

NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COURSE CODE: POL 228

COURSE TITLE: INTRODUCTION TO COMPARATIVE POLITICS

POL 228

INTRODUCTION TO COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Course Developer: **Abdul-Rahoof Adebayo Bello**

School of Arts & Social Sciences

National Open University of Nigeria

Lagos.

Course Writer: **Prof.Olarotimi Ajayi**

Landmark University,

Omu-Aran, Kwara State.

Course Coordinator:

Course Editor:

NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

POL228

Course Guide

National Open University of Nigeria

Headquarters

E-mail: centralinfo@nou.edu.ng

URL: www.nou.edu.ng

National Open University of Nigeria 2020

First Printed 2009

ISBN: 978-058-949-X

All Rights Reserved

CONTENTS PAGE

Introduction …….....

Course Aims …….....

Course Objectives …….....

Working through the Course …….....

Course Materials …….....

Study Units …….....

Textbooks and References …….....

Assessment Exercises …….....

Tutor-Marked Assignment …….....

Final Examination and Grading …….....

Course Marking Scheme …….....

Course Overview/Presentation…….....

What you will Need in this Course …….....

Tutors and Tutorials …….....

Assessment Exercises.....

How to Get the Most from This Course …….....

Conclusion …….....

Summary …….....

Course Description

Pol. 228: Introduction to Comparative Politics (3 Credit Unit)

This course, POL 228- Introduction to Comparative Politics, is a three credit unit course for undergraduate students in Political Science and other Social Science disciplines. The course compares political systems across the world with a focus on different types of political systems. It also introduces students to the foundation of comparative politics particularly the works of its founding fathers and other scholars particularly the perspectives they espoused. The materials have been developed with special reference to Nigeria. It also provides you with information on the organization and requirements for the course.

Course Aims and Objectives

The general aim of this course is to help you have the basic knowledge and understanding of Comparative Politics, and to enable you appreciate its usefulness in Political Science.

To achieve the general aim set out above, POL 228 has the following as specific objectives:

i) Educating you about the basic concepts and principles of comparative politics.

ii) Highlighting the value of comparison in political studies.

iii) Acquainting you with the methods of comparative politics.

iv) Educating you about how to analyse contemporary political issues using comparative method.

In addition to the general objective of the course, each unit also has specific objectives. It is advisable that you read them before you start working through the unit. Reference may be made to them in the course of study of the units as self-assessmentsstrategy.

Expected Outcomes

On successful completion of the course, you should be able to:

a) Discuss the definitions, scope and origin of Comparative Politics

b) Explain the approaches to the study of Comparative Politics

c) Understand the importance and limitations of Comparative Politics.

d) Comprehend the logic of comparative social inquiry

e) Identify the focus and thrust of comparative politics

f) Understand the role of concepts, models and theories in Comparative Politics

g) Explain the problem of conceptualization in Comparative Politics

h) Gain an insight into the nature and function of paradigm in Comparative Politics

i) Explain political systems across different societies

j) Understand ideologies from the different political platforms in the world

k) Discuss democracy on comparative basis along different political spectrum.

l) Explain the impact of Globalisation on Comparative Politics.

Working through the course

To complete the course, you are required to read the study units and other related materials. It is also necessary to undertake practical exercises for which you require a pen/pencil, a note-book, graph paper and other materials that will be listed in this guide. The exercises are to aid your understanding of the units being presented. At the end of each unit, you will be required to submit written assignments for assessment. At the end of the course, a final examination will be written.

Course Materials

The major materials needed for this course are:

(i) Course guide
(ii) Study guide
(iii) Assignment file
(iv) Relevant textbooks including the ones listed under each unit
(v) You may also need to listen to educative programmes and special reports on electronic and print media.
(vi) In addition, you also need to read newspapers, news magazine, and academic journals. You also need to interact with computer to explore the Internet facilities (specifically browse Google Scholars to access some of the reference materials).

Study Units

There are 18 units (of four modules) in this course. They are listed below:

Module 1: Background to Comparative Politics

Unit 1: Definitions of comparative politics

Unit 2: Origin of comparative politics

Unit 3: Comparative Methods

Unit 4: Focus or Thrust of Comparative Politics

Module 2 Tools of Comparative Politics

Unit 1: Concepts & Models

Unit 2: Theories & Logic

Unit 3: Classification

Unit 4: Case Study

Module 3 Methods of Comparative Study

Unit 1 Comparing Many Countries

Unit 2 Comparing Few Countries

Unit 3 Single- Country Studies

Unit 4 Difficulties in Comparison

Unit 5 Comparative Democratic Order- Federalism

Module 4: Comparative Political Institutions

Unit 1: Parliamentary System

Unit 2: Presidential Systems

Unit 3 Advantages and Shortcomings of the Systems

Unit 4: Comparing the Parliamentary and Presidential Systems

Unit 5: Judiciary in Comparative Perspectives

Textbooks and References

Certain books have been recommended in the course. You may wish to purchase online and, or download them for further reading.

1. Adam Przeworski (2007). Is the science of comparative politics possible? www.researchgate.net/profile/adamprzeworks/publication/287514283Above essay is an adaption from: Henry Tuene& Adam przeworski (1970). The knowledge of Comparative Social Inquiry. New York: Wiley Interscience.
2. Daniele Caramani ed. (2017). Comparative Politics, 4th edition. United Kingdom, Oxford University Press.

3. Dirk Berg-Schlosser (2012). Mixed Methods in Comparative Politics, Principles and Applications. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
4. Gabriel Abraham Almond & James Smoot Coleman (2015). The Politics of Developing Areas. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
5. Goran Hyden (2006) African Politics in Comparative Perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Hague, Rod and Martin Harrop. 2013. Comparative Government and Politics - An Introduction. 9th ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
7. Jorgen Rasmussen (2009). The Process of Politics. A Comparative Approach. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
8. Kenneth newton & Jan W. Van Deth (2016). Foundations of Comparative Politics- Democracies of the Modern World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
9. Mark Kesselman, Joel Krieger, William A. Joseph (2018). Introduction to Comparative Politics: Political Challenges and Changing Agendas. Australia: Cengage.
10. Richard A. Joseph (2014). Democracy & Prebendal Politics in Nigeria – The rise and fall of the Second Republic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Wiarrds, H.J. (2005) Comparative Politics: Critical Concepts in Political Science, London, Rutledge.

Assessment File

An assessment file and marking scheme will be made available to you. In theassessment file, you will find details of the works that must be submitted to thetutor for grading. There are two aspects of the assessment of this course; the TutorMarked Assignment and the written examination. The marks obtained in these twoareas will make up the final mark. The assignment must be submitted to the Tutorfor formal assessment within the deadline stated in the presentation schedule andthe Assignment file.

The work submitted to the Facilitator for assessment will count for 30% of thestudent's total score.

Tutor Marked Assignment (TMAs)

You will have to submit a specified number of the Tutor Marked Assignment(TMAs). Every unit in this course has a TMA. You will be assessed on four ofthem but the best

three grades from the TMAs will be used for your 30% grading.When you have completed each assignment, such should be sent together with aTMA Form to your Tutor. You are advised to ensure that each assignment reachesyour Tutor on or before the deadline for submissions. If for any reason, you cannotcomplete the work on time, contact should be made with the Facilitator for adiscussion on the possibility of an extension. Extensions will not be granted afterthe due date unless under exceptional circumstances.

Final Examination and Grading

The final examination will be a test of three hours. All areas of the course will beexamined. You should find time to read the unit all over before the examination.The final examination will attract 70% of the total course grade. The examinationwill consist of questions, which reflect the kinds of self-assessment exercises andTutor Marked Assignment previously encountered. And all aspects of the coursewill be assessed. You should use the time between completing the last unit, andtaking the examination to revise the entire course.

Course Marking Scheme

The following table lays out how the actual course mark allocation is brokendown.

Assessment	**Marks**
Assignments (Best Three Assignments out of Four marked)	30%
Final Examination	70%
Total	100%

Submission Schedule

The dates for submission of all assignments will be communicated to you. You will also be told the completion dates of study and examinations.

Course**Overview and Presentation Schedule**

Units	**Title of work**	**Weeks activity**	**Assignment (end-of-unit)**
Module 1	**Background to Comparative Politics**		

Unit 1	Definition of Politics and Comparative Politics	Week 1	Assignment 1
Unit 2	Origin of Comparative Politics		
Unit 3	Comparative Methods	Week 2	Assignment 2
Unit 4	Focus or Thrust of Comparative Politics		
Module 2	**Tools of Comparative Politics**		
Unit 1	Concepts & Models	Week 3	Assignment 3
Unit 2	Theories & Logic		
Unit 3	Classification	Week 4	Assignment 4
Unit 4	Case Study in Comparative Politics	Week 5	Assignment 5
Module 3	**Methods of Comparative Study**		
Unit 1	Comparing Many Countries	Week 6	Assignment 6
Unit 2	Comparing Few Countries	Week 7	Assignment 7
Unit 3	Single- Country Studies		
Unit 4	Difficulties in Comparison	Week 8	Assignment 8
Unit 5	Comparative Democratic Order: Federalism		
Module 4	**Political Systems**		
Unit 1	Parliamentary system	Week 10	Assignment 10
Unit 2	Presidential System	Week 11	
Unit 3	Advantages & Shortcomings of the Systems		Assignment 11
Unit 4	Comparing Presidential and Parliamentary Systems	Week 12	Assignment 12
Unit 5	The Judiciary in Comparative Perspective	Week 13	Assignment 13
	Total	**Week 13**	

How to Get the Most from This Course

In distance learning, the study units replace the university lecture. This is one of the great advantages of distance learning; you can read and work through specially designed study materials at your own pace, and at a time and place that suits you best. Think of it as reading the lecture instead of listening to the lecturer. In the same way a lecturer might give you some readings to do, the study units tell distance learner what to read and which are your text materials or set books. Distance learners are provided exercises to do at appropriate points, just as a lecturer might give his students exercise in a formal classroom setting. Each of the study units follows a common format. The first item is an introduction to the subject matter of the unit, and how a particular unit is integrated with the other units and the course as a whole. Next to this is a set of learning objectives. These objectives guide you to know what you should be able to do by the time the units have been completed. These learning objectives are meant to guide you in your studies. The moment a unit is finished, you must go back and check whether you have achieved the objectives. If this is made a habit then, you will significantly improve your chances of passing the course. The main body of the unit guides you through the required reading from other sources. This will usually be either from your set books or from a reading section. The following is a practical strategy for workingthrough the course. If you have any difficulty, you should contact your tutor for assistance. Remember that the Tutor's job is to provide guidance. So do not hesitate to call and seek for such assistance when needed.

On the whole, you need to

1. Read this Course Guide thoroughly, it is your first assignment.
2. Organize a Study Schedule. Design a 'Course Overview' to guide you through the course. Note the time you are expected to spend on each unit and how the assignments relate to the units. Whatever method you choose to use, you should decide on and write in your own dates and schedule of work for each unit.
3. Once you have created your own study schedule, do everything to stay faithful to it. The major reason why students fail is that they are behind in their course work. If you get into difficulties with your schedule, please, seek help before it becomes too late to help.

4. Assemble the study materials. You will need your set books and the unit you are studying at any point in time. As you work through the unit, you will know what sources to consult for further information.

5. Keep in touch with your Study centre, where you can always obtain up-to date course information.

6. Review the objectives for each study unit to confirm that you have achieved them. If you are not sure about any of the objectives, review the study materials or consult your tutor.

7. When you are confident that you have achieved a unit's objectives, you can start on the next unit. Proceed unit by unit through the course and try to pace your study so that you keep yourself on schedule.

8. Note that you will learn a lot by turning in your assignment as at when due. The assignments have been designed to help you meet the objectives of the course and, therefore, will help you pass the examination.

9. When you have submitted an assignment to your tutor for marking, do not wait for its return before starting on the next unit. Keep to your schedule. When the assignment is returned, pay particular attention to your tutor's comments, both on the marked assignment form and also the written comments on the ordinary assignments.

10. After completing the last unit, review the course and prepare yourself for the final examination. Check that you have achieved the unit objectives (listed at the beginning of each unit) and the course objectives (listed in theCourse Guide).

Tutors and Tutorials

Information relating to the tutorials will be provided from time to time as appropriate. Your tutor will mark and comment on your assignments, keep a close watch on your progress and on any difficultiesyou might encounter and provide assistance to you during the course. You must take your tutor-marked assignments to the study centre, at least two working days before the due date. They will be marked by your tutor and returned to you as soon as possible.

Do not hesitate to contact your tutor if you need help. Contact your tutor if:

- You do not understand any part of the study units or the assigned readings
- You have difficulty with the exercises
- You have a question or problem with an assignment or with your tutor'scomments on an assignment or with the grading of an assignment.

You should always attend the tutorials. It affords opportunity for interaction with other students. It will also enhance the face-to-face contact with your tutors, where questions encountered in the course of your study are raised and answered instantly. To gain the maximum benefit from course tutorials, prepare a question list well ahead of tutorials. You will learn a lot from participating in discussion actively.

Summary

The course guide gives you an overview of what to expect in the course of this study. The modules have been carefully designed to introduce you to the field of Comparative Politics. We wish you success in this academic programme. It is our hope that you will find this course both interesting and useful.

Course Description:	The course analyses fundamental issues in politics from comparative perspectives. It is designed to facilitate your understanding of different political systems and the scheme for classifying and comparing them.
Course Aims:	The course is structured in a way to equip you with the requisite knowledge and skills in explaining political issues anddevelopments across various system of the world

Course Outcomes

On successful completion of the course, you should be able to:

a) Discuss the definitions, scope and origin of Comparative Politics

b) Explain the approaches to the study of Comparative Politics

c) Understand the importance and limitations of Comparative Politics.

d) Comprehend the logic of comparative social inquiry

e) Identify the focus and thrust of comparative politics

f) Explain the problem of conceptualization in Comparative Politics

g) Understand the role of concepts, models and theories in Comparative Politics

h) Gain an insight into the nature and function of paradigm in Comparative Politics

i) Explain political systems across different societies

j) Understand ideologies from the different political platforms in the world

k) Discuss democracy on comparative basis along different political spectrum.

CONTENT:

MODULE 1 BACKGROUND TO COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Unit 1DEFINITIONS OF POLITICS AND COMPARATIVE POLITICS

1.1 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Definition of Comparative Politics

3.2 Comparative Government

3.3 Comparative Strategies

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

This Unit introduces the conceptual understanding of Politics and Comparative Politics as a sub-field in Political Science. This will enable you have an understanding of the issues involved in Comparative Politics. The Unit also identifies the different forms of comparison and the significance of Comparative Politics as sub field in political science discipline.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to

1. Understand and conceptualize Comparative Politics
2. Appreciate and explain the different forms or methods of comparison in political politics
3. Assess the usefulness of comparative politics in political science and the broader social sciences.

3.0 MAIN CONTENTS

3.1 Definitions of Comparative Politics

Comparative Politics is a sub-field of Political Science. Other sub-fields are Public Administration, Political Theory, International Relations, Public Policy Analysis and Political Economy among others. The study of Comparative Politics is essentially, to enable us understand the diversity of processes and institutions of states across ages. To be sure, when we look at the politics, economic and institutions of the various states of the world we discover that there exist wide variations. The questions now are:

- Why are some countries poor and others wealthier?
- What enables some countries to 'make it' in the modern world while others remain perpetually poor?
- Why do poor countries often find themselves under authoritarian regime, while the richer countries are democratically governed?
- Why did states that inherited parliamentary system change to presidential system?
- What are the internal social and political conditions as well as the international structures of these various countries that explain the similarities as well as the difference?

These questions among others lie at the heart of the field of Comparative Politics. According to Ray (2004), it is now widely felt that a realistic evaluation of the government and politics or political system of one's own country is made possible by understanding the governmental process in other countries. By this, not only does comparative study of governments facilitate objective and rational judgment about political systems, but also at the same time dispels the 'dangerously misleading form of ethnocentrism' that one's own country is superior to any other. The study of government is an important part of the study of politics. The structure and behaviour of government, as Roy notes, constitute an existing and challenging area of concern for students of Political Science. Modern governments are emerging more and more as indispensable instrumentalities of multifaceted development, especially in the developing nations of Asia, Africaand Latin America, and also as an active force in the forming of economic, social and environmental conditions.

On the global scene, there are varieties of political systems. The different political systems capture an enormous variety of institutions, processes, and interactions. Thus, it is difficult to see two countries that are completely identical. In other words, governments have varied complexity. Thus, Comparative Politics involves the systematic study and comparison of the world's political systems. It seeks to explain differences between as well as similarities among countries. In contrast to journalistic reporting on a single country, comparative politics is particularly interested in exploring patterns, processes and regularities among political systems. It looks for trends, for changes in patterns; and it tries to develop general propositions or hypothesis that describe and explain these trends. It seeks to do such comparisons rigorously and systematically, without personal, partisan, or ideological axes to grind. It involves hard work, clear thinking, careful and thorough scholarship, and (hopefully) clear, consistent, and balanced writing (see Mark Kesselman et.al, 2018).

In the same vein, comparative politics "aim at an exact knowledge of the nature, end and means of Government. It compares the different forms of government with each other and each of them with their effects on the public and private happiness".

Similarly, Thomas Magstadt and Peter Schotten see Comparative Politics in terms of comparing and contrasting different governments, i.e. comparative analysis of forms of government, stages of economic development, domestic and foreign policies and political traditions. Thus, Comparative Politics helps to formulate meaningful generalizations about government and politics across countries/states. Some comparative political scientists specialize in studying a particular nation intensively. Others focus attention on a particular political phenomenon such as instability or voting behaviour. It compares systems of government in othercountries. For example, a Comparative Political Scientist might investigate the impact of political parties on elections in Australia, the United States, and the United Kingdom.

To Michael Sodaro, comparative Politics is simply an examination of political realities in countries all over the world, looking at the many ways people behave in politics. It also examines political activities within individual countries, and then compares with the domestic experiences of others. For instance, we can compare various democracies with one another to learn more about the process of democracy. We can as well compare various non-democratic governments to learn more about how they work e.g. Communist countries or military dictatorships.

Gregory Marter asserts that, some people view comparative politics from the angle of relativity, terms like bigger, stronger, freer, more stable, less democratic, and so on. Comparative politics, then, involves no more and no less than a search for similarities and differences between and among political phenomenon, including political institutions (such as legislatures, political parties, or political interest groups), political behaviour (such as voting, demonstrating, or reading political pamphlets) or political ideas (such as liberalism, conservatism, or Marxism). The central theme of politics also constitutes the thrust of comparative politics.

On the whole, Comparative politics is characterized by an empirical approach based on the comparative method. ArendLijphart argues that comparative politicsdoes not have a *substantive* focus in itself, but rather a *methodological* one: itfocuses on "the *how* but does not specify the *what* of the analysis." In other words, comparative politics is not defined by the object of its study, but rather by the method it applies to study political phenomena. Peter Mair and Richard Rose advanced a slightly different definition, arguing that comparative politics is defined by a combination of a *substantive* focus on the study of countries' political systems and a *method* of identifying and explaining similarities and differences between these countries using common concepts. Rose also maintains that, "The focus is explicitly or implicitly upon more than one country, thus following familiar Political Science usage in excluding within-nation comparison. Methodologically, comparison is distinguished by its use of concepts that are applicable in more than one country."

When applied to specific fields of study, comparative politics may be referred to by other names, such as comparative government (the comparative study of forms of government) or comparative foreign policy (comparing the foreign policies of different States in order to establish general empirical connections between the characteristics of the State and the characteristics of its foreign policy).

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

> Attempt a definition of Comparative Politics., looking at issues that dominate the attention of scholars in the field.

3.2 Comparative Government

Comparative Government was the earliest adopted method of comparing political institutions. By Comparative Government, we mean the method adopted by the classical

scholars like Aristotle, Plato, Locke, etc to study the institutions of government basically using the constitutions of countries as basis of analysis. Comparative government is equally referred to as the study of foreign government because of the focus of the philosophers who studied politics comparatively was on foreign government. The philosophers who studied government comparatively went about this basically by gathering and analyzing the constitutions of different countries with a view to identifying the similarities and differences characterizing the workings of government. As Roy C. Macridis avers, comparative government entails the study of the legal instrumentalities of government and of political processes conceived as a result of the interaction between the properly constituted organs of government, namely, the electorate, the legislature, the executive, the administration, and the courts.

Philosophers who studied government on comparative basis used the descriptive approach. The approach focuses on describing the structure and institutions of government. That is, the scientific method is discountenanced under the comparative governments because rather than looking into processes to establish cause-effect relationship, only the institutions like, the military, bureaucracy, political parties, executive, legislature and judiciary attracted description from the scholars. This approach, which is basically traditional, has been criticized as being static, formalistic, and essentially a country by country analysis. What constitute the difference and clearly mark out comparative politics from comparative government is the methodology adopted by the former.

The evident weakness/inability of comparative government to study politics, using the scientific approach of method, and to that extent advance knowledge has prompted some modern scholars to explore other means by which the study of politics could be made scientific. According to Kalleberg (1966), numerous contemporary political scientists have endeavoured to create a more dynamic, empirically interpreted, and truly comparative method of analysis. What then is comparative politics?

Comparative Politics is that area of study in political science which adopts the scientific method thereby going beyond the study of the structure and institutions of government through traditional descriptive approach. It focuses on explaining the processes and activities involved in the workings of the institutions of government. The essence of this is to establish a relationship between cause and effects by discovering similarities and regularities as well as patterns of interactions among institutions, groups and social

systems. This approach adopts the scientific method and its procedure in studying the institutions and behaviour of actors in the political process.

It is interested in knowing how the political process has been shaped through the actions and inactions (behaviour) of political actors. Nevertheless, while effort is being made to make the study of politics scientific through the various techniques adopted under the comparative politics, the institutions of government which comparative government focuses on remain indispensable to the understanding of political actions. Consequently, comparative politics is interested in assessing the workings of the institutions of government as well as the behaviour of actors operating the system. It is consequently interdisciplinary in nature.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

What does Comparative government entail?

3.3 Comparative Strategies

Different strategies can be used in comparative research.

- Most Similar Systems Design/Mill's Method of Difference: it consists in comparing very similar cases which only differ in the dependent variable, on the assumption that this would make it easier to find those independent variables which explain the presence/absence of the dependent variable.
- Most Different Systems Design/Mill's Method of Similarity: it consists in comparing very different cases, all of which however have in common the same dependent variable, so that any other circumstance which is present in all the cases can be regarded as the independent variable.

Some major works in comparative politics include the following:

- Aristotle: In his work, The Polity compared different "constitutions", by introducing a famous typology based on two criteria: the number of rulers (one, few, many) and the nature of the political regime (good or corrupt). Thus he distinguished six different kinds of "constitutions": monarchy, aristocracy, and polity (good types), versus tyranny, oligarchy and democracy (corrupt types).
- Barrington Moore compared revolutions in countries like England, Russia and Japan (among others). His thesis is that mass-led revolutions dispossess the landed elite and result in Communism and that revolution by the elite result in

Fascism. It is thus only revolutions by the bourgeoisie that result in democratic governance. For the outlier case of India, practices of the Mogul Empire, British Imperial rule and the Caste System are cited.

- Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, in their work, The Civic Culture embarked on the first major cross-national survey of attitudes to determine the role of political culture in maintaining the stability of democratic regimes.
- ArendLijphart also embarked on a comprehensive study of democracies around the world
- Theda Skocpol compared the major revolutions of France, Russia and China: three basically similar events which took place in three very different contexts. Skopcol's purpose was to find possible similarities which might help explain the phenomenon of political revolution.

3.3.1 Forms of Comparison

Among the types of studies that students of Comparative Politics actually do are the following:

1. Studies of one country – or a particular institution (Political parties, militaries, parliaments, interest groups), political process (decision making), or public policy (for instance, labour or welfare policy) in that country.
2. Studies of two or more countries. Such genuinely comparative studies are harder to carry out, and they are usually more expensive in terms of travel and research cost. Hence, the studies of comparative politics do a case study of one country first and later move on to study others and elaborate the comparison between them. Such a step is very important intellectually because it is in knowing and writing about two or more countries that students can begin to make genuine comparisons.
3. Regional or area studies. This may include studies of Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, East Asia, South East Asia, Europe or other sub regions (Southern Europe or North Africa for example). Such studies are useful because they involve groups of countries that may have several things in common – for example, similar histories, cultures, languages, geographic locations, legal systems, religions, colonial backgrounds, and so on.
4. Studies across regions. Such studies are becoming more prevalent, but at more advanced levels they are often expensive and difficult to carry out. One must

know, master and travel to not just one region but two or more. Such studies might involve comparisons of the role of the military in Africa and the Middle East or of the quite different paths to development of the East Asian countries and Latin America.

5. Global comparisons. With the improved statistical data collected by the World Bank, the UN, and other agencies, it is now possible to do comparison on global basis. Such studies can best be done through the use of statistical correlations. But such correlations cannot be said to prove causation – that is, that economic growth causes democratization, there is a relationship between economic growth and democracy, but the first does not necessarily cause the second
6. Thematic studies. Comparative politics focuses on themes as well as countries and regions. For example, some scholars may be interested in the changing role of the state in comparative perspective, in the process of military professionalization as seen comparatively, in the structure of class relations as analyzed comparatively, or in the process of political socialization. Others may be interested in such themes as dependency theory (the dependence of some countries on others), the process by which emerging countries achieve national development, or the newer systems of interest group representation call "corporatism" viewed from a comparative viewpoint.

3.3.2. Why Study Comparative Politics?

The study of Comparative Politics, among other reasons, helps to achieve the following objectives:

- To capture and analyse the major political similarities and differences between countries. The task is to develop some perspective on the mixture of countries and variability which characterizes the world's governments and the political contexts in which they operate.
- Comparative Politics helps scholars to overcome biases associated with ethnocentrism.
- It enables us to understand how nations change and the patterns that exist.
- It is intellectually stimulating and exciting as a sub-discipline of political science.
- It employs a rigorous and empirical methodological approach to the study of politics, institutions, etc.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.3

Explain the rationale for the study of Comparative Politics and the various strategies adopted in the study of Comparative Politics?

4.0Summary

In this Unit, definitions of Comparative Politics as a sub-field of Political Science were espoused. The unit also delved on the dimensions of Comparative Politics as a discipline, while considering the process at the different forms of comparison. Finally, the significance of Comparative Politics, and advanced reasons for it as a field of study was duly examined.

5.0 Conclusion

Comparative Politics represents a significant area in political science. The Unit has shown that as a field of study that focuses on the workings of the institutions of government as well as the behaviour of actors operating the system, the discipline is interdisciplinary in nature. An understanding of this reality will enable students have a better understanding of the course.

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments (TMAS)

Define comparative politics as espoused by three different authors and explain the strategies adopted in comparative study?

7.0 References/Further Readings

1. Lijphart, Arend (1971). "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method". American Political Science Review 65 (3): 682–693.
2. Mair, Peter (1996). "Comparative Politics: An Overview". in Goodin, Robert E.; Klingemann, Hans-Dieter. A New Handbook of Political Science. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 309–335.
3. Hopkin, J. (2002) "Comparative Methods", in Marsh, D. and G. Stoker (ed.) Theory and Methods in Political Science, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 249-250
4. Todd Landman and Edzia Carvalho (2016). Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction. 4th Edition. London:Routledge Taylor & Francis Group

UNIT 2: ORIGIN OF COMPARATIVE POLITICS

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Different Phases in the Development of Comparative Politics

3.2 Approaches to the study of Comparative Politics

3.3 The Revolution in Comparative Politics

3.4 New Approaches to the Study of Government and Politics

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Readings

1.0 Introduction

In this Unit, attemptis made to provide a historical background to the study ofComparative Politics. The Unit also highlights the approaches to the study ofComparative Politics from a historical point of view. The characteristics ofeach of the approaches are examined, beginning from the traditional to themodern epoch.

2.0Objectives

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to:

1. Explain the developmental process of Comparative Politics as a fieldof study.
2. Identify the peculiarities of each epoch in the developmental process
3. Understand the uniqueness of Comparative Politics as it is known inmodern political studies.

3.0 Main Contents

The attempt to study politics comparatively started about 2300 years ago. Philosophers like Aristotle, Plato, and Socrates among others blazed the trail in this regard. However, it is necessary to point out that attempt to study institutions comparatively actually predate the era of traditional philosophers that we have earlier mentioned. For instance, several chapters of the Bible consist of several comparisons of Israel with other states around them. God, according to the bible, constantly compared Israel with other nations each time the Israelites took a wrong step, or when they sinned against Him. By this, the nation of Israel and its governance was constantly compared with the states of the gentiles to see in what ways the Israelites had conformed to the lifestyle of the nations around them.

Four phases or epoch are often identified in the evolution of comparative politics. These are the **traditional epoch**, the **renaissance**, the**enlightenment** and the **modern epoch**.

3.1 Different Phases in the Development of Comparative Politics

3.1.1 The traditional and renaissance Periods

The traditional epoch was essentially the era of philosophers like Aristotle, Plato and Socrates when focus was on the institutions of government. Essentially, the philosophers who belong to that epoch studied the institutions of government by way of describing how they operate. Their analysis was predicated on the constitutional basis of the working of the institutions if government. They studied political institutions to discover what state is best governed and what form of government best served the common good. Aristotle compared existing political systems in order to theorize about the best possible regime. Aristotle's ultimate concerns were ethical in natureashe was interested in questions of justice. His empirical investigations were driven by such questions as: what is the good life?

What form of government is best? What is the relationship between the type of political regime in a given place and the moral character of the people who live under them? Aristotle studied 50 Greek City states and categorized them into different system of governments.

The second phase is the renaissance period. This is the era of the rebirth or revival of Comparative Politics in Europe. Philosopher like John Locke, Thomas Hobbes and John Montesquieu, Niccolo Machiavelli were some of the major actors during the period. Essentially, these philosophers, among others, focused on the institutions of government by studying the workings of the institutions of the various European States. They were highly normative in their study. Thus, they were concerned with how best a state should be organized? What should be the basis of authority that will command obedience from the citizens? Should citizens obey government and what form of government is best for the society? The philosophers who belong to the epoch, like the traditionalists before them, were basically prescriptive in approach. That is because they merely studied institutions to explain a form of government as either bad or good and often accounted for the reasons for the observable development in the institutions. The third phase is the age of enlightenment.

3.1.2. The Age of Enlightenment and the Modern Era

The third epoch in comparative politics is the age of enlightenment, the era of 18^{th}century intellectual movement in Western Europe that emphasized reason and science in philosophy and in the study of human culture and the natural world. In this phase were philosophers like David Richardo, Adams Smith, Karl Marx, Fredrich Engel, Nigel among others. During the historical phase, the philosophers made efforts to elevate intellectual activity to the realm of scientism. Beyond the level of common sense and reason, the philosophers started to provide explanation to justify the political, social, and economic structure and system of their time.

For instance, Karl Marx studied the origin of modern states through human historyusing the scientific method. He succeeded in coming out with the various phases in human history. According to him, the phases in human history include communalism, slave, feudal, capitalism, socialism, and communism. However, as evident in the work of Marx the approach of this epoch is equally prescriptive.

Nevertheless, the thinking of these scholars has largely shaped the world's political system and processes. For instance, the Russian revolution of 1917 was pioneered by VladimirLenin who gave practical effect to the idea of Marx on socialism. Also, Adams Smith's theory on international trade with regards to comparative and absolute advantage in world trade is still as valid as ever.

The contemporary or modern era is the fourth phase. In the modern epoch, emphasis shifted from mere focusing on the institutions of government to a critical examination of the processes and activities of both actors and institutions, as well as the behaviour of institutions using the scientific procedures. Basically, this era succeeded in taking political studies out of the traditional and description domain by adopting the scientific tools in the study of politics. Scholars who belong to this epoch include David Easton, Robert Dahl, Gabriel Almond, Harold Lasswell, ArendLijphard, Arthur Kalleberg etc. These scholars attempt to study politics comparatively by gathering and analyzing data, so as to provide explanation for certain political development, the ultimate aim of which is to be able to predict political phenomenon. In this epoch, scholars attempt to establish the relationship between A and B and if there is no relationship, the probable reason for the absence of relationship.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

1. Identify the main attributes of the traditional phase in the development of Comparative Politics
2. Show the major difference between the nature of Comparative Politics in the age of enlightenment and the modern period.

3.2 Approaches to the study of Comparative Politics

There are basically two approaches to the study of politics. These are the traditional approach and the behavioural approach.

3.2.1. The Traditional Approach

The traditional approach became popular among many American political scientists in the 19th and early 20th centuries and has up till date continued to attract consideration in political discourse. According to Ray (2004:5), 'the traditional approach to the study of comparative government grew out of a response to the historicism of the nineteen centuries. The approach placed much emphasis on the formal and legal aspects, as well as the political institutions of the states in its analysis. The approach embraces the descriptive method in explaining any political phenomenon. The most important ones are the historical, legalistic and institutional approaches.

Right from its inception in the 19th century, US Political Science was looked uponby many of its practitioners as primarily a historical discipline. In the opinion of the people, only a thin line of separation was thought to lie between history and political science. Political science was even considered a branch or division of the former. This is underscored by Richard Jesen, who avers that the motto of this generation of political scientist was 'history is past politics and politics present history.' In other words, political science was really seen primarily as political history, and included such fields as the history of political parties, of foreign relations, and of great political ideas.

Furthermore, it appears and in fact always seemed natural to limit the study of politics to law or the legal system. This is the legalistic perspectives of the study of politics. An approach which has its origin among the US political scientist who conceived political science primarily from the stand points of studying the constitutions and legal codes. Those who study politics from this perspective endeavour to answer questions relating to politics and actions of political actors from constitutional or legal underpinning of actions.

Characteristics of the Traditional Approach

Comparative Politics has certain characteristics which are the focus of the traditional approach. The characteristics and the emphasis of the traditional approach on the comparative study of government reveal the source of the current dissatisfaction as well spring the inevitability of the need for reorientation. Comparative study has comparative in name only. It has been part of what may loosely be called the study of foreign governments. Under this condition, the governmental structure and the formal organization of the institutions of the state were treated in a descriptive, historical, or legalistic manner. Thus, emphasis was primarily placed on written documents like constitutions, and the legal prescriptions for the allocation of political power. It is worthy of note to point out that although the comparative studies were on foreign governments, it was largely addressed to the Western European democracies or to political systems of Western Europe.

The traditional approach to the study of comparative government is essentially non-comparative. Most studies in the area of comparative government deal either with one country or with parallel descriptions of the institutions of a number of countries. An overwhelming proportion of literature in this field illustrates this fact. By this, the students of comparative government are schooled in constitutional foundations, the

organization of political power as well as a description of the ways in which such powers are exercised in each case.

Another characteristic of the traditional method is that it is descriptive in approach.

One of the major characteristics of the traditional approach is that it adopts the historical method, while the work was largely legalistic. It was basically descriptive. Consequently, itmay be contended that undertaking the description of the formal political institutions is vital for the understanding of the political process and that as such it leads to comparative study. A great proportion of the study carried out with the utility of the traditional approach often carry out separate descriptions of the institutions of individual countries and fails to make explicit comparisons. In most cases, the works describe various politicalinstitutions generally without attempting to compare them. Consequently, only avery negligible comparison is done in reality. And this is limitedexclusively to the identification of differences between types of systems, such as federal versus unitary system or parliamentary versus presidential system or the differences between democratic and totalitarian systems.

Another point to note is that the traditional approach is narrow and parochial. A large number of works in foreign political systems focused on the analysis of the institutions of government in Western European. Various factors comprising the accessibility of the countries studied by the scholars, the relative absence of language difficulties, easy access of necessary and official documents to consult on the countries being studied and other source materials, as well as cultural affinities, made the focus on European states attractive.

The traditional approach is equally static in nature. It is significant to point out that the traditional approach often discountenances the dynamic factors that account for growth and change. After the evolution premises of some of the original works in the nineteenth century were abandoned, students of political institutions apparently lost all interest in the formulation of other theories in the light of which change could be comparatively studied.

The traditional approach has most often appeared as monograph. It is important to note that in the study of foreign governments, while a large volume have been written, the greatest percentage has been in form of monographs.

The InstitutionalApproach.

When it dawned on the political Scientists that legal code or framework and the constitution are too narrow to capture politics in its entirety, a shift in emphasis became inevitable. The necessity to study political relations was believed to be the central theme of politics, rather than just its history or legal manifestations. By this, the basic and most evident realities of political studies focused essentially on political institutions, namely, legislatures, executives and courts. At this stage, some rudimentary kind of empirical study became manifest. This is what has been described as naïve empiricism. Despite the seeming application of rudimentary empiricism, the work done by the institutionalists is mainly descriptive. Indeed, the comprehensive description of political institutions, rather than offering analytical explanation of the political systems, is the goal of the institutionalists. For instance, the legal power, responsibilities and functions of the legislative assembly are listed and described.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Identify the key elements of the traditional approach to the study ofComparative Politics.

3.3 The Revolution in Comparative Politics

Following the observable weaknesses of the traditional approach as depicted by its very characteristics, there were efforts towards innovation and attempts to create a new intellectual order. The result, as Sidney Verba notes, is a revolution in comparative politics. The revolution manifested in:

- looking beyond description to more theoretically relevant problems
- looking beyond the formal institutions of government to political process and political conditions.
- looking beyond the countries of Western Europe to the new nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

These efforts at reforming the approach to the study of government and politics, according to Almond and Powell, were motivated, essentially, by the search for more comprehensive scope, the search for realism as opposed to idealism, the search for precision and the search for theoretical order. Consequently, ‘the mood of

dissatisfaction with the subjectivism and formalism of the traditional approach to the study of government and politics led, by the logic of the situation, to the process of reconstruction of the discipline' (Ray, 2004: 6). It was the efforts to explore new approach that yielded the behavioural approach.

3.3.1 The Behavioural Approach in Political Science

According to Robert A. Dahl, the most striking characteristic of the behavioural approach in political science is the ambiguity of the term itself, and of its synonym 'political behaviour'. The behavioural approach seems rather difficult to be appropriately defined. The difficulty posed in finding appropriate definition for behaviouralism is seen in what one could say with considerable confidence that it is not.It is difficult to say what it is. In the opinion of Dahl, a little investigation of what behavioural approach is,reveals that confusing and even contradictory interpretations given to the terms from its emergence. The transformation that resulted from the shift of focus from the traditional approach to the behavioural approach is that the institutional mode of analysis was replaced with the process mode. Therefore, the behaviour of political actors, either of persons or groups, rather than the structures and institutions became the main attraction in a political study. In the opinion of Ray, behaviouralism has a dynamic dimension that is extremely valuable in accurately capturing the mercurial quality of political life. It appears that the term 'political behaviour' was first used by American political scientists from the First World War onward. The concept was however coined by an American journalist, Frank Kent, who published a book in 1928 entitled Political Behaviour'. The meaning that Kent ascribed to political behaviour is that of reporting the things that 'really' happen and not the way they were supposed to happen.

The Meaning of Behaviouralism

As earlier noted, finding an appropriate definition for behaviouralism has been most challenging. Despite this challenge, writers have attempted to define the concept in the most all-encompassing way. For instance, David Easton attempted to specifically identity the basic features that perhaps added up in given definite meaning to behaviouralism. However, in an attempt to unveil the analytical, methodological riddles as well as the operational technique underling the concept, David Easton, rhetorically ask a pertinent question on what is the nature of (the) assumptions and objectives, the intellectual foundations on which (behaviouralism) has been constructed? To answer

these questions, require a multi-dimensional thinking as it will be difficult to conjure a one-way definition that will capture in its totality and accurately too the subject matter of the behavioural approach. Easton consequently came up with the following as the foundations upon which behaviouralism is predicated.

Regularities: There are discoverable infinities in political behaviour. These can be expressed in generalizations or theories with predictive value.

Verification: The validity of such generalizations must be testable, in principle, by reference to relevant behaviour.

Techniques: Means for acquiring and interpreting data cannot be taken for granted. They are problematic and need to be examined self-consciously, refined, and validated so that rigorous means can be found for observing, recording, and analyzing behaviour.

Quantification: Precision is the recording of data and the statement of findings requires measurement and quantification, not for their own sake, but only where possible relevant, and meaningful in the lights of other objectives.

Values: Ethical evaluation and empirical explanation involve two different proportions that, for the sake of clarity, should be kept analytically distinct. However, a student of political behaviour is not prohibited from asserting propositions of either typeseparately or in combination as long as he does not mistake one for the other.

Systematization: Research ought to be systematic, that is, theory and research are to be seen as intertwined parts of a coherentand body of knowledge. Research conducted by theory may prove trivial, and theory unsupported by data, futile.

Pure Science: The application of knowledge is as much a part of the scientific enterprise as theoretical understanding but the understanding and explanation of political behaviour logically precede and provide the basis for efforts to utilize political knowledge in the solution of urgent practical problems of society.

3.3.2 Nature and Features of the Behavioural Approach

Considering the above foundational premise of the new approach to the study of government and politics, this development gives birth to the operational and analytical reconstruction. By this, the institutional mode of analysis lost its prime place to the process mode. Equally important is that assertion shifted away from the state, as the central organising concept, while focus was turned to the empirical investigation of

relations among human beings.Thus smaller and more manageable units like individuals and groups, and their interaction became the focus of analysis.

In addition, a salient focus of the methodological innovation had been the defining of institutions as systems of related individual behaviour or systems of social actions. For example, instead of studying the Nigerian Supreme Court or the Nigerian National Assembly as isolated institutions, the behaviouralists seek to study the behavioural patterns of the judges or members of the institutions.With regards to the methods, it is evident that there is indeed a discernible moveaimed at building of sophisticated models. Similarly, the new approach has lent itself to the use of quantitative techniques of statistical measurement and manipulation, as well as the utility of computer in speeding up its manipulation of large amount of quantitative data, and in stimulating administrative or military process of decision making.

Considering the widen scope of the approach, the level of scientific tools readily available for use and the body of knowledge it has generated, the revolution in the study of comparative government and politics, according to Sydney Verba, have yielded a rich body of theoretical literature, a proliferation of frameworks, paradigms and theories, and elaborate systems models which are important as part of the intellectual equipment of the student of political systems.

Self-Assessment exercise (SAE) 3.3

1. Assess the impact of the behavioural revolution to the study of Comparative Politics.

3.4 New Approaches to the Study of Government and Politics

Approaches to modern empirical political studies are numerous. But for our purpose at this level, we shall only examine two. These are the Systems Theory and the Structural Functionalist Theory.

General Systems Theory.

No doubt, the emergence of the behavioural approach has translated into a change of both analytical tools and methodological framework from what it used to be under the traditional model. The new approach has equipped students of government and politics with the required analytical tools, conceptual framework and the models within which critical evaluation of political phenomenon may be executed. The new approach places

more emphasis on empiricism than normative study. Consequently, a number of theories have been developed under the scholarly ambit of behaviouralism to empirically study and explain political phenomenon.

In the opinion of Ray (2004), the most important among these are a number of systems approaches which stem from the general system theory. Historically, systems theory had its root in the natural science. However, the theory was the result of the movement aimed at the unification of science and scientific analysis. It was the intention of the proponents of the systems theory to find a central point that could serve as a wider platform for creative analysis. The concept is predicated on the notion that objects or elements within a group are not only related in one way or the other, but also, in turn, interact with one another on the basis of certain identifiable processes. The utility of systems theory is most relevant in political analysis because it does not only identify the components in any framework or social system but also encourage the evaluation of the patterns and levels of relationship among different units. It therefore establishes the fact of interrelatedness and interdependence of distinct but interactional units.

Although the systems theory has its origin in the natural sciences, it was adoptedand adapted as an analytical framework in political science particularly in the middle of the twenty centuries. For instance, David Easton, one of the major pioneers of the application of systems theory to political studies, defines a political system as that 'behaviour or set of interaction through which authoritative allocations (or binding decisions) are made and implemented for society.' A system is marked by different action and integration. The proponents of the system theory identify three primary components of every political system. These components include the political community; the regime; and the authorities. By this, the political community comprises people bound together by a political division of labour. The regime in this case includes the constitutional legal structures as well as the political processes for institutional norms. Those individuals who exercise power as the agents of the state at any given time constitute the political authorities.

The general systems theory operates with certain basic concepts:

The first among the concepts is descriptive concept. These include, for instance, open and closed systems, organismic and non-organismic systems, such hierarchical levels as subsystems, orders of interaction and scale effect. Also important are concepts of general systems theory that deal with the factors for the regulation and maintenance of

systems. In this class are concepts like stability and equilibrium among others. Other concepts include boundaries, input and output specifically relating to aspects of organization. Some concepts also pay attention to the dynamic of change, capturing both disruptive and non-disruptive notions of adaptation. Some of these concepts enable us to understand why a system may break down and while some others thrive. They may also highlight under what condition a system comes under stress due to overloading. Indeed, there are myriads of concepts which the students of comparative politics could take advantage of in understanding factors that facilitate political stability and those that are threat to the stability of a polity. This perhaps explains why Ray (2004) notes that the general systems theory provides a broad framework for the examination of politics.

Offshoots of the Systems Theory

To develop new methods for the purpose of political analysis some basic framework and terminology of the general systems theory have to be adapted by the behaviouralist. David Easton has been credited with developing an original and unique systemic approach for the purpose of political analysis. By this, Easton developed the input – output analytical framework. This model stresses the behaviour of the political system vis-a-vis its environment in terms of analysing inputs (demand as supports) and outputs (authoritative allocation of values or policy decisions and actions). Easton intends to make his theory an all-purpose theory that is capable of being utilized to analyse any form of political systems or international political systems. In fact, David Easton sees political systems as that system of interaction in any society through which binding or authoritative allocations are made and implemented. Thus wherever authoritative decisions are made the input – output functions are performed, either at the local or international political levels.

Weakness of the Easton Input – Output Approach

The input - output analytical framework has proved useful and remains an excellent technique for comparative analysis. This is more so because it is focused on an overview of entire political systems, and has an inclusive set of concepts and categories which facilitate comparison. As useful and comprehensive as the input outputapproach is, it has certain weaknesses. These include:

Firstly, the presumptions that questions concerning system–persistence are the most important and inclusive subjects for political analysis may not be always tenable. Secondly, the importance of the analytical framework, contrary to the expectation of Easton, the input-output theory falls short of being a general theory of politics in the real sense of the word.

Thirdly, the theory is narrow with a highly restricted coverage with regards to the interactions among the different political systems.

Finally, the theory focuses on the politically active and relevant members of society which tends to give it an elitist orientation.

Structural Functional Analysis

The Structural Functional Analysis is one of the foremost system-derivatives in Political Science, and a major framework for political research. According to Bernard Sussie (1992), in practical sense, structural-functionalism often presupposes a 'systems' view of the political world. Although structural functionalism originated from anthropology and has been applied in sociology, it has been adopted as a framework for political analysis in political science. Indeed, it was adopted in the field of comparative politics by Gabriel Almond. This mode of analysis is fundamentally concerned with the phenomena of system maintenance and regulation. The basic theoretical proposition is that in all social systems, certain basic functions have to be performed. The central question is: 'what structure fulfils what basic functions and under what conditions in any given system. In the words of Radcliff-brown, Function is the contribution that a partial activity makes to the total activity of which it is a part. The function of a particular social usage is the contribution it makes to the total social system.

The theory presupposes that a political system is often made up of several structures which are "patterns of action and resultant institutions". While there are different institutions and patterns of actions, they all however have certain functions which are defined as objective consequences for the system. By this, a function is, therefore, a regularly recurring pattern of action and behaviour carried in for the preservation and advancement of the system. Although various institutions perform different functions, a system may sometimes become dysfunctional. The reverse of function is in fact dysfunctional. Dysfunctional implies an action detrimental to the existence of growth of the system. A certain degree of dysfunction is inevitable in the operation of any pattern

of action on occasion, it is possible to identify actions or decisions which are functional for the political system as a whole for some of its components but dysfunction for certain groups or individuals.

On the other hand, structures refer to those arrangements within the system which perform the functions. According to Gabriel Almond, there is no such thing as a society which maintains internal and external order which has no 'political structure'. Merton contends that a given function can be fulfilled by many different structural arrangements.

Gabriel Almond developed a list of functional requisites and divided them into four inputs and three output functions. The four functions are: political socialization and recruitment, interest-articulation, interest-aggregation, andpolitical communication. The three output functions, performed by nongovernmentalsystems, by society, and the general environment, are regarded as highly significant. The output functions are performed by the traditional government agencies like the legislature, the executive, the judiciary and the bureaucracy.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.3

Compare and contrast the Systems theory and the Structural-Functionalist theory as frameworks for comparative political research.

4.0 Summary

This Unit delved into the historical background to the study of Comparative Politics. The basic assumptions of the traditional epoch were examined. The revolution in political studies that culminated in the emergence of the behavioural and later, the post behavioural schools were also outlined. Two major theories to further explain the contemporary frameworks for comparative political analysis were also identified and examined.

5.0 Conclusion

The study of Comparative Politics has undergone a series of metamorphosis. Each of these stages left indelible footprints in the process that culminated into what may be referred to as Comparative Politics of the 21st century. Each was relevant to the issues of their time, and therefore significant to a total appreciation and understanding of what constitutes the totality of Comparative Politics.

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments (TMAs)

1. Compare and contrast the traditional phase and the renaissance period ofComparative politics.

2.Identify the salient features of the behaviouralist era in comparative Politics.

7.0 References/Further Reading

1. Almond G. A. (1956): "Comparative Political Systems" Journal of Politics. Vol. Xviii, No.3, August, pp 395 – 396.
2. Ray, S.N, (1999), Modern Comparative Politics: Approaches, Methods and Issues, New York, Harcourt, Brac.
3. Ley Roy M. K., Comparative Politics, UK, Thomson Wadsworth.
4. Wiards, H.J. (2005) Comparative Politics: Critical Concept in Political Science, London, Rutledge.
5. S. Ulmer.(1961). Introductory Readings in Political Behaviour, Chicago and McNally.
6. H. Elock, (1976). Political Behaviour, London, Methuen & Co Ltd.

UNIT 3 COMPARATIVE METHOD

1.0Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Comparative Methods

3.1.1 Different Views of the Comparative Method

3.1.2 Normative and Empirical Research

3.2 Why Do We Compare

3.2.1 Advantages of Comparison

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

In this Unit, attempt is made at explaining what the Comparative Method entails. The unit provides justification for the adoption of the Comparative Method in politicalstudies, its strength over other scientific methods usually employed in testing empirical relationships.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to:

1. Discuss Comparative method and all that it entails.

2. Explain the imperatives of Comparativemethod.

3. Show the advantages of the Comparative method in political analysis.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Comparative Method

Comparative method in the understanding of political phenomenon is referred to as the 'master strategy' for its utility and capacity to drawing inferences about causation in any area of study. By this, it means that comparative approach encompasses the strategies and techniques which scholars adopt or embrace to advance understanding within the field.

Comparing institutions and the workings of such institutions, most often, is intended to answer certain questions with regards to why the observable trends in the institutions are what they are. To effectively achieve this, experiments and statistical analysis may have to be designed in order to get the root of the cause ofthe observable patterns of institutional behaviour. Experiment andstatistical analysis designed to uncover relationships of cause and effect necessarily involve a comparison between observations, whether of individuals, social groups or countries.

Arthur L. Kalleberg (1996) in his article, "The Logic of comparison: A methodological note on comparative study of political systems"highlights some approaches towards the understanding of political phenomenon. As Kalleberg notes, phrases such as 'decision making' 'interest groups' and 'functionalism' which are so commonly found in general social analysis, all refer to basic 'approaches' to the study of social and political phenomena. Essentially, they are expressions symbolizing alternative focus of scholarly interest. They are not terms that refer to any of the procedures (logical or operational) basic to scientific method.

3.1.1 Different Views of Comparative Methods

According to Arendlijphart, comparative methods are defined from three standpoints. First, the comparative method is defined here as one of the basic methods. The others being experimental, statistical, and case study methods of establishing propositions. Similarly, it is, in the first place, definitely a method, not just "a convenient term vaguely symbolizing the focus of one's research interest (Kalleberg, 1996). Second, the comparative method is defined here as one of the basic specific methods, not the scientific method. By this definition as Lijphartargues, comparative method is narrower in scope than what Harold Lasswell has in mind when he argues that "anyone with a scientific approach to political phenomena the idea of an independent comparative

method seems redundant", because the scientific approach is 'unavoidably comparative'. However, Gabriel A. Almond equates the comparative method with the scientific method. As Almond argues, 'it makes no sense to speak of a comparative politics in political science since it is a science; it goes without saying that it is comparative in its approach.

Third, the comparative method is here regarded as a method of discovering empirical relationships among variables, not as a method of measurement. These two kinds of methods should be clearly distinguished. Kalleberg had the latter in mind when he discusses the 'logic of comparison.' He defines the comparative method as 'a form of government'; comparison means 'non-metrical ordering', or in other words, ordinal measurement. On a final note, Lijphart avers that, 'the comparative method may be thought of as a basic research strategy'.

The comparative method is - together with the experimental method, the statistical method and the case study approach - one of the four fundamental scientific methods, which can be used to test the validity of general empirical propositions, i.e. to establish empirical relationships among two or more variables while all other variables are held constant. In particular, the comparative method is generally used when neither the experimental nor the statistical method can be employed: on the one hand, experiments can only rarely be conducted in political science; on the other hand, the statistical method implies the mathematical manipulation of quantitative data about a large number of cases, while sometimes political research must be conducted by analysing the behaviour of qualitative variables in a small number of cases. The case study approach cannot be considered a scientific method according to the above definition; however, it can be useful to gain knowledge about single cases, which can then be put to comparison according to the comparative method.

3.1.2 Normative and Empirical Research

Basically, there are two broad paths on the road of political inquiry, namely, the normative and the empirical approach. The normative approach focuses upon philosophy, values and norms. The empirical approach relies on measurements and observation rather than theory or norm. The differences between the two groups would be further explained.

According to ArendLigphart, there are four basic methods of discovering and establishing general empirical prepositions. One of these methods is experimental, while the other three are non-experimental. The non-experimental methods are the case study, the statistical method and the comparative method.

The case study method involves "the intensive study of individual cases. The statistical methods involve more sophisticated forms of measurement and observation: public opinion polls, survey research, and various other forms of quantitative measurement are used to help make the measurement and observation that is characteristics of the empirical approach even more accurate. The comparative method may be likened to two or more case studies put together.

We focus upon a particular political structure or behaviour and examine it in a comparative perspective. We look for similarities, and differences in different settings, or we may do our comparison in one setting but compare across time, this is called **diachronic comparison**. For example, we may compare Nigeria legislature in 2015 with that of 2011 and 1999 in order to observe differences in the relative power and structures of that legislature. Or we may compare institutions or behaviour at one point in time -**synchronic comparison** but compare across national borders, for example, examining the role of the legislature in Nigeria with the role of the legislature in the United State of America or Australia.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

Account for the different views on the theme of Comparative Methods

3.2. Why Do We Compare?

We undertake comparison in political studies to achieve the following objectives

1. Comparison is a useful way to evaluate what we see and hear about the world beyond our shores, as well as about our own society.
2. It widens our understanding of politics in other countries.
3. To increase our appreciation of the advantages and disadvantages of our own political system and to enable us to learn from other countries.

4. To develop a more sophisticated understanding of politics in general including the nature of democracy and non-democratic governments, the relationships between governments and people, the interdependencies connecting individual countries with the rest of the world, and other concepts and processes.

5. To see the relationship between politics around the world and such fields as science and technology, the environment, public health, law, business,religion, ethnicity, culture, and the like

6. To enable us to become more informed citizens, so that we can more effectively develop our own political opinions, participate in political life, evaluate the actions and proposals of political leaders, and make our own political decisions and electoral choices.

7. To sharpen our critical thinking skills by applying scientific logic and coherent argumentation to our understanding of political phenomena.

8. An attempt to identify and explain the fundamental patterns of political behaviour across different societies and cultures may help us arrive at useful theoretical generalizations.

3.2.1 Advantages of Comparison

Several reasons explain the advantages of comparison in political analysis. They include:

1. It enables the "comparativists" to find out, and by implication know more about the places where they would otherwise know little about. Having adequate and relevant background information about foreign governments not only helps to interpret new developments, it also helps with practical political relationships. In international politics, the fact that one is aware that the decision-making environment in his domestic terrain is not the same with those of others is enough factor to influence the attitudinal modification in relating with other countries. This explains why Dogan and Pelassy (1990) aver that studying the politics of other countries helps us to discover our own ethnocentrism and the means to overcome it.

2. It improves our classifications of political processes. For instance, once institutions and political systems have been identified by their different processes and characteristics it becomes less problematic to classify. Thus when constitutions are grouped into written and unwritten, or electoral systems into proportional and non-proportional, we search for the factors which predispose countries to have one type rather than the other. In a similar vein, when different political features and the processes that shape them are taken, it may become easy to know why one operates and behaves the way it does and why the others do not. Consequently, once we classify executives into presidential and parliamentary types, or party systems into presidential and parliamentary types, or party systems into two-party or multi-party, we may then try to find out what the end results are. All this could only be achieved only when there is variation and the possibility of measurement, so as to be in a proper stead to explain.

3. Comparison arms the comparativists with the potential and tools for explanation. Comparative researchers seek to understand a variety of political systems not just for the sake of it but in order to formulate and list hypotheses about the political process. Comparison gives us some potential for prediction and control. Comparison of analysis enables us todevelop and scrutinize such questions as: Do proportional representation in electoral systems always produce a multi-party system? Are revolutions most likely after a defeat in war? Evident from these questions is that hypothesis depicts a relationship between two or more factors or variables. For example, between electoral and party systems, or between war and revolution.

4. With comparison, the political scientist is armed with the potential for prediction and control. By this, a validated generalisation offers the comparativists the potential for prediction. Thus the ability to predict occurrence based on the relationships between variables and the outcomes that are consistently produced is the fourth reason for comparison.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Explain the central objectives and advantages of Comparative Politics as a sub-field in Political Science?

4.0Summary

In this unit, attempts have been made to explain what the Comparative Methods entail. The major characteristics of both normative and empirical studies are examined, with a view to further situating Comparative Studies within the realms of scientific research. The unit also enumerates why the tools of comparative Studies are employed and their advantages in political studies.

5.0 Conclusion

Comparative studies remain an important sub-field of Political Science. Its centrality in political studies cannot be over-emphasised, given the inherent advantages outlined in this Unit. Comparative Methods indeed lend further credence to the study of Politics as a scientific discipline.

6.0 Tutored Marked Assignments (TMAs)

Discuss the rationale for comparison in political studies and enumerate the advantages in comparative studies?

7.0 References/ Further Readings

1. Lijphart, Arend (1971). "Comparative politics and the comparativemethod". *American Political Science Review* 65 (3): 682–693.

2. Mair, Peter (1996). "Comparative politics: An overview". in Goodin, Robert E.; Klingemann, Hans-Dieter. *A New Handbook of PoliticalScience*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 309–335.

3. Hopkin, J. [2002 (1995)] "Comparative Methods", in Marsh, D. and G. Stoker (ed.) *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 249-250

4. Blondel, J (ed), Comparative Government-A Reader, London, Macmillan.

5. Hechscher, G (1957), The Study of Comparative Government and politics, London, Macmillan.

UNIT 4: FOCUS OR THRUST OF COMPARATIVE POLITICS

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Most Similar and Most Different Systems

3.2 Main Focus of Comparative Politics

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0Introduction

This Unit attempt to further elucidate on the central theme of Comparative Politics. The Unit provides answers to the basic question: How do we go about using comparative method? If we indiscriminately engage in comparing every object within the political landscape, in a very short time we will find ourselves inundated with similarities and differences, most of which will turn out to be trivial distinctions either in scope or in significance. Consequently, the researcher gets bogged down in inconsequential detail. As a result, in this Unit, we want to show how comparative analysis is undertaken, and why it is undertaken, and provide examples of the types of things that one might look at while engaging in this kind of study.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to:

1. Explain the major theme or main focus of Comparative Politics.

2. Discuss the two general approaches to the study of Comparative Politics.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Przeworski& Tenure "Most Similar and Most Different Systems"

Adam Przeworski and Henry Tenure discussed two general approaches to the comparative method that they called the "most similar system design and the"most different systems" design. Investigations take two systems that are, for themost part similar, and subsequently study differences, that exist between the two basically similar

systems. They may, then, observe the impact of these differences, in some other social or political phenomenon. Their studies are based on the belief that "systems that are similar with respect to as many features as possible constitute the optimal samples for comparative inquiry. If some important differences are found between two essentially similar countries, then the number of features attributable to these differences will be sufficiently small to warrant explanation in terms of these differences alone.

There is a different approach to comparative inquiry, one that Przeworski and Tenure call the "most different system" approach. This approach allows us to select two or more systems to compare that may not be essentially similar. Instead of looking for differences between two or more essentially similar nations, focusing on nation states, for example, we look for similarities, between two or more essentially different nations. An example is the study of Britain and the United Arab Emirate, in terms of their political structures and political behaviour. If we find a political behaviour that is similar in the two systems, and we are interested in knowing why that behaviour is the way that is, we know that the explanation cannot lie in the many political structures, and patterns of behaviour that differs in the two nations; we must look elsewhere.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

Explain Przeworski and Tenure's two general approaches to the Comparative Method

3.2 Main Focus of Comparative Politics

Comparative Politics focuses mainly on the following:

1. What governments do: In comparative studies, we focus attention on what governments do. Comparisons may be made between governments of different nations, governments in various stages of development (for example, "developed" nations versus "developing nations", or governments and policy over time (for example, the government of Nigeria in 1999 and the government of Nigeria of 2019). Although the focus of attention is upon what government do, however the study may prop up why governments act, and what the stimuli are that help the governments in question to decide to act in the direction that they do at the time than they do.
2. Political behaviour: Studies of this type may focus on voting behaviours, political stability, political elite and leaders in politics, party behaviour and so

on. The central thrust of this assumption is thatif one understands how people behave in a political system, then onecan develop an understanding about the political system within whichthat behaviour takes place.

3. Governmental institutions: this type of study may focus on legislatures, executive, courts, constitutions, legal systems, bureaucracies and perhaps even political parties. It is argued that, by studying these institutions of a regime, we are in a better position to understand how the regime operates than studying it through behavioural or policy approach. Often in comparative analysis we focus our attention on countries. Countries are important to study for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that they happen to be the links into which the contemporary world is operated. That is to say, it would be difficult to engage in comparative research without touching upon the political structure that we call the nation-state. Beyond this, however, nation-state, often are useful basis for analysis because of what they represent.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Identify the main focus of Comparative Politics from the standpoints of the functions of government.

4.0 Summary

Approaches to the study of Comparative politics are varied. Nevertheless, there are dominant themes that are easily identifiable as this Unit has shown. We need to arm ourselves with these tools as we embark on comparing politics across different political climes.

5.0 Conclusion

The Unit has explained the central focus or theme of Comparative Politics as a field of study. This is meant to serve as the vital foundation necessary for understanding the critical issues involved in comparative political studies.

6.0 Tutored Marked Assignment

1. Explain the major focus of Comparative Political Studies from the angles of behaviour of political actors and government institutions

2. Discuss the two major approaches to Comparative Politics identified by Przeworski and Tenure.

7.0 References/Further Readings

1. Adam Przeworski (2007). Is the Science of Comparative Politics Possible? In www.researchgate.net/profile/Adam_Przeworski/publication/287514283
2. Henry Teune and Adam Przeworski (1970). The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
3. Almond G. A. (1956): "Comparative Political Systems" Journal of Politics. Vol. Xviii, No.3, August, pp 395 – 396.
4. Hague, R. and Harrop, M. (2001): Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction, New York, Palgrave.
5. Ray, S.N. (1999): Modern Comparative politics: Approaches, Methods and Issues, New York, Harcourt, Brac.
6. Ley Roy M. K, Comparative Politics, UK, Thomson Wadsworth. Wiards, H.J. (2005) Comparative Politics: Critical Concept in Political Science, London, Rutledge.

MODULE 2. TOOLS OF COMPARATIVE POLITICS

UNIT 1: CONCEPTS & MODELS

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Meaning of Concepts and models

3.2. Theories

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

As we have earlier pointed out, Comparative Politics is a subfield of Political Science. As Political Scientists, we define terms and concepts as precisely as possible. This is

premised on the fact that, all sciences must strive for clarity of definition with respect to the phenomena they study and the terms and concepts they employ. The absence of this may result in conceptual confusion. This is because the same terms or concepts may mean different things to different people or they may have several meanings that depend on the context in which they are used.

2.0 Objectives

In this Unit, you are expected to, among others, be able to:

1. Understand the usefulness of concepts in Comparative Political Analysis.

2. Explain the place of models in Comparative Political Studies.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Meaning of concepts and models

According to Sodaro (2001) "a concept is a word, a term, or a label that applies to a whole class or category of phenomena or ideas" Concepts that are closely associated with comparative politics include: Politics, the State Government, Political System, Democracy or Dictatorship, Presidential versus Parliamentary; Political Institution, theory, variables, observations to mention just a few. On the other hand, a model is a simplified representation of reality in descriptive or abstract form. Models seemed to be peculiar to the Natural Sciences, but with the advent of behaviouralism and the post behavioural school, models have gained increasing importance to the study of politics. Hence political science and ofcourse comparative politics make use of models in presenting and analysing data. Although the composition of these models is different, they all serve the same function: they enable us to understand some aspect of reality, whether Geodynamics or the economy or politics by representing some of its essential features in a simplified or idealized form. It is necessary to note that, models cannot be perfect copies of the realities they represent. The primary goal of a model is not to represent reality perfectly, but to enable us understand reality by allowing us to compare it against some standards or pattern. Models are to be used, more specifically, as guides to further understanding. Models are learning devices that serve a heuristic purpose, term that derives from the Greek word meaning "to find out".

Political Scientists use models of various kinds to help us understand political realities. Some models are purely descriptive i.e. describing political or social phenomenon with

emphasis on its main characteristic features. Some models are static in the sense that they simply define the fundamental attributes of a phenomenon but they do not describe how those attributes change or develop over time. By contrast, dynamic models describe process of change. Some models are analogies. That is they simply clarify political phenomena by comparing them to something else. For example, democracy is said to be similar to a market economy, with voters choosing candidates in the political "market place" on the basis of consideration very similar to those motivating consumers shopping for a good to buy.

In the same vein, some analysts picture many forms of political behaviors as analogous to games. Thus, Game theory is generally used as method of modelling political interactions as if they were games that involve elements of co-operation and conflict. Some models are simply diagrams, or schematic pictures of processes and relationships.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

Explain the significance of Models to the study of Comparative Politics.

3.2 Theories

A theory is a set of propositions and/or hypothesis that are logically related to each other Theory brings organization and the capacity to accumulate knowledge to a field and it enables scholars to tie together the propositions they have developed at different levels. Hence, theory is used primarily to explain political facts. Theory may also be referred to as a sets or systems of statements logically inter-connected in various complex.

A theory, according to Arthur L. Kaleberg, is a system of interrelated definitions and empirically interpreted hypotheses. In the opinion of James L. Price (2003) a theory consists of propositions, concepts, assumptions and scope conditions. Propositions, as Price further observes, are the core of a theory and are viewed as statements of causal relations between two or more concepts. A theory is characterized by multiple propositions.

Arthur Kalleberg has however criticized that what is called theory by the social action theorists is more a 'frame of reference' rather than a theory. The criticism of theory with regards to social action equally extends to political science because the political scientists more or less study political action like their counterpart in other sister social science disciplines especially sociology. In view of thistherefore, what is needed is a set

of hypotheses expressed in a tangible form and a series of verifying studies designed to test those hypotheses.

Levels of Theory

There are usually three levels of theory. These include general, middle and low range theories.

General Theory

According to Price, general theory may be explained from two conceptual perspectives: the use of uniform concepts and labels to study social systems and the focus on the most abstract level of reality in the social phenomenon. A general theory enables scholars to test on a macro level and micro level empirical generalizations and integrate existing body of knowledge. Through an incremental and cumulative knowledge, generalization may be made by a researcher with the utility of the general theory.

Middle Range Theory

The middle-range theory strictly seeks to develop theory with medium levels of abstraction (Merton, 1968:39-72). An example of this strategy can be illustrated by Merton's types of individual adaptation. There are five types of adaptation: Conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism and rebellion. Conformity exists when a population adheres both to a social system, goals and to the means it prescribes to achieve the goals. The middle range theory has been criticized as lacking in precise meaning.

Low Range Theory

This is a theory developed to explain a particular subject or certain phenomenon. An example of this is a theory developed to explain a narrow issue like the crisis in the Niger Delta area of Nigeria.

Functions of Theory

The importance of theory to political studies is not in doubt. The organisation of thoughts and the systematic analytical orientation which theory facilitates have come to mean that theory is most important in any political studies. It is against this background that it becomes necessary to discuss some of the functions performed by theory. According to Isaak (1975), a theory's major function is explanation. This, according to him, is to explain singular fact and occurrences, but beyond that to explain empirical generalizations.

Apart from helping a political researcher to explain, theory is also used to organize, systematized, and coordinate existing knowledge in a particular area or field. Isaak further notes that while in the first notion of theory, it is not only a set of related empirical generations, but also a theory is seen in itself as systematization. On the second level notion on the other hand, a theory organizes as it explains.

On a final note, a good theory must be capable of describing in the most understanding terms any political phenomenon. It must equally be capable of explaining relationships between and among interacting elements and variables, as well as containing the potential for predicting.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Explain the importance of theory in political analysis

4.0 Summary

This Unit has shown some concepts that are associated with the study of Comparative Politics. It highlighted the fact that even though models were originally associated with the Natural Sciences, they have found their way into the study and analysis of political events and issues. The different levels of theories and their importance to political studies are highlighted.

5.0 Conclusion

Concepts and theories constitute major tools of the Political Scientists. They confer uniqueness on both the discipline and scholars, in terms of clarity of views and giving understanding to their writings. An understanding of what they entail is therefore necessary for students who are desirous of making the desired impact in the subject.

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignments (TMAs)

2. Explain the relevance of concepts and models to the study of Comparative Politics.

2. How useful are theories to our understanding of Comparative Politics?

7.0 References/ Further Reading

1. Przeworski, A and Teune, H. (1970) The Logic of Comparative SocialInquiry, New York: Willey.
2. Fame, A.M. (1994)" Some Methodological Problems in Comparative Politics; Journal of Theoretical Polities, 613; 302-322.
3. S. Ulmer, Introductory Readings in Political Behaviour, Chicago and McNally, 1961.
4. H. Elock, Political Behaviour, London, Methuen & Co Ltd, 1976
5. H. Enlau, Segments of Political Science most susceptible to Behavioristic Treatment," in J. Charlesworth, (ed) Contemporary political Analysis, New York, free Press, 1968.

UNIT 2: PARADIGMS, ABSTRACTION AND LOGIC

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Meaning of Paradigms, Abstractions and Logic

3.2 Logical Fallacies in Political Analysis

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

This Unit gives an overview of what paradigms, abstractions and logic are, and their relevance as tools of Comparative Politics. It also delves on what are usually considered as aberrations in logical deductions, which if not carefully handled, can affect the validity of research findings.

2.0Objectives

At the end of the Unit, you should be able to:

1. Explain what paradigms, abstractions and logic are as tools of political analysis.

2. Discuss their role and limitations in comparative political studies.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Meaning of Paradigms, Abstraction and Logic

According to Sodaro (2001) the term paradigm has two connotations in political science. In one sense, a paradigm is a prime example of a particular phenomenon or pattern. Paradigms are quite useful in comparative politics because they help us observe and analyse variations on a theme. In this circumstance, paradigms serve the same purpose with models in summary; a paradigm is a particular way of looking at phenomena, formulating questions and generalizations, and conducting research.

The second dimension of paradigm focuses on a particular forum of intellectual inquiry or a specific approach to scientific investigation. Paradigm in the context of political science is akin to essential features to rules of scientific logic than evolved from empirical approach to scientific enquiry championed by Copernicus, Newton and other contributors to modern science.

In the earlier years, the dominant paradigm of political research tilted towards descriptive mode of analysis with inclination and emphasis on governmental institutions and constitutional law. It was not so much concerned with the study ofhow people behave in political life, neither were concepts as variables, hypotheses, correlations etc. in modern scientific thinking employed.

Abstraction and Logic

The word abstraction is from abstract. Abstract has to do with general principles or theories rather than on specific instances. Thus, abstraction is generalizing idea or theory developed from concrete examples of event. The term “logic” originated from Greek word logike meaning the art and science of reasoning. It is the formal systematic study of the principles of valid inference and correct reasoning. Logic as a discipline dates back to Aristotle, who established its fundamental place in philosophy. Logic concerns the structure of statements and arguments, in formal systems of inference and

natural language. Logic is often associated today with argumentation theory. It is often said that its logical form determines the validity of an argument, not by its content.

The Behavioural approach to political studies has led to the introduction of logic in politics. Logic is an integral part of mathematics and computer science. The advent of behavioural approach has led to introduction of quantitative method of analysis in political studies. However, the introduction of quantitative method has resulted into hot contention between the advocates of quantitative and qualitative approaches to political science about which mode of analysis is superior.

Quantitatively inclined analysts cherish the precision and neatness of statistical rigor; they deride qualitatively oriented researcher of vagueness. Conversely, qualitatively oriented political scientists accuse their number – crunching colleagues of ignoring everything about politics that cannot be reduced to mere statistics. Thus, they accused quantifiers of failing to appreciate the full scope of political reality in all its complexity.

However, a good number of political scientist today, agree that quantitative and qualitative approaches are complementary and that the approach an analyst uses depends on the nature of the problem being studied. It is essential to note that, both quantitative and qualitative approaches use scientific analysis, hence, both must observe the ground rules of scientific logic.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

Explain the usefulness of paradigms, abstraction and logic to the study of Comparative Politics.

3.2 Logical Fallacies in Political Analysis

It is necessary to stress that the application of logic has to do with critical thinking about politics; however, there are certain logical fallacies that are commonly committed in political argumentation. Sodaro (2001) mentioned some of them that must be avoided when making comparisons in politics. The logical fallacies are:

1. Fallacy of Composition

This error is often committed when a scholar assumes that the whole is exactly the sameas its parts. i.e. ascribing attributes such as attitudes, behaviours, etc. to an entireclass or group when those attributes may only apply to a portion of the group. We

are going to give example relevant to our country Nigeria. e.g. "Nigerians are highly corrupt" when in fact only some Nigerians may be highly corrupt and not all.

2. Tautology (Circular Reasoning)

This has to do with ascribing causation to the very phenomenon that we are trying to explain its causes. Put differently, using dependent variable as an independent variable that account for it. Tautology comes from the Greek word for "the same". Here's an example "Armed conflict among Libyan's contending groups produced a bitter civil war". The statement is tautological because civil war is armed conflict among a country's contending groups. The two points are essentially the same thing, as one cannot cause the other. Sodaro, (2001) continue by saying that one of the most famous tautologies, ever attributed to a politician was the remark attributed to President Calvin Coolidge, "when a great many people are unable to find work, unemployment results."

3. Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc.

"After it, therefore because of it" is the fallacy of concluding that A Caused B just because A Preceded B. For example, "The U.S led victory over Iraq in the Persian Gulf war at the start of 1991, precipitated the collapse of the Soviet Union later that same year". The statement as argued by Sodaro does not explain why the war was a cause of the USSR's demise but simply assume that it was. In actual sense, the war cannot be said to have demonstrable effect in the collapse of Soviet Union.

4. A Fortiori ("All The More")

Assumes that what is true of a phenomenon at one level or degree automatically is true of the same phenomenon at larger levels or degrees. e.g. "the more private enterprise there is in the economy, the more democracy will flourish", assumes without empirical validation, that, because a certain amount of private enterprise maybe good for democracy, then a complete private economy, without the involvement of government in economic affairs whatsoever will be better for democracy. If that is done there will be wide credibility gap between the poor and the rich.

5. False Analogy

This is the error of making inappropriate or inexact analogies or comparison between one phenomenon or situation and another. e.g. "political systems are like organism; they are born, they grow, and they inevitably decay and die." This organic analogy does not

stand up to the facts. Analogies that border on history are often misused as well e.g. the Persian Gulf war was exactly like world war II, Saddam Hussein was another Hitler, and Hitler showed that dictators must not be appeased. Although some similarities can be seen yet they are not exactly similar.

6. Non - Falsifiable

It is only hypotheses that can be tested empirically that are capable of beingcontradicted by factual evidence. An example of a non – falsifiable hypothesis is"the laws of history make the collapse of capitalism inevitable in the long run, though it may succeed in the short run." Since it is impossible to have empirical evidence of the future we have no basis for proving the rightness or wrongness of the hypothesis. It cannot be empirically tested.

7. False Inference.

This is the fallacy of making unwarranted inferences from statistical data or other facts, especially when trying to establish causation.

8. Reductivism.

This is the error of explaining something in terms of one sole cause when other causes could also be at work.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Define and explain 'logical Fallacies'?

4.0 Summary

This Unit have shown the usefulness of paradigms, abstraction and logic to the study of Comparative Politics. It is noted that logic has engendered much rigour in political analysis, particularly with the advent of behaviouralism and the post-behavioural school. However, the Unit has also demonstrated that in spite of the positive value associated with logical reasoning, some shortcomings, which have negated objectivity and precision in political analysis, also exist, and these were pointed out.

5.0 Conclusion

It must be stated that paradigms, abstractions and logics are important tools that have enhanced the scientific orientation of Comparative politics as a field of study. Such tools have raised the stakes of political discourse from the normative to the empirical,

and consequently enhance our capacity to analyse, evaluate, compare and predict political issues and events.

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignments (TMAs)

1. How useful are paradigms, abstractions and logic to our understanding of Comparative Politics?
2. Enumerate and explain the various logical fallacies that may impede objectivity in political analysis.

7.0 References/Further Reading:

1. Sartori; G. (1970)" Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics American Political Science Review, 64; 1033-1053.
2. Gurr; T.R (1968)" A Casual Model of Civil Strife "American Political Science Review, 62:1104-1124.
3. A. Somit and J. Tanenhaus, American political science: A Profile of a Discipline, New York, Atherton Press, 1964

UNIT 3: CLASSIFICATION.

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Classification Defined

3.2 Issues and Challenges in Classification

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

This Unit explain the place of Classification in Comparative Politics. The steps involved in Classification shall be analysed. Similarly, the attributes of a good classification, the issues and challenges involved in Classification shall also be highlighted.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to:1. Explain Classification and the various Classification Schemes used within the context of Comparative Politics.

2.. Identify the challenges in Classification, and how to overcome them.

3.0 Main Contents

It is important to observe that the task of comparative politics is to provide understanding of constant variations and trends in national government and politics. For instance, answering a question like, which of the regions of Africa is most prone to military intervention requires some knowledge about politics and the general political processes in the continent. By this, accessibility to the needed and relevant information about certain political development to understand the susceptibility of and the levels of military involvement in direct governance in each region may put us in a good position to answer the question. To achieve this, for instance, classification is often required.

3.1.1 Classification Defined

Classification, as Kalleberg points out, is logically on "either/or" procedure. By this, a classificatory concept, in the opinion of Hempel represents a characteristic which any object in the domain under consideration must either have or lack; if it's meaning is precise, it divides the domain into two classes separated by a sharp boundary line. Some examples of such dichotomized classification might beachieved by drawing a boundary, for instance, between a military dictator and a democratic government. Another example may be seen in the difference between a socialist regime and a capitalist state. Another example may be found in presidential and parliamentary classification. According to Isaac (1975), a dichotomized classification entails 'defining a concept, for example, 'democracy', according to the scientific procedures already outlined, linking it to observables, such as 'number of political parties and their rate of turnover' or ratio between total adult population and eligible voters'. This, as Isaak avers, may then be treated as the characteristics of political systems and thereafter all systems which share

the same characteristics in one slot or class, and others without the characteristics are grouped together in one class as well.

Indeed, science seeks to know what exists, and to know the relationship among the innumerable elements of what enables; and for that purpose it must know what is not. In short, science must first of all discriminate. This is the ultimate ground of all scientific measurement, from the simplest procedure of empirical classification observation, to comparison observation, to comparison, and finally to the complex constructions of quantitative theory.

Consequently, according to Hempel, a classification of the objects in a given domain D is accomplished by laying down a set of two or more criteria such that every element of D satisfies exactly one of those criteria. Each criterion determines a certain class, namely, the class of all objects in D which satisfies the criterion. And if indeed each of object in D satisfies exactly one of the criteria, then the classes thus determined are mutually exclusive and they are jointly exclusive of D.

Steps in classification

The starting point for drawing up a classificatory scheme is to identify a particular problem deserving a scholarly examination. This may be followed up by observing the political phenomenon under study. The researcher will subsequently require gathering necessary data about the subject under investigation. The next stage will be to analyse the data to know which of the data possess certain qualities and which do not. This will enable the researcher to attempt a classificatory scheme based on the distinguished characteristics discovered from the data analysed.

3.1.2 Attributes of a good classification

A good classificatory scheme must be complete and therefore permit truly comparative analysis in respect of common dimensions. The classificatory scheme must be done in a way that no characteristic simultaneously finds its way into thetwo-way categorizations. That is, each criterion must be mutually exclusive and virtually exhaustive. It is equally important to avoid any form of ambiguity in defining the characteristics and delineating the criterion. Precision is therefore required. Finally, the entire process must conform to the law of parsimony. Let us briefly examine the classificatory scale employed by Aristotle to classify parts of his days.

No of people in Power	Focus of rulers / Forms of Government	
One	Ruling in the interest of all monarchy	Rule for self-interesttyranny
Few	Ruling in the interest of all-Aristocracy	Rule in self-interest – Oligarchy
Many	Ruling in the interest of all-Polity	Rule in self-interest – Democracy

Aristotle classificatory scheme was derived from the analysis of 150 constitutions of the Greek City states. After studying the 150 constitutions, Aristotle derived regime types, which are divided on the one hand between those that are "good" and those that are "corrupt", and on the other, between the different number of rulers that make up the decision making- authority, namely the one, the few, and the many. Good government rule in the common interest while corrupt government rule, in the interests of those who comprise the dominant authority.

The Intersection between these two divisions yields six regime types; the good types include monarchy, aristocracy, and polity. The corrupt types include tyranny, oligarchy and mob rule. Each type is based on a different idea of justice. Thus, monarchy is rule by the one for the common interest; Tyranny is rule by one for the interest of one. Aristocracy is rule by the few for the common interest, while oligarchy is rule by the few for the few. Polity is rule by many for the common good, while democracy is rule by the many for the many. Thus from the above analysis, Aristotle can be referred to as the father of comparative politics.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

Attempt a definition of Classification, and its relevance to Comparative Politics.

3.2. Issues and Challenges in Classification

The fact that different countries carry certain labels as opposed to other countries not carrying the same may not necessarily suggest that they are different in all respects. For instance, the different labels associated with different countries do not suggest that the

two distinct classes of countries do not possess the power of policy making and power of coercion. We know that to some extent the governments of all nations are alike, yet no two governments are exactly alike (Ranney, 1975). This is where a challenge may likely arise. This is so because, how can we justify calling some countries 'democracies' as if they were identical, and distinguishing them from "dictatorship", as if the latter were also identical and completely unlike 'democracies'? A critical review of the fact of political conditions in the two sets of systems may be useful in answering the question. Such answer maybe that in certain respects the governments of the United States and Great Britain seem essentially alike and in those same respects they seem significantly different from the governments of the Cuba, North Korea and the People Republic of China.

It is worthy of note, particularly, that basing the forms of government on certain particular principle of organization may reveal little or nothing about its form. To be sure, classifying governments on the basis of principles may be sometimes scientifically worthless. If, for example, a researcher anchors his classification on formal constitutional arrangements, it might be discovered that certain political realities in the political process negate the principles enunciated by the constitution. This is perhaps evident in the written constitutions of former Eastern European countries (like Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, the Soviet Union, and the former Yugoslavia) where it is expressly stated that each nation's sovereignty lies in the people (Ranney, 1975). Contrary to the position of the constitutions of these countries, it appears that the ultimate decision-making power in these nations is actually held and used to be controlled by the leaders of the communist parties. The challenge then is, shall we then ignore the realities and concentrate on the formalities or vise versa? If we take the former course, our classifications will hardly be worth the effort it takes to make them. If we take the latter course, we may plunge into a helpless search for realities that can be encompassed in simple forms.

Every state is unique and work under different social, economic, cultural and historical influence and background. No two governments are completely identical. Classifying government according to formal constitutional arrangement may be misleading. For instance, nominal and normative constitutions operate differently. While under the normal constitution, the real operation of government is often not as stated in the constitution, in states with normative constitution the operation of government is in line with the very provisions of the constitution (Gordon, 1982). For instance, it is observed

that the written constitution of Finland gives most power to the executive but in reality, it is the Prime Minister that exercises most of the power. Under the defunct communist states also, the constitutions of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Soviet Union and Yugoslavia expressly stated that each nation's sovereignty lie in the people. But this was not so in reality.

The above problem leads to another one. The next challenge, therefore, is that, do we then ignore the realities and concentrate on the formalities or vice versa? Someof the functions performed by the government of both the democratic and authoritarian regimes, for instance, are to make authoritative rules, punish those who violate the rules, maintain armed forces, collect taxes etc. In both types of systems, some measure of coercive power of the state is applied from time to time depending on the issues at stake.

It is salient to point out that while the categories and the criteria we use for classification are so simple, on the contrary, reality is so complex that proper classification of borderline cases is next to impossible. To be sure, given a label to a particular government as democratic or dictatorial may reveal something about its operations but also leave out a great deal.

Classification makes the world of politics less complex, effectually providing the researcher with "data containers" into which empirical evidence is organized. Classification can be a simple dichotomy such as between authoritarianism and democracy, or it can be a more complex "typology" of regimes and governmental systems. Classification helps to group vast numbers of countries, political system, events etc. into distinct categories with identifiable and shared characteristics.

Classification is a necessary component of systematic comparison, but in many ways, it represents a higher level of comparison since it seeks to group many separate descriptive entities into simpler categories. The process of classification is not new. In the introductory part, the most famous effort at classification is found in Aristotle's politics, which has been discussed. Other classifications appear at first glance to deviate from this simple breakdown, but on closer examination are really quite similar. Thus, one scholar identifies the following four types: folk systems, bureaucratic-authoritarian systems, reconciliation systems, and mobilization systems.

Regimes have also been classified as democratic, authoritarian or totalitarian, depending on their degree of openness, adherence to established laws, due process and individuals' fundamental human rights.

Similarly, political developments have been classified as modern, charismatic, or traditional, based on what the authors refer to as the extent to which the system allows for political participation, its ability to mobilize the citizenry, and the sources of authority of the rulers.

Yet, others have classified societies into Developed and Developing, following such parameters as the level of income, industrialization, literacy, services provided and life expectancy.

In the ideological realm, societies are classified as capitalist, socialist, or mixedeconomy, depending on the pattern of ownership and control of the means of production on one hand; and the nature of the relations of production on another. Thus we categorise Britain, France and the United States as capitalist, and the former Soviet Union as socialist, based on the prevalence of private ownership in the former, and an overwhelming state control in the latter.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Identify the salient issues and challenges involved in Classification as a major tool of Comparative Politics.

4.0 Summary

This Unit defined Classification, and identified some salient issues involved in it. Examples of some classificatory schemes employed by Political Scientists were also discussed with some challenges identified in classification as a tool of political analysis.

5.0 Conclusion

Classification simplifies the study of Comparative Politics and it is a higher level of comparison. Classification provides the researcher with "data containers" into which empirical evidence is organized.

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignments (TMAs)

1. Why do we classify our data in comparative political studies?
2. What are the pertinent issue and challenges to consider in classification?

7.0 References/ Further Reading

1. Sander,D. (1995) ”Behavioral Analysis”, in D March And G. Stroker(eds) Theories and Methods in Political Science, London, Macmillan.

2. Wiarrds, H.J. (2005) Comparative Politics: Critical Concepts in Political Science, London, Rutledge.

3. R.A. Dahl, “The Behavioural Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a successful Protest,” American Political Science Review, 55 December 1961. Pp 71-76

4. D. Butler, The Study of Political Behaviour, London, Hutchinson, 1958.

UNIT 4. CASE STUDY METHOD IN COMPARATIVE POLITICAL STUDIES

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 What is a Case Study?

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

According to ArendLijphart, the discussion of comparative method is notcomplete without giving a consideration to the Case Study Method. Thestatistical method can be applied to many cases, the comparative method torelatively few (but at least two) cases, and the case study method to one case. Butthe case study method can and should be closely connected also with statisticalmethod and sometimes also with the comparative method. What then is a casestudy?

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to:

Explain the meaning and relevance of the Case Method approach in Comparative Politics?

3.0Main Contents

3.1What is a Case Study?

A case is an instance of a more general category. To conduct a case study istherefore to investigate something which has significance beyond its boundaries.The case study is used primarily as a test case for the assumptions of theresearcher (Isaak, 1975).

A project turns into a case study only when it becomes clear what the study is acase study of. As Scarrow (1969) points out, case studies make a contribution togeneral knowledge of politics if 'the analysis is made within a comparativeperspective which mandates that the description of the particular be cast in termsof broadly analytic constructs'. In other words, a single case can offer a detailedillustration of a theme of wider interest, whether we take the United States as anexample of presidential government, Canada as an illustration of federalism orFinland as a case of Coalition government. In this situation, the cases areconsciously selected, or may attract some measure of scholarly study for thepurpose of giving a possible picture of such a phenomenon in a broaderphenomenon. Largely due to the fact that case studies locate their findings in awider concept, they are a tool of Comparative Politics, even when only oneexample is examined. This perhaps explains the relevance of case studies toPolitical Science. For instance, in the absence of overarching theory, case studiesare the building blocks from which we construct our understanding of the politicalworld (Yin, 1994).

This is primarily undertaken by comparing cases rather than by making deductionsfrom first principles. This in effect enables a researcher not only to ensure hiscomparative political analysis takes the form not of relating cases to abstracttheory, but also minimize the burden of drawing the analysis between the casesthemselves.

Thus, when a case has been validly proved and established, it may offer someuseful insight to right steps to be taken on the re-occurrence of the subject alreadystudied. By this, lessons are learned while error can be avoided. This in itselfreflects the tendency

for Comparative Politics to move from cases to theory, ratherthan vice-versa. The idea here is that in Comparative Politics, a case oftengenerates the strategy, then taken, in a circular way, as representative.As far as the study of politics is concerned, one of the most important strategiesfor selecting a topic more than a technique for conducting research is the casestudy method. Practically, there are multi-dimensions to it, with range oftechniques and different forms of primary and secondary data generated for thepurpose of effective analysis. With case study, a detailed and concise descriptionof whatever is being studied could be undertaken.

There are two ways in which cases can generate wider significance. Either a casecan be useful because it is representative- a typical, standard example of a widercategory; or else it can be selected because it is deviant or unusual in some way,helping us to understand exceptions to the rule. Out of these two types ofapproaches, the representative case is more common. This appears to account forthe fact that, despite the seeming limitations imposed on the utility of using asingle case as a representative of larger cases, most researchers still rely on their respective countries. This is due to the fact that the representative case isconceived of as capable of capturing different types of studies and applied todifferent types of situation. By contrast, the purpose of a deviant case study is tocast light on the exceptional and the untypical.

As have been established in the previous discussions, comparative politics seeks toidentify the similarities, differences and variables with a view to determining thesystem in operation and the nature of the political process in the different states ofthe world. But beyond that, it attempts to find out if there is regularity ofoccurrence among certain variables or actions, and if there are, what outcomeresults? With this background knowledge, necessary classification to enable usdevelop a typological framework through the distinguishing features of the varioussystems have been offered by various writers on different aspects of the social andpolitical systems. How do we achieve this task? The first point of departure is to identify certainestablished concepts and identity the operational and functional patterns thatmakes one distinct from the other. Some of these concepts are legislature,executive, judiciary, electoral system, political party and federalism. Theseconcepts are universal as the various institutions of government capturing theconcepts are not peculiar to any particular society or continent. However, theforms they take and the modes of operation of the institutions often vary.Therefore, attempt here will be made to analyse the forms some of these conceptstake, their modes of operation and the environment of operation while focusing onselected states from

different continents. According to Landman (2008), thecomparative study of institutional designs involves three types of institutions thatare of greatest importance for democracy. These institutions include executive legislativearrangements, the electoral system, as well as the political party system.Some of these institutions will be fully discussed in subsequent sections.

4.0 Summary

The case study approach, as the Unit has shown, constitutes a major tool ofcomparative political research. Indeed, the Unit has shown that a single case canoffer a detailed illustration of a theme of wider interest. The approach is costeffective, in terms of time, material and other resources at the disposal of theresearcher, especially where the units of analysis are large.

5.0 Conclusion

Case studies are the building blocks from which we construct our understandingof the political phenomenon. As the Unit has demonstrated, with case study, a detailed andconcise description of whatever is being studied could be undertaken.

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignments (TMAs)

1. Explain the meaning and relevance of the case study method in Comparative Politics?

7.0 References/ Further Reading

Kings, G,Keohane, R.O, and Verba, S. (1994) Designing Social Inquiry Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

MODULE 3: METHODS OF COMPARATIVE STUDY

UNIT 1: COMPARING MANY COUNTRIES

1.0Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Meaning and Characteristics of Comparing Many Countries

3.2 Disadvantages of Comparing Many Countries

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

This Unit explains one of the different methods of comparative study, namely Comparing Many Countries. It highlights the basic characteristics of this method as distinct from other methods.

2.0 Objectives

After this Unit, you should be able to:

Explain the meaning and characteristics of 'Comparing Many Countries' method of Comparative Politics as well as its merits and demerits.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Meaning and Characteristics of Comparing Many Countries Method

Basically, there are three methods of country's study. We have single – country studies, comparing few countries and comparing many countries. The central distinction between different comparative methods depends on the key trade-off between the level of abstraction and the scope of countries under study.

Comparing many countries most closely akin to the experimental method of science, since it is particularly suited to quantitative analysis through measurement and analysis of aggregate data collected on many countries (Lijphart,1997).Although there are examples of qualitative comparisons of many countries, such as Huntington's (1996) the clash of civilization, and Finder's (1997) History of Government.However, the majority of studies that compare many countries simultaneously use quantitative methods.

This method of comparisons requires a higher level of abstraction in its specification of concepts in order to include as many countries as possible. Its major advantages include statistical control to rule out rival explanations, extensive coverage of countries, the ability to make strong inferences and the identification of "deviant" countries, or "outliers".

Comparing many countries is often referred to as "variable –oriented", since it focuses primarily on "general dimensions of macro-social "variation" and the relationship between variables at a global level of analysis. The fact that it has wide coverage allows for stronger inferences and theory- building, since a given relationship can be demonstrated to exist with certainty of a greater degree. For example, Ted Gurr (1968) demonstrates that levels of civil strife across 114 countries are positively linked to the presence of economic, political, short-term, and long-term deprivation.

His analysis also explicates that this relationship holds for roughly 65 per cent of the countries. In the same vein, Heinwell (1994) has shown that for 125 countries, from 1960-1985 there is a positive relationship between per capital level of income and democracy. According to Landman (2003:26) after controlling for the differences between OECD countries, MiddleEastern oil producing countries, Africa, and Latin America, this relationship is demonstrated to hold for about 60 per cent of the countries.

A second advantage of comparing many countries lies in the ability to identify so – called "deviant" countries or "outliers." These are countries whose values on the dependent variable (levels of civil strife or democracy in the example above) are different than expected, given the values on the independent variables (level of deprivation or per capital income). In order to test for positive relationship between income inequality and political violence in sixty countries, Mutter and Seligsan (1987:436) use a simple scatter plot to identify which countries fit their theory and which do not. For instance, Gabon, Brazil and Panama were found to have a lower level of political violence than was expected for the relatively high level of income

inequality. On the other hand, the UK was found to have a particularly high level of political violence given its relatively low level of income inequality.

By identifying these "outliers" scholars can look for other explanations that account for their deviance, and they can remove them from their analysis to make more accurate predictions for the remaining countries. Thus in this case the unexpected level of political violence observed for the UK was due to the Northern Ireland conflict. Such deeper analysis of outliers is also known as conducting "crucial" case study.

Quantitative studies of many countries help in building general theories of politics since they allow other scholars to replicate their findings. The data sets for those studies can be read and analysed by a variety of statistical software packages. (Googledata in national data archives, such as the UK Data Archive at the University of Essex, the Roper Center at the University of Connecticut, etc.)

Qualitative comparison of many counties is more difficult than quantitative comparison for two reasons. First, qualitative analysis generally requires a richer level of information, such as deep history of all the countries, which is often difficult to collect and synthesized. Indeed, Finer's (1997) attempt to compare regime types over 5,000 years and across the globe represents a monumental task that occupied all the years of his retirement and produced a three- volume study with 1,700 pages.

Second, it is more difficult to draw strong inferences from these data sincethey cannot be subjected to statistical analysis. Thus, Finer is able to describe and analyse different regime types as they have appeared in history to show how those in existence today are products of innovations from the past, but he is unable (or unwilling) to make any large casual inference.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

Show the relationship between 'Comparing Many Countries' method and quantitative analysis in political studies.

3.2 Disadvantages of Comparing Many Countries

Despite the advantages of comparing many countries, there are some distinct disadvantages, including the availability of data, the validity of measures, and the mathematical and computing skills needed to analyse data.

1. Country relevant data on the independent nation states of the world can be difficult and time-consuming.
2. Second, measuring concepts from political science is difficult and can affect the validity of the measures.
3. Many students eschewed quantitative comparisons of many countries since it requires mathematical and computing skills.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Discuss the disadvantages of the 'Comparing Many Countries' method in Comparative Politics.

4.0 Summary

This unit have shown the distinctive features of Comparing Many Countries method, also linked to the quantitative method of analysis. The differences between this and the qualitative method are also shown. Theadvantages and shortcomings of Comparing Many countries method are also highlighted.

5.0 Conclusion

Quantitative analysis, which the Comparing Many Countries method is associated within political studies, has proved to be a critical measure of the scientific nature of the enterprise. This Unit has shown that in spite of the many advantages of the Comparing Many Countries method, it has its own shortcomings. Comparing many countries is the best method for drawing inferences that have more applicability that is global, for example, the Global Terrorism Index.

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment (TMAs)

Explain the features of Many Countries Comparison and the merits and demerits associated with it?

7.0 References/ Further Reading

1. Banks, A.S. (1994) Cross- Policy Time Series Data Arches, Binghamton, NY, State University of New York At Binghamton.

2. Ragin. C. (1994)" Introduction to Quantitative Comparative Analysis, In T. JanoskiandA.Hicks (Eds), The Comparative Political Economy of the Welfare State, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 299-320

UNIT 2: COMPARING FEW COUNTRIES

1.0Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Meaning of Comparing Few Countries

3.1.1. Most Similar Systems Design

3.1.2. Most Different Systems Design

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

This Unit explains the second method of comparative study, which is the Comparing Few Countries method. It highlights its basic characteristics and typologies, namely, the Most Similar Systems Design and Most Different Systems Design.

2.0 Objectives

After this Unit, you should be able to:

Explain the meaning and characteristics of 'Comparing Few Countries' method of Comparative Politics and show the attributes of the two types of design associated with the method.

3.0 Main Content

3.1 Meaning of Comparing Few Countries

Comparing few countries achieves control through the careful selection of countries that are analysed, using a middle level of conceptual abstractions studies. Using this method is more intensive and less extensive since they encompass more of the nuances specific to each country. The political outcomes that feature in their type of comparison are often seen to be "configurative" i.e. the product of multiple casual factors acting together.

This type of comparisons is thus referred to as "case-oriented" (Ragin 1994), since the country is often the unit of analysis, and the focus tends to be on the similarities and differences among countries rather than the analytical relationship between variables. Comparison of the similarities and differences is meant to uncover what is common to each country that accounts for the observed political outcome.

The method of comparing few countries is divided primarily into two types of system design: "most similar systems design" and "most different systems design" (Przeworski and Teune 1970; Faure 1994). Most similar systems design (MSSD) seeks to compare political systems that share a host of common features in an effort to neutralize some differences while highlighting others. Based on J.S. Mill's (1843) method of difference, MSSD seeks to identify the key features that are different among similar countries and which account for the observed political outcome.

Most different systems design (MDSD) on the other hand, compares countries that do not share any common features apart from the political outcome to be explained and one or two of the explanatory factors seen to be important for that outcome. This system is based on Mill's method of agreement, which seek to identify those features that are the same among different countries in an effort to account for particular outcome. In this way, MDSD allows the researcher to distil out the common elements from a diverse set of countries that have greaterexplanatory power. (Collier 1993:112)

Most Similar Systems Design

Most similar systems design is particularly well suited for those engaged in area studies (Przeworski and Teune, 1970:33). The intellectual and theoretical justification for area studies is that there is something inherently similar about countries that make up a particular geographical region of the world, such as Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin

America. Whether it is common history, language, religion, politics, or culture, researchers working in area studies are essentially employing most similar systems design, and the focus on countries from these regions effectively controls for those features that are common to them while looking for those features that are not.

Our first example will show how the most similar system design is applied to six Latin America countries in an effort to uncover the sources of peasant support for revolutionary activity.

Thus as part of a more comprehensive effort to account for revolutionary activity in Latin America between 1956 and 1970, Wickham Crowley (1993: 92-117) uses the most similar systems design to examine the type of peasant that are most likelyto support guerrillas in the region. Drawing on the work of Jeffery Paige (1975), he argues that guerrilla strongholds and support for revolutionary behaviour ought to be higher in rural areas in which there are peasants whose livelihood is the most vulnerable to negative influences from the structure of the agricultural system of production. His hypothesis is stated as follow:

"If the guerrillas gain support in an area with a relatively high prevalence of share croppers, squatters, or perhaps tenants, my working assumption is that there is an "election affinity" between the two, and that guerrillas would not have received such support in more ordinary agricultural regions".

To test the hypothesis, he compares the regional breakdown of Cuba, Venezuela, Guatemala, Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia to determine whether such a relationship exists. See the table below.

Table 1.1 Most similar System design

Case	Cuba	Venezuela	Guatemala	Colombia	Peru	Bolivia
Key	Squatter	Share Cropper	Tenants	Share croppers	Serf	Smallholders
Peasant groups						
Outco	Guerillasu	Guerillasu	Guerillasu	Guerillasu	Guerillasu	No

me to be explained	pport	pport	pport	pport	pport	Guerillasupport

Source|: Adapted from Wickhama-Crowley (1963: 92 – 117)

Table 1.1 summarizes the comparison and shows that in all the cases except Bolivia, there is the presence of both the specified types of peasants and the outcome to be explained. Bolivia has a prevalence of smallholders, who according to the theory are not likely to support guerrilla activity, and in this case, do not. Thus, across similar cases, the presence of the key explanatory factor is associated with the presence of the outcome to be explained.

Most Different Systems Design

Most different system design is typical of comparative studies that identify a particular outcome that is to be explained such as revolutions, military coups, transition to democracy, or "economic miracle "in newly industrialized countries Geddes (1990 134-141).

In seeking to account for the different regime types that emerged in twelve countries in Europe during the inter-war period Luebbert (1991) claims that thekey explanatory variable is the particular class alliance that formed within these countries. The three regime types include liberalism, social democracy and fascism. The twelve countries are grouped according to these three outcomes and within each group; the countries share few features in common apart from the class alliance and the same outcome. Thus, Luebbert matches the presence of a particular class alliance to a particular regime type.

The table below summarizes this analysis, and show that liberalism is the product of a strong middle class versus a weak working class. Social democracy is seen to be a product of an alliance between the working class and the middle peasantry, and fascism is seen to be a product of an alliance between the middle class and the middle peasantry. In this example the most different systems design is applied to each group of countries.

Most different systems design Group I

Cases	Britain	France	Switzerland	Belgium	The Netherlands
	Middle class vs. Working class	Middle class vs. Working class	Middle class vs. working class	Middle class vs. Working class	Middle class vs. working class
Outcome	Liberalism	Liberalism	Liberalism	Liberalism	Liberalism

Group 2

Cases	Denmark	Norway	Sweden	Czechoslovakia
Class	Working class +	Working class +	Working class +	Working class + middle
Alliance	Middle Peasantry	Middle Peasantry	Middle Peasantry	Peasantry
Outcome	Social democracy	Social democracy	Social democracy	Social democracy

Group 3

Cases	Germany	Italy	Spain
Class Alliance	Middle class + middlePeasantry	Middle class+ middlePeasantry	Middle class + middle Peasantry
Outcome	Fascism	Fascism	Fascism

Source: Luebbert (1991) Landman (2003)

4.0 Summary

The Unit examined the Comparing Few Countries method, and its relevance in Comparative Politics. It also examined the two types of 'systems design' in this method of Comparative Analysis, the Most Similar and Most Different Systems Designs. The desirability of each of these for different aspects of comparative studies has been carefully analysed.

5.0 Conclusion

Comparing Few Countries method is a major means of enhancing our understanding of Comparative Politics. As stated in this Unit, the two types of 'Systems Design' have their unique place in Comparative politics. Through the use of the method of difference and agreement, comparing few countries can lead to inferences that are better informed by the contextual specificities of the countries under scrutiny. The student should be mindful of the applicability of these to the understanding and analysis of Comparative Politics.

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignments (TMAs)

1. Explain the Few Countries method of comparison and the two System Designs often employed in Comparing Few Countries?
2. Clearly outline the merits and demerits of each System Design.

7.0 References/ Further Reading

1. Scheuch, E. K (1969)" Social Contest and Individual Behaviors" In M. Dogan And S.Rokkah (Eds) Quantitative Ecological and Analysis in the Social Sciences, Cambridge, MA:M.T Press, 133-155.
2. Collier D. (1991)" New Perspectives on Comparative Methods; In D.A.Rustow And Kip Erikson (Eds) Comparatives Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives, New York: Harper Collins, 17-31
3. Dogan, M.andPelassy; D. (1990) How to Compare Nations: Strategies, in Comparative Politics, 2nd ed, Chatham, NJ:chatham House Hague
4. R, Harrp, M, and Beestings (1992) Political Science: A Comparative Introduction, New York. St. Martin's Press.

UNIT 3: SINGLE –COUNTRY STUDIES

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Single Country Studies defined

3.1.1 Usefulness of Single Country Studies

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0Introduction

This Unit discusses another method of comparison, namely, the Single-Country Studies. Attempt is made at clarifying its meaning, and its usefulness as a method of Comparative Studies.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to:

Define the Single-Country studies method and its usefulness as a method in Comparative Political Analysis.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Single Country Studies Defined

A single –country study is considered comparative if it uses concepts applicable to other countries, develops concepts applicable to other countries, and/or seeks to make larger inferences. It should be known that inferences made from single country studies are necessarily less secure than those made from the comparison of several countries. Nevertheless, such studies are useful for examining a whole range of comparative issues. For Eckstein, a single country studies are the equivalent of clinical studies from medicine, where the effect of certain treatments is examined intensively. Beyond this however, single- country studies provide contextual description, develop new

classifications, generate hypotheses, confirm and infirm theories, and explain the presence of deviant countries identified through cross-national comparison.

One of the goals of comparison is contextual description. Single-country studies, that merely describe or interpret political phenomena have been variously referred to as "a theoretical and "interpretative or configurative- idiographic. Strictly speaking, these types of studies are not comparative but are useful for comparison purely for their information. But single-country studies that provide new classifications are useful for comparison. For example, in describing the Franco regime in Spain, Juan Linz identified a new form of authoritarianism that was different from personalistic dictatorships and totalitarian states. The regime institutionalised representation of the military, the Catholic Church, and the Falange as, well as the Franco loyalists, monarchists, and technocrats. Unlike totalitarian states, the regime relied on passive mass acceptance rather than popular support.

3.1.1 Usefulness of Single-Country Studies

Single –country studies are also useful for generating hypotheses for theories that are yet to be specified. As "plausibility probes" they either explicitly or implicitly suggest that the generated hypotheses be tested in a large selection of countries. Again, O'Donnell's work on authoritarianism is illustrative. To accountfor the 1966 military coup and subsequent authoritarian regime in Argentina,O'Donnell posited a relationship between a particular stage of dependent capitalist development and the advent of the bureaucratic authoritarian state. This hypothesis was subsequently tested in other Latin American countries and was found wanting on many grounds. The point remains, however, that the hypothesis generated from Argentina and the rejection led to that search for rival explanations.

In addition, single-country studies can be used to confirm or infirm existing theories, or illuminate known deviant countries. Theory-confirming and theory— infirming studies are conducted within the confines of known generalizations and they often adopt the "least likely"or "most likely" method of comparison. Least likely studies find a country where the theory suggests the outcome is not likely to occur. If the outcome is not observed, then the theory is confirmed. Most likely studies are conducted in countries where the theory suggests the outcome is definitely meant to occur. If the outcome is not observed, then the theory is infirmed. These crucial country studies do not definitely

prove or disprove a theory, but merely confirm or infirm its applicability to other countries.

Finally, deviant country studies are particularly useful for theory generation. As stated earlier, comparison of many countries often reveals a host of deviant countries that do not conform to the theoretical expectation of the researcher. This deviance invites further research of the countries to establish which rivalexplanations had not been considered, and it forces the re-evaluation of how the key variables of the study were originally operationalized. Deviant country studies can weaken existing theories as well as further refines the concepts and messages, used in the original comparative analysis.

4.0 Summary

Single-Country Studies have come to represent a major part of Comparative Politics. The method affords researchers and scholars the opportunity of an intensive investigation of issues, as attention is more focused on salient issues under scrutiny.

5.0 Conclusion

The unit has shown that Single-country studies can raise contextual description, generate hypotheses, confirm and infirm theories, and enrich our understanding of deviant countries identified through other comparisons.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE)

Outline the basic characteristics of a Single Country Study comparative method.

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignments (TMAs)

Explain a single-country study as a form of comparative study and its advantages over other methods?

7.0 References/Further Reading

Mayer, L.C. (1980) Redefine Comparatives Politics: Promise versus Performance, Newbury Parks, CA: Sage

Macintyre, A. (1971)" Is A Science of Comparative Politics Possible? Against The Self Images of the Age, Landing Duckworth, 200-279.

UNIT 4: DIFFICULTIES IN COMPARISON

1.0Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Problems in Comparison

3.2 Complementary Challenges

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0Introduction

While the comparative approach to political studies has proved useful in the study of politics, it nevertheless has its challenges. Indeed, Sartori (1970) warned against the dangers of non-conscious thinking leading to the dead-end conclusion that all comparisons suffer overwhelming difficulties. In any case, many of the problems identified in the literature presuppose that explanation is the sole function of comparison. The situation is, however, not a hopeless one because as we accord more weight to description as well as explanation some methodological difficulties fade away. Consequently, this Unit examines the various challenges often encountered in Comparative Studies.

2.0 0bjectives

At the end of this Unit, you are expected to be able to:

Analyse the various difficulties scholars encounter in carrying out Comparative Studies and provides navigational pathways to overcoming such difficulties.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Problems in Comparison

Some of the challenges often encountered in Comparisons include the following:

1. **Knowledge Requirements**

   Comparison is only contemplated when more than one countries are involved. Most comparative studiesinvolve at least twice as many countries except a study of a single country. The quantum of information needed for any study based on comparative politics can be substantial.

2. **Some Phenomena, Different Meanings**

   Difficulties may also arise due to differences in perceptions and backgrounds which are likely to affect the world views of the people. The implication of this situation for comparative politics is that, the 'same' phenomenon can have different meanings in different countries. This makes it difficult to compare "like with like".

3. **Interdependence**

   Modern states interact at very high and complex levels. The implication of this is that relationship between countries means they cannot be required as independent. This often translates to the fact that our ability to test theories is further reduced.

4. **Too Many Variables, Too Far Countries**

   Unlike the natural sciences which make use of the laboratory and have often numerous variables with which to work, undertaken political comparison is usually difficult because only very few variables are available to work because the total number of states available for study is far too few.

5. **Selection Bias**

   In selecting countries for study, our bias might prompt the selections of countries about which we already formed an opinion. The countries or other cases selected for study may be an unrepresentative sample, limiting the general significance of the findings.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAEs) 3.1

Discuss the various constraints militating against Comparison.

3.2 Complementary Challenges

In comparison, six complementary problems, which are associated with the choice of countries, the manner in which they are compared, the structure of the research design, and the nature of the evidence have also been identified. They are:

1. Too Many Variables and Too Few Countries

The first is the problem of too many variables and not enough countries (Collier 1991; Dogan and Pelassy 1990; Hague et al. 1992) also known more generally as "too many inferences or countries and not enough observations (king et al 1994; 119). This problem arises when more factors of explanation for the observed outcome have been identified than there are countries (or observation) in the study, leading to an indeterminate research design.

Clearly this problem tends to be associated more often with single –case studies and those that compare few countries than with those studies thatcompare many countries. In comparative politics, if a study has too many unknown (i.e. inference or possible explanations) and not enough equations (i.e. countries or observation) then solving for the unknown is problematic.

2. Establishing Equivalence

The second problem confronting comparison is the equivalence of both their theoretical concepts and the indication for those concepts across multiple contexts. Mayer (1984:57) argues that the "contextual relativity of the meaning or the measures of indication constitutes the most serious impediment to the cross-contextual validity of empirically testable explanatory theory". In other words, is it possible to specify concepts and indicators that have shared meanings to allow valid comparisons? For example, does the concept of class apply equally in all societies? Does the idea of civic culture" (Almond and Verba 1963) mean the same thing in Brazil as it does in France?

There are three intellectual positions that offer insight into these problems

(1) the universalistic position, (2) the relativist position and (3) the middle position.

The Universalist position argues that if theoretical concepts and their indicators are to have any explanatory power, they must be able to travel to all parts of the globe. For example, rationalist, functionalist and structuralism approaches take such position. The relativist position argues that all meaning is locally determined, and that a general "science" of comparative politics is necessarily limited if not impossible (Macintyre

1971). Ethnographic, interpretivist, and anthropological approaches tend to take this position.

The middle position argues that comparativists must not abandon all their concepts, but should modify them to be more sensitive to the cultural specificities of the context they are studying.

Since the relativist position obviates the reason for comparative politics,common solution for those seeking to make larger inference throughcomparison (i.e. those adhering to the universal and middle position) include:

1. Raising the levels of abstraction (Sartori 1970) focusing on smaller numbers of countries for which the comparativist has thorough substantive knowledge (Sanders 1994), using "specialist teams" in compiling cross-national data sets, and specifying the functional equivalence between concepts or indicators (Dugan and Pelassy 1990).

2. The second solution-focusing on a small set of countries for which the comparativists has through substantive knowledge-suggests that the analyst be "extremely cautious about engaging in cross national comparative research" (Sanders 1994: 43) The explanatory power of concepts can be enhanced if they are applied in context with which the comparativists is most familiar. Thus, those who engage in area studies spend many years studying the history, economics, politics and culture of a regional sub-set of countries in an effort to make more meaningful explanation of political phenomena. This "local" knowledge can identify gaps between theoretical concepts and their application and result in more meaningful comparison.

3. The third solution follows from the second. If truly informed comparison of many countries is limited, then those seeking to compare many countries, should venture out of the security of the familiar if they are prepared to collaborate with other scholars who possess specialist knowledge of the countries under security.

4. The final solution is the identification of "functional equivalence" of concepts and indications.This solution does not engage concepts as identical or even similar, but functionally equivalent. If two entities share exactly the same qualities, properties and characteristics, they are considered identical (apples

are apples). If they share some qualities, properties, or characteristics, then they are said to be functionally equivalent. For example, leaders of countries can serve three functions, namely, symbolic representation of the nation, chief executives of state authority, and party leader. The French President embodies all three while the British monarchembodies the symbolic role and its British Prime Minister embodies the executive and party leader roles (Dogan and (Palassy 1990:37).

Selection Bias

A crucial scientific principle frequently violated by comparative politics is the principle of selection. Comparison seeks to achieve experimental simulation, but experiments and mass attitudinal surveys in political science use random selection of individual respondents, while the essence of much of comparative politics is the intentional selection of countries. The basic experimental form has an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group receive the "treatment" (stimulus, drug, or exposures to some independent factor), and thecontrol group does not.

The outcome of both groups after the treatment is then compared. If the experimental group exhibits a different outcome than the control group, it is attributed to the treatment given that all use is equalled (known as the ceteris paribus condition). In mass attitudinal surveys, a completely random sample of individuals is selected and the subsequent data analysis of responses yields substantial inferences about the whole population from which the sample is drawn. In comparative politics most often, the selection of individuals or units of analysis is not related to the outcome to be explained.

Thus, selection bias in comparative politics occurs through the non-random choice of countries for comparison, or the deliberate selection by the comparativists (Collier 1995:462).

Though selection of countries lies at the heart of comparison, selection without reflection may lead to serious problems of inference. The most blatant form of selection occurs when a study includes only those cases that support the theory.

A second form of selection bias arises in quantitative studies that rely on historical sources, where the catalyst chooses historical account either

intentionally or unintentionally whose description of events fills the particular theory being tested. Lustic (1996:605) opines that inference drawn from studies using descriptive historical account that are organized and presented according to the categories and prepositions of theories they are testing will necessary be biased.

A third form of selection bias can occur from the time period that are used in the comparison especially for those studies seeking to analyse social behaviours that has a theory of long history, such as warfare, trade, and the emergence of state and regimes. Selecting contemporary time period (all those throughout the twentieth and twenty first centuries) and drawing inferences about longer term processes is a form of historical selection bias.

Spuriousness

A spurious explanation is one in which some unidentified factor is responsible for the outcome, while the identified factor is mistakenly attributed to having an effect on the outcome. Also known as omitted variable bias (king et al, 1994:168), this problem frequently arises in comparative politics and is related to selection bias since the choice of cases may overlook an important underlying factor that accounts for the outcome.

In comparatives politics it has been frequently asserted that authoritarian regimes are better at promoting economic development than democraticregime, since their "relative autonomy" from society allows them tocontrol more easily instances of political dissent. Global analysis of the relationship compares indicators of authoritarianism and economic performance and finds strong positive associations between the two.

What these studies fail to identify however, is that authoritarian governments tend to fall during periods of economic downturn, since much of their legitimacy rests on their ability to deliver economic benefits (Przeworski et al. 2000). Once discredited in economic terms, authoritarian regimes tend to lose their grip. Democracies, on the other hand, endure through period of thick and thin.

Ecological and Individualist Fallacies

There are two types of data in the social sciences: individual data and ecological data. Individual data comprise information on individuals and people. Ecological

data comprise information that has been aggregated for territorial unit, such as voting in district, municipalities, counties, states, and countries (Schench, 1969: 136).

Individual data are collected through the use of periodic censuses carried out in the whole of a particular population, through other "official" means, or through surveys carried out on a representative sample of population. The twin problems of ecological and individualist fallacies occur when inferences are drawn about one level of analysis using evidence from another. An ecological fallacy occurs when result obtained through the analysis of aggregate- level data are used to make inference about individual-level behaviour.

Alternatively, an individual fallacy occurs when results obtained through analysis of individual level data are used to make inference about aggregate level phenomena. For example, claiming that women support the right to abortions by correlating the percentage of women in electoral districts with voters in support of an abortion measure is an ecological fallacy; claiming that Germany is a mere authoritarian society than Britain by comparing responses to standardized survey questions is an individualistic fallacy.

Both fallacies are a problem since analysis carried at one level may overestimate relationship at another level (Robinson 1950:353), and both fallacies originate from the same sources, namely, the ontological predispositions of the researcher and data availability.

Value Bias

The final problem of comparison is one of value bias, a problem which depends upon the perspective from which one sees the world. Over the course of the last century, social science has come to recognize that knowledge is not "value free".

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Examine the challenges associated with comparison in Comparative Politics.

4.0. Summary

This Unit has succeeded in explaining that the value of Comparative Studies notwithstanding, the exercise has its shortcomings. While some of these challenges are

directly related to the study carried out, others are complementary. It is necessary for students to understand these loopholes with a view to avoiding them.

5.0 Conclusion

Challenges are part of every academic exercise. Therefore, in Comparative Studies, there are loopholes, but which, as this Unit has demonstrated, are surmountable.

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignments (TMAs)

Explain the challenges associated with undertaking a comparative study and how that could affect the outcome of Comparative Political Analysis?

7.0 References/Further Reading

1. Sanders, D. (1994) ”Methodological Considerations Comparative Cross-National Research”, International Social Science Journal, 46:43-49.
2. Robinson, IN.S. (1950)” Ecological Correlations and the Behavior of Individualist, American Sociological Review, 15:351-357.
3. Collier, D. (1993)” The Comparative Methods “In A. Finifter (Eds) Political Science. The State of the Discipline”, Washington, D.C. The American Political Science Association.

UNIT 5: COMPARATIVE DEMOCRATIC ORDER: FEDERALISM

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Comparative Federalism: Conceptual Clarification

3.2 A Brief Overview of United States of America and Nigeria’s Federalism

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

This Unit examines the characteristics of the federal system of government, and itspractice across various political systems, bringing out their peculiarities anddifferences. Also, the Unit attempts a comparative assessment of two federal states,the United States of America and Nigeria. A closer look at K.C Wheare's federalprinciples was undertaken with a view to comparing the degree of compatibility oralignment of these states with those parameters.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of the study, you are expected to be able to:

1. Explain the basic characteristics of the federal system ofgovernment as well as compare and contrast the federal structures in Nigeria and the United States of America.

2. Discuss some fundamental issues in the federalist principles such asfiscal federalism, resource control and public policy initiatives in both countries.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Comparative Federalism: Conceptual Clarification

The Concept of Federalism

Federalism as a concept of political structure connotes a legal and politicalrelationships among two or more units of government that operate at differentlevels. It is a method of governmental organization in which authority is dividedbetween the central government and the constituent governments. In a federalsystem the responsibility for governing is shared between one nationalgovernment and multiple sub-national units. K. C. Wheare who is reputed as thefather of federalism defines the federal principle or federalism as the method ofdividing governmental legislative powers so that general (central) and regional(component) governments are each within a sphere, coordinate and independent.Similarly, Robert Dahl defines federalism as a system in which some matters areexclusively within the competence of certain local units and are constitutionallybeyond the scope of the national government; and where certain other matters areconstitutionally outside the scope of the authority of the smaller units.

Williams Riker structurally identified federalism as having three characteristicswhich includes:

1. Two levels of government exist in a political system;

2. Each level has at least one area of action in which it is autonomous and

3. There is some guarantee of the autonomy of each government in its own sphere in the constitution.

The pattern of relationships among these levels of government however, is rarelystable over a period. Federalism is highly dynamic and equilibrium of its power iscontinuously changing in ways conducive to mutually beneficial reinvention forthe states as the needs arise. It based on this praxis that federalism has been argued tobe a process rather than a static design. Federalism lies not in the structure, but inthe society in itself. Federalism is therefore a process of compromise between twobasic forces of centrifugal and centripetal forces.

Federalism emerges from the need for a strong central government and rights ofseparate states on certain matters. This necessitates some balance in size,population and wealth of the component units. Federal state must attempt to dealwith diversities which are territorially based either by conferring the power oversome of these pervasive diversities on the state or by giving the constituent units apermanent voice or function in the central government to make the citizens feelthe impact or presence of the government. Therefore, the forces of unity anddiversity provides for a balanced federation.

Wheare's doctrine of federalism recognizes the inevitability of conflicts among thecomponent units and prescribes the mechanisms for constitutionally dealing withsuch conflicts. These mechanisms include:

- The division of powers between the levels of government in such a way that each with a sphere is coordinate and independent.
- The powers of the levels of government are derived from the constitution which details the division of the power.
- An independent judiciary, which act as an arbiter in case of conflict of power between the levels of government.
- The co-equal supremacy of the various level of government each in its respective field of operation in the federal arrangement with the citizens of the federation being concurrently under two authorities and owing loyalties to them.

Some common factors for forming a modern federalism to include among others:

- The desire for union for socioeconomic development.
- A sense of insecurity and therefore the desire for common defence and security.
- Historical factor of long-time peaceful coexistence and settlement of disagreement through a process of give and take.
- An anticipation of economic advantage through pooling together of economic resources and interests.
- A desire for local autonomy within a federation of common course.
- A deep-rooted cultural diversity and heterogeneity among the constituents of the state.

Units of Analysis

Having conceptually analysed the term federalism, it is imperative toaddress the units of comparative analysis of Nigerian federalism vis-à-visthe federal structure of the United States of America. These units of analysis include:

- Fiscal Federalism (Revenue allocation)
- Resource Control
- Public policy initiative

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

Attempt a discussion of the federal system of government.

3.2 A Brief Overview of United State of America and Nigeria's Federalism

The Federalist Papers, written by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay which faulted the American confederation and highlighted the benefits of the proposed federal constitution was historic in the American quest for federalism. This proposed federal constitution was ratified by George Washington to become operative in 1787. The American federalism was therefore established through a process of aggregation i.e. coming together of formerly separate independent territorial entities. The American federalism involves the sharing of governing powers between the national government in Washington, D.C. and fifty states governments. American states are unitary governments with respect to their local governments which get their authority from state. They can be created or abolished by the states and states also have powers to make rules for their own local governments. States however, do not receive their

authority from the national government, but directly from the constitution. The American federalism is rather a process than just a structure having evolved from a dual federalism through cooperative federalism to its present intergovernmental relationship form of competitive federalism.

The Nigerian federalism on the other hand evolved out of series of historical accidents engineered by British government. In ruling Nigeria, the British amalgamated the Northern and Southern Protectorates in 1914 and perpetrated their distinct entities and diverse ethnic and cultural groups. The Nigerian federalism is traceable to the Richard constitution of 1946 which divided the country into three groups of North, West and East. However, Nigeria became a true federalism on October 1, 1954 by the Littleton Constitution. The Nigerian federalism exhibits a geo-political structural imbalance since 1954 and ethniccomposition estimated to be between 250 and over 400. This imbalance was reduced in 1967, 1976, 1987 and 1996 with the creation of 12 states by the Gowon regime, 19 states by Murtala Muhammed, 21 states by Babangida and 36 states and a Federal Capital Territory by Abacha regime respectively. Nigerian federalism therefore evolved through a process of segregation/devolution. The long period of military control of the nation's political system was incompatible with federal principle. The present Nigerian federation of 36 States and Federal Capital Territory (FCT) Abuja is divided into six (6) geopolitical zones. The basic objective is to strengthen geographical spread and balance in the distribution of political offices and socio-economic amenities and allay the fears of marginalization of the minorities (Alonge, op.cit:454, Muhammad, 2007).

Fiscal Federalism (Revenue Allocation)

Federalism has the potential advantage for inducing equality by bringing government closer to the people. One comparative indicator of bringing government closer to the people is the total public expenditures that is actually spent at that level of government that is physically closest to the people. In other word, the more the level of governments closest to the people are involved in public expenditure, the more inequality is reduced in a federal democratic state and the less these levels of governments are involved in public expenditure, the more inequality is induced.

However, the successful constitution of Nigerian federalism, have always vested the responsibility for the collection of a large proportion of national revenue in the Federal Government, a situation that tends to enrich the centre at the expense of the federating

states. This federal fiscal dominance is further perpetuated by the federal control agencies established with Special Funds like Oil and Mineral Producing Areas Development Commission, Petroleum Trust Fund and Niger Delta Development Commission, which apart from lack of fairness and equity in the discharge of their functions, tended to discourage initiatives and creativeness as they co-opt all other units in manners with no regard for local peculiarities. This unilateral usurpation of fiscal responsibility by the federal government represents part of the military legacy in the Nigerian Fiscal relationship. The recently released proposal by the Revenue Mobilization, Allocation and Fiscal Commission (RMAFC) which allocates 52.68%, 26.72% and 20.60 % to the federal, state and local governments respectively have merely maintained the established trend of central financial hegemony without any resource-responsibility analysis.

In contrast however, the American fiscal federalism shows an evolutionary movement from separate levels of government (Dual Federalism) to levels of government that interact (intergovernmental relations) and cooperate (Cooperative federalism) in an increasingly interdependent system. Over the years and especially starting from the administration of President Reagan in the 1980s who proposed a block grant and series of regulatory relief packages to devolve national government authority along a broad range of domestic policy areas to the states,national grant-in-aids funding though keeps increasing has been focused on four key areas that are the national government's sole responsibility – defence, social security, Medicare and financing debts. Though the national government has risen to prominence as a major feature of the fiscal landscape of American federalism, the increase does not come primarily at the expenses of state and local governments. He observes that it is rather part of the growth of public sector as a whole. Federal grants-in-aid programme provides a politically acceptable way of providing needed money to state and local governments while keeping the formal structure of federalism. They provide the means by which the federal government exerts some effect on state programmes without taking over the entire function and removing it from state or local control. The grants-in-aid system of American fiscal federalism provides funds needed by state and local governments, helps reduce inequality of resources in rich and poor states, encourages local initiative and experimentation, concentrates attention in a problem area and provides valuable technical assistance and allow introduction into the federal system of national values and standards.

Resource Control

The success of a federal system depends on acceptable distribution of resources and functions among the levels of government so that efficiency in the use of scarce resources is encouraged while reducing inequality in the treatment of individuals among different states. This view is strongly emphasized by K. C. Wheare when he stated that both federal and state authorities in a federation must be given the power in the constitution each to have access to and control its own sufficient resources.

Nigeria revenue allocation over the years has been bedevilled by warped formulas. It has been a reflection of the views of commissions, individuals, groups which have shown proclivity for embracing theories, belief, ideas and approaches which have contributed to the dislocations within the Nigeria federating states. One of the major problems of Nigerian federalism especially since 1999 is the derivation principle of revenue allocation which has come to be termed resource control. States and localities are differently favoured by this revenue allocation principle.

Until after May 1999, derivation principle amount to as little as 1%. This has been the bases of agitation for resource control in Nigeria. Again, apart from the whittling down of derivation formula from at least 50% in the first republic to one percent by June 1992, the practice that assigns 40 percent and 30 percent respectively to equity and population implies that 70 percent of the revenues in Nigeria are distributed without consideration to origin. Thus, while the oil mineral states and local government areas produce most of the resources with which other parts of Nigeria have been developed, they have received little in return for burning the brunt of deprivation and environmental degradation caused by mineral exploration and production. The continued reliance by government on the use of such revenue allocation principles as population and land mass, both of which do not favour most of the Southern states, has continued to short change the Southern zones relative to other zones of the country. The various national conferences such as the Sovereign National Conference, The Constitutional Conference Commission established to address these functional inequalities have not been able to achieve their aim.

The American federalism however, contrasts the Nigerian federal experience. The experience of American federalism with respect to resource control has beendescribed as a competitive federalism. The various states of the Americanfederation have more control of their resources from where they are expected to generate revenues to provide

the bulk of public services including public education, police protection, road and sanitation, public welfare, health and hospital especially those that falls under the Unfunded Mandate. Thus state and local governments fund their expenditures almost exclusively from their own sources. As noted by Thomas Dye, American federalism cannot be sustained without underlying support for the values of individualism, competition and opportunity. States have become stronger and more vigorous than ever. Especially from Reagan administration, states in USA have reasserted themselves as politics, and have become the principal custodians of most domestic programmes. This is following the federal government relinquishing certain functions to the states, freeing certain revenue sources to accompany them and reducing federal regulatory interventions into state resources, affairs as well as governance. This is the basic argument of Bill Clinton when he noted that the "era of 'big government' is over in America". Resource control and fiscal federalism in America whereby states control their resources has been seen as a cooperative federalist approach as the states acting to fill the vacuum in the spirit of federalism and in a manner that should have demonstrated once and for all virtue of federalism. Thus, over the years, states' control of resources such as agriculture, energy, environment, health, commerce etc., have continued to expand. The twentieth century American federalism exhibits much more of sharing of fiscal functions and resource control and greater interplay among levels of government in the management and funding of public programmes.

Public Policy Initiative

Scholars assert that federalism brings government closer to the people and as a result, there will be more involvement in government and higher levels of participation. It is greater involvement and greater participation that helps produce greater equality of results. Decentralization mode of policy formation, administration and institutions in nations with geographical distances, diverse economies, regional disparities in preferences, and variations in local historical experiences are more efficient and more responsive than centralized ones. The argument made here is that there ismore involvement in politics by citizens in federations,because they are closer to the government which is a force for reducing faceless, less elitist and more equality producing public policies. One important measure of participation in a federal democracy, not of course the only one, is level of government involvement in public policy formulation process. Public policy is directed towards solving societal problems and therefore any solution that is arrived at should be an end product of the political

process of decision-making process which involves negotiation and bargaining between the two level of government (Federal and State) in a federation. The only meeting place should therefore be an intergovernmental relation involving the federal and state governments.

The case in Nigeria federalism is however, such that the federal government dominates public policy making initiatives while the federating units are merely co-opted into it. This federal dominance in public policy initiatives is heightened by the establishment of federal control agencies by the federal government, which apart from lacking fairness and equity in the discharge of their functions, tended to discourage initiatives and creativity as they co-opt all other units in a grand design with no regard for local peculiarities.

In the American federalism on the other hand, states are responsible for most public policies. They have played the role of policy innovators, devising publicpolicies that, if successful serve as models for other state to follow. The American states have always been policy innovators. The states overflow with reforms, new ideas, and new policies. Almost every policy the national government has adopted and implemented nationwide had its beginnings in the states. The recent policy innovation of Learn fare for instance, was created by the state of Wisconsin in 1998 to enhance the educational achievement of children in welfare families by committing parents to give greater attention to their children school attendance in order to increase children punctuality in school thus leading to increase in their educational achievements. This policy was endorsed by conservative President George Bush and activated through special permission granted by the Department of Health and Human Services. One or more states powered the pioneered child labour laws, minimum wage legislation, civil rights protections, and the income tax.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Attempt a historical assessment of the development of federalism in the United States of America and Nigeria.

4.0 Summary

In this Unit, attempt has been made to explain the basic principles underlining the federal structure. The American and Nigerian models have been highlighted, looking at some pertinent issues, such as fiscal federalism, public policy initiative and resource

control. While the American system demonstrates a high degree of alignment with K.C.Wheare's principles of federalism, the Nigerian federal structure seems to negate that.

4.1 Conclusion

Federalism is a form of political structure widely accepted by scholars as a means for achieving democracy in a political system. One of the fundamentals of democracy is equality and political participation. A federal democratic state especially in asymmetrically heterogeneous countries like Nigeria and United States are the ones which consciously reduce inequality both between the national and the state government and between the federating units. They encouragegrassroots involvement in the process of governance by allowing policy initiatives from the federating units so as to cater for the diverse interests of the federation.

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments(TMAs)

Explain the principles of federalism as enunciated by K.C.Wheares and compare and contrast the American and Nigerian federal structures from the standpoints of fiscal federalism and public policy initiatives.

7.0 References/Further Readings

1. K.C. Wheare, Federal Government, Oxford University Press, New York, 1964.
2. L.Adamolekun, "Decentralisation Policies in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Overview", in Donald Rothchild (ed), *Strengthening African Local Initiatives*, Hamburg: institute fur Africa kunde, 1994 pp19-28.
3. Dennis A. Rondinell, "Government Decentralisation in Comparative Perspective: Theory and Practice in Developing Countries", International Review of Administrative Sciences, volxLVII, No 2 1981
4. Douglas V. Verney, The Analysis of Political Systems, the Free Press of Glencoe, Inc. New York, 1959.
5. I.D Duchacek, Comparative Federalism: The Territorial Dimension of Politics, Holt, Rinechart and Winston., New York, 1970.

6. D.J. Elazar, “Federalism”, in International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, Crowell Collier and Macmillan, Inc., New York, 1968, Vol 5, pp 353-365

MODULE 4: COMPARATIVE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

UNIT 1: PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM

1.0Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Why Do We Study Political Institutions?

3.2 Parliamentary System Defined

3.2.1 The Westminster Model

3.2.2 Consensus System

3.3 Advantages and Disadvantages of the Parliamentary System

3.3.1 Advantages of the Parliamentary System Criticisms of the Parliamentary System

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

In this Unit, we examine the Parliamentary system of government, looking at its distinguishing features from other forms of political institutions. The Unit also compares the practice of the Parliamentary system across different political divides, with a view to bringing out their uniqueness and similarities.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to:

1. Understand the basic features of the Parliamentary system of government and show the differences between the Parliamentary and other institutions of government.

2. Compare the practice of the Presidential system across different political systems of the world.

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Why Do We Study Political Institutions?

In the political context, institutions are primarily organizations. It is necessary to state that institutions and ideologies operate political systems; however, there are some institutions and structures that play leading roles in the formulation of public policy. According to Loewestern (1965), institutions are the apparatus through which the power process functions in a society organized as a state. The dynamics of politics i.e. decision-making is constituted by the interplay between social organs. Political institutions mean both the formal organs as well as informal structures, which bear upon deliberation and decision-making, the former including the government, the parliament, the courts, the administrative staff, etc. Political institutions are social instrumentalities for the attainment of community goals. While informal institutions exert great influence on decision-making through such input functions as political socialization, communication, interest-articulation and interest-aggregation. Since, it is through the formal organs and structures that the output functions namely, decisions are officially formulated, expressed and realized or emphasis will be on the formal structures of political institutions.

The familiar structures of institutions of political system include; interest groups, political parties, legislatures, executive, bureaucracies and courts. Countries have these political institutions, but they are not only organized differently, they function very differently indeed. Thus, Institution-by-Institution comparison must spell out functions in details before it can bring us far toward understanding the important similarities and differences in the politics of these countries. It is when we separate structure or institution from function, and trace these activities through the inputs, the conversion process, and outputs of the political system that we can arrive at judgment of the significance of the various political institutions. Gabriel and Bingham Powell (1988) assert that, only when we start to askquestions about the process and performance that we can attach meaning tostructural characteristics. It is when we come to the point that

we can say specificinstitutions perform specific functions with specific consequences does our comparative analysis begin to make some sense.

In addition, institutional comparison focuses on the way legal authority is distributed among these institutions in accordance with constitutional principles and other statutory provisions. What are the powers of the president of the United States vis-à-vis the congress? What is legal authority of the British House of commons and House of Lords? What are the express legal powers of the presidents of France, Germany, Russia, Mexico and South Africa? And above all, why do states distribute legal authority the way they do? In most countries the legal competence of the leading governmental institutions is spelled in the natural constitution. The legislatures, the world over, irrespective of whether they are operating in the developed democracies of the industrialized states or found in the developing countries of the world, are generally perceived to have declined in terms of their ability to efficiently and realistically perform the roles with which they are often associated with in the modern states. The degree to which the assemblies are involved in the affairs of their respective states also vary significantly.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

Explain the significance of the study of political institutions in Comparative Politics.

3.2 Parliamentary System Defined

Parliamentary system is a system of government wherein the ministers of the executive branch are drawn from the legislature, and are accountable to that body, such that the executive and legislative branches are intertwined. In such a system, the head of government is both *de facto* chief executive and chief legislator.Parliamentary systems are characterized by no clear-cut separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches, leading to a different set of checks and balances compared to those found in presidential systems. Parliamentary systems usually have a clear differentiation between the head of government and the head of state, with the head of government being the prime minister or premier, and the head of state often being a figurehead, often either a president (elected either popularly or by the parliament) or a hereditary monarch (often in a constitutional monarchy).

A Parliamentary system may consist of two styles of Chambers of Parliament, one with two chambers (or houses): an elected lower house, and an upper house or Senate which

may be appointed or elected by a different mechanism from the lower house. This style of two houses is called bicameral system. Legislatures with only one house are known as unicameral system. The parliamentary system does not mean that different parties in coalition with each other rule a country. Such multi-party arrangements are usually the product of an electoral system known as proportional representation. Many parliamentary countries, especially those that use "first past the post" voting, have governments composed of one party. However, parliamentary systems in continental Europe do use proportional representation, and tend to produce election results in which no single party has a majority of seats. Proportional representation in a non-parliamentary system does not have this result (Arguelles, 2009).

ArendLijphart divides parliamentary democracies into two different systems: The Westminster and Consensus systems.

3.2.1 The Westminster Model

The Westminster Palace in London, United Kingdom originates from the British Houses of Parliament. Today, the Westminster system is found in many Commonwealth of Nations countries, although they are neither universal within nor exclusive to Commonwealth countries. These parliaments tend to have a more adversarial style of debate and the plenary session of parliament is relatively more important than committees. Some parliaments in this model are elected using a plurality voting system (first past the post), such as the United Kingdom, Canada, and India, while others use proportional representation, such as Ireland and New Zealand. The Australian House of Representatives is elected using instant-runoff voting while the Senate is elected using proportional representation through single transferable vote. Even when proportional representation systems are used, the voting systems tend to allow the voter to vote for a named candidate rather than a party list. This model does allow for a greater separation of powers than the Western European model, since the governing party will often not have a majority in the upper house. However, parliamentary systems still feature a lesser separation of powers than is found in democratic presidential systems.

Government in a parliamentary system of the Westminster model is based on the fact that those who constitute the cabinet are drawn from the legislature. Indeed, the chief executive, that is, the Head of Cabinet, who is the Prime minister, is not elected on the strength of popular votes of the public. The prime minister is chosenon the grounds that he is the leader of the party with majority seats in parliament.

The legislature in parliamentary system appears much weaker than the legislature in the presidential democracy. This is so because, the survival of the cabinet and government depends on the support of the assembly, hence high party discipline ensures that legislatures elected on the platform of the ruling party exercise less independence during voting on issues in the house. Members of the ruling party in parliamentary democracy are subordinated to high party control, such as is not common or seen in presidential arrangement. The laws passed by the entire parliament cannot be reversed or set aside by any Court in the land. This is why it is said that the Westminster parliament is the most powerful in terms of law-making. By this, parliamentary legislation is not subject to judicial review. This contrasts with the practice in most presidential democracies where judicial review is a critical component of the constitutional framework.

The only seeming check on parliamentary power is the power of veto of the Queen, which is rarely applied. On the other hand, the House of Lords may exercise its power of suspensive veto, but such veto is vacated after six months. Thus, the Common can have its suspended laws passed after the suspensive veto lapses. This contrast with the presidential system where the concurrence of the two chambers is required before any bills becomes law. If any of the houses decides not to consider a bill already passed by the other, the bill dies.

Unlike the American presidential model, the parliamentary model is a system where the party that receives or wins the highest seats in parliament forms government. However, in situation where no party receives majority votes required to form government, coalition of parties will be required to form government. Also, coalition may be formed by parties with incongruent ideologies and interests. This may result in frequent dissolution of government.Examples of countries with pure parliamentary system where there exist mutual dependence between executive and legislature include United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Iceland and Denmark (Landman, 2008).

3.2.2 Consensus System

Some Western European parliamentary models (e.g., Spain, Germany) tend to have a more consensual debating system, and have semi-cyclical debating chambers. Consensus systems are identified by proportional representation, where there is more of a tendency to use party list systems than the Westminster Model legislatures. The committees of these Parliaments tend to be more important than the plenary chamber.

This model is sometimes called the West German Model since its earliest exemplar in its final form was in the Bundestag of West Germany (which became the Bundestag of Germany upon the absorption of the GDR by the FRG). Switzerland is considered one of the purest examples of a consensus system. There also exists a Hybrid Model, the semi-presidential system, drawing on both presidential systems and parliamentary systems, for example the French Fifth Republic. Much of Eastern Europe has adopted this model since the early 1990s.

Implementations of the parliamentary system can also differ on whether the government needs the explicit approval of the parliament to form, rather than just the absence of its disapproval, and under what conditions (if any) the government has the right to dissolve the parliament, like Jamaica and many others. Most of the developing countries inherited the parliamentary arrangement bequeath to them at independence by their former colonial administrations. But the parliamentary arrangement was largely assaulted and dismantled by the Africans who took over political power at independence. The system of Parliamentary democracy adopted by the former seventeen British African countries with the exception of Zambia, Botswana and Zimbabwe was what Nwabueze (2004) call the Westminster export model. This model was a by-product of the reform introduced to make the system reflects local realities of the respective states.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Explain the distinctive features of the Parliamentary system of government.

3.3 Advantages and Disadvantages of the Parliamentary System:

3.3.1 Advantages of the Parliamentary System

Faster and easier to pass legislation. This is because the executive branch is dependent upon the direct or indirect support of the legislative branch and often includes members of the legislature.

Parliamentarianism has attractive features for nations that are ethnically, racially, or ideologically divided. In a unitary presidential system, all executive power is concentrated in the president. In aparliamentary system, with a collegial executive, power is more divided.

Power is more evenly spread out in the power structure of parliamentarianism. To this school of thought, the premier seldom tends to have as high importance as a ruling president, and there tends to be a higher focus on voting for a party and its political ideas than voting for an actual person.

There is also a body of scholarship, associated with Juan Linz, Fred Riggs, Bruce Ackerman, and Robert Dahl that claims that parliamentarianism is less prone to authoritarian collapse.

3.3.2: Criticisms of the Parliamentary System

The head of government is in almost all cases not directly elected. In a presidential system, the president is usually chosen directly by the electorate, or by a set of electors directly chosen by the people, separate from the legislature.

Another major criticism of the parliamentary system lies precisely in its purported advantage: that there is no truly independent body to oppose and veto legislation passed by the parliament, and therefore nosubstantial check on legislative power.

Parliamentary systems are also sometimes unstable. Critics point to Israel, Italy, Canada, the French Fourth Republic, and Weimar Germany as examples of parliamentary systems where unstable coalitions, demanding minority parties, votes of no confidence, and threats of such votes, make or have made effective governance impossible.

Election can take place at any time, without a definite election calendar, it has been pointed out that the Parliamentary system can indeed be abused through arbitrary fixing of elections.

Also, critics of parliamentary systems point out that people with significant popular support in the community are prevented from becoming prime minister if they cannot get elected to parliament since there is no option to "run for prime minister" like one can run for president under a presidential system. Additionally, prime ministers may lose their positions solely because they lose their seats in parliament, even though they may still be popular nationally.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.3

> Enumerate the advantages and shortcomings of the Parliamentary system of government.

4.0 Summary

This Unit has taken a look at the principles and practice of the Parliamentary system of government across various countries, focusing in the process, on the peculiarities of the system from one country to another. The Unit also examined the strength of the parliamentary system vis-à-vis its shortcomings.

5.0 Conclusion

It is evident from this Unit that in spite of the general principles associated with the Parliamentary system of government, its application differs from one country to another. Even though the Westminster model seems to be the dominant, some countries have also adopted the consensus and the hybrid models. What the latter shows is that the Parliamentary system has been largely influenced by the socio-culturalrealities of the different countries where they are in practice.

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignments (TMAs)

1. Compare and contrast the workings of the parliamentary system in Britain and any African country.
2. Compare the Westminster Parliament with the Consensus and the hybrid models.
3. Identify and explain the strength and shortcomings of a typicalparliamentary system vis-à-vis other known system(s) of government.

7.0 References/Further Reading

1. J. Blondel, Western European Cabinets in Comparative Perspective 158
2. St. John N. Bates (1986), "Parliament, Policy and Delegated Power", Statute Law Review, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
3. L.D. Epstein, “Parliamentary Government,” in International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, Crowell Collier and Macmillan, Inc., New York 1968, vol. 11, pp 419-425
4. D.K.Price and H.J Laski, “A Debate on the parliamentary and Presidential Systems, in R.C. Macridis and B.F. Brown (eds) Comparative Politics: Notes and Readings, the Dorsey Press, Homewood, Ill, 1961, pp 365-381

UNIT2: PRESIDENTIAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

1.0Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Presidential System of Government Defined

3.1.1 Office of the President

3.2 Features of the Presidential Executive

3.2.1 Semi Presidential System

3.2.3 Mixed System in Developing Societies

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 Introduction

This Unit addresses the basic characteristics of the Presidential System of government. It looks at the Office of the President and the powers it wields under a typical Presidential system. The variants of the Presidential system, especially in developing countries are also examined.

2.0 Objectives

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to:

1. Explain the features of the Presidential system of government and analyse the power of the executive President under the system.

2. Discuss the variants of the Presidential system across different political cultures.

3.0 MAIN CONTENTS

3.1PRESIDENTIAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT DEFINED

A presidential system is a system of government where an executive branch exists and *presides* (hence the name) separately from the legislature, to which it is not accountable and which cannot, in normal circumstances, dismiss it.

The defining characteristic of a republican presidential system is how the executive is elected, but nearly all presidential systems share the following features

1. The president has a fixed term of office. Elections are held at scheduled times and cannot be triggered by a vote of no confidence or other such parliamentary procedures.
2. The executive branch is unipersonal. Members of the cabinet serve at the pleasure of the president and must carry out the policies of the executive and legislative branches.
3. Presidential systems frequently require legislative approval of presidential nominations to the cabinet as well as various governmental posts such as judges.
3. The power to pardon or commute sentences of convicted criminals is often in the hands of the President.

3.1.1 The Office of the President

We must note that countries that feature a presidential system of government arenot the exclusive users of the title of *President* or the republican form of government. For example, a dictator, who may or may not have been popularly or legitimately elected may be and often is called a president. Likewise, many parliamentary democracies are republics and have presidents, but this position is largely ceremonial; notable examples include Germany, India, Ireland and Israel.

Some national Presidents are "figurehead" heads of state, like constitutional monarchs, and not active executive heads of government. In contrast, in a full-fledgedPresidential system, a President is chosen by the people to be the head of the executive branch.

Presidential governments make no distinction between the positions of head of state and head of government, both of which are held by the President. Most parliamentary governments have a symbolic head of state in the form of a President or monarch. That person is responsible for the formalities of state functions as the figurehead while the constitutional prerogatives of head of government are generally exercised by the Prime Minister.

Presidents in presidential systems are always active participants in the political process, though the extent of their relative power may be influenced by the political makeup of the legislature and whether their supporters or opponents have the dominant position therein.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

Explain the attributes of the Presidential system, and the power of the office of the President?

3.2 THE FEATURES OF THE PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE

The president in the presidential democracy is oftentimespopularly elected. According to Almond et al (2007), the American president is elected indirectly by the Electoral College (though actually by indirect popular votes) for a four-year term. The president may be from a party other than the party controlling the majority seats in the legislature. This cannot happen in theparliamentary democracy where the leading party or coalition of parties withmajority seats form government. When the president emerges from a party different from the one controlling the legislature, what results is called a divided government. The executive is separately elected and hence not a member of the legislature (VonDeth,2005). The president is however elected to a fixed term. The president can only be re-elected once. The president cannot dissolve the assembly but the assembly can impeach the president, if found to have abused his oath of office. The presidential system has a single executive, hence executive power is not shared between separate persons.

The legislature is separated from the executive organ. No member of the legislature can serve in the executive office unless and until he has resigned his or her position in the legislature. The lower chamber is always much larger and representative than the upper chamber. Legislators are elected into a specified term of office. But in most presidential

democracies, no limit is imposed on the number of time that legislators may be re-elected.

The judiciary, manned largely by distinct personnel, is vested with power of adjudication. However, unlike the constraint on the judiciary in the British model where no court can review any laws made by the assembly, in the American presidential model, the laws made by the legislature is subject to judicial review. If such laws are found to be inconsistent with the constitution, the laws become null and void. As Almond et al (2007) argues, The Supreme court, through its power of judicial review, can declare any act of the president or Congress null and void on the ground that it violates the constitution.

However, the extent to which a nation judiciary is free to perform its roles, and efficiently too, may depend on how developed and rooted democracy is in the state. For instance, Helmike (2002) contends that experience from Latin American shows that in states that are just emerging from one form of authoritarian regime or the other, the judiciary is usually not too strong and often incapable to fully assert its authority. This fact was demonstrated also in Nigeria, another developing African country, where the executive flagrantly violated judicial orders with impunity.

In developing countries, the legislature are weakinspite of the principles of power dispersion and checks and balances, the legislature are most often too weak to check the executive. The president is so strong in Niger Republic that he can dissolve the legislature and this was demonstrated in the dissolution of the assembly in Niger in August 2009.

3.2.1 Semi Presidential System

This model of government, which has its origin in the fifth Republic Constitution of France, is characterized by a fair blend of the features of both the parliamentary and presidential systems. One of the major features of the model is that the executive is elected by the people into a fixed term of office. Thus, the legitimacy of the authority exercises by the president flows from the consent given in popular election. However, unlike the presidential arrangement, a prime minister selected from the majority party or coalition of parties in parliament work alongside the directly elected president. European examples of this model are found in France and Portugal. Under the model, federal ministers are selected from the legislature. However, where individuals that are

not members of the legislature are selected or appointed as ministers, they are required to seek election in subsequent elections. The president under the French model is more powerful than the executive under the pure presidential system of the US and Nigeria. The president of France can impose his or her will on the assembly and make it to pass legislation through the Constitutional Court.

The constitution vests, in the president, temporary power of dictatorship when it appears that the republic or sovereignty of the state is under threat, as well as when the functioning of public authority is interrupted. The president has certain power exclusively while he shares some power with the prime minister. Also, the Parliament of France consists of two houses- the Senate and the National Assembly. The Senate is elected by indirect suffrage. The senate is seen as representing local authorities and also constitutes the territorial assemblies of the republic. The National Assembly is directly elected by adult suffrage. For the Judiciary, the Fifth republic constitution of France also declares that the President of the republic is the guarantor of judicial independence and authority. He is assisted by the Superior Council of the Judiciary consisting of the minister of justice and nine others nominated by the president; the council is presided over by the president of the republic. This political configuration seen in the semi presidential system clearly undermines the principle of separation of power and in fact concentrated more power in the executive than any other organ of government.

3.2.1 Mixed System in Developing Societies

Different versions of the parliamentary-presidential mix have been adopted in the developing democracies. For instance, in Ghana, while the president is popularly elected, the bulk of the members of cabinet are appointed from the elected members of the assembly. Unlike France, however, judicial review of the constitutionality of the actions and pronouncement of the assembly and theexecutive could be undertaken by the Ghanaian judiciary.

In South Africa where a model close to that of Ghana is operated also, the president is elected or selected from the majority party in the lower chamber. The president is chosen from the National Assembly. Similarly, the members of cabinet are selected from the legislature.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Discuss the role of the executive arm in a typical Presidential system of government.

4.0 SUMMARY

This Unit has attempted to explain the basic features of the Presidential system of government, bringing out the salient issues of the centrality of the powers of the President in a typical executive presidency, the nature of a republican presidency, a semi presidential system and the mixed mode typical of developing societies.

5.0 CONCLUSION

From the analysis in this Unit, it is clear that even though the presidential system of government has its universal principles, its uniqueness could be found in different political systems of the world. In fact, the system has been adapted over the years by societies to suit their different socio-cultural and political orientation and cultures.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1. Explain the dual role of the president in a typical presidential system of government.

2. Outline the essential features of a republican presidential system and analyse the variant of the presidential system in developing countries?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

1. Ajayi, R. (1995) The Presidential System of Government at the Local Government Level in Nigeria", in Davies, A.E. (ed) (1995) Contemporary Issues in Nigerian Affairs, Ibadan, SUNAD Publishers

2. Elaigwu J.I. and Akindele R.A(1996).(eds), Foundations of Nigerian Federalism: 1960-1995, Abuja, National Council on Intergovernmental Relations.

3. Rivero, J. (1952) "Introduction to A Study of the Development of Federal Societies", International Social Science Bulletin, 4: 1, .

4. Ostrom, V. "The American Experiment in Constitutional Choice", Public Choice, Vol xxVII, pp.1-19

UNIT 3: ADVANTAGES AND SHORTCOMINGS OF PRESIDENTIAL SYSTEM

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Advantages of the presidential System

3.1.1 Criticisms

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Unit is a follow-up to Unit 2, and it examines the strengths and weaknesses of the presidential system of government. This is with a view to further expatiate on the workings of the system of government across various political systems.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to:

Explain the advantages and disadvantages of the presidential system of government

3.0 MAIN CONTENTS

3.1 Advantages of the Presidential System of Government

Generally, four basic advantages of the presidential system could be outlined in every system where it is practiced. They include:

Direct mandate in a presidential system: the president is often elected directly by the people. To some, this makes the president's power more legitimate than that of a leader appointed indirectly. The direct mandate of a president makes him or her more accountable to the people. Critics of this view note, however, that presidents cannot typically be removed from power when their policies no longer reflect the wishes of the citizenry. (In the United States, presidents can only be removed by an impeachment trial for "High Crimes and Misdemeanours," whereas prime ministers can typically be removed if they fail a motion of confidence in their government).

Separation of Powers: A presidential system establishes the presidency and the legislature as two parallel structures. Supporters claim that this arrangement allows each structure to supervise the other, preventing abuses. The fact that a presidential system separates the executive from the legislature is sometimes held up as an advantage, in that each branch may scrutinize the actions of the other. In a parliamentary system, the executive is drawn from the legislature, making criticism of one by the other considerably less likely. A formal condemnation of the executive by the legislature is often regarded to be a vote of no confidence.

Speed and decisiveness: a president with strong powers can usually enact changes quickly. Some proponents of presidential system claim that the system can respond more rapidly to emerging situations than parliamentary ones. However, in divided government, where the presidency and the legislature are controlled by different parties, it can restrain the excesses of both parties, and guarantee bipartisan input into legislation.

Stability: a president, by virtue of a fixed term, may provide more stability than a prime minister who can be dismissed at any time.

Emergencies and survival:presidential systems are more able to survive emergencies. A country under enormous stress may be better off being led by a president with a fixed term than rotating premierships. France during the Algerian controversy switched to a semi-presidential system as did Sri Lanka during its civil war, while Israel experimented with a directly elected prime minister in 1992.

Fixed electoral calendar:elections calendarare fixed in a presidential system and there is no room for arbitrary fixing of election dates.

CRITICISMS

Generally, three basic disadvantages of the presidential systems have been identified by scholars. They are:

1. **Tendency towards authoritarianism: w**inning the presidency is a winner-take-all, zero-sum prize. Once elected a president can not only marginalize the influence of other parties, but can exclude rival factions in his own party as well, or even leave the party whose ticket he was elected under. When the president and legislature are in disagreement and government is not working effectively, there is a powerful incentive to employ extra-constitutional manoeuvres to break the deadlock. For example, President Muhammadu Buhari and National Assembly led by Senate President Bukola Saraki and Speaker Honourable Yakubu Dogara from 2015 to 2019. Even though, the same party controlled both the executive and legislature, oftentimes, there was no common ground for mutual agreement.

2. Separation of powers: presidential system does not offer voters the kind of accountability seen in parliamentary systems. It is easy for either the president or Congress to escape blame by blaming the other.

3. Impediments to leadership change: another problem of presidentialism is that it is often difficult to remove a president from office early. The procedure is often long, arduous and cumbersome. In parliamentary systems, unpopular leaders can be quickly removed by a vote of no confidence, a procedure which is reckoned to be a "pressure release valve" for political tension.

Slow in meeting citizen's needs: presidential systems are slow in responding to their citizens' needs. Often, the checks and balances make action extremely difficult.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

What are the attractive factors in the presidential system in countries where it has been adopted?

4.1 SUMMARY

This Unit has attempted to examine the strength and weaknesses of the presidential system of government. It gives us an insight into why some countries prefer this system to another.

4.2 CONCLUSION

It is clear from the above that countries that adopt one form of government or the other do so for various reasons. However, the Unit has shown that the same attractive factor in a system of government can also be an aberration to that system. For instance, while separation of powers inherent in the presidential system allows for checks and balances, it can also lead to avoidable bottlenecks in the discharge of governmental functions. These are issues the student must take into account as you study the different forms of government across various political systems.

5.0 Tutor Marked Assignments.

Why is the presidential system a more preferred option than the other forms of government and what its inherent inadequacies?

6.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

1. R. Remy, United States Government: Democracy in Action, New York, Glencoe.
2. W. Keefe, Parties, Politics and Public Policy in America, Washington D.C. CQ Press, 1998.
3. L. Ragsdale & J. T. John, "The Institutionalization of the American Presidency 1924-92", American Journal of Political Sciences, vol. 41, no 4, 1997.
4. R.E. Neustadt, "Presidential Government," in International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, Crowell Collier and Macmillan, Inc., New York, 1968, vol. 1, pp 473-477

UNIT 4: COMPARING THE PRESIDENTIAL AND PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM

1.0 Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 Differences between the Presidential and Parliamentary Systems of Government.

3.2Comparing the British and American Model

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INRODUCTION

Having examined the significant features of both the presidential and parliamentary systems of government, this unit attempts at making a comparative assessment of both systems along certain identifiable parameters. In doing this, the Unit adopts the American and British models as the basis for comparison. In countries where we have an overlap of both systems, the Unit also points that out.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this Unit, you should be able to:

Undertake a comparative assessment of both the parliamentary and presidential systems of government with particular reference to the British and American models.

1.0 MAIN CONTENTS

1.1 Differences between the Presidential and parliamentary system

A number of key theoretical differences exist between a presidential and a parliamentary system:

1. In a presidential system, the central principle is that the legislative and executive branches of government should be separate. This leads to the separate election of president, who is elected to office for a fixed term, and only removable for gross misdemeanour by impeachment and dismissal. In addition, he or she does not need to choose cabinet members commanding the support of the legislature. By contrast, in a parliamentary system, the executive branch is led by a council of ministers, headed by a Prime Minister, who are directly accountable to the legislature and often have their background in the legislature (regardless of whether it is called a *"parliament"*, a *"diet"*, or a *"chamber"*). In parliamentary systems of government, the legislature is formally supreme and appoints a member from its house as the prime minister, which acts as the executive. In separation of powers doctrine, the legislature in a presidential system is considered a power branch which is coequal to and independent of the both the judiciary and the executive. In addition to enacting laws, legislatures usually have exclusive authority to raise taxes and adopt the budget and other money bills

2. As with the president's set term of office, the legislature also exists for a set term of office and cannot be dissolved ahead of schedule in a presidential system. By contrast, in parliamentary systems, the legislature can typically be dissolved at any stage during its life by the head of state, usually on the advice of either Prime Minister alone, by the Prime Minister and cabinet, or by the cabinet.

   The primary components of a legislature are one or more *chambers* or *houses*: assemblies that debate and vote upon bills. A legislature with only one house is called unicameral. A bicameral legislature possesses two separate chambers, usually described as an upper house and a lower house, which often differ in duties, powers, and the methods used for the selectionof members. Much rarer version have been tricameral legislatures; the most recentexisted in the waning years of white-minority rule in South Africa.

3. In most parliamentary systems, the lower house is the more powerful house while the upper house is merely a chamber of advice or review. However, in presidential systems, the powers of the two houses are often similar or equal. In federations, it is typical for the upper house to represent the component states; the same applies to the supranational legislature of the European Union. For this purpose, the upper house may either contain the delegates of state governments, as is the case in the European Union and in Germany and was the case in the United States before 1913, or be elected according to a formula that grants equal representation to states with smaller populations, as is the case in Australia and the modern United States.

4. In a presidential system, the president usually has special privileges in the enactment of legislation, namely the possession of a power of veto over legislation of bills, in some cases subject to the power of the legislature by weighed majority to override the veto. However, it is extremely rare for the president to have the power to directly propose laws, or cast a vote on legislation. The legislature and the president are thus expected to serve as checks and balances on each other's powers.

5. Presidential system presidents may also be given a great deal of constitutional authority in the exercise of the office of Commander in Chief, a constitutional title given to most presidents. In addition, the presidential power to receive ambassadors as head of state is usually interpreted as giving the president broad powers to conduct foreign policy. Though semi-presidential systems may reduce a president's power over day to day government affairs, semi-presidential systems commonly give the president power over foreign policy.

6. Presidential systems also have fewer ideological parties than parliamentary systems. Sometimes in the United States, the policies preferred by the two parties have been very similar. In some developing countries, differences between political parties are only in terms of personality, and perhaps the ethnic background of political parties, as elections are rarely fought or won on issues.

Overlapping elements

However, in practice, elements of both systems overlap. Though a president in a presidential system does not have to choose a government answerable to the legislature, the legislature may have the right to scrutinize his or her appointments to high governmental office, with the right, on some occasions, to block an appointment. In the United States and Nigeria, for example, many appointments must be confirmed by the Senate. By contrast, though answerable to parliament, a parliamentary system's cabinet may be able to make use of the parliamentary 'whip' (an obligation on party members in parliament to vote with their party) to control and dominate parliament, reducing parliament's ability to control the government.

Self-Assessment Exercise(SAE) 3.1

Discuss the statement that "in spite of the theoretical differences between the presidential and parliamentary systems of government, there exist some overlapping elements".

3.2 COMPARNG THE BRITISH AND AMERICAN MODELS

The presidential system of the United States and the parliamentary system of Britain share some characteristics and differ in many other respects. The two case studies are being assessed along the following parameters

(1) THE LEGISLATURE

The primary purpose of a legislature in any constitutional democracy is to enact laws. However, the specific institutional environment in which this is done differs in a significant way from one type of system to another. In fact, the most fundamental difference is one of principle i.e. the principle of parliamentary sovereignty. This major principle distinguishes Britain from most other democratic countries. Parliament may enact any law it likes and no other body can set the law aside on the grounds that it is unconstitutional or undesirable. Conversely, the American system places the constitution above even the congress.

Despite these fundamental differences, certain functions performed by the legislative branches under both systems are essentially the same, for example either congressional or parliamentary approval is required to legitimize any new law. Also, both legislatures

serve as forums in which political, economic, and social issues are debated. Both congress and parliament represent the true symbols of representative democracy.

(2) LEGISLATIVE INDEPENDENCE

Although the powers of congress are limited by the constitution, U.S legislatures have far more latitude than their British counterpart. Parliament is normally bicameral, but real legislature power is concentrated in the members of House of Commons. The prime minister and cabinet usually do not make policy without first consulting influential MPs, and cabinet domination of parliament is strictly supported by party discipline. Congress presents an entirely different picture. Both its 435-member House and its 100-member senate are powerful bodies whose consent is necessary before any measure can be enacted into law. In addition, representatives and senators tend to be locally oriented rather than national constituencies. They are elected to promote local interests and have the freedom to vote accordingly.

(3) LEGISLATIVE PREDICTABILITY

The greater independence called legislators under the presidential system makescongress a much more unpredictable institution than its British counterpart. In Britain, a party that wins a national election by a clear mandate is presumed to have a popular mandate to carry out its campaign promises. Although disagreement may arise within the ranks of the governing party, but the general tone and direction of the government are usually clear before parliament. U.S election is different in many ramifications in this respect. Even in presidential election years when the presidency and vice-presidency, one-third of senate seats, and all House seats are contested no clear national consensus may emerge. If at all it emerges, it is possible that no legislative consensus may emerge.

(4) STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY

In congress, there is fragmentation of authority and power which makes its structure notably more complex than that of the British parliament. There are six significant standing committees in the entire House of Commons. These committees are not even specialized; their twenty to fifty members consider bills without reference to subject matter. They lack power to call hearings or solicit export testimony, they cannot table a bill, at best they can make technical adjustment in its language. In summary, committees

work in parliament is unexciting and uneventful. By contrast, parliament's committee system of the U.S congress has no less than fifteen specialized committees. These committees have numbers subcommittees, with each charged with even more specialized tasks. In addition, committees and subcommittees have the power to hold hearings and subpoena witnesses as part of routine investigations into executive branch programme and operations.

(5) WATCHDOG ROLE

The congress performs watchdog role, which takes various shapes. Policy review can occur at any point in the legislative process (during the authorization and appropriation phases of the budgetary process e.g. by means of investigations and hearing). The British parliamentary system stands in sharp contrast to this.

(6)THE EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE NEXUS

Another key difference between the two political systems lies in the extent to which the legislature is involved in determining the composition of the executive branch. In parliamentary system, parliament plays a key role in determining the composition of a new administration (the cabinet). The prime minister heads the majority party in parliament, and the cabinet comprises of parliament leaders. In fact, the parliamentary system blurs the distinctions between legislature and executive powers; it is often difficult to determine where the authority of one branch starts and that of the other ends.

This fusion of power is not the case under the presidential system of government. Unlike senators and representatives, presidents are elected by natural majorities and the presidency derives its powers from a separate section of the constitution. Although congress does have some influence through ratification of executive ministerial nominees.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

From a comparative assessment of both the United States and Britain, discuss the view that the type of government a country practices is determined largely by the nature of its parliament.

4.0 SUMMARY

In this Unit, we have attempted to compare and contrast the presidential and parliamentary systems of government, looking first at some theoretical assumptions

underlining both, and then at the practical institutions in both the United States of America and Britain. It is however observed that in spite of these fundamental issues of differences, certain overlapping elements in the structures of government operating both systems can be identified.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The presidential and parliamentary systems have their peculiar characteristics, but they are not mutually exclusive, given some interface that are easily discernible. Students must note this particular point in order to avoid some of the limitations inherent in comparison, as earlier pointed out in other Units.

6.0 Tutor Marked Assignments (TMAs)

1. Compare the workings of the legislature in the United States of America and Britain.
2. Explain areas of convergence and divergence in both the presidential and parliamentary systems of government.

7.0 REFRENCES/FURTHER READING

1.Durverger,M, (1951) Political Parties, their Organisation and Acting in the Modern State, London, Methuen, .

2. Remy,R. United States Government: Democracy in Action, New York, Glencoe.

3. RagsdaleL.and John,T.J(1997) "The Institutionalisation of the American presidency 1924-92, American Journal of Political Sciences.

4. Price, D.Kand Harold,J.L(1961) "A Debate on the Parliamentary and Presidential Systems," in R.C. Macridis and B.E. Brown (eds), Comparative Politics: notes and Readings, the Dorsey Press, Homewood, Ill, pp 365-381.

UNIT 5: THE JUDICIARY IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

1.0Introduction

2.0 Objectives

3.0 Main Contents

3.1 The Place of the Judiciary

3.2 The Rule of Law and Judicial Independence: A Comparative Perspective

3.2.1 Rule of Law and Judicial Independence in Canada

3.2.2 Rule of Law and Judicial Independence in Sub-Sahara Africa

4.0 Summary

5.0 Conclusion

6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments

7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Unit addresses some salient issues on the institution of the Judiciary as an arm of government. It discusses the centrality of the Judiciary in the entrenchment of due process, rule of law and good governance. Also, the Unit examines certain critical issues that are considered fundamental to the independence of the Judiciary in every country. These are the constitution, security of tenure and financial independence of judicial officers. In analysing these issues, the judiciary in Canada and sub-Saharan Africa were taken as the case studies.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this Unit, the student should be able to:

Explain the workings of the judiciary and discuss the divergence in their performances across different political contexts.

3.1 MAIN CONTENTS

3.1.1 The Place of the Judiciary

The Judiciary as a branch of government is also known as the rule-adjudication department of the government. Precisely, it may be defined as the third organ of government concerned with the job of doing justice. It interprets law and awards punishments for the violation of laws. The primary objective of any political system is to protect the rights of the individual, and this work is done by the judicial organ of the government. In liberal democratic systems, the judicial system is said to be characterized by such concepts as impartiality, consistency, openness, predictability and stability. All citizens, in theory, are equal before the law, the legal results of certain actions may be reasonably foreseen, and legal procedure is known and will follow certain patterns. This is what is sometimes meant by "the rule of law".

It is hard to think of a political system that does not trumpet its commitment to "the rule of law," based on the principle that citizens are better off when the political system establishes rules for all to follow, rather than subjecting citizens either to arbitrary rule or to anarchy. By entrusting the interpretation and enforcement of laws to legal specialists, the government agrees to abide by its own laws, and the courts can rule against the government to uphold the "laws of the land." The Rule of Law is an ancient principle. Uncontrolled use of power and discretion by those who governed, coupled with the unpredictability of rule by men in governing society caused a lot of dissatisfaction and eventually gave birth to government of laws. The rule of law became overriding such that both the rulers and the ruled became subject to the sanctity of the law. The scrupulous adherence to the rule of law is the only way to ensure justice, development, well-being, peace and security for this and future generations. Without a vigorous rule of law, defended by an independent judiciary, rights are not safe and the equality and dignity of all citizens are at risk.

The rule of law is defined variously. It means that everyone is subject to the sanctity and discipline of the law and that no one, whether the ruler or the ruled, sits above the law. No person or particular branch of government may rise abovethe law and no branch of government should consider itself to have unlimited powers. This entails that there are established rules known, accepted and which must be respected by all. Such laws must be those that reflect the will and the morals of society expressed neutral, clear and objective manner. The rule of law also entails that citizens can only be constrained or punished for violation of the law and in accordance with the law. This is called the *principle of boundedness* in relation to the rule of law. The rule of law implies the existence of just laws, which make the legal system predictable, fair and transparent; a

legal system supported by effective judicial institutions aimed at protecting citizens against arbitrary use of power by state authority and lawless acts. As the bulwark of society, the rule of law is regarded as a reliable long-term bulwark against the abuse of state power. Once the rule of law is breached, society would not function in peace. The effective operation of the rule of law, confines those with power, whether in government or commercial corporations or the media or, in some societies and contexts, social or religious groups or trade unions. Both the substantive and the procedural laws should aim at resolving disputes in a fair manner. Such set of laws must provide a framework for majority rule as in democracy, while at the same time protecting minority rights. A distinction has often been drawn between *ruleof law and rule by law*. There will be a rule by law where unjust and oppressive laws are enacted and used to exercise governmental power over opponents of the government. The rule of law requires that it be recognized in the constitution of the country, the foundation and framework for orderly government and democracy with appropriate checks and balances. It is a theory of governance which relies upon a series of legal and social constraints designed to promote order and to prevent arbitrary and unreasonable exercise of government power. This is a government and a democracy of adequate and effective participation by the public in selecting leaders and in making laws with full protection for minority rights within majority rule; a democracy that allows for meaningful public input in policy making through free speech, free press, freedom of assembly and public discourse. Most importantly, rule of law requires an independent judiciary which is impartial and effective. An independent judiciary is regarded as the cornerstone of the Rule of law because it facilitates effective application of the Rule of Law. In drawing up the connection between the rule of law and the independence of the Judiciary it is critical to appreciate that the existence of an independent, impartial and effective judiciary is a fundamental aspect of the rule of law.

The independence of the judiciary is widely considered to be the foundation of observance of human rights and the rule of law, which in turn is considered to be a cornerstone of democracy. Thus, human rights, the independence of the judiciary, the rule of law and democracy are so closely related that they stand indispensable to each other in the pursuit of personal well-being. The judicial independence is part of the checks and balances in the process of democratic governance and in upholding of human rights.

Judicial independence as a concept means court autonomy from other actors to the extent that a court is able to make decisions free of influence from other political actors, and to pursue its goals without having to worry about the consequences from other institutions, it is independent. That is, courts should not be subject to improper influence from the other branches of government, or from private or partisan interests. The greater the level of input that these other actors have on the court's personnel, case selection, decision rules, jurisdiction, and enforcement of laws, the less independent it is. In other words, judicial independence is equatedwith the court's ability to act sincerely according to its own preferences andjudgments. It encompasses the idea that individual judges and the judicial branch as a whole should work free of ideological influence. Scholars have broken down the general idea of judicial independence into two distinct concepts: decisional independence and institutional, or branch, independence. Decisional independence refers to a judge's ability to render decisions free from political or popular influence based solely on the individual facts and applicable law. Institutional independence describes the separation of the judicial branch from the executive and legislative branches of government.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.1

Distinguish between the rule of law and the rule by law within the context of your understanding of the Judiciary in a political system.

3.2 The Rule of Law and Judicial Independence: A Comparative Perspective Units of Analysis

1. The Constitution: The constitution of a country is the essential bulwark of the principle of theindependence of the judiciary and constitutional guarantees are critical for theentrenchment, preservation and promotion of the independence of the judiciary. A formal constitutionally entrenched, independent judiciary is essential and a necessary pre-condition to functional and substantive judicial independence.

2. Security of Tenure: One way to promote judicial independence is by granting life tenure or long tenure for judges, which ideally frees them to decide cases and make rulings according to the rule of law and judicial discretion, even if those decisions are politically unpopular or opposed by powerful interests.

3. Financial Security: Financial security means the security of salary or other remuneration, and, where appropriate, security of pension.

3.2.1 Rule of Law and Judicial Independence in Canada Constitutional Provision

The rule of law and Judicial independence as a constitutional principle is fundamental to the Canadian system of government. Canada has a comprehensive, well-established structure for guaranteeing the independence of the judiciary and the rule of law. In Canada, the independence of the federally appointed judiciary isguaranteed by the Canadian constitution, more specifically, sections 96 to 100 of the *Constitution Act*, 1867, (which provide for the appointment of superior court judges, their security of tenure and financial security) and its preamble which provides for a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom, and incorporates fundamental rights of judicial independence which date back to the*Act of Settlement* of 1701. Judicial independence is also guaranteed in theCanadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, Schedule B to the *Constitution Act*, 1982, which provides in s.11(d) that every person charged with an offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal. The fundamental rights incorporated in the preamble and the Charter provisions apply as well to judges of the Provincial Court who are appointed by the Provinces.

Security of Tenure

Security of Tenure of federally appointed judges is assured in s. 99 of the *Constitution* which provides: (1) Subject to subsection 2 of this section, the Judges of Superior Courts, shall hold office during good behaviour, but shall be removable by the Governor General on Address of the Senate and the House of Commons.

The Canadian Judicial Council receives complaints, and if investigation warrants, the Council may direct a committee to conduct an inquiry to determine whether the judge has become “incapacitated or disabled from the due execution of the office of judge” by reason of age, infirmity, misconduct or failure in the due execution of the office. This Committee may also request that an inquiry be held. Following such an inquiry, at which the judge may be represented by counsel and has an opportunity to be heard, Council as a whole considers the report and recommendations of the Inquiry Committee. If in the opinion of the Judicial Council the judge has become incapacitated, Council may recommend that the judge be removed from office. In cases where the Inquiry Committee has decided that the conduct complained of does not merit removal

from office, the Committee may express its disapproval of the conduct. Another feature necessary for the continuation of judicial independence and impartiality is the immunity accorded to judges by respecting their function as judges. In Canada, judges enjoy absolute immunity from criminal and civil actions in respect of judicial decisions. A judge cannot be compelled to answer questions relating to judicial or administrative decisions made by the judge in the exercise of his/her judicial functions.

Financial Security

Section 110 *The Constitution Act*, 1867, imposes on Parliament the duty of fixing the salaries, allowances and pensions of the federally appointed judges. In 1975, the Parliament of Canada amended the *Judges Act* to provide for the establishment, every three years, of an independent commission appointed by government to inquire into the adequacy of salaries and benefits of the federally appointed judges. Until 1997, salaries of provincial court judges were fixed by the executive in most provinces. In 1997, the Supreme Court of Canada decided that the procedures by which salaries of provincial court judges were fixed were unconstitutional, as providing insufficient guarantees of financial security to assure independence of the judiciary, or its perception. The Court concluded that the system which required that judges negotiate their salaries and benefits with the executive could lead to the perception of a lack of independence. The Court recognized that the provincial legislature had the authority to reduce salaries when warranted by economic conditions. The Court concluded that the existence of an independent body to make recommendations regarding salaries and benefits was essential to avoid the possibility of political interference through economic manipulation. The recommendations would not bind Parliament but require a response which would withstand the rationality test.

3.2.2. Rule of Law and Judicial Independence in Sub-Sahara Africa

Most of Sub-Saharan Africa has embraced democratic governance, with democratic constitutions in place. Some of these constitutions contain express provisions for the protection of the independence of the judiciary, showing that democratic Sub-Saharan Africa recognizes the rule of law and independence of the judiciary as vital to modern African societies. The big question is however, whether there is manifest commitment to the rule of law and judicial independence especially among the leaders of democratic Sub-Saharan Africa. Constitutional or legal guarantees of judicial independence

thoughnecessary, are insufficient to show the existence of an independent judiciary and the observance of the rule of law. There is need for political commitment.

Many examples in democratic Sub-Saharan Africa today support an argument that the combination of express political statements and the attitudes of the political leaders towards the judiciary show that they treat the rule of law and independence of the judiciary as unwelcome in the implementation of their agendas. Events in the Comoros, Cape Verde, Togo, Mauritania, Nigeria, Ghana, Senegal, Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Madagascar, Cameroon, The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland and South Africa, to name but a few countries, would tend to support this fact. The status of the independence of the judiciary in the Constitution of the United States of America is less elaborate than in the Constitutions of Sub-Saharan Africa. Yet the independence of the judiciary in the United States is undoubtedly firmly established as a cornerstone of American democracy as evidenced through practice in decisional and institutional terms and the Constitutional provisions.

Independence of the judiciary in Sub-Saharan Africa is characterized by weak and inadequate constitutional guarantees coupled with lack of commitment by political leaders to promote and protect the principle. It is perpetually threatened through unwarranted attacks and circumventing the constitution, especially by the executive branch of government in all of Sub-Saharan Africa. The judiciary in this region has been faced with strong pressure from the executive, incomplete financial and administrative autonomy, interference by the legislature, weak infrastructure, inadequate budgetary allocations, corruption, low pay and sometimes a hostile attitude of the media.

Sub-Saharan Africa can be categorized on the basis of the degree to which the countries guarantee the independence of the judiciary in their Constitutions and other laws:

(i) Strong constitutional and legal safeguards such as South Africa;
(ii) Weak constitutional and legal safeguards;
(iii) No constitutional or legal safeguards.

(i) Strong constitutional and legal safeguards

There are very few Sub-Saharan countries that have strong constitutional guarantees of the independence of the judiciary. South Africa is recognized as acountry in Sub-

Saharan Africa with strong constitutional and legal guarantees of the independence of the judiciary which are also respected in practice. The constitution deals with all or nearly all the basic elements of the doctrine of the independence of the judiciary providing that the judiciary is independent and subject only to the constitution and the law and that all organs of government must do everything within their powers to support and promote the doctrine, providing strict procedures for hiring and tenure, disciplining, qualifications and competences, including principles of judicial accountability. The Constitution of the Republic of Malawi is also said to have entrenched the principle of the independence of the judiciary though, arguably, not as strongly as the South African Constitution.

(ii) Weak Constitutional Guarantees

Constitutional guarantees for the independence of the judiciary are weak in most Sub-Saharan African countries. Such constitutions articulate parliamentary supremacy and not constitutional supremacy. Kenya, Mauritius and Zimbabwe constitutions fall in this category. The Kenyan Constitution does not state that the judicial function is exclusively left to the judiciary.

(iii) No Constitutional Guarantees

The mere mention of the independence of the judiciary is not a constitutional guarantee, unless the principle is in entrenched provisions of the constitution. The Nigerian situation is a clear example. The Nigerian Constitution provides that "The independence, impartiality and integrity of Courts of Law and easy accessibility thereto shall be secured and maintained." This provision, however, is placed under "Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of the constitution." There are few safeguards regarding hiring and firing in Nigeria's Constitution. These flaws account for some of the abuses and violations of the principle. (**Note:** Students are encouraged to read the constitutions of several other Sub-Saharan African countries for purpose of comparative analysis of their respective provisions).

Security of Tenure

The power of impeachment of judges which resides in the National Assembly can operate as a limitation to the exercise of judicial functions, particularly where no clear impeachment procedures which conform to principles of natural justice are in place.

Appointment Processes

In many Sub-Saharan African countries appointment process are heavily politicized with a high potential of packing the judiciary with compliant judicial officers. Mostly the processes are not transparent with the President having powersto appoint on recommendation or on advice from agency that itself may be packed with political appointees. Political patronage and blood-line connections in the appointment of judges limit the independence and effectiveness of the judiciary in Africa.

Remuneration

The remuneration of judicial officers can be used as a device for undermining the independence of the judiciary particularly where it is not secured under the constitution of a country. The case of Swaziland where the judges were awarded a substantial increase in their pay in order to win the judiciary over to do the bidding of the executive is one example. We would not talk of the independence of the judiciary where the executive controls the budget and staff of the judiciary. The trend which reinforces the independence of the judiciary is to give the judiciaries more administrative and budgetary control to protect against executive domination of the judiciary.

Governmental Interference in the Judiciary

Politicization of judicial officers in Sub-Saharan Africa is the biggest threat to the independence of the judiciary. There are numerous instances in Sub-Saharan Africa of harassment of the judiciary and assault on the independence of the judiciary, especially by the executive branch of government which seeks to control, rather than check, the judiciary. It is notable that African leaders quickly learn from each other of the ways to undermine the independence of the judiciary, such that it is easy to see some pattern or trends across the sub-continent. In most Anglophone countries including Malawi, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Uganda, Nigeria and Zambia executive interference in the functioning of the judiciary constituted the main barrier to the attainment of the independence of the judiciary followedclosely by corruption. Thus executive dominance of the judiciary and corruption constituted the biggest barriers to the independence of the judiciary in Africa.

Self-Assessment Exercise (SAE) 3.2

Compare the independence of the judiciary in Canada and Sub Saharan Africa.

4.0 SUMMARY

This Unit has delved on the role of the judiciary as a third –tier of government, the imperatives of judicial independence as sine qua non of stable and organized societies governed by the rule of law. Specifically, the Unit focused on the degree of constitutional and legal safeguards against arbitrariness, security of tenure, remuneration, appointment process and government interference, in all the countries examined, and how these have impacted the nature of the judiciary in those countries.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Judiciary represents a major bastion of democracy, and as this Unit has demonstrated, encumbrances against the independence of the judiciary are counterproductive to the effective functioning of societies. Nowhere are these obstacles aptly demonstrated, as the Unit has observed, than in Sub-Saharan African countries. This is at variance with what the developed societies portray, as the Canadian example, discussed in this Unit has shown.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENTS (TMAs)

1. From the experiences of Canada and selected countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, discuss the statement that the independence of the judiciary is the foundation of the observance of human rights and the rule of law.
2. With examples from relevant African countries, discuss the impact of the politicization of the judiciary. Compare this to the experience of developed societies.

7.0 REFRENCES/FURTHER READING

1. Ostrom, V. “The American Experiment in Constitutional Choice”, Public Choice, Vol xxVII, pp.1-19
2. Ley Roy M. K, Comparative Politics, UK, Thomson Wadsworth.
3. Wiards, H.J. (2005) Comparative Politics: Critical Concept in Political Science, London, Rutledge.
4. Federal Government of Nigeria (1999). Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Abuja.