POLI 7970: Proseminar in Comparative Government

Spring 2015
Room: Stubbs 210
TU 2:00 - 4:50

Dr. Joshua D. Potter
Office: Stubbs 232
Email: jdp97711@gmail.com

Course Description

This course provides an introduction to the major theoretical strains within the subfield of comparative politics, with special attention placed on the practical mechanics of developing research ideas in light of recent literature. This course should be of interest to students working in the comparative subfield or any student planning on producing research on institutions, social movements, democratic representation, regime transitions, or social diversity. The selection of readings attempts to strike a balance between older, canonical works and newer, cutting-edge research. Although the main theoretical and empirical thrust of the class will tend toward cross-national empirical work, substantial portions of the syllabus also pertain to a diversity of methodological approaches, including process tracing narratives, focused qualitative comparisons, field and lab experiments, survey designs, and formal theoretical work.

Course Objectives

The primary objectives of this course are developing facility with **(a)** the theoretical content of the subfield of comparative politics and **(b)** the practical mechanics of tracing the development of knowledge within this field; as well as familiarizing the student with **(c)** several of the subfield's major data repositories and **(d)** the process of applying theoretical constructs to specific empirical examples; and, finally, **(e)** drafting mock grant applications to fund future fieldwork efforts. See the following sections for specific discussions of how these processes will play out during the semester. There are no exams in the course and the final grade is comprised of class participation and a multitude of shorter writing assignments.

Course Policies

Academic integrity is of paramount importance and substantial evidence of plagiarism or cheating will result in a failing grade in the class. Except for the most extenuating of circumstances (accompanied by adequate documentation and justification), **I do not accept late work and I expect each student to come to each of our course meetings having completed the readings and assignments for that day**. I am an advocate of limited technology in the classroom; laptops and tablets are acceptable for the purposes of referring to the course readings and electronic notes during discussion. Cell phones, smart phones, or other electronic devices are unacceptable. Checking email, sending text messages, and other forms of communication are also unacceptable.

Final grades will be assigned in accordance with the following rubric: **A** (90-100 points, or "strong"), **B** (80-89 points, or "average"), and **C** (79 and fewer points, or "failing").

Requirements and Evaluation

Participation – 25 points

For each week in the schedule below, students are expected to have read and reflected upon the manuscripts listed for that day. In addition, students should be prepared to participate in discussion, both in response to comments from their peers as well as to direct questions from me. From time to time, we will run in-class simulations and small group discussions. Students should be good sports and helpful colleagues.

Literature Tracing Exercise – 5 points each, 20 points total

For **weeks 3, 4, 5, and 6**, students are required to submit a "literature tracing" exercise where they select one reading from our syllabus (it could be from **any** week on the syllabus) and write a **2-3 page, double-spaced** summary of how that reading has been utilized in subsequent literature. Specifically, using Google Scholar or the Social Science Citation Index, the student should identify at least **3 peer-reviewed articles** that cite the selected reading in some way (perhaps as a building block of a broader theoretical discussion, as a precedent for a particular type of data measurement strategy, and so on). Describe how each of these 3 articles utilizes the selected reading from the syllabus. The point is to learn **how to use** a manuscript – not just understand its content.

Data Reports – 5 points each, 15 points total

For **weeks 7, 8, and 9**, each student is required to submit a data report of **3-4 double-spaced pages** in length that describes one of the following data sets in the field of comparative politics.

Survey Data Sets: The World Values Survey, Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP), the Arab Barometer, and the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems

Institutional Data Sets: The World Bank's Database of Political Institutions, Matt Golder's Democratic Electoral Systems Around the World, the Quality of Government (QOG) Institute, the Comparative Constitutions Project, and the Autocratic Regimes Data

Parties and Elections Data Sets: Dawn Brancati's Global Elections Database, Yale's National Elections Across Democracy and Autocracy (NELDA), the Comparative Manifesto Project, and the Party Government Data Set (PGDS)

Social and Conflict Data Sets: the Cross-Cutting Cleavages Data Set, the Minorities at Risk (MAR) Project, the Human Rights Data (CIRI) Project, and the Armed Conflict Data Set (UCDP)

This report should include the following: **(1)** a general description of the data set and its empirical scope, **(2)** examples of peer-reviewed research manuscripts that have recently drawn on this data set, **(3)** a technical description of how to download, open, and begin analyzing the data, and **(4)** specific instructions for how to calculate a conceptual variable of interest utilizing this data (such as "electoral volatility" or "economic performance" or "ideological polarization").

Focused Comparison Exercise – 20 points

For the **week 11** meeting, each student is to select **two countries within her region of interest** for a focused comparison exercise. This is a more substantial piece of written work than the previous assignments and should clock in around **8-10 double-spaced pages**. Approach this assignment with an eye toward familiarizing yourself with both countries in "deep" terms – that is, you will learn something about their institutional, historical, social, and political differences and similarities. In particular, I want you to address the following prompt: select **4 major theories or hypotheses** we have encountered in the course of the semester's readings so far (they need not be related). Evaluate the extent to which each of these theories either does or does not explain specific political outcomes in your two countries. In the course of the paper, you should explain why the countries make for a robust comparison and offer specific explanations for why the theories you selected are either applicable or not in each context.

Grant Proposal – 20 points

A major part of research in comparative politics is fieldwork, but fieldwork is very expensive. Unfortunately, most political science departments do not have internal resources sufficient to fund their graduate students' research; thus, you have to be entrepreneurial in applying for grants. Due on **April 30 at 9:00 AM**, you will practice applying for a grant intended to support fieldwork during your dissertation stage. Treat this as a final project and work hard at it; I will provide extensive comments to you at the end of the semester and – if you are willing to revise based upon those comments – you might be in possession of a submission-ready grant proposal for the 2015-2016 academic year. There are several resources for funding graduate work in other countries, including:

- National Science Foundation's Dissertation Research Improvement Grant
- International Foundation for Electoral Systems Democracy Fellowships
- Various Small Grants to Study Abroad from IREX
- Various Individual and Institutional Grants from the Ford Foundation
- The Social Science Research Council's International Dissertation Research Fellowship

Criteria and formats differ widely across grant institutions, but I will ask you to adhere to the following criteria as they are the most generally applicable: **(1)** a title page, with title, biographical information, and a 350-word abstract of the proposed project, **(2)** a project description that runs approximately 8-10 double-spaced pages and addresses the project's merits within political science, its broader intellectual impact, the specific theoretical argument and survey of relevant literature, and a brief description of the work to be undertaken, **(3)** a works cited section, **(4)** a one-page proposed budget, **(5)** a 1-2 page budget justification, and **(6)** a statement intended for the university's Institutional Review Board about what risk – if any – the research poses to human subjects.

Note: your tracing exercises, data set reports, two-country focused comparison, and grant proposal can all draw on and reinforce one another. Indeed, it is possible throughout the semester to leverage each of these assignments in tandem. To that end, investing a bit of thought at the beginning of the semester into where you'd like to end up may reap substantial dividends. Feel free to consult with me early and often. In general, I am *more than willing* to read early drafts of any written assignments. Beginning early has its advantages.

Biases, Survival Strategies, and Motivations

There are many different ways to teach a proseminar in comparative politics; it is an exceedingly diverse subfield of the discipline, with all manner of substantive topics, approaches, and biases. I am coming at this material from the perspective of a newly-minted Ph.D. who was largely trained to think about research questions as a cross-national institutionalist and my own work focuses heavily on large-N statistical analysis. However, I have great respect for methodological pluralism and I tried to strike a balance in our reading load between older (canonical, but not necessarily "most correct") and newer (cutting-edge, but not necessarily "time tested") works. All this by way of saying that, while I'm coming to this material with my own biases, I have worked hard to try to present you with a representative sampling of what the subfield has to offer.

You also have your own biases, whether you're aware of them at this point or not. To a large extent, your experience with the material is mediated by your academic background, your interests, and your ability to roll up your sleeves and put in a good day's work. For this reason, you will find that you and your peers will understand concepts at different rates, develop certain facilities with greater intensities, and harbor divergent preferences over which questions and manuscripts are interesting, effective, and successful. This can be a complicated landscape to navigate and, if you're not careful, you'll incur psychological costs that might stand in your way of being productive and contributing to class. Here are some general principles to keep in mind:

You will not quickly "get" most things. It is important to differentiate (1) those things that you do not know *now, at this moment* but which you might know *in 15 or 20 minutes*, from (2) those things which are *perfectly unknowable regardless of time*. You will read hard material and we will discuss difficult concepts in class, but do not panic. Graduate school is a process.

There is no dignity here, but also no shame. If you spend time trying to maintain a facade of intelligence in front of your peers, you'll be wasting most of that time. We are all essentially idiots moonlighting as smart people. Learn to take criticism, internalize it, and adapt in line with its suggestions. Learn to hazard a guess, take a risk in discussion, and get corrected.

Patience and work trumps intelligence quotient. Get into the habit of working 12 hour days and weekends. Grow accustomed to running down rabbit holes, meticulously collecting and organizing data, writing multiple drafts of manuscripts, grant applications, and course papers. Learn how to step away from the internet, power down the cell phone, and turn off the television. The life of the successful scholar is characterized by focused, quiet contemplation. Brilliance is biological, but learnedness is acquirable through labor (which is good news for all of us).

There are multiple wrong answers and multiple right answers. There is a lot of ambiguity at play in the social sciences, but at the same time, we are not total relativists. Some theories are more compelling than others, but it is rarely the case that one theory explains all variation we see in the world. Arguments can be evaluated in terms of their internal logic as well as their empirical veracity. Most days, our job boils down to selecting the most compelling explanation (drawn from a pool of potentially compelling explanations) and empirically evaluating that explanation with the most correct method (drawn from a number of potential methods).

Finally, don't lose sight of the forest for the trees. Try to see how every day's tasks work in service to a broader goal – whatever that looks like for you. Think big picture when you can.

How to Read

Of necessity, there is a rather large reading load in this course (especially during the front end of the semester, where most of your written work has not kicked in). You will probably find yourself getting overwhelmed at points and, to an extent, this is by design. Learning how to "skim" materials or read strategically is a valuable tool you need to develop in the course of your graduate education. This is not to say that you should read superficially; rather, read with a focused aim that extracts from manuscripts the following pieces of information:

> What is the research question and what is the scope of this question? That is, for what types of cases, time periods, and relationships is the question germane?
>
> What is the novel contribution of the manuscript? How is its importance motivated by the authors and, if applicable, what tension in the literature is the paper attempting to adjudicate?
>
> What is the independent variable, the dependent variable, and the theory that connects one to the other? Are there competing explanations that the authors account for? (these may not necessarily be present in every manuscript we'll read)
>
> Be able to describe the analytical strategy and the paper's results. (these may not necessarily be present in every manuscript we'll read)
>
> Be able to diagnose one (objectively) defensible strength of the paper as well as one (objectively) defensible strength.
>
> This course is primarily concerned with theory, methods, and research design. To that extent, you can ignore the presentation of specific facts.

I would recommend "active" engagement while reading. Rather than simply highlighting or taking notations in the margins, get out a separate piece of paper (or a new Word document) and write (or type) specific responses to each of the points above, where applicable. This will constitute a reading journal, of sorts, that you can use for the in-class discussion. Remember that retention is correlated with activity; passive reading will not help you.

How to Write

You will be put to a variety of writing tasks this semester, none of which is a full-length research manuscript, but all of which are designed with the underlying goal of preparing you for such a task. Practice clear, analytical writing across all of these assignments. Remember that in the context of this course, you are analysts rather than advocates.

Submitted manuscripts should be carefully proofread, free of typographical errors, and evince a high level of organization. I am very willing to read preliminary drafts and provide feedback in advance of the submission deadline; I am much less willing to read hastily assembled and poorly organized final submissions. Good time management and close consultation with the professor will result in stronger end-of-semester products.

Week 1 / Jan 13 / Epistemology

Ostrom, Elinor. 1998. "A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Choice Theory of Collective Action: Presidential Address, American Political Science Association." *American Political Science Review* 92(1): 1-22.

Cox, Gary W. 1999. "The Empirical Content of Rational Choice Theory." *The Journal of Theoretical Politics* 11(2): 147-169.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. Chapter 1. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research.* Princeton University Press.

Brady, Henry E., David Collier, and Jason Seawright. 2004. Chapter 12. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Gerring, John. 2007. "The Case Study: What it is and What it Does." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics.* Carles Boix and Susan Carol Stokes, eds. Oxford University Press.

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

Bates, Robert. 2007. "From Case Studies to Social Science: A Strategy for Political Research." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics.* Carles Boix and Susan Carol Stokes, eds. Oxford University Press.

Hedstrom, Peter and Richard Swedberg. 1998. "Social Mechanisms: An Introductory Essay." In *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory.* Peter Hedstrom and Richard Swedberg, eds. Cambridge University Press.

Morton, Rebecca B. 1999. Chapter 2. *Methods and Models: A Guide to the Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science.* Cambridge University Press.

Week 2 / Jan 20 / Methodological Pluralism

Wood, Elizabeth Jean. 2007. "Field Research." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics.* Carles Boix and Susan Carol Stokes, eds. Oxford University Press.

Cramer Walsh, Katherine. 2012. "Putting Inequality in its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 106(3): 517-532.

Collier, David. 2011. "Understanding Process Tracing." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44(4): 823-830.

Mahoney, James. 2012. "The Logic of Process Tracing Tests in the Social Sciences." *Sociological Methods & Research* 41(4): 570-597.

Macy, Michael W. and Robert Willer. 2002. "From Factors to Actors: Computational Sociology and Agent-Based Modeling." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 143-166.

Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review* 99(3): 435-452.

Rohlfing, Ingo. 2008. "What You See and What You Get: Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 41(11): 1492-1514.

Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2006. "The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100(4): 627-635.

Morton, Rebecca B. 1999. Chapter 3. *Methods and Models: A Guide to the Empirical Analysis of Formal Models in Political Science.* Cambridge University Press.

Week 3 / Jan 27 / Collective Action and Group Organization

Literature Tracing Exercise #1 Due

Olson, Mancur. 1965. Chapters 1 and 2. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups.* Harvard University Press.

Ostrom, Elinor. 1999. "Coping with Tragedies of the Commons." *Annual Review of Political Science.* 2: 493-535.

Ostrom, Elinor, James Walker, and Roy Gardner. 1992. "Covenants With and Without a Sword: Self-Governance is Possible." *American Political Science Review.* 86(2): 404-417.

Greif, Avner. 1994. "Cultural Beliefs and the Organization of Society: A Historical and Theoretical Reflection on Collectivist and Individualist Societies." *The Journal of Political Economy.* 102(5): 912-950.

Lichbach, Mark I. 1994. "What Makes Rational Peasants Revolutionary? Dilemma, Paradox, and Irony in Peasant Collective Action." *World Politics.* 46(3): 383-418.

Kalyvas, Stathis N. 1998. "From Pulpit to Party: Party Formation and the Christian Democratic Phenomenon." *Comparative Politics.* 30(3): 293-312.

Week 4 / Feb 3 / Nations and Ethnic Identity

Literature Tracing Exercise #2 Due

Coakley, John. 2012. Chapters 1, 7, and 9. *Nationalism, Ethnicity, and the State: Making and Breaking Nations.* Sage Publications, Ltd.

Cederman, Lars-Erik and Luc Girardin. 2007. "Beyond Fractionalization: Mapping Ethnicity onto Nationalist Insurgencies." *American Political Science Review* 101(1): 173-185.

Habyarimana, James, McCartan Humphreys, Daniel N. Posner, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2009. Chapters 1 and 4. *Coethnicity: Diversity and the Dilemmas of Collective Action.* The Russell Sage Foundation.

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

Dunning, Thad and Lauren Harrison. 2010. "Cross-Cutting Cleavages and Ethnic Voting: An Experimental Study of Cousinage in Mali." *American Political Science Review* 104(1): 21-39.

Penn, Elizabeth Maggie. 2008. "Citizenship versus Ethnicity: The Role of Institutions in Shaping Identity Choice." *The Journal of Politics* 70(4): 956-973.

Week 5 / Feb 10 / Political Culture

Literature Tracing Exercise #3 Due

Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 96(4): 713-728.

Inglehart, Ronald and Paul R. Abramson. 1999. "Measuring Postmaterialism." *American Political Science Review.* 93(3): 665-677.

Inglehart, Ronald and Wayne E. Baker. 2002. "Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values." *American Sociological Review.* 65: 19-51.

Muller, Edward N. and Mitchell A. Seligson. 1994. "Civic Culture and Democracy: The Question of Causal Relationships." *American Political Science Review.* 88(3): 635-652.

Gibson, James L. 2001. "Social Networks, Civil Society, and the Prospects for Consolidating Russia's Democratic Transition." *American Journal of Political Science.* 45(1): 51-68.

Elkins, David J. and Richard E. B. Simeon. 1979. "A Cause in Search of Its Effects, or What Does Political Culture Explain?" *Comparative Politics.* 11: 127-145.

Week 6 / Feb 24 / Political Violence, Rebellion, and Civil War

Literature Tracing Exercise #4 Due

Boix, Carles. 2008. "Economic Roots of Civil Wars and Revolutions in the Contemporary World." *World Politics.* 60(3): 390-437.

Ross, Michael L. 2004. "How Do Natural Resources Influence Civil War? Evidence from Thirteen Cases." *International Organization.* 58: 35-67.

Blatman, Chris. 2009. "From Violence to Voting: War and Political Participation in Uganda." *American Political Science Review.* 103: 231-247.

Brancati, Dawn and Jack L. Snyder. 2012. "Time to Kill: The Impact of Election Timing on Postconflict Stability." *Journal of Conflict Resolution.* 57(5): 822-850.

Fearon, James and David Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review.* 97(1): 75-90.

Wood, Jean Elizabeth. 2001. "An Insurgent Path to Democracy: Popular Mobilization, Economic Interests, and Regime Transition in South Africa and El Salvador." *Comparative Political Studies.* 34(8): 862-888.

Week 7 / Mar 3 / Democracy and Democratization

Data Report #1 Due

Acemoglu, Daron and James Robinson. 2006. Chapters 1, 2, and 3. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy.* Cambridge University Press.

Przeworski, Adam and Fernando Limongi. 1997. "Modernization: Theory and Facts." *World Politics.* 49(2): 155-183.

Boix, Carles. 2003. Introduction and Chapter 1. *Democracy and Redistribution.* Cambridge University Press.

Ziblatt, Daniel. 2006. "How Did Europe Democratize?" *World Politics.* 58(2): 311-338.

Munck, Gerardo L. and Carol Skalnik Leff. 1997. "Modes of Transition and Democratization: South America and Eastern Europe in Comparative Perspective." *Comparative Politics.* 29(3): 343-362.

Joseph, Richard. 1997. "Democratization in Africa after 1989: Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives." *Comparative Politics.* 29(3): 363-382.

Week 8 / Mar 10 / Autocracies and Dominant Party Systems

Data Report #2 Due

Gandhi, Jennifer and Adam Przeworski. 2007. "Authoritarian Institutions and the Survival of Autocrats." *Comparative Political Studies.* 40(11): 1279-1301.

Boix, Carles and Milan Svolik. 2013. "The Foundations of Limited Authoritarian Government: Institutions and Power-Sharing in Dictatorships." *The Journal of Politics.* 75(2): 300-316.

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

Mogaards, Matthijs. 2009. "How to Classify Hybrid Regimes? Defective Democracy and Electoral Authoritarianism." *Democratization.* 16(2): 399-423.

Magaloni, Beatriz and Ruth Kricheli. 2010. "Political Order and One-Party Rule." *Annual Review of Political Science.* 13:123-143.

Greene, Kenneth F. 2010. "The Political Economy of Authoritarian Single-Party Dominance." *Comparative Political Studies.* 43(7): 807-834.

Week 9 / Mar 17 / Democratic Representation and Accountability

Data Report #3 Due

Przeworski, Adam, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin. 1999. Chapters 1, 2, and 3. *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation.* Cambridge University Press.

Healy, Andrew and Neil Malhotra. 2013. "Retrospective Voting Reconsidered." *Annual Review of Political Science.* 16: 285-306.

Powell, G. Bingham. 2000. Chapters 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9. *Elections as Instruments of Democracy.* Yale University Press.

Adams, James. 2012. "Causes and Electoral Consequences of Party Policy Shifts in Multiparty Elections: Theoretical Results and Empirical Evidence." *Annual Review of Political Science.* 15: 401-419.

Rabinowitz, George and Stuart Elaine Macdonald. 1989. "A Directional Theory of Issue Voting." *American Political Science Review.* 83(1): 93-121.

Week 10 / Mar 24 / Political Parties and Elections

No written work is due this week.

Aldrich, John H. 2011. Chapter 1. *Why Parties? A Second Look.* University of Chicago Press.

Bawn, Kathleen, Martin Cohen, David Karol, Seth Masket, Hans Noel, and John Zaller. 2012. "A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands, and Nominations in American Politics." *Perspectives on Politics* 10(3): 571-597.

Strom, Kaare. 1990. "A Behavioral Theory of Competitive Political Parties." *American Journal of Political Science.* 34(2): 565-598.

Lipset, Seymour Martin and Stein Rokkan. 1990. "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments." In *Western European Party Systems.* Edited by Peter Mair. Oxford University Press.

Cox, Gary W. 1997. Chapters 2, 4, and 5. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems.* Cambridge University Press.

Clark, Williams Roberts and Matt Golder. 2006. "Rehabilitating Duverger's Theory: Testing the Mechanical and Strategic Modifying Effects of Electoral Laws." *Comparative Political Studies.* 39(6): 679-708.

Carey, John M. and Matthew Soberg Shugart. 1995. "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: A Rank-Ordering of Electoral Formulas." *Electoral Studies.* 14(4): 417-439.

Week 11 / Mar 31 / Presidents and Parliaments

Focused Comparison Exercise Due

Cheibub, José Antonio, Zachary Elkins, and Tom Ginsburg. 2014. "Beyond Presidentialism and Parliamentarism." *British Journal of Political Science.* 44(3): 515-544.

Tsebelis, George. 1995. "Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism, and Multipartyism." *British Journal of Political Science.* 25: 289-326.

Martin, Lanny W. and Randolph T. Stevenson. 2001. "Government Formation in Parliamentary Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science.* 45(1): 33-50.

Cheibub, José Antonio, Adam Przeworski, and Sebastián Saiegh. 2004. "Government Coalitions and Legislative Success under Parliamentarism and Presidentialism." *British Journal of Political Science.* 34(4): 565-587.

Shugart, Matthew Soberg. 1995. "The Electoral Cycle and Institutional Sources of Divided Government in Presidential Systems." *American Political Science Review.* 89(2): 327-343.

Samuels, David. 2004. "Presidentialism and Accountability for the Economy in Comparative Perspective." *American Political Science Review.* 98(3): 425-436.

Week 12 / Apr 14 / Political Corruption and Clientelism

No written work is due this week.

Kitschelt, Herbert. 2000. "Linkages Between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Polities." *Comparative Political Studies.* 33(6/7): 845-879.

Keefer, Philip. 2007. "Clientelism, Credibility, and the Policy Choices of Young Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science.* 51(4): 804-821.

Wantchekon, Leonard. 2003. "Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin." *World Politics.* 55: 399-422.

Triesman, Daniel. 2007. "What Have We Learned About the Causes of Corruption from Ten Years of Cross-National Empirical Research?" *Annual Review of Political Science.* 10: 211-244.

Tavits, Margit. 2007. "Clarity of Responsibility and Corruption." *American Journal of Political Science.* 51(1): 218-229.

Potter, Joshua D. and Margit Tavits. 2011. "Curbing Corruption with Political Institutions." In *The International Handbook on the Economics of Corruption, Volume Two.* Edward Elgar.

Anderson, Christopher J. and Yuliya V. Tverdova. 2003. "Corruption, Political Allegiances, and Attitudes toward Government in Contemporary Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science.* 47(1): 91-109.

Week 13 / Apr 21 / Political Economy and Welfare State Politics

No written work is due this week.

Keefer, Philip. 2004. "What Does Political Economy Tell Us About Economic Development – and Vice Versa?" *Annual Review of Political Science.* 7: 247-272.

Huber, Evelyn, Charles Ragin, and John Stephens. 1993. "Social Democracy, Christian Democracy, Constitutional Structure, and the Welfare State." *American Journal of Sociology.* 99(3): 711-749.

Huber, Evelyn, Thomas J. Mustillo, and John D. Stevens. 2008. "Politics and Social Spending in Latin America." *The Journal of Politics.* 70(2): 420-436.

Iversen, Torben and David Soskice. 2006. "Electoral Institutions and the Politics of Coalitions: Why Some Democracies Redistribute More than Others." *American Political Science Review.* 100: 165-181.

Lizzeri, Alessandro and Nicola Persico. 2001. "The Provision of Public Goods under Alternative Electoral Incentives." *The American Economic Review.* 91(1): 225-239.

Pontusson, Jonas, David Rueda, and Christopher R. Way. 2002. "Comparative Political Economy of Wage Distribution: The Role of Partisanship and Labour Market Institutions." *British Journal of Political Science* 32(2): 281-308.

Rueda, David and Jonas Pontusson. 2000. "Wage Inequality and Varieties of Capitalism." *World Politics.* 52(3): 350-383.

Week 14 / Apr 28 / Political Decentralization and Federalism

No written work is due this week.

Wibbels, Erik. 2006. "Madison in Baghdad? Decentralization and Federalism in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science.* 9: 165-188.

Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. 2003. "Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-Level Governance." *The American Political Science Review.* 97(2): 233-243.

Rodden, Jonathan. 2002. "The Dilemma of Fiscal Federalism: Grants and Fiscal Performance around the World." *American Journal of Political Science.* 46(3): 670-687.

Falleti, Tulia G. 2005. "A Sequential Theory of Decentralization: Latin American Cases in Comparative Perspective." *American Political Science Review.* 99(3): 327-346.

Desposato, Scott W. 2004. "The Impact of Federalism on National Party Cohesion in Brazil." *Legislative Studies Quarterly.* 29(2): 259-285.

Brancati, Dawn. 2006. "Decentralization: Fueling the Fire or Dampening the Flame of Ethnic Conflict and Secessionism?" *International Organization.* 58: 35-67.

Apr 30 at 9:00 AM: Grant Proposals Due