

Western European Politics

Political Science 326
Emory University
Fall 2000
White Hall 110
1:00-2:15 P.M. (TTh)

Dr. Thomas D. Lancaster
Dept. of Political Science
Emory University
Tarbuton 312

Office Hours: Thursday 4:00-5:30 P.M.
Other, by appointment
Tel: 404-727-6568 (Voice Mail)
E-mail: polstdl@emory.edu

Course Prerequisite: Political Science 120--Introduction to Comparative Politics.

Course Description: This course examines the contextual, institutional, and developmental variations of politics in Western Europe. It focuses theoretically and substantively on two parallel trends in contemporary Europe that appear to be “pulling in two directions”: its increasing economic and political integration; and a heightened emphasis on regionalization, including social identity and political activity. The course will consider the causes and consequences of these simultaneous, although at times somewhat contradictory, tendencies. As an upper-division course in Political Science, this class will provide an understanding of several European political systems. Five major European nations will be emphasized: Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, and Spain. The course will also devote a significant amount of time to the European Community. References in class will also be made to other European political systems as well. Students will be encouraged throughout the course to draw comparisons between the governmental institutions and processes of these and other European political systems.

Texts: Michael Curtis. 1997. *Western European Government and Politics*. New York: Longman.

William M. Downs. 1998. *Coalition Government: Subnational Style*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

John McCormick. 1999. *Understanding the European Union: A Concise Introduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Reading Assignments: Throughout the semester, each student's reading in the required textbooks should remain abreast with the lectures. The readings are meant to provide background to the lectures. They are meant to expound upon points not presented in class due to time constraints. Although specific assignments may occasionally be discussed in class, the lectures will generally be organized differently from the readings. The lectures and readings are thus to be viewed as complementary. The student is individually responsible for all material in both.

Written Assignments: Two tests will be given that inquiry about factual knowledge: one short in-class midterm will be given and an in-class comprehensive final examination. In terms of interpretation and analysis, two written assignment will be required. First, each student will write a book review of William Downs' book. Second, the students will be required to write a 10-page analytical paper comparing an important aspect of Western European politics. The basic question is assigned below by Professor Lancaster. Together, the book review and the 10-page analytical essays will satisfy the college writing requirement. The following describes the specifics of each.

Short Answer, Factual Quizzes: Two tests will be given during the semester. The first (Thursday, October 26th) will be administered during our regular class meeting. The second (Monday, December 18th, 4:30-7:00 P.M.) is at the time scheduled by the Emory College Office. Rules for these quizzes include:

1. No books or notebooks may be brought to the classroom.
2. Only exam book, pens or pencils, and watches.
3. I can't grade what I can't read.
4. Don't stop by my office after the exam asking about your grade.
5. If you want to have your final grade sent to you, turn in a self-addressed, stamped envelope before the exam.
6. No name on your final exam, only your student identification number. This applies for all work completed for this course.

Book Review: Each student is required to write a 3-5 page review of William M. Downs' *Coalition Government: Subnational Style*. The review is to go well beyond a description of the work. More importantly, it is to interpret and critique Downs' argument, within the context of what you know about Western European politics. Guidelines and examples--both in terms of substance and style--can be found in the review section of any issue of the *American Political Science Review* or *The Journal of Politics*. This book review is due on Wednesday, November 15th, at 1:00 P.M. in Professor Lancaster's mailbox in the Political Science office (Tarbuton 327). Please note, this is NOT a day in which the class meets. Any book review not handed in prior to that time, regardless of quality, can receive a grade of no higher than "C." Any book review not turned in prior to Professor Downs' lecture on November 16th, REGARDLESS OF REASON, will receive an "F." (No book review turned in at all counts as a zero.) The **Emory Honor Code** applies to this book review, especially the use of previously published reviews.

Analytical Essay: A 10-page analytical paper is required for this course. This paper is not intended as a research paper. Instead, it is envisioned as a written essay of an analytical and interpretative nature, one that requires you to build upon the facts about Western European politics gained in the course and apply them to the formulation of an argument. In this paper, the student is to address the following question: "How have institutional arrangements, structures, and/or rules of governance in Western Europe affected the tendency for Western European politics to be 'pulling in two directions'?"

This paper will be due on Friday, December 8th at 3:00 P.M. in Professor Lancaster's mailbox in the Political Science office (Tarbuton 327).

For this assignment, institutional arrangements, structures, and/or rules many not only be thought of as electoral laws or electoral systems. Furthermore, be sure in this analytical paper to go beyond well beyond the description of the institutions. Not more than one-quarter of the paper should be description of the institutions. The remainder of the paper **must consider the effects** of such institutions, structures, or rules. Furthermore, this is to be a comparative paper, so be sure to make direct comparisons. Thus, evidence for this analysis must come from a direct comparison of **at least** two European countries. Finally, the paper must consider contemporary consequences.

Notes on Essays

1. This is an analytical question; it asks you to **go beyond a mere description** of the institutional arrangements of the political systems. Best methodology is to take a theoretical and/or argumentative stance about the effects of governing institutions on European politics “pulling in two directions” and defend it with the descriptive data supporting or rejecting your argument.
2. Some material may be difficult but not impossible to obtain. Thus, start early with your collection of descriptive information. This type of analytical essay requires a great deal of thinking and reflection, not to mention the bibliographic search. So, anticipate the last minute rush. Don’t expect a great deal of sympathy if you wait until the last moment.
3. **Hint:** To give focus to your paper, choose a single aspect of the institutional arrangements, not the entire governmental system. For example, does the existence, or lack thereof, of a constitutional court impact the integration/regionalization process in Europe? As another example, does a federal or a unitary appear to be the most effective means of managing European political affairs given the simultaneous processes of integration and regionalization. My evaluations of your paper will consider the difficulty of the topic chosen as well as the quality of the analysis undertaken.
4. For analytical clarity, use section and title headings.
5. Footnotes, citations, and references must follow the style of *the American Political Science Review*.

Grading System: (for final course grade).

23%--midterm quiz
17%--final quiz
15%--book review
10%--class participation*
35%--10-page analytical paper

100% Final Grade

Grade of F average as 50; no assignment completed averaged as zero. 10-page analytical essay dropped by one letter grade for each day late. No paper accepted more than one week late.

Students taking the class on a Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory basis should be aware that a grade of 70 or above will be considered satisfactory.

***Note on participation:** Given class size and other considerations, participation is defined as class attendance. In full accordance with the **Emory Honor System**, each student will sign the daily attendance sheet that will be circulated during the lecture. This reflects the fact that the objective of this course is to teach the student something about European politics, and this is harder if he/she is not present. The student's final participation grade is determined in the following manner: after drop/add ends on September 8, this class will hold 23 normal meetings, not counting the two when quizzes are taken. Students are awarded 4.5 points for each class they attend-- $23 \times 4.5 = 103.5$ (but the maximum grade is 100). Thus, the student that misses only one class after drop/add will receive a participation grade of 99, two classes = 94.5, three classes = 90.0, four classes = 85.5, five classes = 81.0, etc. Since students are NOT required to attend class, it will be impossible to give credit to students for classes not attended, for whatever reason...the same logic applies to giving credit for a test not taken. (The only exception applies to participation in an official university sponsored intercollegiate event (e.g. debate or swim team--not a practice) which must be confirmed in writing by the team coach at least two weeks prior to the event.)

***Late arrivals (not within reason) and/or leaving class early (and therefore disturbing the class) count as an absence. Stated differently, one must attend the entire one-hour fifteen minute class to receive credit. Signing in anyone else's name other than your own will be treated as a violation of the **HONOR CODE** at Emory University

Additional Comments

1. Students should be aware of the importance of clear, correct, and concise writing. Consultation of such works as a dictionary, William Strunk, Jr.'s *The Elements of Style* and/or Hodges and Whitten's *Harbrace College Handbook* is always appropriate.
2. To maximize the objectivity in evaluation, all written assignments should NOT contain the student's name, only the student identification number.
3. Problems should be discussed before a due date.
4. Students are asked to sit in the same seat throughout the semester to assist the instructor in learning the students' names.
5. It is the **student's** responsibility to sign the daily attendance sheet. Attendance means being physically present for the entire class, not just part of it. Signing the attendance sheet is a statement in accordance with the Honor Code of Emory University.
6. No hats may be worn during the class meetings.
7. All cell-phones must be turned off prior to entering the class, in order to avoid disruption of class. 10 points will be deducted from the student's participation grade for each occurrence of this problem.

Course Outline

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Reading Assignment</u>
Introduction		
August 31 (Th)	Expectations and Requirements	Read syllabus in its entirety
1. Sept. 5 (Tu)	Europe Pulling in Two Directions?	Curtis, Chapter 1 McCormick, Ch. 3
Sept. 7 (Th)	Three Levels of Government: Parliamentary & Federal?	McCormick, Ch. 1-2
Sept. 8 (Friday)	Last Day of Drop/Add (No class)	
The European Union (I)		
2. Sept. 12 (Tu)	Centralizing: Institutions & Structures	McCormick, Ch. 4 (not pages 107-113)
Sept. 14 (Th)	Decentralizing: Distributive Politics: CAP & Regional Funds	McCormick, Ch. 5
The Major Political Systems		
3. Sept. 19 (Tu)	Great Britain: Parliamentary & Unitary	Curtis, Ch. 2.
Sept. 21 (Th)	France: 5 th Republic & Presidentialism	Curtis, Ch. 3
4. Sept. 26 (Tu)	Spain: New Parliamentary System	Curtis, Ch. 6
Sept. 28 (Th)	Germany: Parliamentary & Governmental Stability	Curtis, Ch. 4
5. Oct. 3 (Tu)	Italy: Parliamentary & Governmental Instability?	Curtis, Ch. 5

Regionalization

Oct. 5 (Th)	Federalism Constitutionally Structured: Comparing Belgium and Germany	Curtis, Ch. 4 (again)
6. Oct. 10 (Tu)	Politically Structured: Quasi-Federalism in Multi-National Spain	Curtis, Ch. 6 (again)
Oct. 12 (Th)	Contemporary Devolution: Four Nations in the United Kingdom	Curtis, Ch. 2 (again)
7. Oct. 17 (Tu)	**** Fall Break ****	
Oct. 19 (Th)	Structures Chasing Culture? Regionalism in Italy	Curtis, Ch. 5 (again)
8. Oct. 24 (Tu)	Aborted Devolution: Feeble Steps in France	Curtis, Ch. 3 (again)
Oct. 26 (Th)	**** 1 st Short Answer, Factual Quiz (In class) ****	

The European Union (II)

9. Oct. 31 (Tu)	Centralizing: Monetary Integration	McCormick, Ch. 7
Nov. 2 (Th)	Decentralizing: The Committee of the Regions	Downs (begin)

Comparative Party Systems

10. Nov. 7 (Tu)	Central Party Systems & Electoral Systems	Downs (continued)
Nov. 9 (Th)	Regional Parties and Party Systems: Belgium and Spain emphasized	Downs (continued)

Book Review

11. Nov. 14 (Tu) **** No Class **** Downs (finish)
(Professor Lancaster out-of-town)
- Nov. 15 (Wednesday) **** 1:00 P.M.: Book Review Due (Political Science Office) ***
(not a class day)
- Nov. 16 (Th) A "Meet the Author" Guest Lecture: Professor William M. Downs

Judicial Structures and Politics

12. Nov. 21 (Tu) Comparative Judicial Systems
- Nov. 23 (Th) **** Thanksgiving ****
13. Nov. 28 (Tu) The Role of Constitutional Courts
- Nov. 30 (Th) The European Court of Justice McCormick, pp. 107-113

Comparative Political Economy

14. Dec. 5 (Tu) Economics and its Influence on the Vote Curtis, Ch. 8
- Dec. 7 (Th) Fiscal Policy in Europe: Budgets McCormick, Ch. 8
& Taxation)

Conclusion

- Dec. 8 (Friday) **** 3:00 P.M. Analytical Essay Due (Political Science Office) ***
(not a class day)
15. Dec. 12 (Tu) Concluding Comments & Review Session for 2nd Factual Test
- Dec. 18 (Monday) **** 2nd Short Answer, Factual Test (4:30-7:00 P.M.) ****

Essay Blunders that Must be Avoided

No names, student identification number only to maximize the instructor's objectivity in the evaluation process

The papers must be written in the style format of the *American Political Science Review*. Pay attention to how citations, references, and footnotes are constructed.

Use section and title heads throughout your paper. This helps in the organization of your thoughts and their presentation.

No plastic covers or fancy binders. A staple or paper clip will suffice.

No right margin justification

Your pages must be numbered. Take the time to learn the word processing software you are using.

Don't attached extra blank pages. They don't give you any extra credit or importance. Don't leave blank pages or partial pages at the end of sections.

Tables and graphs should be on separate pages from the text itself.

Don't leave gaps between paragraphs. This is the reason for indentation.

Colons and semicolons must be used correctly.

Avoid split infinitives whenever possible

“It's” and “its” cannot be used interchangeably. The former is a contraction, the later a possessive form.

The words “affect” and “effect” have different usage and meanings.

THE RESEARCH REPORT

In presenting the following design outline, it should be stressed that **this specific outline need not be followed**. Each researcher will need to adapt the design outline to fit the individual research problem. (The following outline was adapted from one found in Delbert C. Miller, *Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement*, 3rd. Edition. New York: Longman, 1983).

I. Statement of the Problem

- A. An introductory statement of the thesis; problem-solution.
- B. Indicate that the problem is amendable to research.
- C. Describe the significance with reference to one or more of the following criteria.
 - 1. Is timely.
 - 2. Relates to practical problems.
 - 3. Fills a research gap.
 - 4. Contributes to or generates a new idea in political theory.
 - 5. Clarifies an important concept or relationship.
 - 6. Creates or improves an instrument for observing or analyzing data.

II. Theory

- A. Describe the theoretical setting of the problem.
- B. Describe the relationship of the problem to previous research.
- C. Present alternative hypothesis feasible within the framework of the theory.

III. Hypotheses and Measurement

- A. State hypotheses selected for test. (Refer back to theory section in introducing each hypothesis.)
- B. Indicate how the test results of each hypothesis will relate to the theory.
- B. Define each variable or concept in operational terms and describe how each will be measured and what level of measurement is implied.
- D. Specify each scale to be used and the source of the scales.
- E. Describe limitations of scales, measures, and hypotheses and what consequences might result.

IV. Methods of Data Collection

- A. If not already in Section III, describe measures and validity and reliability of answer.
- B. If a survey using questionnaires, describe the questionnaire (include the questionnaire in the appendix). Include
 - 1. Number of questions.
 - 2. Time needed for interview or to fill out questionnaire.
 - 3. Preliminary testing of questionnaire and results.
- C. If survey, describe the procedure for collecting information.
 - 1. If survey, describe the procedure according to issues of direct interviews, mail or telephone and any special training required.
 - 2. If survey, discuss the expected return rate and how checks will be made for problems of return rate.
- D. If data is from secondary sources, describe the source and the original procedure for collection. Specify problems and checks.
- E. If data is from other original observation procedures, specify the procedures and expected problems.

V. Analyze Data

- A. Present description of properties.
- B. Report relationships between or among properties.
- C. Consider alternative explanations (other causal properties, chance, etc.)
- D. Conclude whether hypotheses are supported.

VI. Significance and Interpretation of Results

- A. Reevaluate explanations.
- B. Consequences of research.
- C. Future areas of inquiry.

APSA REFERENCE FORMAT

1. Basic Premise: brief references are included in the text, enclosed in parentheses, and all sources are listed alphabetically at the end of the thesis. Conventional footnotes are used only for explanation and/or further elaboration.

2. Examples of In-text References:

A. Old Style: "According to Clement E. Vose(1) and others,(2) more interest groups are resorting to the courts."

B. APSR Style: "According to Clement E. Vose (1972) and others (Berg, 1984; Kluger, 1976), more interest groups are resorting to the courts."

As students will note, the APSR format eliminates the need for footnotes to specify sources. Footnotes need only be used for explanatory comments.

All references to authors in the thesis are placed in a reference section at the end of the thesis. References must be listed in alphabetical order (by author's last name).

3. Examples of References:

A. For books:

Tufte, Edward. 1978. *Political Control of the Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

B. For scholarly articles:

Sigelman, Lee. 1982. "The Nonvoting Voter in Voting Research." *American Journal of Political Science* 26: 47-56.

C. For articles in edited books:

Campbell, J.C. 1984. "Policy Conflict." In E.S. Krauss, ed., *Conflict in Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

4. The advantage of this format is that, given word processing, the student can build his or her reference section during the writing of the thesis without having to type or retype it at the conclusion of the year.

5. Students should also utilize in the writing of the thesis other aspects of the APSR format. For example, the careful organization of tables and graphs, the abstract, and section titles not only help in clearer presentation but also in the organization of thoughts.

