Spring 2024 / Tuesday, 2:00pm-5:00pm ET (updated January 7, 2024)

PLSC-550: Comparative Politics: Theory and Methodology

Daniel L. Tavana
Assistant Professor of Political Science
Pennsylvania State University

Department of Political Science
228 Pond Laboratory
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Email: tavana@psu.edu
Website: http://www.danieltavana.com

Office hours: Wednesday 1:30pm-3:30pm ET
https://danieltavana.youcanbook.me/

Course description

"Comparative Politics: Theory and Methodology" is the core seminar for the subfield of comparative politics in the Ph.D. in Political Science program. The course introduces students to the subfield, its intellectual evolution, and emerging questions and controversies. Throughout the semester, we will read and discuss both foundational theoretical work and more recent empirical research that applies existing theories to the developed and developing world. The primary goals of the course are to prepare students for a research career in comparative politics and to introduce doctoral candidates to the readings they will need to know for the comprehensive examination in comparative politics. The course will proceed thematically: each week we will discuss a subset of the relevant literature and focus our learning on a major theme, question, or debate. Important methodological approaches are addressed in the context of these substantive and theoretical works.

Objectives and learning outcomes

- Familiarize yourself with classical and canonical work in the field of comparative politics and develop an understanding of foundational puzzles, themes, and methods that have shaped the field.
- Engage with recent (empirical) scholarship in comparative politics and discover connections between this work and the major intellectual debates, methods, and research questions that have shaped the field.
- Understand the variety of methodologies that are used in the field, including quantitative statistical methodologies applied to cross-national and within-country datasets and qualitative methodologies such as elite interviews, archival research, and ethnography.
- Develop skills that will help prepare you to submit papers for publication and review articles in leading scientific journals in the field.
- Effectively communicate your ideas, reflections, and research findings to academic communities, policymakers, and industry experts; familiarize yourself with norms and procedures common in academic seminar settings.

Prerequisites

There are no formal prerequisites to enroll in this course. However, since we will read some more advanced work from political science, it will help to have some background in political science, comparative politics, area studies, and/or research design. Similarly, previous coursework in research design, quantitative/qualitative methods, and/or quantitative statistical analysis is strongly recommended. Students who are not currently enrolled in the Department of Political Science's PhD program must speak with the instructor before enrolling.

Class schedule

Week	Day	Date	Theme
1	Tue	9 Jan	Introduction & course overview
2	Tue	16 Jan	The comparative method & research design
3	Tue	23 Jan	Case selection, process tracing, & mixed methods
4	Tue	30 Jan	State formation
5	Tue	6 Feb	Democracy & political development
6	Tue	13 Feb	Democratization
7	Tue	20 Feb	Inequality & democratic backsliding
8	Tue	27 Feb	**Dissertation workshop**
9	Tue	12 Mar	Institutions & representation
10	Tue	19 Mar	Elections, party systems, & electoral competition
11	Tue	26 Mar	Distributive politics & clientelism
12	Tue	2 Apr	Authoritarianism
13	Tue	9 Apr	Revolutions, protest, & contentious politics
14	Tue	16 Apr	Identity & ethnic politics
15	Tue	23 Apr	**Final paper presentations**

Course requirements

Your grade will be based on the following items:

1. In-class participation: **25%**

   This is a seminar-style class that centers the lively (and respectful) exchange of ideas, reflections, and arguments. Students should come to class having done all the required readings. As students, it is your collective responsibility to contribute to our discussions. Your experience in this course will be more productive and intellectually rewarding if you participate. You are welcome to pose questions for discussion, as well: questions can be as generative as explanations. This is a class on **comparative** politics: students often come to this class with a diverse understanding of cases/contexts and other area-focused knowledge. You are welcome to draw connections between this knowledge and the readings where appropriate.

   After the first week, each class will be led by a student. If you are assigned to lead the class discussion, you will a) introduce the topic, b) situate the required readings in broader perspective, and c) open and lead a discussion of the readings with your peers. During our first class meeting, I will assign each student to lead one (1) or two (2) classes depending on enrollment. Before your assigned class, you must arrange to speak with me about your plans for managing the discussion. These meetings should take place no later than the day before our class meets (ideally on Monday). Discussion leaders must cover not more than five (5) of the required readings.

   The following rubric will be used to grade in-class participation:

   - Attendance: **40%**
   - Active participation: **20%**
   - Mastery of course material: **20%**
   - Discussion leadership: **20%**

   Students will receive a class participation grade three times over the course of the semester: after Week 5 (covering Weeks 1-5), after Week 10 (covering Weeks 6-10), and after Week 15 (covering Weeks 11-15).

2. Discussion questions (Canvas): **5%**

   We will supplement our in-class meetings with the submission of discussion questions on the course's Canvas website. Beginning in the second week, students will submit two (2) short questions to the "Discussions" Navigation page on Canvas. These questions are opportunities for you to ask questions and flag aspects of the readings that were most interesting or confusing and shape subsequent class discussions. Questions should mention at least 2 of the readings. They should be of broad interest to your peers, not longer than 50 words, and posted not later than 9:00am on the day of our class meeting. These questions will help set the agenda for our class meeting later that day. Discussion questions are graded as full or no credit. If they are posted on time and meet the above requirements, you will receive full credit.

   Note: If you have been assigned to lead the class discussion, you do not need to post any discussion questions. You do not need to submit discussion questions prior to the "Dissertation workshop" and "Final paper Presentations" sessions.

3. Critical reviews: **20%**

   Students are required to write four (4) critical reviews over the course of the semester. Students may pick the four (4) weeks they prefer to focus on (except the "Dissertation workshop" and "Final paper Presentations" sessions). Each review should be between 750 and 1,250 words in length (i.e., 1-2 single-spaced pages). These reviews are designed to help you showcase your critical reflections of the readings rather than the submission of summaries of course material. Each review should include a discussion of at least three (3) readings from that week. Reviews should include the following:

   - One (1) or two (2) major contributions of the reading. These contributions could include a new concept, theory, or method. What explains why an older piece has had an enduring effect on the field? Why do you think a more recent piece was published in a top journal? Being able to identify the strengths and major contributions of existing research is as important as identifying weaknesses.
   - One (1) or two (2) major limitations of the reading. These limitations could include some sort of important omission, misinterpretation of the evidence, or a design-related flaw. If you have a suggestion for how the research could be improved, you should include it here.
   - One (1) or two (2) connections that link the readings you discuss. The review should not move from one piece to the next: the writing should integrate all of the readings seamlessly. Connections between the readings can be made in several ways: highlighting areas where they converge or diverge, discussing how one piece builds on or updates another, or focusing on conceptual, theoretical, or methodological patterns.

   Critical reviews are graded on a check-plus, check, and check-minus scale. They should be emailed to me no later than 11:59pm on the day before class. Late submissions will not be counted or graded.

4. Literature analysis: **5%**

   You will write one (1) literature analysis over the course of the semester. This written assignment should be between 1,300 and 2,000 words in length (i.e., 3 single-spaced pages). You will pick any topic from any class (i.e., "State formation") or subtopic (i.e., "Process tracing"). For the topic you choose, review past issues of the *American Political Science Review* for all published articles on the topic in the following three (3) decades: 1980s (1981-1990), 1990s (1991-2000), 2000s (2001-2010). For each decade, please pick one article to focus on. Your analysis should highlight the major contributions and weaknesses of each article (i.e., one page for each article you choose). Please specify which reading for each decade you have chosen at the beginning of the review. Literature analyses are due no later than Monday, April 8.

5. Dissertation presentation: **5%**

   Halfway through the course (Week 8), we will hold a workshop on dissertations in comparative politics. For this class meeting, you will select and read a dissertation that has been written in the last five years (i.e., defended after January 1, 2019). You can pick any dissertation you want. Ideally, the dissertation you select should cover a topic you are interested in. For our class meeting, you will prepare a 12-minute (conference style) presentation on the dissertation and highlight the core arguments and evidence (i.e., data and methods used) and discuss the dissertation's strengths and weaknesses. You must let me know which dissertation you have selected no later than Monday, February 12.

6. Final paper: **35%**

   Each student will complete a final paper assignment. Students may choose from one of the following three options:

   - **Critical review** (4,000-5,000 words): Critical reviews are similar to those described above. They must be based on a specific weekly topic and are designed to encourage students to dive more deeply into the topic by reviewing books and articles not included on the syllabus. If you write a critical review in lieu of a final paper, you must choose a week different from those covered in your earlier critical reviews. Your review should connect the literature to areas you are interested in exploring further in your own research.
   - **Research proposal** (3,000-4,000 words): Proposals should include a well-designed research question, a literature review, an argument (with hypotheses and/or observable implications), and a proposed research design. Ideally, these proposals will focus on projects that you will continue working on after the semester ends.
   - **Research paper** (5,000-6,000 words): Students in their second year or above are encouraged to select this option (especially students who are specializing in comparative politics as their primary field). Research papers require original analysis and, by the end of the semester, should be suitable for submission to a workshop, conference, or, in some cases, a scientific journal.

   Students writing research proposals or research papers must submit their proposed topic to me in writing (by email) no later than Monday, February 19. All students must submit a final paper prospectus—regardless of which option they select—by Monday, March 18. The prospectus should include an abstract, outline, and proposed list of references. Final papers are due no later than Monday, April 29.

7. Final paper presentation: **5%**

   At our last class meeting, each student will prepare a 12-minute (conference style) presentation on their final paper.

Assignment schedule

Week	Day	Date	Assignment	Percent
7	Mon	19 Feb	Final paper topic	
8	Tue	27 Feb	Dissertation presentation	5
10	Mon	18 Mar	Final paper prospectus	
13	Mon	8 Apr	Literature analysis	5
15	Tue	23 Apr	Final paper presentation	5
	Mon	29 April	Final paper	35

Grading

All assignments will be graded on a 100 point scale. All letter grades (including the final course grade) will be calculated using the following scale:

		A	100-93%	A-	92-90%
B+	89-87%	B	86-83%	B-	82-80%
C+	79-77%	C	76-70%		
		D	69-60%		
		F	<60%		

If you would like to dispute the grade you receive on an assignment, you must wait at least two (2) full days after you receive your grade to submit a grade dispute. If you plan to dispute your grade, you must do so in writing via email. The email must contain a detailed explanation for each item you think was incorrectly marked. Where applicable, you must reference specific passages in course readings and explain your logic. I will then review the dispute and issue a decision within one (1) week. Any dispute must be sent not later than two (2) weeks after receiving the grade. Disputes submitted after this time will not be accepted.

Course policies and procedures

Attendance

This class will be taught in-person every Tuesday from 2:00pm to 5:00pm ET. Attendance is required at each meeting. If you cannot attend class due to an extracurricular activity, athletic event, or religious holiday, please notify me in the first two (2) weeks of class or at least a week prior so we can make alternative arrangements if necessary. Unexcused absences will result in a reduction of your class participation and attendance grade.

Course communication

We will use Canvas to communicate with each other throughout the course. The course website (psu.instructure.com/courses/2300112) contains the syllabus, course readings, and the "Discussions" navigation page where you can submit questions for discussion before each class meeting.

If you have a quick or non-substantive question about the course, email is the best way to reach me. I typically respond to email messages quickly, but if you do not hear back from me within 48 hours, please follow up with a reminder. Students are encouraged to read Laura Portwood-Stacer's article on email communication: "How to Email Your Professor (without being annoying AF)."

To the best of your ability, avoid sending last-minute emails prior to assignment due dates. I may not be able to help you. Please familiarize yourself with important dates, add them to your calendars, and give yourself enough time to work on course assignments. I realize this may not always be possible. If you have questions about course material or your performance, please make an appointment to speak with me during office hours. If you cannot meet during office hours, appointments can be made during weekdays with some notice.

Deadlines, late assignments, and incomplete grades

Unless otherwise noted, assignments must be submitted by 11:59pm EST on the date they are due. Late assignments will face a ten (10) point penalty for each day late without a prior extension. If you have a personal problem that precludes you from completing coursework on time, please send me an email immediately. A doctor's note, or note from a dean, may be requested. Please familiarize yourself with the university's policies for incomplete work. **Please note: In order to receive a passing grade for this class, all course requirements must be completed by the end of the semester.**

Laptops, mobile devices and technology

You may use your laptop to take notes during class meetings. Laptops can be a useful learning tool, but they can also distract you (and others). Before the start of class, please silence your mobile devices, disable notifications, and close applications that will prevent you from participating actively during class meetings. Audio and video recording devices are prohibited unless previously approved by Student Disability Resources (SDR) in advance. This will encourage the development of a learning environment conducive to the free and open exchange of ideas without fear that student and faculty contributions will be reproduced or distributed without consent. This policy applies to class meetings, office hours, and other informal or group meetings outside of scheduled class meetings.

Collaboration

Course assignments present many opportunities to work together and share ideas. Students are encouraged to collaborate and consult readings and resources not included on this syllabus. However, as with any course that includes coding, computer programming, and data analysis, there is a clear distinction between permissible collaboration and unacceptable copying or plagiarism. Assignments are designed to allow you to reach your own understanding of the question or problem and discover a solution. Conversations with your professor(s), instructional staff, and classmates are acceptable. But when writing code, reactions, and other written assignments, these conversations are no longer appropriate. The code and written work must be your own work. Under no circumstances should you copy code. Incorporating someone else's code into your work in any form is plagiarism. Sharing code in digital form with your classmates is especially prohibited: you should not e-mail your code to anyone. Please take this policy seriously. It supplements (and does not replace) the Penn State Code of Conduct described below. If you have any questions, please speak with me before submitting your work.

Reading and studying

Students are expected to complete the assigned readings before each class meeting and to contribute to class discussions. Students are not expected to understand every theoretical or technical detail that appears in each reading, but you should read each piece carefully. Reading academic or scientific articles can be difficult. The following guides present different approaches that will help you identify the main ideas, key concepts, and central arguments in each reading.

- "How to Read Political Science: A Guide in Four Steps," by Amelia Hoover Green
- "How to Read a (Quantitative) Journal Article," by Greta Krippner
- "Reading and Understanding Political Science," by Leanne C. Powner
- "Reading a Journal Article," by Chad Raymond
- "How to Read in College," by Timothy Burke
- "Beyond the Abstract: Reading for Meaning in Academia," by Jessica Calarco

You may also want to consult this Vox guide on how to study smarter: "Re-reading is inefficient. Here are 8 tips for studying smarter." For more information, please consult the university's learning resources.

Inclement weather

According to updated university guidance for students, faculty and staff, "In the event that normal operations at a Penn State location are disrupted due to snow or other weather or emergency conditions, individuals are urged to avoid coming to campus, if possible, and those who must visit campus should remain alert and avoid sections of campus that may be covered in snow or ice." Class cancellations will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. Please note that in the event class is cancelled, in-person meetings cannot be moved to synchronous remote meetings.

Academic integrity

The Penn State Code of Conduct defines academic integrity as: "the pursuit of scholarly activity in an open, honest and responsible manner. Academic integrity is a basic guiding principle for all academic activity at The Pennsylvania State University, and all members of the University community are expected to act in accordance with this principle. Consistent with this expectation, students should act with personal integrity, respect other students' dignity, rights and property, and help create and maintain an environment in which all can succeed through the fruits of their efforts."

Violations of academic integrity "include, but are not limited to, copying, plagiarism, fabrication of information or citations, facilitation of acts of academic dishonesty by others, unauthorized possession of examinations, submitting work of another person or work previously used without informing the instructor, and tampering with the academic work of other students." Please familiarize yourself with these policies. Students are strongly encouraged to consult the College of the Liberal Arts' academic integrity resources.

Committment to an equitable & inclusive learning environment

Penn State adheres to the philosophy that all community members should enjoy a learning environment free from harassment, sexual misconduct, discrimination, or violence of any kind. If you encounter sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, sexual assault, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, age, national origin, ancestry, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability, please contact the Office of Educational Equity or the Office of Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response.

Counseling & psychological services

Many students at Penn State face personal, emotional, or psychological challenges or difficulties that may interfere with their academic progress, emotional well-being, or social or professional development. Counseling & Psychological Services (CAPS) offers students a variety of confidential services provided by trained staff who welcome all students and embrace an approach grounded in an understanding of different cultural and religious backgrounds and a respect for differences in race, color, religion, age, national origin, ancestry, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, and disability. CAPS services include wellness and self-help options; group, individual, and couples counseling; crisis intervention; psychiatric services; virtual services; and community education and outreach services for the University community. If you need immediate support you may call CAPS at +1 814 863 0395 (M-F, 8:00am-5:00pm), call the Penn State Crisis Line at +1 877 229 6400 (24/7), or text "LIONS" to the Crisis Text Line at 741741 (24/7).

Disability accommodation & accessibility services

I am committed to ensuring your experience in this class is an enjoyable one. Students with disabilities that have been documented by Student Disability Resources (SDR) will be appropriately accommodated. The primary mission of Student Disability Resources (SDR) is to "explore individualized reasonable accommodations for equal access and full participation in academic pursuits; seek interactions with peers or study space; connect with on- and off-campus resources; and promote disability as an important aspect of diversity." In order to receive consideration for reasonable accommodation, students should inform SDR as soon as possible of their needs. If you have not yet contacted SDR but have a temporary health condition or permanent disability that requires accommodation, please do so during the first week of the course. Currently, students can choose either in-person or virtual appointments with SDR staff. Please call SDR at +1 814 863 1807 to schedule an appointment or email upsdr@psu.edu with any questions. SDR will provide you with a letter that will describe the accommodations I will be able to make. You must follow this process for every semester that you request reasonable accommodation.

Course materials and schedule

Introduction & course overview
9 January / Week 1

Required reading:

① Elster, Jon. 2007. *Explaining Social Behavior: More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 7-66 in "Part 1: Explanation and Mechanisms."

② Almond, Gabriel A. and Stephen J. Genco. 1977. "Clouds, Clocks, and the Study of Politics." *World Politics* 29(4): 489-522.

③ Kohli, Atul, Peter Evans, Peter J. Katzenstein, Adam Przeworski, Susanne Hoeber, James C. Scott, and Theda Skocpol. 1995. "The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium." *World Politics* 48(1): 1-49.

④ Przeworksi, Adam. 2007. "Is the Science of Comparative Politics Possible?" In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, eds. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 147-171.

⑤ Ahram, Ariel I., Patrick Köllner, and Rudra Sil. 2018. "Comparative Area Studies: What It Is, What It Can Do." In *Comparative Area Studies: Methodological Rationales and Cross-Regional Applications*, eds. Ariel I. Ahram, Patrick Köllner, and Rudra Sil. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-26.

⑥ Wilson, Matthew. 2017. "Trends in Political Science Research and the Progress of Comparative Politics." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(4): 979-984.

⑦ Boix, Carles and Susan C. Stokes. 2007. "Introduction." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, eds. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-23. (skim)

The comparative method & research design
16 January / Week 2

Required reading:

① Mill, John Stuart. 1970. "Types of Theorizing." In *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods*, eds. Amitai Etzioni and Fredric L. DuBow. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, pp. 205-213.

② Przeworski, Adam and Henry Teune. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry.* New York: Wiley-Interscience. Read pp. 17-30 in "Chapter One: Comparative Research and Social Science Theory" and pp. 31-46 in "Chapter Two: Research Designs."

③ Skocpol, Theda and Margaret Somers. 1980. "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22(2): 174-197.

④ Ragin, Charles and David Zaret. 1983. "Theory and Method in Comparative Research: Two Strategies." *Social Forces* 61(3): 731-754.

⑤ Collier, David. 1993. "The Comparative Method." In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, ed. Ada W. Finifter. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association, pp. 105-119.

⑥ Lieberson, Stanley. 1994. "More on the Uneasy Case for Using Mill-Type Methods in Small-N Comparative Studies." *Social Forces* 72(4): 1225-1237.

⑦ Schaffer, Frederic Charles. 2021. "Two Ways to Compare." In *Rethinking Comparison*, eds. Erica S. Simmons and Nicholas Rush Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 47-63.

Case selection, process tracing, & mixed methods
23 January / Week 3

Required reading:

① Gerring, John. 2007. "The Case Study: What it is and What it Does." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, eds. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 90-122.

② George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Read pp. 3-36 in "Chapter 1 - Case Studies and Theory Development," pp. 65-124 in "Part II - How to Do Case Studies," and pp. 151-179 in "Chapter 8 - Comparative Methods: Controlled Comparison and Within- Case Analysis."

③ Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review* 99(3): 435-452.

④ Sil, Rudra. 2018. "Triangulating Area Studies, Not Just Methods: How Cross-Regional Comparison Aids Qualitative and Mixed-Method Research." In *Comparative Area Studies: Methodological Rationales and Cross-Regional Applications*, eds. Ariel I. Ahram, Patrick Köllner, and Rudra Sil. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 225-246.

⑤ Pepinsky, Thomas B. 2019. "The Return of the Single-Country Study." *Annual Review of Political Science* 22(1): 187-203.

⑥ Collier, David. 2011. "Understanding Process Tracing." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 44(4), 823-830.

⑦ Ricks, Jacob I. and Amy H. Liu. 2018. "Process-Tracing Research Designs: A Practical Guide." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(4): 842-846.

State formation
30 January / Week 4

Required reading:

① Almond, Gabriel A. 1988. "The Return to the State." *The American Political Science Review* 82(3): 853-874.

② Tilly, Charles. 1990. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, Inc. Read pp. 1-37 in "Cities and States in World History" and pp. 67-95 in "How War Made States, and Vice Versa."

③ Herbst, Jeffrey Herbst. 1990. *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Read pp. 11-31 in "The Challenge of State-Building in Africa" and pp. 35-57 in "Power and Space in Precolonial Africa."

④ Olson, Mancur. 1993. "Dictatorship, Democracy, and Development." *American Political Science Review* 87(3): 567-576.

⑤ Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2020. "Beyond War and Contracts: The Medieval and Religious Roots of the European State." *Annual Review of Political Science* 23(1): 19-36.

⑥ Slater, Dan. 2008. "Can Leviathan be Democratic? Competitive Elections, Robust Mass Politics, and State Infrastructural Power." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 43(3-4): 252-272.

⑦ Driscoll, Jesse. 2015. Warlords and Coalition Politics in Post-Soviet States. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 1-29 in "Revisionist History."

Democracy & political development
6 February / Week 5

Required reading:

① Moore, Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World.* Boston: Beacon Press. Read pp. 413-432 in " Chapter 7. The Democratic Route to Modern Society," pp. 433-452 in "Chapter 8. Revolution from Above and Fascism," and pp. 453-483 in "Chapter 9. The Peasants and Revolution."

② Collier, David and Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49(3): 430-451.

③ Bendix, Richard. 1980. *Kings or People: Power and the Mandate to Rule.* Berkeley: University of California Press. Read pp. 247-272 in "Transformations of Western European Societies in the Sixteenth Century."

④ Schmitter, Philippe C. and Terry Lynn Karl. 1991. "What Democracy Is... and Is Not." *Journal of Democracy* 2(3): 75-88.

⑤ Bowman, Kirk, Fabrice Lehoucq, and James Mahoney. 2005. "Measuring Political Democracy: Case Expertise, Data Adequacy, and Central America." *Comparative Political Studies* 38(8): 939-970.

⑥ Lipset, Seymour M. 1959. "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy." *The American Political Science Review* 53(1) 69-105.

⑦ Przeworski, Adam and Fernando Limongi. 1997. "Modernization: Theories and Facts." *World Politics* 49(2) 155-183.

Democratization
13 February / Week 6

Required reading:

① Rustow, Dankwart. 1970. "Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model." *Comparative Politics* 2(3): 337-363.

② O'Donnell, Guillermo and Philippe C. Schmitter. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. Read pp. 1-72.

③ Boix, Carles and Susan C. Stokes. 2003. "Endogenous Democratization." *World Politics* 55(4): 517-549.

④ Boix, Carles. 2003. *Democracy and Redistribution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 1-18 in "Introduction." (skim)

⑤ Ziblatt, Daniel. 2006. "How Did Europe Democratize?" *World Politics* 58(2) 311-338.

⑥ Acemoglu, Daron and James A. Robinson. 2006. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 15-46 in "Our Argument" and pp. 48-87 in "What Do We Know about Democracy?"

⑦ Teele, Dawn Langan. 2018. *Forging the Franchise: The Political Origins of the Women's Vote*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Read pp. 1-14 in "Introduction" and pp. 15-48 in "Democratization and the Case of Women."

Inequality & democratic backsliding
20 February / Week 7

Required reading:

① Slater, Dan. 2013. "Democratic Careening." *World Politics* 65(4), 729-763.

② Levitsky, Steven and Daniel Ziblatt. 2018. *How Democracies Die*. New York: Crown. Read pp. 11-32 in "Fateful Alliances," pp. 33-52 in "Gatekeeping in America," pp. 176-203 in "Trump's First Year: An Authoritarian Report Card," and pp. 204-232 in "Saving Democracy."

③ Waldner, David and Ellen Lust. 2018. "Unwelcome Change: Coming to Terms with Democratic Backsliding." *Annual Review of Political Science* 21(1): 93-113.

④ Svolik, Milan. 2020. "When Polarization Trumps Civic Virtue: Partisan Conflict and the Subversion of Democracy by Incumbents." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 15(1): 3-31.

⑤ Kaufman, Robert R. and Stephan Haggard. 2019. "Democratic Decline in the United States: What Can We Learn from Middle-Income Backsliding?" *Perspectives on Politics* 17(2): 417-432.

⑥ Little, Andrew and Anne Meng. 2024. "Measuring Democratic Backsliding." *PS: Political Science & Politics* (forthcoming).

Dissertation workshop
27 February / Week 8

No required reading.

Institutions & representation
12 March / Week 9

Required reading:

① Manin, Bernard, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes. 1999. "Introduction." In *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*, eds. Bernard Manin, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-26.

② Manin, Bernard, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes. 1999. "Elections and Representation." In *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*, eds. Bernard Manin, Adam Przeworski, and Susan C. Stokes. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 29-54.

③ Przeworski, Adam. 2004. "Institutions Matter?" *Government and Opposition* 39(4) 527-540.

④ Thelen, Kathleen and Sven Steinmo. 1992. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics." In *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*, eds. Sven Steinmo, Kathleen Thelen, and Frank Longstreth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-32.

⑤ Powell, G. Bingham. 2000. *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Read pp. 3-19 in "Elections as Instruments of Democracy" and pp. 20-43 in "Constitutional Designs as Visions of Majoritarian or Proportional Democracy."

⑥ Powell, Jr., G. Bingham. 2004. "Political Representation in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7(1) 273-296.

⑦ Greif, Avner and David D. Laitin. 2004. "A Theory of Endogenous Institutional Change." *American Political Science Review* 98(4) 633-652.

⑧ Dancygier, Rafaela, Karl-Oskar Lindgren, Pär Nyman, and Kåre Vernby. 2021. "Candidate Supply is not a Barrier to Immigrant Representation: A Case-Control Study." *American Journal of Political Science* 65(3): 683-698.

Elections, party systems, & electoral competition
19 March / Week 10

Required reading:

① Lipset, Seymour M. and Stein Rokkan. 1967. "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments: An Introduction." In *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives*, eds. Seymour M. Lipset and Stein Rokkan. New York: Free Press, pp. 1-64.

② Sartori, Giovanni. 1976. *Parties and Party Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 119-130 in "The numerical criterion" and pp. 131-200 in "Competitive systems."

③ Przeworski, Adam and John Sprague. 1986. *Paper Stones: A History of Electoral Socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Read pp. 15-28 in "" and pp. 29-56 in "The Dilemma of Electoral Socialism."

④ Cox, Gary. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 3-12 in "Introduction," pp. 13-33 in "Duverger's propositions," and pp. 37-68 in "On electoral systems."

⑤ 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.

⑥ LaPalombara, Joseph and Myron Weiner. 1990. "The Origin of Political Parties." In *The West European Party System*, ed. Peter Mair. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 25-30.

⑦ Kirchheimer, Otto. 1990. "The Catch-all Party." In *The West European Party System*, ed. Peter Mair. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 50-60.

⑧ Sartori, Giovanni. 1990. "A Typology of Party Systems." In *The West European Party System*, ed. Peter Mair. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 316-350.

Distributive politics & clientelism
26 March / Week 11

Required reading:

① Stokes, Susan C. and Thad Dunning, Marcelo Nazareno, and Valeria Brusco. 2013. *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 3-27 in "Between Clients and Citizens: Puzzles and Concepts in the Study of Distributive Politics," pp. 31-74 in "Gaps Between Theory and Fact," pp. 75-95 in "A Theory of Broker-Mediated Distribution," pp. 96-129 in "Testing the Theory of Broker-Mediated Distribution," pp. 130-151 in "A Disjunction Between the Strategies of Leaders and Brokers?," and skim pp. 200-242 in "What Killed Vote Buying in Britain and the United States?"

② Wantchekon, Leonard. 2003. "Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin." *World Politics* 55(3): 399-422.

③ Auyero Javier. 2000. *Poor People's Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press. Read pp. 152-181 in "The 'Clientelist' Viewpoint."

④ Hicken, Allen and Noah L. Nathan. 2020. "Clientelism's Red Herrings: Dead Ends and New Directions in the Study of Nonprogrammatic Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 23(1): 277-294.

Authoritarianism
2 April / Week 12

Required reading:

① Svolik, Milan. 2012. *The Politics of Authoritarian Rule*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 1-17 in "Introduction: The Anatomy of Dictatorship" and pp. 19-45 in "The World of Authoritarian Politics."

② Wedeen, Lisa. 1999. *Ambiguities of Domination: Politics, Rhetoric, and Symbols in Contemporary Syria*. 1st edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Read pp. 1-31 in "Believing in Spectacles" and pp. 143-160 in "Complicating Compliance."

③ Levitsky, Steven and Lucan A. Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 3-36 in "Introduction" and skim pp. 37-83 in "Explaining Competitive Authoritarian Regime Trajectories: International Linkage and the Organizational Power of Incumbents."

④ Blaydes, Lisa. 2011. *Elections and Distributive Politics in Mubarak's Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 1-25 in "Introduction."

⑤ Davenport, Christian. 2007. "State Repression and Political Order." *Annual Review of Political Science* 10(1): 1-23.

⑥ Gandhi, Jennifer and Adam Przeworski. 2007. "Authoritarian Institutions and the Survival of Autocrats." *Comparative Political Studies* 40(11): 1279-1301.

⑦ Gandhi, Jennifer and Elvin Ong. 2019. "Committed or Conditional Democrats? Opposition Dynamics in Electoral Autocracies." *American Journal of Political Science* 63(4): 948-963.

Revolutions, protest, & contentious politics
9 April / Week 13

Required reading:

① Kuran, Timur. 1991. "Now Out of Never: The Element of Surprise in the East European Revolution of 1989." *World Politics* 44(1): 7-48.

② Olson, Mancur. 1971. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Read pp. 5-52 in "A Theory of Groups and Organizations."

③ Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 29-42 in "Modular Collective Action", pp. 71-90 in "Political Opportunities and Constraints," pp. 91-105 in "Acting Contentiously," and pp. 141-160 in "Cycles of Contention."

④ Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 1-18 in "Explaining Social Revolutions: Alternatives to Existing Theories" and pp. 47-111 in "Old-Regime States in Crisis."

⑤ Goldstone, Jack A. 2001. "Toward a Fourth Generation of Revolutionary Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4(1): 139-187.

⑥ Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Read pp. 17-44 in "Domination, Acting, and Fantasy," pp. 45-69 in "The Public Transcript as a Respectable Performance," and skim pp. 183-201 in "The Infrapolitics of Subordinate Groups."

⑦ McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6): 1212-1241.

Identity & ethnic politics
16 April / Week 14

Required reading:

① Weber, Max. 1996. "The Origins of Ethnic Groups." In *Ethnicity*, eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 35-40.

② Brubaker, Rogers and Frederick Cooper. 2000. "Beyond 'Identity'." *Theory and Society* 29(1): 1-47.

③ Chandra, Kanchan. 2006. "What Is Ethnic Identity and Does It Matter?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 9(1): 397-424.

④ Smith, Anthony D. 1996. "Chosen Peoples." In *Ethnicity*, eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 189-197.

⑤ Hechter, Michael. 1996. "Ethnicity and Rational Choice Theory." In *Ethnicity*, eds. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 90-98.

⑥ Wimmer, Andreas. 2013. *Ethnic Boundary Making: Institutions, Power, Networks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Read pp. 1-15 in "Introduction," pp. 16-43 in "Herder's Heritage," and pp. 44-78 in "Conflict and Consensus."

⑦ Posner, Daniel. 2005. *Institutions and Ethnic Politics in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 1-10 in "Introduction: Institutions and Ethnic Politics."

Final paper presentations
23 April / Week 15

No required reading.