

POLS 5334 Seminar in Comparative Political Development Spring 2019

Instructor: Dr. Taeko Hiroi

Office: Benedict Hall 312

Office Hours: T 10:00-10:45, W 10:30-11:15, and by appointment

Phone: 747-7983

E-mail: thiroi@utep.edu

Class Time/Location: Tuesdays 6:00-8:50 pm/Benedict 205

Course Description

This graduate seminar examines the development, stability, and breakdowns of political regimes in comparative perspective. The study of political development, of which democracy and democratization are central components, has a long history in the discipline of political science. We will explore theoretical, methodological, and empirical questions on political development with an emphasis on the scholarship that has emerged in response to a number of democratic transitions since the last quarter of the 20th century.

Since the 1970s, the number of democracies in the world dramatically increased. Many seem to have successfully completed the transition to democracy while others have been struggling to maintain and consolidate their fledgling democratic institutions. A few have experienced democratic reversals. Some authoritarian regimes seem quite stable but others are marred with political instability. These political developments have led comparative politics scholars to ask such questions as: (1) What accounts for democratization and democratic stability? (2) Why do some autocratic regimes persist but others are unstable? (3) How does one design democratic institutions given a particular society's problems and goals? (4) Finally, what are the consequences of these democratic institutions for the quality and stability of democracy?

The course is organized around thematic topics rather than geographic areas, but we will also discuss specific examples from around the world. Students are encouraged to develop thematic and regional expertise with their research papers.

Course Objectives

Upon a successful completion of the course, you will be able to:

- 1) define the principal elements of democracy and autocracy;
- 2) evaluate alternative indices of political regimes;
- 3) explain the causes of regime transitions and (in)stability;
- 4) assess the quality of democracy and democratic processes;
- 5) design democratic political institutions; and
- 6) have an early start on your Master's thesis or research paper on democratization, regime breakdown, or consolidation (if you so choose).

Required Books

- Clark, William Roberts, Matt Golder, and Sona Nadenichek Golder. 2018. *Principles of Comparative Politics*. Third edition. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Selway, Joel Sawat. 2017. *Coalitions of the Well-Being: How Electoral Rules and Ethnic Politics Shape Health Policy in Developing Countries*. Cambridge University Press.

Other assigned readings are available through the library, e-journal, or on Blackboard.

Course Requirements

- 1) **Reading Assignment and Class Participation:** Since this is a graduate seminar, the success of the class critically depends on every student's commitment to making class discussions intellectually stimulating and rewarding. Do not expect to be lectured. I may occasionally provide brief lectures on certain topics to facilitate class discussion and learning, but the large part of the quality of the seminar is determined by each student contributing to collective learning by coming to every class, having completed assigned readings and actively discussing them. You will be evaluated on both the quality and quantity of your participation. Note that you cannot possibly participate in discussions if you miss a class, and unjustified absence will significantly affect your participation grade. Specifically, you will lose 25 percent of the participation grade for each unjustified absence.

Engagement is an important part of your participation. To prepare for class discussions and to facilitate everyone's involvement, for each week **every student must prepare at least two discussion questions**. These questions should focus on concepts, theories, methodologies, data, and other key questions in the literature. Questions involving comparisons of various readings are welcome. **These questions should be posted in the designated space on the discussion board in the course's Blackboard page no later than 10 pm of Sunday before each class meeting.** The quality and quantity of these questions and their punctual submission will be graded. Good questions will be rewarded with higher grades. You are also encouraged to respond to questions posted on the discussion board prior to the meeting. Good, thoughtful responses and comments will be rewarded with higher participation points. **All students should review posted questions and comments prior to coming to class.** Please keep in mind that you must post at least two questions for each week regardless of whether you attend the seminar in that week. Each missed question will result in the loss of 2 percentage points of the participation grade.

For participation in the week of research paper proposals, please see the section on the research paper below.

- 2) **Critical Reviews:** You will write **three critical reviews** of the assigned weekly readings. Critical reviews are due at 6:00 pm in the next class. For example, if you choose to write a critical review of the readings assigned for week 2, your review is due in the class in week 3 at 6:00 pm. Please submit a hard copy.

Critical reviews should cover all the readings for the week, but should not merely summarize them. You should identify and discuss the main debates in the literature and critically analyze the week's readings. For example, what are the central questions and central controversies, and how does each reading approach them? What evidence do authors provide? What are their strengths and weaknesses, and how might you improve their theories and research? Emphasize theories, research designs, and methods. Focus on the content.¹ The reviews should be **3 to 4 pages** (no more than 4 pages), typed using *Times New Roman* 12 pt. font size, double-spaced, paged consecutively, and with the standard one-inch margin on all four sides. All references must be appropriately cited. I will stop reading reviews at the end of the fourth page if they are longer than the maximum length.

In general, *no late review will be accepted, including those resulting from being late to class.* You have an entire semester to choose from to write your reviews. If you cannot submit one on time, you just need to write another one. Since unexpected emergencies do happen, I strongly encourage you to submit your reviews early in the semester. **Your first review is due no later than February 26.** Please do not email me your reviews.

- 3) **Discussion Leader:** We will have at least one discussion leader each week. Assignments for discussion leaders will be made during the first class meeting. Your role as a discussion leader will be graded. Please think about how you intend to lead class discussions and **come see me during my office hours with a written proposal detailing your plan. If there is more than one student assigned to lead a week's discussion, you should coordinate your roles before meeting with me.** By being a discussion leader, you are not asked to lecture for the class. Your role is, jointly with me, to facilitate and stimulate class discussions. .
- 4) **Research Paper:** Your research paper should address an important question in political development. Please be sure to obtain my approval for your research topic. Your paper should be empirical and conform to the expectations of social science research. That means that it begins with a research question, followed by a theory and a hypothesis or hypotheses, and evaluating them with real world observations (called data). Merely descriptive studies are not acceptable as graduate research papers. If you need a brief review of social science research, I recommend W. Phillips Shively, *The Craft of Political Research*.

This assignment is evaluated in two phases. The first phase involves writing and presenting a **research proposal**. A good research proposal includes a research question, significance of the project, literature review, theory and hypotheses, research

¹ Critiques in critical reviews should not focus on writing or presentation styles of the authors but rather emphasize the content of their studies.

design and methodology, and expected findings. As stated above, you need to obtain my approval for your research topic. Approval of your topic will require, at minimum, that you articulate your research question and a hypothesis (or hypotheses) and that you be able to discuss the sources of the data/information that you intend to use.

Your research paper proposal is due on Tuesday, March 12 at 6 pm. Post an electronic copy in the designated space on the Blackboard's discussion board, and submit a hard copy to me. **You need to read all other students' proposals and give them substantive feedback on the discussion board by Friday, March 15 at 6 pm.**² This constitutes reading assignments and seminar participation for the week.

The final two weeks of the semester will be devoted to **research paper presentations**. Each presentation should be approximately for **15 minutes** (and no longer than 15 minutes) and use Power Point. **A hard copy of your research paper is due to me on May 7 at 6 pm.** Your research paper must be complete and will be between 15 and 25 pages, including notes, tables, figures, and a bibliography. It should consist of the following sections: introduction, literature review, theory and hypotheses, research design and methodology, analysis and findings, and conclusions.

Your paper should follow the standard paper requirement, i.e., it should be typed, using *Times New Roman* 12 pt. font size, double-spaced, and paged with the standard one-inch margin on all four sides. All references should be appropriately cited both in the body of the text and bibliography. Please refer to APSA's style manual for stylistic guidance. The style manual is available at <https://connect.apsanet.org/stylemanual/>.

Grades

Final grades are determined as follows:

Course Requirement	Weight
Reading & Participation	30%
Critical Reviews	30% (highest grade 15%; second highest 10%; third 5%)
Discussion Leader	5%
Research Paper	35% (proposal 5%; paper presentation 5%; paper 25%)

² Simple comments and questions, such as "great proposal," "interesting," "why did you choose this topic?" and the like, are not substantive feedback. Substantive feedback includes comments, questions, and suggestions aimed to help improve theory, research design, methodology, and other aspects of the substantive content of the paper. Feedback should be constructive.

Final Grade Scale	
90% ≤	A
80% ≤ & < 90%	B
70% ≤ & < 80%	C
60% ≤ & < 70%	D
<60%	F

Course Policy

- Cell phones must be off during class hours. They are allowed under emergency circumstances, but please notify me ahead of time.
- Please do not use your personal computer, cell phones, or tablet computers during class meetings. Our classroom is small, and students have indicated that they find the use of personal computers by other students quite distracting, even for typing class notes.
- Please do not be late to class so that you will not disturb other students or interrupt class discussions.
- At times it may be necessary to make adjustments to reading assignments and course schedule as the semester unfolds. If necessary, I will make such announcements in class and/or on Blackboard. If you miss a class when these announcements are made, you are responsible for obtaining such information.
- Please check Blackboard on a regular basis.
- All assignments and papers need to be professional. They must be typed with standard citation and writing styles (see APSA's style manual) and standard margins of one inch on all four sides. All pages must be numbered consecutively (except for the title page) and stapled together. Where there is a page limit, you must follow it. All assignments and papers must be proofread before submission. If you need assistance in writing, I encourage you to go to the writing center. NEVER turn in your first draft: there is no excuse for turning in an unedited paper! Depending on the extent of editorial problems, your assignment's grade will be lowered by one-third of a letter grade to one full letter grade.

Academic Integrity Policy

Academic dishonesty is prohibited and is considered a violation of the UTEP Handbook of Operating Procedures. It includes, but is not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, and collusion. Cheating may involve copying from or providing information to another student, possessing unauthorized materials during a test, or falsifying research data on laboratory reports. Plagiarism occurs when someone intentionally or knowingly represents the words or ideas of another person's as one's own. Collusion involves collaborating with another person to commit any academically dishonest act. Any act of academic dishonesty attempted by a UTEP student is unacceptable and will not be tolerated. Violations will be

taken seriously and will be referred to the Office of Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution for possible disciplinary action. Students may be suspended or expelled from UTEP for such actions. Refer to <http://www.utep.edu/dos/acadintg.htm> for further information.

Accommodations

If you have a disability and need accommodations, please contact the Center for Accommodations and Support Services (CASS) at 747-5148, or by email to cass@utep.edu, or visit their office located in UTEP Union East, Room 106. For additional information, please visit the CASS website at www.sa.utep.edu/cass. CASS' Staff are the only individuals who can validate and, if need be, authorize accommodations for students with disabilities.

Course Materials

Course materials are intended for your personal use only. An unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution, publication or replication of course materials is strictly prohibited. Course materials refer to those made available to you through this course and/or by me and teaching assistants. They include, but not limited to, materials made available on Blackboard (such as power point slides, lecture outlines, and supplementary readings), study guides, and exams.

Course Schedule

The following is a *tentative* schedule. You will be notified of any changes made to this schedule.

	Topics and Readings
Jan 22	<p>Course Overview Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Golder & Golder, Chs. 1-2. <p>Assignment of discussion leading weeks</p>
Jan 29	<p>Politics and the Modern State—Game Theoretic Perspective Reading</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Golder & Golder, Chs. 3-4.
Feb 5	<p>What Is Democracy (and Is Not)? Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert Dahl. 1971. <i>Polyarchy</i>. New Haven: Yale University Press. pp. 1-47 (Blackboard). • Philippe C. Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl. 1991. "What Democracy Is...and Is Not." <i>Journal of Democracy</i> 2(3): 75-88. • Guillermo O'Donnell. 1994. "Delegative Democracy." <i>Journal of Democracy</i> 5(1): 55 – 69. • Andreas Schedler. 2002. "The Menu of Manipulation." <i>Journal of Democracy</i> 13(2): 36-50.
Feb 12	<p>Measuring Democracy Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Golder & Golder, Ch. 5. • Mike Alvarez, Jose Antonio Cheibub, Fernando Limongi, and Adam Przeworski. 1996. "Classifying Political Regimes." <i>Studies in Comparative International Development</i> 31(2): 3-36. • Freedom House, "Methodology" available at https://freedomhouse.org/report/methodology-freedom-world-2018 • Gerardo L. Munck and Jay Verkuilen. 2002. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices." <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 35(1): 5-34. • Shawn Treier and Simon Jackman. 2008. "Democracy as a Latent Variable." <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> 52(1): 201–217. • Michael Coppedge and John Gerring with others. 2011. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: A New Approach." <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 9(2): 247-267.
Feb 19	<p>Democratic Transitions Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Golder & Golder, Ch. 8-9. • Samuel Huntington. 1991. <i>The Third Wave</i>. Chs. 1-3 (e-book available through UTEP library).

Feb 26	<p>The Economic & Cultural Determinants of Democracy</p> <p>Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Golder & Golder, Chs. 6-7 • Adam Przeworski, Michael Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub & Fernando Limongi. 1996. “What Makes Democracies Endure?” <i>Journal of Democracy</i> 7(1): 39-55. • Stephen Haber and Victor Menaldo. 2011. “Do Natural Resources Fuel Authoritarianism? A Reappraisal of the Resource Curse.” <i>American Political Science Review</i> 105(1): 1-26. • Taeko Hiroi and Sawa Omori. 2015. “Policy Change and Coups: The Role of Income Inequality and Asset Specificity.” <i>International Political Science Review</i> 36(4): 441–456. • Francis Fukuyama. 1995. “The Primacy of Culture.” <i>Journal of Democracy</i> 6(1): 7-14. • Robert D. Putnam. 1995. “Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital.” <i>Journal of Democracy</i> 6(1): 65-78. <p><i>Note: First critical review due no later than Feb. 26</i></p>
March 5	<p>Varieties of Dictatorship</p> <p>Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Golder & Golder, Ch. 10 • Barbara Geddes, Joseph Wright and Erica Frantz. 2014. “Autocratic Breakdown and Regime Transitions: A New Data Set.” <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 12(2): 313-331. • Yonatan L. Morse. 2012. “The Era of Electoral Authoritarianism.” <i>World Politics</i> 64 (1): 161-198. <p><i>Report progress on research paper</i></p>
March 12	<p>Research Paper Proposal (Online Seminar Week)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post an electronic copy in the designated space on the Blackboard’s discussion board, and submit a hard copy to me (due Tuesday, March 12 at 6 pm) • You need to read all other students’ proposals and give them substantive feedback on the discussion board (due Friday, March 15 at 6 pm) <p>Reading: Student paper proposals (on Blackboard)</p>
	<p>March 18-22: Spring Break</p>

March 26	<p>Electoral Systems and Political Parties</p> <p>Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Golder & Golder, Chs. 11, 13 (except sections on electoral integrity) &14. • Peter M. Siavelis. 2005. "Electoral System, Coalitional Disintegration, and the Future of Chile's Concertación." <i>Latin American Research Review</i> 40 (1): 56-82 • John Polga-Hecimovich and Peter M.Siavelis. 2015. "Here's the bias! A (Re-)Reassessment of the Chilean electoral system." <i>Electoral Studies</i> 40 (December): 268-279
April 2	<p>Issues in Elections (Electoral Integrity, Malapportionment, etc.)</p> <p>Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Golder & Golder, Ch. 13 (read sections on electoral integrity) • Pippa Norris. 2013. "The new research agenda studying electoral integrity." <i>Electoral Studies</i> 32 (4): 563-575. • Miguel Carreras and Yasemin İrepoğlu. 2013. "Trust in elections, vote buying, and turnout in Latin America." <i>Electoral Studies</i> 32 (4): 609-619. • Tavishi Bhasin and Jennifer Gandhi. 2013. "Timing and targeting of state repression in authoritarian elections." <i>Electoral Studies</i> 32 (4): 620-631. • Richard Snyder, David Samuels. 2001. "Devaluing the Vote in Latin America." <i>Journal of Democracy</i> 12(1): 146-159. • Taeko Hiroi. "Paradox of Redistribution: Legislative Overrepresentation and Regional Development in Brazil." <i>Publius: The Journal of Federalism</i>. Advance online publication in 2018. https://academic.oup.com/publius/advance-article/doi/10.1093/publius/pjy043/5255637 •
April 9	<p>Systems of Government (Presidential vs. Parliamentary Democracy; Majoritarian vs. Consensus Democracy)</p> <p>Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Golder & Golder, Chs. 12&16. • Juan Linz. 1990. "The Perils of Presidentialism." <i>Journal of Democracy</i> Volume 1, Number 1: 51-69. • Scott Mainwaring. 1993. "Presidentialism, Multipartyism and Democracy: The Difficult Combination." <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 26: 198-228.

April 16	Veto Players—Federalism, Bicameralism, and the Court Reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark, Golder & Golder, Ch. 15. • George Tsebelis. 1995. “Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism and Multipartyism.” <i>British Journal of Political Science</i> 25(3): 289-325. • Frances E. Lee. 1998. “Representation and Public Policy: The Consequences of Senate Apportionment for the Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds.” <i>The Journal of Politics</i> 60(1): 34-62.
April 23	Institutions and Public Goods (Health Politics) Reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selway, Joel Sawat. 2017. <i>Coalitions of the Well-Being: How Electoral Rules and Ethnic Politics Shape Health Policy in Developing Countries</i>. Entire book.
April 30	Student Presentations Students will present their research paper using Power Point. The presentation should not exceed 15 minutes. See the section on <i>Research Paper</i> for more instructions.
May 7	Research Paper Presentations (cont'd) Research paper due at the beginning of the class (6 pm) Please submit a hard copy