

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

PhD Course, four credits, Fall 2009

Instructor

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

Classes

Mondays and Wednesdays, 15:30-17:10

Office hours

Mondays and Wednesdays, 9:30-10:30 and by appointment

Credits

4 CEU credits, 8 ECTS credits

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. investigate current institutional reforms
3. analyze the ways how institutions constrain behavior, both mechanically and psychologically, and how they endow actors with resources.
4. 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. Students are encouraged to attend Prof. Katz's class, because his focus on electoral rules complements this course ideally. The course overlaps to some extent with Prof. Dimitrijevic's class, but it is more focused on the actual design of specific political institutions.

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.

Evaluation

- (1) One in-class presentation
- (2) One written review of a book
- (3) Two position papers
- (4) Class activity
- (5) Final essay

The two 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 (ca. 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 25%
- (2) Book review 15%
- (3) Position paper 15 %
- (4) Class activity 20%
- (5) Final essay 25%

Learning Outcomes and their assessment

The overall grade will primarily indicate the ability of the students to comprehend the ways political institutions can shape the life of democracies and to analyze various institutional solutions as representatives of analytically distinct alternatives that maximize different social values. The learning outcomes of the doctoral program are supported and measured by the

present course in the following ways: The ability to reflect on the intellectual tradition of the discipline is measured primarily by the book review. The ability to deploy effective oral presentation and discussion skills is assessed through the two presentations. The skills to analyze contemporary events in broader institutional, political and social context, to evaluate political institutions in a comparative perspective, to make policy-relevant conclusions and to employ cutting-edge methods are reflected by the final essay. Finally, the seminar discussions (measured by the 'class activity' component of the final grade) will show how students can conduct a dialogue employing cross-national comparative perspectives.

Reading Material

All the course material is available in electronic form through a pass word protected e-learning site. Students who do not wish to purchase a paper reader are welcome to download the texts from <http://e-learning.ceu.hu/> . The password will be communicated to students who enroll for this course.

Course Outline

Week 1. Institutionalism

In the first class we discuss the major political science traditions that focus on the analysis of institutions. The intellectual status, fundamental functions, and basic mechanisms of institutions are discussed from the point of view of logic of consequentiality and the logic of appropriateness. New institutionalism and historical institutionalism receive special attention.

Compulsory:

- Pierson, Paul (2000): Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics. *American Political Science Review*, vol. 94, no. 2, 251-267.
- March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen (2006): Elaborating the “New Institutionalism”, In: R.A.W. Rhodes, Sarah Binder, and Bert Rockman (eds) *Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*. Oxford: OUP, 3-22.

Recommended:

- Hall, Peter A./Taylor, Rosemary C. R. (1996): Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies*, vol. 44, 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. The presidential-parliamentary dilemma

The presidential-parliamentary dichotomy is one of the most traditional and best known alternative in institutional design. The class investigate the differences between the two regimes, the internal divisions and the relevance of this dilemma for democratic consolidation.

Compulsory:

- Cheibub, Jose Antonio and Fernando Limongi (2002). Democratic Institutions and Regime Survival: Parliamentary and Presidential Democracies Reconsidered. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5,151–79.
- Stepan, Alfred and Cindy Skach (1993). Constitutional Frameworks and Democratic Consolidation: Parliamentarianism versus Presidentialism. *World Politics*. vol. 46, no. 1, 1-22

Recommended:

- Lijphart, Arend, Ronald Rogowski, and R. Kent Weaver (1993). Separation of Powers and Cleavage Management in R. Kent Weaver and Bert A. Rockman (eds) *Do Institutions Matter? Government Capabilities in the United States and Abroad*. Washington D. C; Brookings Institution, 302-344.
- 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.

- 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.
- Sartori, Giovanni (1994): *Comparative Constitutional Engineering: an Inquiry into Structures, Incentives and Outcomes*. London: Macmillan
- Shugart, Matthew S. and John M. Carey 1992. *Presidents and Assemblies: Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- 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.
- Cheibub, José Antonio (2001). Presidentialism and Democratic Performance. In Andrew Reynolds (ed.) *The Architecture of Democracy. Constitutional Design, Conflict Management, and Democracy*. Oxford: OUP, 104-141.

Week 3. The majoritarian-consensual dilemma

Perhaps the most comprehensive typology of democracies has been produced by Arend Lijphart. The class analyzes his ideas, investigates the consociationalist roots of his model and discusses the advantages and disadvantages of consensual and majoritarian systems.

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.
- Tsebelis, George (2002): *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Ghai, Yash (2002). Constitutional Asymmetries: Communal Representation, Federalism, and Cultural Autonomy,” In: Andrew Reynolds (ed.) *The Architecture of Democracy: Constitutional Design, Conflict Management, and Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 141-170.

Week 4. The direct-indirect dilemma. Normative debates and institutional alternatives.

Although the most ancient, the opposition between direct popular control and representative politics is the most hotly debated issue nowadays. The first week discussing this issue will focus on normative considerations. The class will weight the pros and cons from the point of view of democracy, individual and minority rights, and equality. Classic, liberal democratic institutional setups are contrasted with alternatives that aim at a higher degree of inclusion.

Compulsory:

- Matusaka, John G. (2004). *For the Many or the Few. The Initiative, Public Policy, and American Democracy*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 129-145
- Setälä, Maija (1999). *Referendums and Democratic Government. Normative Theory and the Analysis of Institutions*. Macmillan Press, Basingstoke, 69-107.
- Hobolt, Sara and Berthold Rittberger (2006). Direct Democracy and European Integration. *Journal of European Public Policy*. Vol. 13 Issue 1, p.153-166,

Recommended

- Garrett, Elizabeth and Mathew D. McCubbins (2008). When Voters Make Laws. How Direct Democracy Is Shaping American Cities *Public Works Management & Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 39-61
- Fung, Archon and Erik Olin Wright (2003). Thinking about Empowered Participatory Governance in Fung and Wright (eds) *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London and New York: Verso, 3-43.
- Haskell, John. (2001) *Direct Democracy or Representative Government? Dispelling the Populist Myth*. Westview Press., 85-146

Week 5. The direct-indirect dilemma. Transforming democracy

The second week dedicated to direct vs. indirect democracy focuses on actual, tangible institutional alternatives, innovations and reforms in this area. It also analyzes the question

whether reforms change the functioning of liberal democracies to the extent that new typologies need to be constructed.

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.

Vatter, Adrian (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.

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

Week 6. Electoral and Party Systems

In the chain of representation parties occupy the most crucial position because they have an impact both on preference formation and on policy implementation. The class deals with party systems as institutions, and introduces students to current empirical projects which measure the programmatic positions of parties.

Compulsory:

Aldrich, John, 1995. *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 28-61

Cox, Gary W. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral System*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 186-193.

Benoit, Kenneth and Michael Laver (2007): Estimating party policy positions: Comparing expert surveys and hand-coded content analysis, *Electoral Studies*, 26 (1), 90-107

Volkens, Andrea (2007): Strengths and weaknesses of approaches to measuring policy positions of parties, *Electoral Studies*, 2007; 26 (1), 108-120

Recommended:

- Niemi, Richard 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
- Kitschelt, Herbert (2007). Party Systems. In Carles Boix and Susan Stokes (eds). *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*.. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 522-54.
- 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.
- Michelle Kuenzi and Gina Lambright (2001). Party System Institutionalization in 30 African Countries. *Party Politics*. Vol. 7, No. 4: 437-68.

Week 7. Parliaments and Concepts of Representation

This class focuses on the internal structure and external links of legislatures. It also discusses the conceptualization of political representation (Pitkin, Converse, Powell, etc.) and the various roles representatives may fulfill. The stability, transparency, and adaptability of representative linkages are assessed in the light of the current political developments in the modern world.

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
- Rasch, Bjorn Erik (2002). Parliamentary Floor Voting Procedures and Agenda Setting in Europe. In G. Loewenberg, P. Squire & R. D. Kiewit (Eds.), *Legislatures. Comparative Perspective on Representative Assemblies*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 269-287
- Laver, Michael (2007). Divided Parties, Divided Government, in G. Loewenberg, P. Squire & R. D. Kiewit (eds.), *Legislatures. Comparative Perspective on Representative Assemblies* (pp. 269-287). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 201-221.

Recommended:

- Martin, Lanny W., and Randolph T. Stevenson (2001): Government Formation in Parliamentary Democracies. *American Journal of Political Science* 45(1): 33-50.
- Laver, Michael and Kenneth A. Shepsle (1996): *Making and breaking governments: Cabinets and legislatures in parliamentary democracies*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 61-78, 147-174
- 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
- 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), 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), 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: Oxford University Press, 431-454.
- Urbinati, Nadia and Mark E. Warren, (2008). The Concept of Representation in Contemporary Democratic Theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*; 2008, Vol. 11 Issue 1, p. 387-412,
- Thomassen, Jacques (1994). Empirical Research into Political Representation: Failing Democracy or Failing Modells? In M. Kent Jennings/Thomas E. Mann. (eds.) *Elections at Home and Abroad*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, pp. 237-264

Week 8. Cabinets and Concepts of Accountability

The eight week is mainly about the structure of government, particularly the role of Prime Ministers. It also briefly discusses various concepts of accountability. For some writers, accountability is at the core of democracy. We discuss the different notions of this term, try to delineate it from other related concepts and investigate its usefulness as a yardstick for assessing the 'quality' of democracy.

Compulsory:

- Andeweg, Rudy (2003), On Studying Governments in Jack Hayward and Anand Menon (eds.) *Governing Europe*, Oxford: OUP, 39-60.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (2003). What is New about Governance and Why Does it Matter? in Jack Hayward and Anand Menon (eds.) *Governing Europe*, Oxford: OUP, 61-73.
- Goetz, Klaus H. (2003). Executives in Comparative Context in Jack Hayward and Anand Menon (eds.) *Governing Europe*, Oxford: OUP, 74-91.

Recommended:

- Poguntke, Thomas and Paul Webb 2007a. The Presidentialization of Politics in Democratic Societies: A Framework for Analysis. In T. Poguntke & P. Webb (Eds.), *The Presidentialization of Politics. A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-25
- Poguntke, Thomas and Paul Webb 2007b. The Presidentialization of Contemporary Democratic Politics: Evidence, Causes, and Consequences. In T. Poguntke & P. Webb (Eds.), *The Presidentialization of Politics. A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 336-356.
- 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
- 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
- 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

Week 9. State and Interest Groups

This week focuses on the origins of state power, on the links between states and civil society, and on the organization of civil society. The normative and descriptive theories of corporatism and pluralism receive special attention.

Compulsory:

Siaroff, Alan (1999). Corporatism in 24 industrial democracies: Meaning and measurement, *European Journal of Political Research*, 36, 175–205,

Spruyt, Hendrik (2002). The Origins, Development, and Possible Decline of the modern State, *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5, 127–49

Stepan, Alfred (2001). Liberal-pluralist, Classic Marxist, and Organic-Statist Approaches to the State In: Alfred Stepan: *Arguing Comparative Politics*, Oxford: OUP, 39-72.

Recommended:

Anderson, Perry 1974. *Lineages of the Absolutist State*. New York: Humanities Press.

Apter, David, 1965. *The Politics of Modernization*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Evans, Peter (1997). The Eclipse of the State? Reflections on Stateness in an Era of Globalization, *World Politics*, Vol. 50, No. 1, 62-87

Page, Edward C. (1995). Patterns and Diversity in European State Development. In: Jack Hayward and Edward C . Page (eds) *Governing the New Europe*. Oxford: Polity Press, 9-44.

Tilly, Charles (1992). *Coercion, Capital and European States, Ad 990-1992*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 38 – 66.

Week 10. Institutional Engineering

During the tenth week the class considers the possibilities and dangers of tinkering with institutional structures. Democratizing countries are given special attention.

Compulsory:

Katz, Richard S. (2006). Electoral Reform in Italy: Expectations and Results. *Acta Politica*, 41, 285–299

Horowitz, Donald, R. (2002). Constitutional Design: Proposals Versus Processes. In Andrew Reynolds (ed.), *The Architecture of Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 15-36

Schmitter, Philippe C. & Trechsel, Alexander H. (eds.), (2004). *The Future of Democracy in Europe. Trends, Analyses and Reforms*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 93-130.

Recommended:

- Bernhard, Michael (2005). *Institutions and the Fate of Democracy: Germany and Poland in the Twentieth Century*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2-22, 247-263.
- Lijphart, Arend (1993) Constitutional Choice for new Democracies In: Larry Diamond and Mac F. Plattner (eds.) *The Global Resurgence of Democracy*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 146-158
- Quade, Quantin L. (1993). "PR and Democratic Statecraft. In: Larry Diamond and Mac F. Plattner (eds.) *The Global Resurgence of Democracy*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 165-170
- 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
- Sartori, Giovanni (1994): *Comparative Constitutional Engineering: an Inquiry into Structures, Incentives and Outcomes*. London: Macmillan

Week 11. Institutional Performance and Veto Points

The last-but-one week examines institutional alternatives from the point of view of effectiveness, and the structure of decision-making mechanism. It consider the question whether it is possible to design indicators that represent the quality of democracy in a value-neutral way.

Compulsory:

- Roller Edeltraud 2005. *Performance of Democracies. Political Institutions and Public Policies*, Oxford: OUP, 76-138, 223-267

Recommended:

- Levitsky, Steven and Murillo, María Victoria 2009. Variation in Institutional Strength. *Annual Review of Political Science*; 2009, Vol. 12 Issue 1, 115-133,
- Munck, Gerardo L./Verkuilen, Jay (2002): Conceptualizing and measuring democracy: evaluating alternative indices. *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 35, issue 1, pp. 5-33
- 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
- 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 12. Attitudes towards institutions

The last week investigates the response of citizens to the various institutional alternatives, the amount of trust generated or destroyed by the current institutional frameworks. Explicit attitudes about political institutions and

Compulsory:

Gordon, Stacy B. and Gary M. Segura. (1997). Cross-National Variation in the Political Sophistication of Individuals: Capability or Choice? *Journal of Politics* 59,126-47.

Anderson, Christopher J. and Christine A. Guillory (1997). Political Institutions and Satisfaction with Democracy: A Cross-National Analysis of Consensus and Majoritarian Systems. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 1, 66-81

Hibbing, John R. and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse (2001). Process Preferences and American Politics: What the People Want Government to Be. *American Political Science Review*, Volume 95, Number 1, 145-153

Recommended:

Hero, Rodney E, and Caroline Tolbert (2004). Minority Voices and Citizen Attitudes about Government Responsiveness in the American States: Do Social and Institutional Context Matter? *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 34, Num. 1, 109-121

Huckfeldt Robert and John Sprague. (1988). Choice, Social Structure, and Political Information: The Informational Coercion of Minorities, *American Journal of Political Science*, 467-482.

Kaase, Max and Kenneth Newton (1995). *Beliefs in Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carman, Christopher (2006). Public Preferences for Parliamentary Representation in the UK: An Overlooked Link? *Political Studies*, 54, 103-122.