

COMPARATIVE POLITICAL RESEARCH



Syllabus

Code: S_CPR, 6 ECTS credits
2nd period, 2016-2017

Political Science, BSc 2 & PMC

Dr. Paul Pennings (coordinator)
Main Building VU, room 2E-55a

Email: p.j.m.pennings@vu.nl

Dr. Martijn Schoonvelde
Main Building VU, room 2E...

Email: h.j.m.schoonvelde@vu.nl

TIMETABLE

Monday	15.30-17.15	Lecture	(week 44-50)
Wednesday	13.30-15.15	Tutorial, group A – cf. BB	(week 44-50)
Wednesday	15.30-17.15	Tutorial, group B – cf. BB	(week 44-50)

COURSE OBJECTIVES AND CONTENT**Objectives**

This course introduces undergraduate students to the field of Comparative Political Research by placing particular focus on the following aspects. This course:

- provides students with an overview of the central debates within Comparative Political Research.
- teaches students to critically evaluate the premises of theories and the comparative method.
- trains students to set up their own research design. Students are familiarized with key methodological issues such as internal and external validity, conceptualization, measurement, and case-selection.
- teaches students the skills necessary for conducting comparative research across a number of cases (e.g. countries).
- teaches students how to apply the comparative method in qualitative and quantitative research, to think about the advantages and disadvantages of both types of research, and how they can complement each other.

Content

- The course will be taught in the form of lectures and tutorials.
- The tutorials provide students with the opportunity to discuss their preliminary answers to the assignments. The more students prepare and participate in the tutorials, the more feedback they receive in return.
- The course exists of two parts, each with a different focus. Whereas part I teaches students how to assess the quality of existing theories, part II also trains students to perform some empirical research themselves.
- The lectures of Part I introduce students to the basics of Comparative Political Research by addressing central debates within the discipline (Esping-Andersen; Lijphart). Performance is evaluated through individual assignments.
- The lectures of Part II introduce students to the steps of the research process of conducting an empirical study in the field of Comparative Politics. Performance is evaluated through group assignments (with groups consisting of 4 students).

LITERATURE

- Arts, W.A., & Gelissen, J. (2002). Three worlds of welfare capitalism or more? A state-of-the-art report. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12, 137-58.
- Bormann, N.C. (2010). Patterns of democracy and its critics. *Living Reviews in Democracy*, 2, 1-13. <http://democracy.livingreviews.org/index.php/lrd/article/viewarticle/lrd-2010-3/26>
- Cheibub, J.A., Gandhi, J. & Vreeland, J.R. (2010). Democracy and Dictatorship Revisited. *Public Choice*, 143, 67-101.
- Eppler, M.J., Hoffmann, F., & Pfister, R. (2011). Rigor and Relevance in Management Typologies: Assessing the Quality of Qualitative Classifications, mcm working paper No. 1/2011. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/50517413_Rigor_and_Relevance_in_Management_Typologies_Assessing_the_Quality_of_Qualitative_Classifications
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999) Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Ch 5 (pp. 74 – 94). <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/0198742002.001.0001/acprof-9780198742005?rkey=Vy48q6&result=1>
- Gerring, J. (2005). Causation. A unified framework for the social sciences. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 17, 163–98.
- Jackman, R. W. (1985). Cross-national statistical research and the study of comparative politics. *American Journal of Political Science*, 29, 161-182.
- Lijphart, A. (1971). Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method. *American Political Science Review*, 65, 682-693.
- Lijphart, A. (2008). *Thinking about Democracy. Power Sharing and Majority Rule in Theory and Practice*. Taylor & Francis. Ch. 6 (pp. 89-107). <http://www.tandfebooks.com.vu-nl.idm.oclc.org/doi/book/10.4324/9780203934685>
- Lijphart, A. (2012). *Patters of democracy*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press. (pp. 1-7). http://yalepress.yale.edu/yupbooks/excerpts/lijphart_excerpt.pdf
- Lipset, S.M. (1959). Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, 53, 69-105.
- Munck, G.L. & Verkuilen, J. (2002). Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy. Evaluating Alternative Indices. *Comparative Political Studies*, 35, 5-34.
- Pennings, P., Keman, H., & Kleinnijenhuis, J. (2006). *Doing research in political science: An introduction to comparative methods in political science*. London: Sage. (Ch. 1 & 2, pp. 3-28).
- Przeworski, A., & Limongi, F. (1997). Modernization: Theories and facts. *World Politics*, 49, 155-183.

GRADING, DEADLINES & FEEDBACK

The final **grade** for this course has three components: individual assignments, group assignments, and participation (see Table 1 below). You are allowed to compensate grades, i.e. it is not strictly necessary to pass all individual components of the course. If you fail to deliver an assignment either electronically on BB or in print (or both) on time, this will negatively affect your participation grade. If the final version of an assignment is not completed on time, you should still hand in your printed assignment addressed to the respective teacher within the same week.

The **feedback** on the individual assignments in part I consists of two parts. First, there are peer reviews. You select your own reviewer. You are advised to select the reviewer on an exchange basis: You review B and B reviews you. The peer reviews give detailed feedback on the basis of well-defined criteria. The first two reviews will be written on an exchange basis and are not graded. The third peer review on the draft paper is graded. Because of the large number of individual assignments detailed feedback is solely given by the reviewer. If you are not satisfied with the feedback of the reviewer or in doubt about its relevance, you can always ask the lecturer for advice

before or after any class meeting. Second, the tutorials provide detailed instructions and opportunities for asking questions about your work and its assessment.

During **tutorials**, students are randomly asked, and are expected to be able, to present their answers to the assignments. Not being able to respond to questions or to do a presentation counts as being absent. For each assignment, a draft (in pdf) should be submitted through blackboard before the tutorial (see Table 1). The draft has to be at least 50% of the maximum size and end with conclusions in order to count for the participation grade. For all written work, the instructions of the Writing Guide apply.

Regarding **group work**: the task division should be indicated on the front page of your assignment. On request, every group member should be able to present a written proof of his or her contribution to the group assignment. If a group member is not able to show his or her contribution, the grade does not count for that member. In this case, do not mention the student on the front page. Moreover, if the contribution in a group is uneven, the group as a whole can propose to assign different grades to group members (the mean being equal to the initial grade given to the group as a whole). If a group does not function well, these two instruments can be used. **We take group work very seriously**. That means, don't free ride on the work of your fellow students. Not only will this hinder your performance in the class, you are also hindering the learning experience of your fellow students.

For each assignment, you have the right to **resit**. In case of a group assignment, you can resit either as a group or individually. For an individual resit of a group paper you need prior written permission from the responsible lecturer. Permission will be granted only if your participation grade is sufficient, **i.e. at least 50% of both attendance and deadlines for individual and group assignments have been met**. The same rule applies for students who wish to complete the course on an individual basis: this is only possible if you meet the 50% participation criterion just mentioned. The resit is on 17 February 2017, 17.00 (you are obliged to register for the exam in order to obtain a grade). Submit both on BB and as a hardcopy addressed at the respective instructor. If you want to resit a paper for which the deadline has passed you should consult the responsible lecturer first. It may be required that it should be about a new topic (which implies a completely new paper).

Table 1: Breakdown of the course grade.

10%	Participation grade		
	2% Attendance 8% Meeting deadlines	Draft (upload in BB)*	Final (upload in BB + in print during lecture or in post box corridor 2E)
	Individual Assignment 1 on Typologies plus peer review on 9/11 (9.00 hrs)	4/11, 17.00	
	Individual Assignment 2 on Causalities plus peer review on 14/11 (17.00 hrs)	11/11, 17.00	
45%	Assignment Part I (40%) plus peer review (5%) on 18/11 (9.00 hrs) to be graded	16/11, 9.00	21/11, 9.00

	Group Assignment 1 on Research Question, Theory and Hypotheses (on 02/12/16)	28/11, 19:00	
	Group assignment 2 on Data Collection, Measurement and Analysis (on 09/12/16)	05/12, 19:00	
45%	Assignment Part 2 (45%)	12/12, 19:00	23/12, 17:00
(*) In order to be peer reviewed and to count for the participation grade, each assignment has to be at least half of the suggested maximum number of words and end with a conclusion.			

USING SPSS

In the second part of this class you will use SPSS, a statistical package that—together with other statistical packages like R and Stata—is often used in comparative political research. Although you have been exposed to SPSS in the first-year course *Beschrijvende en Inferentiële Statistiek* you will now put SPSS to work in your own research, a prospect that may be a bit daunting for some of you. We want to emphasize though that we will start from scratch and that we will go through the material step-by-step. However, we expect from you that you pay attention in class and during the tutorials and that you speak up when something is not clear to you.

LECTURES & TUTORIALS

PART I. THEORIES

Week 44

Dr. Paul Pennings

31/10/16	Lecture 1	The role of theory in comparative political research
<i>Required readings:</i>		Eppler, Hoffmann & Pfister (2011: pp. 1-6); Lijphart (2012: pp. 1-7); Esping-Andersen (1999: pp. 74-85).
02/11/16	Tutorial 1	Typologies
<i>Content:</i>		Discussion of the assessment of typologies in the individual assignment

Week 45

Dr. Paul Pennings

07/11/16	Lecture 2	Causalities: How does consensus democracy matter?
<i>Required readings:</i>		Gerring (2005); Esping-Andersen (1999: pp. 73-94), Lijphart (2008): Ch. 6
09/11/16	Tutorial 2	Causalities
<i>Content:</i>		Discussion of the assessment of causalities in the individual assignment

Week 46

Dr. Paul Pennings

14/11/16 Lecture 3 The Debate on consensus democracy and welfare statism*Required readings:* Arts and Gelissen (2002); Bormann (2010)**16/11/16 Tutorial 3 Causalities and typologies***Content:* Discussion of the debate on consensus democracy**PART II. METHODS****Week 47**

Dr. Martijn Schoonvelde

21/11/16 Lecture 4 The role of methods in comparative political research*Required readings:* Jackman (1985); Lijphart (1971). Pennings *et al.* (2006)**22/11/16 Tutorial 4 Introduction to the Group Assignments***Content* *Subdivision into groups of 4 and preparation for the group assignments. Example of conducting a literature review.***Week 48**

Dr. Martijn Schoonvelde

28/11/16 Lecture 5 Measuring Democracy*Required readings:* Munck & Verkuilen (2002); Cheibub *et al.* (2010).**Deadline 19:00 Group Assignment 1 due****30/11/16 Tutorial 5 Introduction to SPSS; Collecting Data***Content:* *Introduction to SPSS; Feedback of Draft Group Assignment 1; Introduction to Group Assignment 2***Week 49**

Dr. Martijn Schoonvelde

05/12/16 Lecture 6 Welfare and Democracy*Required readings:* Lipset, 1959; Przeworski & Limongi, 1997.**Deadline 19:00 Group Assignment 2 due****07/12/16 Tutorial 6 Introduction to SPSS; Analyzing and Visualizing Data***Content:* *Conducting analysis in SPSS; Feedback Draft Group Assignment 2;***Week 50**

Dr. Martijn Schoonvelde

12/12/16 Lecture 7 Structuring your paper*Required readings:* *No required readings.*

Deadline 19:00

Draft Assignment 3 due

14/12/16

Tutorial 7

Optional Q&A Final Paper

This is an optional tutorial around the final paper the content of which will depend on requests made / questions asked by the students.

23/12/16

Deadline 19:00

Final Group Assignment 3 due

PART I. ASSIGNMENTS**Individual Assignment on Lijphart's Typology (tutorial 1):**

This individual assignment on Lijphart's typology (tutorial 1) will be the first section in your final paper for part I.

INTRODUCTION (~250 words):

- Introduce Lijphart's typology, copy the typology from in the slides into your paper, and describe in your own words its meaning (how to read it).

DISCUSSION (~1000 words):

- Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of Lijphart's typology using the most relevant criteria for rigor and relevance (see course slides). Put your answers into the same table as the one on the course slide. Discuss the outcomes in the space that is available below the table. See BB for the grading and assessment criteria.

CONCLUSIONS (~250 words):

- Conclude: Explain why Lijphart's typology is (not) a good typology? How can it be improved? See BB for the grading and assessment criteria.

Assessment criteria Assignment on Lijphart's Typology

- Your introduction: is it correct and complete? (5 pts)
- Correctness and Completeness of your evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of Lijphart's typology (60 pts). See BB for the criteria.
- Plausibility of your conclusion. (25 pts). See BB for the criteria.
- The clarity of your argument (English grammar, explanation, formulation, argumentation). (5 pts)
- Use of the Writing Guide (structure, references etc.). (5 pts)

Individual Assignment on Performance (tutorial 2)

Note that this individual assignment on performance (tutorial 2) will be the second section in your final paper for part I. Use this structure in your assignment:

INTRODUCTION (~350 words):

- In this assignment you will combine the theoretical frameworks of Lijphart and Esping-Andersen: do differences between democratic regimes lead to differences in social welfare and performance? Chose two performance indicators stemming from Esping-Anderson and one indicator stemming from Lijphart. Explain why the type of democracy matters for these outcome variables. E.g. How do types of democracies matter for social expenditures, social inequality, satisfaction with life, female representation, environmental performance etc.

EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS (~1000 words):

- Perform a data analysis that includes a test of the causal relationships that you discussed in the introduction. Does your data analysis confirm the assumed causal relationships? Discuss the results and explain why the assumptions are (not) confirmed. You can either do the analysis yourself in SPSS or excel (the data are on BB) or you can discuss the outcomes of existing analyses: see the overview of the literature on BB. For example: Scruggs and Allan (2002) have replicated Esping-Anderson and Armingeon (2002) has replicated Lijphart. See BB for the grading and assessment criteria of the empirical analysis.

ASSESSMENT (~500 words):

- Evaluate the causal relationship(s) using the four questions of Kellstedt and Whitten (see the slides) plus the MOST relevant criteria from the two lists of Gerring (2005). See BB for the grading and assessment criteria of the discussion.

CONCLUSION (~500 words):

- Conclude, on the basis of your evaluation, whether the relationship is truly causal. How could the original proposition (hypothesis) be adapted in order to make the causality more credible? Which change in the research design (case selection etc.) would make the causality more reliable? See BB for the grading and assessment criteria for the conclusions of the assignments in Part I.

Assessment criteria Assignment on Performance

- Your introduction: is it correct and complete? (5 pts)
- Correctness and Completeness of your evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses (60 pts) See BB for the criteria.
- Plausibility of your conclusion: does it logically follow from your discussion? (25 pts) See BB for the criteria.
- The clarity of your argument (English grammar, explanation, formulation, argumentation). (5 pts)
- Use of the Writing Guide (format, references etc.) (5 pts)

Draft Assignment Part I (tutorial 3)

Improve and combine the two previous assignments into one paper which discusses the quality of Lijphart's typology and its causal connection with regime performance. Make sure you present a consistent and well-documented argument that leads to a convincing and compelling conclusion.

New in this assignment is that you will include a discussion of results of existing qualitative comparative research. Include one prominent **qualitatively** oriented author who has done a (comparative) case study in order to test the assumptions of Lijphart or Esping-Andersen. Discuss (in general terms) the strengths and weaknesses of this (comparative) case study and the resulting critiques and alternatives and relate them to your own assessment. Also briefly discuss how Lijphart or Esping-Andersen have commented on alternatives and criticisms: why are they (not) convinced? (max. 3 pages).

Use this structure in your assignment:

INTRODUCTION (~250 words):

- Introduce Lijphart's typology of democratic regimes and why these regimes may differ on performance indicators, in particular related to the welfare state as discussed by Esping-Andersen.

DISCUSSION (~2500 words):

- Apply the relevant criteria to Lijphart's typology in order to arrive at a well-reasoned judgement (~1000 words).
- Present an empirical test of the causal claim that consensus democracies are milder and more gentle in terms of social welfare and other relevant policy indicators. Discuss the logic and rationale of Lijphart's and Esping-Andersen's assumptions and of your empirical findings. Do your findings confirm those assumptions or not? Explain why this is the case (~1000 words).
- In addition, discuss how one qualitative (comparative) case study relates to your own findings (~500 words).

CONCLUSIONS (~500 words):

- Conclude on the basis of your own assessment and that of others to which extent Lijphart's typology meets the relevant criteria. To which extent are these types of democracies related to different worlds of welfare as discussed by Esping-Andersen? Discuss how your results relate to some of the outcomes of the academic literature.

You are free to use text from the previous assignments. See BB for the grading and assessment criteria

Assessment criteria:

- Your introduction (5 *pts*)
- Your judgement based on the relevant criteria for typologies and causalities. The discussion of the alternatives and/or criticisms presented by prominent authors and on the basis of (your own) replication analyses (60 *pts*). See the Rubric on BB.
- Plausibility of your conclusion: does it logically follow from your discussion? (25 *pts*). See the Rubric on BB.
- The clarity of your argument (English grammar, explanation, formulation, argumentation). (5 *pts*)
- Use of the Writing Guide (format, references etc.). (5 *pts*)

Criteria for peer reviews of **Draft Assignment Part I:**

- The review is at least 1/4 of the size of the draft paper that is being reviewed.
- The review includes an evaluation of **each** the assessment criteria (explaining the strengths and weaknesses of the paper). (50%)
- It offers practical advice for **each** of the assessment criteria that helps the student to improve the paper. (50%)

PART II. ASSIGNMENTS

In this methods part of the course students will conduct—in groups of four—their own empirical research project, which is subdivided into Group Assignments 1 and 2 and 3, of which Group Assignment 3 is graded. To prepare for these assignments, Lecture 4 aims to familiarize students with key concepts of the comparative method as well as the different steps of the scientific research process (research question, theory, hypotheses and operationalization, data collection, data analysis, evaluation). Lectures 5 and 6 will introduce students to issues of measuring democracy, as well as evaluating the relationship between (economic) welfare and democracy. These lectures serve as a running example, which will highlight issues that students will encounter in their own work. These topics will also form the basis for the empirical work in SPSS that we will conduct in the Tutorials.

Group Assignment 1: Research Question, Theory and Hypothesis

The first step in the research project is to come up with an interesting research question relating to the theories discussed in class or in the wider field of comparative political science. This can be an empirical puzzle, a theory applied to a specific context, or testing an implication of an existing model. In the readings for week 4 (in particular Pennings *et al.* 2006) you will encounter clear suggestions for what constitutes a good research question. In particular, you will want to decide on a question that builds on existing literature (i.e., it is scientifically relevant) and for which quantitative data is readily available (this is an empirical exercise after all). It is also important to note that it is essential that you explain variation in your *dependent* variable, either between-observations at 1 point in time (for example an analysis of EU countries in 2012), or within-observations across time

(for example, an analysis of an EU member state from 1960 to 2012). Almost by definition it is impossible to explain something that doesn't vary. Given that these considerations are so important, the final decision on a topic will be taken in cooperation with the teacher. For this assignment you will be using the Quality of Government dataset, which contains a large number of interesting indicators, and which will be posted on Blackboard.

In a second step, you will research the relevant literature pertaining to your specific research question, with the aim of developing a theoretically informed answer to your question. A literature review is not just a laundry list of references and nods to authors but instead has to be specifically tailored to problem you address. In Tutorial 4 we will go over the steps of conducting a literature review. From the theoretical model that follows from the literature review, you will develop / derive an empirically testable hypothesis. This will usually take the form of a cause-effect relationship relating some independent variable to a dependent variable.

For this assignment, follow the steps below:

- Define your research question. This should take the form of "What explains the existence of / change in / variation in outcome Y?" This can be a topic we discussed in class or something you yourself are particularly interested in. Be creative here—there are no right or wrong questions but make sure you find something you are interested in and want to explore but which is also theoretically relevant and for which data are available! For example, maybe you are interested in how democracy is related to income in a country? Or how the relative size of government is related to Olympic success? Or maybe you are interested in what explains success of extreme right parties in European member states?
- Theory: Think about how the theories discussed in the readings and in class relate to your research question. Which theories can/cannot explain the phenomenon you are interested in. Explore other/additional explanations based on what you find in a brief review of the literature. Based on this, try to answer your research question. What explains your outcome Y?
- Derive a hypothesis based on your theory that links your cause (independent variable) X to your outcome (dependent variable) Y—and think about how to best measure these two concepts.

For Group Assignment 1, write the following:

- Introduction (~400 words): Briefly introduce the topic you will analyze and why it is important. This is where you take the reader in and convince him or her that what you study matters.
- Theory (~ 500 words): Provide a brief overview of major theoretical approaches that might help answer the research question. Then focus on the theoretical idea that leads to your specific hypothesis.
- Hypothesis (~ 100 words) Write down your specific hypothesis. This usually takes the following form: "In a comparison of countries, if independent variable X changes in way A, then dependent variable Y changes in way B."

Assessment criteria Group Assignment 1:

- The quality of the introduction. In particular, your introduction should convince the reader about the importance of your research. (25 pts)
- The theory section, and in particular the use of discussion of the existing literature. Make sure that your theory section discusses the most important papers that are relevant to your research question. Clearly situate your research in the larger academic debate. (40 pts)
- The hypothesis, and whether it follows from the theory section. (25 pts)

- The clarity of the argument (English grammar, explanation, formulation, argumentation). (5 pts)
- Use of the Writing Guide (format, references etc.). (5 pts)

Group Assignment 2: Measurement, Case Selection and Analysis

After you have finished Group Assignment 1, you will empirically test your hypothesis using quantitative data, which will require you to think about operationalization and measurement of your variables, and your case selection and where to find the data. Once you have the data in hand (**this is a very important step which will require time and attention!**), a data analysis appropriate to the data structure will be conducted to provide a test of the hypothesis. Basic skills for carrying out a simple analysis in SPSS will be taught in the tutorials. Throughout this process, you will be closely monitored and supported by the teacher.

For this assignment, follow the steps below:

- Write a measurement and data section. This section should contain all the information about your observations and your independent and dependent variables. What are your observations? What is your dependent variable? What is your independent variable? How are they measured (nominal, ordinal, interval)? Keep your reader in mind: he or she should be able to exactly reproduce your steps just from reading your work.
- Data Analysis and Interpretation of the Results. In a first step you use SPSS to make a table that summarizes the variation in your independent and dependent variables. You then go on to make a figure or table that displays the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable. Are they positively related? Negatively? Or is there no relationship at all? What does this mean? Clearly verbalize the observed relationship in substantive terms. In a second step you describe your analysis. Summarize the relationship between the two variables and interpret the results.

For Group Assignment 2, write the following:

- Measurement and Data (~ 400 words): Describe for which cases (e.g., countries) you found data, how the concepts that are part of your theory are measured, and what the source of your data is. (40 pts)
- Data Analysis and Interpretation of the Results (~ 600 words): Provide a descriptive statistics table. How exactly do your independent and dependent variables vary? Provide a scatter plot of your data and interpret your results. Are there any identifiable patterns? Does the overall picture support your hypothesis? Which cases stand out? Conduct a regression analysis or some other type of analysis, depending on the structure of your data. (50 pts)

At this point it is important to emphasize a few things. First, it is important that you think hard about your case selection, regardless of whether you are doing a quantitative analysis or a comparative case study. Pennings *et al.* (2006) have a lot of important things to say about case selection as part of building a convincing research design. Second, it is important that you follow both Tutorials on SPSS, so that you know what is expected of you at the analysis stage. At the very minimum you should be able to describe your data using SPSS and display and interpret the bivariate relationship between your independent variable and your dependent variable. Ideally you would also want to run a regression and interpret your results. These are skills that you learned in your first-year course *Beschrijvende en Inferentiële Statistiek* but this time you will apply them using your own comparative data. Third, it is important to emphasize that none of this is beyond you. Pay attention during the lectures and the tutorials and ask questions if you feel you are lagging behind. Talk to your peers, and use the opportunities that are offered.

Assessment criteria Group Assignment 2:

- Measurement of the variables and case selection. The writing should be such that an interested reader could replicate the steps that the authors took in setting up their research design. (40 pts)
- Analysis and interpretation of the results. This section should include clear and labeled Table and Figures that summarize the observed relationship between the independent and independent variable. In addition, the reader should be clearly guided through interpretation of the results. (50 pts)
- The clarity of the argument (English grammar, explanation, formulation, argumentation). (5 pts)
- Use of the Writing Guide (format, references etc.). (5 pts)

Group Assignment 3: Final Paper

In this assignment, you will transform your work in Group Assignments 1 and 2 into a full research paper. Much of the body of the paper is already there, but what is now needed is that you update the introduction to include the work you have done in the paper, and include an abstract, which briefly summarizes the paper. Second you will write a conclusion in which you evaluate your results. **When** developing your paper it is important that you follow the Writing Guide in Political Science that is posted on Blackboard. We want to emphasize that writing a good paper is not just about jumping through the hoops we set for you, but about enjoying the writing as well. Keep your initial excitement for your topic in mind when writing and rewriting your paper. Take the reader in and be creative. Use the literature you cite in your literature review as an example. How are these authors building up their argument and how are they reporting on their results?

For Group Assignment 3, write the following:

- Abstract (~150 words): In your abstract you write a brief summary of your research question, theory and your findings. Look up other papers in comparative politics and learn from how they structured their abstracts. The abstracts **cannot** be longer than 150 words.
- Introduction (~ 400 words): Update your introduction so that it refers to the work you have done in the rest of the paper. What is your research question? What are your theoretical focus and your hypothesis? What data do you use? What is the main result that follows from your analysis?
- Conclusion (~400 words): This is the part of the paper where you evaluate your results. What conclusions can you draw from your analysis? What have been the strengths and the weaknesses of your analysis? If your analysis did not confirm your hypothesis, speculate about why this is the case. In particular, analyze one or more cases that did not fit your hypothesis. What may be the reason they deviate? Be specific here, and go in-depth by studying these cases more closely.
- Bibliography: use the Writing Guide in Political Science to write down a bibliography for all the literature you have consulted in your paper.

In total your paper will be about 3000 words. It will have been a hectic few weeks but you'll have learned a lot of new skills (SPSS, cooperating on a comparative politics paper) and possibly contributed to the body of knowledge in political science!

Assessment criteria Group Assignment 3:

- Abstract and introduction. The abstract clearly summarize the contribution of the paper in light of the existing literature of the topic at hand (10 pts)
- Introduction. The introduction clearly introduces the reader to the topic at hand, and describes the analytical approach and results that follow in the paper. (10 pts)
- Overall structure of the paper. The extent to which the sections and the overall structure of the paper adhere to the Writing Guide in political science. (10 pts)

- Conclusion and evaluation of the analysis. Are the results from group assignment critically evaluated? To what extent are deviant cases analyzed in-depth? (50 pts)
- Bibliography. All the citations in the paper need to be correctly displayed in a reference section. (10 pts)
- The clarity of the argument (English grammar, explanation, formulation, argumentation). (5 pts)
- Use of the Writing Guide (format, references etc.). (5 pts)