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Course Description
Over the last four decades, the world has witnessed the transition of political regimes from different forms of autocracy to various new types of political regimes. The current situation provides ground for disparate, and sometimes outright contradictory, diagnoses about the present state of democracy around the globe and its future development. Clear non-democracies like China show economic growth rates that are overwhelming both in size and duration and rulers in places like Russia and elsewhere have devised sophisticated measures to secure their power and order that turn their political system into hybrid regimes. At the same time, popular uprisings in the Middle East and Northern Africa have brought down long-standing dictators and citizens seek not only social justice and economic growth but also political democracy.

This course is designed to give a broad overview of the literature on the processes of political regime transition in the late 20th and early 21st century. The aim is to provide students with the analytic tools, theories, and concepts that enable them to make better sense of the current political processes in countries around the globe. The list of concepts discussed is comprised of, among others, types of transitions, hybrid regimes, the consolidation, and the qualities of democracy. The topic of this course will be dealt with from a global perspective. We will thus attempt to capture cases and evidence from different world regions. More generally, we will approach the topic of regime changes from the empirical-analytic research tradition.
Course Requirements

The course meets twice a week. Most seminars will be a mix between lecture and seminar. The grading will be composed of the following items:

(1) You are expected to be actively present at all sessions. In case you are unable to attend, you need to inform me via email prior to our class. You are expected to reflect critically on the mandatory readings and to show such reflection by active and stimulating interaction with us and your fellow students in class. Activity in the classroom can be complemented with questions, suggestions and comments to be sent to me at least one hour prior to the next seminar.

(2) Each student will have to do two presentations in class. The first one is shorter (not more than 15-20 minutes) and it must be on one of the more conceptual topics that we are dealing with in sessions 5 - 20. In case the number of participants exceeds the number of available slots, this presentation can be done in a group of two. In all other situations, it must be a single-authored presentation.

(3) The second presentation will be more extensive (around 50 minutes) and needs to be done alone. You are free in choosing the topic of the presentation but it needs to be confirmed by me during the first weeks of the course. The presentation should contain empirical data based on which presenters try to make analytically plausible and substantively interesting points. At least one week prior to your presentation, you are asked to distribute a list of one (!) required and minimum two recommended readings. Each presentation needs to be accompanied by a 1-page handout. Structure, content, and function of this handout will be discussed in the beginning of the course.

(4) You are expected to write a book review. This review must be between 1300-1800 words long (reference list not included) and review at minimum two books that are relevant for this course. You are free in choosing the books but your choice needs to be approved by me. You can choose books that are on the same topic as your (long) presentation. The precise deadline for the paper will be communicated in due time.

Evaluation of Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-class participation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller first presentation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second bigger presentation</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book review</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Outcomes and their assessment

The overall grade will primarily indicate the ability of the students to handle the core concepts and questions in the literature on political regime changes. The learning outcomes of the PhD program are supported and measured by the present course in the following ways: The ability to critically assess scholarly arguments which are based on empirical research; to write an academic paper using an appropriate scholarly tone; and to formulate researchable questions as primarily measured by the final paper and the second, bigger, presentation. The ability to orally present an academic argument is assessed through the two in-class presentations and the in-class participation. The skills to analyze contemporary events related to political regime change and to employ cutting-edge methods are reflected by the bigger presentation. Students will also be exposed to, and expect to critically reflect on, general issues in doing comparative social research, such as concept formation (i.e. how to define, conceptualize, and measure the phenomenon under study) and different strategies of drawing
inference from observational data.

**Reading Material**

All the course material is available in electronic form. Additional material will be posted on the e-learning site of the course at [http://e-learning.ceu.hu/](http://e-learning.ceu.hu/). The password will be communicated to students who enroll for this course. Full references for those readings that appear in brackets below are provided at the very end of this syllabus.

**Course Outline**

**Week 1. Meanings of Democracy**

This week aims at introducing different notions of the term democracy as they are used in the relevant literature. We also discuss the basic framework for concept formation in the empirical comparative social science literature.

**Seminar 1: Definitions and Concepts of Democracy**

**Mandatory:**


Schmitter, Philippe C./Karl, Terry Lynn (1991): What democracy is...and is not. *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 2, issue 3, pp. 75-88

**Recommended:**


(Gerardo. L. Munck 2009), chap 9

**Seminar 2: Concept Formation as such**

**Mandatory:**


**Recommended:**
(Gerring 2012), chapter 5-7


(Schedler and Mudde 2010)

(Schedler 2012a)

(Schedler 2012b)

**Week 2. Measures of Democracy**

In this week we apply our knowledge on the basics of sound concept formation and measurement to some of the major empirical sources for comparatively assessing political regimes from different world regions.

**Seminar 3: Applying and Misapplying Indicators of Democracy**

**Mandatory:**

(Bogaards 2012)


**Recommended:**

(Cheibub, Gandhi, and Vreeland 2009)


(Moon et al. 2006)


Munck, Gerardo L./Snyder, Richard (2004): Mapping political regimes: how the concepts we use and the ways we measure them shape the world we see. Paper prepared for delivery at the 1999 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, Georgia, September 1-5


**Seminar 4: Measures of democracy and their consequences**

**Mandatory:**
Much of the literature on political regime change has moved to the questions of whether or not a democracy, once established, is likely to persist (so-called consolidation of democracy) and whether a democracy, once established and likely to persist, is of higher or lower democratic quality than in other countries. Students learn about the intricacies of both concepts: the consolidation of democracy and the quality of democracy.

**Seminar 5: Meanings, Concepts, and Measures of Consolidation of Democracy**

**Mandatory:**

(Göbel 2010)


**Recommended:**


**Seminar 6: Meanings, Concepts, and Measures of Quality of Democracy**

**Mandatory:**

(Bühlmann, Merkel, and Wessels 2008)

(Gerardo L. Munck 2012)
Recommended:


(Coppedge and Gerring 2011)


(C. H. Knutsen 2010)


Rothstein, Bo/Teorell, Jan (2008): What is quality of government? a theory of impartial government institutions. *Governance*, vol. 21, issue 2, pp. 165-190

(Schmitter 2004)

**Week 4. Transitions of Political Regimes**

Over time, in between two types of political regime lies the period of transition. Students will learn about the differences of this particular moment in time and how best to comparatively study the causes and effects of different modes of transition.

**Seminar 7: Conceptualizing the Transition Period**

(Capoccia and Ziblatt 2010)

**Recommended:**


(Lindberg 2009)


(Schmitter 2010)

(O'Donnell 2010)
Seminar 8: Types of Transitions and Their Effects


(Schneider 2009), chap 7

Recommended:


Bunce, Valerie (1999): The political economy of postsocialism. *Slavic Review*, vol. 58, issue 4, pp. 756-793


McFaul, Michael (2002): The fourth wave of democracy and dictatorship. noncooperative transitions in the postcommunist world. *World Politics*, vol. 54, issue 1, pp. 212-244
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**Week 5: Conditions of Democracy I – Internal Factors**

We discuss which factors are believed to promote democracy. For analytic purposes, we subdivide these factors into different groups but try to keep an eye on the question how different combinations of these factors might jointly exert their impact.

**Seminar 9: Socio-Economic and Institutional Determinants of Democracy**

**Mandatory:**

(Fortin 2011)

(Teorell 2010), chapter 3

**Recommended:**


(Hadenius and Teorell 2005)


(Carl Henrik Knutsen 2010)

Lane, Jan-Erik/Ersson, Svante (2005): The riddle of federalism: does federalism impact on democracy? *Democratization*, vol. 12, issue 2, pp. 163-182


Linz, Juan José (1990): The perils of presidentialism. *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 1, issue 1, pp. 51-69

Linz, Juan José (1990): The Virtues of Parliamentarism. *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 1, issue 1, pp. 84-91


*Seminar 10: Mass attitudes, civil society and democratization*

Mandatory:

(Teorell 2010), chapter 5

(Welzel 2007)
Recommended:


Higley, John/Kullberg, Judith/Pakulski, Jan (1996): The persistence of postcommunist elites. *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 6, issue 2, pp. 133-147

(Howard 2003)


Seligson, Mitchell A. (2002): The renaissance of political culture or the renaissance of the ecological fallacy. *Comparative Politics*, vol. 34, issue 3, pp. 273-292


**Week 6: Conditions of Democracy II – External Factors**

One particular path for regime change is through war by a foreign power. Whether this is a viable option is discussed, the same as if democracy through war is a morally defensible position. In this week we also discuss democracy promotion, diffusion, and so-called colored revolutions as a potential result also of external factors.

**Seminar 11: The International Context, Democracy Promotion, and ‘Colored Revolutions’**

**Mandatory:**

(Beissinger 2007)

(Teorell 2010), chapter 4

**Recommended:**


Finkel, Steven E./Pérez-Liñán, Aníbal/Seligson, Mitchell A./Azpuru, Dinorah (2006): Effects of US foreign assistance on democracy building: results of a cross-national quantitative study. USAID,

(B. H. E. Hale 2005)

(H. E. Hale 2006)

Herd, Graeme P. (2005): Colorful revolutions and CIS: "manufactured' versus "managed" democracy. *Problems of Post-Communism*, vol. 52, issue 2, pp. 3-18


(Lane 2009)


(Radnitz 2010)


(Way 2005)


Special issue of *Contemporary Politics*, 2010, vol. 16, issue 1

**Seminar 12: Democracy by War**

(Merkel 2012)

Recommended:

Special issue on Democracy and War, Democratization, volume 15, issue 3


**Week 7. (New) Authoritarianism and Hybrid Regimes**

Developments over the last decade have shown that the modal regime type that emerged after the last wave of political regime change might well be different forms of non-democracy or, at least, only semi-, hybrid-, or defect democracy. The aim is to develop a classificatory framework and to assess which of the regime typologies currently on offer is best suited to understand political and social realities in countries that few would classify as democratic. Hybrid regimes are widespread but the question is if they can survive or whether - due to their internal logic and/or external pressure - they are prone to either turn into full-blown autocratic regimes or full-blown liberal democracies.

**Seminar 13: Types of Non-Democratic Political Regimes**

**Mandatory:**

(Hadenius and Teorell 2007)

(Magaloni 2008)

(Schedler 2010)

**Recommended:**

(Brooker 2000), introduction


(Gandhi 2008)

(Krastev 2011)

(Levitsky and Way 2010)


(Schedler 2009c)

(Schedler 2011)

(Svolik 2009)

**Seminar 14: Hybrid Regimes, Forms and Effects**

**Mandatory:**

(Brownlee 2009)


**Recommended:**

(Bogaards 2010)


(Gandhi and Lust-Oskar 2009)


(Magaloni 2006)


(Morlino 2009)


(Schedler 2009a)

(Schedler 2009b)


Teorell, Jan/Hadenius, Axel Does type of authoritarianism affect the prospects for democracy? exogenous shocks and contingent democratization. University of Goeteborg: The QOG Institute, Working Paper Series 2006-2,

**Weeks 8: Political Inequalities**

In this week we study one of the most pervasive phenomena in contemporary democratic (and non-democratic) societies: the rise of inequalities. We will distinguish between social and political inequalities. When reflecting on the potential causal relationship between the two, we further differentiate between inequalities within countries (between social groups) and inequalities between countries (both in terms of types and degrees of inequality).

**Seminar 15: Consequences of Social Inequality**

**Mandatory:**

(Haggard and Kaufman 2012)

**Recommended:**


(Anderson and Beramendi 2008)

(Bartels 2008)


(Bourguignon, Levin, and Rosenblatt 2004)

(Gilens 2005)

(Gilens 2009)
(Jaime-Castillo 2009)


Ringen, Stein (2006): Reflections on inequality and equality. Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB), SP I 2006 - 201

(Solt 2008)

(Soroka and Wlezien 2008)


**Seminar 16: Forms of (Political) Inequalities**

*Mandatory:*

(Lijphart 1997)

(Lutz and Marsh 2007)

**Recommended:**

(Alderson 2002)

(Marien, Hooghe, and Quintelier 2010)

(Teorell, Torcal, and Montero 2007)

**Week 9: The Military and Security Bodies; the Middle East and Northern Africa in Comparative Perspective**

This week is dedicated to another important factor for understanding the future of many neo-democracies: the role of the security bodies, most of them inherited from the previous non-democratic regime. In addition, we focus on MENA as the region that is undergoing forms of regime change that so far remain largely not understood.

**Seminar 17: The Military and Security Bodies**

*Mandatory:*

(Croissant et al. 2010)

(Staniland 2008)

**Recommended:**


(Rebecca 1995)

For a collection of relevant websites, go to [http://democracy.stanford.edu/civ_milit.html](http://democracy.stanford.edu/civ_milit.html)

**Seminar 18: Similarities and Differences between MENA and Other World Regions**

**Mandatory:**

(Bellin 2012)

(Cavatorta 2010)

**Recommended:**

(Albrecht and Schlumberger 2004)

(Barany 2011)

(Braizat 2010)

(Carey and Reynolds 2011)

(Plattner 2011)

(Schlumberger 2007)

(Volpi and Cavatorta 2006)

(Way 2011)
Week 10: Wrap up: The Field of Democratization Studies – Where Do We Stand and Where Should We Go?

Seminar 19+20:

Mandatory:

(Coppedge 2012), chapter 10

Schmitter, Philippe C. (n.d.): Retrospective Wisdoms from Twenty-Five Years of Reflection on Transitions from and Consolidation of Democracy, European University Institute, and Central European University, mimeo

Recommended:


(Geddes 1999)

(O’Donnell 2010)

(Gerardo L. Munck 2011)

(Schmitter 2010)

(Teorell 2010), chapter 7

Week 11+12: Student presentations

Week 11 and 12 are mainly dedicated to the presentation of topics selected and presented by students. Each student presents for maximum 50 minutes, followed by a discussion guided by the student. Each student needs to select one mandatory and at least two recommended readings on the topic of their presentation. In general, the aim is both to have students deepen their knowledge on an aspect of the course theme that they care most about and to provide some first supervised experience in being in the position of an instructor.

Seminars 21-24: Student presentation

Mandatory:

Assigned by presenter

Recommended:

Assigned by presenter
Reference list for texts in brackets


Lane, David. 2009. “‘Coloured Revolutions’ as a Political Phenomenon,”. “*Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 25(2).


———. 2012. “Conceptualizing the Quality of Democracy: The Framing of a New Agenda for Comparative Politics.”


Teorell, Jan, Mariano Torcal, and Jose Ramon Montero. 2007. “Political Participation.”


### Some Important Books


(Bunce and Wolchik 2011)


(Coppedge 2012)

Diamond, Larry/Linz, Juan J./Lipset, Seymour Martin (1989): *Democracy in Developing Countries: Latin America*. Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publisher


(Gandhi 2008)


(Grusky 2001)


(Lindberg 2006)

(Linz 2000)


