

POLS 5010: Political Competition and Voting in Comparative Perspective
Th, 1:30-4:00

Matthew Singer
Matthew.m.singer@uconn.edu

MONT 122
Office Hours T/Th from 11-12:30

Overview

Elections are the lifeblood of democracy, affecting policy outcomes, patterns of accountability and governance, the distribution of material goods, and the overall legitimacy of the state. In this course we will focus on how voters approach elections and how elites seek support. In doing so, we will visit many of the central topics in American political behavior (issue voting, ideology, economic voting, partisan identification, etc) in addition to some of the central questions of comparative politics (the role of class, the impact of modernization, the creation of identities, the legitimization of the state). Of central interest, however, is in merging these two traditions to understand how people perceive changing political and economic realities and respond to them as well as documenting how patterns of behavior are influenced by the context in which they occur.

The course is designed around questions of party competition and voting behavior. As a result, we do not deal with many topics central to the study of public opinion more broadly. I wish we had time to talk about political knowledge, trust, efficacy, participation, attitudes toward welfare and globalization, or support for democracy. As it is, I have to restrict those choices off the agenda for now (though they will still crop up in discussion). We also will not spend a whole lot of time on the emergence and changes of political parties and party systems, with especial shortchange given to the rise of Green and Radical Right parties (though we do slightly more with regional parties). **If you are dying to read about and research these topics, however, I can accept final paper proposals on them or any other topic using public opinion data in comparative perspective.**

Grading and Expectations

The primary grade for the semester will come from an original research paper written on any topic of public opinion, voting behavior, or party organization that interests you. That can potentially include topics not covered explicitly in class, such as support for democracy or attitudes toward policy, as long as they use public opinion. I would prefer, however, that you focus on electoral outcomes and processes if possible and so deviations from that need to be cleared in advance with the instructor (e.g. if it is part of your potential dissertation project). The length is a maximum of 35 pages (including notes, citations, tables, etc) and a minimum of 20. This paper can use quantitative or qualitative methods, though many of the topics covered in class will be most easily handled with large-n analysis. Basically I hope that it will be something that could be a conference presentation or revised for eventual publication-it is not a critical reordering of the literature but a new analysis (in the context of the limitations of a single semester). If you have trouble indentifying a topic, I always have ideas but accepting one of my ideas/data means potentially accepting me as a coauthor after you finish the class and continue working on the topic. The paper will represent 40 percent of your grade. No extensions are permitted.

The rest of the grade will then come from your participation in class. Each student will write 2 discussion papers (10 pages double spaced) over the course of the semester analyzing the central issues raised in the readings, harmonizing the larger questions this work raises for further research, and critiquing specific works. In addition to the required reading, this essay should incorporate 2-4 of the suggested readings (the exact number depends upon the ratio of books to articles and the length of the required readings that week) to be chosen in consultation with the instructor a week before class. These

papers will be circulated to the other students before midnight on Tuesday night. Each paper will represent 10 percent of your grade.

In addition, each student will serve once as the discussion leader (ideally, this will be one of the 2 weeks he or she writes the review essay). The discussion leader's job is to provide a list of questions to discuss in class and to lead class discussion after the instructor has finished providing some background. That person will meet with the instructor during Tuesday office hours to plan some of the topics that will be covered. Leading discussion will comprise 15 percent of your grade.

Finally, to make the discussion a success and to help out the discussion leaders, it is expected that all students will come to class having done the readings, with questions they would like to discuss, and critiques of the research presented. This comprises 25 percent of your grade.

If a problem arises during the semester, I need you to come to me as soon as possible so that I can help you fix it. The first step to getting out a hole is to stop digging. Work can be turned in late, but it loses a third of a grade for every day it is late.

Plagiarism

It should go beyond saying that I expect each of us to follow the University's Community Student Code with regards to honesty in the classroom. Plagiarism is defined as:

“Plagiarism occurs when a student, with intent to deceive or with reckless disregard for proper scholarly procedures, presents any information, ideas or phrasing of another as if they were his [or her] own and does not give appropriate credit to the original source. Proper scholarly procedures require that all quoted material be identified by quotation marks or indentation on the page, and the source of information and ideas, if from another, must be identified and be attributed to that source. Students are responsible for learning proper scholarly procedures.”

Improper or incomplete citation of consulted sources will result in a deduction of your grade. Especially blatant plagiarism or any other attempt to pass off someone else's work as you own will be dealt with severely, including (but not limited to) a failing grade for the assignment, a failing grade for the course, and submission of the case to the dean for further action. I do not expect this will be necessary but wish to be clear on this. Please feel free to talk to me if you have any questions about how to properly reference materials you find while doing research from books or on the Internet. For a brief introduction, see <http://www.lib.uconn.edu/using/tutorials/LILT/plagiarism.htm>.

I don't expect this will be an issue.

Texts

Wherever possible I have tried to just assign a part of a book or a paper from the same authors to give you a sampling of their approach. However, there are 2 books I would like us to read almost in their entirety. Both are available in paperback and can be bought from various sites on line.

Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 2000. *The Macropolity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, C. J., Andre Blais, Shaun Bowler, Todd Donovan, and Ola Listhaug. 2005. *Losers' Consent: Elections and Democratic Legitimacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

I list lots of “recommended” readings to help you prepare for your research papers or qualifying exams in addition to resources for the discussion papers.

Schedule of topics

Week 1: Introduction and syllabus

Week 2: Issues in Studying Public Opinion Across Contexts

Steenbergen Marco R., & Jones, Bradford S. (2002). Modeling multilevel data structures. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(1), 218-237

Anderson, Christopher J. and Matthew M. Singer. “The Sensitive Left and the Impervious Right: Multilevel Models and the Politics of Inequality, Ideology, and Legitimacy in Europe,” *Comparative Political Studies* (June 2008): 564-99.

Bischooping, Katherine and Howard Schuman. 1992. Pens and Polls in Nicaragua: An Analysis of the 1990 Preelection Surveys. *American Journal of Political Science* 36 (May): 331-350.

King, Gary, Christopher J. L. Murray, Joshua A. Salomon, and Ajay Tandon. "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research." *American Political Science Review* 98 (2004): 191-207.

Look at the commands for xtmixed in stata in case you decide to do a multi-level model (and not everyone will) (http://www.stata.com/bookstore/stata12/pdf/xt_xtmixed.pdf, or <http://dss.princeton.edu/training/Multilevel101.pdf>) and the basic documentation for HLM (<http://www.ssicentral.com/hlm/>).

I am also assuming that everyone knows the basics of the logit family of estimators and other techniques for outcomes where the dependent variable is not continuous. If not, you might do some reading on this as well. I can help you with this. (This is not a methods class, but I want to make sure we are all on the same page when doing the readings)

Week 3: Participation

Jackman, Robert W. 1987. “Political Institutions and Voter Turnout in the Industrial Democracies.” *American Political Science Review* 29: 161-82.

André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, Neil Nevitte, and Richard Nadeau, “Where Does Turnout Decline Come From?” *European Journal of Political Research*, 43 (2004), 221-236.

Karp, Jeffrey A., Susan A. Banducci, and Shaun Bowler. 2008. “Getting Out the Vote: Party Mobilization in a Comparative Perspective.” *British Journal of Political Science*. 38(1): 91-112.

Pacek, Alexander C., Gregorie Pop-Eleches, and Joshua Tucker. 2009. Disenchanted or Discerning: Voter Turnout in Post-Communist Countries. *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 71, No. 2, April 2009, Pp. 473–491

Marien, Soffe, Marc Hooghe and Ellen Quintelier. 2010. Inequality in

Non-institutionalised Forms of Political Participation: A Multi-level Analysis of 25 Countries." *Political Studies* 58(1):187-213.

Additional Readings

Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba and Kay Lehmann Scholzman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89(2): 271-294.

Van der Meer, Tom W. G., Jan W. van Deth, and Peer L. H. Scheepers. 2009. The Politicized Participant: Ideology and Political Action in 20 Democracies." *Comparative Political Studies* 42(11):1426-1457.

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

Tillman, Erik R. 2008. "Economic Judgments, Party Choice, and Voter Abstention in Cross-National Perspective." *Comparative Political Studies* 41(9):1290-1309.

Mondak, Jeffrey J., Matthew V. Hibbing, Damarys Canache, Mitchell A. Seligson, and Mary R. Anderson. 2010. "Personality and Civic Engagement: An Integrative Framework for the Study of Trait Effects on Political Behavior." *American Political Science Review* 104(1):85-110.

Verba, Sidney and Norman H. Nie, and Jae-on Kim. 1978. *Participation and Political Equality: A Seven-Nation Comparison*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barnes, Samuel H. and Max Kaase. 1979. *Political Action: Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Franklin, Mark J. 2004. *Voter turnout and the dynamics of electoral competition in established democracies since 1945*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Blais, Andre. 2006. "What Affects Voter Turnout?" *Annual Reviews of Political Science* 9:111-125.

Week 4: Partisanship

Dalton, Russel and Martin Watterberg. 2000. *Parties without partisans: Political change in advanced industrial democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapters 2-4

Dalton, Russell J. and Steven Weldon. 2007. Partisanship and Party System Institutionalization. *Party Politics* 13 (March): 179-196

Lupu, Noam and Susan Stokes. 2010. " Democracy, Interrupted: Regime Change and Partisanship in Twentieth-Century Argentina" *Electoral Studies* 29 (1): 91-104.

Tucker, Joshua and Ted Brader. 2008. "Pathways to Partisanship: Evidence from Russia" *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 24 (3): 263-300

Additional Readings

Samuels, David. 2006. "Sources of Mass Partisanship in Brazil." *Latin American Politics and Society* 48(2): 1-27.

Brader, Ted and Joshua Tucker. Forthcoming. "Follow the Leader: Party Cues, Policy Opinion, and the Power of Partisanship in Three Multiparty Systems," Forthcoming in *Comparative Politics*.

Huber, John, Georgia Kernell, and Eduardo L. Leoni. 2005. Institutional Context, Cognitive Resources and Party Attachments Across Democracies. *Political Analysis* 13 (4): 365-85.

Bowler, Shaun, David J. Lanoue, and Paul Savoie. 1994. Electoral systems, party competition, and strength of partisan attachment; Evidence from three countries. *Journal of politics* 56 (4): 991-1007.

Morgan, Jana. 2007. "Partisanship During the Collapse Venezuela's Party System" *Latin American Research Review*. 2007. 42 (1) 78-98.

Miller, Arthur H. and Thomas F. Klocucar. 2000. The development of party identification in post-Soviet Societies. *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (4): 667-86.

Huber, John 1989. Values and partisanship in left-right orientations: measuring ideology. *European Journal of Political Research* 17 (5): 599-621.

Richardson, Bradley. 1991. European party loyalties revisited. *American Political Science review* 85 (Sep): 751-775.

Rose, Richard. 1998. Negative and positive party identification in Post-Communist countries. *Electoral Studies* 17 (2): 217-34.

Week 5: Issue Voting

Edward G. Carmines, James A. Stimson. 1980. The Two Faces of Issue Voting. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 74, No. 1. (Mar., 1980), pp. 78-91

Iversen, Torben. 1994. Political leadership and representation in West European democracies: A test of three models of voting. *American Journal of Political Science* 38 (1): 45-74.

Hinich, Melvin J. and Michael C. Munger. 1996. A Spatial Theory of Ideology. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 4 (1): 5-30.

Singh, Shane. 2010. Contextual influences on the decision calculus: A cross-national examination of proximity voting. *Electoral Studies* 29 (3): 425-34.

Adams, James, and Zeynep Somer-Topcu. 2009. "Promise now, win votes later? The electoral effects of parties' policy shifts in 25 postwar democracies." *Journal of Politics* 71(2): 678-692.

Additional Readings

André Blais, Mathieu Turgeon, Elisabeth Gidengil, Neil Nevitte and Richard Nadeau, "Which Matters Most? Comparing the Impact of Issues and the Economy in American, British and Canadian Elections." *British Journal of Political Science*, 34 (2004), 555-563.

Agnieszka Dobrzynska and André Blais. "Testing Zaller's Reception and Acceptance Model in an Intense Election Campaign." *Political Behavior*, 30 (2008): 259-275.

Adams, James. 2001. *Party competition and responsible party government*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Budge, Ian and Dennis Farlie. 1983. *Explaining and predicting elections: issue effects and party strategies in twenty-three democracies*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An economic theory of democracy*. New York: Harper.

Merrill, Samuel and Bernard Grofman. 1999. *A unified theory of voting: Directional and proximity spatial models*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-3, 5.

Rabinowitz, George and Elaine Stuart Macdonald. 1989. A directional theory of issue voting. *American Political Science Review* 83 (1): 93-121.

Symposium: The directional theory of issue voting. 1997. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 9 (1).

van der Brug, Wouter. 2004. Issue ownership and party choice. *Electoral Studies* 23 (June): 209-33.

Westholm, Anders. 1997. Distance versus direction: The illusory defeat of the proximity theory of electoral choice. *American Political Science Review* 91 (4): 865-84.

Adams, James, Lawrence Ezrow, and Zeynep Somer-Topcu. "Is anybody listening? Evidence that voters do not respond to European parties' policy programmes." Forthcoming in the *American Journal of Political Science*.

Lachat, Romain. 2011. Electoral Competitiveness and Issue Voting. *Political Behavior* 33 (4): 645-63.

Week 6: Ideology

Knutsen, Oddbjorn. 1995. Value orientations, political conflicts, and left-right identification: A comparative study. *European Journal of Political Research* 28 (1): 63-93.

Hellwig, Timothy. 2008. Explaining the salience of left-right ideology in post-industrial democracies: The role of structural economic change. *European Journal of Political Research*. 47 (6): 687-709.

Zechmeister, Elizabeth. 2006. What's Left and Who's Right? A Q-Method Study of Individual and Contextual Influences on the Meaning of Ideological Labels. *Political Behavior* 28 (2): 151-173.

Zechmeister, Elizabeth and Margarita Corral. Forthcoming. Individual and Contextual Constraints on Ideological Labels in Latin America. *Comparative Political Studies*. (Copy from the instructor)

Evans, Geoffrey and Stephen Whitefield. 1993. Identifying the Bases of Party Competition in Eastern Europe. *British Journal of Political Science* 23: 521-48.

Additional Readings

Jou, W. (2011). How do citizens in East Asian democracies understand left and right? *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 12(1): 33-55.

Mair, P. (2010). Left-right orientations. In R. J. Dalton & H-D. Klingemann (Eds.), *Oxford handbooks online: The Oxford handbook of political behavior*.

Kitschelt, H., & Hellemans, S. (1990). The left-right semantics and the new politics cleavage. *Comparative Political Studies* 23(2): 210-238.

Huber, John 1989. Values and partisanship in left-right orientations: measuring ideology. *European Journal of Political Research* 17 (5): 599-621.

Listhaug, Ola, Stuart MacDonald, and George Rabinowitz. 1994. Ideology and party support in comparative perspective. *European Journal of Political Research* 25 (2): 111-49.

Yuval Piurko, Shalom H. Schwartz, Eldad Davidov. 2011. Basic Personal Values and the Meaning of Left-Right Political Orientations in 20 Countries. *Political Psychology* 32 (4): 537-61.

Week 7: Cleavages

I am assuming have read (so you might want to skim it if you have not): Lipset, Seymour M. and Stein Rokkan. 1967. Cleavage structures, party systems, and voter alignments: An introduction. In *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross National Perspectives*. New York: Free Press. 1-64.

Moreno, Alejandro. 1999. *Political cleavages: Issues, parties, and the consolidation of Democracy*. Boulder: Westview Press. 1-28, 106-65.

Roberts, Kenneth. 2002. Social Inequalities Without Class Cleavages in Latin America's Neoliberal Era. *Studies in Comparative International Development*. 36 (4): 3-33.

Niwbbeerta, Paul and Wout Ultee. 1999. Class voting in Western industrialized countries, 1945-1990: Systematizing and testing explanations. *European Journal of Political Research* 35 (1): 123-60.

van der Brug, Wouter, Sara B. Hobolt & Claes H. de Vreese. 2009. Religion and Party Choice in Europe. *West European Politics* 32 (6): 1266-83.

Evans, Geoffrey. 2000. The Continued Significance of Class Voting. *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 401-417.

Additional Readings:

Inglehart, Ronald and Pippa Norris. 2000. The Developmental Theory of the Gender Gap: Women's and Men's Voting Behavior in Global Perspective. *International Political Science Review* 21 (4).

Evans, Geoffrey. 2006. 'The Social Bases of Political Divisions in Post-Communist Eastern Europe', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32: 245-70.

Roberts, Kenneth M. and Moises Arce. 1998. Neoliberalism and Lower-Class Voting Behavior in Peru. *Comparative Political Studies* 31 (2): 217-46.

Knutsen, Oddbjorn. 2008. *Class Voting in Western Europe: A Comparative Longitudinal Study*. Lanham, MA: Lexington Books.

Bartolini, Stephano. 2001. *The Political Mobilization of the European left, 1860-1980*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 8 (411-501)

Franklin MN, Mackie T, Valen H, et al. 1992. *Electoral Change: Responses to Evolving Social and Attitudinal Structures in Western Countries*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Jan van Deth and Elinor Scarborough. 1995. *The impact of values*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapters by Oddbjorn Knutsen "Party Choice" and Knutsen and Scarbrough "Cleavage politics"

Kitschelt, Herbert. 1995. *The radical right in Western Europe: a comparative analysis*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chapter 1.

Evans, G. and C. Mills. 1999. Are there classes in post-communist societies? A new approach to identifying class structure. *Sociology* 33: 23-46.

Manza, Jeff, Michael Hout, and Clem Brooks. 1995. Class voting in capitalist democracies since World War II: Dealignment, realignment, or trendless fluctuation? *Annual review of Sociology* 21: 137-62.

Whitefield, Stephen. 2002. Political cleavages and post-communist politics. *American Review of Political Science* 5 (1): 181-200.

Przeworski, Adam and John Sprague. 1986. *Paper Stones. A History of Electoral Socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kitschelt, Herbert. 1994. *The Transformation of European Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Week 8: Materialism and Post Materialism

Inglehart, Ronald. Post-Materialism in an Environment of Insecurity. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 75, No. 4 (Dec., 1981), pp. 880-900

Clarke, Harold D., and Nitish Dutt. 1991 "Measuring Value Change in Western Industrialized Societies: The Impact of Unemployment." *American Political Science Review* 85

(September): 905-20.

Duch, Raymond M., and Michael A. Taylor. 1993. "Postmaterialism and the Economic Condition." *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (August): 747-79.

Rehm, Philipp. 2009. "Risks and Redistribution. An Individual-Level Analysis." *Comparative Political Studies*. Volume 42 (7), pp. 855-881.

Finseraas, Henning (2009). "Income Inequality and Demand for Redistribution: A Multilevel Analysis of European Public Opinion", *Scandinavian Political Studies* 32(1): 94-119.

Recommended

<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/3f72v9q4> (a fun lit review by Paul Abramson)

Finseraas, Henning (2008). "Immigration and Preferences for Redistribution: An Empirical Analysis of European Survey Data", *Comparative European Politics* 6(4): 407-431.

Cusack, Thomas, Torben Iversen, and Philipp 2006. Risks at Work: The Demand and Supply Sides of Government Redistribution. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 22(3): 365-389

Rehm, Philipp. 2011. Social Policy by Popular Demand. *World Politics*, 63(2): 271-299.

Scarborough, Elinor. 1995. "Materialist-Postmaterialist Value Orientations." In *Beliefs in Government, Vol. 4: The Impact of Values*, ed. Jan W. Van Deth and Elinor Scarborough. New York: Oxford University Press, 123-59.

Dalton, Russell J. 1977. "Was There a Revolution? A Note on Generational Versus Life Cycle Explanations of Value Differences." *Comparative Political Studies* 9 (January): 459-73.

Davis, Darren W., and Christian Davenport. 1999. "Assessing the Validity of the Postmaterialism Index." *American Political Science Review* 93 (September): 649-64.

Flanagan, Scott C. 1980. "Value Cleavages, Economic Cleavages, and the Japanese Voter." *American Journal of Political Science* 24 (May): 177-206.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1971. "The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies." *American Political Science Review* 65 (December): 991-1017.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1977. *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jackman, Robert W., and Ross A. Miller. 1996a. "A Renaissance of Political Culture?" *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (August): 632-59.

Lafferty, William M., and Oddbjørn Knutsen. 1985. "Postmaterialism in a Social Democratic State: An Analysis of the Distinctiveness and Congruity of the Inglehart Value Syndrome in Norway." *Comparative Political Studies* 17 (January): 411-30.

Week 9: Economic Voting

Macropolity-Chapter 3.

Powell, G. Bingham and Guy Whitten. 1993. A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context. *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (2): 391-414.

Hellwig, Timothy and David Samuels. 2007. Voting in Open Economies: the Electoral Consequences of Globalization. *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (3): 283-306.

Singer, Matthew M. ““Who Says “It’s the Economy””? Cross-National and Cross-Individual Variation in the Salience of Economic Performance” *Comparative Political Studies* 44 (March 2011): 284-312.

Owen, Andrew, and Joshua Tucker. 2010. It’s a Multifaceted Economic Effect, Stupid! Conventional vs. Transitional Economic Voting in Poland, 1997-2005. *Electoral Studies*, 29(1): 25-39.

Additional Readings

Tucker, Joshua A. 2006. *Regional Economic Voting: Russia, Poland, Hungary, Slovakia and Russia, 1990-99*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Duch, Ray and Randy Stevenson. 2008. *Voting in Context: How Political and Economic Institutions Condition the Economic Vote*. Cambridge University Press.
http://www.raymond Duch.com/economicvoting/duchstevensonbook_v1_4d.pdf (for a discussion of the methodology, which is quite interesting, see their 2005 piece Context and the Economic Vote: A Multilevel Analysis in *Political Analysis*)

Samuels, David. 2004. Presidentialism and Accountability for the Economy in Comparative Perspective. *American Political Science Review* 98 (3): 425-36.

Lewis-Beck. 1988. *Economics and Elections: The Major Western Democracies*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. (An article version of the major cross-national findings came out in 1986).

Morgenstern, Scott and Elizabeth Zechmeister. 2001. Better the Devil You Know than the Saint You Don't? Risk Propensity and Vote Choice in Mexico. *Journal of Politics* 63 (10): 93-119

Van der Brug, Wouter, Cees van der Eijk, and Mark Franklin. 2007. *The economy and the vote: economic conditions and elections in fifteen countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Especially the chapters on theory and research design)

Lowry, Robert C., James E. Alt, and Karen E. Ferree. 1998. Fiscal Policy Outcomes and Electoral Accountability in American States. *The American Political Science Review* 92 (Dec): 759-774.

Week 10: Ethnic Politics

Chandra, Kanchan. 2007. Chapter in *Patrons, Clients and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkinson, Steven. 2004. *Votes and Violence: Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 2, 5.

Posner, Daniel. 2004. The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi. *American Political Science Review* 98 (4): 529-45.

Ferree, Karen E. 2006. "Explaining South Africa's Racial Census." *Journal of Politics* 68:4, 802-814.

Dunning, Thad and Laura Harrison. 2011. Cross-cutting Cleavages and Ethnic Voting: An Experimental Study of Cousinage in Mali. *American Political Science Review* 104 (1): pp 21-39

Additional Readings:

Rice, Roberta and Donna Lee Van Cott. 2006. The Emergence and Performance of Indigenous Peoples' Parties in South America: A Subnational Statistical Analysis. *Comparative Political Studies* 39 (6): 709-32.

Posner, Daniel N. 2007. Regime Change and Ethnic Cleavages in Africa. *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (11): 1302-27.

Dickson, Eric and Ken Scheve. 2006. Social Identity, Political Speech, and Electoral Competition. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 18 (1): 5-39.

Van Cott, Donna Lee. 2005. *From Movements to Parties in Latin America: The Evolution of Ethnic Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ordeshook, Peter C. and Olga V. Shvetsova. 1994. Ethnic Heterogeneity, District Magnitude, and the Number of Parties. *American Journal of Political Science* 38 (Feb): 100-123.

Mozaffar, Shaheen, James R. Scarritt, and Glen Galaich. 2003. Electoral Institutions, Ethnopolitical Cleavages, and Party Systems in Africa's Emerging Democracies. *The American Political Science Review* 97 (Aug): 379-390.

Mozaffar, Shaheen, and James R. Scarritt. 2005. The Puzzle of African Party Systems. *Party Politics* 11 (4): 399-421.

Week 11: Candidate Traits

Lawson, Chappell, Gabriel S. Lenz, Andy Baker, and Michael Myers. 2010. Looking like a winner: Candidate Appearance and Electoral Success in New Democracies. *World Politics* 62, no. 4 (October 2010), 561-93

Merolla, Jennifer L., and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister. 2011. The Nature, Determinants, and Consequences of Chávez's Charisma. *Comparative Political Studies* 44(1): 28-54.

Clark, Michael. 2009. Valence and electoral outcomes in Western Europe, 1976-1998 *Electoral Studies*. 28 (1):111-122

Gail McElroy and Michael Marsh. 2010. Candidate Gender and Voter Choice: Analysis from a Multimember Preferential Voting System. *Political Research Quarterly* 63 (Dec): 822-833

Samuels, David S. and Matthew S. Shugart. Presidents, Parties, and Prime Ministers: How the Separation of Powers Affects Party Organization and Behavior. Cambridge University press. Chapter 3.

Recommended

Merrolla, Jennifer L., Elizabeth J. Zechmeister, and Jennifer M. Ramos. "Crisis, Charisma, and Consequences: Evidence from the 2004 U.S. Presidential Election." *Journal of Politics* 69 (1): 30-42

Hawkins, Kirk A. 2009. "Is Chávez populist? Measuring populist discourse in comparative perspective." *Comparative Political Studies*. 42 (8): 1040-67.

McAllister, Ian. 1996. Leaders in Luc LeDuc, Richard G. Niemi, Pippa Norris (Eds.), *Comparing Democracies: Elections and Voting in Global Perspective*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA (1996)

Brusattin, Lorenzo. Forthcoming. Candidate Visual Appearance as a Shortcut for Both Sophisticated and Unsophisticated Voters: Evidence from a Spanish Online Study *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*

Atkinson, Matthew D., Ryan D. Enos, and Seth J. Hill. 2009. "Candidate Faces and Election Outcomes: Is the Face-Vote Correlation Caused by Candidate Selection?" *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 4, no. 3: 229-49.

Banducci, Susan A., Jeffrey A. Karp, Michael Thrasher, and Colin Rallings. 2008. "Ballot Photographs as Cues in Low-Information Elections." *Political Psychology* 29, no. 6: 903-17.

Johns, Robert, and Mark Shephard. 2007. "Gender, Candidate Image and Electoral Preference." *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9, no. 3: 430-60.

Johns, Robert, and Mark Shephard. 2008. "Candidate Image and Electoral Preference in Britain." *British Politics* 3, no. 2: 324-49.

Week 12: Clientelism

Chapter by Kitschelt in Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven Wilkinson. 2007. *Patrons, Clients and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wantchekon, Leonard. 2003. Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin. *World Politics* 55 (April): 399-422.

Stokes, Susan. 2005. "Perverse Accountability: A Formal Model of Machine Politics with Evidence from Argentina." *American Political Science Review* 99(3):315-325.

Nichter, Simeon. "Vote Buying or Turnout Buying? Machine Politics and the Secret Ballot." *American Political Science Review* 102 (February 2008): 19-31.

Arias, Enrique D. 2006. Trouble en Route: Drug Trafficking and Clientelism in Rio de Janeiro Shantytowns. *Qualitative Sociology* 29 (Dec): 427-445.

Additional Readings:

Weitz-Shapiro, Rebecca. 2006. Partisanship and protest: The politics of workfare distribution in Argentina. *Latin American Research Review* 41:3.

Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven Wilkinson. 2007. *Patrons, Clients and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kitschelt, Herbert. 2000. Linkages between citizens and politicians in democratic polities. *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (6-7): 845-79.

Mainwaring, Scott. 1999. *Rethinking party systems in the third wave of democratization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Piattoni, Simona. 2001. *Clientelism, interests, and democratic representation: The European experience in historical and comparative perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shefter, Martin. 1994. *Political parties and the state: the American historical experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapters 1-4.

Fox, Jonathan. 1994. The Difficult Transition from Clientelism to Citizenship: Lessons from Mexico. *World Politics* 46 (Jan): 151-184.

O'Dwyer, Connor. 2006. *Runaway State-Building: Patronage, Politics and Democratic Development*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kang, David. 2002. *Crony capitalism, corruption, and development in South Korea and the Philippines*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 7.

Week 13: The Macropolity

Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 2000. *The Macropolity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enns, Peter, and Paul M. Kellstedt 2008. "Policy Mood and Political Sophistication: Why Everybody Moves Mood" *The British Journal of Political Science*. 38(3): 433-454.

Additional readings

Kramer, Gerald H. 1983. The ecological fallacy revisited: Aggregate versus individual-level findings on economics and elections and sociotropic voting. *American Political Science Review* 77 (1): 92-111.

Norpoth, Helmut. 1996. Politics and the prospective voter. *Journal of Politics* 58 (May): 776-92.

AND MacKuen, Michael B., Robert S. Erikson, and James A. Stimson. 1996. Presidents and the Prospective Year: Comment. *The Journal of Politics* 58 (Aug): 793-801.

Bartels, Larry M. 1991. Constituency Opinion and Congressional Policy Making: The Reagan Defense Build Up. *The American Political Science Review* 85 (Jun): 457-474.

Clarke, Harold, Marianne Stewart, Mike Ault, and Euel Elliot. 2005. Men, Women and the Dynamics of Presidential Approval. *British Journal of Political Science* 35 (1): 31-51.

Wlezien, Christopher. 2004. Patterns of Representation: Dynamics of Public Preferences and Policy. *The Journal of Politics* 66 (1): 1-24.

Canes-Wrone, Brandice and Kenneth W. Shotts. 2004. The Conditional Nature of Presidential Responsiveness to Public Opinion. *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (4): 690-706.

Week 14: The Challenge of Losing

Anderson, C. J., Andre Blais, Shaun Bowler, Todd Donovan, and Ola Listhaug. 2005. *Losers' Consent: Elections and Democratic Legitimacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.