

THE RULES OF THE GAME: COMPARATIVE ELECTORAL SYSTEMS

300.545 (2SSt SE, SS 2019) 6 ECTS

Thursdays 15h00-17h00 HS388

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Elections are the central and defining feature of democracy. While much electoral research focuses on voting behavior, a significant portion of research evaluates electoral systems as systemic variables. This class will focus the latter perspective. Electoral systems are a crucial link in the chain connecting the preferences of citizens to governments; they also represent some of the most powerful instruments which undergird power sharing arrangements in democracies.

The purposes of this seminar is to introduce some of the major theoretical and conceptual building blocks concerning electoral institutions, the types, the emergence, changes, effects and related measurement. After an overview of election laws and election systems around the world, we will evaluate how electoral systems influence party systems, representation, citizen attitudes and behavior, and the quality of democracy. The course will proceed 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 the context of each theme: the emphasis will be placed on causality and finding out what makes for good and convincing arguments.

Class will meet every Thursday from 15h00 to 17h00 in Room HS388 starting on March 7th 2019 until 27.6.2019. The seminar and its evaluation will be conducted in English. I will make all the materials you will need for this course on the portal blackboard, within the limits of legality, of course.

Sprechstunde: By appointment

COURSE SCHEDULE

1. March 07: Introduction

Part I: Building blocks: classification and components of electoral systems

2. March 14: Basic features and classification
3. March 21: The single member constituency systems
4. March 28: Proportional representation
5. April 04: Mixed electoral systems

Part II: The effects (and some causes) of electoral rules

6. April 11: The number of political parties I
7. May 02: The number of political parties II
8. May 09: Investigating causality: electoral system origins/reform
9. May 16: Descriptive representation I: women
10. May 23: Descriptive representation II: quotas/reserved seats
11. June 06: Substantive representation: congruence
12. June 13: Citizen behavior and attitudes: Turnout
13. June 27: Electoral system design for new democracies and divided societies

COURSE 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 and hand-in weekly short reviews of the readings
- 5) To select by March 14, one of 3 tracks; (either a series of short papers, a thesis research design, or a classical research paper).

Grade breakdown:

- Participation: 30%
- Weekly handouts: 10%
- Track option total: 60%

About the Readings

Attendance is obligatory, and each student is expected to actively participate in the weekly seminars (participation counts for 30% for your grade, so keep that in mind. If you do all the work and do not talk during the seminar, your grade cannot be higher than 3). If you miss one meeting, you will have to write a two-page summary of the seminar literature of this class including some of the non-required readings. In case you miss more than three seminars you will not pass the course. Every week's session will entail a discussion of the readings; hence you need to prepare for each session and be ready to discuss the texts in details. Take notes, look up words and concepts you are not familiar with, look at references in the text and consult other material cited and suggested by me. You should plan to spend at least a working day to prepare a session. Most important, you should bring 2-3 questions you would like to debate in class with your peers; this ensures a lively in-class experience.

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. Remember that *skimming* is an important professional skill.

BA students: must read the required readings + plus one country reading when indicated.

MA students: must read the required readings plus one recommended or two country reading when indicated.

To prepare for the seminar you should think about:

- How the readings fit together; what unites them;
- What are the main debates, puzzles? What are the main hypotheses defended by the authors? Are there sub-hypotheses?
- What are the main variables? What is the theoretical argument that links the variables? Is there a theory?
- What level of analysis is used? (Micro or macro) Ask yourself who performs the action: people, voters, elites, political parties, institutions, society, states, or other (social) structures?
- What kind of method is each of the authors employing? (Case studies, comparison of many cases, qualitative, quantitative, a mix of methods)
- Are the empirical findings robust? Are you convinced? Why/Why not?
- Taking all the readings together, are the findings unanimous, or split about an issue?
- Are the different arguments to explain a phenomenon reconcilable?
- Why do you think findings are split? Do authors use different methods, variables, countries, years, definitions, to arrive at their findings?
- Overall, what do we know about a topic? Which variables are at work?
- What is there still to know about a topic?

- What is most convincing: the theory or the empirical findings?
- Are there things you might have not understood?
- What are the normative underpinnings?

Weekly Short Reviews

(BA students: 2 reaction papers)

(MA Students one each week)

These should be concise reviews of the current week's required readings. 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 March 14th. Because they are meant to encourage you to think about the readings before you come to class, no late reviews will be accepted. If you chose track 1, you do not have to submit a "weekly short review" if you submit a discussion paper.

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.

TRACK 1:

TRACK 1 is a series of discussion papers (each due in class)

BA students with 6 ECTS: 4 Discussion Papers

Master students with 6 ECTS: 5 Discussion Papers + Discussion leadership

Discussion Leadership (MA STUDENTS)

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 readings. Think of this as an extension of your one-page review – deal with the same issues, but in more detail.

Discussion papers

BA about 5-6 pages on required readings + 1 case study reading (where applicable)

MA about 6-7 pages on required reading + 2 case study reading or 2 recommended (depending of the week).

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 time that could be asked at an MA exam, for example). 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 review essays in journals 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 April 4th

TRACK 2: Research Design (60%) DEADLINE: JULY 31

Master students with 6 ECTS: 20 pages + written proposal

*****not for BA!!**

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?
8. Annotated bibliography

For this option, you should submit a proposal for this research design by **May 9**.

TRACK 3: Research Paper (60%) DEADLINE: JULY 31

Master students with 6 ECTS: 20 pages + written proposal

BA students with 6 ECTS: 18-20 pages + written proposal

Write an original research paper on an already reasonably well-designed research proposal. 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 20-25 pages (12pt font, 1.5 spaced). It is important that you ask and try to answer a clearly stated question.

For this option, you should submit a proposal for this research design by **May 9**.

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 late final papers, but each late day will cost you 5% of your grade. (Weekly review papers cannot be handed in late for the above cited reasons).

PLAGIARISM

A note on plagiarism. Full citations must be included for every source you utilize, including those you paraphrase even loosely. Citations must be included if you paraphrase another author, or if you use another's ideas, even if not the exact words. You should select a standard citation style and stick to it. Lifting papers from the internet will be punished by a failing grade and reported to the appropriate authorities. (ps. I check).

COURSE READINGS

WEEK 1 (March 7): Introduction/ Identifying Types of Electoral Systems

Required readings:

- Golder, Matt. 2005. Democratic Electoral Systems around the World, 1946-2000. *Electoral Studies*. Vol. 24(1): 103-121.

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/>
- Bowler, Shaun. 2008. "Electoral Systems". in Rhodes, R. A. W., Sarah A. Binder, and Bert A. Rockman (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*. Chapter 1 (pp.3-22).

WEEK 2 (March 14): Basic Features, formulas and districting

Required readings:

- Gallagher, Michael and Mitchell, Paul. 2018. "Dimensions and Variation in Electoral Systems." in Herron, Pekkanen, and Shugart (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems*. OUP, pp.23-40.
- Gallagher, Michael. 1991. "Proportionality, Disproportionality and Electoral Systems." *Electoral Studies*. Vol.10(1): 33-51.

Recommended (but not required):

- Blais, André. 1988. "The Classification of Electoral Systems." *European Journal of Political Research*. Vol. 16(1): 99-110.
- Blais, André. & Massicotte, Louis. 1997. "Electoral formulas: A macroscopic perspective" *European Journal of Political Research*. Vol. 32(1): 107-129.
- Norris, Pippa. 2004. *Electoral Engineering. Voting Rules and Political Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 2, pp.39-66).

WEEK 3 (March 21): Single Member Constituency Systems

Required readings:

- David M. Farrell. 2011. *Electoral Systems. A Comparative Introduction*. Palgrave, ch. 2-3 (pp.13-63).

Case studies (BA pick 1, MA pick 2).

- Farrell, David and McAllister Ian. 2005. "**Australia**: The Alternative Vote in Compliant Political Culture" in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.79-98.
- Massicotte, Louis. 2005. "**Canada**: Sticking to First-Past-the-Post for the Time Being" in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.99-118.
- Elgie, Robert. 2005. "**France**: Stacking the Deck" in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.119-136.
- Mitchell, Paul. 2005. "The **United Kingdom**: Plurality under Siege" in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.157-184.

WEEK 4 (March 28): Proportional representation

Required readings:

- David M. Farrell. 2011. *Electoral Systems. A Comparative Introduction*. Palgrave, ch. 4 (pp.64-76).

Case studies (BA pick 1, MA pick 2).

- Rahat, Gideon and Hazan Reuven. 2005. "Israel: The Politics of an Extreme Electoral System" in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.333-352.
- Hopkin, J. 2005. "Spain: Proportional Representation with Majoritarian Outcomes" in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.375-396.
- Mueller, Wolfgang C. 2005. "Austria: A Complex Electoral System with Subtle Effects" in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.397-416.
- De Winter, L. 2005. "Belgium: Empowering Voters or Party Elites" in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.417-432.

WEEK 5 (4 April): Mixed Electoral Systems

Required readings:

- Massicotte, Louis, and André Blais. 1999. "Mixed Electoral Systems: a conceptual and empirical survey." *Electoral Studies* 18(3):341-366.

Case studies (BA pick 1, MA pick 2).

- Saalfeld, Thomas. 2005. "Germany: Stability and Strategy in a Mixed Member Proportional System." in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.209-230.
- Benoit, Kenneth. 2005. "Hungary: Holding back the Tiers." in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.231-252.
- D'Alimonte, R. 2005. "Italy: A Case of Fragmented Bipolarism." in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.231-252.
- Vowles, Jack. 2005. "New Zealand: The Consolidation of Reform?" in Gallagher, M. and Mitchell, P. (eds.). *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. OUP. Pp.295-312.

WEEK 6 (11 April): Electoral rules as causes: The Number of Parties I

Required readings:

- Riker, William H. 1982. "The Two-Party System and Duverger's Law: An Essay on the History of Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 76: 753-766.
- Dunleavy, Patrick. 2012. "Duverger's Law is a dead Parrot. European political scientists need to recognize that plurality or majority voting has no tendency at all to produce two party politics." *SE European Politics and Policy (EUOPP) Blog* (20 Jun 2012) Blog Entry.

Recommended (but not required)

- Blais, André and R. K. Carty. 1991. "The Psychological Impact of Electoral Laws: Measuring Duverger's Elusive Factor" *British Journal of Political Science* Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 79-93.
- Gaines, B. J. "Duverger's Law and the Meaning of Canadian Exceptionalism." *Comparative Political Studies* 32 (1999): 835-861.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1990. "The Political Consequences of Electoral Laws, 1945-1985". *American Political Science Review* 84: 481-496.
- Duverger, Maurice. 1954. *Political Parties*. New York: Wiley [pp. 234-282].
- Rae, Douglas W. 1971. *The Political Consequences of Electoral Laws*. New York: Yale University Press [chapters 4 and 5].
- Benoit, Kenneth. 2006. "Duverger's Law and the Study of Electoral Systems". *French Politics* 4(1): 69-83.
- Bakvis, Herman and Laura G. Macpherson Quebec Block Voting and the Canadian Electoral System." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 28 (1995): 659-92.

Summary text to help you out if you are not sure:

- Norris, Pippa. 2004. *Electoral Engineering. Voting Rules and Political Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapters 4-5, pp.81-125). A GREAT SUMMARY OF THE DEBATE.

WEEK 7 (May 2): Electoral rules as causes: The Number of Parties II

Required readings:

- 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*. Vol.39 (6): 679-708.

Recommended (but not required)

- Ferree, K., G. B. Powell, and E. Scheiner. 2014. "Context, Electoral Rules, and Party Systems." *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 421-439.
- Lublin, David. 2017. "Electoral Systems, Ethnic Heterogeneity and Party System Fragmentation" *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol.47(2): 373-389.
- Moser, Robert. 1999. "Electoral Systems and the Number of Parties in Postcommunist States." *World Politics* 51(3): 539-384.
- Moser, Robert, Scheiner, Ethan and Stoll, Heather. 2018. "Social diversity, Electoral Systems, and the Party System." in Herron, Pekkanen, and Shugart (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems*. OUP, pp.135-158.
- Ordeshook, P. and Shvetsova, O. 1994 "Ethnic heterogeneity, district magnitude, and the number of parties." *American Journal of Political Science* 38(1): 100-123.

WEEK 8 (May 9): Investigating causality: Electoral System Origins/Reform

Required readings:

- Boix, Carles. 1999. "Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 93 (3): 609-24.
- Colomer, J. M. 2005. "It's Parties that Choose Electoral Systems (or, Duverger's Laws Upside Down)." *Political Studies* 53:1-21.

Recommended (but not required):

- Andrews, Josephine T., Jackman, Robert W. 2005. "Strategic Fools: Electoral rule choice under Extreme Uncertainty." *Electoral Studies* 24:65-84.
- Benoit, Kenneth. 2002. "The Endogeneity Problem in Electoral Studies: A Critical Reexamination of Duverger's Mechanical Effect." *Electoral Studies* 21(1): 35-46.
- 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.
- Blais, A., Dobrzynska, A. and I. Indridason. 2004. "To Adopt or Not to Adopt Proportional Representation: The Politics of Institutional Choice". *British Journal of Political Science* 35: 182 -190.
- Calvo, E. "The Competitive Road to Proportional Representation: Partisan Biases and Electoral Regime Change under Increasing Party Competition." *World Politics* 61, no. 2 (2009): 254-295.
- Cusack, T., T. Iversen, and D. Soskice. 2007. "Economic Interests and the Origins of Electoral Systems." *American Political Science Review* 101. 373 -91.
- Lipset, S. M., and S. 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.

Summary texts to help you out if you are not sure:

- Norris, P. 1995. "Introduction: The Politics of Electoral Reform. *International Political Science Review* 16(1):3-8.
- Farrell, D. M. 2011. *Electoral Systems. A Comparative Introduction*. Palgrave, (chapter 8, pp.172-200).

WEEK 9 (May 16): Descriptive Representation I: Women

Required reading:

- Kenworthy, Lane and Melissa Malami. 1999. "Gender Inequality in Political Representation" A Worldwide Comparative Analysis. *Social Forces* 78(1):235-268.

Case studies (BA pick 1, MA pick 2).

- Fortin-Rittberger, Jessica, & Rittberger, Berthold. 2014. "Do electoral rules matter? Explaining national differences in women's representation in the **European Parliament**." *European Union Politics*. Vol. 15(4): 496-520.
- Moser, Robert G. 2001. "The Effects of Electoral Systems on Women's Representation in **Post-Communist States**." *Electoral Studies*. Vol. 20 (3): 353–369.
- Yoon, Mi Yung. 2004. "Explaining Women's Legislative Representation in **Sub-Saharan Africa**." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. Vol. 29(3): 447–468.
- Matland, Richard E., and Michelle M. Taylor. 1997. "Electoral System Effects on Women's Representation: Theoretical Arguments and Evidence from **Costa Rica**." *Comparative Political Studies*. Vol. 30 (2): 186–210.

Summary text to help you out if you are not sure:

- Norris, Pippa. 2004. *Electoral Engineering. Voting Rules and Political Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 8, pp.179-208).

WEEK 10 (May 16): Descriptive Representation II: Quotas, reserved seats

Required readings:

- Krook, Mona Lena, and Diana Z. O'Brien. 2010. "The Politics of Group Representation Quotas for Women and Minorities Worldwide." *Comparative Politics* 42(3):253-272.

Case studies (BA pick 1, MA pick 2).

- Górecki, Maciej A., and Kukołowicz, Paula. 2014. "Gender Quotas, Candidate Background and the Election of Women: A Paradox of Gender Quotas in Open-list Proportional Representation Systems (**Poland**)." *Electoral Studies*. Vol. 36: 65–80.
- Murray, Rainbow. 2010. "Second Among Unequals? A Study of Whether **France's** 'Quota Women' are Up to the Job." *Politics & Gender*. Vol 6(1):93-118.
- Allen, Peter, David Cutts, and Rosie Campbell. 2016. "Measuring the Quality of Politicians Elected by Gender Quotas – Are they Any Different? (**Britain**)" *Political Studies*. Vol 64(1): 143-163.
- Besley, T., Folke O. Persson, T., Rickne, J. 2017. "Gender Quotas and the Crisis of the Mediocre Man: Theory and Evidence from **Sweden**." *American Economic Review*. Vol. 107(8): 2204-42.
- Lublin, David, Matthew Wright. 2013. "Engineering Inclusion: Assessing the effects of Pro-minority Representation Policies." *Electoral Studies*. Vol. 32(4):746-755.

WEEK 11 (June 6): Substantive Representation: congruence

Required readings:

- Blais, Andre, and Marc Andre Bodet. 2006. "Does Proportional Representation Foster Closer Congruence Between Citizens and Policy Makers?" *Comparative Political Studies*. Vol. 39(10): 1243-62.
- Matt Golder & Gabriella Lloyd. 2014. "Re-evaluating the Relationship between Electoral Rules and Ideological Congruence." *European Journal of Political Research*. Vol 53 (1): 200-212.

Recommended (but not required):

- Huber, John D., and G. Bingham Powell Jr. 1994. "Congruence between Citizens and Policy-Makers in Two Visions of Liberal Democracy." *World Politics*. Vol. 46(3): 291-326.

- Golder, Matt, and Ferland, B. 2018. "Electoral Systems and Citizen-Elite Ideological Congruence" in Herron, Pekkanen, and Shugart (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems*. OUP.
- Golder, Matt & Jacek Stramski. 2010. "Ideological Congruence and Electoral Institutions." *American Journal of Political Science* 54: 90-106.
- Powell, G. Bingham. 2009. "The Ideological Congruence Controversy: The Impact of Alternative Measures, Data, and Time Periods on the Effects of Election Rules." *Comparative Political Studies*. Vol. 42:1475–1497.

WEEK 12 (June 13): Citizen Behavior and Attitudes: Turnout

Required readings:

- Endersby, James W., Kreickhaus, Jonathan T. 2008. "Turnout around the Globe: The Influence of Electoral Institutions on National Voter Participation, 1972-2000." *Electoral Studies*. Vol. 27(4) :601-610.

Case studies (BA pick 1, MA pick 2).

- Eggers, Andrew C. 2015. "Proportionality and Turnout. Evidence from **French** Municipalities." *Comparative Political Studies*. Vol. 48(2): 135-167.
- *Cox, Gary W., Fiva, John H. and Daniel M. Smith. 2015. "Proportionality and Turnout: Competitiveness and the Contraction Effect of Electoral Reform (**Norway**).\" (unpublished paper).
- Bowler, Shaun, David Brockington and Todd Donovan. 2001. "Election Systems and Voter Turnout: Experiments in the **United States**." *Journal of Politics*. Vol 63(3): 902-915.
- Karp, Jeffrey A., and Susan A Banducci. 1999. "The impact of proportional representation on turnout: Evidence from **New Zealand**." *Australian Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 34(3): 363-377.
- Perez-Linan, Anibal. 2001. "Neoinstitutional accounts of voter turnout: moving **beyond industrial democracies**." *Electoral Studies*. Vol. 20(2): 281-297.

WEEK 13 (June 30): Electoral system design for new democracies and divided societies

Required readings:

- Carey, John, M. 2018. "Electoral System Design in New Democracies" in Herron, Pekkanen, and Shugart (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems*. OUP, pp. 85-112.

Case studies (BA pick 1, MA pick 2).

- Barkan, Joel D. 1995. "Elections in **Agrarian Societies**." *Journal of Democracy* 6(4):106-116.
- Reilly, Benjamin. 2002. "Electoral Systems for **Divided Societies**." *Journal of Democracy* 13(2): 156-170.
- 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.
- Herron, Erik. S. 2018. "Electoral Systems in Context: **Ukraine**." in Herron, Pekkanen, and Shugart (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Electoral Systems*. OUP, pp. 903-920.