

## Comparative Democratic Processes

Political Science, G8526  
Columbia University, Spring 2014

Professor Kimuli Kasara  
Office: IAB 717  
Office Hours: Tuesday 2-4.  
e-mail: kk2432 • columbia.edu

Time: Tues 4:10-6:00  
Location: IAB 711

### COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course explores with the individual and organizational determinants of candidate selection, accountability and representation in developed and developing democracies. It focuses several questions: 1) Why are political parties necessary? 2) Why are some parties more disciplined or cohesive than others? 3) What explains variation in the importance of programmatic politics? 4) How do people decide whether and how to vote? 5) How do parties and candidates use spending to win votes? 6) What institutions foster substantive and descriptive representation? 7) What are the causes and the effects of electoral laws?

### REQUIREMENTS

- *Class participation – 20% of the final grade for the class.*
- *Referee reports - One due on or before March 11<sup>th</sup> and one due after – 10% each*  
Each student will submit two referee reports. The reports ought to start with a brief summary of the paper followed by a justification of your recommendation (publish, revise and resubmit, or reject). The reports should include a detailed discussion of the rigor and plausibility of the theory advanced and/or an evaluation of the quality of the evidence provided. Because constructive criticism is an important part of our profession, these reports ought to include suggestions on how the paper can be improved. Finally, reports ought to include a discussion of whether the paper makes an important contribution to debates in a research area of general interest. Reports should be 1.5 to 2 single-spaced pages long and students will post them on Courseworks at 9am on the day the paper is being discussed in class.
- *Presentation of research proposal – 20%*  
Each student will make a presentation near the end of the semester describing a proposed research project.
- *Final paper or final exam – 40%*  
Students in the political science PhD program must write a research paper based on the topic of the presentation. All other students may choose to either write the research paper or take a take-home final “exam.” Students choosing to write the final paper who desire an incomplete will receive one that expires on August 1, 2014 (the date on which all final research papers are due).

## COURSE OUTLINE

Readings for which there are no links will be posted in the “Class Files” section of Courseworks.

### **Session 1 (21/01): Introduction**

### **Session 2 (28/01): Parties: Why Parties?**

(For Background) “Inside European Political Parties” in Gallagher, Michael, Michael Laver, and Peter Mair. 2005. *Representative Government in Modern Europe*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Lipset, Seymour, Stein Rokkan. 1967. “Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments: An Introduction.” In: Seymour Lipset, Stein Rokkan (eds.), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives*, 1-64. New York: The Free Press.

Aldrich, John H. 1995. *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapters 1 & 2.

Cox, Gary W., and Matthew D. McCubbins. 1993. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Chapters 4 & 5.

Chhibber, Pradeep, and Ken Kollman. 2004. *The Formation of National Party Systems: Federalism and Party Competition in Canada, Great Britain, India, and the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Chapter 3.

### **Session 3 (04/02): Parties: Party Cohesion and Candidate Selection**

[Strom, Kaare. 1990. A Behavioral Theory of Competitive Political Parties. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 34 \(2\):565-598.](#)

[Krehbiel, Keith. 1993. Where's the Party? \*British Journal of Political Science\* 23 \(2\):235-266](#)

[Kam, Christopher, William T. Bianco, Itai Sened, and Regina Smyth. 2010. Ministerial Selection and Intraparty Organization in the Contemporary British Parliament. \*American Political Science Review\* 104 \(2\):289-306.](#)

[Heller, William B., and Carol Mershon. 2008. Dealing in Discipline: Party Switching and Legislative Voting in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, 1988–2000. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 52\(4\):910-925.](#)

[Kemahlioglu, Ozge, Shapiro Weitz, and Shigeo Hirano. 2009. Why Primaries in Latin American Presidential Elections? \*Journal of Politics\* 71 \(1\):339-352.](#)

#### **Session 4 (11/02): Parties: The Personal Vote**

[Carey, John, and Matthew Shugart. 1995. Incentives to cultivate a personal vote: A rank ordering of electoral formulas. \*Electoral Studies\* 14 \(4\):417-439.](#)

Carey, John M. 2009. *Legislative Voting and Accountability*, New York: Cambridge, chapters 5-6.

[Samuels, David J. 1999. Incentives to Cultivate a Party Vote in Candidate-centric Electoral Systems Evidence from Brazil. \*Comparative Political Studies\* 32 \(4\):487-518.](#)

[Desposato, Scott W. 2005. Parties for Rent? Ambition, Ideology, and Party Switching in Brazil's Chamber of Deputies. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 50 \(1\):62-80.](#)

[Cox, Gary W. , and Michael F. Thies. 1998. The Cost of Intraparty Competition: The Single, Nontransferable Vote and Money Politics in Japan. \*Comparative Political Studies\* 31 \(3\):267-291.](#)

#### **Session 5 (18/02): Parties: Programmatic Politics**

Shefter, Martin. 1994. *Political Parties and the State: The American Historical Experience*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, Chapters 1 & 2.

Kitschelt, Herbert, and Steven Wilkinson. 2007. Citizen-Politician Linkages: An Introduction. In *Patrons, Clients, and Policies: Patterns of democratic accountability and political competition* edited by H. Kitschelt and S. Wilkinson. New York Cambridge University Press.

Stokes, Susan, Thad Dunning, Marcelo Nazareno, and Valeria Brusco. 2013. *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: Puzzle of Distributive Politics* New York, NY Cambridge University Press., Chapter 8.

[Keefer, Philip, and Razvan Vlaicu. 2008. Democracy, Credibility, and Clientelism. \*Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization\* 24 \(2\):371-406.](#)

[Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca. 2012. What Wins Votes: Why Some Politicians Opt Out of Clientelism. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 56 \(3\):568-583.](#)

#### **Session 6 (25/02): Voting Behavior: Party Identification and Partisan Bias**

Bartels, Larry M. 2010. The Study of Electoral Behavior. In *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior*, edited by J. E. Leighley. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dalton, Russell J. 2000. The Decline of Partisan Identification. In *Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, edited by R. J. Dalton and M. P. Wattenberg. New York: Oxford University Press.

[Huber, John D., Georgia Kernell, and Eduardo L. Leoni. 2005. Institutional Context, Cognitive Resources and Party Attachments Across Democracies. \*Political Analysis\* 13 \(4\):365-386.](#)

[Bartels, Larry M. 2002. Beyond the Running Tally: Partisan Bias in Political Perceptions \*Political Behavior\* 24 \(2\):117–150.](#)

[Prior, Markus, Gaurav Sood, and Kabir Khanna. 2013. "Is Partisan Bias in Perception of Objective Conditions Real?" Working Paper, Vanderbilt University.](#)

[Gerber, Alan, and Gregory A. Huber. 2009. Partisanship, Political Control, and Economic Assessments. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 54 \(1\):153-173.](#)

### **Session 7 (04/03): Voting Behavior: Individual Interests and the Vote**

[Druckman, James N. 2004. Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the \(Ir\)relevance of Framing Effects. \*American Political Science Review\* 98 \(4\):671-686](#)

[De La O, Ana L. , and Jonathan A. Rodden. 2008. Does Religion Distract the Poor?: Income and Issue Voting Around the World. \*Comparative Political Studies\* 41 \(4\):437-476.](#)

[Corstange, Daniel. 2013. Ethnicity on the Sleeve and Class in the Heart. \*British Journal of Political Science\* 43 \(04\):889-914.](#)

Huber, John D., and Piero Stanig. 2009. Individual income and voting for redistribution across democracies. Working Paper, Columbia University.

[Kedar, Orit. 2005. When Moderate Voters Prefer Extreme Parties: Policy Balancing in Parliamentary Elections. \*American Political Science Review\* 99 \(2\):185-199.](#)

Nieuwbeerta, Paul , and Nan Dirk De Graaf. 1999. Traditional Class Voting in Twenty Postwar Societies In *The End of Class Politics?: Class voting in comparative context*, edited by G. Evans. New York: Oxford University Press

### **Session 8 (11/03): Voting Behavior: Accountability/Economic Voting**

[Powell, G. Bingham, and Guy D. Whitten. 1993. A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 37 \(2\):391-414.](#)

[Duch, Raymond M., and Randy Stevenson. 2005. Context and the Economic Vote: A Multilevel Analysis \*Political Analysis\* 13 \(4\):387-409](#)

[Samuels, David. 2004. Presidentialism and Accountability for the Economy in Comparative Perspective. \*American Political Science Review\* 98 \(3\):425-436.](#)

[Lewis-Beck, Michael, Richard Nadeau, and Angelo Elias. 2008 Economics, Party, and the Vote: Causality Issues and Panel Data. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 52 \(1\):84-95.](#)

### **Session (18/03): Spring Recess**

**Session 9 (25/03): Turnout**

[Aldrich, John. 1993. Rational Choice and Turnout. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 37 \(1\):246-278.](#)

[Gerber, Alan, Donald P. Green, and Christopher W. Larimer. 2008. Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment. \*American Political Science Review\* 102 \(1\).](#)

[Lupu, Noam, and Jonas Pontusson. 2011. The Structure of Inequality and the Politics of Redistribution. \*American Political Science Review\* 105 \(02\):316-336.](#)

[Anderson, Christopher J., and Pablo Beramendi. 2012. Left Parties, Poor Voters, and Electoral Participation in Advanced Industrial Societies. \*Comparative Political Studies\* 45 \(6\):714-746.](#)

[Kasara, Kimuli, and Pavithra Suryanarayan. 2013. "When Do the Rich Vote Less than the Poor and Why? Explaining Turnout Inequality Across the World." Working Paper. Columbia University.](#)

**Session 10 (01/04): Voters & Parties: Party Strategies for Winning Votes**

[Dahlberg, Matz, and Eva Johansson. 2002. On the Vote-Purchasing Behavior of Incumbent Governments. \*American Political Science Review\* 96 \(1\):27-40.](#)

[Calvo, Ernesto, and Victoria Murillo. 2004. Who Delivers? Partisan Clients in the Argentine Electoral Market. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 48 \(4\):742-757.](#)

Stokes, Susan, Thad Dunning, Marcelo Nazareno, and Valeria Brusco. 2013. *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: Puzzle of Distributive Politics* New York, NY Cambridge University Press., Chapters 2-4.

[Gans-Morse, Jordan, Sebastián Mazzuca, and Simeon Nichter. 2013. Varieties of Clientelism: Machine Politics during Elections. \*American Journal of Political Science\*:](#)

**Session 11 (08/04): Voters & Parties: Representation**

[Fréchette, Guillaume R., Francois Maniquet, and Massimo Morelli. 2008. Incumbents' Interests and Gender Quotas. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 52:891-909.](#)

[Golder, Matt, and Jacek Stramski. 2010. Ideological Congruence and Electoral Institutions. \*American Journal of Political Science\* 54 \(1\).](#)

[Hirano, Kosuke Imai, Yuki Shiraito, and Masaki Taniguchi. 2011. Policy Positions in Mixed Member Electoral Systems: Evidence from Japan.](#)

[Huber, John D., and G. Bingham Powell. 1994. Congruence Between Citizens and Policymakers in Two Visions of Liberal Democracy. \*World Politics\* 46 \(3\):291-326.](#)

[Samuels, David, and Richard Snyder. 2001. The Value of a Vote: Malapportionment in Comparative Perspective. \*British Journal of Political Science\* 31 \(4\):651-671.](#)

#### **Session 12 (15/04): Voters & Parties: Ethnicity**

Chandra, Kanchan. 2004. *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed: Patronage and Ethnic Headcounts in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1-2.

Arriola, Leonardo. 2012. *Multi-Ethnic Coalitions in Africa: Business Financing of Opposition Election Campaigns* New York: Cambridge University Press., Chapters 2 & 8.

[Dunning, Thad, and Lauren Harrison. 2010. Cross-Cutting Cleavages and Ethnic Voting: An Experimental Study of Cousinage in Mali. \*American Political Science Review\* 104 \(1\):21-39.](#)

[Posner, Daniel. 2004. The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi. \*American Political Science Review\* 98 \(4\):529-45.](#)

[Ichino, Nahomi, and Noah Nathan. 2013. Crossing the Line: Local Ethnic Geography and Voting in Ghana. \*American Political Science Review\* 107 \(02\):344-361.](#)

#### **Session 13 (22/04): Voters & Parties: Choosing Electoral Laws**

[Andrews, Josephine, and Robert W. Jackman. 2005. Strategic Fools: Electoral rule choice under extreme uncertainty \*Electoral Studies\* 24 \(1\):65-84.](#)

[Boix, Carles. 1999. Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies. \*American Political Science Review\* 93 \(3\).](#)

[Bol, Damien. 2013. Electoral reform, values and party self-interest. \*Party Politics\*.](#)

[Cusack, Thomas R., Torben Iversen, and David Soskice. 2007. Economic Interests and the Origins of Electoral Systems. \*American Political Science Review\* 101 \(3\):373-391.](#)

Leeman, Lucas, and Isabela Mares. 2013. "The Adoption of Proportional Representation: One Phenomenon, Plethora of Explanations." *Journal of Politics* no. 76 (2).

[McElwain, Kenneth Mori. 2008. Manipulating Electoral Rules to Manufacture Single-Party Dominance \*American Journal of Political Science\* 52 \(1\):32-47.](#)

**Session 14 (29/04): Presentation of Research Projects**