

School of Social and Political Studies  
University of Edinburgh

## **Comparative Politics**

Session 2014-2015  
Course code: PLIT10061

### **Teaching Team**

**Course convenor/Lecturer/Tutor: Dr. Pontus Odmalm**

**Room: Chrystal Macmillan Building 3.20  
E-mail: Pontus.Odmalm@ed.ac.uk**

**Guidance and Feedback Hour: Tuesday, 1-3 pm.**

**Lecturer/Tutor: Mr. Martin Booker  
Room: Chrystal Macmillan Building 4.15  
E-Mail: M.Booker@ed.ac.uk**

**Guidance and Feedback Hour: tba in first tutorial**

**Lecturer: Dr. Wilfried Sweden  
Room: Chrystal Macmillan Building 3.05  
E-mail: W.Swenden@ed.ac.uk**

**Guidance and Feedback Hour: Monday 12-2 pm**

**Tutor: Mr Ewen McIntosh  
E-mail: E.McIntosh-2@sms.ed.ac.uk**

**Guidance and Feedback Hour: tba in first tutorial**

**Course Secretary: Sopita Sritawan  
E-mail: Sopita.Sritawan@ed.ac.uk**

## **1. Introduction**

What does 'comparative research' involve? What areas and questions are typically addressed? And how can it help us to explain and understand political processes, events and outcomes? By using *comparison* as a method, and drawing on a wide range of cases and themes, the course will enable students to better understand key debates and developments in political science (and beyond).

## **2. Learning Objectives**

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

- a) demonstrate knowledge of comparative methods and their applications;
- b) show familiarity with key texts in the field of comparative politics;
- c) critically analyse political processes and developments in comparative perspective,
- d) articulate an informed view about current debates and questions surrounding comparative politics.

## **3. Teaching Methods**

The course is taught in Semester 1 with the teaching format of 1 lecture/week for 10 weeks and 1 tutorial/week for 10 weeks. Detailed readings accompany each week's topic (see below).

Lectures take place on **Wednesday (11.10-12.00), LG. 09 (David Hume Tower)**

**The first lecture is on 17<sup>th</sup> September.**

**Tutorials take place on Thursdays and Fridays, and start in Week 1 – please sign up on Learn. Guide to using Learn for Online Tutorial Sign-up is on page 23 of this handbook.**

**Please note that students who have not signed up for tutorials by the end of week 1 will be deemed to have dropped the course.**

**Students are expected to read all of the core readings for each week.**

**The core readings are available on Learn or hyperlinked in the course guide. Any other information relating to the course will be posted on LEARN as necessary.**

## **4. Assessment**

The course is assessed through a combination of **(a) Learning Exercise (15%) + (b) Essay 1 (35%) + (c) Essay 2 (50%)**.

## A) Learning Exercise (15%)

This assessment has two components.

- i) **Presentation**
- ii) **Discussant**

### i) **Presentation**

Students are **teamed up** and will do a **10 minute presentation** answering one of the questions specified for each week (**starting in Week 3**). The **presentation will be timed exactly** so it is important to **work on time management** and **clearly define the division of labour**.

All presentations will be given a mark (**capped at 70%**) with accompanying feedback (after the tutorial). The marking indicators are listed in the '**Presentation Feedback Form**' (p.20) and further specified below, but students may also address further issues if necessary ('Further comments').

**Please note:** students who are unable to do the '**Presentation**' (e.g. due to illness or absence) will be asked to write a **4000 word essay** (referenced in the standard way) addressing 'their' presentation question. The essay is to be **submitted before the end of Week 11** and **e-mailed to the relevant tutor**. If the essay is not submitted, a mark of 0 will be awarded to the 'Presentation' element. The essay mark is capped at 70%.

The following marking indicators are used:

- a. Evidence of preparation?
  - E.g. has the presentation been rehearsed, or is it ad-libbed?
- b. Presentational style and clarity?
  - E.g. use and type of visual aids? Talking to or reading at the audience? Easy or difficult to follow argument/line of thought?
- c. Time management?
  - E.g. well-paced or speeding up/slowing down? Did time run out?
- d. Answers the question?
  - E.g. is a 'solution' or a description offered?

**Please also note:** if one presenter is missing, the other will do the presentation.

### ii) **Discussant**

This part of the learning exercise consists of students **providing verbal feedback** (for appr. 10 min.) on the presentation made during the tutorial. The way it works is as follows. Following the presentation each pair **comments and/or asks questions to the presenters**. 'Comments' can, e.g., involve suggestions for improvement, relating the presentation to relevant literatures, or other types of constructive criticism. 'Questions' can, e.g., relate to asking for clarification, or further quizzing the presenters on *how* and *why* they arrived at their particular conclusion/s. The following marking indicators are used (p.21):

- a. Clarity?

- e.g. did the presenters understand the questions/comments? Were they to the point?
- b. Quality?
  - e.g. constructive comments? Simplistic questions? Did they stimulate further discussion?
- c. Relevance?
  - e.g. did the questions/comments relate to the presentation topic?

**Marks are capped at 30%.**

**Please note:** students who are unable to do the ‘Discussant’ element (e.g. due to illness or absence) will be asked to submit a **3000 word literature review** which addresses **two of the core readings** for the week in question. The literature review is to be **submitted before the end of Week 11** and **e-mailed to the relevant tutor**. If the literature review is not submitted, a mark of 0 will be awarded for the ‘Participation’ element. The mark for the literature review is **capped at 30%**.

**Please also note:** if one discussant is missing, the other will provide the verbal feedback.

**The final mark for the ‘Learning Exercise’ is calculated in the following way: Presentation [grade] + Discussant [grade] x 0.15.**

**E.g. Presentation (45%) + Discussant (20%) = 65%, and then weighted at 15% = 9.75%.**

**B) Essay 1: ‘Understanding Comparative Research’ (2000 words; 35%)**

This essay **should not exceed 2000 words** (excluding bibliography). Essays above 2000 words will be penalised using the Ordinary level criterion of 1 mark for every 20 words over length: anything between 2000 and 2020 words will lose one mark, between 2000 and 2040 two marks, and so on.

You will not be penalised for submitting work below the word limit. However, you should note that shorter essays are unlikely to achieve the required depth and that this will be reflected in your mark.

Essays should be typed using Times New Roman, font 12 and be one-and-a-half spaced.

**Please note** that the wording for Essay 1’s questions must not be altered or amended in any way. Where the question has been changed a penalty of 5 marks will be applied.

Choose **one** of the following questions:

- i) Can the study of political science be anything but comparative?
- ii) Why would ‘variation’ between cases be more rewarding to explain than ‘similarities’?
- iii) ‘[C]omparative politics in Britain is underdeveloped’ (van Biezen and Caramani, 2006:1). Do you agree?
- iv) Is there always a trade-off between context and generalizability in comparative research?

- v) 'The state' is less important than 'institutions' are for comparative research. Discuss.

### **C) Essay 2: 'Applying Comparative Methods' (3500 words, 50%)**

Based on the topics covered in the course **design and answer a research question**. Students are free to formulate their own question but it **must be 'comparative' and involve a problem** to be solved.

This essay **should not exceed 3500 words** (excluding bibliography). Essays above 3500 words will be penalised using the Ordinary level criterion of 1 mark for every 20 words over length: anything between 3500 and 3520 words will lose one mark, between 3500 and 3540 two marks, and so on.

You will not be penalised for submitting work below the word limit. However, you should note that shorter essays are unlikely to achieve the required depth and that this will be reflected in your mark.

The same text formatting rules apply to the second essay as well. It is recommended that students run their question by their tutor.

**A lecture on 'Designing your research question' is held in Week 6 (please note that there will not be a tutorial in this week).**

**Please note that choosing a 'Presentation' or one of Essay 1's questions is not permitted.**

**Essays are marked anonymously and come with written feedback (see p. 24).**

**Deadline for submission of Essay 1 is 24<sup>th</sup> October 2014 at 12pm (Week 6).**

**Deadline for submission of Essay 2 is 28<sup>th</sup> November 2014 at 12pm (Week 11).**

Feedback for coursework will be returned online via ELMA on 14/11/2014 for Essay 1 and on 19/12/2014 for Essay 2.

**Please note:** the late penalty takes effect **immediately after 12 NOON on the day of the deadline.**

#### **ELMA: Submission and return of coursework**

Coursework is submitted online using our electronic submission system, ELMA. You will not be required to submit a paper copy of your work.

Marked coursework, grades and feedback will be returned to you via ELMA. You will not receive a paper copy of your marked course work or feedback.

For information, help and advice on submitting coursework and accessing feedback, please see the ELMA wiki at <https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/SPSITWiki/ELMA>. Further detailed guidance on the essay deadline and a link to the wiki and submission page will be available on the course Learn page. The wiki is the primary source of information on how to

submit your work correctly and provides advice on approved file formats, uploading cover sheets and how to name your files correctly.

When you submit your work electronically, you will be asked to tick a box confirming that your work complies with university regulations on plagiarism. This confirms that the work you have submitted is your own.

Occasionally, there can be technical problems with a submission. We request that you monitor your university student email account in the 24 hours following the deadline for submitting your work. If there are any problems with your submission the course secretary will email you at this stage.

We undertake to return all coursework within 15 working days of submission. This time is needed for marking, moderation, second marking and input of results. If there are any unanticipated delays, it is the course organiser's responsibility to inform you of the reasons.

**All our course work is assessed anonymously to ensure fairness: to facilitate this process put your Examination number (on your student card), not your name or student number, on your coursework or cover sheet.**

### **The Operation of Lateness Penalties**

Unlike in Years 1 and 2, **NO EXTENSIONS ARE GRANTED WITH RESPECT TO THE SUBMISSION DEADLINES FOR ANY ASSESSED WORK At HONOURS LEVEL.**

Managing deadlines is a basic life-skill that you are expected to have acquired by the time you reach Honours. Timely submission of all assessed items (coursework, essays, project reports, etc.) is a vitally important responsibility at this stage in your university career. Unexcused lateness can put at risk your prospects of proceeding to Senior Honours and can damage your final degree grade.

If you miss the submission deadline for any piece of assessed work 5 marks will be deducted for each calendar day that work is late, up to a maximum of five calendar days (25 marks). Thereafter, a mark of zero will be recorded. There is no grace period for lateness and penalties begin to apply immediately following the deadline. For example, if the deadline is Tuesday at 12 noon, work submitted on Tuesday at 12.01pm will be marked as one day late, work submitted at 12.01pm on Wednesday will be marked as two days late, and so on.

Failure to submit an item of assessed work will result in a mark of zero, with potentially very serious consequences for your overall degree class, or no degree at all. It is therefore always in your interest to submit work, even if very late.

**Please be aware that all work submitted is returned to students with a provisional mark and without applicable penalties in the first instance. The mark you receive on ELMA is therefore subject to change following the consideration of the Lateness Penalty Waiver Panel (please see below for further information) and the Board of Examiners.**

### **How to Submit a Lateness Penalty Waiver Form**

If there are extenuating circumstances beyond your control which make it essential for you to submit work after the deadline you must fill in a 'Lateness Penalty Waiver' (LPW) form to state the reason for your lateness. This is a request for any applicable penalties to be removed and will be considered by the Lateness Penalty Waiver Panel. Before submitting an LPW, please consider carefully whether your circumstances are (or were) significant enough to justify the lateness. Such circumstances should be serious and exceptional (e.g. not a common cold or a heavy workload). Computer failures are **not** regarded as justifiable reason for late submission. You are expected to regularly back-up your work and allow sufficient time for uploading it to ELMA.

You should submit the LPW form and supply an expected date of submission as soon as you are able to do so, and preferably before the deadline. Depending on the circumstances, supporting documentation may be required, so please be prepared to provide this where possible.

LPW forms can be found in a folder outside your SSO's office, online at: [http://www.sps.ed.ac.uk/undergrad/on\\_course\\_students/assessment\\_and\\_regulations/coursework\\_requirements/coursework\\_requirements\\_honours](http://www.sps.ed.ac.uk/undergrad/on_course_students/assessment_and_regulations/coursework_requirements/coursework_requirements_honours)

Forms should be returned by email or, if possible, in person to your SSO. They will sign the form to indicate receipt and will be able to advise you if you would like further guidance or support.

Please Note: Signing the LPW form by either your SSO or Personal Tutor only indicates acknowledgment of the request, not the waiving of lateness penalties. Final decisions on all marks rest with Examination Boards.

There is a dedicated SSO for students in each subject area in SPS. To find out who your SSO is, and how to contact them, please find your home subject area on the table below:

<b>Subject Area</b>	<b>Name of SSO</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Office</b>
Politics	Ruth Winkle	<a href="mailto:ruth.winkle@ed.ac.uk">ruth.winkle@ed.ac.uk</a>	0131 650 4253	Room 1.11, Chrystal MacMillan Building
International Relations	Rebecca Shade	<a href="mailto:rebecca.shade@ed.ac.uk">rebecca.shade@ed.ac.uk</a>	0131 651 3896	Room 1.10, Chrystal MacMillan Building
Social Anthropology	Vanessa Feldberg	<a href="mailto:vanessa.feldberg@ed.ac.uk">vanessa.feldberg@ed.ac.uk</a>	0131 650 3933	Room 1.04, Chrystal MacMillan Building
Social Policy	Louise Angus	<a href="mailto:L.Angus@ed.ac.uk">L.Angus@ed.ac.uk</a>	0131 650 3923	Room 1.08, Chrystal MacMillan Building
Social Work	Jane Marshall	<a href="mailto:jane.marshall@ed.ac.uk">jane.marshall@ed.ac.uk</a>	0131 650 3912	Room 1.07, Chrystal MacMillan Building
Sociology	Karen Dargo	<a href="mailto:Karen.Dargo@ed.ac.uk">Karen.Dargo@ed.ac.uk</a>	0131 651 1306	Room 1.03, Chrystal MacMillan Building
Sustainable Development	Sue Renton	<a href="mailto:sue.renton@ed.ac.uk">sue.renton@ed.ac.uk</a>	0131 650 6958	Room 1.09, Chrystal MacMillan

				Building
--	--	--	--	----------

If you are a student from another School, you should submit your LPW to the SSO for the subject area of the course, Ruth Winkle.

### **Plagiarism Guidance for Students**

#### **Avoiding Plagiarism:**

Material you submit for assessment, such as your essays, must be your own work. You can, and should, draw upon published work, ideas from lectures and class discussions, and (if appropriate) even upon discussions with other students, but you must always make clear that you are doing so. **Passing off anyone else's work** (including another student's work or material from the Web or a published author) **as your own is plagiarism** and will be punished severely. When you upload your work to ELMA you will be asked to check a box to confirm the work is your own. ELMA automatically runs all submissions through 'Turnitin', our plagiarism detection software, and compares every essay against a constantly-updated database, which highlights all plagiarised work. Assessed work that contains plagiarised material will be awarded a mark of zero, and serious cases of plagiarism will also be reported to the College Academic Misconduct officer. In either case, the actions taken will be noted permanently on the student's record. **For further details on plagiarism see the Academic Services' website:**

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/academic-services/students/undergraduate/discipline/plagiarism>

### **Learning Resources for Undergraduates**

The Study Development Team at the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) provides resources and workshops aimed at helping all students to enhance their learning skills and develop effective study techniques. Resources and workshops cover a range of topics, such as managing your own learning, reading, note making, essay and report writing, exam preparation and exam techniques.

The study development resources are housed on 'LearnBetter' (undergraduate), part of Learn, the University's virtual learning environment. Follow the link from the IAD Study Development web page to enrol: [www.ed.ac.uk/iad/undergraduates](http://www.ed.ac.uk/iad/undergraduates)

Workshops are interactive: they will give you the chance to take part in activities, have discussions, exchange strategies, share ideas and ask questions. They are 90 minutes long and held on Wednesday afternoons at 1.30pm or 3.30pm. The schedule is available from the IAD Undergraduate web page (see above).

Workshops are open to all undergraduates but you need to book in advance, using the MyEd booking system. Each workshop opens for booking 2 weeks before the date of the workshop itself. If you book and then cannot attend, please cancel in advance through MyEd so that another student can have your place. (To be fair to all students, anyone who persistently books on workshops and fails to attend may be barred from signing up for future events).

Study Development Advisors are also available for an individual consultation if you have specific questions about your own approach to studying, working more effectively, strategies for improving your learning and your academic work. Please note, however, that Study Development Advisors are not subject specialists so they cannot comment on the content of your work. They also do not check or proof read students' work.

To make an appointment with a Study Development Advisor, email [iad.study@ed.ac.uk](mailto:iad.study@ed.ac.uk) (For support with English Language, you should contact the English Language Teaching Centre).

**Please see the 'Honours Handbook' for further information on submission of coursework; Late Penalty Waivers; plagiarism; learning disabilities, special circumstances; common marking descriptors, re-marking procedures and appeals.**

## Course schedule

### Lecture topics

**Week 1 (17<sup>th</sup> Sept.) Comparative Methods** (Pontus Odmalm)

**Week 2 (24<sup>th</sup> Sept.) Issues in Comparative Politics** (Pontus Odmalm)

**Week 3 (1<sup>st</sup> Oct.) The State and State Formation** (Martin Booker)

**Week 4 (8<sup>th</sup> Oct.) Democracy and Democratisation** (Martin Booker)

**Week 5 (15<sup>th</sup> Oct.) Political Institutions** (Pontus Odmalm)

**Week 6 (22<sup>nd</sup> Oct.) ‘Designing Your Research Question’** (Pontus Odmalm) ---- **LECTURE ONLY**

**Week 7 (29<sup>th</sup> Oct.) Governing Divided Societies** (Wilfried Swenden)

**Week 8 (5<sup>th</sup> Nov.) Moving Beyond ‘the state’ in Comparative Research 1: Parties and Party Competition** (Pontus Odmalm)

**Week 9 (12<sup>th</sup> Nov.) Moving Beyond ‘the state’ in Comparative Research 2: Territorial Politics** (Wilfried Swenden)

**Week 10 (19<sup>th</sup> Nov.) Moving Beyond ‘the state’ in Comparative Research 3: Welfare State(s)** (Martin Booker)

The following textbooks are good companion pieces to the core readings:

- Bara, J. and Pennington, M. (2009) (ed.) *Comparative Politics* (London: Sage)
- Caramani, D. (2011) (ed.) *Comparative Politics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Oxford: OUP).
- Clark, W.R. and Golder, S.N. (2012) *Principles of Comparative Politics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: Sage).
- Drogus, C.A. and Orvis, S. (2012) *Introducing Comparative Politics: Concepts and Cases in Context*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: Sage).
- Hague, R. and Harrop, M. (2010), *Comparative Government and Politics*, 8<sup>th</sup> edition (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Lim, T.C. (2010), *Doing Comparative Politics: An Introduction to Approaches and Issues*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).

## **Week 1: Comparative Methods (Pontus Odmalm)**

The first lecture provides an introduction to ‘comparative politics’ as a sub-discipline of political science. The comparative approach to analysing politics is usually divided into a method and a subject of study. While the former is concerned with *how* to compare the latter focuses on *understanding* and *explaining* political processes within and between states, societies, or political systems.

### ***Core Readings***

- Biezen van, I. and Caramani, D. (2006) ‘(Non)comparative politics in Britain’, *Politics* 26(1): 29-37.
- Hague, R. and Harrop, M (2007) ‘The comparative approach’ in Hague, R and Harrop, M (eds.), *Comparative Government and Politics: an Introduction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan): 83-99.
- Hopkin, J. (2002) ‘Comparative methods’ in Marsh, D. and Stoker, G. (eds.) *Theory and Methods in Political Science* (Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan): 249-267.
- Lijphart, A (1971) ‘Comparative politics and the comparative method’, *American Political Science Review* 65(3): 682-693.

### ***Further Reading***

- Badie, B. (1989) ‘Comparative analysis in political science: requiem or resurrection?’ *Political Studies* 37(3): 340-351.
- Collier, D. and Mahon, J.E. (1993) ‘Conceptual stretching revisited: adapting categories in comparative analysis’, *American Political Science Review*, 87(4): 845-855.
- Holt, R.T. and Turner, J.E. (eds.) (1970) *The Methodology of Comparative Research*.
- Jackman, R.W. (1985) ‘Cross-national statistical research and the study of comparative politics’, *American Journal of Political Science* 29(1):161-182.
- Mayer, L. (1989) *Redefining Comparative Politics: Promise versus Performance* (London: Sage).
- Page, E (1990) ‘British political science and comparative politics’, *Political Studies* 38(2): 438-452.
- Pennings, P., Keman H. and Kleinnijenhuis, J. (2006) *Doing Research in Political Science: An Introduction to Comparative Methods and Statistics* (London: Sage).
- Peters, B.G. (1998) *Comparative Politics: Theory and Methods* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Przeworski, A and Teune, H (1970) *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry* (Malabar, FL: Robert E Krieger Publishing Co).
- Ragin, C. (1987) *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press).
- Rose, R. (1991) ‘Comparing forms of comparative analysis’, *Political Studies* 39(3): 446-462.
- Tilly, C. (1984) *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons* (New York: Russell, Sage Foundation).
- Yin, R.K. (1989) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (London: Sage).

## **Week 2: Issues in Comparative Politics (Pontus Odmalm)**

As a sub-discipline, comparative politics has gained momentum over the past decades. But this development has come with a number of debates regarding the most appropriate way of conducting comparative research. Issues relating to e.g. case selection rationale; qualitative vs. quantitative approaches; deductive vs. inductive modes of analysis, and the nature of 'comparison' itself have all featured high up on the agenda. While the above disputes are still on-going, this week's lecture focuses on the implications that these 'issues' have for doing comparative research, and what the potential solutions can be.

### **Core readings**

- Bowman, K., Lehoucq, F. and Mahoney, J. (2005) 'Measuring political democracy: case expertise, data adequacy and Central America', *Comparative Political Studies* 38(8): 939-970.
- Caramani, D. (2010) 'Of differences and similarities: is the explanation of variation a limitation to (or of) comparative analysis?', *European Political Science* 19(1): 34-48.
- Geddes, B. (1990) 'How the cases you choose affect the answers you get: selection bias in comparative politics', *Political Analysis* 2(1):131-150.
- Tarrow, S. (2010) 'The strategy of paired comparison: toward a theory of practice', *Comparative Political Studies* 43(2): 230-259.

### **Further reading**

- Caramani, D. (2010) 'Debate on the future of comparative politics: a rejoinder', *European Political Science* 9(1):78-82.
- Falleti, T.G. and Lynch, J.F. (2009) 'Context and causal mechanisms in political analysis', *Comparative Political Studies* 42(9): 1143-1166.
- Gerring, J. (2007) 'Is there a (viable) crucial-case method?', *Comparative Political Studies* 40(3):231-253.
- van Kersbergen, K. (2010) 'Comparative politics: some points for discussion', *European Political Science* 9(1): 49-61.
- Levy, J.S. (2007) 'Qualitative methods and cross-method dialogue in political science', *Comparative Political Studies* 40(2): 196-214.
- Munck, G.L. and Snyder, R. (2007) 'Debating the direction of comparative politics: an analysis of leading journals', *Comparative Political Studies* 40(1): 5-31.
- Schneider, G. (2010) 'Causal description: moving beyond stamp collecting in political science', *European Political Science* 9(1): 62-67.
- Taylor-Robinson, M.M. (1999) 'Who gets legislation passed in a marginal legislature and is the label marginal legislature still appropriate?: a study of the Honduran congress', *Comparative Political Studies* 32(5):589-625.

## **Week 3: The State and State Formation (Martin Booker)**

The existence of a 'state' as a unit of analysis in comparative politics is often taken for granted. But what exactly constitutes a state? And how were states historically formed? Is there a generic pattern of state formation; or, do processes of state formation vary from one case to the other? This lecture has three main objectives. Firstly, it will provide several definitions of the state, looking at different theoretical and conceptual approaches. Secondly, it will examine some generic patterns associated with the process of state formation. Finally, it will analyse some variations in the processes of state formation.

## Core Readings

- Abrams, P. (1988) 'Notes on the difficulty of studying the state', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 1(1):58-89.
- Barkey, K. and Parikh, S. (1991) 'Comparative perspectives on the state', *Annual Review of Sociology* 17: 523-49.
- Nettl, J.P. (1968) 'The state as a conceptual variable', *World Politics* 20(4):559-92.
- Tilly, C. (1985) 'War making and state making as organized crime' in Evans, P., Rueschemeyer, D. and Skocpol, T. (eds) *Bringing the State Back In* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press):169-187.

## Further Reading

- Ayoob, M. (1995) *The Third World Security Predicaments: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).
- Ayubi, N. N. (1995). *Over-Stating the Arab State: Politics and Society in the Middle East* (London: I.B. Tauris).
- Call, C. (2003) 'Democratisation, War and State-Building: Constructing the Rule of Law in El Salvador', *Journal of Latin American Studies* 35(4): 827-862.
- Cohen, Y., Brown, B.R. and Organski, A.F.K. (1981) 'The paradoxical nature of state making: the violent creation of order', *The American Political Science Review* 75(4):901-910.
- Elias, N. (1982) *The Civilizing Process / Vol.2, State Formation and Civilization* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- Herbst, J. (1990) 'War and the state in Africa', *International Security* 14(4): 117-139.
- Krasner, S.D. (2001) 'Abiding sovereignty', *International Political Science Review* 22(3): 229-251.
- Mann, M. (1986) 'The autonomous power of the state: its origins, mechanism, and results' in Hall, J.A (ed.) *States in History* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell): 109-136.
- Reinhard, W. (1996) 'Introduction: power elites, state servants, ruling classes, and the growth of state power' in Reinhard, W. (ed.) *Power Elites and State Building* (New York: Oxford University Press): 1-19.
- Rosberg, C.G and Jackson, R.H. (1982) 'Why Africa's weak states persist: the empirical and the juridical in statehood', *World Politics* 35(1):1-24.
- Saouli, A. (2006) 'Stability under late state formation: the case of Lebanon', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 19(4):701-717.
- Skocpol, T. (1979) *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Thies, C.G. (2005) 'War, rivalry, and state building in Latin America', *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 451-465.
- Tilly, C. (1990) *Coercion, Capital, and European States, A.D.990-1990* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- Weber, M., Roth, G. and Wittich, C. (1979) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Woo-Cumings, M. (1999) *The Developmental State* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

## Presentation questions:

- 1) When, and why, do states fail?
- 2) To what extent is the process of state formation universal?

## Week 4: Democracy and Democratisation (Martin Booker)

After successive 'waves' of democratisation, are we now seeing a democratic roll-back in some parts of the world? This lecture focuses on examples of democratic success and relative failure focussing on the key institutional, cultural, socio-economic and personal factors involved in a transition to democracy. We will refer first to theoretical literature on democratisation and explore how it relates to state formation, and then focus on East-Central Europe, the Former Soviet Union, and contemporary China as examples of democratic transitions of varying degrees of success.

### *Core Readings*

- Carothers, T. (2002) 'The end of the transition paradigm', *Journal of Democracy* 13(11): 5-21.
- Rustow, D.A. (1970) 'Transitions to democracy: toward a dynamic model', *Comparative Politics*, 2(3): 337-363.
- Savun, B. and Tirone, D.C. (2011) 'Foreign aid, democratization, and civil conflict: how does democracy aid affect civil conflict', *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2): 233-246.
- Schmitter, P. and Karl, T.L. (1991) 'What democracy is...and is not.' *Journal of Democracy*, 2(3): 75-88.

### *Further Reading*

- Bunce, V. (2000) 'Comparative democratization: big and bounded generalizations', *Comparative Political Studies* 33(6/7): 703-734.
- Dahl, R.B. (1961) *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Democratization (2004) (special issue) *Democratization in the Early Twenty-first Century*, 11(5) ([details](#)).
- Diamond, L., Linz, J.J. and Lipset, S.M. (1988) *Democracy in Developing Countries* (Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner).
- Diamond, L. and Plattner, M.F. (1996) (eds.) *The Global Resurgence of Democracy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Diamond, L. (1999) *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Emerson, M. and Noutcheva, G. (2005) 'Europeanisation as a gravity model of democratisation', *The Herald of Europe* 2: 1-33. ([details](#))
- Held, D. (ed.) (1993) *Prospects for Democracy: North, South, East, West* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Huntington, S. (1991) *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press).
- Journal of Democracy* (2002) (special issue), *Elections without Democracy* 13(2) ([details](#)).
- Levitsky, S. and Way Lucan (2010), *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Lijphart, A. (1999) *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Marsh, C. (2005) *Unparalleled Reforms: China's Rise, Russia's Fall, and the Interdependence of Transition* (Lanham, Md; Oxford : Lexington Books).
- McFaul, M. (2002) 'The fourth wave of democracy and dictatorship', *World Politics*, 54(2): 212-244.
- Nagle, J.D. and Mahr, A. (1999) *Democracy and Democratization: Post-Communist Europe in Comparative Perspective* (London: Sage).

- O'Donnell, G., Schmitter, P.C. and Whitehead, L. (1986) *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule* (Baltimore, MA: John Hopkins University Press).
- Offe, C. (1996) 'Designing institutions in East European transitions' in (ed.) Goodin, R.E. *The Theory of Institutional Design* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 199-227.
- Pei, M. (2006) *China's Trapped Transition: The Limits of Developmental Autocracy* (Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University Press).
- Potter, D. (ed.) (1997) *Democratization* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Rose, R. and Shin, D. C. (2001) 'Democratization backwards: the problem of third-wave democracies', *British Journal of Political Science* 31(2): 331-354.
- Rose, R. and Mishler, W. (2002) 'Comparing regime support in non-democratic and democratic countries', *Democratization* 9(2): 1-20.
- Schedler, A. (2009) 'Electoral authoritarianism' in Landman, T and Robinson, N. (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Comparative Politics* (London: Sage): 381-394.
- Tilly, C. (2000) 'Processes and mechanisms of democratization', *Sociological Theory* 18(1): 1-16.
- Zakaria, F. (1997) 'The rise of illiberal democracy', *Foreign Affairs* 76(6): 22-43. ([details](#)).

**Presentation questions:**

- 1) To what degree are the post-1989 'transitions' in Eastern and East-Central Europe similar to earlier 'waves' of democratisation?
- 2) Is analysing regime change through the conceptual framework of 'democratic transition' misleading and/or misguided?

## **Week 5: Political Institutions (Pontus Odmalm)**

The study of institutions is many ways central to political science as it enables us to understand different authority systems and government structures as well as how power is distributed within different states. This week focuses on the nature of 'institutions', how they can be defined and applied in comparative research. Institutional theory ('new institutionalism') will be contrasted with behaviouralism ('old institutionalism') in order to further understand the potential effects that institutions have on society and on the actors within.

***Core readings***

- Hall, P.A. and Taylor, R.C. (1996) 'Political science and the three new institutionalisms', *Political Studies* 44(5): 936-957.
- Peters, B.G. (2000) *Institutional Theory: Problems and Prospects* (Vienna: Political Science Series).
- Pierson, P. and Skocpol, T. (2002) 'Historical institutionalism in contemporary political science' in Katznelson, I. and Milner, H.V. (ed.) *Political Science: State of the Discipline* (New York: W.W. Norton): 693-721.
- Wormouth, F.D. (1967) 'Matched-dependent behaviouralism: the cargo cult of political science', *The Western Political Quarterly* 20(4): 809-840.

***Further Reading***

- Cheibub, J.A. and Limongi, F. (2002) 'Democratic institutions and regime survival: parliamentary and presidential democracies reconsidered', *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 151-179.

- DiMaggio, P.J. and Powell, W.W. (1991) 'Introduction' in Powell, W.W. and DiMaggio, P.J. (eds.) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* Chicago (University of Chicago Press): 1-38.
- Lowndes, V. (2013) *Why Institutions Matter: the New Institutionalism in Political Science* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- March, J. and Olsen, J.P. (1989) *Rediscovering Institutions: the Organizational Basis of Politics* (New York: Free Press).
- Pierre, J. and Peters, B.G. (2000) *Governance, Politics, and the State* (Basingstoke: MacMillan).
- Riggs, R. Hanson, K, Heinx, M, Hughes, B and Volgy, T. (1970) 'Behavioralism in the study of the United Nations', *World Politics* 22(2): 197-236.
- Shugart, M.S. and Wattenberg, M.P. (2005) *Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: The Best of Both Worlds?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Thelen, K. (1999) 'Historical institutionalism in comparative politics', *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 369-404.
- Thelen, K. and Steinmo, S. (1992) 'Historical institutionalism in comparative politics' in Steinmo, S and Thelen, K and Longstreth, F. (eds.) *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 1-32.

**Presentation questions:**

- 1) Do institutions affect policy outcomes?
- 2) How can similar institutions have different outcomes?

**Week 6: Designing your Research Question (Pontus Odman)**

**PLEASE NOTE: Lecture only this week**

**Week 7: Governing Divided Societies (Wilfried Swenden)**

There are many more nations than there are states but the capacity of multi-national states to hold together may depend on the institutions that have been set up to govern diversity. How can the comparative method help us in determining what is 'good' for divided societies: federalism, consociationalism, or electoral engineering? Why does India hold together, but Yugoslavia or the Soviet Union did not? Why did Bosnia or Iraq opt for federalism to govern diversity, and to what extent have electoral devices contributed to successful conflict regulation in the Fiji Islands?

**Core Reading:**

- McGarry, J. and O'Leary, B. (2009) 'Must plurinational federations fail?', *Ethnopolitics* 8(1): 5-25.
- Reilly, B. (2006) 'Political engineering and party politics in conflict-prone societies', *Democratization* 13(5): 811-827.
- Sorens, J. (2009) 'The partisan logic of decentralization in Europe', *Regional and Federal Studies* 19(2): 255-272.
- Zuber, C. (2011) 'Understanding the multinational game: toward a theory of asymmetrical federalism', *Comparative Political Studies* 44 (5): 546-71.

### **Further Reading:**

- Adeney, K (2007) *Federalism and Ethnic Conflict Regulation in India and Pakistan* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Amoretti U.M. and Bermeo, N. (eds.) (2004) *Federalism and Territorial Cleavages* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press) (esp. 'Introduction').
- Horowitz, D.L (2000) *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Keating, M. (2001) *Nations against the State. The New Politics of Nationalism in Quebec, Catalonia and Scotland* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Keating, M. (2001) *Plurinational Democracy. Stateless Nations in a Post-Sovereignty Area* (Oxford: Oxford University Press). (esp. p. 1-28).
- Kymlicka, W. (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press). (esp. chs 1, 7 and 8).
- Kymlicka, W. (2001), 'Minority nationalism and multinational federalism' in Kymlicka, W. (ed.) *Politics in the Vernacular. Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 91-120.
- Kymlicka W. and Norman, W. (2000) (eds.) *Citizenship in Diverse Societies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Lijphart, A. (2002) 'The wave of power-sharing democracy' in Reynolds, A. (ed.) *The Architecture of Democracy. Constitutional Design, Conflict Management and Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 37-55.
- Luther R.K and Deschouwer K. (eds.) (1999) *Party Elites in Divided Societies. Political Parties in a Consociational Democracy* (London: Routledge).
- Norris, P. (2008) *Driving Democracy. Do Power-Sharing Institutions Work?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Oberschall, A. (2007) *Conflict and Peace Building in Divided Societies. Responses to Ethnic Violence* (London: Routledge).
- Ross, M.H. (2007) *Cultural Contestation in Ethnic Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Rudolph, J. (2006) *Politics and Ethnicity. A Comparative Study* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
- Stepan, A. (2001) 'Toward a new comparative politics of federalism, multinationalism and democracy: beyond Rikerian federalism' in Stepan, A. (ed.) *Arguing Comparative Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 315-362.
- Stepan, A., Linz, J. and Yadav, Y. (2011) *The State-Nation. India and other Multinational Democracies* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Weller, M and Wolff, S. (2005) (eds.) *Autonomy, Self-Governance and Conflict Resolution* (London: Routledge).
- Wilkinson, S.I. (2004) *Votes and Violence. Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

### **Presentation questions:**

- 1) What works 'best' for managing a divided society - power sharing, electoral or territorial strategies?
- 2) Can institutional design *alone* secure the survival of a plurinational society?

## **Week 8: Moving Beyond ‘the state’ in Comparative Research 1: Parties and Party Competition (Pontus Odmalm)**

Why are political scientists ‘obsessed’ with the state? Can comparative politics involve other units of analysis as well? This lecture introduces some of the other possibilities for doing comparative research and focusses on two themes in more detail: 1) political parties and 2) party competition. The lecture looks at different theoretical and conceptual approaches, and how party competition has evolved and changed over time.

### **Core Readings**

- Dalton, R. J. (1996) ‘Political cleavages, issues, and electoral change’ in (ed.) LeDuc, L., Niemi, R.G. and Norris, P., *Comparing Democracies: Elections and Voting in Global Perspective* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications): 319-342.
- Enyedi, Z. (2008) ‘The social and attitudinal basis of political parties: cleavage politics revisited’, *European Review* 16(3): 287-304.
- Green, J (2007) ‘When voters and parties agree: valence issues and party competition’, *Political Studies* 55(3): 629-655.
- Green-Pedersen, C (2007) ‘The growing importance of issue competition: the changing nature of party competition in Western Europe’, *Political Studies* 55(3): 607-628.

### **Further Reading**

- Bomberg, E. (1998) *Green Parties and Politics in the European Union* (London: Routledge).
- Duverger, M. (1959) *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State* (London: Methuen).
- Green, J. and Hobolt, S. (2008) ‘Owning the issue agenda: party strategies and vote choices in British elections’, *Electoral Studies* 27(3): 460-476.
- Gunther, R. and Diamond, L. (2003) ‘Species of political parties: a new typology’, *Party Politics* 9(2): 167-199.
- Inglehart, R. (2008) ‘Changing values among Western publics from 1970 to 2006’, *West European Politics* 31(1-2): 130-146.
- LeDuc, L., Niemi, R.G. and Norris, P. (2002) *Comparing Democracies 2: New Challenges in the Study of Elections and Voting* (London: Sage).
- Levi, M (2002), ‘The state of study of the state’ in Katznelson, I. and Milner, H.V (eds.) *Political Science: The state of the Discipline* (New York: Norton): 35-55.
- Mair, P., Müller, W.C. and Plasser, F. (2004.) *Political Parties and Electoral Change: Party Responses to Electoral Markets* (London: SAGE).
- Mann, M. (1986) ‘The autonomous power of the state: its origins, mechanism, and results,” in Hall, J.A (ed.) *States in History* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell): 109-136.
- Norris, P. (2005), *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market* (New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press).
- Poggi, G. (1978) *The Development of the Modern State: a Sociological Introduction* (London: Hutchinson).
- Reinhard, W. (1996) ‘Introduction: power elites, state servants, ruling classes, and the growth of state power’ in Reinhard, W. (ed.) *Power Elites and State Building* (New York: Oxford University Press): 1-19.
- Ware, A. (1996) *Political Parties and Party Systems* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

- Webb, P. (2002) 'Party systems, electoral cleavages and government stability' in Heywood, P., Jones, E. and Rhodes, M. (eds.) *Developments in West European Politics 2* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan): 115-134.
- Wolinetz, S.B. (2002) 'Beyond the catch-all party: approaches to the study of parties and party organization in contemporary democracies' in Gunther, R., Montero, J.R. and Linz, J.J. (eds.) *Political Parties: Old Concepts and New Challenges* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 136-166.

**Presentation questions:**

- 1) Is 'vote share' or 'ideology' a better indicator for whether a party is 'mainstream' or not?
- 2) Are there any democratic implications associated with an increased emphasis on issue ownership?

**Week 9: Moving Beyond 'the state' in Comparative Research 2:  
Territorial Politics (Wilfried Swenden)**

More than half of the world's population who live in a democracy also live in states with strong regional governments (federal, regional or devolved). But what varieties of territorial politics are there? Why are some states federal while others are not? Does territorial politics make governance more or less efficient? When and how does territorial politics produce policy innovation and experimentation, and when does it lead to policy duplication, immobilism or litigation? Under what conditions can territorial politics help to hold-together multi-national or socio-culturally fragmented societies?

**Core Readings**

- Schakel, A.H. and Jeffery, C. (2013) 'Are regional elections really second order elections?', *Regional Studies* 47(3): 323-341.
- Snyder, R. (2001), 'Scaling down: the subnational comparative method', *Studies in Comparative International Development* 36(1): 93-110.
- Wibbels, E. 'Madison in Baghdad: decentralization and federalism in comparative politics', *Annual Review of Political Science* (9): 165-88.
- Ziblatt, D. (2004) 'Rethinking the origins of federalism: puzzle, theory and evidence from nineteenth-century Europe', *World Politics* 57(1): 70-98.

**Further Reading**

- Bartolini, S. (2005) 'Old and new peripheries in the process of European territorial integration' in Ansell, C.K. and Di Palma, G. (eds.) *Restructuring Territoriality. Europe and the United States Compared*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bednar, J. (2011) 'The political science of federalism', *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* (7): 269-88.
- Bogdanor, V. (1979) *Devolution*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beramendi, P. (2007), 'Federalism', in Boix C. and Stokes, S.S. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burgess M. (2006) *Comparative Federalism: Theory and Practice*, London: Routledge.
- Chibber, P.D. and Kollman, K. (2004) *The Formation of National Party Systems: Federalism and Party Competition in Canada, Great Britain, India and the United States*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Erk, J. (2007), *Explaining Federalism. State, society and congruence in Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany and Switzerland* (London: Routledge)
- Elazar, D. (1987) *Exploring Federalism*, Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Franck, Thomas M. (ed.) (1968) *Why Federations Fail: An Inquiry into the Requisites for Successful Federalism*, New York: New York University Press.
- Gibson, E.L. (ed.) (2004) *Federalism and Democracy in Latin America*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Greer, S. (ed.) (2006) *Territory, Democracy and Justice: Regionalism and Federalism in Western Democracies*, Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2001) *Multi-Level Governance and European Integration*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hooghe L. and Marks, G. (2003) 'Unraveling the central state, but how?' *American Political Science Review* 97(2): 233-243.
- Hough, D. and Jeffery, C. (eds.) (2006) *Devolution and Electoral Politics*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hueglin, T.O. and Fenna, A. (eds.) *Comparative Federalism. A Systematic Inquiry*, Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.
- John, P. (2001) *Local Governance in Western Europe*, London: Sage.
- Karmis, D. and Norman, W. (2005) *Theories of Federalism: A Reader*, Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Keating, M. (2008), 'Thirty Years of Territorial Politics', *West European Politics*, 31(1-2): 60-81.
- Kincaid, J. and Tarr, A.G. (2005) *Constitutional Origins, Structure and Change in Federal Countries*, Montreal and Kingston: Kingston University Press.
- King, P. (1982) *Federalism and Federation*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Le Gales, P. (2002) *European Cities, Social Conflicts and Governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Loughlin, J. (2008) 'Federal and local government institutions' in Caramani, D. *Comparative Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 263-90
- Loughlin, J., Kincaid, J. and W. Swenden, eds., (2013), *Routledge Handbook of Federalism and Regionalism* (London: Routledge).
- Marks, G., Hooghe, L. and Schakel, A. (2008) 'Measuring Regional Authority', *Regional & Federal Studies*, 18 (2-3): 111-121.
- Obinger, H., Leibfried, S. and Castles F.G. (eds.) (2005) *Federalism and the Welfare State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riker, W.H. (1975) "Federalism." in Greenstein, F.I. and Polsby, N.W. (eds.) *Handbook of Political Science, Volume 5: Governmental Institutions and Processes*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, p. 93-113.
- Rodden, J. (2004), 'Comparative Federalism and Decentralization. On Meaning and Measurement', *Comparative Politics*, July 2004, 481-500 [can be downloaded from Professor Rodden's web-site at: <http://www.stanford.edu/~jrodden/ComparativeFederalism.pdf>]
- Rodden, J. (2006) *Hamilton's Paradox. The Promise and Peril of Fiscal Federalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saunders, C. (1996) "The constitutional arrangements of federal systems: a skeptical view from the outside" in Hesse J.J. and Wright, V. (eds.) *Federalizing Europe? The Costs, Benefits and Preconditions of Federal Political Systems*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 46-72.
- Swenden, W. (2006) *Federalism and Regionalism in Western Europe. A Comparative and Thematic Analysis*, Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Swenden, W and Maddens, B. eds., *Territorial Party Politics in Western Europe*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009.
- Treisman, D. (2007), *The Architecture of Government. Rethinking Political Decentralization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Watts R.L. (1996) *Comparing Federal Systems in the 1990s*, Kingston: Queen's University Press (esp. chs. 1, 3 and 4).
- Wibbels, E. (2006) 'Madison in Baghdad? Decentralization and Federalism in Comparative Politics', *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 165-188.
- Wheare, K.C. (1963) *Federal Government* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### **Presentation questions:**

- 1) What would comparative politics gain from making subnational comparisons?
- 2) How and why does federalism matter for one of the following: (1) the containment of ethnic conflict; (2) electoral dynamics and party politics; (3) foreign policy.

## **Week 10 Moving Beyond 'the state' in Comparative Research 3: Welfare State(s) (Martin Booker)**

What exactly do we mean when we refer to a 'welfare state'? What factors caused it to emerge in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and have driven its development since? And what is the best way to explain and understand its different manifestations? This week looks at historical pathways of welfare arrangements across different countries, and examines a variety of approaches and theoretical frameworks that have been used to study welfare states comparatively.

The core readings reflect a rich debate in welfare state research, triggered by Esping-Andersen's work in 1990. It is recommended to read them in chronological order -

### **Core Readings**

- Castles, F.G. and Mitchell, D. (1992) 'Identifying welfare state regimes: the links between politics, instruments and outcomes', *Governance* 5(1):1-26.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) 'The three political economies of the welfare state', *International Journal of Sociology* 20(3): 92-123.
- Pierson, P. (2000) 'Three worlds of welfare state research', *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (6/7): 791-821.
- Svallfors, S. (1997) 'Worlds of welfare and attitudes to redistribution: a comparison of eight western nations', *European Sociological Review* 13(3): 283-304.

### **Further Reading**

- Alber, J. (2006) 'The European social model and the United States', *European Union Politics* 7(3): 393-419.
- Ashford, D.E. (1986) *The Emergence of the Welfare States* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Castles, F.G. (ed.) (1993) *Families of Nations. Patterns of Public Policy in Western Democracies* (Aldershot).
- Castles, F.G. and Pierson, C. (eds.) (2007) *The Welfare State Reader* (Cambridge: Polity).
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Gough, I. (1979) *The Political Economy of the Welfare State* (London: Macmillan).
- Hill, M.J. (2006) *Social Policy in the Modern World: A Comparative Text* (Oxford: Blackwell).

- Jones, K. (1985) *Patterns of Social Policy. An Introduction to Comparative Analysis* (London: Tavistock).
- Kaufmann, F-X. (2013) *Variations of the Welfare State: Great Britain, Sweden, France and Germany between Capitalism and Socialism* (New York: Springer).
- Offe, C. (1984) *Contradictions of the Welfare State*: (London: Hutchinson).
- Oorschot van, W., Opielka, M and Pfau-Effinger, B. (eds.) (2008) *Culture and Welfare State. Values and Social Policy in Comparative Perspective* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).
- Pierson, P. (1994) *Dismantling the Welfare State? Reagan, Thatcher and the Politics of Retrenchment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Rimlinger, G.V. (1971) *Welfare Policy and Industrialization in Europe, America and Russia* (New York: Wiley).
- Rueschemeyer, D. and Skocpol, T. (eds.) (1996) *States, Social Knowledge and the Origins of Modern Social Policies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Skocpol, T. and Amenta, E. (1986) 'States and social policies', *Annual Review of Sociology* 12(1): 131-157.
- Starke, P, Obinger, H. and Castles, F.G. (2008) 'Convergence towards where: in what ways, if any, are welfare states becoming more similar?', *Journal of European Public Policy* 15(7): 975-1000.
- Wilensky, H. (1975) *The Welfare State and Equality. Structural and Ideological Roots of Public Expenditures* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

**Presentation questions:**

- 1) In what ways is the welfare state a manifestation of power struggles between different groups in society?
- 2) What is the role of attitudes and values in the development of the welfare state?

## **Guide to Using LEARN for Online Tutorial Sign-Up**

The following is a guide to using LEARN to sign up for your tutorial. If you have any problems using the LEARN sign up, please contact the course secretary by email (Sopita.Sritawan@ed.ac.uk).

Tutorial sign up will open on Monday 15 September at noon and will close at 12 noon on the Friday of Week 1 (19 September).

### **Step 1 – Accessing LEARN course pages**

Access to LEARN is through the MyEd Portal. You will be given a log-in and password during Freshers' Week. Once you are logged into MyEd, you should see a tab called 'Courses' which will list the active LEARN pages for your courses under 'myLEARN'.

### **Step 2 – Welcome to LEARN**

Once you have clicked on the relevant course from the list, you will see the Course Content page. There will be icons for the different resources available, including one called 'Tutorial Sign Up'. Please take note of any instructions there.

### **Step 3 – Signing up for your tutorial**

Clicking on **Tutorial Sign Up** will take you to the sign up page where all the available tutorial groups are listed along with the running time and location.

Once you have selected the group you would like to attend, click on the 'Sign up' button. A confirmation screen will display.

**IMPORTANT: If you change your mind after having chosen a tutorial you cannot go back and change it and you will need to email the course secretary. Reassignments once tutorials are full or after the sign-up period has closed will only be made in exceptional circumstances.**

**Tutorials have restricted numbers and it is important to sign up as soon as possible. The tutorial sign up will only be available until 12 noon on the Friday of Week 1 19 September. If you have not yet signed up for a tutorial by this time you will be automatically assigned to a group which you will be expected to attend.**

## **Discussing Sensitive Topics**

The discipline of Politics and International Relations addresses a number of topics that some might find sensitive or, in some cases, distressing. You should read this handbook carefully and if there are any topics that you may feel distressed by you should seek advice from the course convenor and/or your Personal Tutor.

For more general issues you may consider seeking the advice of the Student Counselling Service, <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/student-counselling>

**SPS Student Cover Sheet/ Feedback Sheet**

Provisional Mark ( <i>this is for staff use</i> )	
--	--

**\*Indicated fields MUST be completed by student.**

<b>*Exam number</b>	
<b>*Course</b>	
<b>*Essay title</b>	
<b>*Word Count</b>	
<b>Marker's name</b>	

**NOTE:** Essay marks are reviewed by another member of staff prior to being returned to students

-----  
*This section is for office use.*

<b>Initial Mark</b>	
<b>Penalties</b>	
<b>Adjusted Mark</b>	

**Overview**

Aspect of performance	+		Avg		-
<i>Thinking skills</i> (criticism, analysis, interpretation, logic, argumentation, evaluation, use of comparison, anticipating counter-arguments, etc.)					
<i>Comprehension</i> (accuracy in facts, details and representation of author's views, breadth of reading, grasp of major issues, etc.)					
<i>Writing skills</i> (structure and organisation, clarity, precision, grammar/spelling, referencing, use of illustration, style, etc.)					

**Major advice to student**

<b>Main strength(s) of the essay</b>	
<b>Main weakness(es) of the essay</b>	
<b>This and future essays could be improved by...</b>	

**Specific advice/comments**

(Please see numbers in the margins of your essay, corresponding to the numbered advice/comments below)

**PRESENTATION FEEDBACK FORM**

	<i>1</i>	<i>2.1</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>Fail</i>
Evidence of preparation?					
Presentational style and clarity?					
Time management?					
Answers the question?					

**Names:**

**Further comments:**

**Mark (out of 70%):**

**DISCUSSANT FEEDBACK FORM**

	<i>1</i>	<i>2.1</i>	<i>2.2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>Fail</i>
Clarity of feedback?					
Quality...?					
Relevance...?					

**Names:**

**Further comments:**

**Mark (out of 30%):**