

Course Syllabus

Course Information

Course Number/Section	PSCI 6337
Course Title	Comparative Institutions
Term	Spring 2008
Days & Times	Thursdays 2:30-5:15

Contact Information

Professor	Carole J. Wilson
Office Phone	972.883.4957
Email Address	cjwilson@utdallas.edu
Office Location	GR 3.230
Office Hours	M & W 10:30-11:30, or by appointment

Course Pre-requisites, Co-requisites, and/or Other Restrictions

This is a graduate course. Students should be enrolled in a graduate program or have appropriate permissions.

Course Description

A comparative analysis of political institutions in different settings. Includes a consideration of different theoretical approaches to the comparative study and design of institutions in the United States and elsewhere.

Student Learning Objectives/Outcomes

Upon completing this course, students will:

1. Acquire knowledge about different institutional arrangements around the world and theories to explain variation.
 2. Understand the linkage between the institutional context and behavior of political actors
 3. Be able to apply important theoretical and scholarly approaches to explain political institutions, and the relationship between institutions and policy outcomes.
 4. Be able to develop independent research in the field of political institutions.
-

Assignments & Academic Calendar

January 17—Introduction

We will discuss the purpose and format of the course, introduce ourselves, and review the requirements and policies.

Agenda:

- Introductions
- Course Overview (Theory & Practice)
- Assignments
- Expectations & Grading Policy
- Other Policies
 - Missing Class
 - Late Work
 - Incompletes
- Socialization

January 24—Overview of Institutions

The “Institutions” literature is very broad and disparate. There are many different approaches to the subject both theoretically and methodologically. As you read this material try to find some commonalities in these approaches.

Required:

- Shepsle, Kenneth A. 1989. “Studying Institutions: Some Lessons from the Rational Choice Approach.” *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 1 (April): 131-147
- Carey, John M. 2000. “Parchment, Equilibria and Institutions.” *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (6-7): 735-61
- Almond, Gabriel. 1956. “Comparative Political Systems.” *Journal of Politics* 18 (3): 391-409
- Lijphart, Arend. 1971. “Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method.” *American Political Science Review* 65 (September): 682-693
- Collier, David, and James Mahoney. 1996. “Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research.” *World Politics* 49 (1): 56-91
- Grafstein, Robert. 1988. “The Problem of Institutional Constraint.” *Journal of Politics* 50 (3): 577-599

January 31—Constitutions

February 7—Executives and Legislatures

Cheibub, Jose Antonio, and Fernando Limongi. 2002. “Democratic Institutions And Regime Survival: Parliamentary and Presidential Democracies Reconsidered.” *Annual Review of Political Science*.

Przeworski, Adam, Jose Cheibub, and Sebastian M. Saiegh. 2004. “Government Coalitions and Legislative Success Under Presidentialism and Parliamentarism.” *British Journal of Political Science*. 34(4): 565-587.

Shugart, Matthew Soberg. 1995. “The Electoral Cycle and Institutional Sources of Divided Presidential Government” *American Political Science Review* 89(2):327-43.

Pereira, Carlos, Timothy J. Power, and Luci Renn. 2005. “Under What Conditions do Presidents Resort to Decree Power?” *Journal of Politics* 67(1): 178-200.

Martin, Lanny W. and Georg Vanberg. 2005. “Coalition Policymaking and Legislative Review. *American Political Science Review* 99(1): 93-107.

February 14—Workshop

February 21—Parties *Required:*

- Aldrich, John. 1995. *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Party Politics in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Selections]
- Blais, Andre, Donald Blake, and Stephanie Dion. 1993. “Do Parties Make a Difference?” *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (February): 40–62
- Strom, Kaare. 1990. “A Behavioral Theory of Competitive Political Parties.” *American Journal of Political Science* 34 (2): 565–598
- Deschouwer, Kris. 1996. “Political parties and democracy: A mutual murder?” *European Journal of Political Research* 29 (3): 263–278
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 1988. “Left-Libertarian Parties: Explaining Innovation in Competitive Party Systems.” *World Politics* 40 (2): 194–234

February 28—Parties *Required:*

- Kitschelt, Herbert, Peter Lange, Gary Marks, and John D. Stephens, eds. 1999. *Continuity and Change in Contemporary Capitalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 2000. “Citizens, Politicians, and Party Cartellization: Political Representation and State Failure in Post-Industrial Democracies.” *European Journal of Political Research* 37 (2): 149–179
- Dix, Robert H. 1992. “Democratization and the Institutionalization of Latin American Political Parties.” *Comparative Political Studies* 24 (4): 488
- Zielinski, Jakub. 2002. “Translating Social Cleavages into Party Systems: The Significance of New Democracies.” *World Politics* 54 (2): 184–211
- Mainwaring, Scott, and Aníbal Pérez Li nán. 1997. “Party Discipline in the Brazilian Constitutional Congress.” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 22 (4): 453–483

March 6–Federalism *Required:*

- Watts, Ronald L. 1998. “Federalism, Federal Political Systems, And Federations.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 1 (1): 117–137
- Wibbels, Erik. 2006. “Madison In Baghdad?: Decentralization and Federalism in Comparative Politics.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 165–88
- Cai, Hongbin, and Daniel Treisman. 2004. “State corroding federalism.” *Journal of Public Economics* 88 (3-4): 819–843
- Treisman, Daniel. 1999. “Political Decentralization and Economic Reform.” *American Journal of Political Science* 43 (April): 488–517
- Rodden, Jonathan. 2002. “The Dilemma of Fiscal Federalism: Grants and Fiscal Performance around the World.” *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (3): 670–687
- Samuels, David. 2000. “Concurrent Elections, Discordant Results: Presidentialism, Federalism, and Governance in Brazil.” *Comparative Politics* 33 (1): 1–20

March 13–Spring Break

March 20–Electoral Systems I *Required:*

- Cox, Gary W. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [Selections]
- Riker, William H. 1982. "The Two-Party System and Duvergers Law: An Essay on the History of Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 76: 753–766
- Powell, G. Bingham. 2006. "Election Laws and Representative Governments: Beyond Votes and Seats." *British Journal of Political Science* 36 (2): 291–315
- Golder, M. 2005. "Democratic electoral systems around the world, 1946–2000." *Electoral Studies* 24 (1): 103–121
- Mainwaring, Scott. 1991. "Politicians, Parties, and Electoral Systems: Brazil in Comparative Perspective." *Comparative Politics* 24 (1): 21–43

March 27–Electoral Systems II *Required:*

- Hooghe, M., B. Maddens, and J. Noppe. 2006. "Why parties adapt: Electoral reform, party finance and party strategy in Belgium." *Electoral Studies* 25 (2): 351–368
- Birch, S. 2005. "Single-member district electoral systems and democratic transition." *Electoral Studies* 24 (2): 281–301
- Cox, G.W. 1990. "Centripetal and Centrifugal Incentives in Electoral Systems." *American Journal of Political Science* 34 (4): 903–935
- Bawn, K. 1993. "The Logic of Institutional Preferences: German Electoral Law as a Social Choice Outcome." *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (4): 965–989
- Boix, C. 1999. "Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies." *The American Political Science Review* 93 (3): 609–624
- IVERSEN, T., and D. SOSKICE. 2006. "Electoral Institutions and the Politics of Coalitions: Why Some Democracies Redistribute More Than Others." *American Political Science Review* 100 (02): 165–181

April 3–Courts & Varieties of Capitalism *Required:*

- HELMKE, G. 2002. “The Logic of Strategic Defection: Court–Executive Relations in Argentina Under Dictatorship and Democracy.” *American Political Science Review* 96 (02): 291–303
- Ramseyer, J.M. 1994. “The Puzzling InDependence of Courts: A Comparative Approach.” *The Journal of Legal Studies* 23 (2): 721–747
- Epstein, L., J. Knight, and O. Shvetsova. 2001. “The Role of Constitutional Courts in the Establishment and Maintenance of Democratic Systems of Government.” *Law & Society Review* 35 (1): 117–164
- Vanberg, G. 2001. “Legislative-Judicial Relations: A Game-Theoretic Approach to Constitutional Review.” *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (2): 346–361
- Kitschelt, Herbert, Peter Lange, Gary Marks, and John D. Stephens, eds. 1999. *Coninuity and Change in Contemporary Capitalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [Selections]

April 10–Varieties of Capitalism

- CREPAZ, M.M.L. 1992. “Corporatism in Decline?: An Empirical Analysis of the Impact of Corporatism on Macroeconomic Performance and Industrial Disputes in 18 Industrialized Democracies.” *Comparative Political Studies* 25 (2): 139
- Lijphart, A., and M.M.L. Crepaz. 1991. “Corporatism and Consensus Democracy in Eighteen Countries: Conceptual and Empirical Linkages.” *British Journal of Political Science* 21 (2): 235–246
- Molina, O., and M. Rhodes. 2002. “CORPORATISM: The Past, Present, and Future of a Concept.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 5 (1): 305–331
- Kumlin, S., and B. Rothstein. 2005. “Making and Breaking Social Capital: The Impact of Welfare-State Institutions.” *Comparative Political Studies* 38 (4): 339
- Korpi, W. 2003. “Welfare-State Regress in Western Europe: Politics, Institutions, Globalization, and Europeanization.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 29 (1): 589–609

April 17–EU *Required:*

- Hix, Simon. 2004. “Electoral Institutions and Legislative Behavior: Explaining Voting Defection in the European Parliament.” *World Politics* 56 (January): 194-223
- Hooghe, Liesbet, and Gary Marks. 2003. “Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance.” *American Political Science Review* 97 (May): 233-243
- Alter, Karen J. 1998. “Who are the ‘Masters of the Treaty’?: European Governments and the European Court of Justice.” *International Organization* 52 (Winter): 121-147
- Garrett, Geoffrey, R. Daniel Kelemen, and Heiner Schulz. 1998. “The European Court of Justice, National Governments, and Legal Integration in the European Union.” *International Organization* 52 (Winter): 149-176
- Mattli, Walter, and Anne-Marie Slaughter. 1998. “Review: Revisiting the European Court of Justice.” *International Organization* 52 (Winter): 177-209

April 24–Corruption *Required:*

- Scott, J.C. 1972. “Patron-Client Politics and Political Change in Southeast Asia.” *The American Political Science Review* 66 (1): 91–113
- Carey, J.M., and M.S. Shugart. 1995. “Incentives to cultivate a personal vote: A rank ordering of electoral formulas.” *Electoral Studies* 14 (4): 417–439
- CHANG, E.C.C., and M.A. GOLDEN. 2006. “Electoral Systems, District Magnitude and Corruption.” *British Journal of Political Science* 37 (01): 115–137
- Stokes, Susan C. 1996. “Public Opinion and Market Reforms: The Limits of Economic Voting.” *Comparative Political Studies* 29 (5): 499–519
- Mauro, P. 1995. “Corruption and Growth.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 110 (3): 681–712
- GERRING, J., and S.C. THACKER. 2004. “Political Institutions and Corruption: The Role of Unitarism and Parliamentarism.” *British Journal of Political Science* 34 (02): 295–330

Review Assignment—Due Weekly

On 3 occasions, you will review 3 of the week's readings following the format and instructions below.

Purpose:

This assignment is designed to help students succinctly summarize material, identify the important parts of the reading, and prepare for exams.

Grading:

Students will be graded on their ability to demonstrate their understanding of the article and on their ability to identify the important components of the articles. —Value: 10% of course grade.

Article Review Week 1	Your Name Here February 4, 2008
<hr/>	
Hall, Peter A., and Rosemary C. R. Taylor. 1996. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms." <i>Political Studies</i> 44 (5): 936-957	
<hr/>	
Keywords: xxx, xxx, xxx	
 Summary	
Summarize the article two or three paragraphs (not lists).	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Describe the goal of the paper and its contribution to the field.• You will want to note the general area of institutions under which this falls (ie. electoral systems).• You should link the article or chapter to some line of research (ie. this is an extension of Downs (1957), or this builds on Sartori's work on parties).• You should note the important concepts developed in the work.• You should indicate the main hypotheses and the methods of analysis.	
 Comments	
This section is for your comments about the paper. You should note any novelties, inconsistencies, problems, or other opinions.	

Assignment 1—Due date January 31

The following journal article has been cited once in a scholarly journal. What article cites:—Conover, Pamela J., and Donald D. Searing. 2005. “Part III: Deliberation among Citizens - Studying ‘Everyday political talk’ in the Deliberative System.” Acta Politica 40 (September): 269–283

Purpose:

To teach students to use necessary library databases.

Grading:

This assignment will not be graded.

Assignment 2—Due date February 21

You must choose a book about institutions and write a book review of it. You will model your review (in style and length) after one of those found in APSR or JOP. You will summarize the important findings of the book and provide a 10-15 minute presentation to the class.

Purpose:

- To familiarize students with books in the field of comparative politics
- To familiarize students with writing book reviews.

Grading:

Students will be graded on 1) their ability to summarize and critically evaluate books, and 2) present these to their colleagues. —Value: 20% of course grade.

Assignment 3—Due date Friday, April 25th

You will develop an idea into an original research contribution culminating in a 15–25 page research paper. This paper will apply a theory of comparative institutions, generate hypotheses and analyze data to test these hypotheses.

Purpose:

The purpose of this assignment is for students to apply the theories learned in this course, and to produce original research.

Format:

- Choose a major political science journal (*AJPS*, *APSR*, *JOP*) and follow that format for organization and citation style.
- Your finished paper should be of the quality that you would consider submitting to a professional journal. The format should be appropriate, it should be written succinctly, there should be no spelling errors, and no grammatical mistakes.
- Tables and Figures are to be formatted for publication (cutting and pasting from a stats program is not acceptable).
- Read Jim Stimson's thoughts on writing research papers:
<http://www.unc.edu/~jstimson/Writing.pdf>
- You will include the following elements in your paper:
 - introduction;
 - appropriate literature review;
 - theory;
 - hypotheses;
 - research design with explanation of data, appropriateness of case, etc.;
 - analysis;
 - results;
 - conclusion.

Research:

- Spend time in the library. While no literature review will be exhaustive, you should spend time learning the appropriate works for your topic. Don't depend on electronic journals only. There are books available in the library and bound journals. Your references should reflect this. Your literature search must extend beyond the materials in this course. While I think the syllabus is good, it is designed to substitute for your research.
- *"The best laid schemes o' mice an' men\Gang aft agley"* The most important thing is to begin early. The creative process takes time and there are many problems that may pop up that can be dealt with if you have the benefit of time.

Submission:

You will submit both an electronic and paper copy (stapled) to me by noon.

Grading:

Students will be graded on their knowledge of the theory, their research ability, their ability to deduce hypotheses from the theories, their ability to develop a research design, and their ability to analyze data and test hypotheses. —Value: 40% of course grade.

Final Exam—Thursday, May 1st (time TBA)

In this comprehensive exam, you will have 4 hours to answer one question over the course material. The exam is styled after the PhD exams.

Purpose:

The purpose of this exam is to test students' comprehension of the course materials and to prepare students for the format of the program's PhD exams.

Procedure:

Students will receive at least two questions by email from which they will answer one. The completed exam is due at 4 hours later.

Grading:

Students will be graded on their ability to demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to apply the course literature in answering the proposed question. —Value: 30% of course grade.

Grading Policy

Assignment will be graded according to the criteria described above and will use the following scale:

87-89=B+		77-79=C+	
93-100=A	83-86=B	73-76=C	Below 70=F
90-92=A-	80-82=B-	70-72=C-	

Course Policies

Class Attendance: You must not miss class except under the most dire circumstances. If you must miss class, you will prepare a review assignment for each article and/or chapter assigned for the missed class. This work is due the Wednesday after the class is missed. I will not hunt you down to remind you of this assignment. If this assignment is not turned in by the due date, I will deduct 6 percentage points from your final grade.

Late Work: I will deduct 10 percentage points from the assignment for each day the assignment is late.

Make-up exams: None

Extra Credit: None

Special Assignments: None

Classroom Citizenship: Students are expected to be respectful of each other.

Technical Support

If you experience any problems with your UTD account you may send an email to: as-sist@utdallas.edu or call the UTD Computer Helpdesk at 972-883-2911.

Field Trip Policies / Off-Campus Instruction and Course Activities

Off-campus, out-of-state, and foreign instruction and activities are subject to state law and University policies and procedures regarding travel and risk-related activities. Information regarding these rules and regulations may be found at the website address http://www.utdallas.edu/BusinessAffairs/Travel_Risk_Activities.htm.

Additional information is available from the office of the school dean. Below is a description of any travel and/or risk-related activity associated with this course.

Student Conduct & Discipline

The University of Texas System and The University of Texas at Dallas have rules and regulations for the orderly and efficient conduct of their business. It is the responsibility of each student and each student organization to be knowledgeable about the rules and regulations which govern student conduct and activities. General information on student conduct and discipline is contained in the UTD printed publication, A to Z Guide, which is provided to all registered students each academic year.

The University of Texas at Dallas administers student discipline within the procedures of recognized and established due process. Procedures are defined and described in the Rules and Regulations, Series 50000, Board of Regents, The University of Texas System, and in Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities of the university's Handbook of Operating Procedures. Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations (SU 1.602, 972/883-6391) and online at <http://www.utdallas.edu/judicialaffairs/UTDJudicialAffairs-HOPV.html>

A student at the university neither loses the rights

nor escapes the responsibilities of citizenship. He or she is expected to obey federal, state, and local laws as well as the Regents' Rules, university regulations, and administrative rules. Students are subject to discipline for violating the standards of conduct whether such conduct takes place on or off campus, or whether civil or criminal penalties are also imposed for such conduct.

Academic Integrity

The faculty expects from its students a high level of responsibility and academic honesty. Because the value of an academic degree depends upon the absolute integrity of the work done by the student for that degree, it is imperative that a student demonstrate a high standard of individual honor in his or her scholastic work.

Scholastic Dishonesty, any student who commits an act of scholastic dishonesty is subject to discipline. Scholastic dishonesty includes but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, collusion, the submission for credit of any work or materials that are attributable in whole or in part to another person, taking an examination for another person, any act designed to give unfair advantage to a student or the attempt to commit such acts.

Plagiarism, especially from the web, from portions of papers for other classes, and from any other source is unacceptable and will be dealt with under the university's policy on plagiarism (see general catalog for details). This course will use the resources of turnitin.com, which searches the web for possible plagiarism and is over 90% effective.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials, including music and software. Copying, displaying, reproducing, or distributing copyrighted works may infringe the copyright owner's rights and such infringement is subject to appropriate disciplinary action as well as criminal penalties provided by federal law. Usage of such material is only appropriate when that usage constitutes "fair use" under the Copyright Act. As a UT Dallas student, you are required to follow

the institution's copyright policy (Policy Memorandum 84-I.3-46). For more information about the fair use exemption, see <http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/copypol2.htm>

Email Use

The University of Texas at Dallas recognizes the value and efficiency of communication between faculty/staff and students through electronic mail. At the same time, email raises some issues concerning security and the identity of each individual in an email exchange. The university encourages all official student email correspondence be sent only to a student's U.T. Dallas email address and that faculty and staff consider email from students official only if it originates from a UTD student account. This allows the university to maintain a high degree of confidence in the identity of all individual corresponding and the security of the transmitted information. UTD furnishes each student with a free email account that is to be used in all communication with university personnel. The Department of Information Resources at U.T. Dallas provides a method for students to have their U.T. Dallas mail forwarded to other accounts.

Withdrawal from Class

The administration of this institution has set deadlines for withdrawal of any college-level courses. These dates and times are published in that semester's course catalog. Administration procedures must be followed. It is the student's responsibility to handle withdrawal requirements from any class. In other words, I cannot drop or withdraw any student. You must do the proper paperwork to ensure that you will not receive a final grade of "F" in a course if you choose not to attend the class once you are enrolled.

Student Grievance Procedures

Procedures for student grievances are found in Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities, of the university's Handbook of Operating Procedures.

In attempting to resolve any student grievance regarding grades, evaluations, or other fulfillments of academic responsibility, it is the obligation of the student first to make a serious effort to resolve the matter with the instructor, supervisor, administra-

tor, or committee with whom the grievance originates (hereafter called "the respondent"). Individual faculty members retain primary responsibility for assigning grades and evaluations. If the matter cannot be resolved at that level, the grievance must be submitted in writing to the respondent with a copy of the respondent's School Dean. If the matter is not resolved by the written response provided by the respondent, the student may submit a written appeal to the School Dean. If the grievance is not resolved by the School Dean's decision, the student may make a written appeal to the Dean of Graduate or Undergraduate Education, and the dean will appoint and convene an Academic Appeals Panel. The decision of the Academic Appeals Panel is final. The results of the academic appeals process will be distributed to all involved parties.

Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations.

Incomplete Grade Policy

As per university policy, incomplete grades will be granted only for work unavoidably missed at the semester's end and only if 70% of the course work has been completed. An incomplete grade must be resolved within eight (8) weeks from the first day of the subsequent long semester. If the required work to complete the course and to remove the incomplete grade is not submitted by the specified deadline, the incomplete grade is changed automatically to a grade of F.

Disability Services

The goal of Disability Services is to provide students with disabilities educational opportunities equal to those of their non-disabled peers. Disability Services is located in room 1.610 in the Student Union. Office hours are Monday and Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.; Tuesday and Wednesday, 8:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.; and Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

The contact information for the Office of Disability Services is:

The University of Texas at Dallas, SU 22
PO Box 830688

Richardson, Texas 75083-0688
(972) 883-2098 (voice or TTY)
disabilityservice@utdallas.edu

If you anticipate issues related to the format or requirements of this course, please meet with the Coordinator of Disability Services. The Coordinator is available to discuss ways to ensure your full participation in the course. If you determine that formal, disability-related accommodations are necessary, it is very important that you be registered with Disability Services to notify them of your eligibility for reasonable accommodations. Disability Services can then plan how best to coordinate your accommodations.

It is the student's responsibility to notify his or her professors of the need for such an accommodation. Disability Services provides students with letters to present to faculty members to verify that the student has a disability and needs accommodations. Individuals requiring special accommodation should contact the professor after class or during office hours.

Religious Holy Days

The University of Texas at Dallas will excuse a student from class or other required activities for the travel to and observance of a religious holy day for a religion whose places of worship are exempt from

property tax under Section 11.20, Tax Code, Texas Code Annotated. The student is encouraged to notify the instructor or activity sponsor as soon as possible regarding the absence, preferably in advance of the assignment. The student, so excused, will be allowed to take the exam or complete the assignment within a reasonable time after the absence: a period equal to the length of the absence, up to a maximum of one week. A student who notifies the instructor and completes any missed exam or assignment may not be penalized for the absence. A student who fails to complete the exam or assignment within the prescribed period may receive a failing grade for that exam or assignment. If a student or an instructor disagrees about the nature of the absence [i.e., for the purpose of observing a religious holy day] or if there is similar disagreement about whether the student has been given a reasonable time to complete any missed assignments or examinations, either the student or the instructor may request a ruling from the chief executive officer of the institution, or his or her designee. The chief executive officer or designee must take into account the legislative intent of TEC 51.911(b), and the student and instructor will abide by the decision of the chief executive officer or designee. These descriptions and timelines are subject to change at the discretion of the Professor.

These descriptions and timelines are subject to change at the discretion of the Professor.