# Political Science/International Relations 258: Democratic Regimes
# University of Rochester
# Wednesday, 2:00-4:40 PM
# Spring 2016
# LeChase Hall 161

Instructor: Adam Cohon
Phone: 585-275-5466
Email: acohon@ur.rochester.edu
Office: Harkness 307
Office hours: Thursday 2pm-4pm, or by prior appointment

At present, most people live under democratic regimes. Yet democracies vary in the extent to which citizens can exercise their rights and hold leaders accountable. In this course we will read major historical and contemporary works on issues such as clientelism, democratic accountability, party and party system institutionalization, and incomplete state capacity. Weekly class discussions will explore applications of theoretical readings to contemporary democratic regimes in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

**Course Materials:**

All course materials will be posted onto Blackboard, or available through the University of Rochester Library website. Books assigned for the course should be purchased.

I ask students to buy one book: Gordon Harvey's *Writing With Sources: A Guide for Students* (Cambridge, MA: Hackett Publishing Co., 2008 – older versions okay). Used copies are acceptable. The book provides guidance and general outlines for better writing and citations. Points will be deducted for essays that do not conform to guidelines set in *Writing with Sources*.

**Course Requirements:**

The class is designed to expose students to major works in political science on democratic regimes, their classification, democratization, issues of representation and accountability. The course has two major components: an introduction to theoretical debates on democratic regimes, and applications of these theoretical pieces to a country or region of students' choice.

Students are expected to attend class regularly, do the assigned reading, complete all assignments, and participate in class discussions and activities. The assignments comprise in-class participation (30%), a sixty minute in-class midterm at the beginning of class on **March 2nd** (10%), a five-page paper due at the beginning of class on **February 24th** (20%), a five-page paper due in paper format on **April 29th by 3:30 PM** (20%), and a brief (sixty minutes) final exam on **May 2nd, 2016 at 8:30 AM** (10%). Please consult *Writing with* Sources for proper indentation, formatting, and citation procedures.

Both papers will have attached to them a full first draft that has been reviewed and marked up by a classmate. Students are required to make changes specified by the peer editor. Failure to attach such a draft, or to make changes, will result in a 10-point loss on the assignment. Criteria for peer editing will be distributed with the prompt.

Students will also prepare and present a backgrounder memo for fellow students (5%) and do a five-minute oral presentation on their final paper draft or outline on the last week of class (5%). A sign-up sheet for the backgrounder memo will circulate in the first weeks of the course.

***The papers and the oral presentation are an opportunity for students to do outside research on a country or region that interests them.*** Independent research should include at least three peer-reviewed academic sources, and at least five sources in total.

**Written work standards:**

All written work should be in Times New Roman font, size 12, double-spaced, with 1" margins on all sides of the paper. In-text citations are mandatory, in either Chicago or MLA style. Five-page papers should be between 4.5 and 5.5 pages; points will be deducted for papers that are too short or too long. The bibliography at the end does not contribute to the page count. Place your name and paper title in a Header at the top of the page **only.**

**Late work:**

Assignments will be deducted 1/3 of a letter grade (from A to A-, B+ to B, etc.) for each 24 hours or fraction thereof that elapses between the due date and the submission of the assignment.

**Grading scale**

A ($93.0\% < x$)
A- ($90.0\% < x \leq 93.0\%$)
B+ ($87.0\% < x \leq 90.0\%$)
B ($84.0\% < x \leq 87.0\%$)
B- ($80.0\% < x \leq 84.0\%$)
C+ ($77.0\% < x \leq 80.0\%$)
C ($74.0\% < x \leq 77.0\%$)
C- ($70.0\% < x \leq 74.0\%$)

Non-passing grades ($x \leq 70.0\%$)

**In-class participation:**

We will conduct class discussions in seminar format, with extra activities and breakout sessions for enrichment. Up to two students will present a backgrounder memo each week, in order to provide context and history for that week's topic of discussion. The memo should be distributed to peers via Blackboard and should answer a provided prompt. In presenting your memo, show enthusiasm and energy; inform and teach your peers instead of simply reading an assignment.

**Re-grades:**

Students should feel free to contact me about re-grades due to arithmetic errors. If students feel that grades were incorrectly given, they can re-submit the assignment to me with a memorandum of at least 250 words explaining why they thought they deserve a different grade. Requests for re-grades should be made within 72 hours after the results have been passed back. I reserve the right on re-grades to lower, raise, or maintain any grade.

**Studying and work outside of class:**

You are encouraged to discuss class readings and your research project with classmates for the examinations, and send me any questions. You may even trade drafts and outlines with your peers. Peer editing of the papers is mandatory. All final work, however, should be your own. You will be held responsible for errors in citation and attribution. The College standards on Academic Honesty will be strictly enforced.

**Accommodations:**

If you are entitled to accommodations, please coordinate these with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning early in the semester. Their information and policies can be found at

http://www.rochester.edu/college/cetl/undergraduate/index.html **I cannot make these arrangements for you; you must contact CETL (formerly LAS) yourself.**

There will be no make-up work for students who fail to turn in final projects on time or miss classes. Be sure to contact your peers for class notes. I am happy to discuss the material with you, but I do not offer individual recap sessions.

**Academic Honesty:**

Students and faculty at the University must agree to adhere to high standards of academic honesty in all of the work that we do. As freshmen, students read and sign an academic honesty policy statement to indicate that they understand the general principles upon which our work is based. The College Board on Academic Honesty website gives further information on our policies and procedures: www.rochester.edu/college/honesty

In this course the following additional requirements are in effect:

You are encouraged to discuss course readings and assignments with your fellow students. However, all written work must be done independently and not in collaboration with another. In order to make appropriate help available for your essays, I encourage you to consult with me and with the College Writing Center. The term research paper will require citations and "Works Cited" following the MLA format.

Be sure to cite all your sources. When in doubt, add a footnote or endnote. In-text citations are acceptable. All reports and independent papers should contain a bibliography at the end. Wikipedia is not considered a reliable source of information for this class, and should never be cited as an authority.

Any instance of plagiarism will result in zero credit for the assignment and referral of the student(s) involved to the College Board on Academic Honesty.

**Letters of Recommendation:**

I am happy to write letters of recommendation for graduate school and for enrichment programs. I need **at least** two weeks' advance notice to prepare a letter, and I may ask for a meeting or conversation to further discuss your interests and achievements. Requests made within fourteen days of the deadline will be denied.

Course Readings Outline

**Students should come to class prepared to discuss all readings assigned for that week and for prior weeks.**

**I reserve the right to drop or replace readings to better direct learning and sharpen the focus of the course. All readings are required.**

**Readings marked with an asterisk (*) can be found on Blackboard. All other readings are available through the university library's website.**

Introduction

1. **January 13 - On democracy**

Knight, Jack and James Johnson. 2007. "The Priority of Democracy: A Pragmatist Approach to Political-Economic Institutions and the Burden of Justification," *American Political Science Review* 101(1): 47-61.

2. **January 20 - Theories of Democratic Quality**

O'Donnell, Guillermo. 2004. "Human Development, Human Rights, and Democracy," in Guillermo O'Donnell, Jorge Vargas Cullell, and Osvaldo M. Iazzetta, eds. *The Quality of Democracy: Theory and Applications*. South Bend, IN: Notre Dame Univ. Press. pp. 9-85.*

Powell Jr., G. Bingham. 2000. *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 3 *

3. **January 27 - Typologies of Democratic Regimes**

Lijphart, Arend. 1989. "Democratic Political Systems: Types, Cases, Causes, and Consequences," *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 1(1): 33-48.

Collier, David and Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research," *World Politics* 49(3): 430-451.

Munck, Gerardo and Jay Verkuilen. 2002. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices," *Comparative Political Studies* 35(1): 5-34.

Dynamics

4. **February 3 - Transitions out of Authoritarian Rule: Elite-Based Perspectives**

Rustow, Dankwart. 1970. "Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model," *Comparative Politics* 2:3. April. pp. 337-363.

Acemoglu, Daron and James Robinson. 2000. "Why Did the West Extend the Franchise? Democracy, Inequality and Growth in Comparative Perspective," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 115:4. pp. 1167-1199 [skim the math]

O'Donnell, Guillermo and Philippe Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. Chapters 1-4.*

5. **February 10 - Transitions out of Authoritarian Rule: Perspectives on Mobilization from Below**

Collier, Ruth Berins and James Mahoney. 1997. "Adding Collective Actors to Collective Outcomes: Labor and Recent Democratization in South America and Southern Europe," *Comparative Politics* 29:3. April. pp. 285-303.

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2001. "An Insurgent Path to Democracy: Popular Mobilization, Economic Interests and Regime Transition in South Africa and El Salvador," C*omparative Political Studies* 34(8): 862-88.

Schock, Kurt. 1999. "People Power and Political Opportunities: Social Movement Mobilization and Outcomes in the Philippines and Burma," *Social Problems* 46(3): 355-375.

6. **February 17 - Democratic Consolidation**

Schedler, Andreas. 1998. "What is Democratic Consolidation?" *Journal of Democracy* 9(2): 91-107.

Gasiorowski, Mark and Timothy J. Power. 1998. "The Structural Determinants of Democratic Consolidation: Evidence from the Third World," *Comparative Political Studies* 31(6): 740-771.

Hutchcroft, Paul and Joel Rocamora. 2003. "Strong Demands and Weak Institutions: The Origins and Evolution of the Democratic Deficit in the Philippines," *Journal of East Asian Studies* 3(2): 259-292.

Political parties and political party systems

7. **February 24 - Measuring political party systems**

Randall, Vicky and Lars Svasand. 2002. "Party Institutionalization in New Democracies," *Party Politics* 8(1): 5-29.

Kitschelt, Herbert, Kirk Hawkins, Juan Pablo Luna, Guillermo Rosas, and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister. 2010. *Latin American Party Systems*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1: Patterns of Programmatic Party Competition in Latin America.*

Mainwaring, Scott and Timothy Scully. 1995. *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.. Chapter 1: Introduction*

**First five-page paper due at beginning of class (on February 24)**

8. **March 2 - One-party-dominant systems**

**Midterm held at the beginning of class.**

Pempel, T.J., ed. 1990. *Uncommon Democracies: The One-Party Dominant Regimes*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Chapter TBD.*

Pempel, T.J. 2010. “Between Pork and Productivity: The Collapse of the Liberal Democratic Party,” *The Journal of Japanese Studies* 36(2): 227-254.

Bogaards, Matthijs. 2004. “Counting Parties and Identifying Dominant Party Systems in Africa,” *European Journal of Political Research* 43: 173–197.

**March 9 - NO CLASS (SPRING BREAK)**

**9. March 16 - Defining clientelism**

Scott, James C. 1972. “Patron-Client Politics and Political Change in Southeast Asia,” *The American Political Science Review* 66(1): 91-113.

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(3): 399-422.

**10. March 23 - Cases of clientelism: Argentina**

Auyero, Javier. 2000. “The Logic of Clientelism in Argentina: An Ethnographic Account,” *Latin American Research Review* 35(3): 55-81.

Szwarcberg, Mariela. 2012. “Revisiting Clientelism: A Network Analysis of Problem-Solving Networks in Argentina,” *Social Networks* 34(2): 230-240.

Zarazaga, Rodrigo, S.J. 2014. “Brokers Beyond Clientelism: A New Perspective Through the Argentine Case,” *Latin American Politics and Society* 56(3): 23-45.

**11. March 30 - Ethnic parties and ethnic representation**

Chandra, Kanchan. 2005. “Ethnic Parties and Democratic Stability,” *Perspectives on Politics* 3(2): 235-252. [note: this source is <u>not</u> peer-reviewed and will not count as such]

Van Cott, Donna Lee. 2003. “Institutional Change and Ethnic Parties in South America,” *Latin American Politics and Society* 45(2): 1-39.

Posner, Daniel N. 2004. “The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi,” *American Political Science Review* 98(4): 529-545

**12. April 6 - Ethnic parties and ethnic representation: India**

Chandra, Kanchan. 2004. *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed: Patronage and Ethnic Headcounts in India*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press. Chapter 1*

Varshney, Ashtoush. 2002. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press. Chapter 1. (on library website)

Thachil, Tariq and Emmanuel Teitelbaum. 2015. "Ethnic Parties and Public Spending: New Evidence from the Indian States," *Comparative Political Studies* 48(11): 1389-1420.

**13. April 13 - Gender in Democracies**

Htun, Mala, Marina Lacalle, and Juan Pablo Micozzi. 2013. "Does Women's Presence Change Legislative Behavior? Evidence from Argentina, 1983-2007," *Journal of Politics in Latin America* 5(1): 95-125

Jones, Mark P. 2008. "Gender Quotas, Electoral Laws, and the Election of Women: Evidence from the Latin American Vanguard," *Comparative Political Studies* 42(1): 56-81.

Krook, Mona Lena. 2008. "Quota Laws for Women in Politics: Implications for Feminist Practice," *Social Politics* 15(3): 345-368.

**14. April 20 - New and Uncertain Democracies in Southeast Asia**

Students will be assigned to read ***one*** of the following:

Horowitz, Donald. 2013. *Constitutional Change and Democracy in Indonesia*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 4-7.*

Ferrera, Federico. 2015. *The Political Development of Modern Thailand*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 5-8.*

**Student presentations**

**15. April 27 - TBD**

One week of class will likely be cancelled for (short-term) paternity leave, and all readings will be pushed back one week. The syllabus will be revised and re-posted to Blackboard to reflect the change. This change is expected to occur in early April.

**Final paper due by 3:30 PM on April 29, 2016 in my office, 307 Harkness, my faculty mailbox, or a box outside my office on the third floor of Harkness Hall.**

**Grading rubric for weekly participation grades**

| | A (Above Standards) | B (Meets Standards) | C (Approaching Standards) | D (Below Standards) | E (No credit) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 100% | 90% | 80% | 70% | 0% |
| Reading (50 points) | Student has carefully read and understood the readings as evidenced by familiarity with main ideas, supporting evidence and secondary points. Comes to class prepared with questions and critiques of the readings. | Student has read and understood the readings as evidenced by grasp of the main ideas and evidence. Comes prepared with questions and critiques of the readings. | Student has read the material, but comments often indicate that he/she misunderstood or forgot many points or has not thought about questions or critiques of the readings. | Student comes to class unprepared, as indicated by unwillingness or inability to answer basic questions or contribute to discussion. | Non-attendance |
| Listening (50 points) | Always attends to what others say as evidenced by regularly building on, clarifying, or responding to their comments. | Generally attends to what others say as evidenced by periodically building on, clarifying, or responding to their comments. | Does not regularly listen well as indicated by the repetition of comments or questions presented earlier, or frequent non sequiturs. | Behavior frequently reflects a failure to listen or attend to the discussion as indicated by repetition of comments and questions, non sequiturs, off-task activities. | Non-attendance |

**Grading rubric for final presentations, April 20 or April 27**

| | A (Above Standards) | B (Meets Standards) | C (Approaching Standards) | D (Below Standards) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 100% | 90% | 80% | 70% |
| | | | | |
| Completeness *(10 points)* | All parts of the assignment are addressed. | A minor part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the speaker is addressing it. | A major part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the speaker is addressing it. | Two or more major parts of the assignment are unaddressed or it is unclear how the speaker is addressing them. |
| Clarity *(10 points)* | Ideas are provided in a logical order that makes it easy to follow the speaker's train of thought. | Ideas are provided in a fairly logical order that makes it reasonably easy to follow the speaker's train of thought. | A few ideas are not in an expected or logical order, making the presentation a little confusing. | Many ideas are not in an expected or logical order, making the presentation confusing. |
| Point of view *(30 points)* | The presentation has an argument and a thorough discussion of accurate, relevant evidence and examples bolstering that argument. | The presentation has an argument. There is discussion of accurate, relevant evidence and examples bolstering that argument but key evidence is missing or inaccurate. | An argument and at least one piece of accurate, relevant evidence is offered. | There is no argument in the presentation or the evidence and examples are inaccurate, vague and/or irrelevant and/or are not explained. |
| Creativity and energy *(40 points)* | The presentation engages the audience and highlights all important facts and ideas in a memorable manner. | The presentation mostly engages the audience and highlights many important facts and ideas in a memorable manner. | The presentation does not engage the audience, although it does present information. | The presentation is unengaging and uninformative. |
| Q&A *(10 points)* | Provides thoughtful answers to audience questions. | | | Provides inadequate answers to audience questions. |

**Grading rubric for five-page papers**

| | A (Above Standards) | B (Meets Standards) | C (Approaching Standards) | D (Below Standards) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 100% | 90% | 80% | 70% |
| **Completeness (25 points)** | All parts of the assignment are addressed | A minor part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the author is addressing it. | A major part of the assignment is unaddressed or it is unclear how the author is addressing it. | Two or more major parts of the assignment are unaddressed or it is unclear how the author is addressing them. |
| **Clarity (25 points)** | Ideas are provided in a logical and organized order that makes it easy to follow the author's argument and thoughts. The author provides guidance to readers. Errors are minimal. | Ideas are provided in a fairly logical order that makes it not too hard for readers to follow the argument. Grammatical and spelling errors occur. | Ideas are not presented in an organized or logical order, making the argument difficult to follow. Grammatical and spelling errors occur. | Many ideas are not in an expected or logical order, making the essay confusing. Grammatical and spelling errors are frequent. |
| **Support (20 points)** | Every point in the argument is supported with valid inferences from evidence or logic. | Minor points are unsupported or supported with invalid or tendentious inferences from evidence or logic. | At least one major point is unsupported or supported with invalid or tendentious inferences from evidence or logic. | Many major points are unsupported or supported with invalid or tendentious inferences from evidence or logic. |
| **Research (20 points)** | More than five sources, of which at least three are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books, are used. Sources include both general background sources and specialized sources. Politicized or popular sources are acknowledged as such when used. | Five sources, of which at least two are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books, are used. Politicized or popular sources are mostly acknowledged as such when used. | Five sources, of which at least two are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books, are used. Politicized or popular sources are used without acknowledgement. | Fewer than five sources are used, or fewer than two of the minimum five sources used are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books. |
| **Source Documentation (10 points)** | Correct attributions are provided for all quotations, esoteric facts, and original research. | | | Correct attributions are not provided for quotations, non-trivial facts, and original research. |