

## **Comparative Political Research and Post-Communist Politics**

Course syllabus, Fall 2003

Department of Political Science  
Central European University

Lecturer: András Bozóki, Gábor Tóka  
Teaching assistant: Róbert Sata

Classes: from 1 to 3 pm on Monday and Wednesday in FT 909

Office hours: András Bozóki: 4 to 5 pm on Monday, 2 to 3 pm on Friday, or by appointment

Róbert Sata: 3 to 5 pm on Wednesday in FT 909

Gábor Tóka: 3 to 5 pm on Monday and Wednesday in FT 803

### **Who has to take this course and when?**

The purpose of this four-credit course is to serve as an introduction to concepts, theories and methods in comparative politics. It is a core course, which means that all MA students in Political Science have to take either this course in the Fall semester, or the Comparative Political Research course in the Winter semester, or pass an exemption test from comparative political research in September 2003. Enrollment will be limited to maximum 30 students in each semester.

### **Goals**

The course uses examples mainly from Eastern and Central European politics to explore the strengths and limitations of empirical analyses in comparative politics and on improving your skills in setting a tractable research question and carrying out a sound analysis. At the same time it also serves as an introduction to institutionalist accounts of political processes, reviewing some important theoretical controversies and empirical generalizations regarding the sources and consequences of variations in democratic regime types. Throughout the course we will pay close attention to how scholarly analyses develop their arguments, what kind of proofs they offer, and how they deal with contradictory evidence. We shall examine ways of tackling the cumbersome problem that arises when there are very few cases (say political systems) that would be relevant for the analysis, while the outcome of interest (say the success of inter-ethnic accommodation in a democratic system) may well be influenced by a large number of factors.

The topics will be explored both by lectures and seminars discussing the mandatory readings of the week. With a few exceptions the readings are typical examples of state of the art scholarly work. This does not mean that you should definitely accept, and even less that you should like their conclusions. Rather, they were selected because they neatly demonstrate some methodological problems that we shall contemplate.

### **Requirements**

It is essential that you contribute to in-class discussions every week (task A). However, the central consideration in evaluating your contributions to the seminars will be their quality, and not length or frequency. Your remarks are expected to reflect a thorough digesting of the mandatory readings and enable us to spot and assess their errors as well as normative and practical implications.

During weeks 1-8 of the course, you will have to submit a position paper by leaving a hard copy of it in the pigeonhole of Gábor Tóka before 1 pm on the Monday of the respective week (task B). The topic of each position paper is defined in the syllabus in the "assignment" section after the list of readings for each week. The position papers will be graded. If you fail to meet the deadline above but submit your assignment within a week, you will only receive two-thirds of the points that you would get otherwise, and one-third if you are even later than that.

By the end of October, you will have to choose a topic on which you will prepare a research proposal (task C) to be discussed at one of the workshops during weeks 9-11 (task D). The workshops will be small-group discussions about a maximum 3000-word long research proposal by each of you. The research proposal can be a preliminary outline for an MA thesis, or it can outline an entirely hypothetical study that you may or may not carry out some time in the future. It may (but does not have to) anticipate a costly, organizationally complicated and extremely time-consuming research effort that you, personally, may never be able to undertake. What is important is just that the project must be doable provided that the necessary resources are available. The proposal must define a

research question, justify its theoretical or practical significance, and explain how one can seek to answer the question through empirical research. Doing so it will identify what kind of information, data or other resources will be needed for the analysis, how the necessary empirical evidence can be obtained and evaluated, and what conclusions one could draw from the investigation if the empirical evidence goes one way or another. The length of the proposal must not exceed 3000 words and can be shorter than that, but must make your answer to the above questions comprehensible and compelling for the readers. You will have to email the proposal before Friday, 21 November, to Robert Sata, who will forward them to all participants at the workshop where we shall discuss it. At the workshop you will merely answer the questions/comments of the audience about your research proposal and present your questions/comments regarding the proposals/book reviews of others.

Because of the size of the class, we will probably have to split in two smaller groups of equal size for the workshop meetings. There will be approximately six meetings of the length of a regular seminar for each of the two groups, and we will discuss the proposals one by one (task D). All participants in a workshop will have to send their comments and questions about all research proposals to Robert Sata and the author of the respective proposal before the day when we discuss it. At the workshops the author of the proposal in question will merely answer the questions/comments of the audience about his or her research proposal. Your comments, questions and answers will be evaluated according to how substantial, well-reasoned and constructive they were.

At the end of the semester you will take an open-book in-class test (task E). The questions will address the issues explored by the seminars, lectures and the readings.

Fifteen percent of your grade will depend on your general participation (task A), 30 percent on your position papers (task B), 20 percent on the excellence of your research proposal (task C), 15 percent on your comments/questions about other participants' research proposals (task D), and 20 percent on the test results (task E).

### **About the readings**

The readings are listed below after the title of the respective week's lecture and seminar. Mandatory readings are marked with \*, and usually followed by a list of recommended texts on the given topic. Course packets including all mandatory readings are available from the secretariat of the Political Science department. Below we list some texts that may prove a useful reading throughout the course.

These three books are good – and varied - examples of state-of-the-art textbooks in comparative politics (not methods):

Almond, Gabriel A., Russell J. Dalton, and G. Bingham Powell eds. 2001. *European Politics Today*. New York: Longman.

Mahler, Gregory S. 2000. *Comparative Politics: An Institutional and Cross-National Approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Shively, W. Phillips 2001. *Power and Choice: An Introduction to Political Science*. 7th ed. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

On social science methods in general and comparative methods in particular the following texts are particularly useful and comprehensive. I ordered them in approximate order of their accessibility, i.e. listing first the most introductory and last the most advanced texts:

Landman, Todd 2000. *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Shively, W. Phillips 2001. *The Craft of Political Research*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Elster, Jon 1989. *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Van Evera, Stephen 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Collier, David 1991. "The Comparative Method: Two Decades of Change." in *Comparative Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives*, ed. by Dankwart A. Rustow, and Kenneth Paul Erickson. New York: Harper Collins, pp. 7-31.

As it often happens in newly emerging sciences, so too in political science the history of the discipline is, to some extent, the intellectual and personal history of some leading scholars. Some of them are well covered in this rather interesting book by one of the retired classics of our discipline:

Daalder, Hans 1997. *Comparative European Politics: The Story of a Profession*. London: Pinter.

There is a website with an excellent and regularly updated bibliography on some of the topics that we cover during the course. It also directs you to some relevant software for small-N analyses and other useful sources:

Rihoux, Benoît, and Charles C. Ragin 2002-. "Comparative Methods, Small N, Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Fuzzy-Sets (fs/QCA) International Resource Site." URL: <http://smalln.spri.ucl.ac.be/>. Accessed on 16 August 2002.

On how to read and write your various assignments, the Academic Writing course and the LTC website give plenty of useful information. In addition, you may want to consult the following sources:

Colorado State University 1997-2002. "Writing Guides." Posted at <http://writing.colostate.edu/references/index.cfm>, accessed on 3 August 2002.

Hart, Chris 1998. *Doing a Literature Review*. London: Sage.

## READINGS AND TOPICS BY WEEK

**Week 0:** Introductory talk (no readings and no written assignment this week)

[Click here to see the presentation](#)

**Week 1:** The goals of political research and comparison. What makes comparative political science a science? Thick description vs. generalizations about causal relationships.

[Click here to see the presentation](#)

Readings:

- \* Schmitter, Philippe C. and Terry Lynn Karl 1994. "The Conceptual Travels of Transitologists and Consolidologists: How Far to the East Should They Attempt to Go?" *Slavic Review* 53: 173-85.
- \* Bunce, Valerie 1995. "Should Transitologists Be Grounded?" *Slavic Review* 54: 111-27.
- \* Karl, Terry Lynn, and Philippe C. Schmitter 1995. "From an Iron Curtain to a Paper Curtain: Grounding Transitologists or Students of Post-Communism?" *Slavic Studies* 54: 965-78.
- \* Bunce, Valerie 1995. "Paper Curtains and Paper Tigers." *Slavic Studies* 54: 979-87.
- \* Motyl, Alexander J. 1999. "Why Empires Reemerge: Imperial Collapse and Imperial Revival in Comparative Perspective." *Comparative Politics* 31: 127-46.
- Collier, David 1993. "The Comparative Method." in *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, ed. by Ada W. Finifter. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association, pp. 105-19.
- Levi-Faur, David 1999. "Comparative Methods in Political and Social Research. For students of the Political Science Department of the University of Haifa." URL: <http://poli.haifa.ac.il/%7Elevi/method.html> Accessed on 16 August 2002.
- Landman, Todd 2000. *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1-34.
- Peters, B. Guy 1998. *Comparative Politics: Theory and Methods*. London: Macmillan.
- Peters, B. Guy 1999. *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The 'New Institutionalism'*. London: Pinter, pp. 1-24.
- Ragin, Charles C. 1994. *Constructing Social Research: The Unity and Diversity of Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, pp. 31-53.

**Assignment:** Is there a genuine controversy between "comparability" and "uniqueness"? Summarize your views in a position paper on pros and cons in the Schmitter-Bunce debate and show how the example of the Motyl article supports your points.

**Week 2:** From questions to theories and from theories to methods. Example: theories about the effects of presidential vs. parliamentary institutional design on the performance of the democratic system, and the methods that can be used to study and improve them

Readings:

- \* Linz, Juan J. 1990. "The Perils of Presidentialism." *Journal of Democracy* 1 (Winter): 51-69. Reprinted in *Parliamentary versus Presidential Government*, ed. by Arend Lijphart, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992, pp. 118-27.
- \* Lijphart, Arend 1992. "Introduction." in *Parliamentary versus Presidential Government*, ed. by Arend Lijphart. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-27.
- \* Mainwaring, Scott, and Matthew Soberg Shugart 1997. "Juan Linz, Presidentialism, and Democracy." *Comparative Politics* 30: 449-71.
- Cheibub, José Antonio, and Fernando Limongi 2002. "Democratic Institutions and Regime Survival: Parliamentary and Presidential Democracies Reconsidered." *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 151-79.
- Colomer, Josep M. 1995. "Strategies and Outcomes in Eastern Europe." *Journal of Democracy* 6 (April): 74-85.
- Holmes, Stephen 1993. "Superpresidentialism and its Problems." *East European Constitutional Review* 2-3: (Fall 1993 - Winter 1994): 123-6.
- Mainwaring, Scott, and Matthew Soberg Shugart eds. 1997. *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Metcalf, Lee Kendall 1997. "Institutional Choice and Democratic Consolidation: The Experience of the Russian Successor States, 1918-1939." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 30: 307-20.
- Ordeshook, Peter C. 1995. "Reexamining Russia: Institutions and Incentives." *Journal of Democracy* 6 (April): 46-60.
- Ostrow, Joel M. 1998. "Procedural Breakdown and Deadlock in the Russian State Duma: The Problems of an Unlinked Dual-channel Institutional Design." *Europe-Asia Studies* 50: 793-816.
- Przeworski, Adam, Michael Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub and Fernando Limongi 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shugart, Matthew Soberg 1993. "Of Presidents and Parliaments." *East European Constitutional Review* 2 (Winter 1993): 30-2.
- Shugart, Matthew Soberg 1995. "Books in Review: Parliaments over Presidents?" *Journal of Democracy* 6 (April): 168-72.
- Shugart, Matthew S. and John M. Carey 1992. *Presidents and Assemblies: Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Stepan, Alfred, and Cindy Skach 1993. "Constitutional Frameworks and Democratic Consolidation: Parliamentarism versus Presidentialism." *World Politics* 46: 1-22.
- Strom, Kaare 2000. "Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies." *European Journal of Political Research* 37: 261-89.
- Taras, Ray ed. 1997. *The Presidency in Post-Communist States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- von Mettenheim, Kurt ed. 1997. *Presidential Institutions and Democratic Politics: Comparing Regional and National Contexts*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Weaver, R. Kent, and Bert A. Rockman 1993. "When and How Do Institutions Matter?" in *Do Institutions Matter? Government Capabilities in the United States and Abroad*, ed. by Kent Weaver and Bert A. Rockman. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, pp. 445-61.

**Assignment:** The authors of the three mandatory readings appear to have some disagreements regarding what and why is influenced by the difference between presidential and parliamentary regimes. Some of these disagreements are explicitly mentioned in the articles, others are not. Identify key points of disagreements between them and what – if any - the position of each article is on the issue.

**Week 3:** Concept formation. Identifying the objects of inquiry: definitions, measurement, and classifications. What determines the value of scientific concepts and definitions? Example: classifying the political systems of Eastern Europe and measuring the degree of democracy

Readings:

- \* Collier, David, and Robert Adcock 1999. "Democracy and Dichotomies: A Pragmatic Approach to Choices about Concepts." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 537-65.
  - \* Schmitter, Philippe C. and Terry Lynn Karl 1991. "What Democracy Is... and Is Not." *Journal of Democracy* 2 (Summer): 75-88.
- Brooker, Paul 2000. "Semi-Dictatorships and Semidemocracies." in *Non-Democratic Regimes*, ed. by Paul Brooker. London: Macmillan, pp. 226-55.
- Collier, David, and Steven Levitsky 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49: 430-51.
- Collier, David, and James Mahon 1993. "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 87: 845-55.
- Diamond, Larry 1999. *Developing Democracy Toward Consolidation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press
- Gastil, Raymond, Duncan 1991. "The Comparative Survey of Freedom: Experiences and Suggestions." in *On Measuring Political Democracy: Its Consequences and Concomitants*, ed. by Alex Inkeles. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. 21-46.
- Hague, Rod, Martin Harrop, and Shaun Breslin 1998. *Political Science: A Comparative Introduction*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Macmillan, pp. 3-19.
- Handelman, Howard and Mark Tessler eds. 1999. *Democracy and Its Limits*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press
- IDEA 2002b. "Democracy Assessment Questionnaire." URL: [http://www.idea.int/ideas\\_work/14\\_political\\_state.htm](http://www.idea.int/ideas_work/14_political_state.htm)

- Marshall, Monty G, and Keith Jagers 2001. *Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-1999. The Polity IV Dataset*. URL: <http://www.cidcm.umd.edu/inscr/polity/>
- Munck, Gerardo L., and Jay Verkuilen 2002. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices." *Comparative Political Studies* 35: 5-33.
- Poe, Steven C., and C. Neal Tate 1994. "Repression of Human Rights to Personal Integrity in the 1980s: A Global Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 88: 853-72.
- Przeworski, Adam, Michael Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub and Fernando Limongi 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sartori, Giovanni 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64: 1033-53.
- Sartori, Giovanni 1991. "Comparing and Miscomparing." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 3: 243-57.
- Vanhanen, Tatu 2000. *The Polyarchy Dataset: Vanhanen's Index of Democracy*. URL: <http://www.svt.ntnu.no/iss/data/vanhanen>

**Assignment:** Write a short position paper about what is the point of developing abstract concepts like democracy, and exactly what we may gain by carefully defining them. How do you think democracy should be measured in scientific analyses?

**Week 4:** From classifications to theoretical proposition and models. Example: Development models, transition theories, path-dependency and institutional choices

Readings:

- \* Bernhard, Michael 2000. "Institutional Choice after Communism: A Critique of Theory-building in an Empirical Wasteland." *East European Politics and Societies* 14 (Spring): 316-47.
- \* Van Evera, Stephen 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 7-14, 17-27.
- Diamond, Larry 1999. *Developing Democracy Toward Consolidation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Linz, Juan J. and Alfred Stepan 1996. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press
- O'Donnell, Guillermo and Philippe C. Schmitter 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions About Uncertain Democracies*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 6-64.
- Przeworski, Adam 1991. *Democracy and the Market*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 51-99.

**Assignment:**

NOTE ABOUT THE READINGS: Although it is included in the reader, we will not deal with and you can ignore Van Evera's discussion of *What Is a Specific Explanation?* on pp. 15-17 of his book. Note that Van Evera is a bit inconsistent about whether theories always have "antecedent conditions" or not – in fact sometimes they do and sometimes they do not. Yet other times theories simply make certain assumptions (for instance that all humans rationally follow their self-interest) that are not tested empirically, but rather their validity is taken for granted.

Note too that when Van Evera talks of the "prescriptive" content of theories, he only means that they may indirectly imply what to do if your goals happen to be this or that. These "prescriptive" implications of a theory apply for all relevant cases, including those where the "antecedent conditions" are not present.

Note too that talking of "laws" Van Evera means "empirical laws" only. By and large, any statement which says something like "if A, then B" can be called a law. Non-empirical laws include legal norms and laws of logic (e.g. if A is equal to B and B is equal to C then A is equal to C).

When Van Evera talks hypotheses as "predictions", he does not mean forecasts about future events, but expectations derived from the theory.

The "parsimoniousness" of a theory has a tradeoff with how "satisfying" it is.

**Assignment:** Select an article featuring some empirical analysis of transitions from communism or post-communist politics that was published in any one of the following journals since January 2000: *Comparative Politics*, *Comparative Political Studies*, *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, *Democratization*, *Euro-Asia Studies*, *Political Studies*, *World Politics*. Reconstruct the theory proposed in the paper using an arrow diagram identifying

key theoretical variables and the direction of the postulated causal relationship between them. Write a short position paper on how good, according to the criteria proposed by Van Evera, the theory of the article was.

**Week 5:** How can theories be improved? Example: legacies, choices and post-communist regime transitions

Readings:

- \* Kitschelt, Herbert 2001. "Accounting for Post-Communist Regime Diversity: What Counts as a Good Cause?" in *Transformative Paths in Central and Eastern Europe*, ed. by Radoslaw Markowski and Edmund Wnuk-Lipinski. Warsaw: Institute of Political Studies and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, pp. 11-45.
- \* Grzymala-Busse, Anna 2002. *Redeeming the Communist Past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-30.
- Baylis, Thomas A. 1996. "Presidents and Prime Ministers: Shaping Executive Authority in Eastern Europe." *World Politics* 48: 297-323.
- Bunce, Valerie 1997. "Presidents and the Transition in Eastern Europe." in *Presidential Institutions and Democratic Politics: Comparing Regional and National Contexts*, ed. by Kurt von Mettenheim. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 161-76.
- Carey, John M., and Matthew Soberg Shugart eds. 1998. *Executive Decree Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Easter, Gerald M. 1997. "Preference for Presidentialism: Postcommunist Regime Change in Russia and the NIS." *World Politics* 49: 184-211.
- Elster, Jon ed. 1996. *The Roundtable Talks and the Breakdown of Communism*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press
- Elster, Jon, Claus Offe, Ulrich K. Preuss et al. 1998. *Institutional Design in Post-Communist Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 63-108.
- Frye, Timothy 1997. "A Politics of Institutional Choice: Post-Communist Presidencies." *Comparative Political Studies* 30: 523-52.
- Lijphart, Arend 1992. "Democratization and Constitutional Choices in Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, and Poland 1989-1991." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 4: 207-223. See also in *Flying Blind*, ed. by György Szoboszlai. Budapest: Hungarian Political Science Association, pp. 99-114.

**Assignment:** Elaborate your own view in a position paper on the conditions that facilitate the choice of parliamentarism and of presidentialism. Which are the effects of the choices of presidentialism or parliamentarism in the post-communist context? To what extent are these institutional arrangements independent variables? In the course of developing your points reflect on the reasoning of the Kitschelt article regarding each of these points.

**Week 6:** Testing hypotheses and generating alternative explanations through case studies with comparative referents. Example: probes of consociational theory on the examples of India and Dagestan

Readings:

- \* Lijphart, Arend 1996. "The Puzzle of Indian Democracy: A Consociational Interpretation." *American Political Science Review* 90: 258-68.
- \* Ware, Robert Bruce, and Enver Kisriev 2001. "Ethnic Parity and Democratic Pluralism in Dagestan: A Consociational Approach." *Europe-Asia Studies* 53: 105-32.
- \* Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 34-44.
- Bogaards, Matthijs 1998. "The Favourable Factors for Consociational Democracy: A Review." *European Journal of Political Research* 33: 475-96.
- Cohen, Frank S. 1997. "Proportional versus Majoritarian Ethnic Conflict Management in Democracies." *Comparative Political Studies* 30: 607-30.
- Gasiorowski, Mark J., and Timothy J. Power 1998. "The Structural Determinants of Democratic Consolidation: Evidence from the Third World." *Comparative Political Studies* 31: 740-71.
- Horowitz, Donald L. 2000. "Constitutional Design: An Oxymoron?" in *Designing Democratic Institutions. Nomos XLII*, ed. by Ian Shapiro and Stephen Macedo. New York: New York University Press, pp. 253-84.
- Lehmbruch, Gerhard 1975. "Consociational Democracy in the International System." *European Journal of Political Research* 3: 377-91.

- Lijphart, Arend 1977. *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- McRae, Kenneth D. 1997. "Contrasting Styles of Democratic Decision-making: Adversarial versus Consensual Politics." *International Political Science Review* 18: 279-95.
- Power, Timothy J., and Mark J. Gasiorowski 1997. "Institutional Design and Democratic Consolidation in the Third World." *Comparative Political Studies* 30: 123-55.
- Scholten, Ilja 1987. "Introduction: Corporatist and Consociational Arrangements." in *Political Stability and Neo-Corporatism: Corporatist Integration and Social Cleavages in Western Europe*, ed. by Ilja Scholten. London: Sage, pp. 1-38.

**Assignment:** Write a short position paper about how the two papers on consociational democracy use the methods described by Ragin in analyzing the political process in India and Dagestan. Discuss whether or not you think that they were right in using the concept of consociational democracy to understand these two cases better, and justify your opinion.

**Week 7:** Laws, hypotheses, statistical and other tests in comparative research. Types of laws and tests in social science. Example: Lijphart's work on the contrast between consensus and majoritarian democracies as a response to the weaknesses in the theory of consociational democracy

Readings:

- \* Lijphart, Arend 1999. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, pp. 9-47, 275-300.
  - \* Van Evera, Stephen 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 27-39.
  - \* Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp. 55-64.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shively, W. Phillips 2001. *The Craft of Political Research*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

**NOTE ABOUT THE READINGS:** Note that the Ragin text discusses the use of statistical analyses *specifically* in comparative *macro-social* research. Therefore, when he asserts that the independent variables in these analyses are usually "structural" (e.g. "In a typical variable-oriented study, the investigator examines relationships between general features of social structures conceived as variables" on p. 55 of his book), then he does *not* mean that *all* statistical analyses concern socio-structural variables. In fact, in most comparative *political* research the variables of interest refer to characteristics of political institutions or political behavior in a given country. Similarly, Ragin's list of problems with the application of statistical methods in macro-social research (see pp. 61-64 of his book) do not refer to problems with statistical analyses as such, but just with their application to problems where the number of relevant cases is small.

**Assignment:** Select an article featuring some empirical analysis that was published in any one of the following journals since January 2000: *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *British Journal of Political Science*, *European Journal of Political Research*, *Journal of Politics*, *Political Research Quarterly*. Reconstruct the theory proposed in the paper using an arrow diagram identifying key theoretical variables and the direction of the postulated causal relationship between them. Write a short position paper on how strong the empirical test was according to Van Evera's criteria of strong tests and his "helpful hints" for empirical tests.

**Week 8:** The application of quantitative analyses in comparative political research. How can theoretical, conceptual, measurement and model specification problems plague statistical analyses? Example: quantitative analyses of the impact of civic culture

Readings:

- \* Putnam, Robert D., with Roberto Leonardi and Raffaella Y. Nanetti 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 63-120.
- \* Marsh, Christopher 2000. "Social Capital and Democracy in Russia." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 33: 183-99.

- Boix, Carles and Daniel N. Posner 1998. "Social Capital: Explaining Its Origins and Effects on Government Performance." *British Journal of Political Science* 27: 686-93.
- Cusack, Thomas R. 1999. "Social Capital, Institutional Structures, and Democratic Performance: A Comparative Study of German Local Governments." *European Journal of Political Research* 35: 1-34.
- Jackman, Robert W., and Ross A. Miller 1996. "A Renaissance of Political Culture?" *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 632-59.
- Stoner-Weiss, Kathryn 1997. *Local Heroes: The Political Economy of Russian Regional Governance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

**Assignment:** Summarize how Putnam's measurement procedures and empirical analyses help us to test the hypotheses he deals with. Do you find his proofs satisfactory? Propose some further tests that one could undertake to check whether his theory about the impact of civic culture is correct and evaluate the test offered by the Marsh article.

**Weeks 9-11:** Workshops discuss research proposals

**Week 12:** Taking stock: Problems and perspectives in contemporary political science. End of term test

Readings:

- \* Schmitter, Philippe C. 2001. "Seven (Disputable) Theses Concerning the Future of 'Transatlanticised' or 'Globalised' Political Science." *European Political Science* 1 (Spring): 23-40.
  - \* Goodin, Robert E. and Hans-Dieter Klingemann 2001. "In Defence of the New Handbook: A Comment on Criticism by Schmitter and Gunnell." *European Political Science* 1 (Spring): 41-4.
- Ball, Terence 1987. "Is There a Progress in Political Science?" in *Idioms of Inquiry: Critique and Renewal in Political Science*, ed. by Terence Ball. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, pp. 13-44.
- Wagner, Peter 2001. "The Social Sciences in the US and in Europe: Plural Interpretations of Modernity." *European Studies Newsletter* 30 (1-2).