

Comparative Political Institutions

POLS 235

Winter 2018

Heather Stoll

hstoll@polsci.ucsb.edu

Class Meeting Time: W 9:00 – 11:50 a.m.

Office: 3715 Ellison Hall

Office Hours: T 10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m., R 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., or by appointment

1 Course Objectives

This seminar introduces students to political institutions in comparative perspective. It first aims to familiarize students with the major theoretical approaches to institutions. It then surveys the literature on the core political institutions, from the electoral system to bureaucracy. Along the way, it grapples with issues such as institutional change (for example, which theoretical approach provides the best account?); debates about how institutions should be conceptualized and measured (for example, are mechanisms for contestation the key institutional feature of democratic regimes?); and the link between institutions, democratic representation, and other consequential outcomes of the policy process (for example, do consensual institutions indeed deliver a “kinder and gentler” form of democracy?). Accordingly, the course will help to prepare students for the political institutions section of the comparative politics comprehensive exam, as well as for conducting research in comparative politics.

2 Course Requirements

First and most obviously, students should come to class prepared to discuss the readings. That means having read the readings both carefully and critically. Moreover, we will discuss student work throughout the quarter; students are expected to have read and be prepared to discuss this work, in addition to the readings. The student work that we will discuss will take two forms: first, as described below, brief research prospectuses; second, past CP political institutions exam answers, which we will constructively criticize and grade at several points (to be announced in class), which means that students will have need to have read the answers and come prepared to discuss them.

Second, students are required to serve as a moderator for one topic (i.e., one week’s readings) for Weeks 2–9. The moderator’s main job is to come to class prepared enough to keep everyone else (including the instructor!) on their toes, helping to lead discussion. The secondary responsibility of the moderator is to write and share with the class an approximately *one to three page, meaning brief* critical summary of the readings containing questions for discussion. This critical summary should be posted on the course Gaucho Space website by 5:00 p.m. on the Monday before the class meeting so as to allow everyone time to reflect upon it prior to class. To elaborate, these reports should not merely summarize the readings (e.g., “Jones says X”). Instead, they should be *critical*. That is, they

might identify key conceptual disagreements; identify central debate(s) running through the different readings; point out any methodological (including measurement) issues that seem potentially problematic; and/or offer thoughts about useful directions for future work. Please send me your top three choices of weeks (ranked from first to third) by the end of the first day of class, and I will assign students to topics in order to ensure an even distribution, doing my best to take everyone's preferences into account.

Third, students will write a brief (approximately three to four page) research prospectus for *two* of the topics from Weeks 3 through 9. These prospectuses will identify a *research question* and *testable hypothesis* drawn from the readings for empirical investigation, and then propose and justify a research design for testing this hypothesis. Be creative—this is your chance to draw attention to what you see as an overlooked claim or observable implication of someone's argument. You can assume a reasonably generous budget (for a graduate student!) to carry out the research, such as \$50,000. The best prospectuses will either identify existing data for testing their hypothesis, or make the case that the appropriate data does not exist and describe a methodology for gathering it, from a survey to a field experiment to a comparative case study. The goal is to provide students practice with constructing empirical research proposals, a skill that is obviously required of comparative politics doctoral students. The research prospectuses must be written for topics for which the student does *not* serve as the moderator. Like the moderator's critical summary, the prospectus is due on the Monday before the class when the topic from which the prospectus is drawn will be discussed. We will devote about 1/2 hour of class to discussing the prospectuses. Students are expected to have read their colleagues' prospectuses and come prepared with constructive criticism for the discussion. As with the choice of weeks for the job of moderator, please send me your top three choices by the end of the first day of class, and I will assign students to topics.

Fourth and finally, as the final project for the class, students will be given a sample comprehensive exam question for political institutions and asked to write an approximately five to ten page answer within a 48 hour period of their choosing (modeling the real comprehensive exam situation) between the day following the last day of class and March 23rd (the Friday before grades are due, so as to give me time to grade these final projects).

3 Grading

Grades for the course will be calculated as follows.

- Class participation. (25%)
- Service as moderator, including critical summary/discussion questions. (15%)
- Short research prospectuses. (15% each for a total of 30%)
- Final project consisting of a sample comprehensive exam question answer. (30%)

4 Required Reading Materials

Readings for the course are available in one of three ways. For copyright reasons, the few books from which we will be reading four or more chapters are available on reserve from the library; these readings are labeled [LIB] in the schedule below. You are of course alternatively welcome to purchase copies of these books. Because they can be obtained from so many online vendors nowadays, often used (and hence inexpensively), I have not asked the university bookstore to stock them. For example, the 1999 edition of the Lijphart text is an acceptable substitute for the recently-released 2012 edition, and both it and the 2012 editions are available used. Accordingly, if you are interested in building your personal library, which I recommend, go shopping with your fingers for these modern classics! All other reading materials are available from the course GauchoSpace page. Note, however, that you will either need to be on a university computer or to have your home computer configured for off campus access to access some of these readings.

The course GauchoSpace page also lists (and sometimes provides) further, recommended readings for most topics.

5 Syllabus

PART I: Theoretical Approaches

An Introduction to Organization Theory (Week 1)

Jonathan Bendor, 2001, “Bounded Rationality in Political Science,” in Neil Smelser and Paul Baltes, eds., *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences*, New York: Elsevier.

Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell, 1991, *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 1, p. 7-33 (skim p. 1-6 if you’d like, which review rational choice).

Colin Hay, 2008, “Constructivist Institutionalism,” in Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.

Hal G. Rainey, 2014, *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 5th ed. Chapter 2, “Understanding the Study of Organizations,” p. 16–43.

Kenneth A. Shepsle, 2008, “Rational Choice Institutionalism,” in Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.

Kathleen Thelen and Sven Steinmo, 1992, “Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics,” in Sven Steinmo, Kathleen Thelen and Frank Longstreth, eds., *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Politics, Institutions, and Organizations: Major Issues (Week 2)

- Jean Blondel, 2008, "Institutions, Mainly, but not Exclusively, Political," in Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.
- Jack Knight, 1992, *Institutions and Social Conflict*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2, and 7.
- Robert Lieberman, 2002, "Ideas, Institutions, and Political Order: Explaining Political Change," *American Political Science Review* 96 (4): 697–712.
- Terry Moe, 2005, "Power and Political Institutions," *Perspectives on Politics* 3 (2): 215–233.
- Adam Przeworski, 2004, "Institutions Matter?" *Government and Opposition* 39 (4): 527–540.
- Hal G. Rainey, 2014, *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 5th ed. Chapter 3, "What Makes Public Organizations Distinctive."
- Giovanni Sartori, 1997, *Comparative Constitutional Engineering: An Inquiry into Structures, Incentives and Outcomes*, 2nd ed., Chapter 13.

PART II: Democratic Institutions in Comparative Perspective

Democracy and Autocracy (Week 3)

- Darren Acemoglu and James Robinson, 2006, *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1–3.
- Barbara Geddes, 1999, "What Do We Know about Democratization after Twenty Years?," *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 115–144.
- Arend Lijphart, 2012, *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapter 4. [LIB]
- Adam Przeworski, 1991, *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 2.
- Adam Przeworski, Michael Alvarez, Jose Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi, 2000, *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950–1990*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 2.
- Barry Weingast, 1997, "The Political Foundations of Democracy and the Rule of Law," *American Political Science Review* 91 (2): 245–263.
- Daniel Ziblatt, 2013, "Barrington Moore's Centennial Legacy," APSA Comparative Democratization Section Newsletter, Volume 11, No. 1. Skim others, especially Berman and Snyder.

Political Regimes I: Presidentialism vs. Parliamentarism (Week 4)

Jose Antonio Cheibub, 2007, *Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, and Democracy*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 6.

Timothy Frye, 1997, "A Politics of Institutional Choice: Post-Communist Presidencies," *Comparative Political Studies* 30 (5): 523-552.

Arend Lijphart, 2012, *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapter 7. [LIB]

David Samuels and Matthew Shugart, 2010, *Presidents, Parties and Prime Ministers: How the Separation of Powers Affects Party Organization and Behavior*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Summary provided by Shugart in February 2010.

Matthew Soberg Shugart, 2008, "Comparative Executive-Legislative Relations," in Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.

Matthew Shugart and John Carey, 1992, *Presidents and Assemblies*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-3, 8-9. [LIB]

Political Regimes II: Centralization vs. Decentralization (Week 5)

Pradeep Chhibber and Ken Kollman, 1998, "Party Aggregation and the Number of Parties in India and the United States," *American Political Science Review* 92 (2): 329-342.

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

Arend Lijphart, 2012, *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapter 10. [LIB]

Gerry Stoker, 2008, "Comparative Local Governance," in Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.

Daniel Treisman, 2007, *The Architecture of Government: Rethinking Political Decentralization*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2 (p. 21-27 only), 7, and 10-12. [LIB]

Barry Weingast, 1995, "The Economic Role of Political Institutions: Market-Preserving Federalism and Economic Development," *Journal of Law, Economics & Organization* 11 (1): 1-31.

Electoral Systems (Week 6)

Shaun Bowler, 2008, "Electoral Institutions," in Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.

Gary Cox, 1997, *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-4, 7, 9-11. [LIB]

Thomas Cusack, Torben Iversen and David Soskice, 2007, “Economic Interests and the Origins of Electoral Systems,” *American Political Science Review* 101 (3): 373–391.

Jennifer Gandhi and Abigail L. Heller, 2017, “Electoral Systems in Authoritarian States,” in Erik S. Herron, Robert J. Pekkanen, and Matthew S. Shugart, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems*.

Ken Kollman, 2017, “Election Data and Levels of Analysis,” in Erik S. Herron, Robert J. Pekkanen, and Matthew S. Shugart, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems*.

Note: Read *either* Gandhi and Heller *or* Kollman.

Arend Lijphart, 2012, *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapter 8. [LIB]

David Lublin and Shaun Bowler, 2017, “Representation of Ethnic Minorities,” in Erik S. Herron, Robert J. Pekkanen, and Matthew S. Shugart, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems*.

Legislatures (Week 7)

John M. Carey, 2008, “Legislative Organization,” in Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.

John Huber, 1996, *Rationalizing Parliament: Legislative Institutions and Party Politics in France*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Introduction and Chapter 7.

Arend Lijphart, 2012, *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapters 6 and 11. [LIB]

R. A. W. Rhodes, 2008, “Executives in Parliamentary Systems,” in Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.

Paul Schuler and Edmund J. Malesky, 2014, “Authoritarian Legislatures,” in Shane Martin, Thomas Saalfeld, and Kaare W. Strom, *Oxford Handbook of Legislative Studies*.

George Tsebelis and Jeanette Money, 1997, *Bicameralism*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Introduction, Chapters 1, 2 and 9.

Eric Uslaner and Thomas Zittel, 2008, “Comparative Legislative Behavior,” in Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.

Bureaucracy (Week 8)

John Huber and Charles Shipan, 2002, *Deliberate Discretion*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 8. [LIB]

Donald F. Kettl, 2008, “Public Bureaucracies,” in Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.

Terry Moe, 2012, “Delegation, Control, and the Study of Public Bureaucracy,” *The Forum* 10 (2).

James Rauch and Peter Evans, 2000, “Bureaucratic Structure and Bureaucratic Performance in Less Developed Countries,” *Journal of Public Economics* 75 (1): 49–71.

James Wilson, 1989, *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*, New York: Basic Books. Chapters 1, 2, 16, and 20.

PART III: Pulling It All Together (Maybe):

Institutions, Typologies, and Democracy (Week 9)

Donald Horowitz, 2001, “Constitutional Design: Proposals versus Processes,” in Andrew Reynolds, ed., *The Architecture of Democracy*.

Arend Lijphart, 2012, *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapters 1 (skim 2-3 as needed), 15 and 16. [LIB]

G. Bingham Powell, Jr., 2000, *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*, New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapters 1, 2 and 10.

Adam Przeworski, Michael Alvarez, Jose Antonio Cheibub, and Fernando Limongi, 2000, *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950–1990*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 6.

Richard Rose, 2000, “The End of Consensus in Austria and Switzerland,” *Journal of Democracy* 11 (2): 26–40.

Joel Selway and Kharis Templeman, 2012, “The Myth of Consociationalism? Conflict Reduction in Divided Societies,” *Comparative Political Studies* 45 (12): 1542–1571.

George Tsebelis, 1995, “Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism and Multipartyism,” *British Journal of Political Science* 25 (3): 289–325.