

POL 438/2321H Political Parties in Comparative Perspective

Carolina de Miguel Moyer

University of Toronto Department of Political Science

Fall 2016

Lecture Location and Meeting Time: UC67, Tuesdays 12:00 PM - 2:00 PM

Instructor: Carolina de Miguel Moyer (carol.demiguel@utoronto.ca)

Instructor office hours: Tuesdays 4:00 - 5:00 pm (SS 3035)

Description

This course provides an overview of the literature on comparative political parties. Our goal is to explore the main questions, puzzles and theories on the origins and nature of parties and party systems. Why do parties arise? How do institutions, societal cleavages and strategic action shape parties and party systems? Why do some countries have more parties than others? What explains differences in ideology and party organization? We will also study the role of parties in transitions to democracy and in non-democratic regimes. Finally, we take a look at specific issues of party change, party system collapse, party competition, and party institutionalization in developed and developing democracies including the role of ethnic parties, the relationship between parties and clientelism, and the role of dominant parties.

Readings

The required readings for this course are based on a series of book chapters, articles and other resources that are available as a live link from your course reserve module: <http://go.utlib.ca/coursereserves>.

Course Requirements

Course Requirements	%	Due Date	Submission Guidelines
Participation	13%	Varies	
Critical Review	15%	Varies	Blackboard Turnitin: Before class & Hard copy: Beginning of class
Leading Discussion	15%	Varies	Powerpoint on Blackboard: 2h before class
Research Proposal	10%	Oct 18th	Blackboard Turnitin: Before class & Hard copy: Beginning of class
Peer Review	2%	Oct 25th	Blackboard: Before Class
Poster Presentation	10%	Nov 8th	In-class poster session: location TBD
Final Research Paper	35%	Dec 9th	Blackboard Turnitin: Before class & Hard copy: Department of Political Science by noon
Final Grade	100%		

Participation (13%): Participation is a crucial component of this course. Students are expected to attend lectures and do the assigned weekly readings. As instructor, I will be giving a few introductory remarks to begin the course and facilitate discussion, but otherwise I expect the course to be student-driven. The goal is to give you an opportunity to engage your peers in a seminar-style class. Participation is thus crucial, and you will be evaluated on both the quantity AND quality of your participation. Missing more than THREE seminars will result in a 0% for participation.

Critical Review (15%): The critical review is a short paper that critically assesses **two or more** readings in one of the weeks. You must analyze the readings and not merely summarize them. Your critical review must be written and turned in before we discuss the readings in class, so if you want to write about readings in week 3 you will turn in your paper at the start of the class on September 27th (both hard copy and electronic copy on Blackboard). The critical review should be 4 pages long (12-point Times New Roman, double-spaced, 1" (2.5 cm) margins) and should do the following:

- Present the main argument of the works that you are reviewing in a clear and concise manner. What is the question or topic of each reading? What are the main arguments and the evidence in support of these arguments? **Note: this part consisting on summarizing the readings should be short. The meat of your review should be the next two points on analysis and critique.**
- Evaluate the theoretical and empirical soundness of the arguments presented, offering concrete and well-justified criticisms. What are the strengths and weaknesses? Why is the argument good or bad? Does the evidence help support the argument? Are there omitted variables? Does the author consider alternative explanations? If not, what could those be?
- Explain how the readings fit together and the linkages between them. Do they wrestle with similar puzzles? Is there a unifying theme? Which reading do you find more convincing and why?

Leading Discussion (15%): Each student will present ONE reading orally to the class **once** throughout the semester. Your presentation should be 5-7 minutes long **and should use powerpoint**. The content of the presentation should be quite similar to the critical review (see above). You will critically analyze (NOT merely summarize) one of the readings for your week **AND you will link that reading to the rest of readings for that week (and to previous readings in the course if you wish)**. The goal of “leading discussion” is to present the reading to the rest of the class in a concise, critical and interesting manner so as to stimulate discussion. You should email me the powerpoint presentation two hours in advance of class the day that you are leading discussion. Presentations will take place between week 2 (September 20th) and week 11 (December 6th). You should send me an email **by September 16th** indicating three potential choices of weeks to present (in order of preference) and the reading you wish to focus on. I will then assign each student to a week and a reading trying to respect preferences as much as possible (note that you may not get your first choice of week and/or reading). **Note that your critical review should be done for a different week than your presentation.**

The two readings below are an excellent and didactic description of what constitutes a good presentation and a good powerpoint. These two readings will also be helpful in preparing your powerpoints and your poster presentation. Please read them carefully.

David T. Smith and Rob Salmond. 2011. “Verbal Sticks and Rhetorical Stones: Improving Conference Presentations in Political Science.” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44 (3), 583-588:
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/459819>

Rob Salmond and David T. Smith. 2011. “Cheating Death-by-PowerPoint: Effective Use of Visual Aids at Professional Conferences.” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44 (3), 589-596:
<http://simplelink.library.utoronto.ca/url.cfm/459820>

Research Proposal (10%), Peer Review (2%), Poster Session (10%) and Research Paper (35%): This course will give you the opportunity to develop a research paper on a topic of your choice within the themes of the course. Ultimately, all papers need to involve original research well beyond required and suggested readings and **MUST** include an empirical component. They should be well-written, well-argued

and follow the structure of an academic article. There are different variants of research paper that you can conduct for this class. I am open to other types of research paper, but you should run your ideas past me before-hand.

- You can identify a new puzzle/question not addressed by the literature and bring empirical evidence (one or more country case studies) to help answer the question or solve the puzzle.
- You can explore/extend an existing hypothesis in the literature through a new case study (or group of case studies), through a new policy issue or other dimension of interest
- You can conduct a replication paper in which you get a hold of the data used by an author in one of the articles, replicate their findings and extend/criticize their work. [This is done usually with large-N analyses, but could potentially be done with a smaller set of cases]

I strongly encourage you to come to office hours to discuss your paper before the research proposal is due and afterwards as well. We will break the task of writing this paper into three steps. First you will write a research proposal. Once you have a draft of your paper we will have a poster presentation; and finally you will write the final version of the paper. You will get feedback at all stages from myself and from the rest of students in the course for the first and second stages.

- **Research Proposal (10%):** The research proposal should describe your main research question or puzzle and how it fits in the literature. You should provide a literature review that connects your question or puzzle to the existing literature and reveals why it is important. The research proposal should hint at what your argument might be and the research design you will likely use (cases, data...) to evaluate your argument and answer your question. The research proposal should be 3-5 pages long (excluding bibliography).
- **Peer Review (2%):** A peer in the class will provide comments on your research proposal and you will be responsible to give comments to someone else's proposal.
- **Poster Presentation (10%):** Once you have had some time to work on a first draft of your paper, we will hold a poster session in class. You should imagine you are going to an academic conference to present the preliminary draft of your paper. This is work in progress but it should definitely have a clear exposition of your main topic and question, an argument and some data/evidence/development of the argument, even if rough. You will make a poster to present to the class and we will simulate a conference poster session.
- **Final Research Paper (35%):** The final paper should be 10-15 pages (for undergraduates) and 15-20 pages (for graduates), 12-point Times New Roman, double-spaced, 1" (2.5 cm) margins. The paper should obviously include a list of references. The list of references does not count towards the page-limit. Any tables or figures that you include in your paper are part of the page-limit.

Course Policies

- **Due Dates, Submission Procedures and Late Penalties:** Please refer to the table above for deadlines and different submission formats for each assignment. Note that for the papers (and paper proposal) you will need to submit an electronic copy through Turnitin on Blackboard (in addition to a hard copy in lecture class). *“Normally, students will be required to submit their course essays to Turnitin.com for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. In doing so, students will allow their essays to be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The terms that apply to the University's use of the Turnitin.com service are described on the Turnitin.com web site.*

All work must be submitted on time. **Late assignments will receive a 2% penalty for each late day or fraction of a day (weekends and holidays included).** Late assignments should be submitted to the main office of the Political Science Department (3rd floor of Sidney Smith Hall),

and should obtain a time stamp at the main office.¹ **Emailed or faxed copies of on-time or late assignments will not be accepted.**

- **Extensions for Assignments:** Extensions for assignments will only be granted in extenuating circumstances and with appropriate supporting documentation. According to the Faculty of Arts & Science Academic Handbook you can submit a written request for special consideration within one week of the missed test, attaching appropriate documentation, such as a medical certificate [...] or a College Registrar’s note.” If your extenuating circumstance is medical you must submit the original copy of a University of Toronto student medical certificate (<http://www.illnessverification.utoronto.ca>). Extensions and make-up tests are at my discretion and assignments in other courses are not grounds for an extension.
- **Grade Appeal Policy:** The final grade in the course cannot be appealed. You can appeal the grade for an individual assignment and/or test. Students have up to one month from the date of return of the item of term work to query the marking. The appeal must be made in writing to the TA that graded the work explaining the reasons of your dissatisfaction, making explicit references to the grading criteria and to the course and lecture materials. Such re-marking may involve the entire piece of work, and may raise or lower the mark. If the student is not satisfied with this re-evaluation, he or she may appeal to the instructor in charge of the course. According to the Faculty of Arts & Science Academic Handbook “any appeal of a mark beyond the instructor in the course may only be made for an item worth at least 20% of the course mark.”
- **Contacting the Instructor:** Please feel free to stop by my office (SS 3035) during office hours (Tuesdays 4-5 pm). Office hours are a great time to discuss any questions or concerns you may have about the readings, presentations, research paper etc. Take advantage of them. I expect all lengthy and substantial conversations to happen during office hours rather than by email. For non-substantive questions you can e-mail me at carol.demiguel@utoronto.ca including “POL438/2321H” or “Parties Course” in the subject line. I will respond within 2 working days during weekdays.
- **Blackboard and Announcements:** I will use Blackboard to manage this course and to communicate with you outside of class time. It is your responsibility to have an active U of T e-mail address and to access Blackboard regularly. I will post announcements through Blackboard as well as any new resource or reading material that I consider important for the course.
- **Academic Integrity and Plagiarism:** Academic integrity is fundamental to learning and scholarship at the University of Toronto. While I don’t expect to encounter instances of cheating in this class, you should be aware that I take academic integrity very seriously, and that there are significant consequences if you are caught cheating or engaging in academic misconduct. You are expected to know what constitutes Academic Integrity and familiarize yourself with the University of Toronto’s Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm>). Potential offences include, but are not limited to:
 - In papers and assignments: Using someone else’s ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement. Copying material word-for-word from a source (including lecture and study group notes) and not placing the words within quotation marks. Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor. Making up sources or facts. Including references to sources that you did not use. Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment.
 - On tests and exams: Using or possessing unauthorized aids. Looking at someone else’s answers during an exam or test. Misrepresenting your identity. Submitting an altered test for re-grading.
 - In academic work: Falsifying institutional documents or grades. Falsifying or altering any documentation required by the University, including (but not limited to) doctor’s notes.

¹Please note that the Political Science main office is not open on weekends and closes at 5:00 pm during weekdays. If the office is closed, there is a dropbox and your assignments will be considered as turned in that day, but note that in the weekends your assignment will be considered as turned in the following Monday.

- **Academic Integrity Checklist:** To remind you of these expectations, and help you avoid accidental offences, **you must include a printed and signed Academic Integrity Checklist with all assignments** (the academic integrity check list is posted on Blackboard). **If you do not include the Academic Integrity Checklist with your assignments, your work will not be graded.** If you have questions about appropriate research and citation methods, seek out additional information from me, or from other available campus resources like the U of T Writing Website <http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/advice/using-sources>. Students are strongly advised to keep rough and draft work and hard copies of their research paper and other assignments.
- **Accessibility Needs:** The University of Toronto is committed to accessibility. If you require accommodations for a disability, or have any accessibility concerns about the course, the classroom or course materials, please let me know and contact Accessibility Services as soon as possible at disability.services@utoronto.ca or <http://studentlife.utoronto.ca/accessibility>.
- **Alteration of the Syllabus:** The course schedule and readings may be subject to revision over the course of the semester. Any change in the grading scheme (which I do not expect will happen) will have to be approved by the students of this course in accordance to university regulations.

Course Schedule

September 13th – Introduction & course overview

DUE SEPTEMBER 16th by email: indicate 3 potential choices of weeks to present (in order of preference) and the reading you wish to focus on. AND these week you will be doing your critical review.

Recommended

- Linz, Juan. “Parties in Contemporary Democracies: Problems and Paradoxes,” in Richard Gunther, Jose Ramon Montero, and Linz (eds.), *Political Parties: Old Concepts and New Challenges*. Oxford University Press, 2002. pp. 291-317.
- Schlesinger, Joseph. 1984. “On the Theory of Party Organization.” *The Journal of Politics*. 46: 369-400.
- Stokes, Susan. 1999. “Political Parties and Democracy.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2: 243-267.

September 20th – Origins of parties: social & cultural explanations

- Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Stein Rokkan. 1990. “Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments,” in *The West European Party System*, ed. Peter Mair. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 91-138.
- Kalyvas, Stathis. 1996. *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP. Intro, Chapter 1-2 (pp. 1-113).
- Tavits, Margit, and Natalia Letki. 2014. “From Values to Interests? The Evolution of Party Competition in New Democracies.” *Journal of Politics* 76 (1).

Recommended

- Caramani, Daniele. 2004. *The Nationalization of Politics: The Formation of National Electorates and Party Systems in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chhibber, Pradeep and Mariano Torcal. 1997. “Elite Strategy, Social Cleavages, and Party Systems in a New Democracy: Spain.” *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 30(1) 27-54.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 2008. “Changing Values among Western Publics from 1970-2006.” *West European Politics*, vol. 31, nos. 1- 2 (January - March 2008).

- Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. "The Rise of New Issues and New Parties" p. 237-252 (Chapter 8). In *Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Key, V.O. 1984 [1949]. *Southern Politics in State and Nation*.
- Posner, Daniel N. 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) 529-545.
- Seymour M. Lipset and Gary Marks. 2000. *It Didn't Happen Here: Why Socialism Failed in the United States*.
- Sitter, Nick. 2002. "Cleavages, Party Strategy and Party System Change in Europe, East and West." In *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 3(3), pp. 425-451.
- Stoll, Heather. 2013. *Changing Societies, Changing Party Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

September 27th – **Origins of parties: institutional & organizational explanations**

- Aldrich, John H. 1995. *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Chapters 1, 3, 4 (pp. 3-27; 68-97; 97-125).
- Cox, Gary W. 1987. *The Efficient Secret: The Cabinet and the Development of Political Parties in Victorian England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1-8 (pp. 1-90).

Recommended

- Cox, Gary and Matthew McCubbins. 2007. *Legislative Leviathan*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. Chapters 4-5.

October 4th – **The impact of electoral rules and other institutions on party systems**

- Cox, Gary W. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1, 2, 11.
- Hicken, Allen. 2009. *Building Party Systems in Developing Democracies*. New York: Cambridge UP. Chapters 1 and 2.
- Mainwaring, Scott. 1991. "Politicians, Parties, and Electoral Systems: Brazil in Comparative Perspective" *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 21-43

Recommended

- Blais, Andre and R. K. Carty. 1991. "The Psychological Impact of Electoral Laws: Measuring Duverger's Elusive Factor." *British Journal of Political Science*, 2: 79-93.
- 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: Princeton University Press.
- Clark, William and Matt Golder. 2006. "Rehabilitating Duverger's Theory: Testing the Mechanical and Strategic Modifying Effects of Electoral Laws." *Comparative Political Studies*. 39: 679-708.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1994. *Electoral and Party Systems: A Study of Twenty-Seven Democracies, 1945-1990*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mozaffar, Shaheen, James R. Scarritt, and Glen Galaich. 2003. "Electoral Institutions, Ethnopolitical Cleavages, and Party Systems in Africa's Emerging Democracies." *APSR*, 97, 3: 379-390.
- Ordeshook, Peter C. and Olga Shvetsova. "Ethnic heterogeneity, district magnitude, and the number of parties" *American Journal of Political Science*, 38, 1, 100-123.

October 11th – Party goals, party organization and candidate selection

- Strøm, Kaare. 1990. “A Behavioral Theory of Competitive Political Parties.” *American Journal of Political Science* 34 (2): 565-98.
- Marcus Kreuzer. 1998. “Electoral Institutions, Political Organization, and Party Development: French and German Socialists and Mass Politics.” *Comparative Politics*, 30(3): 273-292.
- Nahomi Ichino and Noah I. Nathan. 2012. “Primaries on Demand? Intra-Party Politics and Nominations in Ghana” *British Journal of Political Science*, 42, pp. 769-791.
- Ozge Kemahlioglu, Rebecca Weitz-Shapiro and Shigeo Hirano. 2009. “Why Primaries in Latin American Presidential Elections?” *Journal of Politics*, vol. 71, no. 1, pp. 339-352.

Recommended

- Chhibber, Pradeep. 2013. “Dynastic parties: Organization, finance and impact.” *Party Politics*, pp. 1-19.
- Dalton, Russell J. and Martin P. Wattenberg. 2000. “Unthinkable Democracy: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies” (Chapter 1, p. 316) in Russell J. Dalton and Martin P. Wattenberg, eds., *Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Duverger, Maurice. 1954. *Political Parties* (New York: Wiley Publishers).
- Harmel, Robert and Janda, Kenneth. 1994. “An Integrated Theory of Party Goals and Party Change.” *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 6, 3: 259- 287.
- Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Katz, Richard S. and Peter Mair. 1995. “Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy: The Emergence of the Cartel Party.” *Party Politics*, 1, no. 1: pp. 5-28.
- Michels, Robert. 1962 [1911]. *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchic Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. New York Free Press.
- Sassoon, Joseph. 2011. *Saddam Hussein’s Ba’th Party: Inside an Authoritarian Regime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 2.
- Scarrow, Susan E. 2000. “Parties Without Members?” In Russell J. Dalton and Martin P. Wattenberg, eds., *Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tavits, Margit. 2012. “Organizing for Success: Party Organizational Strength and Electoral Performance in Postcommunist Europe.” *Journal of Politics*, 74, 1, 83-97.

October 18th – Party competition, party strategy & electoral success I

DUE BEGINNING OF CLASS: Research Proposal

- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Boston: Addison Wesley, Chapters 7-8 (pp. 96-141).
- Meguid, Bonnie M. 2005. “Competition between Unequals: The Role of Mainstream Party Strategy in Niche Party Success.” *American Political Science Review* 99 (3): 347-359.
- Ziegfeld, Adam. “Coalition Government and Party System Change: Explaining the Rise of Regional Political Parties in India”

Recommended

- Spoon, Jae-Jae. 2011. *Political Survival of Small Parties in Europe*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Spoon, Jae-Jae. 2009. “Holding their own: Explaining the Persistence of Green Parties in France and the UK”, *Party Politics*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 615-634.
- Tavits, Margit. 2007. “Principle vs. Pragmatism: Policy Shifts and Political Competition.” *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (1): 151-65
- Kedar, Orit. “When Moderate Voters Prefer Extreme Parties: Policy Balancing in Parliamentary Elections” *American Political Science Review*, vol. 99, no 2.

October 25th – Party competition, party strategy & electoral success II

DUE BEGINNING OF CLASS: Peer Review

- Chandra, Kanchan. 2004. *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed: Patronage and Ethnic Head Count in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1-5.
- Thachil, Tariq. 2014. *Elite Parties, Poor Voters: How Social Services win Votes in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chapters 1, 3, 7, 8.

November 1st – Parties and clientelism

- Kitschelt, Herbert, and Steven Wilkinson. 2007. “Citizen-Politician Linkages: An Introduction,” in *Patrons, Clients, and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, eds. Herbert Kitschelt and Steven Wilkinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-49. *** Do not choose for critical review or leading discussion**
- Scheiner, Ethan. 2005. “Pipelines of Pork: Japanese Politics and a Model of Local Opposition Party Failure.” *Comparative Political Studies* 38 (7): 799-823.
- Levitsky, Steven. 2007. “From populism to clientelism? The transformation of labor-based party linkages in Latin America.” In Herbert Kitschelt and Steven I. Wilkinson, eds. *Patrons, Clients, and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2007, Ch. 9.
- Ziegfeld, Adam. 2016. *Why Regional Parties? Clientelism, elites, and the Indian party system*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2 and 5.

Recommended

- Brusco, Valeria, Marcelo Nazareno, and Susan C. Stokes. 2004. “Vote Buying in Argentina.” *Latin American Research Review* 39 (2): 66-88. 4 April 9 OR Susan Stokes, Thad Dunning, Marcelo Nazareno and Valeria Busco. *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism*. Chapter 1.
- Hagopian, Frances, Carlos Gervasoni and Juan Andres Moraes. 2009. “From Patronage to Program: The Emergence of Party-Oriented Legislators in Brazil.” *Comparative Political Studies* 42(3):360391.
- Hicken, Allen. 2011. “Clientelism.” *Annual Review of Political Science*. 14: 289-310. (overview of the literature).
- Keefer, Philip and Stuti Khemani. 2009. “When Do Legislators Pass on Pork? The Role of Parties in Determining Legislator Effort.” *American Political Science Review* 103(1): 99-112.
- Szwarcberg, Mariela. 2013. “The Microfoundations of Political Clientelism: Lessons from the Argentine Case.” *Latin American Research Review* 48(2): 32-54.

November 8th – FALL BREAK – NO CLASS

November 15th – POSTER SESSION

LOCATION TBD

November 22nd – Party systems in new democracies: origins & consolidation

- Birnir, Johanna Kristin. 2007. “Divergence in Diversity? The Dissimilar Effects of Cleavages on Electoral Politics in New Democracies.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(3): 602-619.
- Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2002. *Redeeming the Communist Past: The Regeneration of Communist Parties in East Central Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Introduction and Conclusion (pp.
- Ellen Lust and David Waldner. *Political Transitions: Authoritarian Legacies and Post-Authoritarian Challenges*

Recommended

- Croissant, Aurel and Philip Volkel. 2010. “Party System Types and Party System Institutionalization: Comparing New Democracies in East and Southeast Asia.” *Party Politics*.
- Hicken, Allen and Erik Kuhonta. 2014. “Introduction: Rethinking Party System Institutionalization in Asia.” In *Party System Institutionalization in Asia: Democracies, Autocracies, and the Shadows of the Past*. Forthcoming. Cambridge University Press.
- Lupu, Noam, and Rachel Beatty Riedl. 2013. “Political Parties and Uncertainty in Developing Democracies.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 46 (11): 1339-65.
- Mainwaring, Scott, and Timothy R. Scully. 1995. “Introduction: Party Systems in Latin America,” in *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*, eds. Scott Mainwaring and Timothy R. Scully. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 1-34.
- Reich, Gary. 2004. “The Evolution of New Party Systems: Are Early Elections Exceptional?” *Electoral Studies*, 23 (2): 232-250.
- Tavits, Margit. 2005. “The Development of Stable Party Support: Electoral Dynamics in Post-Communist Europe.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 49: 283-298.

November 29th – Party systems in new democracies: continuity and change

- Mainwaring, Scott, and Edurne Zoco. 2007. “Political Sequences and the Stabilization of Interparty Competition: Electoral Volatility in Old and New Democracies.” *Party Politics*, 13 (2): 155-78.
- Lupu, Noam. 2013. “Brand Dilution and the Breakdown of Political Parties in Latin America.” *World Politics*.
- Roberts, Kenneth M. 2015. *Changing Course in Latin America Party Systems in the Neoliberal Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Introduction, Chapter 2, 3 and 10.

Recommended

- Kitschelt, Herbert. 1994. *The Transformation of European Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1 and 5.
- Sundquist, James L. 1983. *Dynamics of the Party System: Alignment and Realignment of Political Parties in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, Chapters 1-3.
- Wickham, Carrie Rosefsky. 2004. “The Path to Moderation: Strategy and Learning in the Formation of Egypt’s Wasat Party.” *Comparative Politics* 36 (2): 205-28.

December 6th – Dominant Party Regimes & Parties in Non-Democracies

RESEARCH PAPER DUE

- Brownlee, Jason. 2007. *Authoritarianism in an Age of Democratization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 1.
- Greene, Kenneth. 2007. *Why Dominant Parties Lose: Mexico’s Democratization in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1-3.

Recommended

- Magaloni, Beatriz. 2006. *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and its Demise in Mexico*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McElwain, Kenneth. 2008. "Manipulating Electoral Rules to Manufacture Single Party Dominance." *American Journal of Political Science* 52.1: 32-47.
- Smith, Benjamin B. 2005. "Life of the Party: The Origins of Regime Breakdown and Persistence under Single-Party Rule." *World Politics* 57 (3): 421-51.