

Research Seminar, Herbstsemester 2010:
COMPARATIVE ELECTORAL SYSTEMS

Termin: Tuesdays 10h15-13h30
Room: A 5, 6 Bauteil B - B 318

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The seminar has two main goals: 1) to introduce you to the main research topics in the electoral institutions subfield of comparative politics, at the macro level, and 2) to help you develop your research design and academic writing skills. One of the purposes of this research seminar is to introduce some of the major theoretical and conceptual building blocks concerning electoral institutions, the emergence, change, effects and related measurement. The course proceeds thematically, with participants discussing a subset of the pertinent scholarly literature every week. Discussion should focus on a major theoretical or empirical controversy. Key methodological issues are addressed in the context of each theme: the emphasis will be placed on causality and finding out what makes for good and convincing arguments.

The course is a graduate seminar, so class time will be devoted exclusively to the discussion of the assigned readings, rather than to lecturing. This means participants should read the assigned material for the week *before* class. We will focus on certain key elements in conducting and evaluating social science analysis. In particular, we will consider:

- The importance of theory/model development based on clearly-drawn mechanisms
- Generating testable implications
- Linking hypotheses and theory
- The importance of assumptions
- Effective approaches to presenting your work

Class will meet every Tuesday from 10h15 to 13h30 in Room A 5, 6 Bauteil B - B 318 starting on 07.09.2010 until 07.12.2010. The seminar and its evaluation will be conducted in English.

COURSE SCHEDULE:

1. September 7: Introduction
2. September 14: Democratic Institutions: Competing Views
3. September 21: Identifying Types of Electoral Systems
4. September 28: Measuring Types of Electoral Systems
Electoral system Effects
5. October 5: The Number of Political Parties
6. October 12: Substantive Representation
7. October 19: Descriptive Representation
8. October 26: Fraud/Democratization
9. November 2: Citizen Behavior and Attitudes
10. November 9: Special Cases: Mixed-Member Systems
Electoral Systems as Dependent Variables
11. November 16: Electoral System Design/Birth
12. November 23: Electoral System Reform/Change
13. November 30: Stretching the Rules: Gerrymandering, Redistricting, malapportionment
Conclusions
14. December 7: Are there “better” types of electoral institutions? How do we know?

REQUIREMENTS:

The following is required of all students enrolled in this course:

- 1) To attend all class meetings;
- 2) To do all required readings;
- 3) To participate actively in the class discussions;
- 4) To prepare weekly short handouts;
- 5) To select by September 21 one of 4 tracks;

Grade breakdown:

- Participation: 20%
- Weekly handouts: 10%
- Track option total: 70%

TRACK 1: 3 Discussion Papers (20% each) + Discussion leadership (10%)

Discussion Leadership

You will serve as the class discussion leader once during the semester. After I give a short, general overview of the week's topic, we will discuss the readings individually. You will briefly (in 2-3 minutes) introduce each reading by reminding the class of the author's main argument and the method(s) he/she uses to support that argument. Then you will lead the discussion by raising questions about the reading. Think of this as an extension of your one-page review – deal with the same issues, but in more detail.

Discussion papers

Three papers of 7-8 pages each about 3 of the weekly readings (your pick among required or recommended). The papers should be literature reviews of the readings with a twist. That is, they present a sketch of the major theories (explanations) and the results of your own assessment, focused around a question of your choice (think about something to really unite the readings to a common theme). Some of the best examples of this type of literature review of several books appear in *World Politics* and *The Annual Review of Political Science*. You may want to look at some of the review essays before you write your own. You should address the 3 following points.

- 1) What are the authors trying to demonstrate? Summarize the arguments using the following criteria:
 - a. What are the main hypotheses defended by the authors? Are there sub-hypotheses?
 - b. What are the main variables? What is the theoretical argument that links the variables?
 - c. What level of analysis is used? (Micro or macro) Who performs the action: people, institutions, states?
 - d. What is the type of analysis used (Deductive/inductive)
 - e. What kind of method is the author employing? (Case studies, comparison of many cases, qualitative, quantitative, a mix of methods)
- 2) Evaluate the theory: are these pieces of literature convincing? Below are some examples of evaluation criteria to help you make your point. You don't need to deal with all these items at once, just those you feel are relevant to your argument.
 - a. Originality: new findings? New theory?
 - b. simplicity/parsimony (uses many or few variables to make a point?)
 - c. Coherent/internally consistent (no propositions that contradict each other)
 - d. pertinent/useful (you can apply this to real world cases)
 - e. Predictive (you can make predictions using this theory, and if the predictions coming from it are validated by facts)
 - f. Is this generalizable to many cases/countries, or just applicable to a single/few cases?
 - g. Does it seem normative or objective? (Do the authors speak about how things are in the real world, or how things should be?)
 - h. Are the variables adequately conceptualized and operationalized? Are the concepts clear? Were the measures chosen to evaluate concepts adequate?

- i. Was the choice of design acceptable, or could you recommend a better way to test the theory?

3) What links the articles together? Which of the theories proposed is most adequate and why, at least with respect to the question you have posed. Keep in mind that mature scholarship asks not so much whether someone is right or wrong but under what kinds of circumstances a theory is useful...

Papers are due no later than class time. I cannot accept late papers because that would put those who complied with the deadline at a disadvantage (e.g. after the class discussion on the topic). If you think you will fail to meet the deadline, then you should plan to submit a later paper. You have control over which papers you choose to write, and that flexibility should be sufficient to make sure you plan your schedule so that all your deadlines do not coincide. You should write at least one paper before October 19.

TRACK 2: Literature Review (70%) (Deadline December 17)

The literature review should be a synthesis on a topic you have negotiated with me, of course, related to this class (e.g. If you decide to write a literature review, you should meet with me to discuss the topic). Your paper should examine the relevant literature with a critical viewpoint regarding theoretical and empirical developments. You should discuss the strengths and limitations of methodological or conceptual conventions in that literature, as well as the importance and relevance of the questions around which it is organized. Your literature review should therefore have a *critical* core, and not just be descriptive. It goes without saying that I expect you to expand significantly on the required readings. Recommended readings may be a good start for further reading, but the review should not be limited to the readings in the syllabus. Be creative.

TRACK 3: Research Design (70%) (Deadline December 17)

Write a research design for a study related to the comparative analysis of electoral institutions. You should only pick this option if you are actually planning to write your thesis in this field. The research design should be written in the form of a thesis proposal and should include the following aspects:

1. A brief discussion of your proposed thesis' substantive importance; Why is resolving this question important?
2. A brief and purposive review of the relevant literature. Your review should set up the question and demonstrate the need for research of the type you are proposing (so not just a laundry list of what is out there, see above for tips);
3. A clear and concise presentation of your thesis and outline of your theoretical framework. This includes the specification of the dependent and independent variables (definition, operationalization and measurement if applicable);
4. Specification of the theory's principal (testable) hypotheses: explain the theory, or the rationale, that links your independent to the dependent variables;
5. Discussion of your case selection if applicable. Why these countries/years?
6. Discussion of data that you plan to collect, or use, and the method you are proposing to employ (try to be as concrete as possible).
7. Discuss limitations of your reliance on the cases and the data you will use. Acknowledge what kinds of evidence would disconfirm your hypotheses, also, the limitations of your research design in general. Can you really demonstrate causality? Why not?

TRACK 4: Research Paper (Better suited to PhD Students) (70%) (Deadline December 17)

Write an original research paper on an already reasonably well-designed research proposal (which I should approve ahead of time, by, say, October 19). The topic should be directly related to this course. The structure of the research paper should be modeled on an academic article from a peer-reviewed journal, with about 20-24 pages. You should choose this option only if you can reasonably collect, prepare and analyze the data and write up the results by December 17th.

READINGS

The reading load for this course might seem heavy at first sight. I have selected sections from a various amount of articles and books to cover topics in order to permit interesting comparisons and some disagreement on certain issues. The secret to cope with a bulk of reading is to skim strategically: Knowing how to *skim* readings is an important professional skill for students (you can't realistically be expected to read ALL the materials for each class you are taking, right?). In most cases, you can skim the empirical details, especially if they are buried in complex formulas. For this, you need to read purposefully, and look out for the important "stuff" in a text:

- The central question or puzzle the author seeks to answer or resolve;
- The definition of the dependent variable, or what the author wants to explain;
- The main independent variables the author(s) thinks are at work;
- The theory, or the rationale, that links independent to dependent variables; why should certain things be related?
- The author's research design: the types of evidence used to test hypotheses, where the evidence comes from, and if you are convinced by it all.

Weekly Short Reviews

These should be concise reviews of the current week's reading. Keep them to one page, single-spaced maximum. Your short Reviews do not need to be in a continuous text form, they can be a series of points. These are due in class each week, beginning on September 14. Because they are meant to encourage you to think about the readings before you come to class, no late reviews will be accepted.

In your reviews, you should:

1. Summarize the main arguments of the readings for the week. What are the readings about? How do they relate to each other? (Keep this part short – half of the page, maximum)
2. Critique the readings – consider methodology, logic, biases, omissions, etc. Do the authors prove what they propose convincingly? Why or why not?
3. Identify some questions that you would like to discuss in class.

ILIAS

I will make all the materials you will need for this course on the portal ILIAS, within the limits of legality, of course.

Sprechstunde

TBA

WISDOM FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

The most common characteristic among students who are not doing well in graduate school is lack of communication. If you need to turn in something late for my class, please just let me know, we will see what is reasonable. If you feel lost, depending on your background in political science, I can propose textbooks to fill the gaps. And if you are having problems with the program or with this class, just come talk with me.

LATE PAPER POLICY

I understand that printers break, dogs/uncles/grandmas sometimes die, and hard drives often fail around final paper due dates. I will accept track 3, 4, 5, papers late, but each late day will cost you 5% of your grade. (Weekly review papers and discussion papers cannot be handed in late for the above cited reasons).

Course Readings:

WEEK 1 (September 7): Introduction

- Shugart, Matthew S. 2004. Comparative Electoral Systems Research: The Maturation of a Field and New Challenges Ahead. In Michael Gallagher and Paul Mitchell (Eds.) *The Politics of Electoral Systems* Oxford: Oxford University Press (Chapter 2, pp.27-56)

WEEK 2 (September 14): Democratic Institutions: Competing Views

Required readings:

- Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press. (Chapters 1-3, pp.9-47)
- Bingham Powell Jr. G. 2000. Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions. New Haven: Yale University Press. (Chapters 1-2, pp.3-19)
- Riker, William H. 1982. *Liberalism against Populism* Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

Recommended (but not required):

- McDonald, Michael D., Silvia M. Mendes, and Ian Budge. 2004. What Are Elections For? Conferring the Median Mandate. *British Journal of Political Science* 34: 1-26.
- Arrow, Kenneth. 1957. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

WEEK 3 (September 21): Identifying Types of Electoral Systems

Required readings:

- Norris, Pippa. 2004. *Electoral Engineering. Voting Rules and Political Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 2, pp.39-66).
- Golder, Matt. 2005. Democratic Electoral Systems around the World, 1946-2000. *Electoral Studies* 24:103-121.
http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mrg217/es_published.pdf
- Cox, Garry. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*, New York: Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 3)

Recommended (but not required):

- International IDEA. *Electoral System Design: The New International IDEA Handbook*, chapters 2-3 (pp. 27-118)
<http://www.idea.int/publications/esd/>

WEEK 4 (September 28): Measuring Types of Electoral Systems and their Effects

Required readings:

- Gallagher, Michael. 1991. Proportionality, Disproportionality and Electoral Systems. *Electoral Studies*. 10(1):33-51.
- Laakso, Markku, Taagepera, Rein. 1979. The "Effective" Number of Parties: A Measure with Application to West Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 12(1):3-27.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2008. The Quantity and the Quality of Party Systems: Party System Polarization and Its Consequences. *Comparative Political Studies* 41(7):899-920.
- Teorell, Jan, Lindstedt, Catharina. 2010. Measuring Electoral Systems. *Political Research Quarterly* 63(2):434-448.
- Bogaards, Matthijs. 2004. Counting Parties and Identifying Dominant Party Systems in Africa. *European Journal of Political Research* 43:173-197.

Recommended (but not required):

- Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapter 5 (party systems), 8 (electoral systems).

Some (great) data sources:

- The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems
<http://cses.org/>
- Thorsten Beck, Philip E. Keefer and George R. Clarke. Database of political institutions
<http://econ.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTRESEARCH/0,,contentMDK:20649465~pagePK:64214825~piPK:64214943~theSitePK:469382,00.html>

- Klaus Armingeon et al. Comparative Political Data Set I (23 OECD Countries), Comparative Political Data Set II (28 Post Communist Countries), Comparative Political Data Set III (35 OECD Countries and/or EU-member countries)
http://www.ipw.unibe.ch/content/team/klaus_armingeon/index_ger.html
- Golder, Matt. 2005. Democratic Electoral Systems around the World, 1946-2000. *Electoral Studies* 24:103-121.
http://homepages.nyu.edu/~mrg217/es_published.pdf

ELECTORAL SYSTEM EFFECTS

WEEK 5 (October 5): The Number of Parties

Required readings:

- Riker, W.H. 1982. The Two-Party System and Duverger's law: An Essay on the History of Political Science. *American Political Science Review* 76(4): 753-766.
- Norris, Pippa. 2004. *Electoral Engineering. Voting Rules and Political Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapters 4-5, pp.81-125).
- Cox, Gary and Amorim Neto, Octavio. 1997. "Electoral institutions, cleavage structures, and the number of parties." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(1):149-174.
- Clark, William, and Matt Golder. 2006. "Rehabilitating Duverger's Theory: Testing the Mechanical and Strategic Modifying Effects of Electoral Laws" *Comparative Political Studies* 39: 679-708.

Recommended (but not required):

- Cox, Garry. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems*, New York: Cambridge University Press. Party IV
- Ordeshook, P. and Shvetsova, O. (1994) 'Ethnic heterogeneity, district magnitude, and the number of parties', *American Journal of Political Science* 38(1): 100-123.
- Moser, Robert G. 1999. "Electoral Systems and the Number of Parties in Postcommunist States." *World Politics* 51(3): 539-384.
- Lipset, Seymour M., and Stein Rokkan. 1967. "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments: An Introduction," in *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*. S.M. Lipset and S. Rokkan (eds.). New York: The Free Press. pp. 1-64.

WEEK 6 (October 12): Substantive Representation/Government and Policy Outcomes

Required readings:

- Bingham Powell Jr. G. 2000. *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New Haven: Yale University Press. (Chapters 3, pp.47-68, 6-9, pp.122-232).
- Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press. (Chapter 6, and 13, pp.90-115 and 258-274)
- Iversen, Torben, and David Soskice. 2006. Electoral Institutions and the Politics of Coalitions: Why Some Democracies Redistribute More than Others." *American Political Science Review* 100(2), pp. 165-181.
- Golder, Matt. 2003. Explaining Variation in the Success of Extreme Right Parties in Western Europe. *Comparative Political Studies* 36(4):432-466.
- Crepaz, Markus, M.L. 1996. Consensus versus Majoritarian Democracy. Political Institutions and their Impact on Macroeconomic Performance and Industrial Disputes. *Comparative Political Studies* 29(1):4-26.

Recommended (but not required):

- Katz, Richard S. 1980. A theory of Parties and Electoral Systems. Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press. (Chapter 2-3, pp.17-59).
- Glasgow, Garret and R. Michael Alvarez. 2005. "Voter Behavior and the Electoral Context of Government Formation." *Electoral Studies* 24: 245-64.
- Golder, Sona Nadenichek. 2006. "Pre-Electoral Coalition Formation in Parliamentary Democracies." *British Journal of Political Science* 36: 193-212.

WEEK 7 (October 19): Descriptive Representation (Women, Minorities)

Required readings:

- Norris, Pippa. 2004. *Electoral Engineering. Voting Rules and Political Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapters 8-9, pp.179-229).
- Paxton, Pamela, Hughes, Melanie M. and Matthew A. Painter. 2010. Growth in Women's Political Representation: A Longitudinal Exploration of Democracy, Electoral System and Gender Quotas. *European Journal of Political Research* 49:25-52.
- Matland, Richard E., Studlar, Donley T. 1996. The Contagion of Women Candidates in Single-Member District and Proportional Representation Electoral Systems: Canada and Norway. *The Journal of Politics* 58(3):707-733.
- Schmidt, Gregory D. 2008. The election of Women in list PR Systems: Testing the Conventional Wisdom. *Electoral Studies* 28:190-203.

Recommended (but not required):

- Rule, Wilma. 1994. Women's Underrepresentation and Electoral Systems. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 27(4):689-692.
- Salmond, Rob. 2006. "Proportional Representation and Female Parliamentarians." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 31(2): 175-204.
- McAllister, Ian, Studlar, Donley T. 2002. Electoral Systems and Women's Representation: A Long-Term Perspective. *Representation* 39(1):3-14
- Moser, Robert G. 2001. "The Effects of Electoral Systems on Women's Representation in Post-Communist States. *Electoral Studies* 20(3): 353-69.
- Freedman, Jane. 2004. Increasing Women's Political Representation: The Limits of Constitutional Reform. *West European Politics* 27(1): 104-23.

WEEK 8 (October 26): Fraud/Corruption

Required readings:

- Carey, John and Matthew S. Shugart. 1995. "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: A Rank Ordering of Electoral Formulas." *Electoral Studies* 14:417-439.
- Chang, Eric C., Golden, Miriam A. 2007. Electoral Systems, District Magnitude and Corruption. *British Journal of Political Science* 37(1):115-137.
- Birch, Sarah. 2007. Electoral Systems and Electoral Misconduct. *Comparative Political Studies*, Volume 40 Number 12, December 2007, pp. 1533-1556.
- Golden, Miriam. 2003. Electoral Connections: The Effects of the Personal Vote on Political Patronage, Bureaucracy and Legislation in Postwar Italy. *British Journal of Political Science* 33:189-212.
- Persson, Thorsten, G. Tabellini, and F. Trebbi. 2003. Electoral Rules and Corruption. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 1(4):958-989.

Recommended:

- Samuels, DJ. 1999. Incentives to Cultivate a Party Vote in Candidate-centric Systems: Evidence from Brazil. *Comparative Political Studies* 32:487-518.

WEEK 9 (November 2): Citizen Behavior and Attitudes

Required readings:

- Norris, *Electoral Engineering*, (Chapters 6-7, pp.126-178)
- Blais, Andre, and Kees Aarts. 2006. "Electoral Systems and Turnout." *Acta Politica* 41(2): 180-96.
- Endersby, James W., Kreickhaus, Jonathan T. 2008. Turnout around the Globe: The Influence of Electoral Institutions on National Voter Participation, 1972-2000. *Electoral Studies* 27:601-610.
- Geys, Benny. 2006. "Explaining Voter Turnout: A Review of Aggregate-level Research." *Electoral Studies* 25(4): 637-63.
- Franklin, Mark N. 1999. Electoral Engineering and Cross-National Turnout Differences: What Role for Compulsory Voting? *British Journal of Political Science* 29(1):205-216.

Recommended (but not required):

- Singh, Shane. 2010. Contradictory Calculi: Differences in Individual's Turnout Decisions across Electoral Systems. *Political Research Quarterly* (Forthcoming).
- Banducci, Susan, Karp, Jeffrey. 2009. Electoral Systems, Efficacy and Voter Turnout. In H.D. Klingemann, *The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blais, Andre. 2006. "What Affects Voter Turnout?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 111-25.
- Huber, John D., Kernell, Georgia, and Eduardo L. Leoni. 2005. Institutional Context, Cognitive Resources and Party Attachments across Democracies. *Political Analysis* 13:365-386.

WEEK 10 (November 9): Special type: Mixed-Member Systems

- Shugart, Matthew S. and Martin P. Wattenberg (Eds.) 2001. *Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: The Best of Both Worlds?* Oxford: Oxford University Press. Chapters 1-2.
- Massicotte, Louis, and André Blais. 1999. "Mixed Electoral Systems: A Conceptual and Empirical Survey." *Electoral Studies* 18(3); 341-66.
- Moser, Robert G. and Ethan Scheiner. 2004. "Mixed Electoral Systems and Electoral System Effects: Controlled Comparison and Cross-National Analysis." *Electoral Studies* 23(3): 575-99.
- Bowler, Shaun and David M. Farrell. 2006. "We Know Which One We Prefer but We Don't Really Know Why: The Curious Case of Mixed Member Electoral Systems." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 8(3): 445-60.

Recommended (but not required):

- Pekkanen, R., Benjamin Nyblade, and E.S. Krauss. 2006. "Electoral Incentives in Mixed-Member Systems: Party, Posts, and Zombie Politicians in Japan." *American Political Science Review* 100(2): 183-93.
- Ferrara, Federico, and Erik S. Herron. 2005. "Going It Alone? Strategic Entry under Mixed Electoral Rules." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(1): 16-31.

ELECTORAL SYSTEMS AS DEPENDENT VARIABLES

WEEK 11 (November 16): Electoral System Design for New Democracies

Required readings:

- Andrews, Josephine T., Jackman, Robert W. 2005. Strategic Fools: Electoral rule choice under Extreme Uncertainty. *Electoral Studies* 24:65-84.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1996 "Constitutional Choices for New Democracies," in Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner (eds). *The Global Resurgence of Democracy*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp.163-174
- Lardeyret, Guy. 1996. "The Problem with PR," in Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner (eds). *The Global Resurgence of Democracy*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 175-180.
- Taagepera, Rein. 1998. How Electoral Systems Matter for Democratization. *Democratization*. 5(3):68-91.
- Barkan, Joel D., Densham, Paul J., Rushton, Gerard. 2006. Space Matters: Designing Better Electoral Systems for Emerging Democracies. *American Journal of Political Science* 50(4):926-939.

Recommended (but not required):

- Reilly, Benjamin. 2002. Electoral Systems for Divided Societies. *Journal of Democracy* 13(2): 156-170.
- Gabel, Matthew J. 1995. The Political Consequences of Electoral Laws in the 1990 Hungarian Election. *Comparative Politics* 27:2
- Mozaffar, Shaheen, James R. Scarritt, and Glen Galaich. 2003. Electoral Institutions, Ethnopolitical Cleavages and Party Systems in Africa's Emerging Democracies. *American Political Science Review* 97(3):379-90.

- Birch, Sarah. 2005. Single-Member District Electoral Systems and Democratic Transition. *Electoral studies*. 24:281-301.
- Horowitz, Donald. L. 2003. "Electoral Systems: A Primer for Decision Makers," *Journal of Democracy* 14(4):32-46.

WEEK 12 (November 23): Electoral System Reform

Required readings:

- Norris, Pippa. 1995. Introduction: The Politics of Electoral Reform. *International Political Science Review* 16(1):3-8.
- Dunleavy, Patrick, Margetts, Helen. 1995. Understanding the Dynamics of Electoral Reform. *International Political Science Review* 16(1):9-29.
- Boix, Carles. "Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 93, no. 3 (1999): 609-24.
- Katz, Richard. 2009. Why are there so Many (or so Few) Electoral Reforms? In Michael Gallagher and Paul Mitchell (Eds.) *The Politics of Electoral Systems* Oxford: Oxford University Press (Chapter 3, pp.57-79).
- Benoit, Kenneth. 2007. Electoral Laws as Political Consequences: Explaining the Origins and Change of Electoral Institutions. *Annual Review of Political Science* 10(1): 363-390.

Recommended (but not required):

- Colomer, Josep M. 2005. It's Parties that Choose Electoral Systems (or, Duverger's Laws Upside Down). *Political Studies* 53:1-21.
- Benoit, Kenneth. 2004. Models of Electoral System Change. *Electoral Studies* 23: 363-389.
- Benoit, Kenneth, Jacqueline Hayden. 2004. Institutional Change and Persistence: The Evolution of Poland's Electoral System, 1989-2001. *The Journal of Politics* 66(2):396-427
- Sakamoto, Takayuki. 1999. Explaining Electoral Reform: Japan versus Italy and New Zealand. *Party Politics* 5(4):419-438.
- Scheiner, Ethan. 2008. Does electoral System Reform Work? Electoral System Lessons from Reforms of the 1990s. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 11:161-181.

WEEK 13 (November 30): Stretching the rules: Gerrymandering, Redistricting, Malapportionment



Required readings:

- Robert S. Erikson. 1972. Malapportionment, Gerrymandering, and Party Fortunes in Congressional Elections *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 66, No. 4 (Dec., 1972), pp. 1234-1245.
- Katz, Richard S. 1998. Malapportionment and Gerrymandering in Other Countries an Alternative Electoral Systems, in Mark E Rush (ed.) *Voting Rights and Redistricting in the United States*. Greenwood
- Samuels, David, Snyder, Richard. 2001. The Value of a Vote: Malapportionment in Comparative Perspective. *British Journal of Political Science* 31:651-671.
- Gelman, Andrew, King, Gary. 1994. Enhancing Democracy through Legislative Redistricting. *American Political Science Review* 88(3):541-558.

Recommended (but not required):

- Barreto, Matt A. et al .2004. The Mobilizing Effect of Majority-Minority Districts on Latino Turnout. *American Political Science Review* 98:1

CONCLUSIONS

WEEK 14: (December 7): Are there “better” types of electoral institutions? How do we know?

Required readings:

- Norris, *Electoral Engineering*, Chapter 3.
- Blais, Andre, and Marc Andre Bodet. 2006. “Does Proportional Representation Foster Closer Congruence Between Citizens and Policy Makers?” *Comparative Political Studies* 39(10): 1243-62.
- Powell, G. Bingham. 2006. “Election Laws and Representative Governments: Beyond Votes and Seats.” *British Journal of Political Science* 36(2): 291-315.
- Doorenspleet, R. 2005. “Electoral Systems and Democratic Quality: Do Mixed Systems Combine the Best or the Worst of Both Worlds? An Explorative Quantitative Cross-National Study.” *Acta Politica* 40(1): 28-49.
- Horowitz, Donald. L. 2003. “Electoral Systems: A Primer for Decision Makers,” *Journal of Democracy* 14(4):32-46.

Recommended (but not required):

- Farrell, David M., and Ian McAllister. 2006. “Voter Satisfaction and Electoral Systems: Does Preferential Voting in Candidate-Centred Systems Make a Difference?” *European Journal of Political Research* 45(5): 723-49.
- Anderson, Christopher J., and Christine A. Guillory. 1997. “Political Institutions and Satisfaction with Democracy: A Cross-National Analysis of Consensus and Majoritarian Systems.” *American Political Science Review* 91(1): 66-81.
- Curtice, John, Shively, W. Philips. 2009. Who Represents Us Best? One Member or Many? In H.D. Klingermann, *The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, (chapter 7, pp.171-192).