

# **POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE**

PhD Course, four credits, Fall 2008

## ***Instructor***

Zsolt Enyedi, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science  
Central European University  
E-mail: enyedizs@ceu.hu

Carsten Q. Schneider, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science  
Central European University  
E-mail: schneiderc@ceu.hu

## ***Classes***

Tuesdays and Thursdays, 11-12:40

## ***Office hours***

Zsolt Enyedi: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 9:30-10:30 and by appointment  
Carsten Schneider: Thursdays 15.30 - 17.10 and by appointment

## ***Course Description***

This is a course on the fundamental political institutions of modern, primarily democratic, societies. The principal aim of the course is to familiarize students with cutting-edge research on the development and consequences of political institutions, and to discuss the normative and empirical regime-alternatives.

The course will

1. discuss the principal theoretical frameworks of comparative government
2. analyze the ways how institutions constrain behavior, both mechanically and psychologically, and how they endow actors with resources.
3. help students to conduct comparative analysis, with a strong awareness of the methodological opportunities and dangers involved in such an exercise

The course centers on the institutions related to preference aggregation and government building, and will treat institutions involved in policy making and implementation only marginally. The geographical focus is on Europe and North America.

## ***Course Requirements***

No prior knowledge is assumed, although students with solid background in political science are expected to benefit most from the course. The curriculum has been established taking into

account the research interests of those first year PhD students who intend to work within the framework of comparative politics, but other students are also welcome.

Students are expected to be present at all lectures and seminars. During the seminars they are expected to reflect critically on the mandatory readings listed below. If one is unable to attend the class, (s)he should signal this via e-mail to the lecturer. Activity in the classroom can be complemented with questions, suggestions and comments sent to the lecturer 24 hours prior to the meetings.

The course is organized into lectures and seminars. Typically the first meeting of the week is a lecture, while the second is a seminar. The mandatory literature must be read before the seminars. This format is, however, flexible, depending on the progress in the class and the difficulty of certain topics.

### ***Learning Aims***

The first part of the course is aimed at developing a sophisticated understanding of the principal methodological tools used in comparative politics and at familiarizing students with the most relevant concepts employed in institutional analyses. The purpose of the second part is to introduce students into the contemporary literature on the functioning of modern political systems, with a special emphasis on processes that bridge the stage of preference formation of citizens with the public policies of governments. The expected outcome is the ability to comprehend the ways political institutions can shape the life of democracies and the skill to analyze various institutional solutions as part of analytically distinct alternatives that maximize different social values.

### ***Evaluation***

- (1) Two in-class presentation (one of them can be done in a group of maximum 2 students)
- (2) One written review of a book
- (3) Position paper
- (4) Class activity
- (5) Final essay

The position papers should summarize the content of the readings for a particular week and comment them relying on previous readings and lectures. The student decides for which weeks she prepares a position paper (cca 800 words), but the paper must be sent by e-mail to the lecturer not later than 12 o'clock the day prior to the seminar (i.e. the second meeting of that week). The presentations are also expected to be related to the topic of the week, but in this case complementing it by describing phenomena not analyzed by the texts in the reader. The topic of the presentations must be chosen during the first two weeks of the course, through a consultation with the lecturers. The final essay may elaborate on the topic of one of the presentations.

The final grade is determined by the following proportion of partial grades:

- (1) Presentations 30%
- (2) Book review 15%
- (3) Position paper 15 %
- (4) Class activity 15%
- (5) Final essay 25%

### *Course Outline*

#### **Week 1. Sep 23+25    *The Power of Institutions (Zsolt Enyedi)***

##### Compulsory:

Pierson, Paul (2000): Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics. *American Political Science Review*, vol. 94, no. 2, pp. 251-267.

March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen (2006): Elaborating the “New Institutionalism”, R.A.W. Rhodes, Sarah Binder, and Bert Rockman, eds., Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions. Oxford University Press, pp. 3-22.

##### Recommended:

Hall, Peter A./Taylor, Rosemary C. R. (1996): Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies*, vol. 44, issue 4, pp. 936-957

Immergut, Ellen M. (1998): The theoretical core of the new institutionalism. *Politics & Society*, vol. 26, issue 1, pp. 5-34

March, James G./Olsen, Johan P. (1984): The new institutionalism: organizational factors in political life. *American Political Science Review*, vol. 78, pp. 734-749,

Peters, B. Guy (1998): *Institutional theory in political science: the new institutionalism*. London: Pinter Publishers

Pierson, Paul and Skocpol, Theda (2002): Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science, in Ira Katznelson & Helen V. Milner (eds). *Political Science: State of the Discipline*. New York: W.W. Norton, 693-721.

Patrikios, Stratos (2008): American Republican Religion? Disentangling the Causal Link Between Religion and Politics in the US. *Political Behavior* 30 (3), pp. 367-389.

Sanders, Elisabeth (2006): Historical Institutionalism in R.A.W. Rhodes, Sarah Binder, and Bert Rockman, eds., Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions. Oxford University Press, pp. 476-494.

Sartori, Giovanni (1994): *Comparative Constitutional Engineering: an Inquiry into Structures, Incentives and Outcomes*. London: Macmillan

Thelen, Kathleen/Steinmo, Sven (1992): Historical institutionalism in comparative politics. In Steinmo, Sven/Thelen, Kathrin/Longstreth, Frank: *Structuring Politics. Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-32

**Week 2. Sep 30+Oct 2 Core Issues in Comparative Methodology – Concept Formation (Carsten Q. Schneider)**

Compulsory

Adcock, Robert/Collier, David (2001): Measurement validity: a shared standard for qualitative and quantitative research. *American Political Science Review*, vol. 95, issue 3, pp. 529-546

Goertz, Gary (2006): *Social Science Concepts. a User's Guide*. Princeton : Princeton University Press, chap. 4

Recommended:

Collier, David/Gerring, John (eds.) (2008): *Concepts and Methods in Social Sciences. Giovanni Sartori and His Legacy*. London, New York: Routledge

Collier, David/Adcock, Robert (1999): Democracy and dichotomies: a pragmatic approach to choices about concepts. *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 2, pp. 537-565

Collier, David/Mahon, James E. Jr. (1993): Conceptual "stretching" revisited: adapting categories in comparative analysis. *American Political Science Review*, vol. 87, issue 4, pp. 845-855

Collier, David/Levitzky, Steven (1997): Democracy with adjectives: conceptual innovation in comparative research. *World Politics*, vol. 49, issue 3, pp. 430-451

Elkins, Zachary (2000): Gradations of Democracy? Empirical tests of alternative conceptualizations. *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 44, issue 2, pp. 287-294

Gerring, John (2001): *Social Science Methodology. a Critical Framework*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chap 3 and 4

King, Gary/Keohane, Robert O./Verba, Sidney (1994): *Designing Social Inquiry. Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 23-27 and 151-155

Sartori, Giovanni (1970): Concept misformation in comparative politics. *American Political Science Review*, vol. 64, issue 4, pp. 1033-1053

Sartori, Giovanni (1984): Guidelines for concept analysis. In Sartori, Giovanni: *Social Science Concepts. a Systematic Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage, pp. 15-85

**Week 3. Oct 7+9      *Regime Typologies (Carsten Q. Schneider)***

Compulsory:

- Linz, Juan José (2000): *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*. Boulder, CO: L. Rienner, pp. 49-63
- Merkel, Wolfgang (2004): Embedded and defective democracies. *Democratization*, vol. 11, issue 5, pp. 33-58
- Munck, Gerardo L./Verkuilen, Jay (2002): Conceptualizing and measuring democracy: evaluating alternative indices. *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 35, issue 1, pp. 5-33
- Moon, Bruce E./Birdsall, Jennifer Harvey/Ciesluk, Sylvia/Garlett, Lauren M./Hermias, Joshua J./Mendenhall, Elizabeth/Schmid, Patrick D./Wong, Wai Hong (2006): Voting counts: participation in the measurement of democracy. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, vol. 41, issue 2, pp. 3-32

Recommended:

- Chelabi, H. E./Linz Juan J. (1998): A theory of sultanism 1: a type of nondemocratic rule. In Chelabi, H. E./Linz Juan J.: *Sultanistic Regimes*. Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 3-25
- Collier, David/Adcock, Robert (1999): Democracy and dichotomies: a pragmatic approach to choices about concepts. *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 2, pp. 537-565
- Bollen, Kenneth A. (1993): Liberal democracy: validity and method factors in cross-national measures. *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 37, issue 4, pp. 1207-1230
- Bollen, Kenneth A./Jackman, Robert W. (1989): Democracy, stability, and dichotomies. *American Sociological Review*, vol. 54, issue 3, pp. 612-621
- Coppedge, Michael/Reinicke, Wolfgang H. (1990): Measuring polyarchy. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, vol. 25, issue 1, pp. 51-72
- Elkins, Zachary (2000): Gradations of Democracy? Empirical tests of alternative conceptualizations. *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 44, issue 2, pp. 287-294
- Gastil, Raymond Duncan (1991): The Comparative Survey of Freedom: Experiences and Suggestions. In Inkeles, Alex: *On Measuring Democracies: Its Consequences and Concomitants*. New Brunswick (New Jersey): pp. 21-46
- Mainwaring, Scott/Brinks, Daniel/Pérez-Linán, Aníbal (2001): Classifying political regimes in Latin America, 1945-1999. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, vol. 36, issue 1, pp. 37-65
- Marshall, Monty G./Gurr, Ted Robert/Davenport, Christian/Jagers, Keith (2002): Polity IV, 1800-1999. comments on Munck and Verkuilen. *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 35, issue 1, pp. 40-45

McHenry, Dean E. Jr. (2000): Quantitative measures of democracy in Africa: an assessment. *Democratization*, vol. 7, issue 2, pp. 168-185

Przeworski, Adam/Alvarez, Michael E./Cheibub, José Antonio/Limongi, Ferdinando (2000): *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Material Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 13-55

**Week 4. Oct 14+16 Core Issues in Comparative Methodology – Case Selection and Unit of Analysis (Carsten Q. Schneider)**

Compulsory

Collier, David/Mahoney, James/Seawright, Jason (2004): Claiming too much: warnings about selection bias. In Brady, Henry E./Collier, David: *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham: Rowman&Littlefield, pp. 85-102, preface, pp. 85-102

King, Gary/Keohane, Robert O./Verba, Sidney (1994): *Designing Social Inquiry. Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 115-149

Ragin, Charles C. (1987): *The Comparative Method. Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press: pp. 7-9

Recommended:

Collier, David/Mahoney, James/Seawright, Jason (2004): Claiming too much: warnings about selection bias. In Brady, Henry E./Collier, David: *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham: Rowman&Littlefield, pp. 85-102

Geddes, Barbara (1990): How the cases you choose affect the answers you get. selection bias in comparative politics. *Political Analysis*, vol. 2, pp. 131-150

Gerring, John (2004): What is a case study and what is it good for? *American Political Science Review*, vol. 98, issue 2, pp. 341-354

Mahoney, James/Goertz, Gary (2004): The possibility principle and case selection: choosing negative cases in comparative analysis. *American Political Science Review*, vol. 98, pp. 653-669

Pennings, Paul/Keman, Hans/Kleinnijenhuis, Jan (1999): *Doing Research in Political Science. an Introduction to Comparative Methods and Statistics*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage, chap 1

Ragin, Charles C./Becker, Howard S. (eds.) (1992): *What Is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Ragin, Charles C. (2004): Turning the tables: how case-oriented research challenges variable-oriented research. In Brady, Henry E./Collier, David: *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham: Rowman&Littlefield, pp. 123-138

Seawright, Jason/Gerring, John (2008): Case-selection techniques in case study research: a menu of qualitative and quantitative options. *Political Research Quarterly*, vol. 61, issue 2, pp. 294-308

Van Evera, Stephen (1997): *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Itaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 77-88

Walker, Henry A./Cohen, Bernard P. (1985): Scope statements: imperatives for evaluating theory. *American Sociological Review*, vol. 50, issue 3, pp. 288-301

**Week 5. Oct 21      *Types of democracy: the majoritarian-consensual dilemma (Zsolt Enyedi)***

Compulsory

McGann, A. J. (2004). The Tyranny of the Supermajority How Majority Rule Protects Minorities, *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 53-77

Lane, Jan-Erik and Svante Ersson (2000). *The New Institutional Politics: Performance and Outcomes*. London: Routledge, 207-224.

Cohen, Frank S. (1997). Proportional versus Majoritarian Ethnic Conflict Management in Democracies. *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 30, no. 5, 607–630.

Recommended:

Lijphart, Arend (1999) *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

Powell, G. Bingham Jr (2000). *Elections as instruments of democracy: majoritarian and proportional visions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 20-46, 122-157.

George Tsebelis (2002): *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

**Week 6. Oct 28+30      *Types of democracy: the direct-indirect dilemma (Zsolt Enyedi)***

Compulsory

Warren, Mark E. (2003). ‘A Second Transformation of Democracy?’, in Bruce Cain, Russell Dalton and Susan Scarrow (eds.) (2003). *Democracy Transformed? Expanding Political Opportunities in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.223-249.

Adrian Vatter (2007). *Three Dimensions of Democracy? Lijphart's Typology and Direct Democracy A Cross-National Analysis of Forms of Government in 23 Advanced Democracies between 1997 and 2006*, paper presented at the Joint Sessions of Workshops of the European Consortium for Political Research, Helsinki, Mai 7-12, 2007.

Recommended:

Svensson, Palle (2007) Direct and Representative Democracy - Supplementing, not Excluding Each Other Paper presented at the ECPR Joint Sessions, Helsinki, 7-12 May 2007

Papadopoulos, Yannis (2001): How Does Direct Democracy Matter? The Impact of Referendum Votes on Politics and Policy-Making, in: West European Politics, vol. 24, no. 2, S. 35-58.

George Tsebelis (2002): *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, pp. 116-135.

**Week 7. Nov 4+6      *e-Democracy (Carsten Q. Schneider)***

Compulsory:

Mendez, Fernando (2007): e-democratic experimentation in Europe: the case of e-voting. Aarou: e-Working Papers, 2007/2, e-Democracy Center, Universitaet Zuerich,

Recommended:

On the Estonian e-voting experience consult the following reports:

[http://www.coe.int/t/e/integrated\\_projects/democracy/02\\_activities/02\\_e-voting/00\\_e-voting\\_news/FinalReportEvotingEstoniaCoE6\\_3\\_06.asp#TopOfPage](http://www.coe.int/t/e/integrated_projects/democracy/02_activities/02_e-voting/00_e-voting_news/FinalReportEvotingEstoniaCoE6_3_06.asp#TopOfPage)

[http://www.coe.int/t/e/integrated\\_projects/democracy/02\\_Activities/02\\_e-voting/00\\_E-voting\\_news/Report\\_Evoting\\_Estonia\\_for\\_the\\_CoE\\_2007.asp#TopOfPage](http://www.coe.int/t/e/integrated_projects/democracy/02_Activities/02_e-voting/00_E-voting_news/Report_Evoting_Estonia_for_the_CoE_2007.asp#TopOfPage)

**Week 8. Nov 11+13      *Accountability (Carsten Q. Schneider)***

Compulsory:

Manin, Bernard/Przeworski, Adam C./Stokes, Susan C. (1999): Introduction. In Przeworski, Adam C./Stokes, Susan C./Manin, Bernard: *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-26

Schmitter, Philippe C. (2004): The ambiguous virtues of accountability. *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 15, issue 4, pp. 47-60

Recommended:

- O'Donnell, Guillermo A. (1999): Horizontal accountability in new polyarchies. In Schedler, Andreas/Diamond, Larry/Plattner, Marc F.: *Institutionalizing Accountability*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, pp. 29-51
- Manin, Bernard/Przeworski, Adam C./Stokes, Susan (eds.) (1999): *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Manin, Bernard/Przeworski, Adam C./Stokes, Susan (eds.) (1999): *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Schedler, Andreas/Diamond, Larry/Plattner, Marc F. (eds.) (1999): *The Self-Restraining State: Power and Accountability in New Democracies*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner
- Schmitter, Philippe C. (2007): Political accountability in 'real existing' democracies: meaning and mechanisms. unpublished manuscript, European University Institute

***Weeks 9. Nov 18+20 How Representation Works? Electoral and Party Systems (Zsolt Enyedi)***

Compulsory:

- Mair, Peter (2007): "Party Systems and Alternation in Government, 1950-2000: Innovation and Institutionalization", in Siri Gloppen and Lise Rakner (eds.) *Globalisation and Democratisation: Challenges for Political Parties*, Bergen: Fagbokforlaget. 135-154.
- Taagepera, Rein (2006): Electoral Systems in *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, ed. by Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, pp. 678-702
- Benoit, Kenneth and Michael Laver (2007): Estimating party policy positions: Comparing expert surveys and hand-coded content analysis, *Electoral Studies*, 26 (1), pp. 90-107
- Volkens, Andrea (2007): Strengths and weaknesses of approaches to measuring policy positions of parties, *Electoral Studies*, 2007; 26 (1), pp. 108-120

Recommended:

- Blais, André and Louis Massicotte (1996): Electoral Systems. In Lawrence LeDuc, Richard Niemi and Pippa Norris (eds.) *Comparing Democracies. Elections and Voting in a Global Perspective*. London: Sage Publications, 49–81.
- Siaroff, Alan (2000): *Comparative European Party Systems and Comparative European Party Systems: An Analysis of Parliamentary Elections Since 1945*, New York: Garland Publishing, 69-80.

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter ... [et al.] (2006): Mapping policy preferences II. Estimates for parties, electors, and governments in Eastern Europe, European Union, and OECD 1990-2003. Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press.

Keman, Hans (2007): Experts and manifestos: Different sources – Same results for comparative research?, *Electoral Studies*, 2007; 26 (1), 76-89

McDonald, Michael D., Silvia M. Mendes, Myunghee Kim (2007) Cross-temporal and cross-national comparisons of party left-right positions, *Electoral Studies*, 2007; 26 (1), pp. 62-75

***Week 10. Nov 25+27 How Representation Works? Parliaments and Cabinets (Zsolt Enyedi)***

Compulsory:

Andeweg, Rudy B. and Jacques J. A. Thomassen (2005). Modes of Political Representation: Toward a New Typology. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 30 (4): 507-528

Martin, Lanny W., and Randolph T. Stevenson (2001): Government Formation in Parliamentary Democracies. *American Journal of Political Science* 45(1): 33- 50.

Michael Laver and Kenneth A. Shepsle (1996): *Making and breaking governments: Cabinets and legislatures in parliamentary democracies*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 61-78, 147-174

Recommended:

Stokes, Susan C. (2001): Mandates and democracy: neoliberalism by surprise in Latin America New York: Cambridge University Press, 154-196.

Stokes, Susan C. (1999): What do Policy Switches Tell Us about Democracy in Bernard Manin, Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes eds. *Democracy, accountability, and representation*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 98-130.

Powell, G. Bingham, Jr, (2000): *Elections as instruments of democracy: majoritarian and proportional visions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 159-231.

Powell, G. Bingham, Jr. (2007): Aggregating and Representing Political Preferences, in *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, ed. by Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, 653-678

Strom, Kaare, Wolfgang C. Müller, Torbjörn Bergman and Benjamin Nyblade (2003): Dimension of Citizen Control. In: Kaare Strom, Wolfgang C. Müller and Torbjörn Bergman (eds.) *Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies*, 651-706.

Siaroff, Alan (2003): Varieties of Parliamentarianism in the Advanced Industrial Democracies *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 24, No. 4, 445-464 (2003)

Morgenstern, Scott (2003): *Patterns of Legislative Politics: Roll-Call Voting in Latin America and the United States*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 26-46, 85-114.

Mansbridge, Jane (2003): Rethinking Representation. *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 515-528.

Uslaner, Eric M and Thomas Zittel (2006): Comparative Legislative Behavior in R.A.W. Rhodes, Sarah Binder, and Bert Rockman, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 455-473.

Uhr, John (2006): Bicameralism in R.A.W. Rhodes, Sarah Binder, and Bert Rockman, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (Oxford University Press), pp. 476-494.

Carey, John M (2006): Legislative Organization. in R.A.W. Rhodes, Sarah Binder, and Bert Rockman, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (Oxford University Press), pp. 431-454.

***Week 11. Dec 2+4: Current trends: Europeanization and radicalization (Zsolt Enyedi and Carsten Q. Schneider)***

Compulsory:

Ladrech, R. (2002): Europeanisation and Political Parties: Towards a Framework for Analysis. *Party Politics* 8(4), 389-403.

Eatwell, Roger (2000): The Rebirth of the Extreme Right in Western Europe. *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 53 (3), pp. 407-25.

Recommended:

Mair, Peter (2000): The limited impact of Europe on national party systems. *West European Politics* 23(4), 27-51.

Radaelli, Claudio M. (2000): Whither Europeanization? Concept Stretching and Substantive Change. *European Integration online Papers* (EIoP), Vol. 4, No. 8, Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=302761> or DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.10.2139/ssrn.302761

Norris, Pippa 2005. *Radical Right: Parties and Electoral Competition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chapter 1: 1-11, chapter 11: 1-9 (<http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~pnorris/Books/Radical%20Right.htm>)

Lubbers, Marcel, Mérove Gijsberts and Peer Scheepers, 2002. Extreme Right Wing Voting in Western Europe, *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol 41, no. 3, pp. 345-78.

Mudde, Cas (2007): *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Week 12. Dec. 9+11 Wrap up (Zsolt Enyedi and Carsten Q. Schneider)**

Recommended:

Sartori, Giovanni (1994): *Comparative Constitutional Engineering: an Inquiry into Structures, Incentives and Outcomes*. London: Macmillan

Schmitter, Philippe C. (2001): Contrasting approaches to political engineering: constitutionalism and democratization. In Becker, Michael/Lauth, Hans-Joachim/Pickel, Gert: *Rechtsstaat Und Demokratie*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 130-138