

Professor Karen Ferree
Office: 391 SSB
Phone: (858) 822 2309

Fall Quarter 2009
Fridays: 9-11:50
E-mail: keferree@ucsd.edu

PS 224: Elections in Consolidating Democracies

Objectives

As noted by Fareed Zakaria, “illiberal democracy is a growth industry.” Elections have spread like wildfire to all corners of the globe, including to places that are poor and non-Western and have long histories of authoritarian rule. Often these elections are highly flawed. Parties and party systems are weak; incumbents are omnipotent, oppositions divided; fraud, violence, and clientelism flourish; electorates are uneducated and poorly informed and may be guided more by atavistic attachments to tribe and clan than “rational” evaluations of policy or performance. Although the category of “illiberal democracies” has increased rapidly during the past two decades, our understanding of how elections operate in these countries is quite limited. The goal of this class is to review some of the literature pertaining to these elections. In the process, we will be asking a series of questions. How do elections work in these countries? What is the “reality on the ground” and is it addressed by our current theories? Are the old theories relevant? How might they need to be changed in order to accommodate new data? Where are new theories most needed? The course considers a variety of important electoral outcomes or aspects of elections (party system institutionalization, party weakness, clientelism, single party dominance, fraud, public opinion formation, violence, ethnic politics, economic voting, political business cycles) and considers both institutional and behavioral, elite and mass level sources for these outcomes. While the course is divided into ten separate weeks, students should realize that many of these distinctions are arbitrary, and most selections are relevant for multiple weeks.

Assignments

This class has written and oral assignments. **The written assignment:** three 5-7 page review papers. These should be similar to (but better, since you are now older and wiser) your field seminar papers. They should critically engage the literature for a particular week, both reviewing it (succinctly but in depth) and making a critical argument. These are due at the beginning of class (no extensions, no exceptions). If you do this option, you should plan to write one paper from the first section of the syllabus (parties), one from the second section (voters), and one from the third (electoral quality).

The oral assignment: each student will be designated to lead two class discussions (students will typically work in teams). The seminar leaders will circulate by e-mail to class participants five discussion questions by **noon the Thursday** before the class meeting. The seminar leaders will also be charged with introducing the week’s topic by starting out class with a 10-15 minute overview (see attached guidelines). You should hand out copies of your overview the day of class. Your leadership will constitute **20%** of your grade. I will be available to discuss your discussion questions – please schedule an appointment and send me a draft of them prior to our meeting.

Students are expected to do the readings and be prepared to discuss them for each week’s session. The final **20%** of your grade comes from class participation. *Active participation* in

seminar discussions is an important skill to master and essential for getting a good grade in this class!! **So come prepared to TALK!**

Readings

Most articles are easily available on-line (see me for more on this). A few very recent articles may require photocopying. In addition, many of the selections come from books. You should buy or have access to the following texts:

Mainwaring, Scott and Timothy Scully. 1995. *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Reilly, Benjamin. 2001. *Democracy in Divided Societies: Electoral Engineering for Conflict Management*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lehoucq, Fabrice and Ivan Molina. 2002. *Stuffing the Ballot Box: Fraud, Election Reform, and Democratization in Costa Rica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schaffer, Frederic C. 1998. *Democracy in Translation*. Chapter 4 "Demokaraasi and Voting Behavior."

Bratton, Michael, Robert Mattes, and E. Gyimah-Boadi. 2005. *Public Opinion, Democracy, and Market Reform in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horowitz, Donald. 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chandra, Kanchan. 2004. *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed*. Cambridge University Press. C

Scheiner, Ethan. 2006. *Democracy without Competition in Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkinson, Steven. 2005. *Votes and Violence: Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snyder, Jack. 2000. *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*. New York: Norton.

Stokes, Susan C., editor. 2001. *Public Support for Market Reforms in New Democracies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lindberg, Staffan I. 2006. *Democracy and Elections in Africa*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven I. Wilkinson, editors. 2007. *Patrons, Clients, and Politics: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Magaloni, Beatriz. 2006. *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and Its Demise in Mexico*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greene, Kenneth F. 2007. *Why Dominant Parties Lose: Mexico's Democratization in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manning, Carrie. 2008. *The Making of Democrats*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

1. Flawed Elections: Should We Study Them? (September 25)

Zakaria, Fareed. 1997. "The Rise of Illiberal Democracy." *Foreign Affairs*, November 1997.

Schedler, Andreas. 2002. "The Nested Game of Democratization by Elections." *International Political Science Review* 23(1): 103-122.

Lindberg, Staffan I. 2006. *Democracy and Elections in Africa*, Chapter Four: "The Self-Reinforcing Power of Elections." Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

PART I: PARTIES AND PARTY SYSTEMS

2. Institutionalization of party systems (October 2)

Note: For this week, it will be most useful to review Cox (1997). You might also look at Cox's 1999 review piece in the *Annual Review of Political Science*.

Mainwaring, Scott and Timothy Scully. 1995. *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Introduction.

Manning, Carrie. 2008. "Mozambique: Electoral Politics and the Underdevelopment of Renamo." Chapter 2 of *The Making of Democrats*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Riedl, Rachel Beatty and J. Tyler Dickovick. 2008. "Democratic Transitions and Institutional Consolidation: Authoritarian Legacies, Ethnic Politics, and Party Systems in West Africa." Paper presented at the 102nd meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 28-31, 2008.

Levitsky, Steven and Maxwell Cameron. 2003. "Political parties and Regime Change in Fujimori's Peru." *Latin American Politics and Society* 45 (3: Fall): 1-33.

Moser, R. 1999. "Electoral Systems and the number of parties in postcommunist states." *World Politics* 51(3):359-84.

Chhibber, Pradeep and Ken Kollman. 1998. "Party Aggregation and the Number of Parties in India and the United States." *American Political Science Review* 92(2): 329-342.

Ferree, Karen. 2009. "The Social Origins of Electoral Volatility in Africa." Forthcoming, *British Journal of Political Science*.

Tavits, Margit. 2005. "The Development of Stable Party Support: Electoral Dynamics in Post-Communist Europe." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2): 283-298.

Additional Readings:

Caramani, Daniele. 2004. *The Nationalization of Politics: the Formation of National Electorates and Party Systems in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moon, Woojin. 2005, "Decomposition of Regional Voting in South Korea: Ideological Conflicts and Regional Interests," *Party Politics* 11(5):579-599.

Jones, Mark P. 1997. "Federalism and the Number of Parties in Argentine Congressional Elections." *Journal of Politics* 59(2): 538-49.

Coppedge, Michael. 1997. "The Dynamic Diversity of Latin American Party Systems." *Party Politics* 4(4): 547-568.

Roberts, Kenneth M. and Eric Wibbels. 1999. "Party Systems and Electoral Volatility in Latin America: A Test of Economic, Institutional, and Structural Explanations." *American Political Science Review* 93(3): 575-90.

Kuenzi, Michelle and Gina Lambright. 2001. "Party System Institutionalization in 30 African Countries." *Party Politics* 7(4): 437-468.

Bielasiak, Jack. 2002. "The Institutionalization of Electoral and Party Systems in Postcommunist States." *Comparative Politics* 34(January): 189-210.

Mainwaring, Scott and Edurne Zoco. 2007. "Political Sequences and the Stabilization of Interparty Competition: Electoral Volatility in Old and New Democracies." *Party Politics* 13(2): 155-178.

3. Party discipline and party labels: the Brazil Debate (October 9)

James Snyder and Michael Ting. 2002. "An Informational Rationale for Political Parties." *American Journal of Political Science* 46(1): 90-110.

Carey, John, and Matthew Shugart. 1995. "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote." *Electoral Studies* 14(4): 417-439.

Mainwaring, Scott. 1997. "Multipartyism, Robust Federalism, and Presidentialism in Brazil." In *Presidentialism and Democracy in Latin America*, edited by Scott Mainwaring and Matthew Soberg Shugart. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Figueiredo, Argelina and Fernando Limongi. 2000. "Presidential Power, Legislative Organization, and Party Behavior in Brazil." *Comparative Politics*, January, 32(2):151-170.

Samuels, David. 2000. "The Gubernatorial Coattails Effect: Federalism and Congressional Elections in Brazil." *The Journal of Politics* 62(1): 240-253.

Desposato, Scott. 2006. "The Impact of Electoral Rules on Legislative Parties: Lessons from the Brazilian Senate and Chamber of Deputies." *Journal of Politics* 68(4), November 2006: 1015-1027.

Additional Readings

Samuels, David. 2000. "Concurrent Elections, Discordant Results: Presidentialism, Federalism, and Governance in Brazil." *Comparative Politics* 33(1): 1-20.

Ames, Barry. 1995. "Electoral Rules, Constituency Pressures, and Pork Barrel: Bases of Voting in the Brazilian Congress." *Journal of Politics*, May, 57(2): 324-343.

Desposato, Scott. Chapter 4 of Dissertation, "Federalism and Parties in Brazil."

4. Clientelism, Pork and Patronage (October 16)

Kitschelt, Herbert and Steven I. Wilkinson. 2007. "Citizen-politician linkages: an introduction." In *Patrons, Clients, and Politics: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, edited by Herbert Kitschelt and Steven I. Wilkinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixit, Avinash and John Londregan. 1996. "The Determinants of Success of Special Interests in Redistributive Politics." *Journal of Politics* 58(November): 1132-55.

Keefer, Philip, and Razvan Vlaicu. 2008. "Democracy, Credibility, and Clientelism." *Journal of Law and Economics*, September 2008.

Stokes, Susan. 2005. "Perverse Accountability: A Formal Model of Machine Politics with Evidence from Argentina." *American Political Science Review* 99(3): 315-326.

Van de Walle, Nicolas. 2007. "Meet the new boss, same as the old boss? The evolution of political clientelism in Africa." In *Patrons, Clients, and Politics: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, edited by Herbert Kitschelt and Steven I. Wilkinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calvo, Ernesto, and Maria Victoria Murillo. 2004. "Who Delivers? Partisan Clients in the Argentine Electoral Market." *American Journal of Political Science* 48(4): 742-757.

Matthew Shugart. 1999. "Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, and the Provision of Collective Goods in Less-Developed Countries." *Constitutional Political Economy* 10: 53-88.

Additional Readings

Scott, James. 1972. "Patron-Client Politics and Political Change in Southeast Asia." *American Political Science Review* 66(1).

- Magaloni, Beatriz, Alberto Diaz-Cayeros, and Federico Estevez. 2003. "The Erosion of Party Hegemony, Clientelism, and Portfolio Diversification: The Programa Nacional de Solidaridad (Pronosal) in Mexico." Typescript: Stanford University.
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 2000. "Linkages between Citizens and Politicians in Democratic Politics." *Comparative Political Studies* 33(6/7).
- Schaffer, Frederic C. 1998. *Democracy in Translation: Understanding Politics in an Unfamiliar Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Piattoni, Simona. 2001. *Clientelism, Interests and Democratic Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, James and Thierry Verdier. 2003. "The Political Economy of Clientelism." Manuscript.
- Molinar, Juan and Jeffrey Weldon. 1994. "Electoral Determinants and Consequences of National Solidarity." In *Transforming State-Society Relations in Mexico: The National Solidarity Strategy*, edited by Wayne A. Cornelius, Ann L. Craig, and Jonathan Fox. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, UCSD.
- Dresser, Denise. 1994. "Bringing the Poor Back In: National Solidarity as a Strategy of Regime Legitimation." In *Transforming State-Society Relations in Mexico: The National Solidarity Strategy*, edited by Wayne A. Cornelius, Ann L. Craig, and Jonathan Fox. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, UCSD.
- Medina, Luis Fernando and Stokes, Susan. 2002. "Clientelism as Political Monopoly." Paper delivered at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, August 29-September 1.
- Barkan, Joel and Michael Chege. 1989. "Decentralizing the State: District Focus and the Politics of Reallocation in Kenya." *JMAS* 27(3):431-453.
- Kasara, Kimuli. 2004. "Ethnic Geography, Democracy, and the Taxation of Agriculture in Africa." Working paper.
- Fisman, Raymond. 2001. "Estimating the Value of Political Connections." *American Economic Review* 91(4): 1095-1102.
- Fox, Jonathan. 1994. "The Difficult Transition from Clientelism to Citizenship." *World Politics* 46(2): 151-84.
- Auyero, Javier. 2000. "The Logic of Clientelism in Argentina: An Ethnographic Account." *Latin American Research Review* 35(3): 55-81.
- Miguel, Edward. 2003 (?) "Tribe or Nation? Nation Building and Public Goods in Kenya versus Tanzania." *World Politics*.
- Miguel, Edward, and Mary Kay Guggerty. 2002. "Ethnic Diversity, Social Sanctions, and Public Goods in Kenya."
- Lindberg, Staffan. 2003. "It's Our Time to Chop: Do elections in Africa feed neopatrimonialism rather than counter-act it?" *Democratization* 14(2).
- Leonard Wantchekon. 2003. "Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin." *World Politics* (April, 2003): 399-422.
- Medina, Luis Fernando and Susan C. Stokes. 2007. "Monopoly and monitoring: an approach to political clientelism." In *Patrons, Clients, and Politics: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, edited by Herbert Kitschelt and Steven I. Wilkinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schady, Norbert. 2000. "The Political Economy of Expenditures by the Peruvian Social Fund (FONCODES), 1991-95." *American Political Science Review* 94(2): 289-304.

5. Single Party Dominant Systems and Weak Oppositions (October 23)

Diaz-Cayeros, Alberto, Beatriz Magaloni, and Barry Weingast. 2003. "Tragic Brilliance: Equilibrium Hegemony and Democratization in Mexico." Manuscript, Stanford University.

Magaloni, Beatriz. 2006. *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and Its Demise in Mexico*. Chapter One: Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greene, Kenneth F. 2007. *Why Dominant Parties Lose: Mexico's Democratization in Comparative Perspective*. Chapter Two: A Theory of Single-Party Dominance and Opposition Party Development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rigger, Shelley. 2000. "Machine Politics in Protracted Transition in Taiwan." *Democratization* 7(3): 135-152.

Scheiner, Ethan. 2006. *Democracy without Competition in Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 5 and 6.

Arriola, Leonardo. 2008. "A Theory of Opposition Coordination." Book chapters presented at the WGAPE Meetings, UCLA, May 2008.

Ferree, Karen. 2009. *The Political Origins of South Africa's "Racial Census" Elections*. Chapter 1.

Additional Readings

Baum, Jeeyang. "Breaking Authoritarian Bonds: The Political Origins of the Taiwan Administrative Procedure Act." 2005 (October). *Journal of East Asian Studies* 5(3):365-399.

Niou, E. and P. Paolino. 2003. "The Rise of the Opposition Party in Taiwan: Explaining Chen Shui-bian's Victory in the 2000 Presidential Election." *Electoral Studies* 22.

Molinar Horcasitas, Juan. 1996. "Changing the Balance of Power in a Hegemonic Party System: the Case of Mexico." In Arendt Lijphart and Carlos Waisman (eds.), *Institutional Design in New Democracies: Eastern Europe and Latin America*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Kohno, Masaru. 1997. "Electoral Origins of Japanese Socialists' Stagnation." *Comparative Political Studies* 30(1), February: 55-77.

Curtis, Gerald L. 1988. *The Japanese Way of Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press. Pages 1-79.

Pempel, T.J., ed. 1990. *Uncommon Democracies: The One-Party Dominant Regimes*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

PART II: VOTERS

6. Culture and Public Opinion (October 30)

Schaffer, Frederic C. 1998. *Democracy in Translation*. Chapter 4 “Demokaraasi and Voting Behavior.”

James Gibson, “A Sober Second Thought: An Experiment in Persuading Russians to Tolerate.” *American Journal of Political Science* 42(3), July 1998: pp. 819-850.

David Patel. 2008. “Ayatollahs on the Pareto Frontier: Islam, Identity, and Electoral Coordination in Iraq.” Unpublished manuscript.

Bratton, Michael, Robert Mattes, and E. Gyimah-Boadi. 2005. *Public Opinion, Democracy, and Market Reform in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2.

7. Ethnicity (November 6)

Horowitz, Donald. 1985. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Chapters 7-8.

Chandra, Kanchan. 2004. *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 – 5.

Posner, Daniel N. 2004. “The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tambukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi.” *American Political Science Review* 98(4): 529-545.

Cheesman, Nic, and Robert Ford. 2008. “Ethnicity and Party Support in Africa: The Limits of ‘Census Politics.’” Paper presented at the 102nd meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 28-31, 2008.

Eifert, Benn, Ted Miguel, and Daniel Posner. 2007. “Political Sources of Ethnic Identification in Africa.” *Afrobarometer* Working Paper No. 89.

Reilly, Benjamin. 2001. *Democracy in Divided Societies: Electoral Engineering for Conflict Management*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter Four: “The Rise and Fall of Centripetalism in Papua New Guinea.”

Horowitz, Jeremy, and James Long. 2008. “Information, Ethnicity, and Strategic Voting in Kenya’s 2007 Election.” Unpublished manuscript.

Additional Reading

Ferree, Karen. 2006. “Explaining South Africa’s Racial Census.” *Journal of Politics* 68(4): 803-815.

Posner, Daniel. 2005. *Institutions and Ethnic Politics in Africa*. Cambridge University Press.

Dickson, Eric and Kenneth Scheve. 2006. "Social Identity, Political Speech, and Electoral Competition." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 18(1): 5-39.

Battle, Martin, and Jennifer C. Seely. 2007. "It's All Relative: Competing Models of Vote Choice in Benin." *Afrobarometer* Working Paper No. 78.

Bratton, Michael, and Mwangi S. Kimenyi. 2008. "Voting in Kenya: Putting Ethnicity in Perspective." *Afrobarometer* Working Paper No. 95.

Ferree, Karen, and Jeremy Horowitz. 2007. "Identity Voting and the Regional Census in Malawi." *Afrobarometer* Working Paper No. 72.

Norris, Pippa, and Robert Mattes. 2003. "Does Ethnicity Determine Support for the Governing Party?" *Afrobarometer* Working Paper No. 26.

Ferree, Karen, Clark Gibson, and Barak Hoffman. 2008. "Coordination, Contamination, and Social Diversity in South African Local Elections." Paper presented at the 102nd meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 28-31, 2008.

8. Economic Voting (November 13)

Stokes, Susan C., editor. 2001. *Public Support for Market Reforms in New Democracies*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Introduction and chapter on Peru.

Magaloni, Beatriz. 2006. *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and Its Demise in Mexico*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 5.

Dominguez, Jorge I., and James A. McCann. 1995. "Shaping Mexico's Electoral Arena: Construction of Partisan Cleavages in the 1988 and 1991 National Elections." *American Political Science Review* 89: 34-48.

Bratton, Michael, Robert Mattes, and E. Gyimah-Boadi. 2005. *Public Opinion, Democracy, and Market Reform in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 11, 12.

Posner, Daniel N. and David J. Simon. 2002. "Economic Conditions and Incumbent Support in Africa's New Democracies: Evidence from Zambia." *Comparative Political Studies* 35(3): 313-336.

Lindberg, Staffan and K.C. Morrison. 2008. "Are African Voters Really Ethnic or Clientelistic? Survey Evidence from Ghana." *Political Studies Quarterly* 123: 95-122.

Ferree, Karen. 2009. *The Political Origins of South Africa's "Racial Census" Elections*. Chapter 5.

Additional Reading

Block, Steven, Karen Ferree, and Smita Singh. 2003. "Multiparty Competition, Founding Elections and Political Business Cycles in Africa." *Journal of African Economies*.

Youde, Jeremy. 2005. "Economics and Government Popularity in Ghana." *Electoral Studies* 24: 1-16.

Arriola, Leonardo. Forthcoming. "Ethnicity, Economic Conditions, and Opposition Support: Evidence from Ethiopia's 2005 Elections." *Northeast African Studies* 10(2).

Tucker, Joshua. 2006. *Regional Economic Voting: Russia, Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic, 1990-1999*. Cambridge University Press.

PART III: ELECTION QUALITY

9. Electoral Fraud (November 20)

Lehoucq, Fabrice and Ivan Molina. 2002. *Stuffing the Ballot Box: Fraud, Election Reform, and Democratization in Costa Rica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Magaloni, Beatriz. 2006. *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and Its Demise in Mexico*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 8.

Geisler, Gisela. 1993. "Fair? What Has Fairness Got to Do with It? Vagaries of Election Observations and Democratic Standards." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 31(4): 613-637.

Hyde, Susan. Forthcoming. "The Observer Effect in International Politics: Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *World Politics*.

Beaulieu, Emily, and Susan D. Hyde. Forthcoming. "In the Shadow of Democracy Promotion: Strategic Manipulation, International Observers, and Election Boycotts." *Comparative Political Studies*.

Additional reading

Gobel, Christian. 2004. "Beheading the Hydra: Combating Political Corruption and Organized Crime." *China Perspectives* 56, November-December.

Cox, Gary and Morgan Kousser. 1981. "Turnout and Rural Corruption: New York as a Test Case." *American Journal of Political Science* 25(4): 646-663.

Eisenstadt, Todd A. 2002. "Measuring Electoral Court Failure in Democratizing Mexico." *International Political Science Review* 23(1): 47-68.

10. Violence (December 4)

Hegre, Harvard, Tanja Ellingsen, Scott Gates, and Nils Peter Gleditsch. 2001. "Toward a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816- 1992." *American Political Science Review*.

Wilkinson, Steven. 2004. *Votes and Violence: Electoral Competition and Ethnic Riots in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 2, 5, 7.

Snyder, Jack. 2000. *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*. New York: Norton. Chapters 1-3, 5, 6.

Makumba, John. 2002 "Zimbabwe's Hijacked Election". *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 4:87-101.

Barry Bearak and Celia W. Dugger, "As Zimbabwe's Election Nears, Assassins Aim at the Grass Roots." *The New York Times*, June 22, 2008.

Template for Weekly Presentations

One or two students will introduce the topic each week. This entails critically summarizing the readings and proposing a set of questions or issues that will help structure the discussion. The presentations, approximately 15 minutes in length, are meant to develop seminar communication skills and to encourage participation by all members.

The following “template” provides a sense of what is required.

- Begin your presentation by introducing and *motivating* the topic. The heading in the syllabus is a good clue but try to go beyond it, indicating, for example, *why* the topic is important. For example, why is it relevant to discuss “Institutionalization?” What are the key issues and questions the authors are grappling with? Are there important issues the authors ignore but should also consider? How do these readings relate to/challenge our “standard” views of elections? How do they relate to questions of democratic consolidation?
- Review the main readings of the week. Succinctly state each author’s main argument and findings. What outcomes is each author trying to explain? What variables do they use in explaining these outcomes? How does the article relate to the main themes of the week? *Avoid summarizing the details - stick to the most central points.* These summaries should be **very brief** and to the point. They should focus on providing a road-map of the readings – not a definitive review of them.
- Handouts or transparencies are extremely useful. These will help highlight main points and focus attention on areas of debate for further discussion. Keep them simple! As a rule, less is more.
- Close your presentation with a set of **discussion questions** aimed at getting the discussion going. These are very important, and the more thought you put into them, the better. These might highlight major unanswered (even unasked) questions that the readings do not deal with. What are the authors forgetting? They might tie a week’s readings into earlier themes and readings. They might push on themes some or all of the readings develop. They might explore the empirical evidence the readings bring to bear on their questions. They might suggest ways that the readings challenge existing understandings of elections. They might ask how the week’s topic relates to the broader issue of democratic consolidation. In general, your questions should stimulate conversation by focusing the class on some aspect or aspects of the readings that are interesting, contradictory, revolutionary, etc. At the same time, good questions avoid being so broad that they abstract away from the central issues of the readings. **Please circulate these by 2pm the Wednesday before the class meeting.**

