

Course Manual

Comparative and International Politics Research Master's Core Specialization Course

Course Catalogue Number
7525F003FY

Instruction language
English

Time Period
Thursday 9:00-12:00

Location: see <https://rooster.uva.nl>

Lecturer: Dr. Mike Medeiros
Office: Nieuwe Achtergracht 166, Room B10.05
Office Hours: By appointment
E-mail: m.medeiros@uva.nl

Entry requirements
Admission to the Research Master's Social Sciences (RMSS).

Course Objectives & Learning Outcomes

The course introduces students to major research questions in Political Science, with a particular focus on the subfields of Comparative Politics and International Relations. Through a series of guest lectures, students would be acquainted with researchers in the Department of Political Science and their research projects. At the end of the course students are expected to

- gain a general overview of the substantive areas of inquiries in the field of Comparative and International Politics.
- understand different theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches applied to examine inquiries in Comparative and International Politics.
- be able to formulate and motivate original research questions on the basis of the existing literature.

Manner & Form of Assessment

Two class assignments (20x2=40%); Term paper (40%); In-Class Presentation (10%); Participation (10%)

The student will produce two short (5 double-spaced pages, approximately 1,500 words) assignments that will consist of synthesizing the readings assigned for a particular class. The first part of the assignment will consist of a synthesis of the readings; the second part will critically analyse them. Each assignment must be submitted via Canvas by the Wednesday (midnight) prior to the class in which the materials are discussed. No late assignments will be accepted. Further details will be provided in class.

The student will also produce a term paper in the form of a literature review of 15 double-spaced pages (approximately 4,500 words). They are expected to choose a research topic that (broadly) falls in one of the five themes discussed in the course. The student is expected to conduct a systematic review of the existing body of literature on the chosen topic. The student is also required to identify gaps in the scholarship and to formulate an original research question that contributes to the existing literature as well as propose tentative answers (hypotheses) to this question. In order to get useful feedback, the student **must** present, **by November 16th**, a preliminary outline that will count for 5% of the term paper. The paper must be submitted via Canvas by December 19th. No late assignments will be accepted. Further details will be provided in class.

The student will also present in-class their term paper. The presentation should not exceed 10 minutes.

Finally, the student's participation will be evaluated in each session based on class presence as well as the quality of their comments and questions. Students are expected to complete the required readings each week and to contribute to the seminar discussion. A foreseeable absence should be motivated and discussed with the lecturer at least 48 hours beforehand.

Rules regarding Fraud and Plagiarism

The provisions of the Regulations Governing Fraud and Plagiarism for UvA Students apply in full. Access this regulation at <http://www.student.uva.nl/preventfraud-plagiarism>. Plagiarism is presenting someone else's ideas as your own. Copying, paraphrasing or translating of text needs to be referenced according to academic standards. Plagiarism will be sanctioned severely.

Literature

Extensive use will be made of online journal resources via the digital library. If not, the readings will be available via Canvas or through provided webpage links.

Schedule

Week	Date	Lecturer	Content
1	Nov 1 st	Mike Medeiros & Gijs Schumacher	Introduction to political science research & Experimental research design
2	Nov 8 th	Ursula Daxecker	Political violence
3	Nov 15 th	Tom van der Meer	Political trust
4	Nov 22 nd	Geoffrey Underhill	Political economy
5	Nov 29 th	Imke Harbers	State formation and the subnational state
6	Dec 6 th	Jana Krause	Gender, peace and security
7	Dec 13 th	Mike Medeiros	Student presentations

Week 1 (November 1st)

Introduction to political science research & Experimental research design

The first class will be divided into two segments.

In the first part, students will be introduced to the aims of the core specialization course, as well as to the expectations regarding properly conducted academic research.

The second part of the class will consist of a presentation on the role of experiments in political science research. Experimental research is a method, with roots in psychology, that is increasingly used in political science. The students will be exposed to different types of experiments and to the various topics in which experimental designs are used to conduct research. Special guest Gijs Schumacher will briefly introduce the students to some of the innovative research that he is conducting.

Required

Brians, C. L. et al. 2011. *Empirical Political Analysis: Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*. 8th ed. Boston: Longman. Chapter 1.

Öhberg, P. & . Medeiros. 2017. A Sensitive Question? The Effect of an Ethnic Background Question in Surveys. *Ethnicities* (Online First).

Bakker, B., G. Schumacher & M. Rooduijn. 2018. The Populist Appeal: Personality and Anti-Establishment Communication. *Open Science Framework*. October 12. www.osf.io/yr6um.

Recommended

Landman, T. 2002. *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction*. Routledge. Chapter 1.

Druckman, J. N., D. P. Green, J. H. Kuklinski, and A. Lupia. 2006. The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science. *American Political Science Review* 100(4): 627-635.

Green, D. P., M. C. McGrath & P. M. Aronow. 2013. Field Experiments and the Study of Voter Turnout. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 23(1): 27-48.

Schoonvelde, M., A. Brosius, G. Schumacher and B. Bakker. 2018. Liberals Lecture, Conservatives Communicate: Analyzing Complexity and Ideology in 381,609 Speeches. *Open Science Framework*. October 8. www.osf.io/s3gdm.

Week 2 (November 8th)

Ursula Daxecker - Political Violence in International Relations: New Research on Election Violence

Recent research in international relations has shown a decline in the incidence of war and the number of battle-related deaths in conflict (Pinker 2011, Goldstein 2011, Lacina 2006). While explanations are still contested, the global decline in violence has been attributed to greater democratization, less ethnic discrimination, increasing economic integration, and greater scope for conflict management by the UN and other international organizations. Yet despite this decline in the magnitude of large-scale violence (or perhaps even because of it), trends in lower-level violence do not necessarily coincide with global trends. Terrorist incidents appear to be increasing, political violence often spikes around elections or other consequential political changes, and decreases in political violence could inadvertently increase opportunities for criminal actors.

This session will examine recent work on election violence as one type of lower-level political violence that still occurs routinely despite a global decline of violence. Since 1990, more than 30% of elections held outside of advanced, industrialized democracies experienced deadly electoral violence. We will examine under what conditions elites resort to criminal or political violence during the electoral process (Daxecker 2018; Trejo and Ley 2018), whether and how the conduct of elections contributes to post-election mobilization (Daxecker, Di Salvatore, and Ruggeri 2018, Straus 2011), and how experiencing election violence shapes political behavior at the individual level (Young 2018). These contributions showcase the diversity of methodological approaches to the study of election violence, including qualitative case studies, analyses of subnational observational data, individual-level data from surveys, and experimental methods.

Required

Daxecker, U., J. Di Salvatore & A. Ruggeri. 2018. Fraud is what People make of it? Election Fraud, Perceptions, and Protesting in Nigeria. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. Available on Canvas.

Trejo, G. & S. Ley. 2018. Why did Drug Cartels go to War in Mexico? Subnational Party Alternation, the Breakdown of Criminal Protection, and the Onset of Large-Scale Violence. *Comparative Political Studies* 51(7): 900-937.

Young, L. Forthcoming. The Psychology of State Repression: Fear and Dissent Decisions in Zimbabwe. *American Political Science Review*. http://www.laurenelyssayoung.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Young_PsychPolRisk_Paper.pdf

Recommended

Daxecker, U. 2018. Unequal Votes, Unequal Violence: Malapportionment and Election Violence in India. Available on Canvas.

Straus, S. 2011. 'It's Sheer Horror Here': Patterns of Violence during the First Four Months of Côte d'Ivoire's Post-Electoral Crisis. *African Affairs* 110(440): 481-489.

Week 3 (November 15th) 10:00-13:00

Tom van der Meer - The Politics and Economics of Political Trust

For decades, trust in government and trust in parliament are argued to be in decline. Political trust would be in crisis, either due to democratic erosion, generational replacement, institutional overload, and the rise of populism. But what evidence is there that political trust is in decline? What are trust's root sources? And why should we care? By answering these questions, this meeting provides an overview of the political trust literature, which is at the heart of political science. Specifically, it will focus in-depth on the political and economic roots of political trust, and its implications for our understanding of citizens, the nature of trust, and the state of democracy.

Required

Anderson, C. J. & C. A. Guillory. 1997. Political Institutions and Satisfaction with Democracy: A Cross-National Analysis of Consensus and Majoritarian Democracy. *The American Political Science Review* 91(1): 66-81.

Marien, S. 2011. The Effect of Electoral Outcomes on Political Trust. A Multi-level Analysis of 23 Countries. *Electoral Studies* 30(4): 712-726.

van der Meer, T. 2017. Dissecting the Causal Chain from Quality of Government to Political Support. In C. van Ham, J. Thomassen, K. Aarts, & R. Andeweg (Eds.), *Myth and Reality of the Legitimacy Crisis: Explaining Trends and Cross-National Differences in Established Democracies* (pp. 136-155). Oxford University Press. Available on Canvas.

van der Meer, T. 2018. Economic Performance and Political Trust. In E. M. Uslander (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social and Political Trust*. Oxford University Press.

Vavreck, L. 2015. The Long Decline of Trust in Government, and Why That Can Be Patriotic. *New York Times*, 4/7/2015. <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/04/upshot/the-long-decline-of-trust-in-government-and-why-that-can-be-patriotic.html>

Week 4 (November 22nd)

Geoffrey Underhill - Political Economy: Comparative and International Dimensions

Political economy is the ‘before there was disciplinary specialization’ origin of the social sciences, from economics to sociology to political science. This makes it the master social science, prior to the emergence of the others. The classical political economists of the 17th and 18th century Enlightenment began the study of society: how communities provide for themselves and distribute the (hopefully) surplus of their labours, and how they organize and govern themselves as a result. Scholars began to ask why it was that some societies were better governed and more prosperous (and powerful) than others. The central question of the field remains one of understanding the relationship between the way that societies are governed, the way they manage and share their resources, and the success of this combination if success there might be. Central to this enterprise is exploring the tension between individual and ‘small-group’ interests and actions versus the broader ‘public good’ or general interest. Some seem to receive more than they ‘deserve’ and if not, they simply take it to the detriment of others, and who determines the rules of the game is crucial to the outcome. The idea that economic and political freedoms (government by consent and the freedom to do what one wishes to do to earn one’s keep) are one and the same, this was central to the enquiry. From political economy emerged the specialized social sciences we know today. In this sense, contemporary political economy is (or should be!) more than a consideration of how politics affects our economy and market relationships, or the other way around. The field of political economy continues to present the case that the problem of creating and distributing wealth and how well this turns out (and for whom) is intimately part of how we govern ourselves and what we are as societies. Political economy challenges the illusion that economic and political dynamics are separate and contrasting domains obeying separate ‘laws of motion’.

This session will explore how the desires and preferences of individuals produce patterns of collective behaviour in the first place, and how that leads to various economy-politics combinations. Because individuals cannot achieve very much on their own, their mutual interdependence produces patterns of collective action the outcomes of which are better for some than for others. This implies conflicts of interest that may or may not be resolved. The resulting arrangements can range from the predatory and exploitative to the inclusive and consensual. A relevant observation is that *all* successful advanced political economies have big governments, high taxes, lots of redistribution, open economies (‘markets’, so liberal economies cannot be bad), and crucially they are also all democracies. There must be something going on.

Required

Sabel, C. & J. Zeitlin, J. 1985. Historical Alternatives to Mass Production: Politics, Markets and Technology in Nineteenth-Century Industrialization. *Past and Present* 108: 133-176.

Commons, J. R. 1932. The Problem of Correlating Law, Economics, and Ethics. *Wisconsin Law Review* 8(1): 3-26

B. Eichengreen & D. Leblang. 2008. Democracy and Globalization. *Economics and Politics* 20(3): 289-334.

Recommended

D. North, J. Wallis & B. Weingast. 2009 *Violence and Social Orders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Entire book is available via the Digital Library.

Week 5 (November 29th)

Imke Harbers - State Formation and the Subnational State

Following in the footsteps of many of the classics in the field, countries have generally been understood as the “natural units of analysis in the comparative study of politics, and the causes and consequences of cross-country variation in governance are often assumed to be contained within them. These units, however, are themselves endogenous to the political processes that created them. The “weight of the state” on societies shapes how citizens and local communities interact with and experience the state. Most countries do not intervene in the lives of citizens to the same degree as European states do. Moreover, the degree to which formal boundaries within and between countries are meaningful varies widely across time and space.

Substantively, this guest lecture focuses on the process of state formation and state capacity, and on how differences within and between states influence how we can think about contemporary institutions. Methodologically, acknowledging that units of analysis are embedded in broader political processes challenges researchers to conceptualize and measure interdependence. Throughout, I will draw on examples from my own work on Latin America to highlight ways to think about structures of dependence, and to illustrate why examining the extent to which boundaries delimit political processes should be a core focus of the field. The chapters from Scott’s book provide a classic argument of how and why states, mostly in Europe, came to play an important role in the lives of citizens. Hooghe and Marks, in turn, draw on new data to examine the dynamics of jurisdictional design within countries. My article on Ecuador examines within-country variation in state capacity, and also illustrates some of the empirical challenges of studying politics inside countries. Finally, the PS piece (which is fairly short) illustrates some of the methodological issues and opportunities that arise from questioning political boundaries.

Required

Hooghe, L. & G. Marks. 2016. Chapter 4: Designing Jurisdictions. *Community, Scale, and Regional Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available on Canvas.

Harbers, I. 2015. Taxation and the Unequal Reach of the State: Mapping State Capacity in Ecuador. *Governance* 28(3): 373-391.

Harbers, I. & M. C. Ingram. 2017. Incorporating Space in Multimethod Research: Combining Spatial Analysis with Case-Study Research. *PS: Politics and Political Science* 50(4): 1032-1037.

Recommended

Scott, J. C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State*. New Haven: Yale University Press, Part 1 (pp. 11-83); available digitally via the UvA library.

Week 6 (December 6th)

Jana Krause: Gender, Peace and Security

With the adoption of UN Security Council resolution 1325 in the year 2000, the international community has recognized women's participation in peacemaking and peacebuilding and gendered forms of violence as questions of international security. The resolution came into being based on transnational feminist activism and coalitions of women civil society groups' advocacy work. Although feminist research and activism had long established a connection between international security and the well-being of women, empirical (both quantitative and qualitative) research into gender, conflict dynamics and peacebuilding emerged more recently and now represents a vibrant academic field. Much initial research and policy attention has focused on the issue of sexual violence in war and women's protection. More recently women's political participation in war-making and peacemaking and its impact on conflict and peacebuilding has received further scrutiny.

This session introduces the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda and discusses key academic debates about women in peacebuilding. We will examine a plurality of approaches to the study of gender and peacebuilding, taking into account essentialist assumptions, instrumentalist and constructivist theoretical approaches. The discussion will draw on the lecturer's qualitative and quantitative research on gender dynamics in conflict and peacebuilding.

Required

Tickner, J. A. & J. True. 2018. A Century of International Relations Feminism: From World War I Women's Peace Pragmatism to the Women, Peace and Security Agenda. *International Studies Quarterly*, 62(2), 221-233.

Krause, J., W. Krause & P. Bränfors. 2018. Women's Participation in Peace Negotiations and the Durability of Peace. *International Interactions*, 44(6), 985-1016.

Caprioli, M. 2005. Primed for Violence: The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly* 49(2): 161-178.

Recommended

Braithwaite, A. & L. B. Ruiz. 2018. Female Combatants, Forced Recruitment, and Civil Conflict Outcomes. *Research & Politics* 5(2).

Hudson, V. M., et al. 2009. The Heart of the Matter: The Security of Women and the Security of States. *International Security* 33(3): 7-45.

Hudson, V. M., D. L. Bowen & P. L. Nielsen. 2015. Clan Governance and State Stability: The Relationship between Female Subordination and Political Order. *American Political Science Review* 109(3): 535-555.

Shair-Rosenfield, S. & R. M. Wood. 2017. Governing Well after War: How Improving Female Representation Prolongs Post-conflict Peace. *The Journal of Politics* 79(3): 995-1009.

Duncanson, C. 2015. Hegemonic Masculinity and the Possibility of Change in Gender Relations. *Men and Masculinities* 18(2): 231-248.