

McMaster University
Department of Political Science

POLSCI 740
Theories of Comparative Politics
Winter 2018, Term 2

| | | | |
|-------------|---------------------|---------------|--|
| Seminar: | Thursday, 2:30-5:20 | Instructor: | Dr. Netina Tan |
| Start term: | January 8, 2017 | Office: | KTH 541 |
| End term: | April 5, 2018 | Office hours: | Thursdays, 1:00-2:20 p.m. or by appointment |
| Classroom: | KTH 709 | E-mail: | netina@mcmaster.ca |
| | | Phone: | 1-90-525-9140 ext. 21271 |

COURSE OVERVIEW

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 intended for MA and PhD political science students who plan to write comprehensive exams and/or a thesis in comparative politics. Each week we will discuss a subset of the pertinent 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 a more detailed reading list for the comparative politics exam.*

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this course are to: 1) prepare doctoral students to write a comprehensive field examination in Comparative Politics; and 2) provide doctoral and MA students with the sense of the breadth of the field, its intellectual history, the theoretical and methodological approaches and debates and 3) equip students with the necessary skills to formulate own research questions and have the tools to answer those questions.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1. Class Discussions and Participation (20%)

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 in this class. 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're 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.

2. Two Reading Presentations (10% X 2 = 20%)

You will serve as a discussion leader for two weekly sessions. You will sign up for your two presentations on the first day of class. Each presentation should not last more than 20 minutes (including 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 and set up in advance.

The presenter ought to circulate a 1-page handout with a short summary of the article's key argument (bullet points are acceptable) with 2-3 questions for discussion. 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:

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

The in-class presentation provides an opportunity 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 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.

3. Research Proposal (25%): DUE 1 Mar 2018

You will submit a **3-page outline** (single-spaced) 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 may like to consider the weekly questions as a guide. You are strongly encouraged to sign up for office hours and develop your research question in consultation with me. A bibliography is required for all works cited. Please submit a hardcopy in class and upload it electronically on Avenue to Learn folder.

4. Take Home Final Exam (35%): DUE 5 Apr 2018

The final exam will cover all the materials introduced through the term. You will choose two out of four research questions. The exam questions will be circulated electronically on **23 Mar 2018**. 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.

Summary of Course Assignments and Requirements

| Course Requirements | Grade |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Class attendance/participation | /20 |
| 2. Reading presentation 1 | /10 |
| 3. Reading presentation 2 | /10 |
| 4. Research proposal | /25 |
| 5. Take Home Final Exam | /35 |
| Final Grade | 100 |

COURSE SCHEDULE

| | Date | Topics | Due Dates |
|----------|---------------|---|--|
| 1 | 4 Jan | Introduction | Sign up for presentations |
| 2 | 11 Jan | What is Comparative Politics? | |
| 3 | 18 Jan | Comparative Method | |
| 4 | 25 Jan | Structural-Historical Analysis and Institutionalism | |
| 5 | 1 Feb | Rational Choice | |
| 6 | 8 Feb | Culture | |
| 7 | 15 Feb | States and Regimes | |
| 8 | 22 Feb | Mid-Term Recess | |
| 9 | 1 Mar | Democratization | Research Proposal Due |
| 10 | 8 Mar | Elections and Electoral Systems | |
| 11 | 15 Mar | Ethnicity and Ethnic Conflicts | |
| 12 | 22 Mar | Gender and Women's Political Representation | Circulate Final Take-Home Exam Questions |
| 13 | 29 Mar | Globalization and International Context | |
| 14 | 5 Apr | Course Review | Submit Take-Home Exam |

RECOMMENDED 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 at

<http://search.proquest.com.libaccess.lib.mcmaster.ca/socialsciences?accountid=12347>

Course Weekly Topics and Readings

WEEK 1: January 4, 2018

Topic: COURSE INTRODUCTION

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

WEEK 2: January 11, 2018

Topic: WHAT IS COMPARATIVE POLITICS?

Required Reading

1. Kohli, Atul, Peter Evans, Peter J. Katzenstein, Adam Przeworski, Susanne Hoebler 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.

Week 2 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: January 18, 2018

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.

Week 3 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?
- Contrast small-n comparative analysis with case study, experimental or statistic model. What are the advantages and disadvantages of small n-comparative research?

WEEK 4: January 25, 2018

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. 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.
4. Capoccia, 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." *The 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

5. 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.
6. Mahoney, James. 2004. "Comparative-Historical Methodology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30 (1): 81–101.
7. Steinmo, Sven, Kathleen Thelen, and Frank Longstreth, ed. 1992. *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1-32.
8. Pierson, Paul. 2000. "The Limits of Design: Explaining Institutional Origins and Change." *Governance* 13 (4): 475–499.
9. Remmer, Karen L. 1997. "Theoretical Decay and Theoretical Development: The Resurgence of Institutional Analysis." *World Politics* 50 (1) (October 1): 34–61.

10. Tsebelis, George. 2002. *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Preview of chapters available here:
http://politics.as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/4756/tsebelis_book.pdf

Advanced graduate students are strongly encouraged to read or scan these classic texts:

- Moore, Barrington. 1993. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Beacon Press.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, Charles, ed. 1975. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. 1st Ed. Princeton Univ Pr.

**These books are available on course reserves.*

Week 4 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?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of institutionalism? How do institutions explain institutional change?

WEEK 5: February 1, 2018

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. 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.
http://pages.ucsd.edu/~tkousser/Green_Shapiro_CH2,%20Pathologies%20of%20Rational%20Choice.pdf

Recommended Reading

5. 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.
6. Calvert, Randall. 2002. "Identity, Expression and Rational Choice Theory." In *Political Science: State of the Discipline*, 568–596. W.W. Norton & Co.
7. 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. Preview Chapter available here:
https://www.amazon.com/Problems-Methods-Study-Politics-Shapiro/dp/0521539439/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1472050788&sr=1-1&keywords=Problems+and+Methods+in+the+Study+of+Politics

Week 5 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: February 8, 2018

Topic: CULTURE AND CONSTRUCTIVISM

Required Reading

1. 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.
2. Geertz, Clifford. 1973. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, 3–30. N.Y.: Basic Books.
3. Putnam, Robert D., Robert Leonardi, and Raffaella Y. Nanetti. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton University Press, Chapters 4 and 5.
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. Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science." *The American Political Science Review* 96 (4) (December 1): 713–728.
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.
<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/48950/samuel-p-huntington/the-clash-of-civilizations>.
9. Berman, Sheri. 2001. "Ideas, Norms, and Culture in Political Analysis." *Comparative Politics* 33 (2) (January 1): 231–250.

Week 6 Questions

- What is civic culture?
- What is political culture? How are they created?
- 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 7: February 15, 2018

Topic: STATE AND REGIME

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. Johnson, Chalmers. 1999. "The Developmental State: Odyssey of a Concept." In *The Developmental State*, 32–60. USA: Cornell University Press.
5. Lawson, Stephanie. 1993. "Conceptual Issues in the Comparative Study of Regime Change and Democratization." *Comparative Politics* 25 (2): 183–205.

Recommended Reading

6. 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.
7. Levitsky, S, and D Collier. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49 (3): 430–451.
8. Fishman, Robert M. 1990. "Rethinking State and Regime: Southern Europe's Transition to Democracy." *World Politics* 42 (3): 422–40. doi:10.2307/2010418.
9. Linz, Juan J. 2000. *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Chapter 1.
10. Bogaards, M. 2009. "How to Classify Hybrid Regimes? Defective Democracy and Electoral Authoritarianism." *Democratization* 16 (2): 399–423.

Week 7 Questions:

- What is the difference between "state" and "regime"?
- Define and differentiate between two or three major political regimes (democracy, authoritarianism, electoral authoritarianism, totalitarianism, communism etc) in the articles.
- What is the best way to classify and assess hybrid regimes with both democratic and authoritarian features?
- What are the key problems of the post-cold war regime transitions?

WEEK 8: February 22, 2018

NO CLASS (MID-TERM RECESS)

WEEK 9: March 1, 2018

Topic: DEMOCRATIZATION AND REGIME TRANSITIONS

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.

Week 9 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 are authoritarian regimes persistent in the age of democracy?

WEEK 10: March 8, 2018

Topic: ELECTIONS AND PARTY SYSTEMS

Required Reading

1. Mair, Peter, and Richard S. Katz. 1995. *How Parties Organize: Change and Adaptation in Party Organizations in Western Democracies*. SAGE, 1-24.
2. Aldrich, John H. 2011. *Why Parties?: A Second Look*. University of Chicago Press, 3-66.
3. Mair, Peter. "The Problem of Party System Change." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 1, no. 3 (July 1, 1989): 251–276.
4. Powell, G. Bingham. "Political Representation in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 07, no. 1 (May 2004): 273–296.
5. Norris, Pippa. "Choosing Electoral Systems: Proportional, Majoritarian and Mixed Systems." *International Political Science Review* 18, no. 3 (July 1, 1997): 297–312.

Recommended Reading

6. Lijphart, Arend. "Constitutional Design for Divided Societies." *Journal of Democracy* 15, no. 2 (2004): 96–109. doi:10.1353/jod.2004.0029.
7. Boix, Carles. "21. The Emergence of Parties and Party Systems." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, by Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, 499–522. 1st ed. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. Accessed December 2, 2012, 499-522.
<http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199566020-e-21>.
8. Reynolds, Andrew. "Constitutional Engineering in Southern Africa." *Journal of Democracy* 6, no. 2 (1995): 86–99. doi:10.1353/jod.1995.0035.
9. Mainwaring, Scott. "Party Systems in the Third Wave." *Journal of Democracy* 9, no. 3 (1998): 67–81. doi:10.1353/jod.1998.0049.
10. 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>.
11. Grofman, Bernard, and Arend Lijphart. *Electoral Laws and Their Political Consequences*. New York: Algora Publishing, 2003. Read selectively.
12. Sartori, Giovanni. *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*. U.K.: ECPR Press, 2005.
http://books.google.ca/books?hl=en&lr=&id=ywr0CcGDNHwC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=sartori+parties&ots=xRdclPitgW&sig=nSL11s1SN2GX7kN4HXZhpROekJA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=sartori%20parties&f=false (Scan selectively)

Week 10: Questions

- Why parties? Why interest groups?
- Are some electoral systems more democratic and representative than others?

WEEK 11: March 15, 2018

Topic: ETHNICITY AND ETHNIC CONFLICTS

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: University of California Press, pp.3-54.
3. Snyder, Jack L. 2000. *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*. Norton, pp. 15-43.
4. Zuber, Christina Isabel. 2015. "Reserved Seats, Political Parties, and Minority Representation." *Ethnopolitics* 14 (4): 390–403.
5. Bird, Karen. 2014. "Ethnic Quotas and Ethnic Representation Worldwide." *International Political Science Review* 35(1): 12-26.

Recommended Reading

6. Lake, David A., and Donald Rothchild. 1996. "Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict." *International Security* 21 (2) (October 1): 41–75.
7. Banducci, Susan A., Todd Donovan, and Jeffrey A. Karp. 2004. "Minority Representation, Empowerment and Participation." *Journal of Politics*, 56 (2): 534-556.
8. Zuber, Christina. 2015. "Reserved Seats, Political Parties, and Minority Representation." *Ethnopolitics* 14(4): 390-403.
9. Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 01 (2003): 75–90.
10. McCauley, John F. 2017. "Disaggregating Identities to Study Ethnic Conflict." *Ethnopolitics* 16 (1): 12–20.
11. 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.

Week 11: 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.

WEEK 12: March 22, 2018

Topic: QUOTAS AND WOMEN'S 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 (March 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.

Week 12: Questions

- Compare and discuss the different theoretical approaches with reference to at least one empirical example.
- 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.

WEEK 13: March 29, 2018

Topic: GLOBALIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

Required Reading

1. Evans, Peter B. 1997. "The Eclipse of the State? Reflections on Stateness in an Era of Globalization." *World Politics* 50 (1): 62–87.
2. Gourevitch, Peter. 1978. "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics." *International Organization* 32 (4) (October 1): 881–912.
3. Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1999. "Transnational Advocacy Networks in International and Regional Politics." *International Social Science Journal* 51 (159): 89–101.
4. Solingen, Eten. 2009. "The Global Context of Comparative Politics." In *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*, 220–259. U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Recommended Reading

5. Tarrow, Sidney. 2001. "Transnational Politics: Contention and Institutions in International Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4 (1): 1–20.
6. Lichbach, Mark I., and Helma G. E. de Vries. 2012. "Mechanisms of Globalized Protest Movements." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, by Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, 1:461–497. 1st ed. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
7. Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan A. Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War*. Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1 and 2.

Week 13: Questions

- How does globalization change the way we study comparative politics?

- Should Political Science do away with the artificial divide between Comparative Politics and International Relations?
- Why and how does the “international” factor matter in the understanding of Comparative Politics? Discuss using two or three empirical examples to explain why transnational factors matter and how we can incorporate the international context in our analysis.

WEEK 14: April 5, 2018

Topic: COURSE REVIEW

Student Responsibilities and University Policies

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 here: <https://library.mcmaster.ca/citation-and-style-guides>

In-class Behaviour

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

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. **20% 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.

Academic Integrity

You are expected to exhibit honesty and use ethical behaviour in all aspects of the learning process. Academic credentials earned 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 the students’ responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. For information on the various types of academic dishonesty, please refer to the Academic Integrity Policy, located at <http://www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity>

The following illustrates only three forms of academic dishonesty:

1. Plagiarism, e.g., the submission of work that is not one’s own or for which other credit has been

obtained.

2. Improper collaboration in group work.
3. Copying or using unauthorized aids in tests and examinations.

Accommodations for 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. <http://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies/AcademicAccommodation-StudentsWithDisabilities.pdf>

Course Modification Policy

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.

Electronic Resources

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.

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. Email Forwarding in MUGSI: <http://www.mcmaster.ca/uts/support/email/emailforward.html>

*Forwarding will take effect 24-hours after students complete the process at the above link.

Privacy Protection

In accordance with regulations set out by the Freedom of Information and Privacy Protection Act, the University will not allow return of graded materials by placing them in boxes in departmental offices or classrooms so that students may retrieve their papers themselves; tests and assignments must be returned directly to the student. Similarly, grades for assignments for courses may only be posted using the last 5 digits of the student number as the identifying data. The following possibilities exist for return of graded materials:

1. Direct return of materials to students in class;
2. Return of materials to students during office hours;
3. Students attach a stamped, self-addressed envelope with assignments for return by mail;
4. Submit/grade/return papers electronically.

Arrangements for the return of assignments from the options above will be finalized during the first class.