

PP 353: Comparative Political Parties and Elections
Fall 2016
Tuesday 4-7pm
Burkle Hall, Room 26
Claremont Graduate University

Professor Melissa Ziegler Rogers
Office Hours: Tuesday 2-4pm
Email: melissa.rogers@cgu.edu

Course Description: Political parties are the building blocks of democratic politics. Elections are the means by which our democratic governors are chosen. These are two of the foundational institutions of the dominant governmental system in the world. Why do politicians and voters create, change and destroy parties? What do citizens want from them and what affects how well parties meet these demands? How do elections shape representation? How do they help to determine the functioning of democracy? With such questions in mind, this seminar explores comparative theories of political parties in both established and new democracies.

Course Readings: We will read many chapters out of the following books. You should consider buying them. They are available at the bookstore and used copies are on Amazon. All other readings are on Canvas.

Aldrich, John. 2011. *Why Parties? A Second Look* University of Chicago Press.

Cox, Gary. 1997. *Making Votes Count*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, Karol, Noel, Zaller. 2008. *The Party Decides*. University of Chicago Press.

Course PodCast: We will discuss the 538 Elections PodCast each week. You are required to listen to the podcast released Thursday of the previous week for class on Tuesday.

<http://fivethirtyeight.com/politics/> (Also available on iTunes)

Following the Election: We will be closely following the US elections. In addition to discussing the US Presidential elections, each student will monitor a competitive US House or US Senate election. I have listed the (currently) competitive races. In the House elections, the number following the state name refers to the Congressional district in question. Once you have chosen the race that you will follow, you will be expected to research that election and report on it in the weeks before the election.

House: Maine 02, Michigan 01, Florida 18, 26; New York 01, 03, 19, 22, 24, CA 25, 31, 36, 49, 52; Utah 04, Texas 23, Iowa 03

Senate: Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio, Florida, New Hampshire, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Nevada

Course Requirements & Assignments:

Students are required to complete a midterm exam, final exam, and 2 response papers (3-4 pages long). The midterm and final exams will take place in class and will mimic the structure of the Ph. D. qualifying exams. Students can write the papers on two weeks of their choice.

Participation is also crucial to your grade in the course. It will be worth 20% of the total course grade and will include discussion questions. These discussion questions are due the weeks that you write a response paper (determined in a sign-up sheet in weeks 1 and 2.)

No late exams will be accepted unless special arrangements are made via a request, in writing, to me at least 2 weeks prior to the exam. Late papers will be deducted a 10 points per day for each day late and will not be accepted after the 4th day.

Assignment Schedule:

Response Papers- 2 total, timing determined by sign up sheet in class, weeks 1 and 2

Midterm Exam- October 11th

Final Exam- December 13th

Grade Breakdown:

Midterm: 30%

Final Exam: 35%

Response Papers (2): 25%

Participation: 10%

Grading Description: Written Assignments

Assignments are graded based on their academic rigor. In particular, I focus on whether the student has made an argument and how that argument is supported by logic and by the cited literature. I do not want students simply to summarize the literature but rather to fit literature into a coherent argument that both demonstrates understanding of the literature and ability to develop and defend an original argument. I use the following grading rubric, developed by the Association of American Universities to evaluate papers. The numbers at the top of the grid reflect the point value for each element of the paper.

Grading Description: Participation

Students should be prepared to participate in every class session. I will document the frequency of participation by individual students in each class period. Participation can include participation in class discussions, presentation of discussion questions, and background research on current elections. Students will present discussion questions the weeks that they write

response papers. This gives students a clear opportunity to participate in the course. This semester we will follow global elections. Each student will be assigned an election to follow and report findings back to the course as a whole. I understand that different students have different ways of participating. If students are uncomfortable speaking often in class, they can participate by uploading current event articles to Sakai and presenting additional discussion questions.

| | Capstone | Milestones | | Benchmark |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Explanation of issues | Issue/ problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding. | Issue/ problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions. | Issue/ problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/ or backgrounds unknown. | Issue/ problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description. |
| Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i> | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly. | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/ evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/ evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question. |
| Influence of context and assumptions | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position. | Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position. | Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa). | Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position. |
| Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) | Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue. | Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious. |
| Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) | Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order. | Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified. |

Attendance

Students are expected to attend all classes. Students who are unable to attend class must seek permission for an excused absence from the course director or teaching assistant. Unapproved absences or late attendance for three or more classes may result in a lower grade or an “incomplete” for the course. If a student has to miss a class, he or she should arrange to get notes from a fellow student and is strongly encouraged to meet with the teaching assistant to obtain the missed material. Missed extra-credit quizzes and papers will not be available for re-taking.

Scientific and Professional Ethics

The work you do in this course must be your own. Feel free to build on, react to, criticize, and analyze the ideas of others but, when you do, make it known whose ideas you are working with. You must explicitly acknowledge when your work builds on someone else's ideas, including ideas of classmates, professors, and authors you read. If you ever have questions about drawing the line between others' work and your own, ask the course professor who will give you guidance. Exams must be completed independently. Any collaboration on answers to exams, unless expressly permitted, may result in an automatic failing grade and possible expulsion from the Program. Any plagiarism will result in a failing grade and possible disciplinary action by CGU.

Grading

| <i>Letter Grade</i> | <i>Grade Point</i> | <i>Description</i> | <i>Learning Outcome</i> |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>A</i> | <i>4.0</i> | <i>Complete mastery of course material and additional insight beyond course material</i> | <i>Insightful</i> |
| <i>B</i> | <i>3.0</i> | <i>Complete mastery of course material</i> | <i>Proficient</i> |
| <i>C</i> | <i>2.0</i> | <i>Gaps in mastery of course material; not at level expected by the program</i> | <i>Developing</i> |
| <i>U</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>Unsatisfactory</i> | <i>Ineffective</i> |

Instructor Feedback and Communication

The best way to get in touch with me is by email at Melissa.rogers@cgu.edu. I will respond to email within two business days. If you have not heard from me in two days, please contact me again and I will respond promptly.

Expectations and Logistics

All readings that can be uploaded to Canvas are available through this site. I will distribute and receive assignments through Canvas unless special arrangements are needed. All assignments should be submitted in .doc or .pdf format on Canvas. Graded assignments will be returned in class the week after they were submitted.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

CGU is committed to offering auxiliary aids and services to students with verifiable disabilities, in compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. To ensure that their individual needs are addressed, students with special needs are encouraged to contact the Dean of Students Office as early as possible. Additional resources can be found on the linked page (<http://www.cgu.edu/pages/1154.asp>).

Class 1 (August 30): Introduction

Class 2 (September 6): What is a Party?

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Chapter 2.

Schlesinger, J. 1984. "On the Theory of Party Organization." *Journal of Politics* 46(2): 369-400.

Aldrich, Chapters 1-2

APSA. 1950. "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party Systems: A Report of the Committee on Political Parties," *APSR* 44:3, Part 2, Supplement, pp. 1-14.

Bawn, K., Cohen, M., Karol, D., Masket, S., Noel, H., & Zaller, J. (2012). A theory of political parties: Groups, policy demands and nominations in American politics. *Perspectives on Politics*, 10(03), 571-597.

Class 3 (September 13): Party Systems and Electoral Systems

Cox, Gary. 1997. *Making Votes Count*. Chs 1-4.

Boix, Carles. 1999. "Setting the Rules of the Game." *American Political Science Review* 93(3).

Norris, Pippa. 1997. "Choosing Electoral Systems: Proportional, Majoritarian, and Mixed Systems" *International Political Science Review* 18(3): 297-312.

Neto, Octavio and Gary Cox. 1997. "Electoral Institutions, Cleavage Structures and the Number of Parties." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(1): 149-174.

Podcast: Freakonomics Radio, Episode 254 "Ten Ideas to Make Politics Less Rotten"

Class 4 (September 20): Parties as Institutions

Cox, G. W., & McCubbins, M. D. (1994). Bonding, structure, and the stability of political parties: party government in the House. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 215-231.

Keith Krehbiel 1993 Where's the Party? *British Journal of Political Science*

McCarty, N. (2001). The hunt for party discipline in congress. In *American Political Science Association* (Vol. 95, No. 03, pp. 673-687).

Aldrich, Chapters 6-9

Class 5 (September 27): Party Emergence from Electoral and Governing Coordination Problems

Cox, Gary. 1987. *The Efficient Secret*. Chs 5-6, 8-11

Cohen, Karol, Noel, Zaller. 2008. *The Party Decides*, Chapters 1, 4

Binder, Lawrence, Maltzman. Uncovering the Hidden Effect of Party. *Journal of Politics*

Cox, *Making Votes Count*, Chapter 14

FiveThirtyEight Article on *The Party Decides*

Class 6 (October 4): Partisanship and Party Identification

Goren, P. (2005). Party identification and core political values. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(4), 881-896.

The Party Decides Ch 3.

K. Zielinski, "Translating Social Cleavages into Party Systems: The Significance of New Democracies," *World Politics* (2002), 184-211.

Rigby, E., & Wright, G. C. (2013). Political parties and representation of the poor in the American states. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(3), 552-565.

Koger, Masket Noel. Partisan Webs: Information Exchange and Partisan Networks. *British Journal of Political Science*.

Class 7 (October 11): Midterm Exam

Class 8 (October 18): Ideology and Polarization

Chandra, Kanchan. *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed*. Pp. 1-30.

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row. Chapters 7-8.

Miller, Gary and Norman Schofield. 2003. "Activists and Partisan Realignment in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 97(2): 245-260.

Rogowski, J. C. (2014). Electoral choice, ideological conflict, and political participation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(2), 479-494.

Mason, L. (2015). "I disrespectfully agree": the differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(1), 128-145.

Class 9 (October 25): Participation and Voter Turnout

Powell, G. Bingham Jr. 1986. "American Voter Turnout in Comparative Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 80(1): 17-43.

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

Stokes, Susan. 2005. "Perverse Accountability: A Formal Model of Machine Politics with Evidence from Argentina." *American Political Science Review* 99(3): 315-326.

Dale, A., & Strauss, A. (2009). Don't forget to vote: Text message reminders as a mobilization tool. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(4), 787-804.

Class 10 (November 1): Why People Vote: Economic, Retrospective, Strategic and Expressive Voting

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

Lewis-Beck, Michael S. and Mary Stegmaier. 2000. "Economic Determinants of Electoral Outcomes." *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 183-219.

Cox, Gary. *Making Votes Count*. Chapter 12.

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

Kayser, Mark Andreas and Christopher Wlezien. 2011. "Performance Pressure: Patterns of Partisanship and the Economic Vote." *European Journal of Political Research* 50(3): 365-94.

Class 11 (November 8): Choosing Candidates

Cox, *Making Votes Count*, Chapter 8

Stokes, Susan. 1999. "Political Parties and Democracy," *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 243-267.

Cooper, A., & Munger, M. C. (2000). The (un) predictability of primaries with many candidates: Simulation evidence. *Public Choice*, 103(3-4), 337-355.

Brady, D. W., Han, H., & Pope, J. C. (2007). Primary elections and candidate ideology: Out of step with the primary electorate?. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 32(1), 79-105.

Jacobson, Gary. (2013). Party Polarization in American Politics: Background Information. *Presidential Politics Quarterly*.

Class 12 (November 15): Election Campaigns and Party Strategies

The Party Decides, Chapters 7 and 9

Farrell, David and Paul Webb. "Political Parties as Campaign Organizations" in Dalton and Wattenberg. Ch. 6.

Abbe, Owen, Jay Goodliffe, Paul Herrnson, and Kelly Patterson. 2003. "Agenda Setting in Congressional Elections: the Impact of Issues and Campaigns on Voting Behavior." *Political Research Quarterly* 56(4): 419-430

Gerber, A. S., & Green, D. P. (2000). The effects of canvassing, telephone calls, and direct mail on voter turnout: A field experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 94(03), 653-663.

Lupu, Noam. (2014). Brand Dilution and the Breakdown of Political Parties in Latin America. *World Politics* 66(4).

Class 13 (November 22): Electoral Rules and Aggregation

Hirano, S., & Snyder, J. M. (2007). The decline of third-party voting in the United States. *Journal of Politics*, 69(1), 1-16.

Shugart, Matthew S. 1995. "The Electoral Cycle and Institutional Sources of Divided Government." *American Political Science Review* 89(2): 327-343.

Cox, Gary. 1997. *Making Votes Count*. Chapters 10-11.

Chhibber, P., & Kollman, K. (1998). Party aggregation and the number of parties in India and the United States. *American political Science review*, 92(02), 329-342.

Clark, Terry and Jill Witrock. 2005. "Presidentialism and the Effect of Electoral Law in Postcommunist Systems." *Comparative Political Studies* 38(2): 171-88.

Class 14 (November 29): Campaigns, Parties, and Interest Groups

Baumgartner, F. R., & Leech, B. L. (2001). Interest niches and policy bandwagons: Patterns of interest group involvement in national politics. *Journal of Politics*, 63(4), 1191-1213.

Bowler, S., & Hanneman, R. (2006). Just how pluralist is direct democracy? The structure of interest group participation in ballot proposition elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, 59(4), 557-568.

Leech, B. L., Baumgartner, F. R., La Pira, T. M., & Semanko, N. A. (2005). Drawing lobbyists to Washington: Government activity and the demand for advocacy. *Political Research Quarterly*, 58(1), 19-30.

Denzau, A. T., & Munger, M. C. (1986). Legislators and interest groups: How unorganized interests get represented. *American Political Science Review*, 80(01), 89-106.

Class 15 (December 6): Vote Buying and Clientelism

Carey, John M. and Matthew Shugart. 1995. Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: a Rank Ordering of Electoral Formulas. *Electoral Studies* 14(4): 417-440.

Calvo, Ernesto and Victoria Murillo. 2004. "Who Delivers? Partisan Clients in the Argentine Electoral Market." *AJPS* 48(4): 742-757.

Kitschelt. 2000. Linkages between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Politics. *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (6/7)

Gans-Morse, J., Mazzuca, S., & Nichter, S. (2014). Varieties of clientelism: Machine politics during elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(2), 415-432.

Final Exam: December 13th