

PSC 355/555 Democratic Political Processes

Professor Bing Powell
Fall 2018

(gb.powell@rochester.edu)
Wednesday 14:15-16:45 Harkness 329

Objective. This course is designed primarily as a graduate seminar in comparative politics. Its object is to introduce the participants to the comparative study of democratic political processes. The course meets preparation requirements for this substantive subfield of the Ph.D. comprehensive examination in comparative politics. No background in comparative politics is assumed. It is appropriate as an introduction for students new to the field or as an "outside" course.

Approach. The comparative democratic political processes subfield focuses on choosing political leaders and making political decisions in the context of competitive elections and relative freedom of political action. We begin by discussing the meaning and measure of contemporary democracy and the nature of democratic transitions. We then turn to political parties, as key institutions linking citizens and policymakers, and policymaking institutions. The last part of the course focuses on the comparative study of individual citizens' attitudes and behavior (political culture, participation, interest groups.)

Many seminar sessions will be divided into two main parts. In one of these, we shall discuss the **starred** collective readings shown in Column 3 of the syllabus. Our discussion is designed to accomplish both substantive and methodological objectives. On one hand, we want to understand how to explain the particular substantive theme, addressing the concepts, theories and evidence presented. The readings are designed to introduce a variety of substantive topics, not to be definitive on any of them. (The unstarred readings are recommended for those interested in following up some additional aspects of these topics.) On the other hand, we want to understand strengths and limitations of various approaches to comparative analysis--cross-sectional or longitudinal comparisons, sample of countries or units, quantitative vs. qualitative measurement of variables, specification issues, causal inferences.

In the other part of the session, we shall have presentations by seminar members. These presentations are of several types, exemplifying some of the important approaches to the study of democratic processes in comparative politics. **Each seminar participant is responsible for two presentations.** They should be of two different types. Each type of presentations should be about 20 minutes long, followed by another 10 minutes of discussion. A written summary or annotated bibliography should be emailed ahead of time.

One presentation could be on a particular **comparative quantitative data set**, as suggested in Column 4. The student is responsible for examining the appropriate website and related material, downloading the data (or a subset of it), doing some simple analysis to show that the data are accessible, describing to the class the unit basis of the data, the types of variables and their measurement, and identifying some publications or papers using these data. Any special problems or limitations of the data should be noted. Feel free to find other data sets.

A second presentation could be a **replication** of an existing published political science article that

uses quantitative analysis. The student should obtain the data, reproduce (if possible) the core finding, and then conduct an additional analysis that tests the robustness of the results, possibly based on an alternative theory.

Another presentation could **focus on a specific country** and application of the general theme of the week to the politics of that country and vice versa. We would hope for a presentation that would focus on a theoretical issue and demonstrate the importance of context, or trace some particular institution or process in a case-study approach.

Another presentation could be of a research idea using **regression discontinuity** techniques. The proposal should outline the theory to be tested, the data to be used, expected results, and the plausibility of the identifying assumptions.

Grades and Responsibilities of Seminar Participants. Seminar participants are responsible for two presentations and associated written summaries/annotated bibliographies. Grades will be based on the seminar presentations and the associated written summaries (15% each), the midterm (15%), class discussion (10%) and a research paper on some aspect or problem of democratic processes (45%). Individual meetings with the instructor about the paper topic early in the semester are mandatory, no later than the middle of term. The paper topic must be approved in advance. Papers are due on the last Friday of classes for the semester, December 14. In exceptional cases, a take-home final exam may be substituted for the research paper, in which case the presentations and midterm are worth 20% each and the final is worth 30%.

Availability of Materials. I suggest purchasing used copies of most of these books on line. But I did order them through the bookstore also:

- Achen and Bartels. *Democracy for Realists*. Princeton 2016.
- Cox, Gary. *Making Votes Count*. Cambridge, 1997.
- Duch and Stevenson. *The Economic Voter*. Cambridge. 2008.
- Helmke, Gretchen. *Institutions on the Edge*. Cambridge 2016.
- Przeworski, et al., *Democracy and Development*. Cambridge 2000.
- Stokes, Susan, et al. *Brokers, Voters and Clientelism*. Cambridge 2013.
- Tarrow, Sidney. *Power in Movement*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, 2011.
- Tsebelis, George. *Veto Players*. Cambridge 2002.

Required assigned chapters in other books will be available through Blackboard, linked to the syllabus, distributed by email, or occasionally in a box in the political science lounge (Harkness 314.)

PSC 355/555	Syllabus	Fall 2018
<u>Date</u>	<u>Discussion Theme</u>	<u>Collective Reading</u>
		(Data Set Presentation Possibilities)
August 29	APSA Meetings.	No class this day. Please Read Syllabus to be prepared for a full seminar next week. Also be prepared to choose your first presentation date, which must be before the midterm.
Sept. 5	Democratic Concepts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aristotle. <u>Politics</u>. Books IV and VI http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/politics.3.three.html * Dahl, <u>Democracy & Critics</u> 1989 Ch. 6-8, 15. * Achen & Bartels. 2016 <u>Democracy for Realists</u>. Ch. 1-3, 5, 10, 11.
Sept. 12	Democracy: Measure and Consequence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Przeworski, et al. <u>Democracy and Development</u>, 2000, Ch.1-2-3. (CIRI Human Rights) * Graham, et al. "Safeguarding Dem." APSR 2017. * Haschke, "Democracy and the Human Right to the Physical Integrity of the Person" 2014 Ch. 4, 7. Schedler, "Menu," <i>JoD</i>, Ap 2002
Sept. 19	Democratization & Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lipset, <i>APSR</i> 1959. (Polity IV Project: Regimes.) * Acemoglu, et al., "Income & Dem" <i>AER</i> 2008 98:3 * Boix 2011. "<u>Democracy...</u>" <i>APSR</i> 105 (November): 809-828. Geddes, "What Do We Know?" <i>Ann. Rev. Pol Sci</i>, 2006 Robinson, "Democracy & Dev." <i>Ann.Rev.Pol.Sci</i> 2006. Rueschemeyer, et al, 1992 <u>Capitalist Development</u>,
Pp. 75-121, (Ch 4)		
Sept. 26	Cleavages and Alignments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Posner, "Cultural Differences," <i>APSR</i> Oct. 2004. * Shayo, "Social Identity," <i>APSR</i> May 2009 * Ferree, Karen "How Fluid is Fluid? Ethnic Demography and Electoral Volatility in Africa" in Chandra, Kanchan, ed. <u>Constructivist theories of ethnic politics</u>. Oxford University Press, 2012. Rogowski, <u>Commerce & Coalitions</u> 1989 Ch. 1 Lipset & Rokkan, <u>Party Systems & Voter Alignments</u> 1967, pp. 1-64. Wilkinson, <u>Votes & Violence</u>, 2004. Anderson, <u>Imagined Communities</u> 1991

Chapters 1, 3, 7, 8.

*Stokes, Susan C. "Perverse accountability: A formal model of machine politics with evidence from Argentina." *American Political Science Review* 99.3 (2005): 315.

*Kitschelt & Kselman, *CPS* 46. 2013

Nichter, Simeon. "Vote buying or turnout buying? Machine politics and the secret ballot." *APSR* 1 (2008): 19-31.

Treisman, Daniel. "The causes of corruption: a cross-national study." *Journal of public economics* 76.3 (2000): 399-457.

Nov. 21 THANKSGIVING WEEK NO CLASS

Nov.28 Comparing

(**CSES Election Studies**)

Citizen Behavior
(Partisanship,
Economic voting,
Cleavages
Participation)

* Duch & Stevenson, *The Economic Voter* 2008, Ch. 1-4,7,9

* Achen & Bartels, *Democracy for Realists* 2014. esp ch 4,7-9,10

* Huber, John D., and Pavithra Suryanarayan. "Ethnic Inequality and the Ethnification of Political Parties." *World Politics* 68.01 (2016): 149-188.

Quinn, "Voter Choice..." *AJPS* 1999 43:4

Converse & Pierce, *Repres in France*, 1986, Ch. 3,4,7

Samuels, "Presidentialism & Eco Voting" *APSR*, Aug 2004.

Verba, Nie, Kim *Participation & Equality*. 1978, Ch. 3-4

Dec 5 Political Culture and
Political Movements

*Norris & Inglehart *CS* 2002 (**World Values**)

*Tarrow, *Power in Movement*, Cambridge 2011.

*Tabellini, "Culture & Institutions" *J of EEA* June 2010.

Inglehart, *Culture Shift*, 1990, Intro, Ch. 1-2

Lohmann, "Signaling Model," *APSR* (2) 1993.

Putnam *Making Democracy Work* 1993

Dec. 12 Responsiveness
and Representation

*Powell, *Elections as Instruments* 2000, ch 1,2

* Powell, *Ideological Representation* 2019.

*Thompson, et al. "Promise-Keeping." *AJPA* 2017.

Stokes, *Mandates & Democracy*, 2001, Ch. 1.

Pettersson-Lidbom "Do Parties Matter?" *JofEEA* S

Kraymon & Posner "Who Benefits..." *POP* 2013

Papers are due on Friday December 14.