

POL 9600: Introduction to Comparative Politics

University of Missouri

Fall 2023

T 6:00-8:30PM, Locust Street Building #E304

Laron K. Williams

Office location: Locust Street Building #319

Phone: 573-882-2820

Email: williamslaro@missouri.edu

Office hours: Office hours (or by appointment): TW 1:00 - 2:00 PM

Course Description

This is a graduate level seminar in comparative politics. The purpose of this seminar is to provide an introduction to the study of comparative political systems. We will discuss a wide variety of topics dealing with political institutions and behavior. The readings will expose you to the main paradigmatic approaches in comparative politics—in particular, to structural, sociological, and rational-choice explanations of political behavior. The readings will allow you to assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of the various methodological approaches used in comparative politics—e.g., formal theoretic models, historical narratives, and cross-national statistical research. A secondary goal of this course is to provide a solid foundation upon which you can build to begin your studying for comprehensive examinations.

Course Requirements

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 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%)

For each class (excluding the Mini-Conference and classes where the student is writing an Analysis Paper), the student will submit on Canvas at noon three “talking points” about the readings. 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 given a grade out of 5.

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.

Weekly Analysis (25%)

At 5 points throughout the semester, students should write a 2-3 page analysis of the week's readings and submit it on Canvas by noon. Each paper will be worth 5%. 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.

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 Design (30%)

Another requirement is the development of an original research design, involving the development of one or more hypotheses on one of the broad substantive topics that we cover in the seminar. 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. While there is no requirement for the actual testing of these hypotheses (students can test their hypotheses if they choose), all students must present a detailed research design section that explains how the student might test these hypotheses. In essence, this project is what a front half of a manuscript would look like (without the Empirics/Findings section). The research proposal is a preliminary version of a full paper that focuses on the theory and provides only a conceptual discussion of the empirical analysis. The research proposal 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 proposal should also discuss the dependent variable(s) and central explanatory variables that would be employed in an empirical investigation of these hypotheses. In addition to submitting a written version, students will make a 15 minute presentation of their research proposal to the class.

The final paper must be 15-20 pages in length, and should be comparable to an academic journal article in style. Please note that 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.

There will be four components of research design:

1. A 3-4 page proposal that is due by the beginning of class on Tuesday, October 24 (worth 5% of the course grade). An effective proposal will include the following sections: *Background/literature* in which the student identifies gaps in the literature and introduces the research question, *Theory and Hypothesis* where the student identifies the credible mechanism, develops the theory and derives testable hypotheses, *Research Design* where the student discusses possible data sources and potential methods, and finally *Potential Problems/Obstacles* where the student can discuss areas in which he/she needs help.
2. A final version of the paper submitted to Canvas (which I will then distribute to the rest of the class) by the start of class on Tuesday, November 28 (worth 15% of the course grade).
3. Participation in the Mini-Conference on December 5 and 12 (5%). Each student will make a 15 minute presentation and serve as a discussant/reviewer for two other student presentations. These 1-2 page reviews should follow the format of journal reviews and will be collectively worth 5% (due by the start of class on December 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 comments/criticisms arranged into three topics: aesthetics, empirical and theoretical. 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

Presentations must be submitted to Canvas by the start of class on December 5.

The paper will be graded on the clarity and contribution of the theory as an addition to the literature on the topic, as well as on the appropriateness of the empirical analysis proposed to test the theory. These papers will be expected to conform to the submission standards of the *American Journal of Political Science*.

Grammatical mistakes in the talking points, weekly analysis papers or in the research design will NOT be tolerated. Any student turning in an assignment with grammatical mistakes have the assignment returned without a grade. The student will have one opportunity to improve and resubmit the work with a grade penalty in a time frame decided by me.

All assignments will be submitted to Canvas (courses.missouri.edu).

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

- Out of respect for fellow students, each person will refrain from talking, whispering, eating, making offensive remarks, newspaper reading, and other disruptive behavior during lecture. Inappropriate classroom behavior may result in the student being requested to leave the classroom.
- 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.

- 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. When in doubt about plagiarism, paraphrasing, quoting, collaboration, or any other form of cheating, consult the course instructor.

Plagiarism will not be tolerated. Any student plagiarizing (or cheating on tests) will receive an automatic grade of 0 for that assignment.

- The Writing Center is a free and confidential service available for your entire career at the University. Writing tutors are available to help all writers at MU with any stage of their writing process, on any writing task, including course-based assignments and application materials. Writing Center tutors will ask great questions and provide feedback and considerations for revision but will never discuss grades with or edit/write for students. Writing support is available year-round via the Online Writery and synchronously via video or on-campus sites during fall, spring, and summer semesters.

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.

- The goal of the University of Missouri is to ensure an inclusive learning environment for all students. The University of Missouri Disability Center provides services and accommodations for students to participate fully in the learning experience and to experience equitable evaluation of their performance. Students (including online students) with a documented disability can contact the Disability Center to establish an accommodation plan. Documented disabilities include hearing, vision, mobility, learning and attention, psychological health and physical health. Students' accommodations are implemented with the input of students to maximize the learning experiences. The MU Disability Center keeps information about a student's disability confidential. Please notify me of your eligibility for accommodations as soon as possible. Additionally, if there are aspects of the course that present as barriers, such as inaccessible course content (e.g., learning assessments, PowerPoints, non-captioned videos, images, tables, PDFs) or if you need an immediate accommodation due to an injury, please contact me or the Disability Center as soon as possible.
- The University of Missouri prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, sex (including sex/gender and pregnancy discrimination; sexual assault; sexual harassment; dating/domestic violence; stalking; statutory rape; and incest. Retaliation for making or supporting a report of discrimination or harassment is also prohibited), sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, disability, veteran status, and any other status protected by applicable state or federal law. Discrimination includes any form of unequal treatment such as denial of opportunities, harassment, and violence.

If you experience discrimination or sexual violence, you are encouraged (but not required) to report the incident to the MU Office of Institutional Equity. Learn more about your rights and options at equity.missouri.edu or call 573-882-3880. You also may make an anonymous report online. If you are a survivor, or someone concerned about a survivor, and need immediate information on what to do, visit RSVP.missouri.edu. Both the Office of Institutional Equity and the RSVP Center can provide assistance to students who need help with academics, housing, or other issues. In the event that you choose to write or speak about having experienced any of these forms of prohibited discrimination or harassment, Mizzou policies require that, as your instructor, I share this information with the MU Office of Institutional Equity. They will contact you to offer information about resources, as well as your rights and options as a member of our campus community.

- 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.

Late Assignments

Late assignments are deducted 10% for each calendar day that they are late. Turning in an assignment late is preferable to not turning in the assignment.

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 22: Course Overview

August 29: Theories of Comparative Politics

- Almond, Gabriel A. 1956. "Comparative Political Systems". *Journal of Politics* 18: 391-409.
- Almond, Gabriel A. 1965. "A Developmental Approach to Political Systems." *World Politics* 17: 183-214.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *The American Political Science Review*. 65.3: 682-693.
- Kohli, Atul, Peter Evans, Peter J. Katzenstein, Adam Przeworski, Suzanne Hoerber Rudolph, James C. Scott, and Theda Skocpol. 1995. "The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium." *World Politics* 49: 1-49.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1995. "The Uses and Limitations of Rational Choice." In *Latin America in Comparative Perspective: New Approaches to Method and Analysis*, ed. P. Smith. Boulder: Westview Press, 81-108.

September 5: Research Design

- Jackman, Robert. 1985. "Cross-National Statistical Research and the Study of Comparative Politics." *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 161-82.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 1.
- Mahoney, James. 2010. "After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research." *World Politics*. 62.1: 120-147.
- Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review* 99:435-452.
- Bates, Robert H. 2008. "From Case Studies to Social Science: A Strategy for Political Research" in *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds. (172-185)
- Wood, Elisabeth. 2008. "Field Research" in *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, eds. (123-146)

Research Areas

September 12: Comparative Political Behavior

- Gurr, Ted R. 1968. "A Causal Model of Civil Strife: A Comparative Analysis Using New Indices." *American Political Science Review* 62: 1104-1124.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1 (pp. 3-43).
- Kitschelt, Herbert P. 1986. "Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest: Anti-Nuclear Movements in Four Democracies." *British Journal of Political Science* 16: 57-85.
- Fearon, James, and David Laitin. 1996. "Explaining Interethnic Cooperation." *American Political Science Review* 90: 715-35.
- Norris, Pippa, Stefaan Walgrave, and Peter Van Aelst. 2005. "Who Demonstrates? Antistate Rebels, Conventional Participants, or Everyone?" *Comparative Politics* 37: 189-205.

September 19: Democracy and Democratization

- Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1959. "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy" *American Political Science Review* 53(1): 69-105.
- Almond and Verba. 1963. *The Civic Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Chapter 1: 1-44).
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Evelyne Huber Stephens, and John D. Stephens. 1992. *Capitalist Development and Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Chapter 3).
- Chilcote, Ronald H. 1994. *Theories of Comparative Politics: The Search for a Paradigm Reconsidered* (2nd edition). Boulder: Westview Press. (Chapter 7: 215-249 and 262-269).
- Przeworski, Adam and Fernando Limongi. 1997. "Modernization: Theories and Facts" *World Politics* 49(2): 155-183.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson and James A. Robinson. 2001. "The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation" *The American Economic Review* 91(5): 1369-1401.

September 26: Political Culture

- Inglehart, Ronald. 1988. "The Renaissance of Political Culture." *American Political Science Review* 82: 1203-30.
- Anderson, Christopher J. and Christine Guillory. 1997. "Political Institutions and Satisfaction with Democracy: A Cross-National Analysis of Consensus and Majoritarian Systems." *American Political Science Review* 91 (1):66-81.
- Mishler, William and Richard. Rose. 2001. "What are the Origins of Political Trust? Testing Institutional and Cultural Theories in Post-Communist Societies." *Comparative Political Studies* 34 (1):30-63.
- Duch, Raymond M., and Harvey D. Palmer. 2004. "It's Not Whether You Win or Lose, But How You Play the Game: Self-Interest, Social Justice, and Mass Attitudes toward Market Transition." *American Political Science Review* 98: 437-52.

- Chandra, Kanchan. 2006. “What Is Ethnic Identity and Does It Matter?” *Annual Review of Political Science*. 9: 397-424.

October 3: Democratic Institutions

- Mainwaring, Scott, and Matthew Soberg Shugart. 1997. *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Read chapters 1 and 2.
- Tsebelis, George. 1999. “Veto Players and Law Production in Parliamentary Democracies: An Empirical Analysis” *The American Political Science Review* 93(3): 591-608.
- Yashar, Deborah J. 1999. “Democracy, Indigenous Movements, and the Postliberal Challenge in Latin America.” *World Politics*. 52.1: 76-104.
- Strom, Kaare. 2000. “Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies.” *European Journal of Political Research*. 37: 261-289.
- Azari, Julia R. and Jennifer K. Smith. 2012. “Unwritten Rules: Informal Institutions in Established Democracies.” *Perspectives on Politics*. 10.1: 37-55.

October 10: Representation

- Ordeshook, Peter, and Olga Shvetsova. 1994. “Ethnic Heterogeneity, District Magnitude, and the Number of Parties”. *American Journal of Political Science*. 38: 100-23.
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 2000. “Linkages between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Polities.” *Comparative Political Studies* 33: 845-79.
- Boix, Carles. 2007. “Emergence of Parties and Party Systems” in *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Carles Boix and Susan Stokes, eds. (499-521).
- O’Brien, Diana Z. and Johanna Rickne. 2016. “Gender Quotas and Women’s Political Leadership.” *The American Political Science Review*. 110.1: 112-126.
- Ofosu, George Kwaku. 2019. “Do Fairer Elections Increase the Responsiveness of Politicians?” *The American Political Science Review*. 113.4: 963-979.
- Parthasarathy, Ramya, Vijayendra Rao, and Nethra Palaniswamy. 2019. “Deliberative Democracy in an Unequal World: A Text-As-Data Study of South India’s Village Assemblies”. *The American Political Science Review*. 113.3: 623-640.

October 17: Party Competition

- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Chapters 2, 7 & 8.
- Strom, Kaare and Wolfgang C. Muller. 1999. “Political Parties and Hard Choices.” In *Policy, Office, or Votes? How Political Parties in Western Europe Make Hard Decisions*. Eds: Wolfgang C. Muller and Kaare Strom. Chapter 1
- Adams, James. 2001. *Party Competition and Responsible Party Government*. Chapters 1 & 2
- Meguid, Bonnie M. 2005. “Competition between Unequals: The Role of Mainstream Party Strategy in Niche Party Success.” *The American Political Science Review*. 99.3: 347-359.
- Somer-Topcu, Zeynep. 2015. “Everything to Everyone: The Electoral Consequences of the Broad-Appeal Strategy in Europe.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 59.4: 841-854.

October 24: Proposal Discussion

- Research design proposal due

October 31: Accountability

- Remmer, Karen. 1991. "The Political and Economic Impact of Economic Crisis in Latin America in the 1980s." *American Political Science Review* 85:777-800.
- Powell, G. Bingham, and Guy D. Whitten. 1993. "A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context." *American Journal of Political Science* 37: 391-414.
- de Boef, Suzanna and Paul M. Kellstedt. 2004. "The Political (and Economic) Origins of Consumer Confidence." *American Journal of Political Science*. 48.4: 633-649.
- Kedar, Orit. 2005. "When Moderate Voters Prefer Extreme Parties: Policy Balancing in Parliamentary Elections". *American Political Science Review* 99: 185-200.
- Gomez, Brad T., and J. Matthew Wilson. 2006. "Cognitive Heterogeneity and Economic Voting: A Comparative Analysis of Four Democratic Electorates." *American Journal of Political Science* 50:127-145.
- Tavits, Margit. 2007. "Clarity of Responsibility and Corruption." *American Journal of Political Science* 51: 218-29.

November 7: Political Economy in the Developing World

- Bates, Robert. 1981. *Markets and States in Tropical Africa: The Political Basis of Agricultural Policies*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Chapter 1 (pp. 1-29).
- Diamond, Jared. 1999. *Guns, Germs, and Steel*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapters 4 & 14.
- Bates, Robert H. 2001. *Prosperity and Violence: The Political Economy of Development*. New York: W.W. Norton. Entire book (pp. 17-115).
- Weyland, Kurt. 2002. *The Politics of Market Reform in Fragile Democracies*, Chapters 2 and 3 (18-70).

November 14: Political Economy in the Developed World

- Hibbs, Douglas A. 1979. "The Mass Public and Macroeconomic Performance: Dynamics of Public Opinion toward Unemployment and Inflation." *American Journal of Political Science*. 23.4: 705-731.
- Alesina, Alberto and Nouriel Roubini. 1997. *Political Cycles and the Macroeconomy*. Chapter 6.
- Barro, Robert J. 1997. *Determinants of Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Empirical Study*. Chapter 1.
- Garrett, Geoffrey. 1998. *Partisan Politics in the Global Economy*. Chapters 1 & 2.

November 21: No Class: Thanksgiving

November 28: No Class

- **Research design due at 6:00pm**

December 5: Mini-Conference: Week I

- **All presentations and reviews must be uploaded to Canvas by 6:00pm**

December 12: Mini-Conference Week II