

THEORIES OF COMPARATIVE POLITICS

POLSCI 740

Term 1, Fall 2019

Instructor: Dr. Netina Tan
Email: netina@mcmaster.ca
Lecture: Mondays, 2:30-5:20pm
Room: KTH 709

Office: KTH 541
Office Hours: Wednesdays, 11:00am-1:00p.m.

Contents

Course Description.....	2
Course Objectives.....	2
Recommended Materials and Texts.....	3
Class Format.....	3
Course Evaluation – Overview.....	3
Course Evaluation – Details.....	3
Class Discussions and Participation (15%).....	3
Weekly Responses (10%), due Week 2-13.....	4
Reading Presentation (10%). [see Sign-up sheet].....	4
Book Review (10%) and Presentation (5%), due 21 or 28 Oct 2019.....	5
Research Proposal (20%), due 11 Nov.....	6
Take Home Final Exam (30%), due 2 Dec.....	6
Course Schedule.....	7
Weekly Course Schedule and Required Readings.....	7
Week 1: Sep 9 / Intro.....	7
Week 2: Sep 16 / What is Comparative Politics?.....	7
Week 3: Sep 23 / Comp Methodology.....	8
Week 4: Sep 30 / Structural-Historical Analysis.....	8
Week 5: Oct 7 / Rational Choice.....	9
Week 6: Oct 14 / Mid-term recess, No Class.....	10
Week 7: Oct 21 / Culture & Constructivism.....	10
Week 8: Oct 28 / State and Regimes.....	11
Week 9: Nov 4 / Democratization.....	11
Week 10: Nov 11 / Elections, Electoral System and Malpractices.....	12
Week 11: Nov 18 / Ethnic Conflicts and Minority Representation.....	13
Week 12: Nov 25 / Gender and Political Representation.....	14

Week 13: Dec 2 / Technology & Democracy	14
Course Policies	15
Submission and Grading of Assignments	15
Grades	15
Late Assignments	16
Absences, Missed Work, Illness	16
Avenue to Learn	16
Turnitin.com	16
Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous or Spiritual Observances (RISO)	16
University Policies	16
Academic Integrity Statement	16
Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities	17
Faculty of Social Sciences E-mail Communication Policy	17
Course Modification	17

Course Description

This course is designed to introduce students to the main theoretical and conceptual issues in the field of Comparative Politics. It offers students a broad view of the selected themes, concepts and approaches that characterize the field, as well as an appreciation of how the field has evolved over time. The scope of the material will range from comparative paradigms, dominant methodologies, theoretical approaches, key issues and debates in the understanding of politics and government in Western and non-Western, developed and developing areas.

This course is also intended for PhD political science students planning to write comprehensive exams and/or a thesis in comparative politics. Each week we will discuss a subset of the key scholarly literature, focusing on a major theme or theoretical debate. Key methodological issues are addressed in context of the substantive and theoretical works, as well as in the written assignments for the class. Students who plan to take the comprehensive exams are strongly encouraged to read the recommended readings.

****PhD students planning to take the comprehensive exam in Comparative Politics should note that this course does not contain the complete readings and need to consult the detailed Comparative Politics exam reading list.***

Course Objectives

By the end of the course graduate students should be able to:

- be prepared write a comprehensive field examination in Comparative Politics

- have a better sense of the breadth of the field, its intellectual history, the theoretical and methodological approaches and debates and
- be equipped with the necessary skills to formulate own research questions and have the tools to answer those questions

Recommended Materials and Texts

- Lichbach, Mark Irving, and Alan S. Zuckerman. 2009. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge University Press. Available from Titles bookstore.
- Dickovick, J. Tyler, and Jonathan Eastwood. 2013. *Comparative Politics: Integrating Theories, Methods, and Cases*. New York: Oxford University Press. (*Recommended for MA students*).
- Caramani, Daniele. 2011. *Comparative Politics*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press. (*Recommended for MA students*).

*Most assigned book chapters are available on course reserves. Assigned journal articles can be downloaded via [ProQuest](#).

Class Format

This is a reading intensive and discussion based seminar. Each seminar will typically begin with 30-40 mins overview of the key ideas or concepts presented in each week's readings by the instructor, followed by 2 hours of student presentations and deep discussions of the readings.

Course Evaluation – Overview

1. Class Discussions and Participation - 15%
2. Weekly Responses - 10%, due each week (Wk 2-12)
3. Book Review - 10%, due 21 or 28 Oct
4. Book Review Presentation - 5%, due 21 or 28 Oct
5. Reading Presentation - 10%
6. Research Proposal - 20%, due 11 Nov
7. Take Home Final Exam - 30%, due 2 Dec

Course Evaluation – Details

Class Discussions and Participation (15%)

This is a reading intensive and discussion based seminar. All students are expected to complete the reading assignments for each week and contribute actively to class discussion. Your class attendance and participation is critical to your learning success. Regardless of medical note/emergencies, your absence will affect your participation grade. All students should be prepared to talk and respond to the day's required readings. Even if you are not the presenter, you should come prepared with three key points and have something meaningful to say about each reading. You will be evaluated based on 1) attendance, 2) quality of your participation, and 3) the degree to which your interventions advance the discussion. You are welcome to see me during office hour to discuss your interim class participation grade/progress.

Weekly Responses (10%), due Week 2-13

Each student will submit one response (about 1 paragraph) on at least one assigned reading or comment on the links between the readings for each week (Weeks 2-5 and 7-12). The weekly response should address these following questions:

- a. What are the key arguments/approach in the week's readings?
- b. What are the central debates in the field on the issue under consideration?
- c. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the article/book under study?
- d. Have the disputes been resolved and what more needs be done or discovered?

Your response is not a summary of the readings. Every response must include a thesis/key argument that is in reference to the week's readings. You may like to refer to the questions each week to get the key arguments/debates of the readings for each week. Your response will be graded based on quality and depth of analysis. **All weekly responses must be uploaded onto the Avenue's Dropbox the night before our lesson.**

Reading Presentation (10%). [see Sign-up sheet]

You will serve as a discussion leader for 1 weekly sessions from Week 2-12. You will sign up for your presentations on the first day of class. Each presentation and discussion should not be more than 30 minutes (ideally around 15 mins presentation and 10 mins for Q and A). You are welcome to use power point slides or any other presentation tools that facilitate understanding and class discussion. A projector will be available. If you decide to use power point, please bring your own laptop, appropriate adaptors for the projector and set up in advance.

The presenter must circulate electronically a **1-page handout** with a summary of the article's key arguments (bullet points are acceptable) with 1-2 questions for discussion. You should also list **3-4 key terms** that you have learnt in your articles. Presenter can print and circulate the handout in class OR upload the handout on Avenue prior to presentation.

As a guide, the presentation ought to include the following:

- State key thesis/argument/theoretical approach of the article;
- Compare strengths and weaknesses of the piece;
- Offer new insights/contributions to /gaps in comparative politics;
- Make links between readings, as well as provide a critical assessment of those readings;
- List two to three questions for discussion.

Treat the presentations as opportunities for you to act as an instructor of the course and lead discussions. As an instructor, you would want to review and highlight issues/concepts from the readings that they may not have noticed on their own and raise pertinent questions that lay the ground for further discussion. Being a presenter also offers you an opportunity to practice your presentation skills and demonstrate your ability to use technology to present your academic work. You will be assessed based on the content, quality, clarity and delivery of the presentation. Plan ahead. Any last-minute change or absence on the day of your scheduled presentation will receive a zero grade.

Book Review (10%) and Presentation (5%), due 21 or 28 Oct 2019

You will submit a 2-page (single-spaced) review of one of these classic, key comparative politics books (10%). Select your book early to ensure no overlap between students. And visit the library as soon as possible to get hold of your book. To learn how to write a concise literature review, check samples in good Political Science journals such as *Comparative Politics*, *Perspectives on Politics*, *Democratization* or *Journal of Politics*. MA Students may also read short book reviews in *Foreign Affairs* as a guide. You will submit the literature review in hardcopy in class and upload a soft copy electronically on Avenue.

You will also spend **5 minutes** to present your book review in class (5%). Please sign up for your preferred date (21 or 28 Oct) on the first day of class. Your presentation should summarize the book's thesis in 1-2 sentences; assess the author's use of methodology, sources of data and relevance of the book to comparative politics/theme for class discussion. Do highlight any favorite quote or memorable aspect of the book that will help us remember the book. PPT slides are not required.

Books for Review:

- Aldrich, John H. 2011. *Why Parties?: A Second Look*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Birch, Sarah. 2012. *Electoral Malpractice*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Bunce, Valerie J., and Sharon L. Wolchik. 2011. *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Postcommunist Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, Gary W. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Darcy, R., Janet Clark, and Susan Welch. 1994. *Women, Elections, and Representation*. 2 Revised edition. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. University of Michigan Press.
- George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Gerring, John. 2001. *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Haggard, Stephan, and Robert R. Kaufman. 1995. *The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Horowitz, Donald L. 2001. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Second edition. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late 20th Century*. Revised ed. edition. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Katz, Richard S. 1997. *Democracy and Elections*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan A. Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Linz, Professor Juan J., and Wallace Sayre Professor Alfred Stepan. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. UK ed. edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ Pr.

- Lublin, David. 2014. *Minority Rules: Electoral Systems, Decentralization, and Ethnoregional Party Success*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Moore, Barrington. 1993. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. 1 edition. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Munck, Gerardo, and Richard Snyder. 2007. *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Norris, Pippa. 2014. *Why Electoral Integrity Matters*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Olson, Mancur. 1701. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups, Second Printing with New Preface and Appendix*. Harvard University Press.
- Phillips, Anne. 1995. *The Politics of Presence*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Putnam, Robert D., Robert Leonardi, and Raffaella Y. Nanetti. 1994. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. 1 edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ragin, Charles C. 2014. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. First Edition, With a New Introduction edition. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Roessler, Philip. 2016. *Ethnic Politics and State Power in Africa: The Logic of the Coup-Civil War Trap*. Cambridge, United Kingdom ; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose-Ackerman, Susan. 1999. *Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences, and Reform*. Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. Yale University Press.
- Skocpol, Theda. 2015. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Research Proposal (20%), due 11 Nov

You will submit a **2-page outline** (12 point font, single-spaced, 1-inch margin) on your proposed research question, thesis, logic of case selection and research method based on any of the course's weekly themes or readings. Start thinking of your research topic early in the term. You will email your proposed research question and brief idea to me on the day of your book review presentation. You may like to consider the weekly themes/questions as a guide for a grant proposal. Please sign up for office hours and develop your research question in consultation with me. A bibliography is required for all works cited. You will submit a hardcopy in class and upload it electronically on Avenue to Learn folder.

Take Home Final Exam (30%), due 2 Dec

The final exam will cover all the materials introduced through the term. You will choose two out of four questions. The exam questions will be circulated electronically on **18 Nov 2019**. The exam questions will be based on the required readings and resemble questions ask in the comparative politics comprehensive field examinations. Your answer for each question should be around 4-5 pages long, single-spaced (about 2000 words each). **A bibliography is required**

for all works cited. All students will submit their exams in hardcopy during class. Only hardcopy submissions will be graded. Late submissions will not be entertained.

Course Schedule

	Date	Topics	Assignment Due Dates
1	9 Sep	Introduction	Sign up for presentations and books
2	16 Sep	What is Comparative Politics?	
3	23 Sep	Comparative Method	
4	30 Sep	Structural-Historical Analysis and Institutionalism	Research Question Due
5	7 Oct	Rational Choice	
6	14 Oct	Mid-Term Recess, NO CLASS	
7	21 Oct	Culture and Constructivism	Book Review Presentations GP 1
8	28 Oct	State and Regime	Book Review Presentations GP 2
9	4 Nov	Democratization	Research Proposal Due
10	11 Nov	Elections, Electoral Systems and Malpractice	
11	18 Nov	Ethnic Conflicts and Minority Representation	Circulate Take-Home Exam Questions
12	25 Nov	Gender and Political Representation	
13	2 Dec	Digital Technology and Democracy	Submit Take-Home Exam

Weekly Course Schedule and Required Readings

Week 1: Sep 9 / Intro

Topic: COURSE INTRODUCTION

Required Reading

1. Lichbach, Mark Irving, and Alan S. Zuckerman. 1997. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge University Press, Chapter 1.

Week 2: Sep 16 / What is Comparative Politics?

Topic: WHAT IS COMPARATIVE POLITICS?

Required Reading

1. Kohli, Atul, Peter Evans, Peter J. Katzenstein, Adam Przeworski, Susanne Hoerber Rudolph, James C. Scott, and Theda Skocpol. 1995. "The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium." *World Politics* 48 (1) (October 1): 1–49.
2. Munck, Gerardo, and Richard Snyder. 2007. "Debating the Direction of Comparative Politics An Analysis of Leading Journals." *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (1):5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414006294815>.
3. Laitin, David. 2002. "Comparative Politics: The State of the Subdiscipline." In *Political Science: State of the Discipline*, 630–659. W.W. Norton & Co.
4. Wilson, Matthew Charles. 2017. "Trends in Political Science Research and the Progress of Comparative Politics." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (4):979–84. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651700110X>.

Recommended Reading

5. Almond, Gabriel A. 1956. "Comparative Political Systems." *The Journal of Politics* 18 (3) (August 1): 391–409.
6. Wiarda, Howard J. 1998. "Is Comparative Politics Dead? Rethinking the Field in the Post-Cold War Era." *Third World Quarterly* 19 (5): 935–949.

Questions

- Is the comparative method an effective means of drawing inferences in social science?
- What is the role of comparative politics in empirical research? Use at least one of the readings to answer the question.

Week 3: Sep 23 / Comp Methodology

Topic: COMPARATIVE METHODOLOGY

Required Reading

1. Ragin, Charles. 1989. "The Distinctiveness of Comparative Social Science." In *The Comparative Method*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1–18.
2. Lijphart, A. 1975. "The Comparable-Cases Strategy in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (2): 158–177.
3. Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2 (1) (January 1): 131–150.
4. Bennett, Andrew, and Colin Elman. 2006. "Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods." *Annual Review of Political Science* 9 (1): 455–476.
5. Mahoney, James. 2007. "Qualitative Methodology and Comparative Politics." *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (2) (February 1): 122–144.

Recommended Reading

6. Dion, Douglas. 1998. "Evidence and Inference in the Comparative Case Study." *Comparative Politics* 30 (2) (January 1): 127–145.
7. Tarrow, Sidney. 2010. "The Strategy of Paired Comparison: Toward a Theory of Practice." *Comparative Political Studies* 43 (2) (February 1): 230–259.
8. Gerring, John. 2004. "What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good For?" *American Political Science Review* 98 (02): 341–354.
9. Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 2003. "Can One or Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains?" In *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, 305–336. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Collier, David, and James Mahoney. 1996. "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research." *World Politics* 49 (1) (October 1): 56–91.

Questions

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of comparative method?
- Comparativists are often accused of selection bias or selecting cases based on the dependent variable. Is this a problem? If so, what can be done about it?
- What is "many variables-small n" problem? What are the ways to overcome this problem in comparative analysis?

Week 4: Sep 30 / Structural-Historical Analysis

Topic: STRUCTURAL-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS AND INSTITUTIONALISM

Required Readings (Structural Historical Analysis)

1. Mahoney, James, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, ed. 2003. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, Chapter 1.
2. Pierson, Paul, and Theda Skocpol. 2002. "Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science." In *Political Science: State of the Discipline*, 693–721. NY: W.W. Norton.
3. Capocchia, Giovanni, and R. Daniel Kelemen. 2007. "The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism." *World Politics* 59 (03): 341–69.

Required Readings (Institutionalism)

1. March, James G., and Johan P. Olsen. 1984. "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life." *American Political Science Review* 78 (3) (September 1): 734–749.
2. Hall, Peter A., and Rosemary C. R. Taylor. 1996. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms." *Political Studies* 44 (5): 936–957.
3. Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2 (1): 369–404.f
4. North, Douglass C. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press, 3-10.

Recommended Reading

1. Mahoney, James. 2004. "Comparative-Historical Methodology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30 (1): 81–101.
2. Skocpol, Theda, and Margaret Somers. 1980. "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (2) (April 1): 174–197.
3. Pierson, Paul. 2000. "The Limits of Design: Explaining Institutional Origins and Change." *Governance* 13 (4): 475–499.
4. Katzelson, Ira. 2009. "Strong Theory, Complex History: Structure and Configuration in Comparative Politics Revisited." In *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture and Structure*, 96–116. Second Edition. Cambridge University Press.
5. Steinmo, Sven, Kathleen Thelen, and Frank Longstreth, ed. 1992. *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1-32.
6. Remmer, Karen L. 1997. "Theoretical Decay and Theoretical Development: The Resurgence of Institutional Analysis." *World Politics* 50 (1) (October 1): 34–61.

Questions

- How is the comparative method used in these analyses?
- What do we learn about the causes of macro-political change?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of structural-historical explanations?
- What are the key strategies used by historical institutionalists to explain political developments? Do these analyses miss out anything important?
- The new institutionalism has been criticized for being too narrow and static. Is this a fair criticism?

Week 5: Oct 7 / Rational Choice

Topic: RATIONAL CHOICE

Required Reading

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

2. Huber, Evelyne, and Michelle Dion. 2002. "Revolution or Contribution? Rational Choice Approaches in the Study of Latin American Politics." *Latin American Politics and Society* 44 (3) (October 1): 1–28.
3. Dixit, Avinash K. 2009. *Games of Strategy*. 3rd ed. W. W. Norton & Co., Read Chapters 2 and 3 for basic concepts and techniques used in Game theory.
4. Magaloni, Beatriz. 2010. "The Game of Electoral Fraud and the Ousting of Authoritarian Rule." *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (3): 751–65.
5. Little, Andrew. 2015. "Fraud and Monitoring in Non-Competitive Elections." *Political Science Research and Methods* 3 (1): 21–41.

Recommended Reading

6. Levi, Margaret. 2009. "Reconsiderations of Rational Choice in Comparative and Historical Analysis." In *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*, 117–133. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Green, Donald P., and Donald P. Green Ian Shapiro. 1994. *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science*. Yale University Press, 1-46.
8. Cox, Gary. 2004. "Lies, Damned Lies and Rational Choice Analyses." In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, 167–86. US: Cambridge University Press.

Questions

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of rational choice approach in comparative studies? Choose two or three major rational choice contributions in comparative politics and assess whether they have micro-foundations.
- Rational choice has often been accused of oversimplifying human behaviour, ignoring the origins of institutions and overlooking culture that shape preferences and decision-making processes. Discuss.

Week 6: Oct 14 / Mid-term recess, No Class

Week 7: Oct 21 / Culture & Constructivism

Topic: CULTURE AND CONSTRUCTIVISM

Required Reading

1. Geertz, Clifford. 1973. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, 3–30. N.Y.: Basic Books.
2. Almond, Gabriel Abraham, and Sidney Verba, ed. 1989. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Sage Publications, Inc, Chapters 1 and 3.
3. Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science." *The American Political Science Review* 96 (4): 713–28.
4. Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 2001. "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4 (1): 391–416.
5. Posner, Daniel N. 2004. "The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi." *American Political Science Review* 98 (04): 529–45.

Recommended Reading

6. Berman, Sheri. 2001. "Ideas, Norms, and Culture in Political Analysis." *Comparative Politics* 33 (2) (January 1): 231–250.

7. Tarrow, Sidney. 1996. "Making Social Science Work Across Space and Time: A Critical Reflection on Robert Putnam's Making Democracy Work." *The American Political Science Review* 90 (2) (June 1): 389–397.
8. Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. "[The Clash of Civilizations?](#)" *Foreign Affairs*, June 1.

Week 6 Questions

- What is political culture? How are they created? How do we know culture matters?
- Do Almond and Verba provide a credible explanation?
- Is there a constructivist methodology? How does Constructivists propose to bridge the divide between international relations and comparative politics?
- Discuss the importance of ideas, norms and values in the study of comparative politics. Support your argument with empirical examples.

Week 8: Oct 28 / State and Regimes

Topic: STATE AND REGIMES

Required Reading

1. Midgal, Joel. 2009. "Researching the State." In *Comparative Politics Rationality, Culture, and Structure*, 162–192. Second. Cambridge University Press.
2. Skocpol, Theda. 1985. "Bringing the State Back In." In *Bringing the State Back In*, 3–43. U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
3. Levi, Margaret, ed. 2002. "The State of the Study of the State." In *Political Science: State of the Discipline*, 33–55. U.S.: W. W. Norton & Company.
4. Levitsky, S, and D Collier. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49 (3): 430–451.
5. Lawson, Stephanie. 1993. "Conceptual Issues in the Comparative Study of Regime Change and Democratization." *Comparative Politics* 25 (2): 183–205.

Recommended Reading

6. Fishman, Robert M. 1990. "Rethinking State and Regime: Southern Europe's Transition to Democracy." *World Politics* 42 (3): 422–40. doi:10.2307/2010418.
7. Linz, Juan J. 2000. *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Chapter 1.
8. Bogaards, M. 2009. "How to Classify Hybrid Regimes? Defective Democracy and Electoral Authoritarianism." *Democratization* 16 (2): 399–423.
9. Linz, Juan J., and Alfred Stepan. 1996. "Modern Nondemocratic Regimes." In *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*, 38–54. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ Press.

Questions

- What is the difference between "state" and "regime"?
- What makes a strong state? What is a developmental state? What is a weak state?
- Define and differentiate between two or three major political regimes (democracy, authoritarianism, electoral authoritarianism, totalitarianism, communism etc) in the articles.

Week 9: Nov 4 / Democratization

Topic: DEMOCRATIZATION

Required Reading

1. Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late 20th Century*. University of Oklahoma Press, 3-108 (read selectively and note key arguments).
2. Bunce, Valerie. 2000. "Comparative Democratization Big and Bounded Generalizations." *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (6-7) (September 1): 703–734.
3. Schedler, Andreas. "Elections Without Democracy: The Menu of Manipulation." *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 2 (2002): 36–50.
4. Howard, Marc, and Philip G. Roessler. "Liberalizing Electoral Outcomes in Competitive Authoritarian Regimes." *American Journal of Political Science* 50, no. 2 (April 2006): 365–381.

Recommended Reading

5. Brownlee, Jason M. "Low Tide after the Third Wave: Exploring Politics under Authoritarianism." *Comparative Politics* 34, no. 4 (July 2002): 477.
6. Carothers, T. "The End of the Transition Paradigm." *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 1 (2002): 5–21.
7. Geddes, Barbara. "What Do We Know About Democratization After Twenty Years?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 2, no. 1 (1999): 115–144.
8. Linz, Juan J. and Alfred C. Stepan. "Toward Consolidated Democracies." *Journal of Democracy* 7, no. 2 (1996): 14–33.
9. Art, David. 2012. "What Do We Know About Authoritarianism After Ten Years?" *Comparative Politics* 44 (3): 351–373.

Questions

- What are the causes of the "third wave" of democratizations?
- What are the key challenges of democratization in the post-third wave era?
- Do mass protests necessarily bring about regime change and stability?
- Why do authoritarian regimes persist in the age of democracy?

Week 10: Nov 11 / Elections, Electoral System and Malpractices

Topic: ELECTIONS, ELECTORAL SYSTEM AND MALPRACTICES

Required Reading

1. Powell, G. Bingham. "Political Representation in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 07, no. 1 (May 2004): 273–296.
2. Norris, Pippa. "Choosing Electoral Systems: Proportional, Majoritarian and Mixed Systems." *International Political Science Review* 18, no. 3 (July 1, 1997): 297–312.
3. Birch, Sarah. 2007. "[Electoral Systems and Electoral Misconduct](#)." *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (12): 1533–56.
4. Lehoucq, Fabrice. 2003. "Electoral Fraud: Causes, Types, and Consequences." *Annual Review of Political Science* 6 (1): 233–56.
5. Van Ham, Carolien, and Staffan I. Lindberg. 2015. "[From Sticks to Carrots: Electoral Manipulation in Africa, 1986–2012](#)." *Government and Opposition* 50 (Special Issue 03): 521–548.

Recommended Reading

6. Svensson, Palle, and Jørgen Elklit. 1997. "[The Rise of Election Monitoring: What Makes Elections Free and Fair?](#)" *Journal of Democracy* 8 (3): 32–46.
7. Fortin-Rittberger, Jessica. 2014. "[The Role of Infrastructural and Coercive State Capacity in Explaining Different Types of Electoral Fraud](#)." *Democratization* 21 (1): 95–117.

8. Reynolds, Andrew, Benjamin Reilly, and Andrew Ellis. *Electoral System Design: The New International IDEA Handbook*. Accessed February 12, 2013.
<http://www.idea.int/publications/esd/index.cfm>.
9. Grofman, Bernard, and Arend Lijphart. *Electoral Laws and Their Political Consequences*. New York: Algora Publishing, 2003. Read selectively.

Questions

- Are some electoral systems more democratic and representative than others?
- Is there a best electoral design to ensure the representation of ethnic minorities?
- Is there an electoral system that is most vulnerable to electoral manipulation and fraud?

Week 11: Nov 18 / Ethnic Conflicts and Minority Representation

Topic: ETHNIC CONFLICTS AND MINORITY REPRESENTATION

Required Reading

1. Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New Edition. Verso, Chapter 1.
2. Horowitz, Donald L. 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, pp.3-54.
3. Lijphart, Arend. "Constitutional Design for Divided Societies." *Journal of Democracy* 15, no. 2 (2004): 96–109. doi:10.1353/jod.2004.0029.
4. McCauley, John F. 2017. "Disaggregating Identities to Study Ethnic Conflict." *Ethnopolitics* 16 (1): 12–20.
5. Lublin, David, and Shaun Bowler. 2018. "[Electoral Systems and Ethnic Minority Representation](#)." *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems*, April, 2018.
6. Zuber, Christina Isabel. 2015. "Reserved Seats, Political Parties, and Minority Representation." *Ethnopolitics* 14 (4): 390–403.

Recommended Reading

7. Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 01 (2003): 75–90.
8. Varshney, Ashutosh. 2012. "Ethnicity and Ethnic Conflict." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, by Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, 1:274–295. 1st ed. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
9. Lake, David A., and Donald Rothchild. 1996. "Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict." *International Security* 21 (2) (October 1): 41–75.
10. Bird, Karen. 2014. "Ethnic Quotas and Ethnic Representation Worldwide." *International Political Science Review* 35(1): 12-26.
11. Banducci, Susan A., Todd Donovan, and Jeffrey A. Karp. 2004. "Minority Representation, Empowerment and Participation." *Journal of Politics*, 56 (2): 534-556.
12. Snyder, Jack L. 2000. *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*. Norton, pp. 15-43.

Questions

- What is "ethnicity" and why is it a main source of national conflicts?
- Theories of ethnic conflict are usually premised on opposite assumptions. Where the theory of cultural pluralism conceives ethnic conflict as the clash of incompatible values, modernization and economic-interest theories of conflict as the struggle of resources and opportunities; others have posited "ancient hatred" and elite persuasion as sources of conflict.

- What is the best electoral design to contain ethnic conflicts? What is the best electoral system to ensure fair representation of ethnic minorities in government?

Week 12: Nov 25 / Gender and Political Representation

Topic: GENDER AND POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

Required Reading

1. Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes.'" *The Journal of Politics* 61 (3): 628–57.
2. Rule, Wilma. 1987. "Electoral Systems, Contextual Factors and Women's Opportunity for Election to Parliament in Twenty-Three Democracies." *Political Research Quarterly* 40 (3): 477–98.
3. Wängnerud, Lena. "Women in Parliaments: Descriptive and Substantive Representation." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12, no. 1 (2009): 51–69.
4. Tripp, Aili Mari, and Alice Kang. "The Global Impact of Quotas on the Fast Track to Increased Female Legislative Representation." *Comparative Political Studies* 41, no. 3 (Mar 1, 2008): 338–61.
5. Htun, Mala. 2004. "Is Gender Like Ethnicity? The Political Representation of Identity Groups." *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (03): 439–458.

Recommended Reading

1. Rule, Wilma. 1981. "Why Women Don't Run: The Critical Contextual Factors in Women's Legislative Recruitment." *Political Research Quarterly* 34 (1): 60–77.
2. Bush, Sarah Sunn. "International Politics and the Spread of Quotas for Women in Legislatures." *International Organization* 65, no. 1 (2011): 103–37.
3. Dahlerup, Drude. 2007. "Electoral Gender Quotas: Between Equality of Opportunity and Equality of Result." *Representation* 43 (2): 73–92.
4. Hughes, Melanie. 2011. "Intersectionality, Quotas, and Minority Women's Political Representation Worldwide." *American Political Science Review* 105 (3): 604–20.

Questions

- Compare and discuss the different theoretical approaches using evidence from one empirical case.
- Institutional remedies for the underrepresentation of women and ethnic minorities often assume distinct forms. Women tend to receive candidate quotas in political parties, whereas ethnic groups are granted reserved seats in legislatures. Discuss why there is a divergence between the modes of gender and ethnic representation in different countries.
- What is the best electoral system to ensure the women's political representation?

Week 13: Dec 2 / Technology & Democracy

Topic: DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY AND DEMOCRACY

Required Reading

1. Moore, Martin. 2019. "[Protecting Democratic Legitimacy in a Digital Age.](#)" *The Political Quarterly* 90 (S1): 92–106.
2. Cheeseman, Nic, Gabrielle Lynch, and Justin Willis. 2018. "[Digital Dilemmas: The Unintended Consequences of Election Technology.](#)" *Democratization* 25 (8): 1397–1418.
3. Humprecht, Edda. 2018. "[Where 'Fake News' Flourishes: A Comparison Across Four Western Democracies.](#)" *Information, Communication & Society* 0 (0): 1–16.

- Placek, Matthew Alan. 2017. "[#Democracy: Social Media Use and Democratic Legitimacy in Central and Eastern Europe](#)." *Democratization* 24 (4): 632–50.
- Greitens, Sheena Chestnut. 2013. "Authoritarianism Online: What Can We Learn from Internet Data in Nondemocracies?" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46 (2): 262–70.

Recommended Reading

- Aro, Jessikka. 2016. "[The Cyberspace War: Propaganda and Trolling as Warfare Tools](#)." *European View* 15 (1): 121–32.
- Howard, Philip N., Samuel Woolley, and Ryan Calo. 2018. "Algorithms, Bots, and Political Communication in the US 2016 Election: The Challenge of Automated Political Communication for Election Law and Administration." *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 15 (2): 81–93.
- Merloe, Patrick. 2015. "[Election Monitoring Vs. Disinformation](#)." *Journal of Democracy* 26 (3): 79–93.
- Tucker, Joshua A., Yannis Theocharis, Margaret E. Roberts, and Pablo Barberá. 2017. "[From Liberation to Turmoil: Social Media And Democracy](#)." *Journal of Democracy* 28 (4): 46–59.

Questions

- Does digital technology promote or disrupt democracy?
- In what ways does digital technology promote democracy?
- Is digital authoritarianism on the rise?

Course Policies

Submission and Grading of Assignments

MA and PhD students

While the course requirements are identical for MA and PhD students, I expect a different level of understanding and engagement depending on a student's level of graduate study. MA students are expected to focus primarily on the assigned readings read recommended literature only for the research papers. PhD students are expected to read the recommended readings each week, draw upon those readings and respond in greater depth in their written assignments and oral presentations.

Citation and Style Guidelines

All written work ought to follow the author-date citation style according to the [Chicago Manual of Style](#) available through the McMaster University Library site.

In-class Behaviour

All cell-phones must be turned off and stowed away during class.

Grades

Grades will be based on the McMaster University grading scale:

MARK	GRADE
90-100	A+
85-90	A
80-84	A-
77-79	B+
73-76	B
70-72	B-

MARK	GRADE
69-0	F

Late Assignments

Assignments are due at the beginning of class on the due dates. Assignments turned in after the beginning of the class will not earn full credit. **10% will be deducted each day after the submission deadline. Late assignments will not be accepted 48 hours after the original due date.** If you anticipate having problems meeting these deadlines, please contact me before the assignment is due to discuss your situation. To avoid late penalties and ensure fairness, written documentation of your emergency may be required

Absences, Missed Work, Illness

In the event of an absence for medical or other reasons, students should review and follow the Academic Regulation in the Undergraduate Calendar "Requests for Relief for Missed Academic Term Work".

Avenue to Learn

In this course we will be using Avenue to Learn. Students should be aware that, when they access the electronic components of this course, private information such as first and last names, user names for the McMaster e-mail accounts, and program affiliation may become apparent to all other students in the same course. The available information is dependent on the technology used. Continuation in this course will be deemed consent to this disclosure. If you have any questions or concerns about such disclosure please discuss this with the course instructor.

Turnitin.com

In this course we will be using a web-based service (Turnitin.com) to reveal authenticity and ownership of student submitted work. Students will be expected to submit their work electronically either directly to Turnitin.com or via Avenue to Learn (A2L) plagiarism detection (a service supported by Turnitin.com) so it can be checked for academic dishonesty. Students who do not wish to submit their work through A2L and/or Turnitin.com must still submit an electronic and/or hardcopy to the instructor. No penalty will be assigned to a student who does not submit work to Turnitin.com or A2L. All submitted work is subject to normal verification that standards of academic integrity have been upheld (e.g., on-line search, other software, etc.). For more information please refer to the [Turnitin.com Policy](#).

Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous or Spiritual Observances (RISO)

Students requiring academic accommodation based on religious, indigenous or spiritual observances should follow the procedures set out in the RISO policy. Students requiring a RISO accommodation should submit their request to their Faculty Office normally within 10 working days of the beginning of term in which they anticipate a need for accommodation or to the Registrar's Office prior to their examinations. Students should also contact their instructors as soon as possible to make alternative arrangements for classes, assignments, and tests.

University Policies

Academic Integrity Statement

You are expected to exhibit honesty and use ethical behaviour in all aspects of the learning process. Academic credentials you earn are rooted in principles of honesty and academic integrity. Academic dishonesty is to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academic credit or advantage. This behaviour can result in serious

consequences, e.g. the grade of zero on an assignment, loss of credit with a notation on the transcript (notation reads: “Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty”), and/or suspension or expulsion from the university.

It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. For information on the various types of academic dishonesty please refer to the [Academic Integrity Policy](#).

The following illustrates only three forms of academic dishonesty

- Plagiarism, e.g. the submission of work that is not one’s own or for which other credit has been obtained.
- Improper collaboration in group work.
- Copying or using unauthorized aids in tests and examinations.

Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities

Students who require academic accommodation must contact [Student Accessibility Services \(SAS\)](#) to make arrangements with a Program Coordinator. Academic accommodations must be arranged for each term of study. Student Accessibility Services can be contacted by phone 905-525-9140 ext. 28652 or e-mail sas@mcmaster.ca. For further information, consult McMaster University’s Policy for [Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities](#).

Faculty of Social Sciences E-mail Communication Policy

Effective September 1, 2010, it is the policy of the Faculty of Social Sciences that all e-mail communication sent from students to instructors (including TAs), and from students to staff, must originate from the student’s own McMaster University e-mail account. This policy protects confidentiality and confirms the identity of the student. It is the student’s responsibility to ensure that communication is sent to the university from a McMaster account. If an instructor becomes aware that a communication has come from an alternate address, the instructor may not reply at his or her discretion.

Course Modification

The instructor and university reserve the right to modify elements of the course during the term. The university may change the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances. If either type of modification becomes necessary, reasonable notice and communication with the students will be given with explanation and the opportunity to comment on changes. It is the responsibility of the student to check his/her McMaster email and course websites weekly during the term and to note any changes.