

PSCI 2101B
Comparative Politics of Advanced Industrialized Countries

Lecture: Friday 11:35 – 1:25
Location: AT 102

Instructor: Professor Heather MacRae
Office: Loeb A629
Telephone: 520 2600 ext. 2294

Email: hmacrae@connect.carleton.ca

Office Hours: Mon. and Wed. 16:00-18:00
and by appointment

Course Description:

Comparative politics is about describing political, social and economic phenomena that shape countries or groups of countries. As such, comparative politics is nothing more and nothing less than the study of politics itself. In order to investigate the nature of politics, we are compelled to ask ourselves questions such as: What are the primary institutions? Who holds power? What are the relationships between various institutions and actors? What makes politics different in different settings, in different cultures and through different historical periods? This leads us to compare institutions, organizations, countries and societies.

This course focuses on the government and politics of advanced democratic states. While “big players” such as the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Sweden and Japan will provide the primary focus of the course, we will also draw on examples from countries around the world including democracies and non-democracies, developing and developed.

The course will be divided into four main sections. In the first, we will discuss the methods of comparative politics and discuss some approaches to comparative political analysis. The second section of the course then looks at key components of the state – executive, legislature, judiciary and bureaucracy. In the third section we will investigate the relationship between politics and society, touching on political cleavages, social movements and political participation. In the final part of the term we will apply much of this knowledge to several specific case studies. These will address a specific topic and will attempt to carry out concrete comparisons of two or more advanced industrial states.

Course Aims:

This course is designed to give students insight into the primary issues and concepts involved in the comparative study of industrialized countries and to apply these concepts to specific comparative analyses. To this end, students will learn not only the theory of comparative politics but to channel this knowledge into a well-written comparative essay.

By the end of the course, students will be expected to be able to:

- discuss the key concepts, ideas and theories of comparative politics;
- apply these concepts to case studies;
- identify and describe the central political and social institutions of selected states.

Course Requirements:

- Tutorial Attendance and Participation 10%
- Short paper 15%
- Outline 15%

- Research Essay 25%
- Final Exam 35%

Tutorial/Discussion Group : All students are expected to attend tutorial groups on a regular basis. You will be marked on your attendance and participation. Attendance alone does not ensure a passing mark in the tutorial group. Participation grades will be assigned according to the quality and quantity of your contributions to class discussions. Thus, a few insightful comments which help to take the discussion into new territory may be more valuable to the group as a whole than frequent but interventions.

One of the easiest ways to ensure quality participation is to do the required readings and to come to class prepared. It is helpful to follow current events and international news. This will allow you to contextualise some of the more abstract ideas that we will be discussing.

TAs will discuss in more detail what they expect from you during the first tutorial class.

Final Exam: There will be a final two-hour exam held during the April exam period (April 10 –29, 2006). The exam will cover all the course material, including readings, lecture material, tutorial discussions and any films, documentaries, etc. that we address in class.

Comparative Research Essay: There is, in addition to the weekly readings and regular participation in tutorial groups, one major assignment in this course. To help you to better understand the steps in a comparative analysis, the assignment is divided into three separate smaller assignments. Each of these smaller assignments is designed to address one of the main steps in comparative essay writing. These smaller assignments will be graded as independent components.

In the first step, or short paper, you will describe a particular institution or concept to be studied. In the second, you will determine and justify your case studies. In the final stage, you will bring these first two steps together and answer a corresponding “Why?” question. The three assignments are described in some detail below. We will also discuss them in class and/or tutorial groups.

Short paper: [due February 3]

In the first step you will be asked write a short paper (5 pages double-spaced) on an institution (or concept) of your choice. The aim of this step is to develop substantial in-depth knowledge on a particular institution or concept in order to then be able to understand differences and similarities in the structure and characteristics of this institution in different countries. You will, through this short paper, acquire the background information which will inform you topic selection and will eventually be used to introduce the reader to the important aspects of the topic in your final paper.

For example, you might choose the Executive branch of government, the concept of class, or the extreme right. You will then critically examine the literature on this institution or concept. Let us assume that you chose to write about the Green Party: you might discuss the history and evolution of Green Parties in Europe (this should be a GENERAL review – not country specific). You might also look at whether Green Parties are the co-optation of the environmental movement and if their presence in the formal political sphere compromises the position of the environmental movement. In short, you discuss what has already been written about this institution. You may use the textbook as a key source for this paper. This stage answers the question: “WHAT” do I want to study?

There are a number of possible topics that you could choose including (but not limited to) the executive branch of government, parliaments, political culture, social cleavages, political parties, evolution of democracy, electoral systems, democratic representation, nationalism, political participation, central banks or another government agency, etc. While policy ideas (foreign policy, social policy, international aid) are certainly interesting topics these are very difficult to work into the framework of this essay. I strongly encourage you to verify your topic selection with your TA.

Research Outline: [due March 3]

In the second step, you will address “HOW” to study this institution or concept. The short paper and accompanying research have hopefully given rise to a number of different research questions. You will now try to focus your research more closely.

The research outline is divided into three key components. In the first, you will outline five possible questions to study. The second section addresses how to study these and the final (and perhaps most important) section offers a detailed outline of your essay. I should stress that this assignment is more difficult and involved than you may first expect.

i) Begin this assignment by outlining five “Why?” questions that your previous research sparked. These can be written in bullet form but must be in complete sentences. This is intended to encourage you to consider your question from a variety of different angles. Using the example of the Green Party, I might draw out several questions: why did the Green Party evolve earlier in some states than in others? Why are the Greens successful in some states and weak in others? Why does the Green Party have a higher representation of women than traditional parties? Select one of these “WHY?” questions. This will become your research question for the final paper. You will now build on this question – add case studies and factors to be addressed in order to answer and analyse the “Why?” question.

ii) Now that you have decided on a specific topic, you need to decide the best way to answer the “Why?” question. To do this in a comparative manner, you need to select two (or in certain cases more) countries for comparison. These may be countries that we address in class, or any other advanced industrialised democracy. Advanced industrialised democracies are, for example states in Western Europe as well as New Zealand, Australia, Japan, South Korea, the United States. You should select countries that are consolidated democracies. The newly democratising states of Eastern and Central Europe, Latin America and the former Soviet states are not generally good choices for this assignment. You may not select Canada as one of your comparative countries. Again, it is helpful to discuss the countries with your TA if you are unsure of their appropriateness.

In this part of the outline, you will also indicate your methodology. How will you use these countries to direct the “Why?” question. For example, I might look at why the German Green Party is better integrated into the formal political system than the French Green Party. This might lead me to make some broad generalizations about certain aspects of the Green Party organization.

Finally, in this part, consider which factors might explain the differences or similarities that you are addressing. These factors (ideally three) are your independent variables.

iii) The third section of the outline will then show how you will structure the final essay. What type of background information will you include. How are the various factors important in creating the outcome you have identified. You may use bullet points or other point form methods to organize this assignment. It is essential, however, that you use full sentences!

** Please do not assume that the outline will be a “simple assignment”. It requires that you carry out a substantial portion of your research and that you consider how to form and develop your outline. While the assignment may only be a few pages long, it will likely require nearly as long to complete as the short assignment.

Research Essay: [due March 31]

Now that you have done all the preparatory work, this step should be quite easy. The research essay (8 - 10 pages double-spaced) will comprise a comparative analysis of the institution from the first paper, using the outline and cases described in the second. This paper will likely begin with a descriptive part in which you describe the institution in the various states. This information will be drawn mostly from the research you have already done in the first paper, although you may need to rework some of the information from general statements to more specific ones. Remember to focus on *relevant* background information. The information you give should support the explanation you will offer.

From the descriptive part of your research, you must now move to the more analytical section. Offering explanations is key to comparative politics and a comparative analysis. For example, I might suggest that differences in political culture have contributed to the different paths of the German and the French Green Party. What are these differences and how do they influence the parties?

Although you can use the course material for much of the research, you will also need to do some outside research for these papers. You must include at least four outside sources. These must be journal articles or books – not internet pages or website. You may, of course use websites, but these will not be considered part of the minimum research requirement.

Please speak to your TA about the assignment and your choices. Keep in touch with him or her throughout the process. You may also come to talk to me during office hours. I am happy to help where I can.

I encourage you to choose your own topics but here are a few examples to get you going.

a) The party system → Britain and France → Why does France have a multi-party system and Britain a two party system?

b) The electoral system → Japan and Germany → Why are there more women in parliament in Germany than in Japan?

c) The coalition system → Germany and Italy → Why are German coalitions more stable than Italian coalitions?

d) revolution → Britain and France → Why has Britain experienced few revolutions in comparison with France?

Submitting Assignments

Due dates for assignments are noted above and in the weekly course outline. You will be expected to hand assignments in on time. Late papers will be penalized one grade point per day.

If you are unable to submit an assignment directly to me, please use the departmental drop box located outside the political science office (Loeb B640). Make sure that the course number, my name and the name of your TA are clearly written on the first page. Assignments placed in the

drop box on weekdays before 4 pm will be date stamped with that day's date and put into my mailbox. Assignments left under my office door or in my mailbox will not be date stamped and will therefore not be accepted.

Please note that assignments sent by fax to the Department of Political Science will not be accepted.

It is, of course, not acceptable to submit the same assignment in two or more courses.

Grading:

I will generally grade assignments and exams with a letter grade. To convert this to a percentage range or to the university 12 point system, please refer to the following table.

Percentage	Letter Grade	12-point scale	Percentage	Letter Grade	12-point scale
90 – 100	A+	12	67 – 69	C+	6
85 – 90	A	11	63 – 66	C	5
80 – 84	A-	10	60 – 62	C-	4
77 – 79	B+	9	57 – 59	D+	3
73 – 76	B	8	53 – 56	D	2
70 – 72	B-	7	50 – 52	D-	1

Grades 49% and below will be assigned a failing grade (F).

The Undergraduate calendar states “[t]o obtain credit in a course, students must meet all the course requirements for attendance, term work, and examinations.” If you fail to complete the required assignments and examinations, you will be given a failing grade in the course.

Readings:

There is one required text for this course. It is available at the university bookstore. Additional readings (**) are on reserve at the library.

Required text:

Hague, Rod and Martin Harrop. 2004. *Political Science: A Comparative Introduction* (Palgrave MacMillan)

Topics and Reading Assignments:

This reading list is tentative. Dates and/or readings may be changed or added. Any changes will be announced in class and/or tutorials. Please note that there may be different readings for discussion groups and lecture preparation.

January 6: Introduction

No readings

January 13: Comparative Methods and Approaches

Lecture Readings:

- Hague and Harrop, Chapter 5, pp. 69-85

Discussion Group Readings:

- ** Sartori. 1994. “Compare Why and How: Comparing, Miscomparing and the Comparative Method” in Dogan and Kazancigil (eds.) in *Comparing Nations: Concepts, Strategies, Substance* pp. 14-34.

January 20: Democracy and the State

Lecture readings:

- Hague and Harrop Chapters 1-3, pp. 1-50

Discussion Group readings:

- **Schmitter, Philippe C. and Terry Lynn Karl. 1991. "What Democracy Is...and Is Not" *Journal of Democracy* Vol 2 (summer 1991) pp. 75-87.

January 27: Politics and Society

Lecture Readings:

- Hague and Harrop, Chapter 6, pp. 89-105
- ** Patricia Hogwood and Geoffrey K. Roberts (eds). 2003. "Sources of Political Conflict" in *European Politics Today*, Manchester University Press. pp. 38-61.

Discussion Group Readings:

- Hague and Harrop, Chapter 7, pp. 105-121

February 3: Institutions of the State – Part I (Constitutions, Courts, Parliaments)

[short paper due]

Lecture and Discussion Group readings:

- Hague and Harrop Chapters 12-14, pp. 209-267.

February 10: Institutions of the State - Part II (Executives, Bureaucracy and Policy Making)

Lecture Readings:

- Hague and Harrop, Chapters 15 and 16, pp. 268 –307.

Discussion Group Readings:

- Hague and Harrop, Chapter 17, pp. 309-324

February 17: Elections and Electoral systems

Lecture Readings:

- Hague and Harrop, Chapter 9, pp. 145-165

Discussion Group Readings:

- ** Nagel, Jack. 1994. "What Political Scientists Can Learn from the 1993 Electoral Reform in New Zealand" *PS: Political Science and Politics* Vol. 27, No 3 pp. 525-529

March 3: Linkage Institutions

[outline due]

Lecture Readings:

- Hague and Harrop Chapters 10-11, pp. 166-205

Discussion Group Readings:

- Hague and Harrop, Chapter 8, pp. 122-141.

March 10: Political Apathy – Why do participation levels vary across democracies?

Lecture Readings:

- ** Franklin, Mark N. 2002. "The Dynamics of Electoral Participation" in *Comparing Democracies 2* Lawrence LeDuc, Richard G. Niemi and Pippa Norris (eds.) pp. 148-168.

Discussion Group Readings:

- ** Putnam, Robert. 1995. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital" *Journal of Democracy* Vol. 6 (Jan. 1995) pp. 65-78.

March 17: Women's Role in Politics – Why does women's level of political participation vary across democratic societies?

Lecture and Discussion Group Readings:

- ** M. Margaret Conway. 2001. "Women and Political Participation" *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (June) pp. 231-233.
- ** Wilma Rule. 1994. "Women's Underrepresentation and Electoral Systems" *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 689-692.
- ** Stetson, Dorothy McBride and Amy Mazur (eds). 1995. *Comparative State Feminism*. Introduction and Conclusion pp. 1-21 and 272-291.
- ** Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart. 2001. "Cultural Obstacles to Equal Representation". *Journal of Democracy* Vol. 12, No 3, July 2001. pp. 126-140.

March 24: State and Market, Democracy and Capitalism — Why do most stable democracies embrace a capitalist economic system? Why are most democracies "more economically developed" than non-democracies?

Lecture Readings:

- ** Landmann, Todd. 2003. "Economic Development and Democracy" in *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction* pp. 66-92.

Discussion Group Readings:

- ** Almond, Gabriel. 1991. "Capitalism and Democracy" *PS: Political Science and Politics* Vol. 24, No. 3. pp. 467-474.

March 31: Democratic Transitions – How does the democratisation of Eastern Europe differ from previous transitions to democracy?

[research essays due]

Lecture Readings:

- ** Linz, Juan J. and Alfred Stepan. 1996. "Southern Europe: Concluding Remarks" in *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America and Post-Communist Europe*. pp. 139-147.
- ** Landmann, Todd. 2003. "Transitions to Democracy" in *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction* pp. 148-177.

Discussion Group Readings:

- ** Bunce, Valerie. 2003. "Rethinking Democratization: Lessons from the Postcommunist Experience" *World Politics* Vol. 55 No. 2. pp. 170-189.

Other Information

Tolerance and Appropriate Behaviour:

The ability to converse across different social, ethnic and other backgrounds is an important component of the university education. The exchange of ideas, beliefs and insights contributes to an especially rich understanding of comparative politics. To this end, students, instructors and teaching assistants are expected to display tolerance for each others' ideas and beliefs across personal and cultural boundaries. All parties are expected to actively maintain a positive classroom environment throughout the term.

Academic Accommodations

For Students with Disabilities: Students with disabilities requiring academic accommodations in this course are encouraged to contact the Paul Menton Centre (PMC) for Students with Disabilities (500 University Centre) to complete the necessary forms. After registering with the PMC, make an appointment to meet with the instructor in order to discuss your needs **at least two weeks before the first in-class test or CUTV midterm exam**. This will allow for sufficient time to process your request. Please note the following deadlines for submitting completed forms to the PMC for formally scheduled exam accommodations: **November 7th, 2005** for fall and fall/winter term courses, and **March 10, 2006** for winter term courses.

For Religious Observance: Students requesting accommodation for religious observances should apply in writing to their instructor for alternate dates and/or means of satisfying academic requirements. Such requests should be made during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist, but no later than two weeks before the compulsory academic event. Accommodation is to be worked out directly and on an individual basis between the student and the instructor(s) involved. Instructors will make accommodations in a way that avoids academic disadvantage to the student. Instructors and students may contact an Equity Services Advisor for assistance (www.carleton.ca/equity).

For Pregnancy: Pregnant students requiring academic accommodations are encouraged to contact an Equity Advisor in Equity Services to complete a *letter of accommodation*. Then, make an appointment to discuss your needs with the instructor at least two weeks prior to the first academic event in which it is anticipated the accommodation will be required.

Plagiarism: The Undergraduate Calendar defines plagiarism as: "to use and pass off as one's own idea or product, work of another without expressly giving credit to another." The Graduate Calendar states that plagiarism has occurred when a student either: (a) directly copies another's work without acknowledgment; or (b) closely paraphrases the equivalent of a short paragraph or more without acknowledgment; or (c) borrows, without acknowledgment, any ideas in a clear and recognizable form in such a way as to present them as the student's own thought, where such ideas, if they were the student's own would contribute to the merit of his or her own work. Instructors who suspect plagiarism are required to submit the paper and supporting documentation to the Departmental Chair who will refer the case to the Dean. It is not permitted to hand in the same assignment to two or more courses. The Department's Style Guide is available at: www.carleton.ca/polisci/undergrad/styleguide.pdf

Oral Examination: At the discretion of the instructor, students may be required to pass a brief oral examination on research papers and essays.

Submission and Return of Term Work: Papers must be handed directly to the instructor and will not be date-stamped in the departmental office. Late assignments may be submitted to the drop box in the corridor outside B640 Loeb. Assignments will be retrieved every business day at 4 p.m., stamped with that day's date, and then distributed to the instructor. For essays not returned in class please attach a **stamped, self-addressed envelope** if you wish to have your assignment returned by mail. Please note that assignments sent via fax or email will not be accepted. Final exams are intended solely for the purpose of evaluation and will not be returned.

Approval of final grades: Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor, *subject to the approval of the Faculty Dean*.

Course Requirements: Students must fulfill all course requirements in order to achieve a passing grade. Failure to hand in any assignment will result in a grade of F. Failure to write the final exam will result in a grade of ABS. FND (Failure – No Deferred) is assigned when a student's performance is so poor during the term that they cannot pass the course even with 100% on the final examination. In such cases, instructors may use this notation on the Final Grade Report to indicate that a student has already failed the course

due to inadequate term work and should not be permitted access to a deferral of the examination. Deferred final exams are available ONLY if the student is in good standing in the course.

Connect Email Accounts: The Department of Political Science strongly encourages students to sign up for a campus email account. Important course and University information will be distributed via the Connect email system. See <http://connect.carleton.ca> for instructions on how to set up your account.

