

Title of the course	COMPARATIVE POLITICS
Instructor	Ekim Arbatli
Title of the Academic Programme	BA in Political Science and World Politics
Course Overview	This course offers an introduction to the core concepts in comparative politics and their empirical applications. It consists of two principal parts: the first six topics focus on democracies, while the second six weeks are dedicated to authoritarian and hybrid regimes. In the first half of the course, we will discuss the institutional variety within democratic regimes, and the main actors such as citizens, political parties, and interests groups. The second part of this course is dedicated to the study of authoritarian regime dynamics, the problem of power-sharing and control, as well as thematic issues such as rentier states and political violence. Finally, the course compares democracies and autocracies across multiple outcomes. Comparative Politics familiarizes students with the foundations of regime-level and institutional comparisons, and enhances their understanding on the relationship between fundamental concepts and their various empirical manifestations.
Readings / Indicative Learning Resources	<u>Mandatory texts:</u> Clark, W. R., Golder, M., & Golder, S. N. (2017). <i>Principles of comparative politics</i>. CQ Press. Lijphart, A. (2012). <i>Patterns of democracy: Government forms and performance in thirty-six countries</i>. Yale University Press. Newton, K., & Van Deth, J. W. (2016). <i>Foundations of comparative politics: democracies of the modern world</i>. Cambridge University Press. Svolik, M. (2012). <i>The politics of authoritarian rule</i>. Cambridge University Press.
Teaching and Learning Methods	The course comprises of 13 lectures and 12 seminars. The following teaching methods are involved: Lectures: - Multimedia support: all lectures are followed by multimedia presentation (slides) with textual and visual materials; - Interactive lectures: interactive elements (quizzes, surveys) during the lecture are used. Seminars (tutorials): - Debates and open discussions based on the mandatory readings; - Mini-group work (collective tasks in class); - Case analysis individually or collectively.

Content and Structure of the Course		
Week №	Topic	
1	Defining and measuring democracy	
2	Presidential and parliamentary democracies	
3	Social cleavages, party systems, electoral systems	
4	Institutional veto players (federalism, bicameralism, constitutionalism)	
5	Consequences of institutional design in democracies	
6	Interest groups and social movements	
7	Authoritarian regimes and the problems of authoritarian rule	
8	Authoritarian power-sharing and selectorate theory	
9	Civil-military relations, coups, and coup-proofing	
10	Authoritarian control: cooptation, legitimation, repression, media	
11	Resource curse and rentier states	
12	Political violence: civil war, ethnic conflict, terrorism	
13	Democracy vs autocracy: does it make a difference?	
Grading Scheme		The assessment happens in four major components. During the term, students are expected to submit a position paper related to one of the topics (30%) and an analysis of a politically relevant movie chosen from the list offered by the instructor (20%). The regular, consistent, and constructive participation of students is graded by the seminar instructors (10%). The course is concluded with an exam (40%) reflecting on the students' capacity to identify and appropriately address academically salient problems and questions. as well as assessing their familiarity with the core concepts introduced by the course and the mandatory readings.
		The grade (G) is calculated as an average, based on the following equation:
		$G = 0,3 \cdot G_{PP} + 0,2 \cdot G_{MA} + 0,1 \cdot G_{PA} + 0,4 \cdot G_{EX}, \text{ where:}$
		G _{PP} - grade for position paper
		G _{MA} - movie analysis
	G _{PA} - grade for class participation	
	G _{EX} - grade for final exam	

WEEKLY COURSE PLAN

1. Defining and measuring democracy

What is democracy? What are the main criteria for conceptualizing and measuring this concept? We begin with an exploration of these questions, and look at some of the main debates in the field about the role of competition, participation, and institutions.

Lecture reading:

- Clark, Golder & Golder, Chapter 5 (pp. 112-157).
- Dahl, R. (1989). *Democracy and its critics*. Chapters 1-5 (pp. 1-82).

Seminar reading:

- Schmitter, P. C., & Karl, T. L. (1991). What democracy is... and is not. *Journal of democracy*, 2(3), 75-88.
- Munck, G. L., & Verkuilen, J. (2002). Conceptualizing and measuring democracy: Evaluating alternative indices. *Comparative political studies*, 35(1), 5-34.
- Lindberg, S. I., Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., & Teorell, J. (2014). V-Dem: A new way to measure democracy. *Journal of Democracy*, 25(3), 159-169.

2. Presidential and parliamentary democracies

This week is dedicated to the two major macro-level arrangements in democratic regimes: presidential versus parliamentary systems. We discuss their origins and core features, their key differences, the conditions leading various countries to choose one or another, and finally their probability of democratic survival.

Lecture reading:

- Clark, Golder & Golder, Chapter 12 (pp. 453-520).
- Lijphart, A. (2012). Chapters 2 and 3.

Seminar reading:

- Martin, L. W., & Stevenson, R. T. (2001). Government formation in parliamentary democracies. *American Journal of Political Science*, 33-50.
- Shugart, M.S. (1993). Of presidents and parliaments. *East European Constitutional Review* 2: 30-32.
- Siaroff, A. (2003). Comparative presidencies: The inadequacy of the presidential, semi-presidential and parliamentary distinction. *European journal of political research*, 42(3), 287-312.

3. Social cleavages, party systems, electoral systems

Elections are the backbone of a democracy, providing representation for different social cleavages within the population. Political parties organize these cleavages to compete in elections, attain power, and implement their public policies. Electoral systems regulate this competition, most of the time balancing between the aims of inclusion and fair competition. In this lecture, we discuss how cleavages, party systems, and electoral systems are linked to each other. We also look at the potential consequences of different electoral designs on party systems and representation.

Lecture reading:

- Lijphart, A. (2012). Chapter 3.
- Clark, Golder & Golder, Chapters 13 and 14. (pp. 521-644)

Seminar reading:

- Lipset, S. M., & Rokkan, S. (1967). *Cleavage structures, party systems, and voter alignments: an introduction* (pp. 1-64). New York: Free Press.
- Kitschelt, H. (2011). Party systems. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*.
- Katz, R. S., & Mair, P. (1995). Changing models of party organization and party democracy: the emergence of the cartel party. *Party politics*, 1(1), 5-28.

4. Institutional veto players (federalism, bicameralism, constitutionalism)

Institutional veto players are individual or collective actors whose agreement is necessary for a change in the political status quo. Every democratic polity has a different set of such actors depending on the constitutional design. We will investigate various types of veto players such as federal units and chambers of parliament. We will also explore the different socioeconomic and political outcomes associated with them.

Lecture reading:

- Clark, Golder & Golder, Chapter 15. (pp. 645-700)
- Lijphart (2012). Patterns of Democracy, Chapter 10, 11, 12.
- Tsebelis, G. (2000). Veto players and institutional analysis. *Governance*, 13(4), 441-474.

Seminar reading:

- Beramendi, P. (2007). Federalism (Chapter 31). *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*.
- Elazar, D. J. (1997). Contrasting unitary and federal systems. *International political science review*, 18(3), 237-251.
- Uhr, J. (2006) Bicameralism (Chapter 24). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*.
- Tsebelis, G. (1999). Veto players and law production in parliamentary democracies: An empirical analysis. *American political science review*, 591-608.

5. Consequences of institutional design in democracies

Are some types of institutional design better than others? The answer to this question usually depends on the outcome of interest, such as regime survival, democratic stability, rapid economic development, or the effective management of ethnic tensions. This week, we compare the advantages and disadvantages of each institutional design across different contexts.

Lecture reading:

- Lijphart, A. (2012). Chapters 14,15,16.
- Clark, Golder & Golder, Chapter 16. (pp. 701-781)

Seminar reading:

- Linz, J.J. 'The Perils of Presidentialism'.
- Cheibub, J.A. and F. Limongi 'Democratic Institutions and Regime Survival'
- Erk, J. and L. Anderson 'The Paradox of Federalism: Does Self-Rule Accommodate or Exacerbate Ethnic Divisions?'
- Gerring, J., Thacker, S. C., & Moreno, C. (2009). Are parliamentary systems better?. *Comparative political studies*, 42(3), 327-359.

6. Interest groups and social movements

In a democracy, citizens do not exclusively seek to represent their interests through institutions: political contention is also a valid option. Interest group and social movements can play a critical role in political participation. People can use the power of numbers to organize, formulate demands, and

push politicians into action. This week, we discuss interest groups and social movements as independent political actors and examine how the strategies they use to achieve their aims.

Lecture reading:

- Newton and Deth (2010). Pressure groups and social movements (Chapter 10). pp. 198-222.
- Della Porta and Diani (2006). *Social Movements: An Introduction*. Chapter 2.

Seminar reading:

- Tarrow, S and Tilly, C. (2007). Contentious Politics and Social Movements. *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. p. 435-460.
- Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age*. John Wiley & Sons. (pp. 1-20, 95-112, 220-318)
- Offe, C. (2019). New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics (1985). In: Institutionen, Normen, Bürgertugenden. Ausgewählte Schriften von Claus Offe, vol 3. Springer VS, Wiesbaden.

7. Authoritarian regimes and the problems of authoritarian rule

There are multiple ways to classify authoritarian regimes. We will focus on the idea of ‘support coalitions’. Secondly, the following questions will be introduced: What are the fundamental problems of authoritarian rule? What are the potential sources of conflict? The lecture will introduce the two fundamental problems of authoritarian rule for dictators: a) Authoritarian power-sharing, and b) Authoritarian control.

Lecture reading:

- Clark, Golder & Golder, Chapter 10. (pp. 349-384)
- Svobik, M. (2012). The Politics of Authoritarian Rule. Chapters 1 and 2.

Seminar reading:

- Geddes, B., Wright, J., & Frantz, E. (2014). Autocratic breakdown and regime transitions: A new data set. *Perspectives on politics*, 12(2), 313-331.
- Pepinsky, T. (2014). The institutional turn in comparative authoritarianism. *British Journal of Political Science*, 44(3), 631-653.
- Slater, D. (2003). Iron cage in an iron fist: Authoritarian institutions and the personalization of power in Malaysia. *Comparative Politics*, 81-101.

8. Authoritarian power-sharing and the selectorate theory

This lecture will expand on the idea of authoritarian power-sharing and how intra-elite conflicts get resolved under different authoritarian regimes. The concept of winning coalitions and the selectorate theory are introduced.

Lecture reading:

- Clark, Golder & Golder, Chapter 10. (pp. 384-403)
- Svobik, M. (2012). The Politics of Authoritarian Rule. Chapter 3.

Seminar reading:

- Gandhi, J., & Przeworski, A. (2007). Authoritarian institutions and the survival of autocrats. *Comparative political studies*, 40(11), 1279-1301.
- Magaloni, B. (2008). Credible power-sharing and the longevity of authoritarian rule. *Comparative political studies*, 41(4-5), 715-741.

- Gallagher, M. E., & Hanson, J. K. (2015). Power tool or dull blade? Selectorate theory for autocracies. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18.

9. Civil-military relations, coups, and coup-proofing

Every authoritarian leader has to acknowledge, to varying degrees, the possibility of a coup against his rule. Most of the time, these coups are attempted by the military actors within the regime. This lecture focuses on the theories discussing the reasons and propensity of coups in different regimes, and the coup-proofing strategies adopted by leaders to secure their survival.

Lecture reading:

- Londregan, J. B., & Poole, K. T. (1990). Poverty, the coup trap, and the seizure of executive power. *World politics*, 42(2), 151-183.
- Powell, J. (2012). Determinants of the Attempting and Outcome of Coups d'état. *Journal of Conflict resolution*, 56(6), 1017-1040.
- Arbatli, E. (2020). Armies in Politics: The Domestic Determinants of Military Coup Behavior. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*.

Seminar reading:

- Belkin, A., & Schofer, E. (2003). Toward a structural understanding of coup risk. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 47(5), 594-620.
- Thyne, C. L., & Powell, J. M. (2016). Coup d'état or coup d'Autocracy? How coups impact democratization, 1950–2008. *Foreign policy analysis*, 12(2), 192-213.
- Sudduth, J. K. (2017). Coup risk, coup-proofing and leader survival. *Journal of Peace Research*, 54(1), 3-15.

10. Authoritarian control

As discussed in Week 7, the second fundamental problem for the authoritarian leader is the control of the masses from revolting against the regime. For this purpose, the autocrats use a mixture of three strategies: cooptation, legitimation, and repression. The lecture will explain these strategies in detail, with country examples when relevant. It will also focus on the role of media as a tool of authoritarian control.

Lecture reading:

- Brooker, P. (2014). Non-Democratic Regimes: Theory, Government & Politics. Chapter 5.
- Schedler, A. (2002). Elections without democracy: The menu of manipulation. *Journal of democracy*, 13(2), 36-50.

Seminar reading:

- Gerschewski, J. (2013). The three pillars of stability: Legitimation, repression, and co-optation in autocratic regimes. *Democratization*, 20(1), 13-38.
- Davenport, C. (2007). State repression and political order. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 1-23.
- Guriev, S., & Treisman, D. (2015). How modern dictators survive: Cooptation, censorship, propaganda, and repression.

11. Resource curse and rentier states

Natural resource wealth is a game-changer for nations, and it is hotly debated in the literature whether it is a blessing or a curse. The resource curse theory is a set of propositions arguing that resources, and especially oil, can deteriorate the political institutions, strengthen autocrats, and instigate civil conflict.

This lecture will focus on the specific problems of resource-rich states and the reasons why most of them remain autocratic.

Lecture reading:

- Ross, M. L. (2012). *The oil curse*. Princeton University Press. (Chapters 1,2,3,6,7)
- Alexeev, M., & Conrad, R. (2009). The elusive curse of oil. *The review of Economics and Statistics*, 91(3), 586-598.
- Ross, M. L. (2015). What Have We Learned about the Resource Curse? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18, 239-259.

Seminar reading:

- Stevens, P. (2008). National oil companies and international oil companies in the Middle East: Under the shadow of government and the resource nationalism cycle. *The Journal of World Energy Law & Business*, 1(1), 5-30.
- Mahdavy, H. (1970). The patterns and problems of economic development in rentier states: the case of Iran. *Studies in the economic history of the Middle East*, 428, 468.
- Hertog, S. (2010). Defying the resource curse: explaining successful state-owned enterprises in rentier states. *World Politics*, 62(2), 261-301.

12. Political violence: civil war, ethnic conflict, terrorism

Although political violence is not unique to authoritarian regimes, these regimes are often associated with a higher likelihood of conflict. Political violence comes in many forms including civil war, ethnic conflict, and terrorism. This lecture will discuss these different types of violence, the determinants of conflict onset and conflict duration, and the strategies of terrorism and counterterrorism.

Lecture reading:

- Valentino, B. A. (2014). Why We Kill: The Political Science of Political Violence. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17, 89-104.
- Kalyvas, S.N. Civil Wars // *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. P. 416-434.

Seminar reading:

- Abrahms, M. (2008). What terrorists really want: Terrorist motives and counterterrorism strategy. *International Security*, 32(4), 78-105.
- Collier, P., & Hoeffler, A. (1998). On economic causes of civil war. *Oxford economic papers*, 50(4), 563-573.
- Easterly, W. (2001). Can institutions resolve ethnic conflict?. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 49(4), 687-706.

13. Democracy or autocracy: Does it make a difference?

The topic of this lecture is to investigate the role of regime type as a main independent variable on various outcomes. Based on the material covered in this course throughout the two modules, the lecturers will discuss the following questions: Does regime type make a difference to material well-being? Do democracies or autocracies produce higher economic growth? What is the effect of regime type on government performance? The students will also be encouraged to draw their own conclusions based on the empirical findings from the literature.

Lecture reading:

- Clark, Golder & Golder, Chapter 9. (pp. 329-346)

Seminar reading:

- Li, Q. (2009). Democracy, autocracy, and expropriation of foreign direct investment. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(8), 1098-1127.
- Møller, J., & Skaaning, S. E. (2013). Autocracies, democracies, and the violation of civil liberties. *Democratization*, 20(1), 82-106.
- Greer, S. L., King, E. J., da Fonseca, E. M., & Peralta-Santos, A. (2020). The comparative politics of COVID-19: The need to understand government responses. *Global public health*, 15(9), 1413-1416.

ASSIGNMENTS AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The position paper (due at the end of Week 6)

The position paper shall be a problem-based, argumentative text demonstrating the student's capacity to identify academically relevant problems, finding avenues to tackle it, and communicating her/his arguments in a persuasive, transparent, and succinct manner. The position paper should also demonstrate the student's firm understanding on the differences between epistemic and methodological traditions. The position paper's extent shall not exceed 1,000 words, including foot/endnotes, excluding the bibliography. The review part of the essay shall not exceed 40% of the position paper. The deadline for sending a position paper linked to each specific topic is the beginning of the following seminar session.

Essay structure:

1. *Short and general formulation of answer, outline of structure*
2. *Review of relevant claims in the literature*
3. *Critical review of relevant positions.*
4. *Core of argument, supported by analytical and/or empirical claims.*
5. *Conclusion, summarizing the core points of the argument.*

Sample position paper question:

- Are presidential systems with proportionally elected legislatures necessarily inefficient?
- Is the practice of grand coalitions rooted in the lack of established democratic traditions?
- Does the poor record of consociationalism in Africa prove Horowitz in his debate with Lijphart?

The movie analysis (due at the end of Week 12)

For this assignment, the students will be asked to pick a topic from the syllabus. Each topic has questions about political processes and accompanying movies assigned. The students should watch the movies with these questions in mind. Then, they should write a critical movie analysis, **answering the given questions based on the movie**. The analysis shall not exceed **1,000 words**, including foot/endnotes, excluding the bibliography. The grade will be based on the clarity and relevance of the answers to the given questions, and the depth of understanding of the subject matter. Originality of the analysis will also distinguish excellent answers from good answers. **Clarity and relevance** means how well the student can connect the ideas in these movies with the works that were studied during the lectures and seminars. **Originality** means whether the student can offer a fresh perspective to connect these ideas. The following points are important:

- The analysis should answer **all of the questions listed for a topic** on the assignment.

- In the answer, students should use the comparative politics concepts learned in this course (e.g. representation, veto player, authoritarian control, etc.) to answer the questions **with specific examples/anecdotes/analysis from the movies**. The students are NOT expected to criticize the movie artistically, but rather to consider its political and theoretical implications.
- The analysis should cite scholarly sources whenever possible. There should be **at least five scholarly sources (books, articles, etc.)** cited to back up the arguments.

Sample question for movie analysis:

Topic: Elections

Movies to watch:

1. No (2012) <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt2059255/>
2. Recount (2008) <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt1000771/>

Questions to answer: Why do clean elections matter? What is at stake? How do different electoral arrangements influence the results of the election?

Grades	Assessment Criteria for Written Assignments
«Excellent» (10)	The paper has a clear scope, focus, and question/polemic, which is addressed in a convincingly justified theoretical framework. The student mobilizes relevant theories and/or empirical evidence in support of the argument presented in the paper. The key conclusions and implications are clearly elucidated.
«Excellent» (9)	The paper has a clear scope, focus, and question/polemic, which is addressed in a convincingly justified theoretical framework. The student mobilizes relevant theories and/or empirical evidence in support of the argument presented in the paper. The key conclusions and implications are clearly elucidated. Though the paper both meets all the relevant criteria of the task description and presents an original argument, either the treatment of certain relevant theories or the empirical evidence could be legitimately questioned.
«Excellent» (8)	Has a clear argument, which addresses the topic and responds effectively to all aspects of the task. Fully satisfies all the requirements of the task; rare minor errors occur.
«Good» (7)	Responds to most aspects of the topic with a clear, explicit argument. Covers the requirements of the task; may produce occasional errors.
«Good» (6)	Responds to most aspects of the topic; nevertheless, the argument presented is either not fully clear, or has moderate theoretical ambition. Covers the requirements of the task; may produce occasional errors

«Satisfactory» (5)	Generally addresses the task; the format may be inappropriate in places; display little evidence of (depending on the assignment): independent thought and critical judgement include a partial superficial coverage of the key issues, lack critical analysis, may make frequent errors.
«Satisfactory» (4)	Generally addresses the task, but some major part of the essay has major flaws.
«Fail» (3)	Generally addresses the task, but major editing and argumentative flaws appear throughout the essay.
«Fail» (2)	The essay is mostly a repetition of other works without any meaningful individual contribution.
«Fail» (1)	The essay fails to address the task appropriately.
«Fail» (0)	Unsubmitted paper, or plagiarism/academic dishonesty detected.

Class participation

- Meaningful engagement with the mandatory readings demonstrated
- Own critical approach to the reading and lecture materials elucidated
- By bringing in concepts and empirical examples from other fields of study, the student demonstrates a complex understanding of the introduced concepts
- Contribution to the class dynamics: by reflecting on earlier points and comments, students can again demonstrate a practical understanding of the discussed concepts, as well as their abilities to understand the dynamics of ongoing discussions. Conversely, redundant and self-serving comments will lower the participation grade.
- In case someone finds participation in discussions challenging, there is also an opportunity to send questions and comments related to the mandatory readings before the respective class sessions.

Grades	Assessment Criteria for Class Participation
«Excellent» (10)	Well-supported original arguments about the topic are presented, and the student is capable of convincingly responding to challenges around the arguments. Both the arguments and the responses demonstrate the necessary preparatory research and broad background knowledge.
«Excellent» (9)	A critical analysis which demonstrates original thinking and shows strong evidence of preparatory research and broad background knowledge.
«Excellent» (8)	Demonstration of preparatory research and broad background knowledge, presented in a fashion that contributes to a constructive and inclusive classroom environment.

«Good» (7)	Valuable, but inconsistent class participation.
«Good» (6)	The student demonstrates sufficient knowledge on the topic and a solid degree of familiarity with the class materials, but class participation seldom happens on own initiative.
«Satisfactory» (5)	Satisfactory overall, showing a fair knowledge of the topic, a reasonable standard of expression. Some hesitation in answering follow-up questions and/or gives incomplete or partly irrelevant answers.
«Satisfactory» (4)	Satisfactory overall, showing a fair knowledge of the topic, a reasonable standard of expression. Nevertheless, contributions are not connected to the class discussion, and often distort the class discussions.
«Fail» (3)	Failure to demonstrate a sufficient familiarity with the course materials.
«Fail» (2)	Failure to demonstrate a fundamental understanding of the class discussions.
«Fail» (1)	Lack of familiarity with the course materials and lack of intellectual effort.
«Fail» (0)	Lack of presence at a necessary amount of class sessions.