

IS 435WX: Comparative Political Economy

Howard Sanborn, Ph.D.

Meeting Time: 1300-1350 MW, 1315-1405 F in 449 SSH

Office Hours: 1000-1100 MTuF, 1300-1600 Tu in 433 SSH

email: sanbornhb@vmi.edu // text: 540-458-1467 // Slack: profsanborn.slack.com

Office Hours

I will hold office hours on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Fridays from 1000-1100 and also on Tuesdays from 1300-1600. You can also make an appointment to meet in person, by phone or, preferably, by e-mail. Please do feel free to stop by with any questions or concerns you may have. I will post my schedule for the term on my office door so you will know when I am in class, prepping to teach, writing, or in meetings. If you have quick questions, you can text me at the mobile phone number above or message me on my Slack channel at any time.

Course Goals

In this course, we will evaluate the important interaction of economic and political systems across several countries and systems. Our initial focus will be on some of the more important, foundational philosophers of modern political economy. We will then review how the economic framework of a given state impacts the workings of the political process. In addition, we will learn how political decisions often impact the growth and development of markets. Examples will be drawn from a number of different countries, from the United Kingdom, Spain, and the post-Communist states of Eastern Europe to China and Japan. We will place special emphasis on the oft-debated link between capitalism and democracy; we will also study the tension between political ideology and economic growth, as well as the influence of business cycles and perceptions of economic performance on voter preference during elections. Finally, we will conclude with a discussion of development, both the meaning of the term and the various paths offered by scholars and policy-makers.

Course Sites

Important information for this course will be posted on Canvas. Lecture notes, links to the readings, discussion forums and the most up-to-date copy of the syllabus will be available on this site. I will also post documents to our class Slack channel, particularly as they pertain to our collaborative group project.

Requirements and Grading

Journal

To make sure you stay on top of the reading and listening load, I require you to submit journal reactions for each class. The goal is not to summarize but to demonstrate that you have done the reading or listened to the podcasts by connecting themes of the class together and posing questions for further discussion.

You should write at least 400 words in your entry; this can include questions for discussion in class later that day. I will only count the top 25 grades; this should give you six “passes” where, if you skip the assignments, you will not be penalized. Do remember you are responsible for all readings and assignments, even on a day that you do not submit an entry.

I will primarily be looking to see that you completed the assigned articles/podcasts and are addressing issues from across the entirety of the article(s) for the day. I will also be looking for discussion questions to use in class. You can discuss the readings and podcasts with your classmates, but it will be considered an honor violation if you look over someone else's journal entry before writing your own.

You will start entering journal posts on 19 January. The journal entries will be graded as follows:

- Check-plus (9.5 out of 10): A well-thought out response to the reading that both demonstrates an understanding of the issues discussed and poses questions that encourage us to take analytical steps.
- Check (8.5): A good discussion of the issues from the reading or podcast, with questions raised about the authors' aims.
- Check-minus (7): A response that mentions some important parts of the article(s) under discussion. The student has not demonstrated that they have read the article or processed the podcast completely or accurately, and questions are too vague for use in class discussion.
- Zero: Either the entry was not turned in or presented no evidence that the student had completed any meaningful part of the reading.

In total, the journals will count as **40%** of your final grade. **Do stay on top of these; there will be no make-ups and no exceptions available.** Budget out your passes in advance. **These journal responses are due every class day, where a reading or podcast is assigned, by 0900.**

Literature Review and Research Design

You will complete a literature review and research design (**50% of your grade**) on a topic of your choosing. This is a way for you to synthesize knowledge around an issue or academic discussion that interests you. You may choose from the topics in this course, or you may pursue a different line of thought. This literature review will be completed in stages:

1. First, you must submit a 300-word proposal to me **in class on 9 February**. This should outline a preliminary question you might want to investigate in your research design. At the very least, you should discuss in detail the themes that most interest you. After turning in this proposal, we will meet individually to review the parameters of the proposal and work out any potential problems that arise. I will provide you verbal feedback.
2. Next, you should complete a draft of your literature review (Appendix C) pertaining to your selected topic. You will need to use academic sources, government webpages, collected data, etc. to demonstrate that you have surveyed the discussions that have taken place over your topic. The literature review (10%) should be at least 1500 words long; for more guidance, see this short piece: Knopf, Jeffrey W. "Doing a Literature Review." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 39. no. 1 (2006): 127-132). **This assignment is due on 2 March**. I will provide you written feedback for your revisions.
3. Then, you will submit a first draft of your research design that outlines how you plan to test your question. This should include a theory, a definition of concepts, and hypotheses. This draft of your research design (10%) should be about 2000 words long **This draft will be due on 6 April**. I will provide you written feedback for your revisions and I will take time in class to hold a peer review session with your classmates.
4. You will then combine your literature review and research design into one full draft of a research design (4000 words); this should include an introduction and concluding discussion section. **You will submit this on Canvas on 20 April**.
5. **You will then have until CAD on 4 May to turn in your final, completed paper (30%).**

Group Modeling Assignment

Over the last few weeks of the semester, we will work on a modeling assignment together in and outside of class. We will develop a question and quickly review literature for theories on how to answer it. Then, we will collect data and develop a model as a test of our hypotheses. You will be graded on the presentation of your survey of the literature, the appropriateness of your assumptions, and the reasoning behind your suggestions for our model. This will include written contributions to our potential research note.

The group modeling assignment will make up **10% of your grade**.

Required Texts

There are no texts for purchase. Almost all of the readings below are available through online databases, such as EBSCO or JSTOR. Some of the early texts (Smith, Marx, etc) are available for free in their entirety from a variety of online sources. A very small number are from my personal collection. I will post all of these readings to the course website on Canvas to save you the time of searching. I encourage you to either print out these articles and take notes or download them to your laptops/tablets. Plan on bringing the readings, or your detailed notes, to class on the assigned day.

On some days, you will listen to podcasts from a number of sources. EconTalk is a series hosted by Professor Russell Roberts of George Mason University and produced by the Library of Economics and Liberty. China 21 is produced by the 21st Century China Program at the University of California, San Diego's School of Global Policy. These episodes can be downloaded from iTunes, though you can Google for them and find episode guides and transcriptions (for EconTalk).

Accommodations and Other Matters:

In order to protect your privacy please make an appointment to see me outside of class for questions about academic honesty, accommodations for disabilities, and grades. I am always happy to help you in any way I can. In addition, there will be a penalty of 10% per day for late assignments, excluding the journals, which will **not** be accepted late.

Schedule

Read or listen to the assignments *for the day they are listed*

Week 1: 15 January - 19 January

Wednesday: *Introduction to the course*

Thursday: *Lecture*

We will meet at 2000 for a lecture in the Gillis Theater. I will provide you compensatory time later in the semester.

Section I: Introduction to Political Economy

What are the general debates that occur amongst these major theorists? In what manner should political systems arrange themselves? Consider, too, the causal mechanism: does economics drive the choice of political system, or are there cultural/sociological factors that mold the economic order? How do each of

these theorists address the strengths and weaknesses of their forebears? What does it mean to take an economic perspective on political phenomena? What are the tradeoffs involved? Is a rational perspective an immoral one?

Friday: *The Free Market*

1. Smith, Adam. Book 1, Chapters 7 and 8: “Of the Natural and Market Price of Commodities” and “Of the Wages of Labor” (read pp. 1-5, 10-13). From *The Wealth of Nations*. 1776.
2. EconTalk Podcast: Russ Roberts and Mike Munger on How Adam Smith Can Change Your Life, 13 October 2014.

Week 2: 22 January - 26 January

Monday: *Critiques of Capitalism*

1. Marx, Karl. Chapter 25: “The General Law of Capitalist Accumulation” (read Sections 1-4). From *Das Kapital: Volume I*. Translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. 1867.
2. EconTalk Podcast: Thomas Piketty on Inequality and Capital in the 21st Century, 22 September 2014.

Wednesday: *Rational Understandings*

1. Mill, John Stuart. Chapter 2: “What Utilitarianism is.” From *Utilitarianism*. 1863.
2. EconTalk Podcast: Daron Acemoglu on Inequality, Institutions, and Piketty, 3 November 2014.

Friday: *Cultural and Structural Bases of Development*

1. Weber, Max. “Asceticism and the Spirit of Capitalism.” From *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1930.
2. Moore, Barrington. “The Democratic Route to Modern Society.” From *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966. (read pp. 418–420, 423-425, 430-432; focus on the English case and the lessons learned as applied to India)

Week 3: 29 January - 2 February

Monday: *Economics as a Tool of the Political System*

1. Keynes, John Maynard. “The General Theory of Employment.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 51. no. 2 (1937): 209-223. (read from the middle of page 215 to the end).
2. Hayek, Friedrich A. excerpt from *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Wednesday: *Economics as a Tool of the Political System*

1. EconTalk Podcast: Milton Friedman on Money, 28 August 06
2. EconTalk Podcast: Milton Friedman on Capitalism and Freedom, 4 September 06.

Thursday: *The Virginia and Bloomington Schools*

1. Buchanan, James M. “What is Public Choice Theory?” *Economic Education Bulletin* of the American Institute for Economic Research. 53. no. 5 (2003): 1-7.
2. Ostrom, Elinor. “A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Choice Theory of Collective Action: Presidential Address, American Political Science Association, 1997.” *American Political Science Review*. 92. no. 1 (1998): 1-22.

Friday: *Modern Scholars*

1. Streeck, Wolfgang, Craig Calhoun, Polly Toynbee, and Amitai Etzioni. "Does Capitalism Have a Future?" *Socio-Economic Review* 14 no. 1 (2016): 163-183.

Week 4: 5 February - 9 February

Section II: Institutionalized Political Systems and Economics

Many of the authors below assess the compatibility of mature, developed democracies with liberal, market economics, while others discuss the suitability of more socialist—even authoritarian—approaches. In reading these pieces, consider, first, this general debate, if you agree with one side more than the other, and whether there is room for a compromise of sorts. Second, review the motivations of actors within differing contexts. Be they presidents or prime ministers, legislators from small districts or legislators from big districts, voters in majoritarian systems or voters in consensual systems, how are the behaviors of these actors influenced by institutions? Finally, answer the question: Are there ideal types of democratic systems that ally with ideal types of economic systems?

Monday: *Democracy as Redistribution*

1. Aristotle. Book 6, Chapters 1-5. From *Politics*. Translated by Carnes Lord. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
2. Dahl, Robert. "Sketches for an Advanced Democratic Country" (read until the section break on p. 332). From *Democracy and its Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.

Wednesday: *The Welfare State*

1. Pierson, Paul. "The New Politics of the Welfare State." *World Politics*. 48. no. 2 (1996): 143-179.
2. Kenworthy, Lane. "Do Social-Welfare Policies Reduce Poverty? A Cross-National Assessment." Luxembourg Income Study, Working Paper No. 188. (1998).

Friday: *Economic Voting and Election Cycles*

Final Paper Topic Proposal Due

1. Hibbs, Jr., Douglas A. "Voting and the Macroeconomy." In Barry R. Weingast and Donald Wittman, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Economy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press (2006): 565-586
2. Singer, Matthew M., and Ryan E. Carlin. "Context Counts: The Election Cycle, Development, and the Nature of Economic Voting." *Journal of Politics*. 75. no. 3 (2013): 730-742.

Week 5: 12 February - 16 February

Monday: *Economics and Elections*

1. Yap, O. Fiona. "Economic Performance and Democratic Support in Asia's Emergent Democracies." *Comparative Political Studies*. 46. no.4. (2013): 486-512.
2. Nadeau, Richard, Michael Lewis-Beck, and Eric Belanger. "Economics and Elections Revisited." *Comparative Political Studies*. 46. no. 5 (2013): 551-573.

Wednesday: *Economics in Presidential and Parliamentary Systems*

1. Smith, Alastair. "Election Timing in Majoritarian Parliaments." *British Journal of Political Science*. 33. (2003): 397-418.
2. EconTalk Podcast: Bruce Bueno de Mesquita on the Spoils of War, 12 December 16.

Friday: *Banking in Modern Systems*

1. EconTalk Podcast: Michael Belongia on the Fed, 11 January 10.
2. China 21 Podcast: Victor Shih and Ken Wilcox on Running a Bank in China, 26 May 16.

Week 6: 19 February - 23 February

Monday: *Central Bank Independence*

1. Goodman, John B. "The Politics of Central Bank Independence." *Comparative Politics*. 23. no. 3 (1991): 329-349.
2. Alesina, Alberto, and Lawrence H. Summers. "Central Bank Independence and Macroeconomic Performance: Some Comparative Evidence." *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*. 25. no. 2 (1993): 151-162.

Wednesday: *Corporatism*

1. Schmitter, Philippe C. "Still the Century of Corporatism?" *Review of Politics*. 36. no. 1 (1974): 85-131. (read from p. 93 - 105).
2. Western, Bruce. "A Comparative Study of Corporatist Development." *American Sociological Review*. 56. no. 3 (1991): 283-294.

Friday: *Fiscal Policy*

1. Rodden, Jonathan. "Reviving Leviathan: Fiscal Federalism and the Growth of Government." *International Organization*. 57. no. 4 (2003): 695-729.
2. China 21 Podcast: Deborah Seligson and Jack Zhang on the 13th Five Year Plan (China's Development Roadmap), 31 May 2016.

Week 7: 26 February - 2 March

Monday: *Political Parties and Policy-making*

1. Boix, Carles. "Partisan Strategies and Electoral Coalitions." *Political Parties, Growth and Equality: Conservative and Social Democratic Economic Strategies in the World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
2. Bawn, Kathleen, Martin Cohen, David Karol, Seth Maskett, Hans Noel and John Zaller. "A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands and Nominations in American Politics." *Perspectives on Politics*. 10. no. 3 (2012): 571-597.

Wednesday: *Limits of Ideology*

1. Tavits, Margit, and Natalia Letki. "When Left is Right: Party Ideology and Policy in Post-Communist Europe." *American Political Science Review*. 103. no. 4 (2009): 555-569.
2. Sattler, Thomas. "Do Markets Punish Left Governments?" *Journal of Politics*. 75. no. 2 (2013): 343-356.

Friday: **Literature Review Draft Due**

Week 8: 6 March - 10 March

Monday: *Inequality*

1. Lupu, Noam, and Jonas Pontusson. "The Structure of Inequality and the Politics of Redistribution." *American Political Science*. 105. no.2 (2011): 316-336.
2. Scheve, Kenneth, and David Stasavage. "Wealth Inequality and Democracy." Working Paper, August 2016.

Wednesday: *International Pressures on Domestic Politics*

1. Garrett, Geoffrey. "Global Markets and National Politics: Collision Course or Virtuous Cycle?" *International Organization*. 54. no. 4 (1998): 787-824.
2. EconTalk Podcast: Joseph Stiglitz on Inequality, 9 July 12.

Friday: *Domestic Decisions and Foreign Actors*

1. Jensen, Nathan M. "Fiscal Policy and the Firm: Do Low Corporate Rates Attract Multinational Corporations?" *Comparative Political Studies*. 45. no. 8 (2012): 1004-1026.
2. Gonzalez-Vicente, Ruben. "Mapping Chinese Mining Investment in Latin America: Politics or Market?" *China Quarterly*. 209. (2012): 35-58.

Week 9: 12 March - 16 March

Section III: Political Economy in Areas of Limited Capacity and Accountability

How are political decisions made when the institutions of centralized government are nascent or even nonexistent? How and why do these institutions come together in the first place? Do individuals living under these systems come together and behave as their developed world counterparts do, or are there economic assessments fundamentally different? Can governments address inefficiencies and corruption through political development?

Monday: *Evolution of Accountability*

1. North, Douglass C., and Barry R. Weingast. "Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth-Century England." *Journal of Economic History*. 49. no. 4 (1989): 803-832.
2. Bates, Robert H., and Da-Hsiang Donald Lien. "A Note on Taxation, Development, and Representative Government." *Politics & Society*. (1985): 53-70.

Wednesday: *Development of Political and Economic Governance*

1. Stasavage, David. "When Distance Mattered: Geographic Scale and the Development of European Representative Assemblies." *American Political Science Review*. 105. no. 4 (2010): 625-643.
2. EconTalk Podcast: Josiah Ober on the Ancient Greek Economy, 6 August 12.

Friday: *Institutional Development and Accountability*

1. Paler, Laura. "Keeping the Public Purse: An Experiment in Windfalls, Taxes, and the Incentives to Restrain Government." *American Political Science Review*. 107. no. 4 (2013): 706-725.
2. Stokes, Susan C. "Perverse Accountability: A Formal Model of Machine Politics with Evidence from Argentina." *American Political Science Review*. 99. no. 3 (2005): 315-325.

Week 10: 19 March - 23 March

Monday: *Developing Economics*

1. Scott, James C. "Introduction." From *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1972.

2. EconTalk Podcast: Daron Acemoglu on Why Nations Fail, 19 March 12.

Wednesday: Accountability

1. EconTalk Podcast: Nina Munk on Poverty, Development, and the Idealist, 27 January 14.
2. EconTalk Podcast: Jeffrey Sachs on the Millennium Villages Project, 17 March 14.

Friday: Spring Furlough: No Classes

Week 11: 26 March - 30 March

Spring Furlough: No Classes

Week 12: 2 April - 6 April

Section IV: Development

What does development mean across varying contexts? Are the paths as varied as the definitions? How does the developed world approach its relations with the developing world and how does this inform the advice given? Can specific political institutions and economic systems be implemented across the world, or is something like democracy a 'chancy' prospect? What makes the transition to liberal systems more, or less successful?

Monday: Spring Furlough: No Class

Wednesday: Models of Development

1. Öniş, Ziya. "The Logic of the Developmental State." *Comparative Politics*. 24. no. 1 (1991): 109-126.
2. Bruton, Henry J. "A Reconsideration of Import Substitution." *Journal of Economic Literature*. 36. no. 2 (1998): 903-936.

Friday: Research Design Draft Due

Week 13: 9 April - 13 April

Monday: Spring FTX: No Classes

Wednesday: The Washington and Beijing Consensuses and their Critics

1. Stiglitz, Joseph, "The Post Washington Consensus Consensus." Paper commissioned for a conference *From the Washington Consensus towards a new Global Governance*, 2004.
2. Tan, Cheng Han. "The Beijing Consensus and Possible Lessons from the 'Singapore Model?'" National University of Singapore Working Paper 2016/001, NUS Centre for Asian Legal Studies, January 2016.

Friday: Peer Review Session

Week 14: 16 April - 20 April

Monday: Comparative Development

1. Lipset, Seymour Martin. "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy." *American Political Science Review*. 53. no. 1 (1959): 69-105.
2. Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson, and James A. Robinson. "The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation." *American Economic Review*. 91. no. 5 (2001): 1369-1401.

Wednesday: *Democratization and its Critics*

1. Przeworski, Adam, and Fernando Limongi. "Modernization: Theories and Facts." *World Politics*. 49. no. 2 (1997): 155-183.
2. Boix, Carles, and Susan C. Stokes. "Endogenous Democratization." *World Politics*. 55. no. 4 (2003): 517-549.

Friday: **Final Paper Drafts Due**

Week 15: 23 April - 27 April

Section V: Group Modeling Project

We will take this last part of the class to pose a question based on academic literature and find ways to answer it. This will include building a theory and building a statistical model to test our hypotheses. We should not only see the assumptions and tradeoffs made in academic research, but also the power of statistical analysis to provide a means to build generalizable knowledge.

This week, I will pose a question, or questions, for us to test. We will also review literature and construct our model. You will be expected to contribute to this project by finding pieces to discuss as directed in class.

Week 16: 30 April - 4 May

We will spend this last week testing and refining our models, as well as updating the class on the status of your research designs. Also, the Final Versions of your papers are due by CAD Friday, 4 May. There will **not** be a final examination for this course but we may use the final exam period to conclude our modeling project.

Note: We will not have a final examination in this course.

Extra Readings of Interest

Readings cut because of time constraints on the course. They have either been included in previous iterations of the course or serve as complementary pieces to articles listed in the syllabus:

- Acemoglu, Daron, and James Robinson. “The Role of Institutions in Growth and Development.” Working Paper No. 10. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank (On behalf of the Commission on Growth and Development), 2008.
- Anderson, Christopher J. “Economic Voting and Political Context: A Comparative Perspective.” *Electoral Studies*. 19. (2000): 151-170.
- Balcerowicz, Leszek. “Understanding Postcommunist Transitions.” *Journal of Democracy*. 5. no. 4 (1994): 75-89.
- Becher, Michael, and Michael Donnelly. “Economic Performance, Individual Evaluations, and the Vote: Investigating the Causal Mechanism.” *Journal of Politics*. 75. no. 4 (2013): 968-979.
- Buchanan, James M. “Public Choice: The Origins and Development of a Research Program.” Center for the Study of Public Choice, George Mason University, 2003.
- Bunce, Valerie. “Democratization and Economic Reform.” *Annual Review of Political Science*. 4 (2001): 43-65.
- Chang, Eric C.C., Mark Andreas Kayser, and Ronald Rogowski. “Electoral Systems and Real Prices: Panel Evidence from the OECD Countries, 1970-2000.” *British Journal of Political Science*. 38. (2008): 739-761.
- Dellapianne-Avellaneda, Sebastian. “Gordon Unbound: The Heresthetic of Central Bank Independence in Britain.” *British Journal of Political Science*. 43. no. 2 (2013): 263-293.
- Evans, Peter B. “Predatory, Developmental, and Other Apparatuses: A Comparative Political Economy of the Third World State.” *Sociological Forum*. 4. no. 4 (1989): 561-587.
- Gilpin, Raymond. “Counting the Costs of Somali Piracy.” United States Institute of Peace Working Paper. (2009).
- Haggard, Stephan, and Robert R. Kaufman. “Inequality and Regime Change: Democratic Transitions and the Stability of Democratic Rule.” *American Political Science Review*. 106. no 3 (2012): 495-516.
- Hart, Austin. “Can Candidates Activate or Deactivate the Economic Vote? Evidence from Two Mexican Elections.” *Journal of Politics*. 75. no. 4 (2013): 1051-1063.
- Helleiner, Eric. “Understanding the 2007-2008 Global Financial Crisis: Lessons for Scholars of International Political Economy.” *Annual Review of Political Science*. 14 (2011): 67-87.
- Hibbs, Douglas A., Jr., “Political Parties and Macroeconomic Policy.” *American Political Science Review*. 71. no. 4 (1977): 1467-1487.
- Kennedy, Scott. “The Myth of the Beijing Consensus.” *Journal of Contemporary China*. 19. (2010): 461-477.
- Klarner, Carl E., Justin H. Phillips, and Matt Muckler. “Overcoming Fiscal Gridlock: Institutions and Budget Bargaining.” *Journal of Politics*. 74. no. 4 (2012): 992-1009.
- Kriekhaus, Jonathan, Byunghwan Son, Nisha Mukherjee Bellinger, and Jason M. Wells. “Economic Inequality and Democratic Support.” *Journal of Politics*. 76. no. 1 (2014): 139-151.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael, and Mary Stegmaier. “Economic Determinants of Electoral Outcomes.” *Annual Review of Political Science*. 3. (2000): 183-219.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael, and Richard Nadeau. “Obama and the Economy in 2008.” *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 42. (2009): 479-483.

- Lewis-Beck, Michael S., Richard Nadeau, and Martial Foucault. “The Compleat Economic Voter: New Theory and British Evidence.” *British Journal of Political Science*. 43. no. 2 (2012): 241-261.
- Nadeau, Richard, Michael Lewis-Beck, and Eric Belanger. “Economics and Elections Revisited.” *Comparative Political Studies*. 46. no. 5 (2013): 551-573.
- Naoi, Megumi, and Ellis Krauss. “Who Lobbies Whom? Special Interest Politics under Alternative Electoral Systems.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 53. no. 4 (2009): 874-892
- Naughton, Barry, “China: Economic Transformation Before and After 1989.” Draft prepared for the conference *1989: Twenty Years After*. University of California, Irvine. 2009.
- Olken, Benjamin A. “Direct Democracy and Local Public Goods: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia.” *American Political Science Review*. 104. no. 2 (2010): 243-267.
- Onoma, Ato Kwamena. “The Contradictory Potential of Institutions The Rise and Decline of Land Documentation.” In James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen (eds.) *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*, 2010: 63-93.
- Persson, Torsten, and Guido Tabellini. *The Economic Effects of Constitutions*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 2003.
- Ramo, Joshua Cooper. “The Beijing Consensus.” Foreign Policy Centre. 2004. (Read through p. 25).
- Ross, Michael L. “The Political Economy of the Resource Curse.” *World Politics*. 51. no. 1 (1999): 297-322.
- Singer, David A. “Migrant Remittances and Exchange Rate Regimes in the Developing World.” *American Political Science Review*. 104. no. 2 (2010): 307-322.
- Taylor, John B. “The Financial Crisis and the Policy Responses: An Empirical Analysis of What Went Wrong.” National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 14631 (2009).
- Tsai, Lily L. “Solidary Groups, Informal Accountability, and Local Public Goods Provision in Rural China.” *American Political Science Review*. 101. no. 2 (2007): 355-372.
- Weingast, Barry R. “Second Generation Fiscal Federalism: Political Aspects of Decentralization and Economic Development.” *World Development*. 53. (2014): 14-25.
- Williamson, John, “A Short History of the Washington Consensus.” Paper commissioned for a conference, *From the Washington Consensus towards a new Global Governance*, 2004.
- Williamson, John. “Is the ‘Beijing Consensus’ Now Dominant?” *Asia Policy*. 13. (2012): 1-16.
- Yang, Dali. “The Smuggling Crisis and the Leveling of the Economic Playing Field.” From *Remaking the Chinese Leviathan: Market Transition and the Politics of Governance in China*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004.
- Yap, O. Fiona. “A Strategic Model of Economic Performance and Democratization in South Korea and Taiwan.” *British Journal of Political Science* 42 (2012): 213-239.

Appendix A: Work for Grade Policy:

Development of the spirit as well as the skills of academic inquiry is central to the mission of VMI's Academic Program. As a community of scholars, posing questions and seeking answers, we invariably consult and build upon the ideas, discoveries, and products of others who have wrestled with related issues and problems before us. We are obligated ethically and in many instances legally to acknowledge the sources of all borrowed material that we use in our own work. This is the case whether we find that material in conventional resources, such as the library or cyberspace, or discover it in other places like conversations with our peers.

Academic integrity requires the full and proper documentation of any material that is not original with us. It is therefore a matter of honor. To misrepresent someone else's words, ideas, images, data, or other intellectual property as one's own is stealing, lying, and cheating all at once.

Because the offense of improper or incomplete documentation is so serious, and the consequences so potentially grave, the following policies regarding work for grade have been adopted as a guide to cadets and faculty in upholding the Honor Code under which all VMI cadets live.

Cadets' responsibilities

"Work for grade" is defined as any work presented to an instructor for a formal grade or undertaken in satisfaction of a requirement for successful completion of a course or degree requirement. All work submitted for grade is considered the cadet's own work. "Cadet's own work" means that he or she has composed the work from his or her general accumulation of knowledge and skill except as clearly and fully documented and that it has been composed especially for the current assignment. No work previously submitted in any course at VMI or elsewhere will be resubmitted or reformatted for submission in a current course without the specific approval of the instructor.

In all work for grade, failure to distinguish between the cadet's own work and ideas and the work and ideas of others is known as plagiarism. Proper documentation clearly and fully identifies the sources of all borrowed ideas, quotations, or other assistance. The cadet is referred to the VMI-authorized handbook for rules concerning quotations, paraphrases, and documentation.

In all written work for grade, the cadet must include the words "HELP RECEIVED" conspicuously on the document, and he or she must then do one of two things: (1) state "none," meaning that no help was received except as documented in the work; or (2) explain in detail the nature of the help received. In oral work for grade, the cadet must make the same declaration before beginning the presentation. Admission of help received may result in a lower grade but will not result in prosecution for an honor violation.

Cadets are prohibited from discussing the contents of a quiz/exam until it is returned to them or final course grades are posted. This enjoinder does not imply that any inadvertent expression or behavior that might indicate one's feeling about the test should be considered a breach of honor. The real issue is whether cadets received information, not available to everyone else in the class, which would give them an unfair advantage. If a cadet inadvertently gives or receives information, the incident must be reported to the professor and the Honor Court.

Each cadet bears the responsibility for familiarizing himself or herself thoroughly with the policies stated in this section, with any supplementary statement regarding work for grade expressed by the academic department in which he or she is taking a course, and with any special conditions provided in writing by the professor for a given assignment. If there is any doubt or uncertainty about the correct interpretation of a policy, the cadet should consult the instructor of the course. There should be no confusion, however, on the basic principle that it is never acceptable to submit someone else's work, written or otherwise, formally graded or not, as one's own.

The violation by a cadet of any of these policies will, if he or she is found guilty by the Honor Court, result in his or her being dismissed from VMI. Neither ignorance nor professed confusion about the correct interpretation of these policies is an excuse.

Appendix B: Department of International Studies & Political Science Work for Grade Policy:

Work for Grade in this department is generally of the following types.

1. Written quizzes, tests, or examinations
2. Book reviews
3. Research Papers, policy memoranda, briefing papers, and discourse analysis– identification and analysis of the critical differences in the findings and opinions of scholars on issues of interest to the discipline.

Cadets are permitted and encouraged to study with their peers to prepare for quizzes, tests and exams. However, when a cadet takes either written or oral quizzes, tests, and examinations, answers must be his/her own work without help from any other source including notes or consultation with others.

In the case of book reviews, research and other papers, as described in “2” and “3” above, research and composing of such works must be done by the cadet alone. Cadets are permitted to use spell and grammar-checking facilities.

IS cadets are encouraged to make use of all VMI tutoring services to receive critical comments (defined above). Cadets who do so and mark ”Help Received” will not receive a lower grade on an assignment. Cadets are also permitted to seek critical comments on their written work from their peers. However, proof-reading and editing (defined above) of a cadet’s written work is not permitted.

Any exceptions to these rules, including the use of tutors, collaboration among cadets, and the use of computer style, spell and grammar checkers; must be explained in writing by the course instructor. Instructors are at liberty to stipulate exceptions only with the written approval of their department head.

If you have any questions about the application of these rules, consult your instructor. Do not leave anything to chance.

Colonel James J. Hentz, Professor and Head

Appendix C: Literature Review Guidance

From the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill Writing Center

OK. You have to write a literature review. You dust off a novel and a book of poetry, settle down in your chair, and get ready to issue a “thumbs up” or “thumbs down” as you leaf through the pages. “Literature review” done. Right?

Wrong! The “literature” of a literature review refers to any collection of materials on a topic, not necessarily the great literary texts of the world. “Literature” could be anything from a set of government pamphlets on British colonial methods in Africa to scholarly articles on the treatment of a torn ACL. And a review does not necessarily mean that your reader wants you to give your personal opinion on whether or not you liked these sources.

What is a literature review, then?

A literature review discusses published information in a particular subject area, and sometimes information in a particular subject area within a certain time period.

A literature review can be just a simple summary of the sources, but it usually has an organizational pattern and combines both summary and synthesis. A summary is a recap of the important information of the source, but a synthesis is a re-organization, or a reshuffling, of that information. It might give a new interpretation of old material or combine new with old interpretations. Or it might trace the intellectual progression of the field, including major debates. And depending on the situation, the literature review may evaluate the sources and advise the reader on the most pertinent or relevant.

But how is a literature review different from an academic research paper?

The main focus of an academic research paper is to develop a new argument, and a research paper will contain a literature review as one of its parts. In a research paper, you use the literature as a foundation and as support for a new insight that you contribute. The focus of a literature review, however, is to summarize and synthesize the arguments and ideas of others without adding new contributions.

Why do we write literature reviews?

Literature reviews provide you with a handy guide to a particular topic. If you have limited time to conduct research, literature reviews can give you an overview or act as a stepping stone. For professionals, they are useful reports that keep them up to date with what is current in the field. For scholars, the depth and breadth of the literature review emphasizes the credibility of the writer in his or her field. Literature reviews also provide a solid background for a research paper’s investigation. Comprehensive knowledge of the literature of the field is essential to most research papers.

Who writes these things, anyway?

Literature reviews are written occasionally in the humanities, but mostly in the sciences and social sciences; in experiment and lab reports, they constitute a section of the paper. Sometimes a literature review is written as a paper in itself.

LET'S GET TO IT! WHAT SHOULD I DO BEFORE WRITING THE LITERATURE REVIEW?

Clarify

If your assignment is not very specific, seek clarification from your instructor:

- Roughly how many sources should you include?
- What types of sources (books, journal articles, websites)?
- Should you summarize, synthesize, or critique your sources by discussing a common theme or issue?
- Should you evaluate your sources?
- Should you provide subheadings and other background information, such as definitions and/or a history?

Find models

Look for other literature reviews in your area of interest or in the discipline and read them to get a sense of the types of themes you might want to look for in your own research or ways to organize your final review. You can simply put the word 'review' in your search engine along with your other topic terms to find articles of this type on the Internet or in an electronic database. The bibliography or reference section of sources you have already read are also excellent entry points into your own research.

Narrow your topic

There are hundreds or even thousands of articles and books on most areas of study. The narrower your topic, the easier it will be to limit the number of sources you need to read in order to get a good survey of the material. Your instructor will probably not expect you to read everything that's out there on the topic, but you'll make your job easier if you first limit your scope.

And don't forget to tap into your professor's (or other professors') knowledge in the field. Ask your professor questions such as: "If you had to read only one book from the 1970s on topic X, what would it be?" Questions such as this help you to find and determine quickly the most seminal pieces in the field.

Consider whether your sources are current

Some disciplines require that you use information that is as current as possible. In the sciences, for instance, treatments for medical problems are constantly changing according to the latest studies. Information even two years old could be obsolete. However, if you are writing a review in the humanities, history, or social sciences, a survey of the history of the literature may be what is needed, because what is important is how perspectives have changed through the years or within a certain time period. Try sorting through some other current bibliographies or literature reviews in the field to get a sense of what your discipline expects. You can also use this method to consider what is currently of interest to scholars in this field and what is not.

STRATEGIES FOR WRITING THE LITERATURE REVIEW

Find a focus

A literature review, like a term paper, is usually organized around ideas, not the sources themselves as an annotated bibliography would be organized. This means that you will not just simply list your sources and go into detail about each one of them, one at a time. No. As you read widely but selectively in your topic

area, consider instead what themes or issues connect your sources together. Do they present one or different solutions? Is there an aspect of the field that is missing? How well do they present the material and do they portray it according to an appropriate theory? Do they reveal a trend in the field? A raging debate? Pick one of these themes to focus the organization of your review.

Construct a working thesis statement

Then use the focus you have found to construct a thesis statement. Yes! Literature reviews have thesis statements as well! However, your thesis statement will not necessarily argue for a position or an opinion; rather it will argue for a particular perspective on the material. Some sample thesis statements for literature reviews are as follows:

The current trend in treatment for congestive heart failure combines surgery and medicine. More and more cultural studies scholars are accepting popular media as a subject worthy of academic consideration.

Consider organization

You have a focus, and you have narrowed it down to a thesis statement. Now what is the most effective way of presenting the information? What are the most important topics, subtopics, etc., that your review needs to include? And in what order should you present them? Develop an organization for your review at both a global and local level:

First, cover the basic categories. Just like most academic papers, literature reviews also must contain at least three basic elements: an introduction or background information section; the body of the review containing the discussion of sources; and, finally, a conclusion and/or recommendations section to end the paper.

1. Introduction: Gives a quick idea of the topic of the literature review, such as the central theme or organizational pattern.
2. Body: Contains your discussion of sources and is organized either chronologically, thematically, or methodologically (see below for more information on each).
3. Conclusions/Recommendations: Discuss what you have drawn from reviewing literature so far. Where might the discussion proceed?

Once you have the basic categories in place, then you must consider how you will present the sources themselves within the body of your paper. Create an organizational method to focus this section even further.

To help you come up with an overall organizational framework for your review, consider the following scenario and then three typical ways of organizing the sources into a review:

You have decided to focus your literature review on materials dealing with sperm whales. This is because you have just finished reading *Moby Dick*, and you wonder if that whale's portrayal is really real. You start with some articles about the physiology of sperm whales in biology journals written in the 1980's. But these articles refer to some British biological studies performed on whales in the early 18th century. So you check those out. Then you look up a book written in 1968 with information on how sperm whales have been portrayed in other forms of art, such as in Alaskan poetry, in French painting, or on whale bone, as the whale hunters in the late 19th century used to do. This makes you wonder about American whaling methods during the time portrayed in *Moby Dick*, so you find some academic articles published in the last five years on how accurately Herman Melville portrayed the whaling scene in his novel.

- Chronological

If your review follows the chronological method, you could write about the materials above according to when they were published. For instance, first you would talk about the British biological studies of the 18th century, then about *Moby Dick*, published in 1851, then the book on sperm whales in other art (1968), and finally the biology articles (1980s) and the recent articles on American whaling of the

19th century. But there is relatively no continuity among subjects here. And notice that even though the sources on sperm whales in other art and on American whaling are written recently, they are about other subjects/objects that were created much earlier. Thus, the review loses its chronological focus.

- By publication: Order your sources by publication chronology, then, only if the order demonstrates a more important trend. For instance, you could order a review of literature on biological studies of sperm whales if the progression revealed a change in dissection practices of the researchers who wrote and/or conducted the studies.
- By trend: A better way to organize the above sources chronologically is to examine the sources under another trend, such as the history of whaling. Then your review would have subsections according to eras within this period. For instance, the review might examine whaling from pre-1600-1699, 1700-1799, and 1800-1899. Under this method, you would combine the recent studies on American whaling in the 19th century with *Moby Dick* itself in the 1800-1899 category, even though the authors wrote a century apart.

- Thematic

Thematic reviews of literature are organized around a topic or issue, rather than the progression of time. However, progression of time may still be an important factor in a thematic review. For instance, the sperm whale review could focus on the development of the harpoon for whale hunting. While the study focuses on one topic, harpoon technology, it will still be organized chronologically. The only difference here between a 'chronological' and a 'thematic' approach is what is emphasized the most: the development of the harpoon or the harpoon technology.

But more authentic thematic reviews tend to break away from chronological order. For instance, a thematic review of material on sperm whales might examine how they are portrayed as 'evil' in cultural documents. The subsections might include how they are personified, how their proportions are exaggerated, and their behaviors misunderstood. A review organized in this manner would shift between time periods within each section according to the point made.

- Methodological

A methodological approach differs from the two above in that the focusing factor usually does not have to do with the content of the material. Instead, it focuses on the 'methods' of the researcher or writer. For the sperm whale project, one methodological approach would be to look at cultural differences between the portrayal of whales in American, British, and French art work. Or the review might focus on the economic impact of whaling on a community. A methodological scope will influence either the types of documents in the review or the way in which these documents are discussed.

Once you have decided on the organizational method for the body of the review, the sections you need to include in the paper should be easy to figure out. They should arise out of your organizational strategy. In other words, a chronological review would have subsections for each vital time period. A thematic review would have subtopics based upon factors that relate to the theme or issue.

Sometimes, though, you might need to add additional sections that are necessary for your study, but do not fit in the organizational strategy of the body. What other sections you include in the body is up to you. Put in only what is necessary. Here are a few other sections you might want to consider:

- Current Situation: Information necessary to understand the topic or focus of the literature review.
- History: The chronological progression of the field, the literature, or an idea that is necessary to understand the literature review, if the body of the literature review is not already a chronology.
- Methods and/or Standards: The criteria you used to select the sources in your literature review or the way in which you present your information. For instance, you might explain that your review includes only peer-reviewed articles and journals.
- Questions for Further Research: What questions about the field has the review sparked? How will you further your research as a result of the review?

BEGIN COMPOSING

Once you have settled on a general pattern of organization, you are ready to write each section. There are a few guidelines you should follow during the writing stage as well. Here is a sample paragraph from a literature review about sexism and language to illuminate the following discussion:

However, other studies have shown that even gender-neutral antecedents are more likely to produce masculine images than feminine ones (Gastil, 1990). Hamilton (1988) asked students to complete sentences that required them to fill in pronouns that agreed with gender-neutral antecedents such as “writer,” “pedestrian,” and “persons.” The students were asked to describe any image they had when writing the sentence. Hamilton found that people imagined 3.3 men to each woman in the masculine “generic” condition and 1.5 men per woman in the unbiased condition. Thus, while ambient sexism accounted for some of the masculine bias, sexist language amplified the effect. (Source: Erika Falk and Jordan Mills, “Why Sexist Language Affects Persuasion: The Role of Homophily, Intended Audience, and Offense,” *Women and Language* 19:2.

- **Use evidence:** In the example above, the writers refer to several other sources when making their point. A literature review in this sense is just like any other academic research paper. Your interpretation of the available sources must be backed up with evidence to show that what you are saying is valid.
- **Be selective:** Select only the most important points in each source to highlight in the review. The type of information you choose to mention should relate directly to the review’s focus, whether it is thematic, methodological, or chronological.
- **Use quotes sparingly:** Falk and Mills do not use any direct quotes. That is because the survey nature of the literature review does not allow for in-depth discussion or detailed quotes from the text. Some short quotes here and there are okay, though, if you want to emphasize a point, or if what the author said just cannot be rewritten in your own words. Notice that Falk and Mills do quote certain terms that were coined by the author, not common knowledge, or taken directly from the study. But if you find yourself wanting to put in more quotes, check with your instructor.
- **Summarize and synthesize:** Remember to summarize and synthesize your sources within each paragraph as well as throughout the review. The authors here recapitulate important features of Hamilton’s study, but then synthesize it by rephrasing the study’s significance and relating it to their own work.
- **Keep your own voice:** While the literature review presents others’ ideas, your voice (the writer’s) should remain front and center. Notice that Falk and Mills weave references to other sources into their own text, but they still maintain their own voice by starting and ending the paragraph with their own ideas and their own words. The sources support what Falk and Mills are saying.
- **Use caution when paraphrasing:** When paraphrasing a source that is not your own, be sure to represent the author’s information or opinions accurately and in your own words. In the preceding example, Falk and Mills either directly refer in the text to the author of their source, such as Hamilton, or they provide ample notation in the text when the ideas they are mentioning are not their own, for example, Gastil’s.

REVISE, REVISE, REVISE

Draft in hand? Now you are ready to revise. Spending a lot of time revising is a wise idea, because your main objective is to present the material, not the argument. So check over your review again to make sure it follows the assignment and/or your outline. Then, just as you would for most other academic forms of writing, rewrite or rework the language of your review so that you have presented your information in the most concise manner possible. Be sure to use terminology familiar to your audience; get rid of unnecessary jargon or slang. Finally, double check that you have documented your sources and formatted the review appropriately for your discipline.

WORKS CONSULTED

We consulted these works while writing the original version of this handout. This is not a comprehensive list of resources on the handout's topic, and we encourage you to do your own research to find the latest publications on this topic. Please do not use this list as a model for the format of your own reference list, as it may not match the citation style you are using.

Anson, Chris M. and Robert A. Schwegler, *The Longman Handbook for Writers and Readers*. Second edition. New York: Longman, 2000.

Jones, Robert, Patrick Bizzaro, and Cynthia Selfe. *The Harcourt Brace Guide to Writing in the Disciplines*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1997.

Lamb, Sandra E. *How to Write It: A Complete Guide to Everything You'll Ever Write*. Berkeley, Calif.: Ten Speed Press, 1998.

Rosen, Leonard J. and Laurence Behrens. *The Allyn and Bacon Handbook*. Fourth edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2000.

Troyka, Lynn Quitman. *Simon and Schuster Handbook for Writers*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2002.

Appendix D: Chicago Manual of Style Formatting Guidelines

Guidelines taken from BG Brower's "Grand Strategy in the 20th Century" course. For more information, please see The Chicago Manual of Style's website

Bibliographic Entry Formats

Judis, John B. "Obama and American Power," *The New Republic* (March 28, 2011). <http://www.tnr.com/print/article/world-and-american-power>

Katzman, Kenneth. "Afghanistan: Post-War Governance, Security and U.S. Policy," Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, November 1, 2007. <http://fpc.state.gov.documents/organization/96427.pdf>

Krepinevich, Andrew F. "The Pentagon's Wasting Assets: The Eroding Foundations of American Power," *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2009): 18-33.

Nye, Joseph S., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.

U.S. Department of State. Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor. "Report on the Taliban's War against Women," November 17, 2001. <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/6185.htm>.

Footnote/Endnote Formats

On-line Journal:

John B. Judis, "Obama and American Power," *The New Republic* (March 28, 2011). <http://www.tnr.com/print/article/world-and-american-power>

On-line Government Report:

Kenneth Katzman, "Afghanistan: Post-War Governance, Security and U.S. Policy," Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, November 1, 2007, 34. <http://fpc.state.gov.documents/organization/96427.pdf>

Print Journal Article:

Andrew F. Krepinevich, "The Pentagon's Wasting Assets: The Eroding Foundations of American Power," *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2009): 20.

Book:

Joseph S. Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: 2004), 52.

On-line Government Document:

U.S. Department of State. Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor. "Report on the Taliban's War against Women," November 17, 2001., 75. <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/6185.htm>.

Additional Notes

- Full footnote or endnote citation is required the first time the source is cited (e.g. Joseph S. Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: 2004), 52.)
- Use *Ibid.* with appropriate page number if citing the source in the immediately preceding footnote or endnote (e.g. *Ibid.*, 33).
- Use author's last name and page number when using previously cited sources (e.g. Nye, 57.)