

INTL 4300: Comparative Political Institutions

Spring 2020

Dr. Molly Ariotti

T TH : 9:30-10:45am

Location: Miller Learning Center (MLC), Room 207

Office Hours: By appointment

Office Location: 303 International Affairs Building

Email: mariotti@uga.edu

Course Description:

Why do dictators create legislatures? Are parliamentary systems better than presidential systems? Could a third party win the presidency in the United States? These questions all ask you to think about political institutions, and their role in structuring the political interactions we observe around the world. Political institutions are often thought of as the "rules of the game," and include topics like the nature of executive-legislative relationships, the type of governments that form and how long they last, party systems, electoral rules, and elections. While much of this class focuses on formal institutions and democracies, we will also discuss the role of informal institutions, and the use of institutions by authoritarian regimes. By improving our understanding of the rules of the game, we can improve our understanding of big questions, such as when and why democratization is more successful, why elections look the way they do, and when parties might be incentivized to behave differently.

The course covers all world regions, and we will examine a number of competing hypotheses and the empirical evidence presented in support of them. As a result, the readings will take a number of methodological approaches.

Course Prerequisites: INTL 3300

Course Objectives:

1. Develop a deeper understanding of political institutions and their effect on political actors.
2. Examine arguments made by existing scholarship and assess strengths and weaknesses in existing knowledge
3. Think critically about the role of both formal and informal political institutions in structuring behavior and outcomes
4. Think about the role political institutions play in both democratic and authoritarian contexts
5. Learn about the role political institutions play in democratic transitions

Course Requirements:

You are expected to (1) attend all lectures; (2) complete the required reading before the start of each class; (3) complete all assignments. In the event of an emergency, it is expected you will contact me with appropriate documentation within 24 hours of a missed class or assignment deadline.

Your responsibilities will often force you to make choices about what you need to prioritize. If you have a conflict and cannot attend class, I expect you to communicate with me in a timely fashion, preferably in advance of the absence. I will not take attendance every class, however I will collect group work and other in-class assignments that will make up your participation grade. As a result, in order to score high marks on participation, you will need to be in class. Because I expect you to attend all lectures, **I will not post slides or notes online.** You should try to befriend some classmates early on so that you can make a copy of their notes in the event that you are absent. I will not make photocopies of my notes, nor will I hold a special make up class session during my office hours.

Special Accommodations:

If you have any special accommodations, I expect that you will provide me with all necessary paperwork during the first week of class, and set up a time to meet with me to discuss what I expect from you.

Students who seek religious or cultural accommodations should address potential conflicts with me as soon as possible so that arrangements can be made to accommodate the religious observance. Absence from classes or examinations for religious reasons does not relieve students from responsibility for any part of the coursework required during the period of absence.

It is the obligation of students to provide faculty with reasonable notice of the dates of cultural and religious holidays on which they plan to be absent.

Participation:

I have one rule about participation in my classes: Class has to be made better by your presence than it would have been otherwise. If you improve the quality of class in some way, you will write a sentence or two describing what you contributed and why it mattered on a piece of paper that **YOU MUST TURN IN** to me on your way out of class. You must hand it to me, directly, and I will either accept it, or reject it. To earn full credit for participation in class, you need to have turned these slips in for a majority of class meetings.

Assignments:

I will discuss assignments in class, and after that discussion information about the assignment and deadline may be posted to eLC. If you are absent, I encourage you to speak with a classmate or come to office hours in order to be clear about the expectations.

Each assignment is due **in class** (paper copy in person in class, unless specifically noted otherwise). Late assignments will be accepted, but penalized commensurate with lateness. I reserve discretion to set a deadline after which I will accept no further late work. It is always best to contact me directly (by whichever means you feel most comfortable) to discuss late work, or other reasons why you may have a problem meeting a deadline. I understand that sometimes things get overwhelming, and I want to work with you to find a solution – but you need to take responsibility by talking to me.

If you know there will be a conflict with a deadline, it is best to talk to me before the assignment is due, rather than the day of or after the fact. I am always happy to accept work before a deadline, if you know that you will be absent on the due date.

Grading and Scale:

Class participation: 15%

Homework assignments (x6): 55%

1. Syllabus Quiz: 5%
2. Research parliamentary democracy: 10%
3. Executive-legislative relations: 10%
4. Electoral integrity: 10%
5. Effective legislatures: 10%
6. Autocratic institutions: 10%

Final project:

Presentation: 10%

Final paper: 20%

A (93-100)	C+ (77-79.9)
A- (90-92.9)	C (73-76.9)
B+ (87-89.9)	C- (70-72.9)
B (83-86.9)	D (60-69.9)
B- (80-82.9)	FAIL (0-59.9)

Required Course Materials:

There is no required textbook for this course. Occasionally readings or chapters excerpted from books will be placed on eLC for you to access. Otherwise, readings are available through the library website (in order to access these readings you may either need to be on campus or logged into your UGA library access account). If you have trouble locating a particular scholarly article, you can often find a copy posted on the author's professional website (try searching their name and "political science"), or on [Google Scholar](#). You may also use the university subscription to the *Washington Post* in order to access articles from the Monkey Cage blog which may be assigned as reading or discussed in class.

SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

Readings should be completed *prior to class* on the day they are listed. Assignments are listed on the day I will discuss them in class, and the due date is clearly listed along with the instructions below.

*The course syllabus is a general plan for the course; deviations announced to the class by the instructor may be necessary. While I might adjust the timing for topics if we are unable to cover them as planned, I will **not** move the exam dates.*

Week 1: January 6-10

Introduction

Tuesday: Course overview, introductions
Challenges of measuring democracy

No required reading

Further [optional] reading:

1. Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy*. Ch. 2, p. 9-30 (Skim -- posted on eLC)
2. Bevir, Mark. 2010. "[The Odd Couple: Coalition government in Britain.](#)" (Skim this, updates parts of p. 11 in Lijphart that are a bit out of date!)
3. Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy*. Ch. 3, p. (posted on eLC)
4. BBC. 2017. "[Why don't we elect MPs by proportional representation?](#)"

HOMEWORK 1: Complete the syllabus quiz on eLC. All questions can be answered using the syllabus, which is posted to Week 1 of eLC's course content modules. You will only have one attempt to take this quiz, so be sure not to start it until you are ready to complete it.

DUE JANUARY 16 BEFORE NOON

Thursday: Introduction to three types of democracy (overview) – Parliamentary democracies

Required reading:

1. Clark, Golder, Golder. 2017. *Principles of Comparative Politics*. p.454-457 (posted on eLC)
2. Strom, Müller, Bergman. 2003. *Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies*. Ch. 1, p. 2-32 (posted on eLC)

Further [optional] reading:

1. Stepan and Skach. 1993. "Constitutional Frameworks and Democratic Consolidation: Parliamentarism versus Presidentialism." *World Politics*. 46:1, p. 1-22.
2. Linz. 1990. "The Virtues of Parliamentarism." *Journal of Democracy*. 1:4, p. 84-91.
3. Huber and Lupia. 2001. "Cabinet Instability and Delegation in Parliamentary Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science*. 45:1, p. 18-32.
4. Gerring, Thacker, Moreno. 2009. "Are Parliamentary Systems Better?" *Comparative Political Studies*. 42:3, p.327-359.

**** Get a head start on Homework 2 for next week (see next page) ****

Week 2: January 13-17

Types of Democracy: Parliamentary democracies

I am away this week for a workshop. You will be screening an episode of Yes, Prime Minister on Tuesday during class time. Thursday class is canceled, but you will have an assignment due Thursday before noon (to be submitted on Dropbox).

Tuesday: Watch Yes, Prime Minister in class. Think about parliamentary delegation and accountability as they are portrayed [comically!] in the episode.

HOMEWORK 2: Find an article in the news that discusses the formation of a coalition government in a parliamentary democracy. Write a (double-spaced) summary describing: 1) Which parties are currently in the legislature 2) Which parties are involved in the government; 3) Details about the negotiation process that led to the formation of the current government; 4) When the last elections were held prior to the formation of this government. Note: The best assignments will likely require you to use more than one article to gather all of this information and discuss it adequately. If you speak another language that is of use, feel free to use resources in that language (i.e. French, Spanish, Chinese, Wolof, Arabic, etc.) to help you in your research.

You must include a list of references with your paper, and clearly document where you found information using in-text citations.

THURSDAY BEFORE NOON TO DROPBOX ON eLC (JANUARY 16)

Thursday:

NO CLASS

Homework 2 due before noon to the Week 2 dropbox on eLC!

Week 3: January 20-24
Types con'd: Semi-presidential democracies

Tuesday: Semi-presidential democracies

Required reading:

1. Duverger. 1980. "A New Political System Model: Semi-presidential Government." *European Journal of Political Research*. 8, p. 165-187. (posted on eLC)

Further [optional] reading:

1. Schleiter and Morgan-Jones. 2010. "Who's in Charge? Presidents, Assemblies, and the Political Control of Semipresidential Cabinets." *Comparative Political Studies*. 43:11, p. 1415-1441.
2. Elgie and Moestrup, eds. 2007. *Semi-Presidentialism Outside Europe: A Comparative Study*. Routledge Press.

Thursday:

Required reading:

1. Elgie. 2008. "The Perils of Semi-presidentialism. Are They Exaggerated?" *Democratisation*. 15:1, p. 49-66.

Further [optional] reading:

1. Cheibub and Chernykh. 2009. "Are semi-presidential constitutions bad for democratic performance?" *Constitutional Political Economy*. 20:3, p. 202-229.

Week 4: January 27-January 31
Types con'd: Presidential democracies

Tuesday:

Required reading:

1. Linz. 1990. "The Perils of Presidentialism." (posted on eLC)

Further [optional] reading:

1. Mainwaring. 1993. "Presidentialism, Multipartyism, and Democracy: The Difficult Combination." *Comparative Political Studies*. 26:2, p. 198-228.
2. van de Walle. 2003. "Presidentialism and Clientelism in Africa's Emerging Party Systems." *Journal of Modern African Studies*.

HOMEWORK 3: Consider our discussions about parliamentary, semi-presidential, and presidential democracies from class and the readings. Is there one that you think is *always* the best choice? Why? Are there certain circumstances where one arrangement might be preferable to another? What characteristics would you see as making one type or another better or worse for a country? Explain the strengths and weaknesses of each type of democracy, and under what circumstances you think it is the best choice.

You must include a list of references with your paper, and clearly document where you found information using in-text citations.

DUE FEBRUARY 4 IN CLASS (PRINT AND BRING TO CLASS)

Thursday:

Required reading:

1. Chaisty, Cheeseman, Power. 2012. "Rethinking the 'presidentialism debate': conceptualizing coalitional politics in regional perspective." *Democratization*, p. 1-23.

Further [optional] reading:

1. Martinez. 2017. "Presidential survival in South America: Rethinking the role of democracy." *International Political Science Review*. 38:1, p. 40-55.

Week 5: February 3-7

Executive-Legislative Relations: Making Governments

Tuesday: Who gets to be in the government?

Required reading:

1. Cheibub, Przeworski, Saiegh. 2004. "Government Coalitions and Legislative Success under Presidentialism and Parliamentarism." *British Journal of Political Science*. 34, p. 565-587.
2. Golder, Golder, Siegel. 2012. "Modeling the Institutional Foundation of Parliamentary Government Formation." *The Journal of Politics*. 74:2, p. 427-445.

Further [optional] reading:

1. Amorim-Neto. 2006. "The Presidential Calculus: Executive Policy Making and Cabinet Formation in the Americas." *Comparative Political Studies*. 39:4, p. 415-440.
2. Martin and Stevenson. 2001. "Government Formation in Parliamentary Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science*. 45:1, p. 33-50.
3. Golder. 2010. "Bargaining Delays in the Government Formation Process." *Comparative Political Studies*. 43:1, p. 3-32.

Thursday: How are ministerial portfolios shared?

Required reading:

1. Ariotti and Golder. 2018. "Partisan Portfolio Allocation in African Democracies." *Comparative Political Studies*.

Further [optional] reading:

1. Gamson. 1961. "A Theory of Coalition Formation." *American Sociological Review*. 26, p. 373-382.
2. Warwick and Druckman. 2006. "The Portfolio Allocation Paradox: An Investigation into the Nature of a Very Strong but Puzzling Relationship." *European Journal of Political Research*. 45, p. 635-665.
3. Bassi. 2013. "A Model of Endogenous Government Formation." *American Journal of Political Science*. 57:4, p. 777-793.
4. Golder and Thomas. 2014. "Portfolio Allocation and the Vote of No Confidence." *British Journal of Political Science*. 44, p. 29-39.

Week 6: February 10-14
Executive-Legislative Relations: Breaking Governments

Tuesday:

Required reading:

1. Cheibub and Limongi. 2002. "Democratic Institutions and Regime Survival: Parliamentary and Presidential Democracies Reconsidered." *Annual Review of Political Science*. 5, p. 151-179.

Thursday: "Strategy"

Required reading:

1. Mershon. 1996. "The Costs of Coalition: Coalition Theories and Italian Governments." *American Political Science Review*. 90:3, p. 534-554.
2. Huber. 1996. "The Vote of Confidence in Parliamentary Democracies." *American Political Science Review*. 90:2, p. 269-282.
(Don't let the formal model intimidate you! Read through the theory and discussion sections, and try your best on the model-- the logic of the argument is what I care most about!)

Further [optional] reading:

1. Warwick. 1992. "Ideological Diversity and Government Survival in Western European Parliamentary Democracies." *Comparative Political Studies*. 25:3, p. 332-361.
2. Bergman, Ersson, Hellström. 2015. "Government formation and breakdown in Western and Central Eastern Europe." *Comparative European Politics*. 13:3, p. 345-375.
3. Druckman and Thies. 2002. "The Importance of Concurrence: The Impact of Bicameralism on Government Formation and Duration." *American Journal of Political Science*. 46:4, p. 760-771.

Week 7: February 17-21
Elections and Electoral Integrity

Tuesday: Assessing election quality

Required reading:

1. Norris, Frank, Martinez i Coma. 2013. "Assessing the Quality of Elections." *Journal of Democracy*. 24:4, p. 124-135. (Posted to eLC)

Further [optional] reading:

1. Matthews. 2016. "[North Carolina "can no longer be classified as a full democracy".](#)" Vox. [Also follow link to Andrew Gelman's blog at the end for a debate about the validity of the EIP claims]

HOMEWORK 4: Read at least one country case study from the "Reports" section of the Electoral Integrity Project (i.e. "The Year in Elections 2017," "Electoral Integrity in Africa," etc. contain case studies). Then look at the PEI Codebook (posted to Week 7 in eLC). Be sure to look at the information used to code electoral integrity, and think about the strengths and weaknesses of the EIP measurement strategy. What questions do you have about how EIP codes the information? Do you think EIP is forgetting anything important?

Write one paragraph summarizing the information you found about the country you selected and how their electoral integrity is rated by the EIP project, and write at least one paragraph discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the EIP measurement strategy.

You must include a list of references with your paper, and clearly document where you found information using in-text citations.

DUE FEBRUARY 25 IN CLASS (PRINT AND BRING TO CLASS)

Thursday: Observing elections

Required reading:

1. Hyde and Marinov. 2014. "Information and Self-Enforcing Democracy: The Role of International Election Observation." *International Organization*. 68, p. 329-359.

Further [optional] reading:

1. Ichino and Schündeln. 2012. "Deterring or Displacing Electoral Irregularities? Spillover Effects of Observers in a Randomized Field Experiment in Ghana." *Journal of Politics*. 74:1, p. 292-307.
2. Hyde. 2011. "Catch Us If You Can: Election Monitoring and International Norm Diffusion." *American Journal of Political Science*. 55:2, p. 356-369.

Week 8: February 24-February 28
Electoral Systems

Tuesday: Majoritarian electoral systems (SMDP, SNTV, AV, TRS)

Required reading:

1. Clark, Golder, Golder. 2017. *Principles of Comparative Politics*. p. 534-548 (posted on eLC)

Further [optional] reading:

1. Carey and Shugart. 1995. "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: Rank Ordering of Electoral Formulas." *Electoral Studies*. 14:4, p. 417-439.

Thursday: Proportional (and mixed) electoral systems (Closed/Open list PR, STV)

Required reading:

1. Clark, Golder, Golder. 2017. *Principles of Comparative Politics*. p. 549-569 (posted on eLC)

Further [optional] reading:

1. Golder. 2005. "Democratic electoral systems around the world, 1946-2000." *Electoral Studies*. 24, p. 103-121.

Week 9: March 2-6
Electoral Systems and Their Consequences

Tuesday: Turning out to vote?

Required reading:

1. Cohen, Mollie J. 2018. "Protest Via the Null Ballot: An Assessment of the Decision to Cast an Invalid Vote in Latin America." *Political Behavior*, 40: 395-414. DOI: 10.1007/s11109-017-9405-9
2. Singh, Shane. 2011. "Contradictory Calculi: Differences in Individuals' Turnout Decisions across Electoral Systems." *Political Research Quarterly* 64(3): 646-655.

Thursday: Types of representation

Required reading:

1. Krook and O'Brien. 2010. "The Politics of Group Representation: Quotas for Women and Minorities Worldwide." *Comparative Politics*. 42:3, 253-272.

Further [optional] reading:

1. O'Brien and Rickne. 2016. "Gender Quotas and Women's Political Leadership." *American Political Science Review*. 110:1, p.112-126.
2. Caul Kittilson and Schwindt-Bayer. 2010. "Engaging Citizens: The Role of Power-Sharing Institutions." *The Journal of Politics*. 72:4, p.990-1002.

Week 10: March 9-13
SPRING BREAK

Week 11: March 30-April 3
Parties and Party Systems

Tuesday: Duverger's Theory (review)

OPTIONAL OFFICE HOURS DURING NORMAL CLASS TIME:

The link to the Zoom meeting below will remain the same throughout the duration of the semester – you can use that link to connect you to any of the Tuesday office hour sessions!

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/970073760>

Meeting ID: 970 073 760

Required reading:

1. Clark and Golder. 2006. "Rehabilitating Duverger's Theory: Testing the Mechanical and Strategic Modifying Effects of Electoral Law"

Further [optional] reading:

1. Amorim Neto and Cox. 1997. "Electoral Institutions, Cleavage Structures, and the Number of Parties." *American Journal of Political Science*. 41:1, p. 149-174.
2. Duverger. 1963 [1954]. *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Thursday: Party systems outside of Western Europe

OPTIONAL CLASS DISCUSSION DURING NORMAL CLASS TIME:

This link to Zoom will remain the same for each week's Thursday discussion – please be sure to connect to either office hours or discussion on the appropriate day!

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/168534887>

Meeting ID: 168 534 887

To maximize coverage of different regions, choose two readings below (see email under Week 11 module) that focus on DIFFERENT regions! Follow instructions (again, see email posted to Week 11) to post twice to the discussion boards. At least one should be a response to one of your classmates, and they should be at least 200 words each.

Required reading (you pick two):

1. Lindberg. 2007. "Institutionalization of Party systems? Stability and Fluidity Among Legislative Parties in Africa's Democracies." *Government and Opposition*. 42:2, p. 215-241.
2. Mainwaring and Torcal. 2006. "Party System Institutionalization and Party System Theory After the Third Wave of Democratization." *Handbook of Party Politics*. p. 204-227. (eLC)
3. Mainwaring and Scully. 1995. *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
4. Bleck and van de Walle. 2012. "Valence Issues in African Elections: Navigating Uncertainty and the Weight of the Past." *Comparative Political Studies*. 46(11): 1394-1421.

5. van de Walle. 2003. "Presidentialism and Clientelism in Africa's Emerging Party Systems." *Journal of Modern African Studies*. 41:2, p.297-321.
6. Chandra. 2005. "Ethnic Parties and Democratic Stability." *Perspectives on Politics*. 3:2, p. 235-252.
7. Tavits. 2005. "The Development of Stable Party Support: Electoral Dynamics in Post-Communist Europe." 49:2, p. 283-298.
8. Moser. 1999. "Electoral Systems and the Number of Parties in Postcommunist States." *World Politics*. 51, p.359-84.
9. Kuenzi and Lambright. 2001. "Party System Institutionalization in 30 African Countries." *Party Politics*. 7:4, p.437-468.
10. Posner. 2004. "The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi." *American Political Science Review*. 98, p. 529-545.
11. Basedau and Stroh. 2012. "How Ethnic are African parties really? Evidence from four Francophone countries." *International Political Science Review*. 33:1, p. 5-24.

Week 12: April 6-10
Legislatures

Tuesday:

OPTIONAL OFFICE HOURS DURING NORMAL CLASS TIME:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/970073760>

Meeting ID: 970 073 760

Required reading:

1. Fish. 2006. "Stronger Legislatures, Stronger Democracies." *Journal of Democracy*. 17:1, p. 5-20.
2. Barkan. 2008. "Legislatures on the Rise?" *Journal of Democracy*. 19:2, p. 124-137.

Further [optional] reading:

1. Opalo, Ken. 2019. *Legislative Development in Africa: Politics and Post-Colonial Legacies*. Cambridge University Press.

HOMEWORK 5: Think about everything we've covered regarding electoral systems and the incentives they create, party systems, and executive-legislative relations (etc.). What do you see as essential to the creation of an effective legislature? What do you think promotes good legislative practice, both with regards to accountability to constituents and with respect to relations with the executive? If you were tasked with improving the capacity of a legislature in a developing democracy, what sorts of recommendations would you make? Be sure to consider trade-offs that come from combining different types of institutions. If you wanted to measure something like "legislative quality" what data would you include in your measure?

You must include a list of references with your paper, and clearly document where you found information using in-text citations.

DUE APRIL 14 BY 5PM, UPLOAD TO eLC DROPBOX (WEEK 13)!

Thursday:

OPTIONAL CLASS DISCUSSION DURING NORMAL CLASS TIME:

This link to Zoom will remain the same for each week's Thursday discussion – please be sure to connect to either office hours or discussion on the appropriate day!

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/168534887>

Meeting ID: 168 534 887

Follow instructions (see email posted to Week 11) to post twice to the discussion boards. At least one should be a response to one of your classmates, and they should be at least 200 words each.

Required reading:

1. Hix, Simon and Noury, Abdul. 2018. "Power versus Ideology: Political Group Switching in the European Parliament." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*.

Further [optional] reading:

1. Hiroi, Taeko. 2014. "Dimensions of Legislative Conflict: Coalitions, Obstructionism, and Lawmaking in Multiparty Presidential Regimes." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*.

Week 13: April 13-17
Institutions in Autocracies

Tuesday: Why build institutions in an autocracy?

OPTIONAL OFFICE HOURS DURING NORMAL CLASS TIME:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/970073760>

Meeting ID: 970 073 760

Required reading:

1. Kendall-Taylor and Frantz. 2014. "Mimicking Democracy to Prolong Autocracies." *The Washington Quarterly*. 37:4, p. 71-84.

Further [optional] reading:

1. Gandhi and Przeworski. 2007. "Authoritarian Institutions and the Survival of Autocrats." *Comparative Political Studies*. 40:11, p. 1279-1301.

HOMEWORK 6: Use the Polity dataset to identify a country that is coded as a dictatorship (-6 to -10) or an "anocracy"/ "mixed regime" (-5 to 5). Research the tactics used by that country's leaders in the past five years to consolidate power through authoritarian institutions. Discuss the creation and reinforcement of authoritarian institutions in your country. Next, imagine you work for an NGO or government institution with an interest in promoting democracy: What sorts of challenges do you see in dismantling these types of institutions? Can they be co-opted into transitional democratic institutions? What proposals would you have for improving democratic institutions in your country?

You must include a list of references with your paper, and clearly document where you found information using in-text citations.

DUE APRIL 21 BY 5PM, UPLOAD TO eLC DROPBOX (WEEK 14)!

Thursday: Authoritarian Institutions

OPTIONAL CLASS DISCUSSION DURING NORMAL CLASS TIME:

This link to Zoom will remain the same for each week's Thursday discussion – please be sure to connect to either office hours or discussion on the appropriate day!

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/168534887>

Meeting ID: 168 534 887

Follow instructions (see email posted to Week 11) to post twice to the discussion boards. At least one should be a response to one of your classmates, and they should be at least 200 words each.

Required reading:

1. Donno. 2013. "Elections and Democratization in Authoritarian Regimes." *American Journal of Political Science*. 57:3, p. 703-716.
2. Jensen, Malesky, and Weymouth. 6 June 2014. "[What good is a fake legislature?](#)" *The Monkey Cage Blog (The Washington Post)*.

Further [optional] reading:

1. Simpser. 2013. [Why Governments and Parties Manipulate Elections](#). Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 1 is available for free online!]
2. Knutsen, Nygard, and Wig. "Autocratic Elections: Stabilizing Tool or Force for Change?" *World Politics*. 69:1, p.98-143.
3. Jensen, Malesky, and Weymouth. 2013. "Unbundling the Relationship between Authoritarian Legislatures and Political Risk." *British Journal of Political Science*. 44, p.655-684.
4. Wilson and Wright. 2015. "Authoritarian Legislatures and Expropriation Risk." *British Journal of Political Science*. 47, p.1-17.

RESEARCH PAPER (Paper and bonus point deliverable due April 28!)

Your final in this class has two parts: a required partner research paper, and an OPTIONAL research presentation – **please note modifications to this presentation requirement below!!!**

For your final paper, you and a partner will select two countries and research their institutions. (If necessary, I will allow a group of three – you must clear it with me first!) Each of you is responsible for researching the country you choose; together you will discuss these countries in a comparative context. You and your partner should discuss which two countries you will be researching early, to ensure that you are prepared to discuss them comparatively later on.

NOTE: You may NOT choose the United States as one of your countries.

Your country research should include this information for each country:

- What type of democracy is this country (if not a democracy, explain the dictatorship: does it involve a military dictator, a monarchy, a personalist dictator, or a dominant party?)
*Be sure to explain how you determined if the country is or is not a democracy.
- What is the nature of executive-legislative relations? Talk about recent government formations/collapses, and how that has affected political developments in your country.
- Talk about the electoral system. Identify what it is, and discuss how this affects the party system that has developed, and any issues regarding electoral integrity in your country. Does the electoral system do a good job addressing the demographic/economic/racial dynamics of your country? How does the electoral system affect electoral accountability? Do citizens feel ties to their elected representatives? How did you come to this conclusion?
- Discuss the composition of the legislature. How does the party system look within the legislature? How does the legislature represent the citizenry? Does it do a good job?

You and your partner will use your individual country research to compare and contrast the institutions of your respective countries. Where does one country do a better job addressing certain considerations (such as types of representation, electoral integrity, etc.)? Do you see variation in the effects that similar institutional structures produce? What does one country do that you think could be profitably applied to the other? Discuss the similarities and differences you observe between the countries you have selected. What does this help to tell us about politics both in these individual countries, but also in a more generalizable context?

Your research paper is due April 28. Please submit it to the assignment dropbox on eLC under Week 15. You must include a list of references with your paper, and clearly document where you found information using in-text citations. Any paper submitted without references will automatically lose 10 points. Any paper submitted without in-text citations will also automatically lose 10 points.

Helpful hints:

- Think about the two countries you choose carefully: Do you want to choose two countries that seem similar, and examine variation in institutions? Or would you prefer to choose two countries that seem different, and see where the institutions are similar? Do you want to choose countries in the same region, or two different regions? Why? Talk about why you chose your cases in the paper!
- Use the weekly topics in the syllabus to help you address different institutional elements that you might want to discuss (some, of course, may be less relevant depending on your country!). Use old homework assignments and readings to help you think about the types of institutions and their effects, and use old readings to guide you in how you define and think about different topics.
- The best papers will likely require you to do collect some data about various elements of the institutional environment – often, the best way to present such information is in a table or figure. Any figures or tables should include a reference to the source of your information, and acknowledgement of the sources consulted even if you build your own graphic! Be sure to discuss the table/figure in the text, as well, to help explain why you thought it was important to include in your discussion of the country’s institutions.

BONUS POINTS FOR A “PRESENTATION” OF YOUR FINDINGS:

I had originally required each of you to participate in a research presentation to share your findings with the rest of the class. Given our move to an online format, this is obviously not playing out the way I had hoped.

As a result, I am formally dropping the requirement that you upload a presentation – but I am offering you the opportunity to earn **bonus points** towards your grade.

If you would like to upload a slide presentation with a voiceover narration, you may do so. Otherwise, I encourage you to think creatively about what sort of “deliverable” you would like to share with me.

To get you started, here are a few ideas that just popped into my head:

1. You could record your own podcast/talk show
2. You could produce a series of TikToks (preferably with a new viral dance but that’s on you)
3. You could create fake tourism brochures that emphasize the institutional virtues of the countries you chose

Go crazy! I don’t have any particular expectations for this – I want you to have fun, and convey to me some of the interesting information you learned as you worked on your final paper. How you want to present that to me is totally up to you – depending on the format you choose to employ for this “deliverable” you can provide me with instructions on how to access it by email. Otherwise, I’ve made a separate assignment dropbox on eLC Week 15 (marked “Bonus presentation materials”) where you can post the file. I don’t know what the file size restrictions are, so if you’re having problems let me know and we will figure it out. Your bonus “presentation” deliverable is due on April 28th by 5pm (same as paper)!

Week 14: April 20-24

OPTIONAL OFFICE HOURS DURING NORMAL CLASS TIME:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/970073760>

Meeting ID: 970 073 760

FINAL “PRESENTATION” DELIVERABLE DUE TO eLC DROPBOX BY 5PM APRIL 28th!

FINAL PAPER DUE TO eLC DROPBOX BY 5PM APRIL 28th!

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

University Honor Code and Academic Honesty Policy

As a University of Georgia student, you have agreed to abide by the University's academic honesty policy, "A Culture of Honesty," and the Student Honor Code. All academic work must meet the standards described in "A Culture of Honesty" found at: <https://ovpi.uga.edu/academic-honesty/academic-honesty-policy>. Lack of knowledge of the academic honesty policy is not a reasonable explanation for a violation. Questions related to course assignments and the academic honesty policy should be directed to the instructor.

Student Resources

UGA has a vast array of resources to support students facing a variety of challenges. Please don't hesitate to come speak with me or contact these resources directly. Please be aware that UGA faculty and staff are obligated to report any knowledge of sexual assault/relationship violence to UGA's Equal Opportunity Office. UGA's Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention (info below) can speak to students confidentially.

- **Office of Student Care & Outreach** (coordinate assistance for students experiencing hardship/unforeseen circumstances) – 706-542-7774 or by email sco@uga.edu
- **Counseling and Psychiatric Services (CAPS)** - 706-542-2273 (during regular business hours)
After Hour Mental Health Crisis: 706-542-2200 (UGA Police—ask to speak to the CAPS on-call clinician)
- **Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention** – 706-542-SAFE (The advocates at RSVP can provide student confidentiality).