International Relations/Political Science

Academic year 2020-2021

Comparative Politics

RI-SP046 - Spring - 6 ECTS

Course Description

This seminar introduces students to the comparative politics subfield, analyzing many essential components of comparative political science: themes, debates, concepts, as well as the different theoretical and methodological approaches. Discussion will be structured around key questions and topics that frame comparative inquiry, and an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of contending theories and methods of analysis. A single semester course is inadequate to cover a specific topic, much less an entire subfield. The course therefore constitutes a primer for comparative research from its units of analysis – national, subnational, institutions, actors – to its main substantive as well as emerging themes. With this aim, the course structures around the current challenges to democracies.

> **PROFESSOR**

Virginie Van Ingelgom

virginie.vaningelgom@uclouvain.be
virginie.vaningelgom@graduateinstitute.ch

Office hours

Monday 14:00 to 16:00 and by appointment.

> **ASSISTANT**

Asees Puri

P2, 6th floor.

asees.puri@graduateinstitute.ch

Office hours

Monday, 14:00 to 16:00 and by appointment.

Syllabus

> *"Among the several fields or subdisciplines into which the discipline of political science is usually divided, comparative politics is the only one that carries a methodological instead of a substantive label. The term "comparative politics" indicates the* how *but does not specify the* what *of the analysis."* (A. Lijphart, 1970).

Objectives

The primary goal of this course is to provide students with the conceptual background of different approaches to social inquiry in comparative politics, and various substantive subfields of comparative politics. It also seeks to provide a set of methodological and analytical tools that students can use to understand and critically analyze contemporary issues in comparative politics.

Upon the completion of this course, students should be able to: (1) Explain and evaluate what comparative politics, as a subfield, is about and be conversant with the main substantive debates in the field. (2) Critique approaches and articles, and identify weaknesses, using their own insights or those of other approaches. (3) Apply comparative methodology and develop a social scientific, inquiry-based research project and pursue further study of or research on related topics of their interest (4) Effectively communicate research findings in both written and verbal formats.

Thus, by the end of the semester, students should be able to critically describe the main conceptual and methodological veins of comparative politics. They should also, and be prepared to undertake a rigorous comparative research design to address original themes of their interest.

Practical organization

The course will meet every Monday from 12:00 – 13h45. The course will be taught **online**. In case the sanitary situation will allow for a **hybrid class room** – note here that if borders are closed in Belgium or in Switzerland the course will have to remain online unfortunately, the course will meet in <mark>Room XX</mark>.

All required articles and book chapters are provided in electronic format on Moodle. Additional readings could occasionally be sent to students after a session to complement the lecture.

Assessments

    1. Readings and participation

A major feature of this class will be **class participation in form of discussing the assigned articles**, critically reflecting on theoretical and methodological approaches, and actively engaging with peers. Thus, it will be essential that students carefully **read the assigned required readings prior to class**. The lecture will only convey general theoretical and topical overviews, as well as key terms and principles that are covered in the readings. Students are expected to complete all required readings by the date listed, which will help you contribute to class discussion.

To read efficiently, spend some time thinking about the reading: What is the author's main argument? What evidence is used to support the argument? How is comparison across units constructed and justified? Is the argument and evidence compelling? Are there alternative explanations? How does the reading relate to previous ones covered in the course?

In order to prepare the discussion, students will have to **submit one question they have on the texts assigned by Friday midnight on Moodle**. Those questions will be key to structure the discussion around the texts and will be address both by the students in charge of moderating the debates (*see below*) as well as in the lecture sessions. The questions could be theoretical, methodological or analytical.

Participation is an essential component of any seminar that requires collective and interactive participation of each student. In the current context of online or hybrid teaching, this is a challenging yet essential task to achieve collectively as the quality of this learning experience is determined by constructive exchange of thoughts and criticisms. The grade you earn will reflect the amount and quality of your participation, as well as your attendance and the question posted on Moodle.

    2. Weekly Moderation of the Debate

The sessions address substantive debates in the comparative politics. Once during the semester each student will be assigned (probably by pair depending on the number of students enrolled) the role of moderator of the debate of the week. They will introduce the debate by **linking the different readings, defining the main concepts and approaches useful for their discussion of the texts and should be able to defend the merits of the week's readings in class as well as identifying their weaknesses**. This oral presentation will last 20 minutes maximum. After presenting their understanding and comments on the readings, students in charge of the moderation should introduce the discussion by selecting questions of their peers and propose their tentative answers to it. The choice of selecting

one question over the other is totally up to the students in charge of the session – they should just make sure to communicate the chosen questions to the TA and Professor by Sunday 16.00. The remaining questions will be addressed in the lecture – note that the time will probably not allow to cover all of them but some questions will probably come back or should even been asked again in link to other readings in order to make sure that they are addressed and don't remain unanswered.

For the session following their moderation, each student in charge of the moderation of the previous debate (not in pair this time) are required to **submit a short paper** based on the assigned required readings of the week they presented on, due to next Monday via Moodle. All articles assigned for a given week need to be addressed and integrated with each other in composing the response paper. To that end, students should try to answer the following question: what connects all the articles, or where do they disagree? If applicable, how is the comparison constructed and justified? What do you find contentious or convincing? The goal of this short paper is to demonstrate that students are able to synthesize key information based on their readings, and at the same time able to be reflexive on class discussion. The response paper should be between 3 pages (double-spaced, Times New Roman 12). The paper will be evaluated based on quality and number of readings incorporated; making links with other readings – in particular the introducing sessions – is more than welcome.

3. Research Design Proposal

The aim of the project is to produce the front part of **an original research proposal** (i.e. research justification and question, literature review, theory and methodology). The selection of the topic is up to students and students are invited to pursue study of or research on related **topics of their interest in the field of comparative politics**. However, the topic of the paper must address an issue that is related to comparative politics in a prominent manner. Students should profit from office hours early in the semester to discuss their topic of choice. If the topic is open, the paper should necessarily **apply comparative methodology and develop a social scientific, inquiry-based research project**. The paper must present an original research idea. General literature reviews or summaries of other works are not the aim of the research design proposal nor pure policy questions rather students should perceive this exercise as producing a research proposal for a PhD scholarship. The project must have a clear theoretical focus and contribution. That is, it should address the general logic of the phenomenon the paper is investigating and not specific cases alone. Even though **students are not asked to perform any analyses of evidence in the paper**, the goal of the project is to produce a well-thought-out research design that features rigorous comparative research and could realistically be tested through evidence in a rigorous manner. To this end, the research design can envision comparisons across countries or other units, or comparisons of one and the same country/unit across time. In order to further help you in this exercise a mandatory workshop "Writing a research design proposal" (date will be confirmed once enrollment is finished). This will be a ca. 45-minute-long interactive workshop on proper citation and how to write a research proposal.

Precise guidelines will be distributed in class. A first draft of your research design paper (the content is not graded at this stage) has to be submitted by April 16 (no later than 18:00) taking the format of a one -slide research poster (*see below*). The final version of your research design paper should be 4 pages maximum, single-spaced, excluding bibliography. A template – inspired by existing templates of applications for funding – will be provided and should be used to submit your research proposal. The research proposal is due June 11 at midnight.

4. Poster Exercise and Peer Review

First drafts of the research design paper will take the format of a research poster to be presented in session 9. Those posters will be discussed in small groups (number of participants per group depend on class size, organized by paper theme) featuring peer review. The goal is to provide constructive

feedback to classmates to help them improve their papers. Each poster will be assigned a formal discussant. Moreover, every student will be graded according to their performance in reviewing other students' work. This entails having read the poster of every participant in the group and providing constructive feedback via a feedback memo on one poster for which student is the formal discussant. Precise guidelines will be distributed in class. Students are expected to provide their poster by Wednesday, April 16 by 18:00. The assignment for the formal peer review discussion and memo will be determined once class enrollment is settled, but feedback memos are due by Friday, April 30.

The breakdown of students' grade will be as follows:

20% = attendance and class participation
20% = poster presentation and peer review exercise (discussion and memo)
20% = weekly moderation and response paper
40% = research design proposal

Tentative Schedule and Reading Assignments [To be completed before Week 1]

Week 1. February 22 – Introductions and Introduction to Comparative Politics

What does comparative politics mean? What is political?

No readings assigned for this week.

Week 2. March 1 – The Comparative Research Methods

What does it mean to compare? What are the ways to construct a political comparison rigorously? What is a case-study and how does is it relevant for comparative research?

Required – To be defined

Lijphart, A. (1971). Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method. *American Political Science Review*. 65, 682-693.

Lijphart, A. (1975). The Comparable-Cases Strategy in Comparative Research. *Comparative Political Studies*. 8(2): 158-177

Mahoney, J. (2007). Qualitative Methodology and Comparative Politics. *Comparative Political Studies*. 2: 122-144.

Della Porta, D. (2008). "Comparative Analysis: Case-oriented versus Variable-oriented Research." In D. Della Porta & M. Keating (Ed.) In *Approaches and Methodologies in Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 198-222.

Gerring, J. (2007). The Case Study: What it is and What is Does? Boix, C. and Stokes, S. (Ed.). *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 90-122.

Additional readings

Bennett, A. and Colin E. (2006). Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods. *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 455-476.

Bates, R. (2007). From Case Studies to Social Science: A Strategy for Political Research. In Boix, C. and Stokes, S. (Ed.). *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 172-185.

Lichbach, I. (2009). Thinking and Working in the Midst of Things: Discovery, Explanation, and Evidence in Comparative Politics. In Mark I. Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 18-71.

Zuckerman, A. (2009). Advancing Explanation in Comparative Politics: Social Mechanism, Endogenous Processes, and Empirical Rigor. InMark I. Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman. *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 72 - 95.

Week 3. March 8 – The Comparative Research Methods: Approaches and Issues

What are the different conceptions of inference discussed in the readings and what do they mean for the empirical analysis? What are the main issues with comparative research?

Required – To be defined

Bennett, A. & Colin E. (2007). Case Study Methods in the International Relations Subfield. *Comparative Political Studies.* 40(2): 170-195.

Collier, D., & Mahoney, J. (1996). Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research. *World Politics.* 49: 56-91.

Collier, D., Mahoney, J. and Seawright, J. (2004). Claiming too much: Warnings about selection bias. H. E. Brady and D. Collier (Ed.), *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Collier, P. (2011). Understanding Process Tracing. *PS: Political Science and Politics.* 44(4): 823-830.
Franzese, R.J. Jr. (2007). Multicausality Context-Conditionality, and Endogeneity. In Boix, C. and Stokes, S. (Ed.). Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 27-72.

Geddes, B. (1990). How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics. in J. A. Stimson, ed., *Political Analysis Vol. 2.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 131-150.

Hogstrom, J. (2013). Does the Choice of Democracy Measure Matter? *Government and Opposition.* 48: 202-21.

Kohli, A., Evans, A. P., Katzenstein, P.J., Przeworski, A., Hoeber Rudolph, S., Scott, J.S. & Skocpol, T. (1995). The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium. *World Politics.* 48(1): 1-49.

Peters, B.G. (2017). Approaches in Comparative Politics. In D. Caramani (Ed.). Comparative Politics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 35-49.

Przeworski, A. (2007). Is the Science of Comparative Politics Possible? Boix, C. and Stokes, S. (Ed.). *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 147-171.

Sartori, G. (1970). Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics. *American Political Science Review,* 64, 1033-1053.

Week 4. March 15 – Institutions and Democracies

What are the main features of Western democracies? Which features distinguish a majoritarian democracy from a consensus democracy? Why are democracies in "crisis"?

Required – To be defined

Aarts, K. & Thomassen, J. (2008). Satisfaction with Democracy: Do Institutions Matter? *Electoral Studies.* 27: 5-18.

Bermeo, N. (2016). On Democratic Backsliding. *Journal of Democracy.* 27(1): 5-19.

Dahl, R. (2005). What Institutions Does Large-Scale Democracy Require? *Political Science Quarterly.* 120(2): 187-197.

Dalton, R. J., Scarrow, S.E. & Cain, B.C. (2004). Advanced Democracies and the New Politics. *Journal of Democracy.* 15 (1): 124–38.

François, A., Magni-Berton, R. & Varaine, S. (2019). Revolutionary Attitudes in Democratic Regimes. *Political Studies.* September 2019. doi:10.1177/0032321719874362.

Gandhi, J., Noble, B, & Svolik, M. (2020). Legislatures and Legislative Politics Without Democracy. *Comparative Political Studies.* 53(9) 1359–1379.

Levitsky, S. & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How Democracies Die.* New-York: Crown.

Lijphart, A. (2012), *Patterns of Democracy. Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-six Countries*, Yale University Press, chapters 1, 2, 3.

Morgenbesser, L. & Pepinsky, T.B. (2019). Elections as Causes of Democratization: Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective. *Comparative Political Studies.* 52(1): 3 – 35.

Munck, G.L. & Verkuilen, J. (2002). Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy – Evaluating Alternative Indices. *Comparative Political Studies.* 35(1), 5-34.

Pérez Liñán, A. (2017). Democracies. D. Caramani (Ed.). *Comparative Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 86-102.

Schmitter, P. C. & Lynn Karl, T. (1991). What Democracy Is…and Is Not. *Journal of Democracy.* 2(3): 75–88.

Siaroff, A. (2003). Comparative presidencies: The inadequacy of the presidential, semi-presidential and parliamentary distinction. *European Journal of Political Research.* 42(3): 287-312.

Week 5. March 22 – Citizens Politics

What are the principal modes of participation? Why do citizens participate (or not) in politics? What role do parties play in the working of democracy?

Required – To be defined

Bakker, R., de Vries, C., Edwards, E., Hooghe, L., Jolly, S., Marks, G., Polk, J., Rovny, J., Steenbergen, M., Vachudova, M. (2015) Measuring party positions in Europe: The Chapel Hill expert survey trend file, 1999-2010. *Party Politics*, 21(1), pp. 143-152.

Dalton, R.J. (2013). *Citizens Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies* (6th edition). Chatham NJ: Chatham House Publishers.

Easton, D. (1975). A Re-Assessment of the Concept of Political Support. *British Journal of Political Science*, 5(4): 435-457.

Franklin, M.N. (2004). *Voter Turnout and the Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Established Democracies since 1945.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobolt, S., Klemmensen, R. (2008). Government Responsiveness and Political Competition in Comparative Perspective. *Comparative Political Studies*, 41(3), 309–337.

Kaase, M. (1999). Interpersonal trust, political trust and non-institutionalized political participation in Western Europe. *West European Politics.* 22(3): 1-21.

Katz, R.S. (2017). Political Parties. D. Caramani (Ed.). *Comparative Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 207 – 223.

Kitschelt, H. & Rehm, P. (2017). Political Participation. D. Caramani (Ed.). *Comparative Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 319 – 335.

Lijphart, A. (1997). Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma. *American Political Science Review.* 91(1): 1-14.

Norris, P. (1999). *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Norris, P. (2011) Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Norris P. (2019). Do perceptions of electoral malpractice undermine democratic satisfaction? The US in comparative perspective. *International Political Science Review*, 40(1): 5-22.

Krishna, A. (2002). Enhancing Political Participation in Democracies: What is the Role of Social Capital? *Comparative Political Studies.* 35(4): 437-460.

Mair, P., & Mudde, C. (1998). The Party Family and Its Study. *Annual Review of Political Science.* 211-229.

Week 6. March 29 – The Welfare State and Democracy

Why is welfare state on important topic for comparative political science? How do different welfare models impact democracy? Why are welfare state so resilient?

Required – To be defined

Esping-Andersen, G. (1989). The three political economies of the welfare state. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie.* 26: 10-36.

Schmidt, V. A. (2002). Does Discourse Matter in the Politics of Welfare State Adjustment? *Comparative Political Studies.* 35 (2): 168-193.

OR

Slaven M., Casella Colombeau S., Badenhoop E. (2020). What Drives the Immigration-Welfare Policy Link? Comparing Germany, France and the United Kingdom. *Comparative Political Studies.* September 2020.

Svallfors, S. (2010). Policy feedback, generational replacement, and attitudes to state intervention: Eastern and Western Germany, 1990–2006. *European Political Science Review.* 2: 119-135.

OR

Taylor-Gooby P., Gyory A., Hvinden B., Schoyen M.A., Mau S., & Leruth B. (2019). Moral economies of the welfare state: A qualitative comparative study. *Acta Sociologica*, 62 (2), 119-134.

Additional readings

Boix, C. (2003). *Democracy and Redistribution.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, A. L. (2003). *How Policies Make Citizens. Senior Political Activism and the American Welfare State.* Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Campbell, A. L. (2012). Policy Makes Mass Politics. Annual Review of Political Science, 15, 333–351.

Esping-Hendersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ferrera, M. (2005). *The Boundaries of Welfare: European Integration and the New Spatial Politics of Social Protection.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grasso, M. T., Farrall, S., Gray, E., Hay, C. and Jennings, W. (2017) Thatcher's Children, Blair's babies, Political Socialization and Trickle-down Value Change: An Age, Period and Cohort Analysis. British Journal of Political Science 49(1): 17-36.

Hall, P. E., & Soskice, D. (2001). *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kumlin, S., Stadelmann-Steffen, I. (eds) (2014), *How Welfare States Shape the Democratic Public. Policy Feedbacks, Participation, Voting, and Attitudes.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Mettler, S. (2011) *The Submerged State. How Invisible Government Policies Undermine American Democracy.* Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.

Mettler, S., Soss, J. (2004). The Consequences of Public Policy for Democratic Citizenship. Bridging Policy Studies and Mass Politics. *Perspectives on Politics.* 2(1), pp. 55–73.

Pierson, P. (1993). When Effect Becomes Cause. Policy Feedback and Political Change. *World Politics.* 45(4): 595–628.

Pierson, P. (1994). *Dismantling the Welfare State? Reagan, Thatcher, and the Politics of Retrenchment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rothstein, B. (1998) *Just Institutions Matter. The Moral and Political Logic of the Universal Welfare State.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watson, S. (2015). Does Welfare Conditionality Reduce Democratic Participation? *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(5): 645–686.

Week 7. April 12 – Political Communication and the Media (with Asees Puri)

Required – To be defined

Tucker, J. A., Theocharis, Y., Roberts, M.E. and Barberá, P. (2017). From liberation to turmoil: Social media and democracy. *Journal of democracy.* 28 (4): 46-59.

Bond, R. M., Fariss, C.J., Jones, J.J., Kramer, A.D., Marlow, C., Settle, J.E. and James H. Fowler, J. H. (2012). A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization. *Nature.* 489, no. 7415: 295-298.

OR

Barnidge, M., Huber, B., Gil de Zúñiga, H. and Liu, J.H. (2018). Social Media as a Sphere for 'Risky' Political Expression: A Twenty-Country Multilevel Comparative Analysis. *The International Journal of Press/Politics.* 23 (2): 161–82.

OR

Stockmann, D., Luo, T. and Shen, M. (2020). Designing authoritarian deliberation: how social media platforms influence political talk in China. *Democratization.* 27 (2): 243-264.

Rød, Espen Geelmuyden, and Nils B Weidmann. "Empowering Activists or Autocrats? The Internet in Authoritarian Regimes." Journal of Peace Research 52, no. 3 (May 2015): 338–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343314555782.

Additional readings – To be added

Week 8. April 19 – Populism in Comparative Perspective

How can populism be best defined given the great diversity of populist parties and movements? Is populism homogenous or heterogeneous when considering it in comparative perspective? What motivates people to support Populist movements?

Required – To be defined

Mudde, Cas and Cristobal Rovira Kaltwasser. 2013. Exclusionary vs. Inclusionary Populism: Comparing Contemporary Europe and Latin America. *Government and Opposition,* 48(2): 147-174.

Golder. Matt and Sona N. Golder (eds). 2016. Symposium: Populism in Comparative Perspective. *Comparative Politics Newsletter,* 26(2), APSA.

Katwasser, C. R., Van Hauwaert, S. (2020), The populist citizen: Empirical evidence from Europe and Latin America. *European Political Science Review*, 12: 1-18.

OR

Noordzij, K., de Koster, W., & van der Waal, J. (2020). "They don't know what it is like to be at the bottom": Exploring the role of perceived cultural distance in less-educated citizens' discontent with politicians. *British Journal of Sociology.*

OR

Norris, P. (2020). Measuring populism worldwide. *Party Politics.* 26(6):697-717

OR

Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2017). Trump and the Populist Authoritarian Parties: The Silent Revolution in Reverse. *Perspectives on Politics*, 15(2), 443-454.

Additional readings

Akkerman A., Mudde C., & Zaslove A. (2014). How Populist Are the People? Measuring Populist Attitudes in Voters. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(9), 1324–1353.

Bonikowski, B. (2017). Ethno-nationalist populism and the mobilization of collective resentment. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 68(1):181-213.

Bonikowski, B., & Gidron, N. (2016). Multiple Traditions in Populism Research: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis. *Comparative Politics Newsletter*, American Political Science Association, 26(2): 7-14.

Canovan, M. (1999). Trust the People! Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy. *Political Studies*, 47, 2-16.

Capelos, T., & Demertzis (2018). Political Action and Resentful Affectivity in Critical Times, *Humanity & Society*, 42(4), 1-24.

Gerbaudo, P. (2017). The Mask and the Flag: Populism, Citizenism and Global Protest. Oxford University Press.

Hadiz, V. 2016. *Islamic Populism in Indonesia and the Middle East*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

Hawkins, K.A., Kaltwasser, C.R., Andreadis, I. (2020). The activitation of populist attitudes. *Government and Opposition*, 55: 283–307.

Hochshild, A.R. (2016). *Strangers in their own land: anger and morning on the American right*. London, New-York: New Press.

Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). The Oxford handbook of populism. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mudde, C. (2004). The Populist Zeitgeist. *Government and Opposition*, 39(4), 541 – 563.

Mudde, C. (2007). *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Mudde, C. (2013). Three Decades of Populist Radical Right Parties in Western Europe: So What? *European Journal of Political Research*. 52(1):1-19.

Rydgren, J. (2005). Is Extreme Right-Wing Populism Contagious? Explaining the Emergence of a New Party Family. *European Journal of Political Research,* 44(3): 413–437.

Spruyt, B., Keppens, G., Van Droogenbroeck, F. (2016). Who supports populism and what attracts people to it? *Political Research Quaterly*, 69(2): 335-346.

Week 9. April 26 – Mini-conference: Research Poster Presentation and Discussion

No readings assigned for this week.

Week 10. May 3 – Political Violence (with Asees Puri)

Required

Kalyvas, S. N. (2019). The Landscape of Political Violence. In *The Oxford Handbook of Terrorism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 11.

Straus, S. (2004). How many perpetrators were there in the Rwandan genocide? An estimate. *Journal of Genocide Research.* 6 (1): 85-98.

Malthaner, S. (2017). Processes of political violence and the dynamics of situational interaction. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV).* 11: a627-a627.

Additional readings – To be added

Week 11. May 10 – The EU as a Political System

Is the EU a political system? What is multilevel governance and does it deepen or weaken democracy? Is national identity an obstacle to European integration? Why has Euroscepticism grown in the last decades? How can comparative politics help us to understand Brexit?

Required – To be defined

Andreouli, E., Nicholson, C. (2018). Brexit and Everyday Politics: An Analysis of Focus Group Data on the EU Referendum. *Political Psychology*, 39(6), 1323–1338.

Bartolini, S. (2005). *Restructuring Europe. Centre formation, system-building, and political-structuring between the nation-state and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beetham, D. and Lord, C. (1998). *Legitimacy and the European Union*. London: Longman.

Bruter, M. (2008). Identity in the European Union – Problems of Measurement, Modelling & Paradoxical Patterns of Influence. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 4(4): 273–285.

Carey, S. (2002). Undivided Loyalties: Is National Identity an Obstacle to European Integration? *European Union Politics*, 3(4): 387–413.

Carreras M., Carreras Y., and Bowler S. (2019). Long-Term Economic Distress, Cultural Backlash, and Support for Brexit. *Comparative Political Studies,* Vol 52 (9): 1396-1424.

Cinnirella, M. (1997). Towards a European identity? Interactions between the national and European social identities manifested by university students in Britain and Italy. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 19–31.

De Vries, C. E. (2018). *Euroscepticism and the future of European integration* (First Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Díez Medrano, J. (2003). *Framing Europe: Attitudes to European integration in Germany, Spain, and the United Kingdom*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Down, I. and Wilson, C.J. (2013) A rising generation of Europeans? Lifecycle and cohort effects on support for 'Europe'. *European Journal of Political Research* 52 (4): 431-56.

Duchesne, S. and Frognier, A.-P. (2008) National and European Identifications: A Dual Relationship. *Comparative European Politics*, 6(2): 143–168.

Duchesne, S., Frazer, E., Haegel, F., Van Ingelgom, V. (2013). *Citizens' Reactions to European Integration Compared Overlooking Europe.* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Fligstein, N. (2008). *Euroclash. The EU, European identity and the future of Europe.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gabel, M. (1998). Public support for European integration: an empirical test of five theories, *Journal of Politics*, 60(2): 333–354.

Hobolt, S. B. & De Vries, C. E. (2016). Public Support for European Integration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19: 413–432.

Hooghe, L. & Marks, G. (2004). Does Identity or Economic Rationality Drive Public Opinion on European Integration? *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 37(3): 415–420.

Van Ingelgom, V. (2014). *Integrating Indifference. A comparative, qualitative and quantitative approach to the legitimacy of European integration.* Colchester: ECPR Press.

White, J. (2010). Europe in the Political Imagination. *JCMS*, 48(4), pp. 1015-1038.

Week 12. May 17 – Regionalism and Democracy in Comparative Perspective

---

Required – To be defined

Cole, a., Fox, S., Pasquier, R. and Stafford, I. (2018). Political trust in France's multi-level government. *Journal of Trust Research*, 8(1): 45-67.

Deschouwer, K. (2012) *The Politics of Belgium. Governing a Divided Society* (2nd edition). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

De Winter, L. and Tursan, H. (2003). *Regionalist parties in western Europe*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Dupuy, C., Verhaegen, S. and Van Ingelgom, V. (2020) Support for regionalisation in federal Belgium: the role of political socialization. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* (online first).

Guibernau, M. (2006). National Identity, Devolution and Secession in Canada, Britain and Spain. *Nations and Nationalism*. 12(1): 51–76.

Henderson, A., Jeffery, C. and Wincott, D. (2014). *Citizenship after the Nation State. Regionalism, Nationalism and Public Attitudes in Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hooghe, L., Marks, G., Schakel, A., Chapman Osterkatz, S., Niedzwiecki, S. and Shair-Rosenfield, S. (2016). *A Postfunctionalist Theory of Governance. Volume I: Measuring Regional Authority*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keating, M. (2013). *Rescaling the European State. The Making of Territory and the Rise of the Meso*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Paasi, A. (1986) The institutionalization of regions: a theoretical framework for understanding the emergence of regions and the constitution of regional identity. *Fennia – International Journal of Geography*. 164(1): 105-146.

Serrano, I. (2013). Just a Matter of Identity? Support for Independence in Catalonia. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 23(5): 523-545.

Stepan, A. (1999). Federalism and Democracy: Beyond the U.S. Model. *Journal of Democracy*: 19 - 33.

Verhaegen, S., Dupuy, C., Van Ingelgom, V. (2021). Experiencing and supporting institutional regionalization in Belgium: A normative and interpretive policy feedback perspective. *Comparative European Politics*.

Week 13. May 24 – Globalization and Democracy

Why is there such an intense debate about globalization and its consequences on democracy? Can multilevel governance be democratic?

Required – To be completed

Kriesi, H., Grande, E., Lachat, R., Dolezal, M., Bornschier, S., & Frey, T. (2006). Globalization and the transformation of the national political space: Six European countries compared. *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 45 (6): 921–956.

Additional readings

Croucher, S. (2018). *Globalization and Belonging. The Politics of Identity in a Changing World*.

Dellmuth, L. and Schlipphak, B. (2020). Legitimacy beliefs towards global governance institutions: a research agenda. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 27(6): 931-943.

Hellwig, T. (2014). *Globalization and mass politics: Retaining the room to manoeuvre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kriesi, H., Grande, E., Lachat, R., Dolezal, M., Bornschier, S., & Frey, T. (2008). *West European Politics in the Age of Globalization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Mader, M., Steiner, N. D., & Schoen, H. (2019). The globalization divide in the public mind: belief systems on globalization and their electoral consequences. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 1-20.

Mann, M. (1997). Has globalization ended the rise and rise of the nation state? *Review of International Political Economy*. 4:3, 472-496.

Rodrik, D. (2018). Populism and the Economics of Globalization. *Journal of international business policy*, 1(1-2): 12-33.

Rommel, T. & Walter, S. (2018). The electoral consequences of offshoring: how the globalization of production shapes party preferences. *Comparative political studies*, 51(5), 621-658.

Steiner, N. (2010). Economic Globalization and Voter Turnout in Established Democracies. *Electoral Studies*, 29(3): 444–459.

Steiner, N. (2016) Economic Globalization, the Perceived Room to Manoeuvre of National Governments, and Electoral Participation: Evidence from the 2001 British General Election. *Electoral Studies*, 41: 118–28.

Teney, C., Lacewell, O.P. & De Wilde, P. (2014). Winners and losers of globalization in Europe: attitudes and ideologies. *European Political Science Review*, 6 (4): 575–595.

Walter, S. (2010). Globalization and the welfare state: Testing the micro foundations of the compensation hypothesis. *International Studies Quarterly*, 54(2): 403-426.

Walter, S. (2017). Globalization and the Demand-Side of Politics: How Globalization Shapes Labor Market Risk Perceptions and Policy Preferences. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 5(1), 55-80.

Week 14. May 31 – Conclusions and Face-to-Face Feedbacks