Comparative Democratic Politics (BAK10)

University of Vienna
Winter Semester 2025

Lecturer

Leonardo Carella (Leo)

Office Hrs: on appointment

Rooseveltplatz, R.414

leonardo.carella@univie.ac.at

Classes

Monday

16:45 - 18:15

Seminar room 8, Kolingasse 14-16, OG01 01.18

Overview

The course provides an overview of key themes in democratic politics in a comparative perspective. The course content is articulated in four thematic modules: (1) Democracy: we will start off by examining how political scientists define democracy, explain how it came about, and think about dimensions of variation between types of democratic polities we find around the world. (2) Institutions: we will examine the formal 'infrastructure' of rules and institutions of democracy - e.g. electoral systems, legislatures, executives - and discuss how different ways of distributing political power map onto different democratic processes and outcomes. (3) Politics: we will examine how political divisions emerge in democratic countries, how parties and party systems manage these tensions, and think about some major explanations as to why voters behave the way they do. (4) New Issues and Challenges: we will ask whether recent, transnational trends — populism, technocracy, declining support for democratic norms — spell trouble for democracy, and whether institutional innovation can bolster its resilience.

Learning Objectives

- Defining and identifying key concepts (e.g. democracy, political cleavage, populism, social capital) and conceptual distinctions (e.g. majoritarian-consensus democracy, executive forms, dealignment-realignment) relevant to the study of democratic politics.
- Using this conceptual toolkit to discuss real-world cases.
- Developing the ability to engage critically with specialist literature and to evaluate evidence from case studies and cross-case comparisons.
- Presenting compelling, reasoned arguments, both in writing and orally.
- Understanding the basics of the comparative method, and being able to develop original research questions on democratic politics.

Assessment Structure

15%	Attendance and Participation
30%	In-Class Quizzes
15%	Essay Plan (due Friday, 12 Dec 2025, 23:59)
40%	Final Essay (due Friday, 27 Feb 2026, 23:59)

Each component is graded on a 0–100 scale, where: 87–100 Points is 'Excellent' (1); 75–86 Points is 'Good' (2); 63–74 Points is 'Satisfactory' (3); 50–62 Points is 'Sufficient' (4), and 0–49 Points is 'Insufficient' (5). The overall grade is the weighted average of each component. For a positive completion of this seminar, at least half of the total number of points is required ($\geq$ 50 points).

Readings

Required and recommended readings for each class are listed further down in this document. Required readings must be completed prior to the relevant class. There is no core textbook for this course, but the following may be useful as preliminary readings or companions to the course.

- Caramani, D. (2023) *Comparative politics* (sixth edition). OUP.
- Boix, C. and Stokes, S. (2007) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford Handbooks Online.
- Clark, W., Golder, M. and Golder, S. (2024). *Principles of Comparative Politics* (Fourth edition). CQ Press.
- Ansell, B. (2023). *Why Politics Fails: The Five Traps of the Modern World & How to Escape Them*. Random House. [esp. part 1]
- Dahl, R. (1989). *Democracy and its Critics*. Yale University Press.
- Levitsky, S. and Ziblatt, D. (2019). *How Democracies Die*. Crown.

Assessment Policies

Attendance and Participation: Attendance is a prerequisite for the completion of this seminar, as the evaluation is based on continuous assessments during the semester. This component is evaluated on the basis of: (1) Attendance: for full marks on this component, a maximum of three sessions can be missed. Attendance will be checked every session. Falsification of a signature is equivalent to fraudulent performance and leads to consequences under the study law (see section on plagiarism/fraudulent performance). Class starts at 16:45 sharp; (2) Participation: students are expected to participate in class discussions, ask and answer questions, and demonstrate evidence of having done the weekly readings in advance of the class. Required readings must be done in advance of the relevant class.

In-Class Quizzes: There will be four short in-class quizzes, lasting 20 minutes each and comprising approximately 10 multiple-choice questions. These will be completed within the first part of the classes in weeks 5 (covering material from weeks 2–4), 8 (covering weeks 5–7), 11 (covering weeks 8–10) and 13 (covering weeks 11–12). The assessments test students' command of the required readings and of the content of the lectures. The overall grade for this component is the average of the three highest-scoring quizzes over the course of the term.

Essay Plan: This assessment is meant to serve as a preparation for the final essay, and is due by Friday 12 December 2025 (to be submitted via Moodle). Students will be provided with a choice of essay questions related to the topics from weeks 2–7 in the week starting on 17 November 2025. They will choose one, and submit (1) an introductory paragraph (ca. 300 words), (2) a bullet-point summary of the argument they intend to develop (ca. 500 words), and (3) an annotated bibliography (ca. 7 sources). The essay plan will be evaluated according to the following criteria: coherence and relevance of the introductory paragraph; coherence and relevance of the argument developed in the essay plan; and efficient organisation of the essay plan; accuracy and relevance of the annotated bibliography. Further guidance on this assessment will be provided in class.

Final Essay: The final course assessment is an essay (max 2500 words, excluding bibliography but including title, section titles, footnotes etc.) on one of a choice of essay prompts on topics from the whole course. The essay should be submitted via Moodle by Friday 27 February 2026. It is expected that students develop and defend a clear argument addressing the essay question, rather than simply listing factual information with some relevance to the topic. It is also advisable to engage with literature beyond the required readings. The essay plan will be evaluated according to the following criteria: coherence and relevance of the argument to the prompt; efficient organisation of the argument; evidence of independent thinking; evidence of deep engagement with the literature; adherence to scholarly conventions for references and citations. Further guidance on this assessment will be provided in class.

Course Policies

Academic Conduct: Plagiarism (taking someone else's writing or ideas and passing them off as your own) and ghostwriting (having someone else do *any* part of *any* assessment component for you) are *strictly forbidden* in all the work you produce for these course. To make sure that these rules are not violated all written work will be cross-checked with plagiarism- and AI-checking software. If one performance component in a course with continuous assessment is obtained by fraudulent means (e.g., cheating, use of unauthorised means, plagiarism, etc.), the entire course performance is to be considered as obtained by fraudulent means and no assessment will be returned to the student (Statutes of the University of Vienna). Any plagiarism will be reported to the Studienprogrammleitung.

AI policy: The use of Artificial Intelligence tools (e.g. ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, DeepSeek, Copilot, etc.) to assist with either the essay plan or the final essay, or otherwise completing *any* part of *any* assessment component is also *strictly forbidden*. Evidence of the use of AI tools in any assessment component will be treated as plagiarism, with the same consequences as outlined in the previous section. Note also that feeding to AI tools any part of the content of this course may violate intellectual property rights. I am not a die-hard AI hater, but this class is meant for you to develop your own ideas and your 'voice' as a writer. Using AI to come up with an argument will simply regurgitate a mediocre, unoriginal version of what the median internet poster thinks. While I understand that AI may be useful to sharpen your writing style, assist with referencing etc. my experience is that it's impossible to define 'acceptable' from 'unacceptable' AI use in ways that do not leave large gray areas open to interpretation, and therefore to potentially unfair or uneven application of AI use rules and sanctions. Therefore, so that everyone is on the same page, no AI use is allowed at all.

Deadlines: Late submissions will incur in mark deductions (−10 pts. if submitted 0–24 hours late, −25 pts. if submitted 24-48 hours late). I will not accept any submissions that are over 48 hours late. Extensions of the submission deadline are generally reserved for agreed accommodations for students with disabilities. In exceptional circumstances, extensions may be granted for students who have a valid excuse, to be notified to me by email well in advance of the due date. Approval of extension requests depends on the justification and in any case is not automatic.

Class policies: Students are expected to be respectful in their interactions with course-mates at all times. Consuming snacks and drinking coffee or other beverages is allowed, but please do not have full meals in class. If you are a parent and your childcare falls through, you are welcome to bring your child or infant to class.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: If you need disability-related accommodations in this class, and/or if you have emergency medical information that you wish to share, and/or if you need special arrangements to participate, please inform

me as soon as possible via email or after the first class. I will liaise with the Study Services and follow up with all the necessary information on the logistics on the accommodations.

Course Enrolment: Attendance is compulsory in the first session: if you can't attend but wish to take the course, please let me know in advance. Students who miss the first class without noticing me will be deregistered from the seminar and, in case the class is fully booked, students from the waiting list will be admitted. Regular de-registration from the course is only possible according to the official deadline. All students who are registered after the official deadline will be graded. This also applies to students who drop out of the seminar during the semester.

Course Summary and Timetable

Date	*Topic*	*Required readings*
06/10/25	Democracy: An Introduction	– Dahl, R. A. (2020). *On Democracy*. Yale University Press, Ch. 8 ('What Political Institutions Does Large-Scale Democracy Require?'). 🔗 – Przeworski, A. (1999). Minimalist Conception of Democracy: A Defense. in *Democracy's Value*, ed. Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cordón, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 23–55. 🔗
13/10/25	Varieties of Democracy	– Lijphart, A., (2012) *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries* (New Haven: Yale UP), Chs. 1-3, skim-read also main findings in Chs. 15-16. 🔗
20/10/25	Democratisation	– Geddes, B. (1999). What do we know about democratization after twenty years? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2(1), 115-144. 🔗 – Geddes, B., Wright, J. and Frantz, E. (2018). *How dictatorships work: Power, personalization, and collapse*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 8 ('Why Dictatorships Fall'). 🔗
27/10/25	Democratic Backsliding	– Haggard, S. and Kaufman, R. (2021). *Backsliding: Democratic regress in the contemporary world*. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 1–2. 🔗 – Pirro, A. L. and Stanley, B. (2022). Forging, bending, and breaking: Enacting the "illiberal playbook" in Hungary and Poland. *Perspectives on Politics*, 20(1), 86-101. 🔗
03/11/25	Executives In-class quiz #1	– Linz, J. (1990) The Perils of Presidentialism. *Journal of Democracy*, 1(1):51-69. 🔗 – Elgie, R. (2004). Semi-presidentialism: concepts, consequences and contesting explanations. *Political Studies Review*, 2(3), 314-330. 🔗 – Shugart, M.S. (2008) Comparative Executive–Legislative Relations in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) Ch. 18. 🔗
10/11/25	Legislatures	– Kreppel, A. (2023). Legislatures. In In Caramani, D. (eds) *Comparative Politics* (sixth edition). OUP, Chap. 7. 🔗 – Strøm, K., Muller, W. and Bergman, T. (eds.) (2003) Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies, Chs. 1 and 3. 🔗 – Martin, L. and Vanberg, G. (2011) *Parliaments and coalitions: The role of legislative institutions in multiparty governance* (Oxford University Press), Chs. 2 and 3. 🔗
17/11/25	Electoral Systems	– Shugart, M. S. and Taagepera, R. (2017). *Votes from seats: Logical models of electoral systems*. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 1-4 and 7; skim-read Chs. 5 and 6. 🔗

24/11/25	Cleavages and Party Systems In-class quiz #2	– Bartolini, S. and Mair, P. (1990) Identity, competition, and electoral availability: the stabilisation of European electorates 1885-1985, Cambridge University Press. Ch. 9 ('Cleavage Systems'). – Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2018). Cleavage theory meets Europe's crises: Lipset, Rokkan, and the transnational cleavage. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(1), 109-135.
01/12/25	Electoral Behaviour	– Dalton, R. and Wattenberg, M. (2000) Parties Without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies, Chs. 2 and 3. – Green, J. and Jennings, W. (2017) Valence. In: Kai Arzheimer, et al. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Electoral Behaviour*, SAGE Publications, Ch. 23. – Merrill, S. and Grofman, B. (1999). A unified theory of voting: Directional and proximity spatial models. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1 ('Introduction').
	Essay Plan due Friday 12/12/2025, 23:59	
15/12/25	Party Strategies and Competition	– Meguid, B. M. (2005). Competition between unequals: The role of mainstream party strategy in niche party success. *American political science review*, 99(3), 347-359. – Rovny, J. (2012). Who emphasizes and who blurs? Party strategies in multidimensional competition. *European Union Politics*, 13(2), 269-292. – Dolezal, M., Ennser-Jedenastik, L., Müller, W. C., and Winkler, A. K. (2014). How parties compete for votes: A test of saliency theory. *European Journal of Political Research*, 53(1), 57-76.
12/01/26	Democracy, Norms and Culture In-class quiz #3	– Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster. Chaps. 1 ('Introduction', pp. 15–28) and 21 ('Democracy', pp. 336–349). – Valentim, V. (2024). *The normalization of the radical right: A norms theory of political supply and demand*. Oxford University Press. Chaps. 1 and 2. – Welzel, C., and Inglehart, R. (2023). Political culture. In Caramani, D. (eds) *Comparative Politics* (sixth edition). OUP, Chap. 17.
19/01/26	Populism and technocracy	– Bertsou, E. and Caramani, D. (2020). Introduction. In: Bertsou, E. and Caramani, D. (eds.) *The technocratic challenge to democracy*. London: Routledge. Chap. 1. – Caramani, D. (2017). Will vs. reason: The populist and technocratic forms of political representation and their critique to party government. *American political science review*, 111(1), 54-67. – Mudde, C., and Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). Populism: A very short introduction. Oxford University Press. Chap. 1.
26/01/26	Democratic Innovations In-class quiz #4	– Curato, N. (2023). Democratic innovations. In In Caramani, D. (eds) *Comparative Politics* (sixth edition). OUP, Chap. 10. – Ganghof, S. (2021). *Beyond presidentialism and parliamentarism: Democratic design and the separation of powers*. Oxford University Press. Chs. 1, 6 and 8.
	Essay due Friday 27/02/2026 23:59.	

Reading List

Module 1: Democracy

Week 1 — Democracy: An Introduction

Required Readings:

- Dahl, R. A. (2020). *On Democracy*. Yale University Press, Ch. 8 ('What Political Institutions Does Large-Scale Democracy Require?').
- Przeworski, A. (1999). Minimalist Conception of Democracy: A Defense. in *Democracy's Value*, ed. Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cordón, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 23–55.

Recommended Readings:

- Coppedge, M. (2012). *Democratization and research methods*. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1.
- Dahl, Robert (1971) Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition. Yale University Press, Ch. 1 ("Democratization and Public Opposition").
- Dahl, R. A. (2020). *On Democracy*. Yale University Press, Chs. 4–7.
- Munck, G. L. (2016). What is democracy? A reconceptualization of the quality of democracy, *Democratization*, 23(1), 1-26.
- Przeworski, A., Alvarez, M., Cheibub, J. A., and Limongi, F. (1996). What makes democracies endure?. *Journal of Democracy*, 7(1), 39-55.
- Schmitter, P. C. and Karl, T. L. (1991). What democracy is... and is not. *Journal of democracy*, 2(3), 75-88.

Further Readings:

- Alvarez, M., Cheibub, J. A., Limongi, F. and Przeworski, A. (1996). Classifying political regimes. *Studies in comparative international development*, 31(2), 3-36.
- Boese, V. A. (2019). How (not) to measure democracy. *International Area Studies Review*, 22(2), 95-127.
- Clark, W., Golder, M. and Golder, S. (2024). *Principles of Comparative Politics* (Fourth edition). CQ Press. Ch. 5 ('Democracy and Dictatorship Conceptualization and Measurement').
- Collier, D. and Adcock, R. (1999). Democracy and dichotomies: A pragmatic approach to choices about concepts. *Annual review of political science*, 2(1), 537-565.
- Dahl, R. (1989) *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Munck, G. L. and Verkuilen, J. (2002). Conceptualizing and measuring democracy: Evaluating alternative indices. *Comparative political studies*, 35(1), 5-34.
- Sigman, R. and Lindberg, S. I. (2019). Democracy for all: conceptualizing and measuring egalitarian democracy. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 7(3), 595-612.
- Vanhanen, T. (2000). A new dataset for measuring democracy, 1810-1998. *Journal of peace research*, 37(2), 251-265.
- Weale, A. (2007). Democracy (1st ed). Bloomsbury Academic. Chapter 1 (The Theoretical Challenges of Democracy).

Week 2 — Varieties of Democracy

Required Readings:

- Lijphart, A., (2012) Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries (New Haven: Yale UP), Chs. 1-3, skim-read also main findings in Chs. 15-16.

Recommended Readings:

- Andeweg, R. B. (2000). Consociational democracy. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3(1), 509-536.
- Fortin, J. (2008). Patterns of democracy? Counterevidence from nineteen post-communist countries. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Politikwissenschaft*, 2(2), 198-220.
- Lijphart, A. (1969). Consociational democracy. *World Politics*, 21(2), 207-225.

Further Readings:

- Bogaards, M. (2017). Comparative political regimes: Consensus and majoritarian democracy. In: *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*.
- Ganghof, S. (2015). Four Visions of Democracy: Powell's Elections as Instruments of Democracy and beyond. *Political Studies Review*, 13(1), 69-79.
- Lijphart, A. (1968). *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lijphart, A. (2000). The Pros and Cons – but mainly Pros – of Consensus Democracy. *Acta Politica* 36(2): 129-39.
- Roller, E. (2005). *The performance of democracies: Political institutions and public policy*. OUP Oxford.
- Powell, G. B. (2000). *Elections as instruments of democracy: Majoritarian and proportional visions*. Yale University Press.

- Russell, M. and Serban, R. (2021). The muddle of the 'Westminster model': A concept stretched beyond repair. *Government and Opposition*, 56(4), 744-764.
- Tsebelis, G. (2002). *Veto Players – How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Van Cranenburgh, O. (2006). Namibia: Consensus institutions and majoritarian politics. *Democratization*, 13(4), 584-604.
- Van Cranenburgh, O. and Kopecký, P. (2004). Political institutions in new democracies:(not so) hidden majoritarianism in post-apartheid South Africa. *Acta Politica*, 39(3), 279-296.
- Vatter, A. (2009). Lijphart expanded: three dimensions of democracy in advanced OECD countries?. *European Political Science Review*, 1(1), 125-154.
- Weale, A. (2007). *Democracy* (1st ed). Bloomsbury Academic. Chapter 2 (Forms of Democratic Government).

Week 3 — Democratisation

Required Readings:

- Geddes, B. (1999). What do we know about democratization after twenty years? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2(1), 115-144.
- Geddes, B., Wright, J. and Frantz, E. (2018). *How dictatorships work: Power, personalization, and collapse*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 8 ('Why Dictatorships Fall').

Recommended Readings:

-
- Clark, W., Golder, M. and Golder, S. (2024). *Principles of Comparative Politics* (Fourth edition). CQ Press. Chs. 6 ('The Economic Determinants of Democracy and Dictatorship') and 8 ('Democratic Transitions').
- Huntington, S. P. 1991. Democracy's third wave. *Journal of democracy*, 2(2), 12-34.
- Lipset, Seymour M. (1959). Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review* 53(1), 69-105.
- Paxton, P. (2000). Women's suffrage in the measurement of democracy: Problems of operationalization. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 35(3), 92-111.
- Przeworski, A. and Limongi, F. (1997). Modernization: Theories and facts. *World politics*, 49(2), 155-183.
- Timur Kuran (1991). Now out of Never: the Element of Surprise in the East European Revolutions of 1989.*World Politics*. 44(1): 7-48.

Further Readings:

- Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., Robinson, J. A. and Yared, P. (2008). Income and democracy. *American economic review*, 98(3), 808-842.
- Ansell, B. W. and Samuels, D. J. (2014) *Inequality and Democratization: An Elite-Competition Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Bunce, V. (1995). Should transitologists be grounded? *Slavic Review*, 54(1), 111-127.
- Brinks, D., and Coppedge, M. (2006). Diffusion Is No Illusion: Neighbor Emulation in the Third Wave of Democracy, *Comparative Political Studies* 39(4), 463-489.
- Capoccia, G. and Ziblatt, D. (2010). The historical turn in democratization studies: A new research agenda for Europe and beyond. *Comparative Political Studies*, 43(8-9), 931-968.
- Esposito, J. L., and Piscatori, J. P. (1991). Democratization and islam. Middle East Journal, 45(3), 427-440.
- Gunitsky, S. (2018). Democratic waves in historical perspective. Perspectives on Politics, 16(3), 634-651.
- Hadenius, A. and Teorell, J. (2007). Pathways from authoritarianism. *Journal of Democracy*, 18(1), 143-157.
- Haggard, S. and Kaufman, R. R. (2012). Inequality and regime change: Democratic transitions and the stability of democratic rule. *American Political Science Review*, 106(3), 495-516.
- Hinnebusch, R. (2016). Authoritarian persistence, democratization theory and the Middle East: An overview and critique. Twenty Years of Studying Democratization, 76-98.
- Kurzman, C. (1998). Waves of democratization. Studies in Comparative International Development, 33(1), 42-64.
- Knutsen, Carl Henrik and Svend-Erik Skaaning. 2022. "The Ups and Downs of Democracy, 1789-2018." In Edgell, Amanda, Michael Coppedge, Carl Henrik Knutsen, and Staffan I. Lindberg (eds.) 2022. How Democracies Develop and Decline. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chap. 2
- Lawrence, A. K. (2017). Repression and activism among the Arab Spring's first movers: Evidence from Morocco's February 20th movement. *British Journal of Political Science*, 47(3), 699-718.
- Moore, Barrington. 1966. S*ocial Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy. Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press. Chap. 7.
- North, D. C. and Weingast, B. R. (1989). Constitutions and commitment: the evolution of institutions governing public choice in seventeenth-century England. *The Journal of Economic History*, 49(4), 803-832.
- Przeworski, A. (2009). Conquered or granted? A history of suffrage extensions. *British Journal of Political Science*, 39(2), 291-321.

- Skaaning, Svend-Erik. 2020. "Waves of Autocratization and Democratization: a Critical Note on Conceptualization and Measurement." Democratization 27, no. 8: 1533–1542. doi:10.1080/13510347.2020.1799194.
- Tilly, C. (2000). Processes and mechanisms of democratization. Sociological Theory, 18(1), 1-16.
- Ziblatt, D. (2017). *Conservative parties and the birth of democracy*. Cambridge University Press.

Week 4 — Democratic Backsliding

Required Readings:

- Haggard, S. and Kaufman, R. (2021). *Backsliding: Democratic regress in the contemporary world*. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 1–2.
- Pirro, A. L. and Stanley, B. (2022). Forging, bending, and breaking: Enacting the "illiberal playbook" in Hungary and Poland. *Perspectives on Politics*, 20(1), 86-101.

Recommended Readings:

- Bermeo, N. (2016). On democratic backsliding. Journal of democracy, 27(1), 5-19.
- Carrier, M. and Carothers, T. (2025). US Democratic Backsliding in Comparative Perspective, *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. Available at: `https://tinyurl.com/3a4bbk4c`.
- Little, A. T. and Meng, A. (2024). Measuring democratic backsliding. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 57(2), 149-161.
- Waldner, D. and Lust, E. (2018). Unwelcome change: Coming to terms with democratic backsliding. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1), 93-113.

Further Readings:

- Carothers, T. (2002). The end of the transition paradigm. *Journal of democracy*, 13(1), 5-21.
- Ganghof, S. (2024). How forms of government shape models of democracy and their vulnerability to backsliding. In: *Handbook of Comparative Political Institutions* (pp. 395-409). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gerschewski, J. (2021). Erosion or decay? Conceptualizing causes and mechanisms of democratic regression. *Democratization*, 28(1), 43-62.
- Grillo, E., Luo, Z., Nalepa, M. and Prato, C. (2024). Theories of democratic backsliding. A*nnual Review of Political Science*, 27(2024), 381-400.
- Grumbach, J. M. (2023). Laboratories of democratic backsliding. *American Political Science Review*, 117(3), 967-984.
- Kelemen, R. D. (2021). The European Union's authoritarian equilibrium. In *Strategic Responses to Domestic Contestation* (pp. 153-171). Routledge.
- Kreiss, D. and McGregor, S. C. (2024). A review and provocation: On polarization and platforms. *New Media & Society*, 26(1), 556-579.
- Laebens, M. G. and Lührmann, A. (2023). What halts democratic erosion? The changing role of accountability. In Resilience of Democracy (pp. 40-60). Routledge.
- Lorch, J. (2021). Elite capture, civil society and democratic backsliding in Bangladesh, Thailand and the Philippines. *Democratization*, 28(1), 81-102.
- Orhan, Y. E. (2022). The relationship between affective polarization and democratic backsliding: Comparative evidence. *Democratization*, 29(4), 714-735.
- Scheppele, K. L. (2018). Autocratic legalism. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 85(2), 545-584.
- Simonovits, G., McCoy, J. and Littvay, L. (2022). Democratic hypocrisy and out-group threat: Explaining citizen support for democratic erosion. *The Journal of Politics*, 84(3), 1806-1811.
- Singer, M. M. (2023). Fiddling while democracy burns: Partisan reactions to weak democracy in Latin America. *Perspectives on Politics,* 21(1), 9-26.

Module 2: Institutions

Week 5 — Executives

Required Readings:

- Linz, J. (1990) The Perils of Presidentialism. *Journal of Democracy*, 1(1):51-69.
- Elgie, R. (2004). Semi-presidentialism: concepts, consequences and contesting explanations. *Political Studies Review*, 2(3), 314-330.
- Shugart, M.S. (2008) Comparative Executive–Legislative Relations in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) Chap. 18.

Recommended Readings:

- Chaisty, P., Cheeseman, N., and Power, T. (2014). Rethinking the 'presidentialism debate': conceptualizing coalitional politics in cross-regional perspective. *Democratization*, 21(1), 72-94.
- Cheibub, J. A. (2007). Presidentialism, parliamentarism, and democracy. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 1–2 and 7.

- Elgie, R. (1998). The classification of democratic regime types: Conceptual ambiguity and contestable assumptions. *European Journal of Political Research*, 33(2), 219-238.
- Ganghof, S. (2021). *Beyond presidentialism and parliamentarism: Democratic design and the separation of powers*. Oxford University Press. Chs. 1, 2 and 9.
- Samuels, D. J. and Shugart, M. S. (2010). *Presidents, parties, and prime ministers: How the separation of powers affects party organization and behavior*. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 1–2 and 9.

Further Readings:

- Cheibub, J. A., Elkins, Z. and Ginsburg, T. (2014). Beyond presidentialism and parliamentarism. *British Journal of Political Science*, 44(3), 515-544.
- Cheibub, J.A., Przeworski, A. and Saiegh, S.M. (2004) Government Coalitions and Legislative Success Under Presidentialism and Parliamentarism, *British Journal of Political Science*, 34(4), 565-587.
- Holmes, S. (1993). Superpresidentialism and its Problems. *East. Eur. Const. Rev.*, 2, 123.
- Kellam, M. (2017). Why pre-electoral coalitions in presidential systems? *British Journal of Political Science*, 47(2), 391-411.
- Mainwaring, S. (1993). Presidentialism, multipartism, and democracy: the difficult combination. *Comparative political studies*, 26(2), 198-228.
- Schleiter, P. and Morgan-Jones, E. (2009) Review Article: Citizens, Presidents and Assemblies: The Study of Semi-Presidentialism beyond Duverger and Linz. *British Journal of Political Science*, 39(4):871-892.
- Siaroff, A. (2003) Comparative Presidencies: The Inadequacy of the Presidential, Semi- Presidential and Parliamentary Distinction, *European Journal of Political Research*, 42(3), 287- 312.
- Shugart, M. S. (2005). Semi-presidential systems: Dual executive and mixed authority patterns. *French politics*, 3(3), 323-351.
- Von Cranenburgh, O. (2008) 'Big Men' Rule: Presidential Power, Regime Type and Democracy in 30 African Countries, *Democratization*, 15(5), 952-973.

Week 6 — Legislatures

Required Readings:

- Kreppel, A. (2023). Legislatures. In In Caramani, D. (eds) *Comparative Politics* (sixth edition). OUP, Chap. 7.
- Strøm, K., Muller, W. and Bergman, T. (eds.) (2003) Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies, Chs. 1 and 3.
- Martin, L. and Vanberg, G. (2011) *Parliaments and coalitions: The role of legislative institutions in multiparty governance* (Oxford University Press), Chs. 2 and 3.

Recommended Readings:

- Cheibub, J. A., Martin, S. and Rasch, B. E. (2021). Investiture rules and formation of minority governments in European parliamentary democracies. *Party Politics*, 27(2), 351-362.
- Hix, S. and Noury, A. (2016) Government-opposition or left-right? The institutional determinants of voting in legislatures, *Political Science Research and Methods*, 4(2), 249-273.
- Fish, M. S. (2006). Stronger legislatures, stronger democracies. *Journal of democracy*, 17(1), 5-20.
- Wängnerud, L. (2009) Women in parliaments: Descriptive and substantive representation, *Annual Review of Political Science*, 12(1), 51-69.

Further Readings:

- Aaskoven, L. and Martin, S. (2024) Parliamentary Control of the Executive and the Duration of Government Formation, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 49(3), 695-720.
- Auel, K., Rozenberg, O. and Tacea, A. (2017) To scrutinise or not to scrutinise? Explaining variation in EU-related activities in national parliaments' In After Lisbon: National Parliaments in the European Union (Routledge), pp. 22-44.
- Barnes, T. (2016) Gendering legislative behavior (Cambridge University Press), Chs. 1-3.
- Campbell, R., Cowley, P., Vivyan, N., and Wagner, M. (2019). Legislator dissent as a valence signal. *British Journal of Political Science*, 49(1), 105-128.
- Carnes, N. and Lupu, N. (2015) Rethinking the comparative perspective on class and representation: Evidence from Latin America, *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(1), 1-18.
- Coakley, J. (2014). The strange revival of bicameralism, *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 20(4), 542-572.
- Cheibub, J. A. and Rasch, B. E. (2022). Constitutional parliamentarism in Europe, 1800–2019. *West European Politics*, 45(3), 470-501.
- Preuhs, R. R. (2006) The conditional effects of minority descriptive representation: Black legislators and policy influence in the American states, The Journal of Politics, 68(3), 585-599.
- Russell, M. (2013). Rethinking Bicameral Strength: A Three-Dimensional Approach. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 19(3), 370–391.

- Russell, M., and Cowley, P. (2016). The policy power of the Westminster parliament: The "parliamentary state" and the empirical evidence. *Governance*, 29(1), 121-137.
- Russell, M., Gover, D., and Wollter, K. (2016). Does the Executive dominate the Westminster legislative process?: six reasons for doubt. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 69(2), 286-308.
- Sobolewska, M., McKee, R. and Campbell, R. (2018) Explaining motivation to represent: how does descriptive representation lead to substantive representation of racial and ethnic minorities?, *West European Politics*, 41(6), 1237-1261.
- Tavits, Margit (2009) The making of mavericks: Local loyalties and party defection. Comparative Political Studies 42(6): 793-815.
- Winzen, T. (2017) Constitutional Preferences and Parliamentary Reform (Oxford University Press), Chs. 1–3.
- Zubek, R. (2025). How Coalitions Shape Legislative Institutions in Parliamentary Democracies. *The Journal of Politics*, 87(4), 1546-1558.

Week 7 — Electoral Systems

Required Readings:

- Shugart, M. S. and Taagepera, R. (2017). Votes from seats: Logical models of electoral systems. Cambridge University Press. Chs 1-4 and 7; skim-read Chs. 5 and 6.

Recommended Readings:

- Boix, C. (1999) Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies, American Political Science Review, 93(3), 609-624.
- Bowler, S. (2008) Electoral Systems. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), Chap. 29.
- Clark, W., Golder, M. and Golder, S. (2024). *Principles of Comparative Politics* (Fourth edition). CQ Press. Ch. 13 ('Elections and Electoral Systems').
- Kedar, O. (2023). Electoral systems and representation. In Caramani, D. (eds) *Comparative Politics* (sixth edition). OUP, Chap. 11.
- Iversen, T. and Soskice, D. (2006). Electoral institutions and the politics of coalitions: Why some democracies redistribute more than others. *American Political Science Review*, 100(2), 165-181.

Further Readings:

- Ahmed, A. (2010). Reading history forward: The origins of electoral systems in European democracies. *Comparative Political Studies*, 43(8-9), 1059-1088.
- Andrews, J. T., and Jackman, R. W. (2005). Strategic fools: electoral rule choice under extreme uncertainty. *Electoral Studies*, 24(1), 65-84.
- Barnes, T. D. and Holman, M. R. (2020) Gender quotas, women's representation, and legislative diversity, *The Journal of Politics*, 82(4), 1271-1286.
- Benoit, K. (2004) Models of Electoral System Change. *Electoral Studies*, 23(3), 363-389.
- Benoit, K. (2006). Duverger's law and the study of electoral systems. *French Politics*, 4(1), 69-83.
- Carey, J. M. and Shugart, M. S. (1995). Incentives to cultivate a personal vote: A rank ordering of electoral formulas, *Electoral Studies*, 14(4), 417-439.
- Carey, J. M. and Hix, S. (2011). The electoral sweet spot: Low-magnitude proportional electoral systems. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(2), 383-397.
- Colomer, J. M. (2005). It's parties that choose electoral systems (or, Duverger's laws upside down). *Political Studies*, 53(1), 1-21.
- Cox, Gary W. 1990. Centripetal and centrifugal incentives in electoral systems. *American Journal of Political Science*, pp. 903–935.
- Cox, G. W., Fiva, J. H., and Smith, D. M. (2016). The contraction effect: How proportional representation affects mobilization and turnout. *The Journal of Politics,* 78(4), 1249-1263.
- Eggers, A. C. 2015. Proportionality and turnout: Evidence from French municipalities. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(2):135–167.
- Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (Eds.). (2005). *The politics of electoral systems*. OUP Oxford.
- Herron, E. S., Pekkanen, R. J. and Shugart, M. S. (Eds.). (2018). *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems* (Oxford University Press), Chs. 2 and 15.
- Kerevel, Y. (2010) The legislative consequences of Mexico's mixed-member electoral system, 2000–2009, *Electoral Studies*, 29(4), 691-703.
- Kim, H., Powell Jr, G. B. and Fording, R. C. (2010). Electoral systems, party systems, and ideological representation: an analysis of distortion in Western Democracies, *Comparative Politics*, 42(2), 167-185.
- Knutsen, C. H. (2011). Which democracies prosper? Electoral rules, form of government and economic growth. *Electoral Studies*, 30(1), 83-90.

- Kreuzer, M. (2010) Historical Knowledge and Quantitative Analysis: The Case of the Origins of Proportional Representation, *American Political Science Review*, 104(2), 369-392.
- Martin, S. (2011) Electoral institutions, the personal vote, and legislative organization, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 36(3), 339-361.
- Moser, R.G. and Scheiner, E. (2004) Mixed Electoral System Effects: Controlled Comparison and Cross-National Analysis, *Electoral Studies*, 23(4), 575-599.
- Mozaffar, S., Scarritt, J. R. and Galaich, G. (2003). Electoral institutions, ethnopolitical cleavages, and party systems in Africa's emerging democracies. *American Political Science Review*, 97(3), 379-390.
- Pinto-Duschinsky, M. (1999). Send the rascals packing: defects of proportional representation and the virtues of the Westminster Model. *Representation*, 36: pp. 117–126
- Rodden, J. (2009) Back to the Future: Endogenous Institutions and Comparative Politics in Lichbach, M.I. and Zuckerman, A. eds. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture and Structure* 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Shugart, M.S. and Wattenberg, M.P. eds. (2001) *Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: The Best of Both Worlds?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Module 3: Politics

Week 8 — Cleavages and Party Systems

Required Readings:

- Bartolini, S. and Mair, P. (1990) Identity, competition, and electoral availability: the stabilisation of European electorates 1885-1985, Cambridge University Press. Ch. 9 ('Cleavage Systems').
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2018). Cleavage theory meets Europe's crises: Lipset, Rokkan, and the transnational cleavage. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(1), 109-135.

Recommended Readings:

- Best, R. E. (2011). The declining electoral relevance of traditional cleavage groups. European Political Science Review, 3(2), 279-300.
- Caramani, D. (2023). Party Systems. In In Caramani, D. (eds) *Comparative Politics* (sixth edition). OUP, Chap. 14.
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2025). How does the education cleavage stack up against the classic cleavages of the past?. *West European Politics*, 1-33.
- Kitschelt, H. (1992). The formation of party systems in East Central Europe. *Politics & Society*, 20(1), 7-50.
- Ford, R. and Jennings, W. (2020). The changing cleavage politics of Western Europe. *Annual review of political science*, 23(1), 295-314.
- Lipset, S.M. and Rokkan, S. (1967) Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives (New York: Free Press), Introduction.
- Posner, D. (2004) The Political Salience of Cultural Differences: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi. *American Political Science Review*, 98, 529-546.
- Rovny, J. and Polk, J. (2019). New wine in old bottles: Explaining the dimensional structure of European party systems. *Party Politics*, 25(1), 12-24.
- Von Schoultz, Å. (2017). Party systems and voter alignments. In Kai Arzheimer, et al. (eds.) *Sage handbook of electoral behavior* (pp. 30-55). Sage Publications.

Further Readings:

- Bornschier, S., Haffert, L., Häusermann, S., Steenbergen, M., and Zollinger, D. (2024). Cleavage formation in the 21st century: How social identities shape voting behavior in contexts of electoral realignment. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Casal-Bértoa, F. (2014). Party systems and cleavage structures revisited: A sociological explanation of party system institutionalization in East Central Europe. *Party Politics*, 20(1), 16-36.
- Clark, W., Golder, M. and Golder, S. (2024). *Principles of Comparative Politics* (Fourth edition). CQ Press. Ch. 14 ('Social Cleavages and Party Systems').
- Deegan-Krause, K. (2013). Full and partial cleavages. The handbook of political change in eastern Europe, Chap. 35.
- Dix, R. H. (1989). Cleavage structures and party systems in Latin America. *Comparative politics*, 22(1), 23-37.
- Evans, G., and Whitefield, S. (1993). Identifying the bases of party competition in Eastern Europe. *British Journal of Political Science*, 23(4), 521-548.
- Kitschelt, H. (1999). *Post-communist party systems: Competition, representation, and inter-party cooperation.* Cambridge University Press.
- Mair, P. (2007). Political parties and party systems. In Europeanization: New research agendas (pp. 154-166). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Madrid, R. (2005). Ethnic cleavages and electoral volatility in Latin America. *Comparative Politics*, 1-20.
- Marks, G., Attewell, D., Hooghe, L., Rovny, J. and Steenbergen, M. (2023). The social bases of political parties: A new measure and survey. *British Journal of Political Science*, 53(1), 249-260.

- Mozaffar, S. and Scarritt, J. R. (2005). The puzzle of African party systems. Party Politics, 11(4), 399-421.
- Rovny, J. (2023). Antidote to backsliding: Ethnic politics and democratic resilience. *American Political Science Review*, 117(4), 1410-1428.
- Rokkan, S. (1977). Towards a generalized concept of verzuiling: A preliminary note. *Political studies*, 25(4), 563-570.
- Westheuser, L., and Zollinger, D. (2025). Cleavage theory meets Bourdieu: studying the role of group identities in cleavage formation. *European Political Science Review*, 17(1), 110-127.
- Whitefield, S. (2002). Political cleavages and post-communist politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5(1), 181-200.
- Zucco, C. and Power, T. J. (2021). Fragmentation without cleavages? Endogenous fractionalization in the Brazilian party system. *Comparative Politics*, 53(3), 477-500.

Week 9 — Electoral Behaviour

Required Readings:

- Dalton, R. and Wattenberg, M. (2000) Parties Without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies, Chs. 2 and 3.
- Green, J. and Jennings, W. (2017) Valence. In: Kai Arzheimer, et al. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Electoral Behaviour*, SAGE Publications, Ch. 23.
- Merrill, S. and Grofman, B. (1999). A unified theory of voting: Directional and proximity spatial models. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1 ('Introduction').

Recommended Readings:

- Dalton, R. J. (1984). Cognitive mobilization and partisan dealignment in advanced industrial democracies. *The Journal of Politics*, 46(1), 264-284.
- Dassonneville, R. and Hooghe, M. (2017). Economic indicators and electoral volatility: Economic effects on electoral volatility in Western Europe, 1950–2013. *Comparative European Politics*, 15(6), 919-943.
- Dinas, E. (2017) The Evolving Role of Partisanship, In: Kai Arzheimer, et al. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Electoral Behaviour*, SAGE Publications, Ch. 13.
- Downs, Anthony. An economic theory of political action in a democracy. *Journal of Political Economy* 65.2 (1957): 135-150.
- Green, J. (2007). When voters and parties agree: Valence issues and party competition. *Political Studies*, 55(3), 629-655.
- Kitschelt, H. (2000). Linkages between citizens and politicians in democratic polities. *Comparative political studies*, 33(6-7), 845-879.
- Tafoya, G. and Singer., M. M. (2021). *Voter Behavior in Latin America*, Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics.

Further Readings:

- Baker, A., and Greene, K. F. (2011). The Latin American left's mandate: free-market policies and issue voting in new democracies. *World Politics*, 63(1), 43-77.
- Bélanger, É. and Meguid, B. M. (2008). Issue salience, issue ownership, and issue-based vote choice. *Electoral studies*, 27(3), 477-491.
- Dennison, J. and Kriesi, H. (2023). Explaining Europe's transformed electoral landscape: structure, salience, and agendas. *European Political Science Review*, 15(4), 483-501.
- Elff, M. (2007). Social structure and electoral behavior in comparative perspective: The decline of social cleavages in Western Europe revisited. *Perspectives on politics*, 5(2), 277-294.
- Fieldhouse, E., Green, J., Evans, G., Mellon, J., Prosser, C., Schmitt, H., and Van der Eijk, C. (2021). *Electoral shocks: The volatile voter in a turbulent world*. Oxford University Press.
- Langsæther, P. E., and Stubager, R. (2019). Old wine in new bottles? Reassessing the effects of globalisation on political preferences in Western Europe. European Journal of Political Research, 58(4), 1213-1233.
- Lefkofridi, Z., Wagner, M., and Willmann, J. E. (2014). Left-authoritarians and policy representation in Western Europe: Electoral choice across ideological dimensions. *West European Politics*, 37(1), 65-90.
- Moraes, J. A., and Béjar, S. (2023). Electoral volatility and political polarization in developing democracies: Evidence from Latin America, 1993–2016. *Party Politics*, 29(4), 636-647.
- Steiner, N. D. (2024). The shifting issue content of left–right identification: cohort differences in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 47(6), 1276-1303.
- Valdini, M. E., and Lewis-Beck, M. S. (2018). Economic voting in Latin America: Rules and responsibility. *American Journal of Political Science*, 62(2), 410-423.
- Van der Brug, W. and Rekker, R. (2021). Dealignment, realignment and generational differences in The Netherlands. *West European Politics*, 44(4), 776-801.

Week 10 — Party Strategies and Competition

Required Readings:

- Meguid, B. M. (2005). Competition between unequals: The role of mainstream party strategy in niche party success. *American political science review*, 99(3), 347-359.
- Rovny, J. (2012). Who emphasizes and who blurs? Party strategies in multidimensional competition. *European Union Politics*, 13(2), 269-292.
- Dolezal, M., Ennser-Jedenastik, L., Müller, W. C., and Winkler, A. K. (2014). How parties compete for votes: A test of saliency theory. European Journal of Political Research, 53(1), 57-76.

Recommended Readings:

- Abou-Chadi, T. (2016). Niche party success and mainstream party policy shifts–how green and radical right parties differ in their impact. *British Journal of Political Science*, 46(2), 417-436.
- Hobolt, S. B. and De Vries, C. E. (2015). Issue entrepreneurship and multiparty competition. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(9), 1159-1185.
- Lupu, N. (2014). Brand dilution and the breakdown of political parties in Latin America. *World Politics*, 66(4), 561-602.
- Rovny, J. and Edwards, E. E. (2012). Struggle over dimensionality: Party competition in Western and Eastern Europe. *East European Politics and Societies*, 26(1), 56-74.
- Karreth, J., Polk, J. T., and Allen, C. S. (2013). Catchall or catch and release? The electoral consequences of social democratic parties' march to the middle in Western Europe. Comparative Political Studies, 46(7), 791-822.
- Adams, J. (2012). Causes and electoral consequences of party policy shifts in multiparty elections: Theoretical results and empirical evidence. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15(1), 401-419.

Further Readings

- Abou-Chadi, T. and Krause, W. (2020). The causal effect of radical right success on mainstream parties' policy positions: A regression discontinuity approach. *British Journal of Political Science*, 50(3), 829-847.
- Abou-Chadi, T., Green-Pedersen, C., and Mortensen, P. B. (2020). Parties' policy adjustments in response to changes in issue saliency. *West European Politics*, 43(4), 749-771.
- Daur, V. (2025). Legitimize or delegitimize? Mainstream party strategy toward (former) pariah parties and How voters respond. *American Political Science Review*, 119(3), 1514-1529.
- De Sio, L. and Weber, T. (2014). Issue yield: A model of party strategy in multidimensional space. *American Political Science Review*, 108(4), 870-885.
- De Sio, L. and Lachat, R. (2020). Making sense of party strategy innovation: challenge to ideology and conflict-mobilisation as dimensions of party competition. *West European Politic*s, 43(3), 688-719.
- Evans, G., and Tilley, J. (2012). The depoliticization of inequality and redistribution: Explaining the decline of class voting. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(4), 963-976.
- Hjorth, F., and Larsen, M. V. (2022). When does accommodation work? Electoral effects of mainstream left position taking on immigration. *British Journal of Political Science*, 52(2), 949-957.
- Klüver, H., and Spoon, J. J. (2016). Who responds? Voters, parties and issue attention. British Journal of Political Science, 46(3), 633-654.
- Spoon, J. J., and Klüver, H. (2021). Responding to far right challengers: does accommodation pay off?. In *Domestic contestation of the European Union* (pp. 113-131). Routledge.
- Spoon, J. J. and Klüver, H. (2019). Party convergence and vote switching: Explaining mainstream party decline across Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 58(4), 1021-1042.
- Vries, C. E. D. and Hobolt, S. (2020). *Political entrepreneurs: The rise of challenger parties in Europe*. Princeton University Press.
- Wagner, M., and Meyer, T. M. (2014). Which issues do parties emphasise? Salience strategies and party organisation in multiparty systems. *West European Politics*, 37(5), 1019-1045.

Module 4: New Issues and Challenges

Week 11 — Democracy, Norms and Culture

Required Readings:

- Valentim, V. (2024). *The normalization of the radical right: A norms theory of political supply and demand*. Oxford University Press. Chaps. 1 and 2.
- Welzel, C., and Inglehart, R. (2023). Political culture. In Caramani, D. (eds) *Comparative Politics* (sixth edition). OUP, Chap. 17.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster. Chaps. 1 ('Introduction', pp. 15–28) and 21 ('Democracy', pp. 336–349).

Recommended Readings:

- Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1963). *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. London: Sage. Chaps. 1 and 13

- Claassen, C. (2020). Does public support help democracy survive?. *American Journal of Political Science*, 64(1), 118-134.
- Dalton, R. J. and Welzel, C. (2014) *The Civic Culture Transformed*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chap. 1 (Introduction).
- Norris, Pippa (2011) *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited*. Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, R. (1994). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Valentim, V. (2023). Social norms. In: *Encyclopedia of Political Sociology. Edward Elgar Publishing*.
- Valgarðsson, V., Jennings, W., Stoker, G., Bunting, H., Devine, D., McKay, L., and Klassen, A. (2025). A crisis of political trust? Global trends in institutional trust from 1958 to 2019. *British Journal of Political Science*, 55.

Further Readings:

- Collier, P. (2017). Culture, Politics, and Economic Development. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 20(1): 111–25.
- Bolet, D. (2021). Drinking alone: local socio-cultural degradation and radical right support—the case of British pub closures. *Comparative Political Studies*, 54(9), 1653-1692.
- Dahlum, S., and Knutsen, C. H. (2017). Democracy by demand? Reinvestigating the effect of self-expression values on political regime type. *British journal of political science*, 47(2), 437-461.
- Dinas, E., Martínez, S., and Valentim, V. (2024). Social norm change, political symbols, and expression of stigmatized preferences. *The Journal of Politics*, 86(2), 488-506.
- Hetherington, M. J, and Husser, J. A. (2011) How Trust Matters: The Changing Political Relevance of Political Trust. *American Journal of Political Science* 56(2): 312–325.
- Foa, R. S. and Mounk, Y. (2017). The signs of deconsolidation. *Journal of democracy*, 28(1), 5-15.
- Inglehart, R. (1988). The renaissance of political culture. *American political science review*, 82(4), 1203-1230.
- Inglehart, R., and Welzel, C. (2018). Political culture and democracy. In New directions in comparative politics (pp. 141-164). Routledge.
- Muller, E. and Seligson, M. (1994). Civic culture and democracy: the question of causal relationships. *American Political Science Review*, 88(3): 635-652.
- Paxton, Pamela (2002). Social Capital and Democracy: An Interdependent Relationship. American Sociological Review, 67(2): 254-277.
- Putnam, R. D. (2020). *The upswing: How America came together a century ago and how we can do it again*. Simon and Schuster.
- Rodríguez-Pose, A., Lee, N., and Lipp, C. (2021). Golfing with Trump. Social capital, decline, inequality, and the rise of populism in the US. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 14(3), 457-481.
- Satyanath, S., Voigtländer, N., and Voth, H. J. (2017). Bowling for fascism: Social capital and the rise of the Nazi Party. *Journal of Political Economy*, 125(2), 478-526.
- Welzel, C. (2013). *Freedom rising: Human empowerment and the quest for emancipation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wuttke, Alexander, Konstantin Gavras, and Harald Schoen. 2020. "Have Europeans Grown Tired of Democracy? New Evidence From Eighteen Consolidated Democracies, 1981–2018." British Journal of Political Science, 52(1), 416-428.
- Zilinsky, Jan. 2019. Democratic Deconsolidation Revisited: Young Europeans Are Not Dissatisfied with Democracy. *Research and politics* 6(1).

Week 12 — Populism and Technocracy

Required Readings:

- Bertsou, E. and Caramani, D. (2020). Introduction. In: Bertsou, E. and Caramani, D. (eds.) *The technocratic challenge to democracy*. London: Routledge. Chap. 1
- Caramani, D. (2017). Will vs. reason: The populist and technocratic forms of political representation and their critique to party government. *American political science review*, 111(1), 54-67.
- Mudde, C., and Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). Populism: A very short introduction. Oxford University Press. Chap. 1.

Recommended Readings:

- Bertsou, E. and Pastorella, G. (2017). Technocratic attitudes: A citizens' perspective of expert decision-making. *West European Politics*, 40(2), 430-458.
- Bickerton, C., and Accetti, C. I. (2017). Populism and technocracy: opposites or complements?. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 20(2), 186-206.
- McDonnell, D., and Valbruzzi, M. (2014). Defining and classifying technocrat-led and technocratic governments. *European Journal of Political Research*, 53(4), 654-671.
- Mudde, C. (2021). Populism in Europe: an illiberal democratic response to undemocratic liberalism (The Government and Opposition/Leonard Schapiro Lecture 2019). *Government and Opposition*, 56(4), 577-597.
- Mudde, C., and Kaltwasser, C. R. (2013). Exclusionary vs. inclusionary populism: Comparing contemporary Europe and Latin America. Government and opposition, 48(2), 147-174.

- Sánchez-Cuenca, I. (2017). From a deficit of democracy to a technocratic order: The postcrisis debate on Europe. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 20(1), 351-369.
- Zulianello, M., and Larsen, E. G. (2024). Blurred positions: The ideological ambiguity of valence populist parties. *Party Politics*, 30(1), 190-199.
- Wratil, C., and Pastorella, G. (2018). Dodging the bullet: How crises trigger technocrat-led governments. *European Journal of Political Research*, 57(2), 450-472.

Further Readings:

- Abts, K., and Rummens, S. (2007). Populism versus democracy. *Political studies*, 55(2), 405-424.
- Akkerman, T. (2003). Populism and democracy: Challenge or pathology?. *Acta politica*, 38(2), 147-159.
- Cheeseman, N. (2018). Populism in Africa and the potential for "ethnically blind" politics. In *Routledge Handbook of Global Populism* (pp. 351-369). Routledge.
- Chiru, M., and Enyedi, Z. (2022). Who wants technocrats? A comparative study of citizen attitudes in nine young and consolidated democracies. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 24(1), 95-112.
- Invernizzi-Accetti, C. (2021). Repoliticizing environmentalism: Beyond technocracy and populism. *Critical Review*, 33(1), 47-73.
- Habermas, J. (2015). *The lure of technocracy*. John Wiley & Sons. Chaps. 1 and 2.
- Hunger, S., and Paxton, F. (2022). What's in a buzzword? A systematic review of the state of populism research in political science. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 10(3), 617-633.
- Kurki, M. (2011). Democracy through technocracy? Reflections on technocratic assumptions in EU democracy promotion discourse. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 5(2), 211-234.
- Laclau, E. (2005). Populism: What's in a Name?. In: *Populism and the Mirror of Democracy*, 48, 103-114.
- Norris, P., and Inglehart, R. (2019) *Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism*. Cambridge University Press
- Pastorella, G. (2016). Technocratic governments in Europe: Getting the critique right. *Political Studies*, 64(4), 948-965.
- Rico, G., Guinjoan, M., and Anduiza, E. (2017). The emotional underpinnings of populism: How anger and fear affect populist attitudes. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 23(4), 444-461.
- Schaub, M., and Morisi, D. (2020). Voter mobilisation in the echo chamber: Broadband internet and the rise of populism in Europe. European Journal of Political Research, 59(4), 752-773.
- Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a contested concept: Pop*ulism in the study of Latin American politics.* Comparative politics, 1-22.
- Weyland, K. (1999). Neoliberal populism in Latin America and eastern Europe. *Comparative politics*, 379-401.

Week 13 — Democratic Innovations

Required Readings:

- Curato, N. (2023). Democratic innovations. In In Caramani, D. (eds) *Comparative Politics* (sixth edition). OUP, Chap. 10.
- Ganghof, S. (2021). *Beyond presidentialism and parliamentarism: Democratic design and the separation of powers*. Oxford University Press. Chs. 1, 6 and 8.

Recommended Readings:

- Ganghof, S. (2018). A new political system model: Semi-parliamentary government. *European Journal of Political Research*, 57(2), 261-281.
- Fournier, P. (2011). *When citizens decide: Lessons from citizen assemblies on electoral reform*. Oxford University Press.
- Landwehr, C. (2024). Institutional design beyond democratic innovations. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 27(2), 259-265.
- Macq, H. and Jacquet, V. (2023). Institutionalising participatory and deliberative procedures: The origins of the first permanent citizens' assembly. *European Journal of Political Research*, 62(1), 156-173.
- Warren, M. E. and Gastil, J. (2015) Can Deliberative Minipublics Address the Cognitive Challenges of Democratic Citizenship?, *Journal of Politics*, 77(2): 562–74.
- Tong, Z. (2024). Designing Confucian democracy: A semi-parliamentarian framework. *American Journal of Political Science*.

Further Readings:

- Ganghof, S., Eppner, S., and Pörschke, A. (2018). Australian bicameralism as semi-parliamentarism: patterns of majority formation in 29 democracies. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 53(2), 211-233.
- Hayward, J. (2014). Rethinking electoral reform in New Zealand: the benefits of citizens' assemblies. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, 9(1), 11-19.
- Lafont, C. (2019). *Democracy without shortcuts: A participatory conception of deliberative democracy*. Oxford University Press.

- Reuchamps, M., Vrydagh, J., and Welp, Y. (2023). *De Gruyter handbook of citizens' assemblies*, Especially Chaps. 1, 2, 3, 10, and 23.
- Qvortrup, M. (2021) *Democracy on Demand: Holding Power to Account* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Sintomer, Y. (2018). From deliberative to radical democracy? Sortition and politics in the twenty-first century. *Politics & Society*, 46(3), 337-357.
- Ward, I. (2008). An Experiment in Political Communication: The British Columbia Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 43(2), 301-315.
- Weale, A. (2018). What's so good about parliamentary hybrids? Comment on 'Australian bicameralism as semi-parliamentarian patterns of majority formation in 29 democracies'. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 53(2), 234-240.
- Weale, A. (2019). Three types of majority rule. *The Political Quarterly*, 90(S1), 62-76.
- White, S. (2020). Citizens' Assemblies and Republican. *Radical Republicanism: Recovering the Tradition's Popular Heritage*, 19(2), 81.