

SPRING 2008

| | | |
|--------------|----------|------------------|
| 1. August 25 | | |
| 2. Sep 8 | | |
| 3. 15 | | |
| 4. 22 | | |
| 5. 29 | | |
| 6. Oct 6 | | paper 1 (20) |
| 7. 13 | | |
| 8. 20 | | mid-term |
| 9. 27 | | midterm due (12) |
| 10. Nov 3 | | |
| 11. 10 | | paper 2 (2) |
| 12. 17 | | |
| 13. 24 | | |
| 14. Dec 1 | | |
| 15. 8 | Exam due | Final; paper 3 |

August 21, 2008

PSCI 5610
Proseminar in Comparative Politics
Fall 2008

DRAFT

David Mason
Office Hours: 1:00-3:00 WF or any time I'm in my office
Electronic Office Hours: 24 hours a day, 7 days a week at:

152 WOOTEN HALL
940-565-2386
masontd@unt.edu

Required Text:

- Putnam, Robert. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Third Six Countries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Moore Jr. Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon.
- Bunce, Valerie. 1999. *Subversive Institutions: The Design and The Destruction of Socialism and the State*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1991. *Democracy and the Market : Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*. Cambridge University Press.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this course is to introduce beginning graduate students to the central theoretical approaches and methods in the field of comparative politics as well as the currently prominent research programs in the field. The field of comparative politics is a complex and diverse field. In a practical sense (for instance, in designating courses in a U.S. university catalog), it refers to politics within nations other than the U.S. It also involves comparisons across all nations or subsets of nations (by region, by level of development, by regime type, by other criteria) in an effort to "discover" general laws that explain and predict the behavior of individuals and groups and the performance of institutions across systems. That presents us with an extraordinarily diverse array of nations, cultures, configurations of government institutions, patterns of mass behavior and of state-society relations. It also compels us to become familiar with a variety of research methods and to develop some understanding of what method is most appropriate for what kind of research question. The Seminar in Scope and Methods will introduce you to the principles and mechanics of research design, so this course will, to come extent, assume you are familiar with those principles. Our goal in this course will be to gain some understanding of how to apply those principles in comparative research, whether it involves the analysis of cross-national data sets, comparative case studies, or even single nations over time and/or across regions.

Given the breadth, diversity, and complexity of the subject matter of comparative politics, it should not be surprising to you that there is no single paradigm that dominates the field. We are still in the era of "competing paradigms". Indeed, it is arguably a permanent condition of the field. Therefore, this course will necessarily involve brief introductions to major research traditions in comparative politics. We cannot touch on all of them, but I have made an effort to structure the course around introductions to several of the major research programs on-going in the field today. If comparative politics is one of your major fields, you should use this as an opportunity to identify the research areas that engage your interest to the point that you could build a career around teaching and research in that subject area.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Your grade in this course will be based on a take-home final exam (worth 40% of your final grade), three reaction papers (collectively worth 10% of your grade), and a research design (worth 40% of your grade), with the final 10% determined by class participation. The writing assignments are intended to sharpen your analytical skills and give you some experience with the kind of analysis that you will be required to do in your other courses, on your comprehensive exams (for Ph.D. students), and in the kind of research and writing you will do as a practicing political scientist.

A. Exam: (40% of final grade)

There will be a take-home final exam that will consist of essay questions. You are free to use any books, notes, or journal articles that you have, but you are not to confer with other students on the test questions. Evidence of collaboration with other students or anyone else will be treated as an instance of cheating and dealt with according to University rules on cheating. You will receive a grade of "0" for the exam and an "F" for the course. The exam will be distributed during the last class session (December 1) and will be due December 8. There is a 3 point penalty for

each day you are late turning in an exam.

B. Reaction Papers: (10% of final grade)

Students will be expected to write three short (2 page maximum) reaction papers during the semester. These papers will consist of an analytical discussion that week's readings. The paper will be due at the beginning of class on the day that the readings are discussed. No late papers or electronic papers will be accepted. One must on one of the weekly sets of readings from September 8 through September 29 (and turned in no later than the day we cover those readings). The second must cover the readings for one of the weeks from October 6 through November 3, and the last must cover one of the sets of readings between November 10 and December 1. These papers should not be simply summaries of the readings but focused critiques and analyses of the readings: what theoretical and methodological approaches do they employ and with what success (and what problems)? In what ways do they contribute to the development of that subfield of comparative politics? What are the critical points of agreement and disagreement between the readings? Papers that simply summarize the readings with no original discussion will be penalized heavily. Papers that summarize only one or two of the readings to the exclusion of the others will also not receive high marks. These papers must be typed, single-spaced, 1-2 pages.

C. Research Design: (40%)

Over the course of the semester, you should select one of the topics in the course (or another topic in comparative politics) and develop a research design that should culminate in a conference paper, publication, and/or thesis/dissertation. This review will be completed in two stages. The first installment should be a **research problem statement** with an **annotated bibliography**: you will present detailed problem statement that clarifies the research puzzle at the center of your project. This statement should be in a form that makes it clear that testable hypotheses can be derived from it. It should be on the order of an extended abstract of a journal article. In order to demonstrate how this research puzzle is grounded in existing research, you should offer in support of the problem statement detailed summaries (one page each) on each of **seven refereed journal articles** on the topic you have chosen. For this installment, confine yourself to refereed journal articles; do not use books, chapters in edited books, government reports, or any other type of resource. Those sources can be used in the final draft, but the purpose of the first installment is to get you to delve into the journal literature on your subject. Each summary should be preceded by a complete citation of the relevant journal article, in the style format of the *American Political Science Review*. This installment is due **Thursday, October 16**.

The final draft should include 1) the research problem statement (revised and expanded from the first draft), 2) a detailed **literature review**, which is an analytical essay that explains how this body of works defines the parameters of research program in comparative politics in which your research project is grounded, and 3) your research design, which includes a theoretical framework (derived from the literature) from which you derive one or more testable hypotheses and then specify what data would be required to test these hypotheses. The final draft is due **Wednesday, November 25**.

Remember:

1. The research design and reaction paper assignments assignment are not optional; you will receive a grade of "F" for the course if you do not turn in any one of the paper assignments, regardless of your score on the exam.
2. You may NOT do a paper on an issue in U.S. domestic policy or U.S. domestic politics. If you do, you will receive a grade of "0" for the paper assignment. If you have the slightest doubt concerning the legitimacy of your paper topic, clear it with me.
3. You may NOT turn in a paper that you have done in another class this semester or any previous semester. If you do, that will be counted as an instance of plagiarism, and you will receive a grade of "F" for the course and be referred to the appropriate University authorities.
4. You may NOT turn in a paper that was written in whole or in part by someone else. If you do, that will be treated as an instance of plagiarism, and you will receive a grade of "F" for the course and be referred to the appropriate University authorities.
5. Your paper must demonstrate that you have read multiple scholarly articles from several different **refereed scholarly** journals (not news magazines, government reports, web sites), and you must use the appropriate citation and bibliographic format.
6. Your paper must be typed, double-spaced, with no more than one inch margins on all four sides and no larger than 12 point type. You must turn in a printed copy AND an electronic copy (by email) in MS Word, word perfect, or pdf format.
7. You may NOT change topics after you turn in the first installment. If you decide you cannot complete the paper you originally proposed, see me. To change topics you will have to do the first installment for your new topic before you turn in your final draft.

IMPORTANT DATES

- October 16 Research Problem and Annotated Bibliography due
November 25 Final Draft of Research Design due
December 1 Take-Home Final distributed
December 8 Take Home Final Due
Reaction Paper 1: any week between September 5 and September 29
Reaction Paper 2: any week between October 6 and November 3
Reaction Paper 3: any week between November 10 and December 1

COURSE OUTLINE

The course outline that follows delineates in sequence the major themes addressed in the course and the assigned readings for each theme. You are expected to complete the assigned readings before class and come to class prepared to discuss them. Class participation counts 10% of your grade, and informed discussion requires careful reading of the assignments. The readings load is rather heavy for this course, but it is essential that you devote the time needed to master them.

1. August 25: Overview of the Field/Methodological Premises

We will begin with some readings that present an overview of the substantive concerns and methodological approaches of the field of comparative politics. This set of readings focuses on the methodological issues inherent in deciding what set of cases you will use to explore a particular research question. They offer some insights into the advantages and disadvantages of case-study, small-n approaches versus cross-national, large-n studies. These readings should give you some idea of how the field has evolved over the last half century under the influence of the behavioral revolution in the social sciences.

Required Readings

- Wiarda, Howard. 1991. "Comparative Politics, Past and Present," in Howard Wiarda, ed. *New Directions in Comparative Politics* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991), pp. 3-30.
Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method," *American Political Science Review* 65: 682-693.
Lichbach, Mark. 1997. "Social Theory and Comparative Politics", in Lichbach, Mark and Alan Zuckerman, eds. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, Structure*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Laitin, David. 2002. "Comparative Politics: the State of the Subdiscipline" pp.630-659" in Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner eds. 2002. *Political Science: State of the Discipline*. New York: Norton and Company

Suggested Readings:

- Sartori, Giovanni (1970). "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64 (December): 1033-1053.
Verba, Sidney (1985). "Comparative Politics: Where Have We Been, Where Are We Going." In Howard J. Wiarda, Ed. (1985). *New Directions in Comparative Politics*. Boulder, Co.: Westview.
Ragin, Charles and David Zaret (1983). "Theory and Method in Comparative Research: Two Strategies." *Social Forces* 61 (March): 731-755.
Sartori, Giovanni. 1991. "Comparing and Miscomparing," *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 3: 243-57.
Collier, David. 1991. "The Comparative Method: Two Decades of Change," in Dankwart Rustow and Kenneth Erikson, *Comparative Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991), pp. 7-32.

2. September 1 - Labor Day: no class

3. September 8: Research Design in Comparative Politics I

Having surveyed the broad scope of the field, we turn to some basic questions of research design. Przeworski and Teune contrast “most similar systems design” with “most different system design”. We also consider the role of case study methods or “thick description”.

Required Readings

- Adam Przeworski and Henry Teune, *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*, pp 1-47
- John Gerring, “What is a Case Study and What is it Good for?” *American Political Science Review* 98 (2004): 341-354.
- Michael Coppedge. 1999., “Thickening Thin Concepts and Theories: Combining Large N and Small in Comparative Politics.” *Comparative Politics* 31: 465-476.
- John Frensdreis. 1983. “Explanation of Variation and Direction of Covariation,” *Comparative Political Studies* 16: 255-272
- Meckstroth, Theodore W. 1975. "'Most Different Systems' and 'Most Similar Systems': A Study in the Logic of Comparative Inquiry." *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (July): 132-157.

Suggested Readings:

- Barbara Geddes. 1990. “How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics,” *Political Analysis* 2: 131-150.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- King, Gary; Robert O. Keohane, Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton University Press.
- Teune, Henry (1975). "Comparative Research, Experimental Design, and the Comparative Method." *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (July): 195-199.
- Harry Eckstein, “Case Study and Theory in Political Science,” in Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby, eds., *Handbook of Political Science*, Volume 7, Strategies of Inquiry (Reading, MA: Addison-Elsevy, 1975), pp. 79-137
- Charles Ragin. 1997. “Turning the Tables: How Case-Oriented Research Challenges Variable-Oriented Research,” *Comparative Social Research* 16: 27-42.
- Eulau, Heinz. 1977. "Multilevel Methods in Comparative Politics." *American Behavioral Scientist* 21 (September/October): 39-62.
- DeFeliz, E. Gene. 1986. "Causal Inference and Comparative Methods." *Comparative Political Studies* 19 (October): 415-437.
- Lieberson, Stanley. 1991. “Small N’s and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases,” *Social Forces* 70: 307-320.
- Teune, Henry (1973). "Political Systems as Residual Variables: Explaining Differences Within Systems." *Comparative Political Studies* 6 (April): 3-21.
- Robert Jackman, “Cross-National Statistical Research and the Study of Comparative Politics,” *American Journal of Political Science* 29 (1985):161-182.
- Giovanni Sartori, “Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics,” *American Political Science Review* 64 (1970): 1033-1053
- David Collier and James E. Mahon, Jr., “Conceptual Stretching Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Political Analysis,” *American Political Science Review* 87 (1993): 845-855.

4. September 15: Research Design in Comparative Politics II

We conclude our introduction to research design and methodology in comparative politics with Barbara Geddes’ work on the subject. Geddes addresses a number of critical research design issues that take from the earlier discussions of the principles of theory building to some practical issues that you will encounter in the process of designing and executing your own research projects in comparative politics, whether they be comparative case studies or statistical analyses of cross-sectional time series data or any type of study in between those two types.

Required Readings

- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press

5. September 22: Comparative Historical Studies

Barrington Moore’s classic work uses the methodology of comparative social history to analyze the nature of state-society relations in pre-modern society and the forces of social and economic change that undermined that system. When social change undermines the old order, a nation can embark upon one of several paths that lead drastically different outcomes. You should gain some insight into the different conditions and dynamics of change that gave rise to democracy, communism, and fascism. You should also consider what comparable dynamics are driving contemporary processes such as the “third wave” of democratization. Studies such as Moore’s give us some insight

into how broadly sweeping conceptual frameworks aid us in understanding dynamics of change and development, and how these processes can be path dependent. Within these richly textured but broadly sweeping frameworks such as Moore's we can begin to identify narrower research puzzles that are amenable to research using other methods.

Required Readings

- Moore Jr. Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon., Ch. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich; Evelyne Huber Stephens, and John D. Stephens. 1992. *Capitalist Development and Democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-78.
- Peters, B. Guy; Pierre, Jon; and King, Desmond S. 2005. "The Politics of Path Dependency: Political Conflict in Historical Institutionalism," *Journal of Politics*, 67, 4 (November): 1275–1300

Suggested Readings:

- Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. "Historical Institutionalism In Comparative Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2: 369-404
- North, D. C. and B. R. Weingast (1989). "Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth Century England." *Journal of Economic History*. 49 (4): 803-832.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1976. "France, Russia, China: A Structural Analysis of Social Revolutions", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 18 (2): 175-210
- Ira Katznelson, "Structure and Configuration in Comparative Politics," in Lichbach and Zuckerman, eds., pp. 81-112.
- Skocpol, Theda and Margaret Somers. 1980. "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22. 174-197.
- Luebbert, Gregory. 1991. *Liberalism, Fascism, or Social Democracy* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goldstone, Jack A. 1991. *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Douglass North and Barry Weingast, "Constitutions and Commitments: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth Century England," *Journal of Economic History* 49 (1989): 369-404
- Steven Smith and Thomas Remington, *The Politics of Institutional Choice: The Formation of the Russian State Duma* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001)
- John D. Huber and Charles Shipan, *Deliberate Discretion: The Institutional Foundations of Bureaucratic Autonomy* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Douglass North, *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

6. September 29: Comparative Institutions

With the wave of democratization that has swept Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe and Africa, it is perhaps wise for us to examine the variety of institutional forms that representative democracy can assume. In this section we shall examine the structure and operations of parliamentary democracies and how these institutions mediate the relations between state authority and society. We will focus especially on variations in party systems and how these affect the politics within governments.

Required Readings

- Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Third Six Countries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, chapters: 1-3, 5-8, 11, 15, 16
- Norris, Pippa. 2004. *Electoral Engineering: Voting Rules and Political Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-95.
- Cheibub, José Antonio. 2007. *Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, and Democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-48.

Suggested Readings

- Powell, G. Bingham. 1984. *Contemporary Democracies*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1994. *Comparative Constitutional Engineering*. New York: NYU Press.
- Powell, G. Bingham, Jr. 2000. *Elections As Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New Haven: Yale Univ Press.
- Laver, Michael and Kenneth Shepsle. 1996. *The Making and Breaking of Governments: Cabinets and Legislatures in Parliamentary Democracies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lijphart, Arend, ed. (1992). *Parliamentary Versus Presidential Government*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lijphart, Arend (1994). *Electoral Systems and Party Systems: A Study of Twenty-Seven Democracies, 1945-1990*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LeDuc, Lawrence; Richard G. Niemi; Pippa Norris, eds. 2002. *Comparing Democracies 2: New Challenges in the Study of Elections and Voting*. London: Sage.

7. October 6: Institutionalism - Rational Choice Approaches

Most institutional analysis begin with an implicit assumption of rational actors populating those institutions. Their behavior, then, is what we would expect a rational person to do under the "rules of the game" defined by a given set of institutions. The readings for this week deal explicitly with the rationality assumption and its implications, including some counterintuitive findings and conclusions.

Required Readings

- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith. 2000. "Political Institutions, Political Survival, and Policy Success," pp. 59-84 in Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and Hilton Root, eds., *Governing for Prosperity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tsebelis, George. 1990. *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press). Pp. 1-47, 119-158.
- Barbara Geddes. 1991. "A Game Theoretic Model of Reform in Latin American Democracies," *American Political Science Review* 85: 371-392.
- Donald Green and Ian Shapiro, *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), pp. 1-46.
- Acemoglu, Daron and James A. Robinson. 2006. *The Economic Origins of Dictatorships and Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1 & 2

Suggested Readings

- Tsebelis, George "Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism and Multipartyism." *British Journal of Political Science* 25 (1995): 289-325
- Tsebelis, George. 2002. *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Robert Bates. 1981. *Markets and States in Tropical Africa*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988)
- Margaret Levi, "A Model, a Method, and a Map: Rational Choice in Comparative and Historical Analysis," in Lichbach and Zuckerman, eds., pp. 19-41.
- Robert Bates, "Governments and Agricultural Markets in Africa," in Robert Bates, ed., *Toward a Political Economy of Development: A Rational Choice Perspective* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), pp. 331-358
- Boniface, Dexter, and J.C. Sharman. 2001. "An Analytic Revolution in Comparative Politics?" *Comparative Politics* 33: 475-493
- Munck, Gerald. 2001. "Game Theory and Comparative Politics: New Perspectives and Old Concerns." *World Politics* 53: 173-204.
- Milner, Helen V. 1998. "Rationalizing Politics: The Emerging Synthesis of International, American and Comparative Politics." *International Organization* 52: 759-786.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1994. *The Politician's Dilemma: Building State Capacity in Latin America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

8. October 13: Bringing the State Back in

The behavioral revolution in political science resulted in a thorough shift in focus to individual and group behavior that by the late 1970s, a group of scholars began to raise the critique that the state had been reduced to little more than the arena in which behavioral games were acted out or the stakes over which political conflict was waged. Theda Skocpol's *State and Social Revolutions* began the movement to "bring the state back in" to political science. In this section, we will examine the renewed attention to the state and the question of state autonomy from society. We will also survey some exemplary readings on particular varieties of (non-democratic) states: corporatism, bureaucratic authoritarianism, and neo-patrimonial states.

Required Readings

- Tilly, Charles. 1985. "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime." pp. 169-191 in Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol, eds. *Bringing the State Back In*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ayoob, Mohammed. 1992. "The Security Predicament of the Third World State: Reflections on State Making in a Comparative Perspective" Ch. 3 in Job, Brian, ed. *The Insecurity Dilemma: National Security of Third World States*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner
- Guillermo O'Donnell, "Tensions in the Bureaucratic-Authoritarian State and the Question of Democracy" pp. 285-318 in David Collier, ed. 1979. *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Malloy, James M. 1977. "Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Latin America: The Modal Pattern", in James M. Malloy, ed. 1977. *Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Bratton, Michael and Nicolas Van De Walle (1994). "Neopatrimonial Regimes and Political Transitions in Africa", *World Politics* 46 (July): 453-489.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1969. "Consociational Democracy." *World Politics* 21 (January): 207-25.

Suggested Readings

- O'Donnell, Guillermo (1978). "Reflections on the Patterns of Change in the Bureaucratic-Authoritarian State", *Latin American Research Review*. 13:3-38.
- Skocpol, Theda (1985). "Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research." In Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, Eds. *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oscar Molina and Martin Rhodes, "Corporatism: The Past, Present and Future of a Concept," *Annual Review of Political Science* 5 (2002): 315-31
- Skocpol, Theda (1979). *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Reno, William. 1997. "War, Markets, and the Reconfiguration of West Africa's Weak States," *Comparative Politics*, 29 (4): 493-510
- H. E. Chehabi and Juan J. Linz, eds. *Sultanistic Regimes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998, pp. 3-81.
- Joel Migdal, "Studying the State," in. Lichbach and Zuckerman, eds., pp. 208-36.
- Jackson, Robert. 1987. "Quasi States, Dual Regimes, and Neoclassical Theory: International Jurisprudence and the Third World." *International Organization* 41(Autumn).
- Jackson, Robert H. and Carl G. Rosberg. 1982. "Why Africa's Weak States Persist: The Empirical and the Juridical in Statehood," *World Politics* 35: 1-24.

9. October 20: Modernization and its Critiques

With the creation of a host of newly independent nation states in the post-World War II era, and the emergence in these nations of a staggering array of social, economic, and political problems, social scientists were compelled to "retool" if they intended to play any role in the effort to analyze these problems and propose remedies for them. Consequently, the 1960s saw numerous efforts to develop new analytical schemes or "paradigms" that would allow us to make some sense out of the politics of newly independent nations of the Third World. We will contrast the "Modernization" school with the "Dependency" school and assess the strengths and weaknesses of each.

Required Readings

- Huntington, Samuel P. 1971. "The Change to Change: Modernization, Development, and Politics," *Comparative Politics*, 3 (3): 283-322.
- Huntington, Samuel. 1965. "Political Development and Political Decay," *World Politics* 17 (3): 386-430.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2002. "The Great Transformation in the Study of Politics in Developing Countries," in Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner eds. *Political Science: State of the Discipline*. New York: Norton and Company
- Rostow, W. W. 1956. "The Take-Off into Self-Sustained Growth", *The Economic Journal*. 66 (March): 25-48.
- Samuel Valenzuela and Arturo Valenzuela, "Modernization and Dependency: Alternative Perspectives in the Study of Latin American Underdevelopment," *Comparative Politics* 10 (1978): 535-557.

Suggested Readings:

- Huntington, Samuel P. 1968. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bates, Robert H., ed. (1988). *Toward a Political Economy of Development*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wiarda, Howard. 1991. "Toward a Nonethnocentric Theory of Development" in Howard Wiarda, ed. *New Directions in Comparative Politics*. 2nd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview. (photocopied)
- dos Santos, Theotonio. 1970. "The Structure of Dependence" *American Economic Review* 60 (2): 231-236.
- Cristobal Kay, "The Structuralist School of Development", in Cristobal Kay (1989). *Latin American Theories of Development and Underdevelopment*. London: Routledge (photocopy).
- Bratton, Michael. 1982. "Patterns of Development and Underdevelopment: Toward a Comparison," *International Studies Quarterly* 26 (Sep): 333-372.
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique and Enzo Faletto (1979). *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. (trans. by Marjory Mattingly Urquidi). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Caporaso, James A. (1978). "Dependence, Dependency, and Power in the Global System: A Structural and Behavioral Analysis", *International Organization*. 32 (Winter).

10. October 27: Political Culture

One long-standing debate on the transition to democracy is whether a “democratic political culture” or “civic culture” is a prerequisite for the effective functioning of democracy or whether, alternatively, the successful functioning of democratic institutions eventually gives rise to democratic values and a civic culture. Almond and Verba’s classic book documents variations in political culture across several nations. Ronald Inglehart and his collaborators have subsequently gone beyond the “civic culture” to document a generational change in political values in advanced industrial democracies, from what they term “materialist” orientations to “post-materialist” values. Specifically, to what extent did the emergence of a post-materialist constituency in Eastern Europe, Latin America, and parts of Asia stimulate and/or sustain the transition to democracy?

Required Readings:

- Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba (1963). *The Civic Culture*. Boston: Little Brown, pp. 1-47; 307-336.
Inglehart, Ronald. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. Introduction, Ch. 1-4, 10, 11
Inglehart, Ronald and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 15-134.

Suggested Readings

- Flanagan, Scott. 1979. “Value Change and Partisan Change in Japan: The Silent Revolution Revisited,” *Comparative Politics* 11: 253-277.
Inkeles, Alex. 1969. “Making Men Modern: On the Causes and Consequences of Individual Change in Six Developing Countries,” *American Journal of Sociology* 75 (Sep): 208-225
Inglehart, Ronald. 1971. “The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 65 (Dec): 991-1017.
Flanagan, Scott (1987). “Changing Values in Industrial Societies Revisited: Towards a Resolution of the values Debate”, *American Political Science Review*. 81: 1303-1319.
Flanagan, Scott (1982). “Changing Values in Advanced Industrial Society”, *Comparative Political Studies*. 14:403-444.
Johnson, James. 2003. “Conceptual Problems as Obstacles to Progress in Political Science: Four Decades of Political Culture Research,” *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 15 (2003).
Seligson, Mitchell. 2002, “The Renaissance of Political Culture or the Renaissance of the Ecological Fallacy,” *Comparative Politics* 34 (April): 273-292.
Abramson, Paul R. and Ronald J. Inglehart. 1992. “Generational Replacement and Value Change in Eight West European Societies,” *British Journal of Political Science* 22 (Apr): 183-228.
D. W. Davis, K. M. Dowley, and B. D. Silver, “Postmaterialism in World Societies: Is It Really a Value Dimension?” *American Journal of Political Science* 43 (July 1999): 935-962
B. D. Silver, and K. M. Dowley, “Measuring Political Culture in Multi-Ethnic Societies: Reaggregating the World Values Survey,” *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (May 2000): 517-550.
J. Granato, R. Inglehart, and D. Leblang, “The Effect of Cultural Values on Economic Development: Theory, Hypotheses, and Some Empirical Tests,” *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (August 1996): 607-631.
R. W. Jackman and R. A. Miller, “The Poverty of Political Culture,” *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (August 1996): 697-716.
P. Norris. *Critical Citizens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

11. November 3: Culture, Institutions, and the Individual

Putnam’s book provides some valuable insights on the interaction between institutions and political culture. His study incorporates elements of comparative historical methods as well as large-n survey research to assess the ways in which long-standing regional variations in political culture in Italy affected the way that the institutions of regional governments performed. In short, how do we account for such wide variation in the performance of similar institutions in different regions of the same country? This study illustrates the ways in which culture can shape the performance of institutions and institutions can shape the evolution of culture. It also illustrates how a comparative research design can be executed within a single country, with political subdivisions of that nation as the units of analysis. We will supplement this with studies of civil society in other societies.

Required Readings

- Robert Putnam, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (Princeton, 1993) [selected chapters]
Booth, John and Patricia Bayer Richards. 1998. “Civil Society, Political Capital, and Democratization in Central America,” *Journal of Politics* 60:780-800.

Suggested Readings

- M. Steven Fish (1995) *Democracy From Scratch: Opposition and Regime in the New Russian Revolution*. Princeton.

12. November 10: Ethnic Politics

One source of group identity and sub-national social organization is ethnic identity. Ethnic identity and ethnic conflict are especially prevalent in many regions of the Third World because the formal boundaries of the nation-states (especially in Africa and parts of Asia) were drawn by European powers during the colonial era, and they were drawn with little or no regard for the geographic distribution of "nations" of people who shared a common language, religion, culture and heritage. Thus many Third World nations are characterized by multiple ethnic groups coexisting (uneasily) as citizens of a single nation state and/or identifiable ethnic groups being divided between two or more nation states. In this section we will examine the ethnic dimension of politics in the Third World, including both ethnic conflict and the special problems of sustaining democracy in an ethnically divided society.

Required Readings

- Horowitz, Donald. 1971. "Three Dimensions of Ethnic Politics," *World Politics* 23: 232-244.
- Kaufman, Stuart J. 1996. "Spiraling to Ethnic War: Elites, Masses and Moscow in Moldova's Civil War." *International Security*. 21 (2): 108-138.
- Donald Horowitz, 1993. "The Challenge of Ethnic Conflict: Democracies in Divided Societies," *Journal of Democracy*. (Oct).
- Lijphart, Arend. 2004. "Constitutional Design for Divided Societies," *Journal of Democracy* 13 (3): 96-109
- Gurr, Ted Robert. 1994. "Peoples Against States: Ethnopolitical Conflict and the Changing World System." *International Studies Quarterly*. 38: 347-378.
- Lake, David A. and Donald Rothchild. 1996. "Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict." *International Security* 21 (Fall): 41-75.
- Hechter, Michael., D. Friedman and M. Appelbaum 1982. "A Theory of Ethnic Collective Action." *International Migration Review*. 16: 412-34.

Suggested Readings:

- James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin. 2000. "Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity" *International Organization* 54, 4, Autumn 2000, pp. 845-877
- Mozaffar, Shaheen; James R. Scarritt; Glen Galaich. 2003. "Electoral Institutions, Ethnopolitical Cleavages, and Party Systems in Africa's Emerging Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 97
- Kaufmann, Chaim. 1996. "Possible and Impossible Solutions to Ethnic Civil Wars." *International Security*. 20 (4): 136-175.
- Fearon, James D. And David D. Laitin. 1996. "Explaining Interethnic Cooperation," *American Political Science Review*. 90: 715-735.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1969. "Consociational Democracy." *World Politics* 21 (January): 207-25.
- Ashutosh Varshney. 2003. "Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict, Rationality," *Perspectives on Politics* 1: 85-100.
- Donald Horowitz. 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ashutosh Varshney, *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002).
- Horowitz, Donald L. 1981. "Patterns of Ethnic Separatism." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23: 165-95.
- Hechter, Michael and Margaret Levi. 1979. "The Comparative Analysis of Ethnoregional Movements." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2:260-74.
- Ted R. Gurr (2000). *People Versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century*. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press.
- Posen, Barry R. 1993. "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict." *Survival* 35 (1): 27-47.

13. November 17: Collective Action and Political Violence

One of the central theoretical anomalies in political science is the collective action problem: how do you induce rational individuals to contribute to the provision of public goods when they will be able to enjoy those goods regardless of whether or not they contributed to their production? In this section, we focus on the special case of how collective dissent arises. These readings address the collective action problem in revolution and collective protest.

Required Readings

- Lichbach, Mark I. 1994. "Rethinking Rationality and Rebellion: Theories of Collective Action and Problems of Collective Dissent," *Rationality and Society* 6: 8-32.
- McAdam, Doug; Tarrow, Sidney; and Charles Tilly. 1997. "Toward an Integrated Perspective on Social Movements and Revolution." Pp. 142-173 Lichbach and Zuckerman
- Goldstone, Jack A. 1994. "Is Revolution Individually Rational? Groups and Individuals in Revolutionary Collective Action," *Rationality and Society* 6: 139-166.
- Taylor, Michael. 1988b. "Rationality and Revolutionary Collective Action." Pp. 63-97 in Michael Taylor, ed. *Rationality and Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University
- Popkin, Samuel L. 1988. "Political Entrepreneurs and Peasant Movements in Vietnam." Pp. 9-62 in Michael Taylor, ed., *Rationality and Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Suggested Readings:

- Paige, Jeffrey M. 1975. *Agrarian Revolution: Social Movements and Export Agriculture in the Underdeveloped World*. New York: Free Press. Ch. 1
- Scott, James C. and Ben Kerkvliet. 1977. "How Traditional Rural Patrons Lose Legitimacy." in S. W. Schmidt, L. Guasti, C. H. Landé, and J. C. Scott, eds. *Friends, Followers and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mason, T. David. 1986a. "Land Reform and the Breakdown of Clientelist Politics in El Salvador." *Comparative Political Studies*. 19: 487-516 .
- McAdam, Doug; Sidney Tarrow; and Charles Tilly. 1996. "To Map Contentious Politics." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 1 (1): 17-34.
- DeNardo, James. 1985. *Power in Numbers: The Political Strategy of Protest and Rebellion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Frohlich, Norman O., Joe A. Oppenheimer, and Oran Young. 1971. *Political Leadership and Collective Goods*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hardin, Russell. 1982. *Collective Action*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hardin, Russell. 1995. *One For All: The Logic of Group Conflict*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jenkins, J. Craig. 1983a. "Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9: 527-53.
- Marwell, Gerald, and Pamela E. Oliver. 1993. *The Critical Mass in Collective Action: A Micro-Social Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, eds. 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. 2d ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley.
- Van Belle, Douglas A. 1996. "Leadership and Collective Action: The Case of Revolution." *International Studies Quarterly* 40: 107-32.
- Jenkins, J. Craig. 1983a. "Why Do Peasants Rebel? Structural and Historical Theories of Modern Peasant Rebellions." *American Journal of Sociology* 88 (November): 487-514

14. November 24: Democratic Transitions

The last quarter of the 20th century was marked by what Samuel Huntington has termed the "third wave" of transitions to democracy. Most of these occurred in the Third World. In this section we will explore the politics of transition from various forms of authoritarian, non-democratic rule to democratic governance. Of particular interest will be consideration of how the structure of the non-democratic regime (e.g., corporatist, bureaucratic authoritarian, neopatrimonial) affects the trajectory of the transition to democracy and the prospects for successful consolidation. We will also consider how ethnic divisions affect the transition to democracy and the prospects for democratic consolidation.

Required Readings

- Rustow, Dankwart. 1970. "Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model," *Comparative Politics* (April): 337-363.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1991. *Democracy and the Market : Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America* Cambridge University Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1991-92. "How Countries Democratize," *Political Science Quarterly* 106 (4): 579-616.
- Adam Przeworski, Michael Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub & Fernando Limongi. 1996. "What Makes Democracies Endure?" *Journal of Democracy* 7.1: 39-55
- Linz, Juan J. And Alfred Stepan. 1991. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 38-83.

Suggested Readings

- Bratton, Michael. 1997. "Deciphering Africa's Divergent Transitions," *Political Science Quarterly* 112 (Spring): 67-93.
- Przeworski, Adam and Fernando Lemongi. 1997. "Modernization: Theory and Facts," *World Politics* 49 (2): 155-183.
- Snyder, Richard. 1992. "Explaining Transitions from Neopatrimonial Dictatorships," *Comparative Politics* 24: 379-400.
- Helliwell, John F. 1994. "Empirical Linkages between Democracy and Economic Development," *British Journal of Political Science* 24: 225-248.
- Haggard, Stephen and Robert R. Kaufman. 1997. "The Political Economy of Democratic Transition". *Comparative*

Politics. Vol.29, no. 3, p.263.

- Karl, Terry Lynn. 1990. "Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America", *Comparative Politics* 23 (October): 1-21.
- Caspar, Gretchen and Michelle M. Taylor. 1996. *Negotiating Democracy: Transitions from Authoritarian Rule*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1991). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin (1959). "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy", *American Political Science Review*. 53: 69-105.
- Linz, Juan J. and Alfred Stepan. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam, Michael E. Alvarez, Jose Antonio Cheibub, Fernando Limongi. 2000. *Democracy and Development : Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

14. December 1: Communist and Post-Communist Politics

The collapse of Communist Party rule in the Soviet Union was a product not only of conditions within the Soviet Union but of international forces as well. In 1989 Communist Party regimes in the Soviet Union's Warsaw Pact allies faced a sudden eruption of popular challenges from below. When the Soviet Union declined to support these regimes with the force necessary to repress these social movements, communist party regimes imploded in Eastern Europe. In this section we will examine the features of Leninist regimes that contributed to this revolutionary transition and the special challenges those nations face in making the transition to a democratic polity and a market economy.

Required Readings

- Bunce, Valerie. 1999. *Subversive Institutions: The Design and The Destruction of Socialism and the State*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- James L. Gibson, "Mass Opposition to the Soviet Putsch of August 1991: Collective Action, Rational Choice and Democratic Values in the Former Soviet Union," *American Political Science Review* 91 (1997): 671-684.
- James L. Gibson. 1996. "A Mile Wide But an Inch Deep (?): The Structure of Democratic Commitments in the Former USSR," *American Journal of Political Science*. 40,2 (May): 396-420.

Suggested Readings: [add readings]

- Bunce, Valerie and John M. Echols. 1980. "Soviet Politics in the Brezhnev Era: 'Pluralism' or 'Corporatism'", in Donald R. Kelley, ed. *Soviet Politics in the Brezhnev Era*. New York: Praeger. (on reserve)
- Hough, Jerry F. 1997. *Democratization and Revolution in the USSR, 1985-1991*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Hough, Jerry and Merle Fainsod. 1979. *How the Soviet Union is Governed*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,
- Duch, Raymond M. 1995. "Economic Chaos and the Fragility of the Democratic Transition in Former Communist Regimes". *Journal of Politics*. 57 (1): 121.
- Hough, Jerry F. 1977. "Party Saturation in the Soviet Union" in Jerry F. Hough, ed. *The Soviet Union and Social Science Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

University of North Texas - Department of Political Science
POLICY ON CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

The UNT Code of Student Conduct and Discipline defines cheating and plagiarism as the use of unauthorized books, notes, or otherwise securing help in a test; copying others' tests, assignments, reports, or term papers; representing the work of another as one's own; collaborating without authority with another student during an examination or in preparing academic work; or otherwise practicing scholastic dishonesty.

Normally, the minimum penalty for cheating or plagiarism is a grade of "F" in the course. In the case of graduate departmental exams, the minimum penalty shall be failure of all fields of the exam. Determination of cheating or plagiarism shall be made by the instructor in the course, or by the field faculty in the case of departmental exams.

Cases of cheating or plagiarism on graduate departmental exams, theses, or dissertations shall automatically be referred to the departmental Graduate Studies Committee. Cases of cheating or plagiarism in ordinary coursework may, at the discretion of the instructor, be referred to the Undergraduate Studies Committee in the case of undergraduate students, or the Graduate Studies Committee in the case of graduate students. These committees, acting as agents of the department Chair, shall impose further penalties, or recommend further penalties to the Dean of Students, if they determine that the case warrants it. In all cases, the Dean of Students shall be informed in writing of the case.

Students may appeal any decision under this policy by following the procedures laid down in the UNT Code of Student Conduct and Discipline.

STATEMENT OF ADA COMPLIANCE

The Political Science Department cooperates with the Office of Disability Accommodation to make reasonable accommodations for qualified students with disabilities. Please present your written accommodation request on or before the sixth class day (beginning of the second week of classes).