

PS 169: Political Parties in Comparative Perspective
Updated Jan 29, 2019

Winter 2019

Instructor: Dr. Kathryn Wainfan

Lectures: T, Th 11:00 – 12:15,
Royce 190

Email: kwainfan@ucla.edu

Office Hours: T: 9:30 – 10:30;
Th: 1:00 – 2:00,
4250 Bunche

Course Overview:

Political parties are a fundamental component of democratic governance. These groups both shape and reflect public opinion by recruiting candidates for office, creating campaign platforms and responding to other parties' positions, as well participating in government. In this course we will focus on the roles that political parties play in democracies and what factors shape these roles.

Learning Objectives:

Upon completing this course, students should:

- Understand the functions that political parties serve in democratic governance
- Be able to distinguish between different types of parties and party systems
- Appreciate how and why political parties choose the policies they support
- Understand how parties can control their own elected officials
- Understand how political institutions influence party behavior
- Understand how parties are influenced by outside actors

Pre-requisites

Students should have a basic understanding of the variations of democratic political institutions, particularly presidential vs. parliamentary systems and proportional vs. majoritarian electoral systems. At UCLA, Introduction to Comparative Politics (PS 50) and Comparative Constitutional Design (PS 166) covered these topics.

Requirements and Grading

Your final grade will come from two discussant papers, each worth 30% of your course grade and a cumulative, in-class final, worth 40% of your course grade.

For each *discussant paper* you should choose a week's topic (from weeks 2-4 for the first and 5-7 on the second) and produce a 5-6 page paper. This paper should include a short summary of each reading (1-2 pages total) followed by an analysis bringing together the readings and some suggestions for improvement on either specific readings or overall on the study of the subject itself (2-3 pages). These papers are due on **Wednesday, February 6 and Wednesday, February 27 at 5pm** to turnitin. Late submissions will lose 10% of the possible grade for each 24-hour period or portion thereof past the assigned deadline.

The *cumulative final* will take place on Wednesday, March 20 from 8am to 11am in a location to be announced.

You can receive *extra credit* of 2% towards your course grade by completing a mid-course review by **Friday, February 8 at 5pm**. I will receive a list of those who responded separately from the reviews themselves, so I will not know who wrote which comments.

Regrade requests must be submitted no later than one week after assignments are returned. They should take the form of a type written document, no longer than two double-spaced pages, explaining why a certain part of your assignment should receive more points. If you submit a regrade request, your entire assignment will be reviewed, this means your grade may go up or down.

University and Course Policies

- ***Any suspicion of academic dishonesty including plagiarism and cheating will be reported to the Dean of Students without exception.*** Please consult the university's [guide](#) on academic dishonesty and how to avoid it. ***It is your responsibility to be familiar with these policies and follow them.***
- If you need special accommodations for lectures or exams, it is your responsibility to coordinate this with the Center for Accessible Education ([CAE](#)). ***Please do this as soon as possible as it can take some time.***
- Under [FERPA](#), you have a right to know how you're doing in the course, but ***it is a violation of university policy to discuss grades or any private information via email***, because legally, email is not private communication. Any discussion of your performance in the course, including your grade, must take place in person.
- Under University policy, all TAs and instructors are mandated Title IX reporters. If I am informed of or witness sexual violence or harassment, I am required to report this to UCLA's Title IX coordinator. The coordinator is committed to maintaining anonymity of victims and I am as well.
 - If you have experienced sexual harassment or sexual violence, you can receive confidential support and advocacy at the CARE Advocacy Office for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence, 1st Floor Wooden Center West, CAREadvocate@careprogram.ucla.edu, **(310) 206-2465**.

- You can also report sexual violence or sexual harassment directly to the University’s Title IX Coordinator, 2241 Murphy Hall, titleix@conet.ucla.edu, **(310) 206-3417**.
- Reports to law enforcement can be made to UCPD at **(310) 825-1491**.

Course Schedule

All course readings will be posted on the course website. You should complete the readings for a topic before the lecture. I would recommend reading them in the order given in the syllabus.

Please note that this schedule is subject to change. Make sure to check the course website and syllabus regularly.

Numbers in brackets indicate the total number of pages for the readings.

Week	Date	Topic and Readings
1	T 1/8 Th 1/10	Course Intro Introduction to Political Parties [22 + 37 = 59] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stokes, 1999. “Political Parties and Democracy”, <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i>, pgs 243 – 267. • Gunther and Diamond, 2001. “Types and Functions of Parties”, in <i>Political Parties and Democracy</i>, pts 3 – 39.
2	T 1/15 Th 1/17	Origins and Roles of Political Parties Origins of Parties [57] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cox, 1987. <i>The Efficient Secret</i>, chs 2,6,9, pgs 9-20, 45-67, 91-112. Role of Parties [33] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muller and Strum, 1999. <i>Policy, Office, or Votes?</i>, ch 1, pgs 1-32.
3	T 1/22	Party Systems Party Systems in Established Democracies [26 + 23 = 49] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kitschelt, 2009. “Party Systems” in <i>The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics</i>, pgs 522 – 553. • Boix, 2009. “The Emergence of Parties and Party Systems” in <i>The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics</i>, pgs 499 – 521.

3 (con.)	Th 1/24	<p>Party Systems in New Democracies [19 + 21 = 40]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manning, 2005. “Assessing African Party Systems After the Third Wave”, <i>Party Politics</i>, pgs 707 - 727. • Tavits, 2007. “Party Systems in the Making: The Emergence and Success of New Parties in New Democracies”, <i>British Journal of Political Science</i>, pgs 111 – 133.
4	<p>T 1/29</p> <p>Th 1/31</p>	<p>Party Types</p> <p>Mainstream and Niche Parties [13 + 17 + 17 = 47]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meguid, 2005. “Competition Between Unequals: The Role of Mainstream Party Strategy and Niche Party Success”, <i>American Political Science Review</i>, pgs 347 – 360. • Abou-Chadi, 2014. “Niche Party Success and Mainstream Party Policy Shifts – How Green and Radical Right Parties Differ in their Impact”. <i>British Journal of Political Science</i>, pgs 417 – 433. • Golder, 2016. “Far Right Parties in Europe”, <i>Annual Political Science Review</i>, pgs 477 – 493. <p>Ethnic and Regionalist Parties [10 + 16 + 18 = 44]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chandra, 2005. “Ethnic Parties and Democratic Stability”, <i>Perspectives on Politics</i>, pgs 14 – 248. • Massetti and Schakel, 2016. “Between Autonomy and Succession Decentralization and Regionalist Party Ideological Radicalism”, <i>Party Politics</i>, pgs 59 – 79. • Elias and Tronconi, 2011. “From Protest to Power: Autonomist Parties in Government”, <i>Party Politics</i>, pgs 505-524.
5	<p>T 2/5</p> <p>W 2/6</p>	<p>Parties and Campaigns</p> <p>Position Taking [30 + 22 = 52]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iverson, 1994. “The Logics of Electoral Politics: Spatial, Directional, and Mobilizational Effects”, <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>, pgs 155 – 189. • Rovny, 2012. “Who Emphasizes and Who Blurs? Party Strategies in Multidimensional Competition”, <i>European Union Politics</i>, pgs 269 – 292. <p>Discussant Paper Due, 5pm</p>

5 (con.)	Th 2/7 F 2/8	<p>Electoral Systems [16 + 18 + 14 = 48]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Golder and Stramski, 2009. “Ideological Congruence and Electoral Institutions”, <i>American Journal of Political Science</i>, pgs 90 – 106. **Ok to skip equations • Karp, 2010. “Electoral Systems, Party Mobilisation, and Political Engagement”, <i>Australian Journal of Political Science</i>, pgs 71-89. • Doering and Manow, 2015. “Is Proportional Representation More Favourable to the Left? Electoral Rules and their Impact on Elections, Parliaments, and the Formation of Cabinets”, <i>British Journal of Political Science</i>, pgs 149 -164. <p>Extra Credit Review Due by 5pm</p>
6	T 2/12 Th 2/14	<p>Parties in the Legislature</p> <p>Parties in Government [14 + 20 = 34]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keman, 2006. “Parties and Government: Features of Governing in Representative Democracies” in <i>Handbook of Party Politics</i>, pgs 160 -174. • Green-Pederson and Mortensen. 2010. “Who Sets the Agenda and Who Responds to it in the Danish Parliament? A New Model of Issue Competition and Agenda-Setting” <i>European Journal of Political Research</i>, pgs 257-281. <p>Parties in Opposition [19 + 28 = 47]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kaiser, 2008. “Parliamentary Opposition in Westminster Democracies: Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand”, <i>The Journal of Legislative Studies</i>, pgs 20 – 45. • Morgenstern, et al. 2008. “Parliamentary Opposition in Non-Parliamentary Regimes: Latin America”, <i>The Journal of Legislative Studies</i>, pgs 160 – 189.
7	T 2/19	<p>Intra-Party Politics</p> <p>Candidate Selection [13 + 21 = 34]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazan and Rahat, 2006. “Candidate Selection: Methods and Consequences” in <i>Handbook of Party Politics</i>, pgs 109 – 121. • Cross, 2008. “Democratic Norms and Candidate Selection: Taking Contextual Factors into Account”, <i>Party Politics</i>, pgs 596 – 619.

7 (con.)	Th 2/21	<p>Cohesion and Discipline [10 + 24 = 34]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazan, 2006. “Does Cohesion Equal Discipline? Towards a Conceptual Delineation” in <i>Cohesion and Discipline in Legislatures</i>, pgs 1-10. • Sieberer, 2006. “Party Unity in Parliamentary Democracies: A Comparative Analysis”, <i>The Journal of Legislative Studies</i>, pgs 150-178.
8	<p>T 2/26</p> <p>W 2/27</p> <p>Th 2/28</p>	<p>Parties and Political Institutions</p> <p>Presidentialism [10 + 29 = 39]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoon and Jones West, 2015. “Alone or Together? How Institutions Affect Party Entry in Presidential Elections in Europe and South America”, <i>Party Politics</i>, pgs 393 – 403. • Hicken and Stoll, “Presidents and Parties: How Elections Shape Coordination in Legislative Elections”, <i>Comparative Political Studies</i>, pgs 854 – 883. <p>Discussant Paper Due, 5pm</p> <p>Decentralization [20 + 21 = 41]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorlakson, 2009. “Patterns of Party Integration, Influence, and Autonomy in Seven Federations”, <i>Party Politics</i>, pgs 157 – 177 • Massetti and Schakel, 2013. “Ideology Matters: Why Decentralization Has a Differentiated Effect on Regionalist Parties’ Fortunes in Western Democracies”, <i>European Journal of Political Research</i>, pgs 797 – 821
9	<p>T 3/5</p> <p>Th 3/7</p>	<p>Parties Outside the Legislature</p> <p>Party Membership and Activists [18 + 18 + 11 = 47]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Van Haute and Gaujia, 2015. “Introduction” in <i>Party Members and Activists</i>, pgs 1 – 17 • Enos and Hersh, “Party Activists as Campaign Advertisers: The Ground Campaign as a Principal-Agent Problem”, <i>American Political Science Review</i>, pgs 252 – 278. • Van Biezen and Poguntke, 2014. “The Decline of Membership-Based Politics”, <i>Party Politics</i>, 205 – 216. <p>Interest Groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readings TBD

