

# POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

David A. Siegel

## **Course information:**

Course Number: CPO 5934 / POS 5698

Time: Monday 9:00 - 11:45 am

Place: Bellamy Building 113

## **Contact information for Professor:**

E-mail: dsiegel@fsu.edu

Tel: 850-645-0083

Office: 541 Bellamy Building

Office Hours: Monday 2:00 - 3:00 pm or by appointment.

## **Course Description**

What falls under the rubric of political institutions varies widely by who is doing the categorization. The so-called old institutionalism focused on the formal rules, administrative procedures, and legislative, executive, and judicial bodies that scripted how political behavior functioned. The intent here was primarily to describe how rules operated. A strong reform tradition operated alongside this, seeking to match these rules better to normative issues associated with democracy and governmental accountability. This perspective dominated political science for decades, until a strong focus on individual behavior overtook the field. This new school of behavioralism centered on the actions and political knowledge and beliefs of individuals, observing and theorizing about this directly, rather than inferring aggregate outcomes as functions of formal rules. This was a significant advance in that now scholars could formulate and test theories as to the reasons people partook in various political behaviors, and strict behavioralism also took its turn as the dominant paradigm.

Yet gradually political scientists began to turn back to the role of institutions. Not as rules that in and of themselves determined political outcomes, but rather as sets of incentives—either exogenously set or endogenously ar-

rived at—which structure the behavior of political actors influenced by them. Institutions are in some sense the “rules of the game” in political life, in that individual behavior is constrained by these institutions. Yet institutions do not arise from some primeval soup; they are created in turn by individuals, sometimes unconsciously, but often quite deliberately to solve political problems. This view, dubbed the new institutionalism, treats both formal rules and structures and informal rules and norms as institutions, which may be exogenously set or endogenously determined.

It is here that this course begins. The first two weeks go into the difference between old and new institutionalism in more depth, and expand upon the general concepts discussed in the previous paragraph. With this background established, we then try to understand in sequence the role of institutions in contributing to and solving problems of preference aggregation, information aggregation, cooperation and coordination, agenda-setting, and finally delegation and agency.

Many of the readings use game-theoretic models and/or statistical analyses. It is assumed that all of the students have had introductory classes in *both* game theory and econometrics, and these are prerequisites for the course. One objective of this course is to familiarize the students with some of the models that are often used in the institutions literature, as well as some of the econometric techniques and choices frequently applied when testing institutional theories. As part of your preparation for class, you are expected to spend a significant amount of time working your way through the models in the readings. We will also devote time in class to discuss both the formal and statistical models used in this literature. The second objective of the course is to give students an array of theoretical approaches for use in their own research. The general theories as well as the specific applications are designed to be relevant across political science subfields, and you are explicitly encouraged to explore the ways in which models traditionally used in one subfield might be useful in others.

### **Required Texts:**

The following books are available at the university bookstore.

- Kenneth A. Shepsle and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics*.

Norton.

- John D. Huber and Charles R. Shipan. 2002. *Deliberate Discretion: The Institutional Foundations of Bureaucratic Autonomy*. Cambridge.
- Gary W. Cox and Mathew D. McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda*. Cambridge.
- Aldrich, John H. 1994. *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. Chicago.
- J. Knight. 1992. *Institutions and Social Conflict*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Keith Krehbiel. 1991. *Information and Legislative Organization*. University of Michigan Press.
- North, Douglass. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

In addition to the books listed above, we will read a number of articles and unpublished manuscripts. These will be available on the web or on the door to my office. Students are responsible for locating the assigned readings. Some additional recommended readings are listed below each topic on the schedule. These are included as a preliminary (and non-exhaustive) guide for further reading.

## Grading

- Participation: 20%. All students are required to have completed the readings for each week before class begins, and *everyone* should be prepared to discuss the readings during class. Intelligent participation in departmental talks and at conferences will be highly valued throughout your professional career and you should practice this ability now. I expect you to provide evidence that you have done the readings in a thoughtful and careful manner.
- Discussion leadership: 20%. Each student will be assigned one or more seminars to lead. Students should prepare a list of discussion questions,

and e-mail them to the rest of the class by 5 pm of the Friday before the class they lead. The depth of and preparation evidenced in these questions, along with the leading of the seminar itself, will determine the student's grade.

- Final exam: 60%. The exam will be take-home and is due on April 21, 2007. The exam questions are attached to this syllabus.

### **Tentative Schedule:**

#### APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF INSTITUTIONS

#### **Week 1: January 7** — From Old to New Institutionalism

##### REQUIRED READING:

“Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System: A Report of the Committee on Political Parties (1950). APSR, Vol. 44, No. 3, Part 2, Supplement.

J. March and J. Olsen. 1984 “The New Institutionalism: Organization Factors in Political Life.” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 78, No. 3, pp. 734-749.

Daniel Diermeier and Keith Krehbiel. 2003. “Institutionalism as a Methodology”. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 15(2): 123-144.

John Carey. 2000. “Parchment, Equilibria, and Institutions”. *Comparative Political Studies* 33(6/7): 735-761.

##### RECOMMENDED READING:

Kenneth A. Shepsle and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics*. Norton. Chapter 11.

#### **Week 2: January 14** — Institutions as Rules of the Game

##### REQUIRED READING:

J. Knight. 1992. *Institutions and Social Conflict*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

J. Landa. 1986. "The Political Economy of Swarming in Honeybees." *Public Choice* 51(1): 25-38.

G. Mackie. 1996. "Ending Footbinding and Infibulation: A Convention Account." *American Sociological Review* 61, 999-1017.

RECOMMENDED READING:

J. Vromen. 2002. "Stone Age Minds and Group Selection: What Difference Do They Make? Constitutional Political Economy, 13:173-198.

J. Alt and K. Shepsle. 1998. "Rules, Restrictions, Constraints: Structure and Process in the New Institutional Economics." *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*. 154 (4): 735-43.

AGGREGATING PREFERENCES

**Week 3: January 21 (MLK Jr. Day; may be rescheduled)** — Aggregation in the Absence of Institutions: Why Institutions are Needed

REQUIRED READING:

Kenneth A. Shepsle and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics*. Norton. Chapters 3 - 4.

William H. Riker. 1988 [1982]. *Liberalism Against Populism*. Waveland Press. Chapters 3-6 (pp. 41-168).

M. Olson. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Harvard University Press. Chapters 1-2.

RECOMMENDED READING:

William H. Riker. 1988 [1982]. *Liberalism Against Populism*. Waveland Press.

M. Olson. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Harvard University Press.

Kenneth May. 1952. "A Set of Independent Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Simple Majority Rule." *Econometrica* 20(4):680-684.

Keith Krehbiel. 1998. *Pivotal Politics*. University of Chicago Press. Selections.

Kenneth A. Shepsle. 1974. "On the Size of Winning Coalitions". *American Political Science Review* 68: 505-18.

Kenneth A. Shepsle. 1974. "Minimum Winning Coalitions Reconsidered". *American Political Science Review* 68: 522-24.

Arthur Lupia and Mathew D. McCubbins. 2005. "Lost in Translation: Social Choice Theory is Misapplied Against Legislative Intent." *Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues* 14: 585-617.

**Week 4: January 28** — Elections and Voting Rules: Spatial Location

REQUIRED READING:

Kenneth A. Shepsle and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics*. Norton. Chapter 5.

Anthony Downs. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper and Row. Chapter 8.

Gary W. Cox. 1990. "Centripetal and Centrifugal Incentives in Electoral Systems". *American Journal of Political Science* 34(4): 903-935.

Kenneth A. Shepsle and Barry R. Weingast. 1981. "Structure-Induced Equilibrium and Legislative Choice". *Public Choice* 37(3): 503-519.

RECOMMENDED READING:

Ken Kollman, Scott E. Page, and John H. Miller. 1992. "Adaptive Parties in Spatial Elections". *American Political Science Review*. 86: 929-37.

Jay K. Dow. 2001. "A Comparative Spatial Analysis of Majoritarian and

Proportional Elections”. *Electoral Studies* 20: 109-125.

Thomas Palfrey. 1984. “Spatial Equilibria with Entry”. *Review of Economic Studies* 51: 139-156.

Duncan Black. 1987 [1958]. *The Theory of Committees and Elections*. Kluwer. Selections.

### **Week 5: February 4** – Electoral Rules and Party Systems.

#### REQUIRED READING:

Gary Cox. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World’s Electoral Systems*. Cambridge. Chapters 1-2, 7, 10.

William R. Clark and Matt Golder. 2006. “Rehabilitating Duverger’s Theory: Testing the Mechanical and Strategic Modifying Effects of Electoral Laws.” *Comparative Political Studies* 39: 679-708.

Thomas Brambor, William Clark and Matt Golder. 2006. “Understanding Interaction Models: Improving Empirical Analyses.” *Political Analysis* 14: 63-82.

Pradeep K. Chhibber and Irfan Nooruddin. 2004. “Do Party Systems Count? The Number of Parties and Government Performance in the Indian States.” *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 152-187.

#### RECOMMENDED READING:

Maurice Duverger. 1963 [1954]. *Political Parties*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Selections.

Thomas Brambor, William Clark and Matt Golder. Forthcoming. “Are African Party Systems Different?” *Electoral Studies*.

Joel D. Barkan, Paul J. Densham, and Gerard Rushton. 2006. “Space Matters: Designing Better Electoral Systems for Emerging Democracies.” *American Journal of Political Science* 50: 926-939.

Kenneth A. Shepsle and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics*. Norton. Chapters 6-7.

Pradeep K. Chhibber and Ken Kollman. 2004. *The Formation of National Party Systems*. Princeton.

Anna Harvey. 1998. *Votes Without Leverage: Women in American Electoral Politics*. Cambridge.

## INFORMATION AGGREGATION

### **Week 6: February 11** — Committees, Elections, and Parties

#### REQUIRED READING:

Keith Krehbiel. 1991. *Information and Legislative Organization*. University of Michigan Press.

James D. Fearon. 2006. “Self-Enforcing Democracy”. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Snyder, James M. Jr. and Michael M. Ting. 2000. “An Informational Rationale for Political Parties” *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 90-110.

#### RECOMMENDED READING:

Timothy Feddersen and Wolfgang Pesendorfer. 1997. “Voting Behavior and Information Aggregation in Elections With Private Information.” *Econometrica*, Vol. 65, No. 5, pp. 1029-1058.

David Austen-Smith and Jeffrey S. Banks. 1996. “Information Aggregation, Rationality, and the Condorcet Jury Theorem.” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 90, No. 1, pp. 34-45.



## COOPERATION/COORDINATION

### Week 7: February 18 — Identity

#### REQUIRED READING:

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

James Habyarimana, Macartan Humphreys, Daniel N. Posner, and Jeremy Weinstein. “Ethnic Identifiability: An Experimental Approach.” Unpublished paper ([http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/posner/pdfs/ethnic\\_identifiability.pdf](http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/posner/pdfs/ethnic_identifiability.pdf)).

James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin. 1996. “Explaining Interethnic Cooperation”. *American Political Science Review* 90(4): 715-735.

Jenna Bednar and Scott E. Page. 2006. “Can Game(s) Theory Explain Culture? The Emergence of Cultural Behavior within Multiple Games”. *Rationality and Society* 18(4).

#### RECOMMENDED READING:

Daniel N. Posner. 2005. *Institutions and Ethnic Politics in Africa*. Cambridge.

Kanchan Chandra. 2005. “Ethnic Parties and Democratic Stability”. *Perspectives on Politics* 3(2): 235-252.

Daniel N. Posner. 2007. “Regime Change and Ethnic Cleavages in Africa”. *Comparative Political Studies* 40, 11, pp. 1302-1327.

Kanchan Chandra and Cilanne Boulet. 2005. “Ethnic Diversity and Democratic Stability.” Unpublished manuscript, NYU.

Kanchan Chandra. 2004. *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed: Patronage and Ethnic Headcounts in India*. Cambridge.

Jenna Bednar and Scott E. Page. 2006. "Culture, Institutional Performance, and Path Dependence". Unpublished manuscript, Michigan.

David D. Laitin. 1995. "Marginality: A Microperspective". *Rationality and Society* 7: 31-57.

### **Week 8: February 25 — Party Formation**

#### REQUIRED READING:

John H. Aldrich. 1995. *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. Chicago.

#### RECOMMENDED READING:

Sona N. Golder. 2006. *The Logic of Pre-Electoral Coalition Formation*. Ohio State University Press.

Kenneth A. Shepsle and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics*. Norton. Chapter 12.

E. E. Schattschneider. 1942. *Party Government*. Rinehart.

Gary W. Cox and Mathew D. McCubbins. 1993. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*. University of California Press.

Michael Laver and Norman Schofield. 1998 [1990]. *Multiparty Government*. Michigan.

David Austen-Smith and Jeff Banks. 1988. "Elections, Coalitions and Legislative Outcomes". *American Political Science Review* 82: 405-22.

Lanny Martin and Randolph T. Stevenson. 2001. "Cabinet Formation in Parliamentary Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science*. 45: 33-50.

**Week 9: March 3** - Constitutions, Path Dependence, and Coordination Failure

REQUIRED READING:

Kenneth A. Shepsle and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics*. Norton. Chapters 8 - 10.

Barry R. Weingast. 1997. "The Political Foundations of Democracy and the Rule of Law". *American Political Science Review* 91: 245-263.

Douglass C. North and Barry R. Weingast. 1989. "Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth-Century England", *The Journal of Economic History* 49: 803-832.

Milgrom, Paul R., Douglass C. North, and Barry R. Weingast. 1990. "The Role of Institutions in the Revival of Trade: The Law Merchant, Private Judges, and the Champagne Fairs." *Economics and Politics* 2: 1-23.

M. Olson. 1993. "Dictatorship, Democracy, and Development, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 3, pp. 567-576.

North, Douglass. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press. [[selections]]

RECOMMENDED READING:

Adam Przeworski. 1991. *Democracy and the Market*. Cambridge.

William Clark, Matt Golder & Sona Golder. 2006. "Power & Politics: Exit, Voice, and Loyalty Revisited." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia.

## AGENDA-SETTING

**Weeks 10-11: March 17 and 24** — Setting the Agenda.

### REQUIRED READING:

Kenneth A. Shepsle and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics*. Norton. Chapter 14.

Thomas Romer and Howard Rosenthal. 1978. "Political Resource Allocation, Controlled Agendas, and the Status Quo". *Public Choice* 34: 2743.

David P. Baron and John Ferejohn. 1989. "Bargaining in Legislatures". *American Political Science Review*, 83(4):1181-206.

Peter C. Ordeshook and Thomas R. Palfrey. 1988. "Agendas, Strategic Voting, and Signaling with Incomplete Information." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 441-466

John D. Huber. 1996. "The Vote of Confidence in Parliamentary Democracies". *American Political Science Review* 90(2): 269-282.

Gary W. Cox and Mathew D. McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda*. Cambridge.

### RECOMMENDED READING:

See the comparative studies of legislatures from Cox & McCubbins on their "Setting the Agenda" webpage, <http://mccubbins.ucsd.edu/settingtheagenda/index.html>.

Daniel Diermeier and Timothy J. Feddersen. 1998. "Cohesion in Legislatures and the Vote of Confidence Procedure". *American Political Science Review* 92(3): 611-621.

John D. Huber. 1992. "Restrictive Legislative Procedures in France and the United States". *American Political Science Review* 86(3): 675-687.

Kathleen Bawn. 1999. "Money and Majorities in the Federal Republic of Germany: Evidence for a Veto Players Model of Government Spending". *American Journal of Political Science* 43(3): 707-736.

## DELEGATION AND AGENCY

**Weeks 12-13: March 31 and April 7** — Legislative Delegation and Electoral Control.

### REQUIRED READING:

John D. Huber and Charles R. Shipan. 2002. *Deliberate Discretion: The Institutional Foundations of Bureaucratic Autonomy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kenneth A. Shepsle and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics*. Norton. Chapter 13.

J. Bendor, A. Glazer, and T. Hammond. 2001. "Theories of delegation". *Annual Review of Political Science*. 4: 235.

Mathew D. McCubbins and Thomas Schwartz. 1984. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols and Fire Alarms." *American Journal of Political Science* 28: 165-179.

Ferejohn, John. 1986. "Incumbent performance and electoral control. *Public Choice* 50: 525.

Kaare Strom, Wolfgang C. Muller, and Torbjorn Bergman (Editors). 2003. *Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies*. Oxford. Chapters 1-4. (Pp. 3-220.)

### RECOMMENDED READING:

Kenneth A. Shepsle and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics*. Norton. Chapter 15.

Stu Jordan. 2005. "Public Participation in Delegated Decisions". Manuscript, University of Rochester.

Christopher Reenock and Sarah Poggione. 2004. "Agency Design as an Ongoing Tool of Bureaucratic Influence". *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 29: 383-406.

Christopher Reenock. "The Political Architecture of Environmental Regulatory Agencies: Do Legislators Draft Institutional Designs to Get What They Want?" Manuscript, FSU.

Adam Przeworski. 2003. "Principal-Agent Framework" (Chapter 4), "Governments and Private Agents: Regulation" (Chapter 6), "Politicians and bureaucrats: Oversight" (Chapter 7), and "Citizens and Politicians: Representation" (Chapter 8) in *States and Markets: A Primer in Political Economy*. Cambridge. Pp. 55-75, 99-157.

#### **Week 14: April 14** — International Institutions and Domestic Judiciaries

##### REQUIRED READING:

Helen V. Milner. 2005. "Why Multilateralism? Foreign Aid and Domestic Principal-Agent Problems". Manuscript, Princeton ([www.princeton.edu/~hmlner/working%20papers/delegation7-05CUP.pdf](http://www.princeton.edu/~hmlner/working%20papers/delegation7-05CUP.pdf)).

David Stasavage and Philip Keefer. 2003. "The Limits of Delegation: Veto Players, Central Bank Independence, and the Credibility of Monetary Policy". *American Political Science Review* 97: 407-23.

Georg Vanberg. 2001. "Legislative-Judicial Relations: A Game-Theoretic Approach to Constitutional Review". *American Journal of Political Science* 45: 346-361.

Charles R. Shipan. 2000. "The Legislative Design of Judicial Review: A Formal Analysis". *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 12(3): 269-304.

##### RECOMMENDED READING:

Daniel L. Nielson and Michael J. Tierney. 2003. "Delegation to International Organizations: Agency Theory and World Bank Environmental Reform". *International Organization* 57: 241-276.

Peter D. Feaver. 2003. *Armed Servants: Agency, Oversight, and Civil-Military Relations*. Harvard.

Georg Vanberg. 2001. "Legislative-Judicial Relations: A Game-Theoretic Approach to Constitutional Review". *American Journal of Political Science* 45: 346-361.

Charles R. Shipan. 2000. "The Legislative Design of Judicial Review: A Formal Analysis". *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 12(3): 269-304.

Jeffrey K. Staton and Georg Vanberg. 2005. "The Value of Vagueness: A Positive Theory of Judicial Opinions". Unpublished manuscript, FSU.

Jeffrey K. Staton. 2006. "The Politics of Judicial Impartiality." Unpublished manuscript, FSU.

Gretchen Helmke. 2002. "The Logic of Strategic Defection: Judicial Decision-Making in Argentina Under Dictatorship and Democracy". *American Political Science Review* 96:291-30.

**Final exam due Monday, April 21.**

## **Additional Information**

### **Students with Disabilities**

Instructors will make reasonable accommodations for students with physical, mental or learning disabilities. Students with disabilities which may require some modification of seating, testing, or other class requirements are to inform the instructor (after class or during the instructor's office hours) so that appropriate arrangements may be made. Students should register with the Student Disability Resource Center and bring a letter to the instructor from the SDRC indicating the required accommodations in the first week of class.

### **Department/Collegiate Complaint Procedures**

A student who has a complaint against any member of the college's teaching staff is responsible for following the procedures described in the Student Handbook at the following website: [www.fsu.edu/Books/Student-Handbook/](http://www.fsu.edu/Books/Student-Handbook/). The student should attempt to resolve the issue with the faculty member or teaching assistant involved. Lacking a satisfactory outcome, the student can turn to the department chair. If a satisfactory outcome still is not obtained, the student can turn to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Complaints may concern inappropriate faculty conduct (including inappropriate course materials), incompetence in oral communications, inequities in assignments, scheduling of examinations at other than authorized and published times, failure to provide disability accommodations, or grading grievances. FSU has a specific policy regarding sexual harassment - this can be found at <http://www.auditservices.fsu.edu/>.

### **Plagiarism and Cheating**

All students are bound by the Academic Honor Policy (<http://www.fsu.edu/~dof/academics.htm>). You are expected to be honest and honorable in your fulfillment of assignments and in test-taking situations. Plagiarism and cheating are serious forms of academic misconduct. Examples of them are given in the Student Handbook: <http://www.fsu.edu/Books/Student-Handbook/2003codes/honor.html>. The department of Political Science works with individual instructors to detect plagiarism and cheating and to ensure that appropriately serious punishments are applied. Instructors who detect cheating or plagiarism may decide to reduce the student's grade on the assignment or course, even to assign an F. The instructor will discuss the matter with the student, put any agreement regarding academic penalty in writing signed by both the instructor and the student, and report the infraction to the Chair and the University judicial office. If no agreement can be reached, the instructor refers the matter to the Academic Honor system Hearing Panel.



**Your Responsibilities**

Your responsibilities to this class - and to your education as a whole - include attendance and participation. This syllabus details specific expectations the instructor may have about attendance and participation. You have a responsibility to help create a classroom environment where all may learn. At the most basic level, this means you will respect the other members of the class and the instructor and treat them with the courtesy you hope to receive in turn.

**Plus-Minus Grading**

All the department's instructors can append plus or minus grades to the letter grades they assign for the course. If the instructor does not specifically indicate in the syllabus that he or she will not assign plusses or minuses, students should assume that this form of grading will be used.

Please visit the Political Science Department's website: <http://www.fsu.edu/~polisci/>. It is frequently updated with new events and procedures in our department.