

POL 9720: Comparative Political Institutions

University of Missouri

Fall 2021

W 3:00-5:30PM, Professional Building 104

Laron K. Williams

Office location: 203 Professional Building

Phone: 573-882-2820

Email: williamslaro@missouri.edu

Office hours: M W 1:00-2:00 in-person or over Zoom (Meeting ID: 975 2355 2475; Passcode 3000)

Course Description

The study of comparative political institutions has exploded over the past twenty years. As theories of new institutionalism took hold in American politics, comparative scholars began to explore the causes and consequences of the wide variety of rules and norms governing democracies around the world. This gave rise to an array of questions such as: Why do democracies emerge and break down? How do presidential and parliamentary systems differ and what are the consequences of these differences? How do electoral rules shape party systems and the nature of political representation? How do political institutions affect policy outputs and policy outcomes? Where do institutions come from in the first place? Drawing on theories of new institutionalism, specifically historical institutionalism and rational choice institutionalism, comparative politics scholars have created a vast literature that answers these and many other questions about political institutions.

In this course, we will examine a cross-section of the literature on comparative political institutions to provide you with sufficient background for future research in this area. The subject area is enormous, and we will not be able to cover all aspects of it. Instead, I have selected topics within the literature on comparative political institutions that are of key importance and that I will be able to guide you in understanding. We begin the course by looking at some of the major theoretical approaches to studying political institutions and how ideas of representation and accountability are embedded in democratic institutions. We then examine some of the large literatures on executive-legislative relations, electoral rules, party systems, representation, and policy. We conclude with discussions reconciling the exogeneity and endogeneity of institutions. By the end of this course, students should have a solid understanding of major trends in the literature on comparative political institutions and be able to explore the field more deeply on their own.

Course Requirements

All assignments will be submitted via Canvas. Late assignments will have 10% deducted for each calendar day that they are late.

Class Participation and Attendance (20%)

This course is a seminar, not a lecture series. It is your responsibility, as well as mine, to come to class prepared to discuss the information and claims found in the readings and explore related research possibilities. If any of us shirk, we all lose. I expect no absences in the course, and I encourage you to discuss any

circumstances with me that will preclude you from attending class. I also expect you to arrive on time. If you do need to miss class, please contact me ahead of time to let me know that you will not be able to attend and to make arrangements to complete an alternate assignment. A large portion of my overall evaluation of your performance in the course will depend on the quality of your seminar participation.

Keep in mind that the purpose of the seminar is to engage in informed group discussion: we are not interested in uninformed opinion. This means that students should closely and critically read each book or article on the reading list, and spend time thinking about what each contributes to the topic that week and to comparative politics in general. Class discussion will focus on such issues as the theoretical arguments being made (both explicitly and implicitly), the empirical evidence that is marshaled to test these arguments, weaknesses of the work, and potential directions for future study.

Grades for participation (including discussion questions and attendance) will be assigned at the end of the semester, but you may ask for feedback on your performance at any time. If you have concerns about the quality and quantity of your participation in the course, I hope you will speak to me. Remember, this is a seminar, so just showing up to class is not enough. You must come to class prepared to participate in an informed discussion of the issues raised by the week's readings. If you just show up to class every week, but never say a word, you can expect to receive a D or lower for class participation (20% of your grade).

The following general grading scale will be used for participation and preparation:

- A: The student made a very strong contribution to the course. Class discussion, comments, and presentations reflected understanding and analysis of the material, and were constructive. Constructive means that a student does not simply identify a weakness or problem. Rather, constructive comments identify a problem and offer suggestions for how to address the weakness or problem.
- B: The student contributed meaningfully to the course. Class participation and/or presentations went beyond repeating the assigned material, perhaps identifying weaknesses in the current literature, but did not make many constructive suggestions about how weaknesses might be overcome or how the literature might be usefully extended in the future.
- C: The student did not contribute meaningfully to the seminar. Class participation and/or presentations were limited to repeating the assigned material rather than making connections or extensions.
- D or lower: The student attended class, but did not participate in discussions or present meaningful questions for academic debate.

Finally, because we will engage in vigorous academic debate during class, classroom etiquette is vital. Please work to ensure that you make comments in ways that invite discussion. Our classroom contains members with various life experiences, divergent perspectives, varying levels of experience with political science research, and different strategies for defending their views. Please state your opinions constructively and respectfully, listen carefully when your colleagues are speaking, and speak to me if you are offended by something that is said in class. If you do not follow these guidelines, your participation grade will be adversely affected.

Talking Points (25%)

At each week of substantive readings (except for those where the student is writing an Analysis Paper), the student must submit three "talking points" about the readings via Canvas by Monday at 9am. Students' grades will come from the highest five grades. I will arrange these talking points and have students read them aloud. The talking points should be in the form of a short paragraph outlining the question or argument.

These questions are intended to improve understanding of the material and inspire discussion, so they should be the most interesting questions or arguments that the student has identified based on the week's readings. Questions can be related to a single reading, a set of readings, or the week's selections as a whole. Each

talking point should refer to a different chapter or article from the weekly readings. You may also include questions of clarification if there are areas in the reading that you find difficult to understand. However, keep in mind that I will evaluate the quality of your questions as a critical part of this grade component. Given the size of the class, and the amount of material covered, not everybody gets an opportunity to ask every question they have. Consider this your opportunity to get your questions on record. The talking points will be graded on a 5-point scale.

This is an example of an effective talking point:

McClosky believes that economics should be more literary in its writings so that it tells a story to its readers. This argument fits with Kuhn's point that scientists write to an audience of other scientists. Obviously, audience is important, but how important? Has the field of political science suffered from the same use of scientific jargon in the same manner as economics? Has the language that political scientists use hindered the field in accomplishing its goals of explanation and prediction of social phenomenon?

This example highlights the main argument of the author (*economics should be more literary*) and relates it to readings from previous weeks (*Thomas Kuhn*). The talking point then presents a question that pits the two arguments against one another, thereby creating points for discussion. Note that this is only one of the many ways to produce a quality talking point.

Analysis Papers (25%)

At 5 points throughout the semester, students should write a 3 page analysis of the week's readings and submit them via Canvas by the Monday before class at 9am. The primary goal of the papers is not to earn grades but to provide you with an opportunity to reflect on the readings and develop critical thinking and writing skills. Feel free to use these papers as an aid in class discussion. Each paper will be worth 5%.

Keep the following questions in mind when crafting your analysis paper:

- *Theory*: Does the work make original contributions to the current state of theory on the topic being addressed? Are the assumptions and causal mechanisms elaborated clearly? Are the assumptions plausible? Is the theory internally consistent? Do the hypotheses follow logically from the theory?
- *Empirical Design*: Is the research design used by the author(s) suitable for testing the theoretical hypotheses? If not, how might this problem be resolved? Are there other relevant empirical issues the work has failed to consider?
- *Data*: Do the measures of the dependent and independent variables adequately correspond to the theoretical concepts of interest? Are better measures possible? Are more reliable data available to test the hypotheses? Are the data and construction of measures described in sufficient detail so as to permit replication?
- *Findings*: Have the results been interpreted correctly? Are the interpretations substantively interesting? How well do the findings fit with theoretical expectations? Are there other possible explanations of the phenomenon of interest that need to be considered? Are there other testable implications arising from the theory that might give us greater leverage on the posited relationships?

Be sure that your analysis is a coherent whole. In other words, you should not haphazardly offer answers to all of these questions, but use them as a guide to develop an original argument for your paper. You should have an introduction that sets out the thesis or primary argument of your analysis paper, a body that develops your thesis/argument citing the readings as needed to support your points, and a conclusion

that rounds out your analysis paper. This is an opportunity to go beyond restating key points from the readings and think intelligently and originally about what they mean, what they tell us about comparative politics, and what concerns you about them. The best papers will be those that take up a single point or small issue and develop a thoughtful analysis of that point. Do not try to cover too much in the paper.

Research Paper (30%)

Another requirement is the development of an original research paper involving the development and empirical testing of one or more hypotheses on comparative political institutions. This paper may be quantitative or qualitative in nature, depending on the nature of the question and the student's methodological training, but in any case it must be analytical and theoretical in nature rather than descriptive.

The research paper will have seven components:

Theory Proposal: the Theory Proposal will include two sections: *Background/literature* in which the student identifies gaps in the literature and introduces the research question, and *Theory and Hypothesis* where the student identifies the credible mechanism, develops the theory and derives testable hypotheses. An effective Theory Proposal will clearly delineate the author's theoretical contributions from others' contributions, and will clearly answer how this project addresses the gap or problem identified in the *Background* section. This is due on Monday, October 25 at 9am and is worth 2.5% of the course grade.

Students must have a meeting with me either in-person or over Zoom to discuss necessary changes to the project.

Research Design proposal: The Research Design Proposal focuses on the empirical elements of the research project. It will contain the following information: data source(s), description of temporal and spatial frames, operationalization of key explanatory variables and the dependent variable, model specification (and justification for including all the variables), proposed techniques for analyzing the data, descriptive statistics for the key variables, and a graphical or tabular depiction of the hypothesized relationship at its most basic (i.e., bivariate). You should provide justification for your choice in each of these components. You can also include a *Potential Problems/Obstacles* section where you can discuss areas in which you need help. This is due on Monday, November 8 at 9am and is worth 2.5% of the course grade.

Initial Submission: An initial version of the research paper submitted by Monday, November 29 at 9am. The paper will be graded on the clarity and contribution of the theory to the literature on comparative political institutions as well as on the appropriateness of the empirical analysis proposed to test the theory. The research paper should discuss the theoretical motivation for the proposed research, citing the relevant literature (at least 20 sources) to which the research seeks to contribute. It should clearly explain the original theoretical argument made and explicitly posit the key testable hypotheses derived from this theory. The paper should also discuss the variables, methods used to analyze the data, and the substantive meaning of the results.

The research paper must be 20-30 pages in length, and should conform to the submission standards of the *American Journal of Political Science*. This must be an original paper for this course, and can not overlap in any substantial way with a paper written for another course; if there is any question please talk to me about it and bring me a copy of the other paper. I strongly encourage students to typeset using L^AT_EX. This is worth 10% of the course grade.

Participation in the Mini-Conference: each student will make a 10-12 minute presentation on either Wednesday, December 1 or 8. Presentations must be uploaded by noon on the day of the presentation and the presentation is worth 2.5% of the course grade.

An effective presentation will include the following elements:

- introduce research question
- place your research in the context of the literature
- derive hypotheses
- describe your research design
- discuss your empirical results (including the substantive meaning of the results)
- conclude by offering implications and future research

Reviews: Each student will serve as a reviewer for two other student manuscript submissions. Reviews are due Friday, December 3 at 3pm. These 1-2 page reviews should follow the format of journal reviews and will be collectively worth 5%. I will provide more in-depth description of the requirements for the Reviews at a later date, but they should include an overall summary and then carefully considered comments related to theoretical and empirical elements.

Memo: The final version of the paper will be treated as if it is a resubmission for a manuscript following an offer to revise and resubmit (R&R). The author must produce a memo that highlights key revisions and addresses the comments of the editor (me) and the reviewers. This is worth 2.5% and is due on Wednesday, December 15 at 3pm.

Revised Submission: The final resubmission of the project is due on Wednesday, December 15 at 3pm. Grades will be based partly on how well the student has responded to the comments, and if necessary, made the appropriate revisions to strengthen the project. Additionally, students must submit the files—including data and script files—necessary to replicate the empirical findings in the submission. Altogether, the Revised Submission is worth 5% of the course grade.

Grammatical mistakes in the assignments will NOT be tolerated. I reserve the right to require students to resubmit their assignments and, if necessary, take the assignment to the Writing Center for help.

Final class grades will be assigned with the following grading scale:

A+ = 97.0 - 100
A = 90.0 - 96.99
B+ = 87.0 - 89.99
B = 80.0 - 86.99
C+ = 77.0 - 79.99
C = 70.0 - 76.99
D+ = 67.0 - 69.99
D = 60.0 - 66.99
F = 0 - 59.99

There are no required textbooks. All required readings will be available on electronic course reserves or through jstor.

Other Considerations

Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is fundamental to the activities and principles of a university. All members of the academic community must be confident that each person's work has been responsibly and honorably acquired,

developed, and presented. Any effort to gain an advantage not given to all students is dishonest whether or not the effort is successful. The academic community regards breaches of the academic integrity rules as extremely serious matters. Sanctions for such a breach may include academic sanctions from the instructor, including failing the course for any violation, to disciplinary sanctions ranging from probation to expulsion. Any efforts to pass off someone else's ideas as your own is considered plagiarism! When in doubt about plagiarism, paraphrasing, quoting, collaboration, or any other form of cheating, consult the course instructor.

Plagiarism (or cheating in any way) will not be tolerated. Any student plagiarizing will receive an automatic "F" on the assignment, no exceptions!

Decreasing the Risk of COVID-19 in Classrooms and Labs

MU cares about the health and safety of its students, faculty, and staff. To provide safe, high-quality education amid COVID-19, we will follow several specific campus policies in accordance with the advice of the Center for Disease Control and Boone County health authorities. This statement will be updated as information changes.

- If you are experiencing any COVID-related symptoms, or are otherwise feeling unwell, do not attend in-person classes and contact your health care provider and/or student health immediately. COVID symptoms include: fever greater than 100.4 or chills; cough, shortness of breath or difficulty breathing; fatigue; unexplained muscle or body aches; headache; new loss of taste or smell; sore throat; congestion or runny nose; nausea or vomiting; diarrhea.
- We will all wear face coverings while in the classroom, unless you have a documented exemption due to a disability or medical condition.
- We will maintain a 6-foot distance from each other at all times (except in specific lab/studio courses with other specific guidelines for social distancing).
- We will enter the classroom and fill the room starting at the front, filing all the way across a row. When class ends, we will exit the row nearest to the door first; the instructor or TA will give the signal for the next row to exit, in the same manner.
- In any small section or lab class that requires them, additional measures will be listed in the syllabus and be mandatory for class participation.
- Online office hours will be available for all students.
- This course may be recorded by the instructor for the sole purpose of sharing the recording with students who can't attend class. The instructor will take care not to disclose personally identifiable information from the student education records during the recorded lesson.

Compliance with these guidelines is required for all; anyone who fails to comply will be subject to the accountability process, as stated in the University's Collected Rules and Regulations, Chapter 200 Student Code of Conduct.

If an instructor has concerns about how a student is following COVID-19 policies and protocols, please report those concerns to the Office of the Dean of Students. You can fill out a COVID Safety Measures Reporting Form [here](#):

https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?UnivofMissouriSystem&layout_id=38

By taking the above measures, we are supporting your health and that of the whole Mizzou community. Thank you in advance for joining me and your peers in adhering to these safety measures.

Other Considerations

- The University of Missouri is committed to supporting student well-being through an integrated network of care, with a wide range of services to help students succeed. The MU Counseling Center offers professional mental health care, and can help you find the best approach to treatment based on your needs. Call to make an appointment at 573-882-6601. Any student in crisis may call or go to the MU Counseling Center between 8:00 – 5:00 M-F. After hours phone support is available at 573-882-6601.

Visit our website at <https://wellbeing.missouri.edu> to take an online mental health screening, find out about workshops and resources that can help you thrive, or learn how to support a friend. Download Sanvello, a phone app that teaches skills and strategies to help you maintain good mental health. Log in with your Mizzou e-mail to unlock all the tools available through Sanvello at no cost to you.

- The Writing Center, located in the Student Success Center, offers writing support to all students at the University of Missouri. Students can access tutors via synchronous face-to-face and Zoom sessions as well as the ever-present Online Writery for asynchronous submissions. Our tutors come from a variety of majors and are familiar with many writing styles and formats. Although tutors are not editors and therefore will not “fix” a student’s writing, they will provide detailed feedback and revision options for any writing project at any stage of the writing process, including initial brainstorming, early drafting, major (and minor) structural revisions, and/or finishing touches on a final draft. To make an appointment, submit your work to the Online Writery, or learn what else the Writing Center has to offer, visit their website at writingcenter.missouri.edu.

Though there may be specific times where we will request that a student meets with a Writing Center tutor before submitting an assignment, we encourage all students to use this excellent resource.

- If you anticipate barriers related to the format or requirements of this course, if you have emergency medical information to share with me, or if you need to make arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please let me know as soon as possible.

If disability related accommodations are necessary (for example, a note taker, extended time on exams, captioning), please establish an accommodation plan with the MU Disability Center, S5 Memorial Union, 573-882-4696, and then notify me of your eligibility for reasonable accommodations. For other MU resources for persons with disabilities, click on “Disability Resources” on the MU homepage.

- The University community welcomes intellectual diversity and respects student rights. Students who have questions or concerns regarding the atmosphere in this class (including respect for diverse opinions) may contact the departmental chair or divisional director; the Office of Academic Integrity; the MU Equity Office, or equity@missouri.edu. All students will have the opportunity to submit an anonymous evaluation of the instructor(s) at the end of the course.
- University of Missouri System Executive Order No. 38 lays out principles regarding the sanctity of classroom discussions at the university. The policy is described fully in section 200.015 of the Collected Rules and Regulations. In this class, students may not make audio or video recordings of course activity, except students permitted to record as an accommodation under section 240.040 of the Collected Rules. All other students who record and/or distribute audio or video recordings of class activity are subject to discipline in accordance with provisions of section 200.020 of the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University of Missouri pertaining to student conduct matters.

Those students who are permitted to record are not permitted to redistribute audio or video recordings of statements or comments from the course to individuals who are not students in the course without the express permission of the faculty member and of any students who are recorded. Students found to have violated this policy are subject to discipline in accordance with provisions of section 200.020

of the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University of Missouri pertaining to student conduct matters.

Class Schedule:

We will spend as much time as necessary on each topic for this course. Because I am unable to predict in advance how long each topic will take, the schedule below is only a rough guideline.

Methodological and Theoretical Foundations

August 25: Overview/Syllabus

September 1: Theories of Political Institutions

- North, Douglass C. 1991. "Institutions," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 5: 97-112.
- Rothstein, Bo. 1996. "Political Institutions: An Overview". In *A New Handbook of Political Science*, ed. R. E. Goodin and H.-D. Klingemann. New York: Oxford University Press, 133-166.
- Hall, Peter and Rosemary C.R. Taylor. 1996. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms" *Political Studies* 44: 935-957.
- Helmke, Gretchen, and Steven Levitsky. 2004. "Informal Institutions and Comparative Politics: A Research Agenda" *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (4): 725-740.
- David D. Laitin. 2003. "The Perestroika Challenge to Social Science," *Politics & Society*, 3: 163-184.
 - For background on the Perestroika movement (read this before Laitin), read Miller, D.W. 9-21-2001 "Storming the Palace in Political Science." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 48.4
- Przeworski, Adam. 2004. "Institutions Matter?," *Government and Opposition* 39: 527-540.

September 8: Democracy, Representation, and Accountability

- Collier, David, and Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49 (3):430-451.
- Huber, John D., and G. Bingham Powell, Jr. 1994. "Congruence Between Citizens and Policymakers in Two Visions of Liberal Democracy," *World Politics* 46: 291-326.
- Manin, Bernard, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes. 1999. "Elections and Representation" in *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*, eds. Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin. New York: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 1 (29-54).
- Samuels, David J. and Matthew Soberg Shugart. 2003. "Presidentialism, Elections, and Representation" *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 15(1): 33-60.
- Hellwig, Timothy, and David Samuels. 2008. "Electoral Accountability and the Variety of Democratic Regimes." *British Journal of Political Science* 38 (1):65-90.

September 15: Parliamentarism, Presidentialism, and Mixed Regimes

- Cheibub, Jose Antonio. 2006. *Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, and Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 2.
- Linz, Juan J. 1990. “The Perils of Presidentialism.” *Journal of Democracy* 1 (Winter).
- Stepan, Alfred, and Cindy Skach. 1993. “Constitutional Frameworks and Democratic Consolidation.” *World Politics* 46:1-22.
- Mainwaring, Scott, and Matthew Soberg Shugart. 1997. “Juan Linz, Presidentialism, and Democracy: A Critical Appraisal.” *Comparative Political Studies* 29 (4):449-471.
- Cheibub, Jose A., and Fernando Limongi. 2002. “Democratic Institutions and Regime Survival: Parliamentary and Presidential Democracies Reconsidered.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 5:151-179.
- Gerring, John, Strom C. Thacker and Carola Moreno. 2009. “Are Parliamentary Systems Better?” *Comparative Political Studies* 42.3: 327-359.

Research Areas

September 22: Coalition Building and Government Formation

- Laver, Michael and Kenneth Shepsle. 1990. “Coalitions and Cabinet Government.” *American Political Science Review* 84(3): 873-890.
- Strom, Kaare, Ian Budge, and Michael J. Laver. 1994. “Constraints on Cabinet Formation in Parliamentary Democracies.” *American Journal of Political Science* 38 (2):303-335.
- Tavits, Margit. 2008. “The Role of Parties’ Past Behavior in Coalition Formation.” *American Political Science Review* 102 (4):495-508.
- Ariotti, Margaret H. and Sona N. Golder. 2018. “Partisan Portfolio Allocation in African Democracies.” *Comparative Political Studies*. 51.3: 341-379.
- Golder, Sona Nadenichek. 2006. “Pre-Electoral Coalition Formation in Parliamentary Democracies.” *British Journal of Political Science*. 36: 193-212.

September 29: Government Duration in Parliamentary Systems

- King, Gary, James E. Alt, Elizabeth Burns, and Michael Laver. 1990. “A Unified Model of Cabinet Dissolution in Parliamentary Democracies.” *American Journal of Political Science* 34:846-871.
- Lupia, Arthur, and Kaare Strom. 1995. “Coalition Termination and the Strategic Timing of Legislative Elections.” *American Political Science Review* 89:648-665.
- Schleiter, Petra and Edward Morgan-Jones. 2009. “Constitutional Power and Competing Risks: Monarchs, Presidents, Prime Ministers, and the Termination of East and West European Cabinets.” *American Political Science Review* 103(3): 496-512.
- Williams, Laron K. 2016. “Opposition Parties and the Timing of Successful No-Confidence Motions.” *Political Science Research and Methods*. 4.3: 533-553.

- Schleiter, Petra and Margit Tavits. 2018. "Voter Reactions to Incumbent Opportunism." *The Journal of Politics*. 80.4: 1183-1196.
- Huber, John D. and Cecilia Martinez-Gallardo. 2008. "Replacing Cabinet Ministers: Patterns of Ministerial Stability in Parliamentary Democracies." *American Political Science Review*. 102.2: 169-180.

October 6: Presidential Institutions

- Metcalf, Lee Kendall. 2000. "Measuring Presidential Power." *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (5):660-686.
- Negretto, Gabriel L. 2004. "Government Capacities and Policymaking by Decree in Latin America: The Cases of Brazil and Argentina." *Comparative Political Studies* 37 (5):531-562.
- Shugart, Matthew Soberg. 1995. "The Electoral Cycle and Institutional Sources of Divided Presidential Government." *American Political Science Review* 89(2):327-43.
- Amorim Neto, Octavio. 2006. "The Presidential Calculus: Executive Policy Making and Cabinet Formation in the Americas." *Comparative Political Studies* 39 (4):415-440.
- Martinez-Gallardo, Cecilia and Petra Schleiter. 2015. "Choosing Whom to Trust: Agency Risks and Cabinet Partisanship in Presidential Democracies." *Comparative Political Studies*. 48.2: 231-264.

October 13: Electoral Rules and Legislative Behavior

- Cox, Gary W. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*. Chapter 3.
- Carey, John M. and Matthew Soberg Shugart. 1995. "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: A Rank Ordering of Electoral Formulas" *Electoral Studies* 14(4): 417-39.
- Crisp, Brian F., Maria C. Escobar-Lemmon, Bradford S. Jones, Mark P. Jones, and Michelle M. Taylor-Robinson. 2004. "Vote-seeking Incentives and Legislative Representation in Six Presidential Democracies" *The Journal of Politics* 63(3): 823-846.
- Crisp, Brian F. Kristin Kanthak, and Jenny Leijonhufvud. 2004. "The Reputations Legislators Build: With Whom Should Representatives Collaborate?" *American Political Science Review* 98(4): 703-716.
- Desposato, Scott W. 2006. "The Impact of Electoral Rules on Legislative Parties: Lessons from the Brazilian Senate and Chamber of Deputies." *The Journal of Politics*. 68.4: 1018-1030.
- Yildirim, T. Murat. 2020. "Politics of Constituency Representation and Legislative Ambition under the Glare of Camera Lights." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 45.1: 101-130.

October 20: Electoral Rules and Party Behavior

- Cox, Gary. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*. Chapter 2.
- William R. Clark and Matt Golder. 2006. "Rehabilitating Duverger's Theory: Testing the Mechanical and Strategic Modifying Effects of Electoral Laws." *Comparative Political Studies* 39: 679-708.

- Stoll, Heather. 2008. "Social Cleavages and the Number of Parties: How the Measures You Choose Affect the Answers You Get." *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (11): 1439-1465.
- Daniel N. Posner. 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.
- Spoon, Jae-Jae and Karleen Jones West. 2015. "Alone or Together? How Institutions Affect Party Entry in Presidential Elections in Europe and South America." *Party Politics*. 21.3: 393-403.
- Carey, John M., and Simon Hix. 2011. "The Electoral Sweet Spot: Low-Magnitude Proportional Electoral Systems." *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (2): 383-397.

October 27: No Class

- **Theory proposal due (Monday, October 25 at 9am); individual meetings**

November 3: Institutions and Economic Policy

- Tsebelis, George. 1999. "Veto Players and Law Production in Parliamentary Democracies: An Empirical Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 93(3): 591-608.
- Cheibub, Jose Antonio. 2006. "Presidentialism, Electoral Identifiability, and Budget Balances in Democratic Systems." *American Political Science Review* 100 (3):353-68.
- Bawn, Kathleen, and Frances Rosenbluth. 2006. "Short versus Long Coalitions: Electoral Accountability and the Size of the Public Sector." *American Journal of Political Science* 50:251-265.
- Linzer, Drew A., and Ronald L. Rogowski. 2008. "Lower Prices: The Impact of Majoritarian Systems in Democracies around the World." *Journal of Politics* 70 (1):17-27.
- Beckman, Tristin and Petra Schleiter. 2020. "Opportunistic Election Timing, a Complement or Substitute for Economic Manipulation?" *The Journal of Politics* 82.3: 1127-1141.

November 10: Institutions, Women and Minorities

- **Research design proposal due (Monday, November 8 at 9am)**
- Kittilson, Miki Caul and Leslie A. Schwindt-Bayer. 2010. "Engaging Citizens: The Role of Power-Sharing Institutions" *Journal of Politics*
- Wahman, Michael, Nikolaos Frantzeskakis and Tevfik Murat Yildirim. 2021. "From Thin to Thick Representation: How a Female President Shapes Female Parliamentary Behavior." *American Political Science Review*. 115:2: 360-378.
- Hughes, Melanie M. 2011. "Intersectionality, Quotas, and Minority Women's Political Representation Worldwide." *American Political Science Review* 105 (03):604-620.
- Elkins, Zachary, and John Sides. 2007. "Can Institutions Build Unity in Multiethnic States?" *American Political Science Review* 101 (4):693-708.
- Liu, Amy H. 2011. "Linguistic Effects of Political Institutions." *Journal of Politics*, 73(1), 125-139.

November 17: Endogenous Institutional Change

- Greif, Avner and David Laitin. 2004. "A Theory of Endogenous Institutional Change." *American Political Science Review* 98(4): 633-652.
- Bawn, Kathleen. 1993. "The Logic of Institutional Preferences: German Electoral Law as a Social Choice Outcome." *American Journal of Political Science* 37(4): 965-989.
- Boix, Carles. 1999. "Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 93(3): 609-624.
- Remmer, Karen L. 2008. "The Politics of Institutional Change: Electoral Reform in Latin America, 1978-2002." *Party Politics* 14 (1):5-30.
- Hughes, Melanie M., Mona Lena Krook and Pamela Paxton. 2015. "Transnational Women's Activism and the Global Diffusion of Gender Quotas." *International Studies Quarterly* 59: 357-372.

November 24: Thanksgiving Break

December 1: Mini-Conference: Week I

- Initial research paper submission due (Monday, November 29 at 9am)
- Presentations for Week I need to be uploaded (Wednesday, December 1 at noon)
- Two peer reviews due (Friday, December 3 at 3pm)

December 8: Mini-Conference Week II

- Presentations for Week II need to be uploaded (Wednesday, December 8 at noon)

December 15: Revised Paper Due

- Revised research paper, replication materials and memo to editor and reviewers are due (Wednesday, December 15 at 3pm)