer. It's Parties that Choose Electoral Systems (or, Duverger's Laws Upside Down). *Political Studies*, 53:1–21, 2005

Shale Horowitz and Eric C. Browne. Sources of Post-Communist Party System Consolidation: Ideology Versus Institutions. *Party Politics*, 11(6):689–706, 2005

Mark P. Jones. The Role of Parties and Party Systems in the Policymaking Process. 2005. URL <http://www6.iadb.org/res/publications/pubfiles/pubS-310.pdf>

Arend Lijphart. *Electoral Systems and Party Systems. a Study of Twenty-Seven Democracies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1994

Peter Mair. What is different about post-communist party systems? In Peter Mair, editor, *Party System Change. Approaches and Interpretations*, pages 175–198. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997a

Peter Mair. Party system and structures of competition. In Peter Mair, editor, *Party System Change. Approaches and Interpretations*, pages 199–223. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997b

C. Mudde. Fighting the system? Populist radical right parties and party system change. *Party Politics*, 20(2):217–226, 2014

Vicky Randall and Lars Svasand. Party Institutionalization in New Democracies. *Party Politics*, 8(1):5–29, 2002

Giovanni Sartori. *Parties and Party Systems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1976

Philippe C. Schmitter. Parties are not what they once were. In Larry Diamond and Richard Gunther, editors, *Political Parties and Democracy*, pages 67–89. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2001a

Session 12: Comparative Politics: Wrap-up and Outlook

Mandatory readings:

Andrew Roberts. Consensus and dissensus in comparative politics: Do comparativists agree on the goals, methods, and results of the field? *International Political Science Review*, page 019251211985837, 2019. URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0192512119858370>

Philippe C Schmitter. Seven (disputable) theses concerning the future of 'transatlanticized' or 'globalized' Political Science. 2001b

Recommended readings:

Matthew Flinders. The Future of Political Science? The Politics and Management of the Academic Expectations Gap: Evidence from the UK. *European Political Science*, pages 1–14, 2017. ISSN 16820983. doi: 10.1057/s41304-017-0118-7

G. L. Munck and R. Snyder. Debating the Direction of Comparative Politics: An Analysis of Leading Journals. *Comparative Political Studies*, 40(1):5–31, 2007a. ISSN 0010-4140. doi: 10.1177/0010414006294815

Carsten Q Schneider, Daniel Bochsler, and Mihail Chiru. Comparative politics in central and eastern europe: Mapping publications over the past 20 years. *European Political Science*, 12:127–145, jun 2013. ISSN 1680-4333. doi: 10.1057/eps.2012.27