Chapter 2

1.a. Denying the consequent.
1.b. Is this a valid or an invalid argument? Valid.

2.a. Denying the antecedent.
2.b. Invalid.

3.a. Affirming the antecedent.
3.b. Valid.

4.a. Denying the consequent.
4.b. Valid.

5.a. Affirming the consequent.
5.b. Invalid.

6.a. Denying the antecedent.
6.b. Invalid.

7.a. Affirming the consequent.
7.b. Invalid.
7.c. You would have to observe a rich country that was not a democracy. This could be denying the consequent, a valid form of argument.

8. Answers will vary.

9. A statement is scientific if it is falsifiable. Which of the following statements are scientific and why?
“Smoking increases the probability of getting cancer.” Scientific, because finding that smoking does not increase the probability of getting cancer would falsify the statement.
“A square is a two-dimensional figure with four equal straight sides and four right angles.” Not scientific, because the statement is a true by definition.
“The sun revolves around the earth.” Scientific, because finding that the sun does not revolve around the earth would falsify the statement.
“It always rains in England during the winter.” Scientific, because observing a winter in England with no rain would falsify the statement.
“Education spending increases under left-wing governments.” Scientific, because finding that education spending does not increase under left-wing governments would falsify the statement.

“Religious faith assures a person a place in the afterlife.” Not scientific, because the statement cannot be tested.

“Democracies are less likely to go to war than dictatorships.” Scientific, because finding that democracies are not less likely to go to war than dictatorships would falsify the statement.

“The unexamined life is not worth living.” Not scientific, because the statement cannot be tested.

“Voter turnout is higher among citizens living in rural areas than for citizens in urban areas.” Scientific, because finding that turnout is not higher among citizens living in rural areas than for citizens in urban areas would falsify the statement.

10. Answers will vary.

11. [For the statement: All mainstream U.S. senators agree that the House bill is unacceptable.]
   a. No, because in this case the statement is a tautology and cannot be falsified.
   b. Yes, because in this case finding that Senators who share a middle-of-the-road ideology do not all find the House bill to be unacceptable would falsify the statement.

12. “If a person contracts measles, then she was exposed to the measles virus.” Necessary.
    “If a democracy is rich, then it will stay a democracy.” Sufficient.
    “If a democracy has a participant culture, then it will stay a democracy.” Sufficient.
    “A country cannot maintain democracy unless it has a participant culture.” Necessary.
    “Countries have many parties only when they employ proportional electoral rules.” Necessary.
    “Countries always have few parties when they employ majoritarian electoral rules.” Sufficient.
    “Students will receive a good grade only if they work hard.” Necessary.

13. Answers will vary.

14. Answers will vary.

15. Answers will vary.
16. Answers will vary.

17. Answers will vary.
1a. Generic Game I: Figure 3.10
   Expected outcome: P1 choose Down and the game ends.
   Payoffs to each player: P1 gets 3 and P2 gets -5.
   Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Down; Down)

1b. Generic Game II: Figure 3.11
   Expected outcome: P1 chooses Up, P2 chooses Down, and then P1 chooses Right.
   Payoffs to each player: P1 gets 4 and P2 gets 5.
   Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Up, Right; Down)

1c. Generic Game III: Figure 3.12
   Expected outcome: P1 chooses West and P2 chooses North.
   Payoffs to each player: P1 gets 3 and P2 gets 4.
   Subgame perfect equilibrium: (West; North, North)

1d. Generic Game IV: Figure 3.13
   Expected outcome: P1 chooses Down and P2 chooses Down.
   Payoffs to each player: P1 gets 6, P2 gets 4, and P3 gets 1.
   Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Down; Down, Down; Left)
2a. See payoffs in figure below.

2b. Expected outcome: Reenock enters and Staton does not advertise

Reenock gets 4 and Staton gets 2

Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Enter; Don’t advertise, Don’t advertise)

2c. Yes, the order of the players’ moves matters for the outcome of the game. In the original game, with Staton (the incumbent) moving first, the outcome was that Reenock did not enter and Staton did advertise. In the new game, with Reenock (the challenger) moving first, Reenock does enter and Staton does not advertise. Thus, both actors choose a different option in equilibrium depending on who moves first.
3a. See payoffs listed in game tree below. Expected outcome: Terrorist act; Payoffs: 3 to the social group and 1 to the government; Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Violence; Repress).

3b. See payoffs listed in game tree below. Expected outcome: Terrorist act; Payoffs: 3 to the social group and 1 to the government; Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Violence; Negotiate).

3c. No; the outcome (a Terrorist act) is the same regardless of the type of government faced by True Believers.

3d. See payoffs listed in game tree below. Expected outcome: Terrorist act; Payoffs: 2 to the social group and 1 to the government; Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Violence; Repress).
3e. See payoffs listed in game tree below. Expected outcome: Good faith negotiations; Payoffs: 3 to the social group and 3 to the government; Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Negotiate; Negotiate).

3f. Yes; the outcome depends on the type of government faced by Reluctant Terrorists. When facing a repressive government, Reluctant Terrorists will commit a terrorist act to avoid repression, but when facing a responsive government they prefer to negotiate.
3g. No, not necessarily. In the scenario with Reluctant Terrorists and a repressive government, a terrorist act gets committed, but this would not have occurred if the same Reluctant Terrorists had been playing the game with a responsive government.

3h. Such government declarations will make no difference if the social group does consist of True Believers, but they can be dangerous if the social group in question consists of Reluctant Terrorists instead. By making statements that signal that a government is of the repressive type, a group of Reluctant Terrorists might commit a terrorist act that could have been avoided.

4a. Answers will vary.

4b. See payoffs in figure below.

4c. Expected outcome: Raise; Payoffs: 4 to Legislator 1, 3 to Legislator 2, and 3 to Legislator 3; Subgame perfect equilibrium: (No; No, Yes; No, Yes, Yes, No).
4d. You should choose to vote first if you have a choice, so that you can vote No and still get the raise. In equilibrium, the legislator who votes first gets the highest payoff. Whether this answer is different from the answer given in 4a will vary.

4e. Yes, it suggests that agenda-setting power can be useful if you want to be able to affect which outcomes get chosen. Whether you would want to move first, last, or somewhere in the middle will depend on the situation at hand, but being in a position to determine the order of moves can work to your advantage.

5a. (i) Conditions: (E > 0, L < 1). SPE: (Exit, Exit; Ignore)
(ii) Conditions: (E > 0, L > 1). SPE: (Voice, Exit; Respond)
(iii) Conditions: (E < 0, L < 1). SPE: (Loyalty, Loyalty; Ignore)
(iv) Conditions: (E < 0, L > 1). SPE: (Loyalty, Loyalty; Ignore)

5b. No, the equilibria are not different. The cost of voice for the government applies to all of the government’s payoffs following its move, so comparisons between payoffs remain unchanged.

6a. (i) Conditions: (E > 0, L < 1). SPE: (Exploit, Ignore; Exit, Exit)
(ii) Conditions: (E > 0, L > 1). SPE: (Don’t Exploit, Respond; Voice, Exit)
(iii) Conditions: (E < 0, L < 1). SPE: (Exploit, Ignore; Loyalty, Loyalty)
(iv) Conditions: (E < 0, L > 1). SPE: (Exploit, Exploit; Loyalty, Loyalty)

6b. The government will exploit the citizen if it is autonomous, and thus values the benefit it can take more than the value of a loyal citizen. The government will also exploit the citizen if the citizen does not have a credible exit threat. In this game, the citizen never uses her voice in equilibrium; although voice is a part of the equilibrium strategy in a.(ii) above, in that scenario the government would not choose exploit in the first place, so the citizen would not have to use her voice.

7a. Answers will vary.
7b. Answers will vary.
Chapter 4

1. Answers will vary.

2. Answers will vary.

3. Answers will vary.

4a. Ren’s preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of Ren [listed first] and Chuck [listed second] that produce the outcome):
   - Drive straight; Swerve > Swerve; Swerve > Swerve; Drive straight > Drive straight; Drive straight
Chuck’s preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of Ren [listed first] and Chuck [listed second] that produce the outcome):
   - Swerve; Drive straight > Swerve; Swerve > Drive straight; Swerve > Drive straight; Drive straight
4b. Nash equilibria: (Drive straight; Swerve) and (Swerve; Drive Straight).
4c. No, neither player has a dominant strategy.
4d. Answers will vary.

5a. Hunter 1’s preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of Hunter 1 [listed first] and Hunter 2 [listed second] that produce the outcome):
   - Stag; Stag > Hare; Stag > Hare; Hare > Stag; Hare
Hunter 2’s preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of Hunter 1 [listed first] and Hunter 2 [listed second] that produce the outcome):
   - Stag; Stag > Stag; Hare > Hare; Hare > Hare; Stag
5b. Nash equilibria: (Stag; Stag) and (Hare; Hare).
5c. No, neither player has a dominant strategy.
5d. Answers will vary.

6a. Driver 1’s preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of Driver 1 [listed first] and Driver 2 [listed second] that produce the outcome):
   - Left; Left = Right; Right > Left; Right = Right; Left
Driver 2’s preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of Driver 1 [listed first] and Driver 2 [listed second] that produce the outcome):
   - Left; Left = Right; Right > Left; Right = Right; Left
6b. Nash equilibria: (Left; Left) and (Right; Right).
6c. No, neither player has a dominant strategy.
6d. Answers will vary.

7a. Edith’s preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of Edith [listed first] and Archie [listed second] that produce the outcome):
   Movie; Movie > Bowling; Bowling > Movie; Bowling > Bowling; Movie

Archie’s preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of Edith [listed first] and Archie [listed second] that produce the outcome):
   Bowling; Bowling > Movie; Movie > Movie; Bowling > Bowling; Movie

7b. Nash equilibria: (Movie; Movie) and (Bowling; Bowling).
7c. No, neither player has a dominant strategy.
7d. Answers will vary.
7e. Answers will vary

8a. There are no (pure-strategy) Nash equilibria in this game.
8b. It would be best to randomize over the three choices; if you chose only one action, then the other player could play her best response to that action, and you would always get your worst payoff as a result.

9a. Nash equilibrium: (Short pass; Counter pass).
9b. Neither player has a dominant strategy.

10a. If $c = 0$, then the Nash equilibrium is (Talk; Talk). This is the standard Prisoner’s Dilemma Game.
10b. If $c > 10$, then the Nash equilibrium will be (Quiet; Quiet). This is because subtracting more than 10 away from the payoffs as a punishment for talking makes those payoffs lower than the comparable payoffs a player would get for remaining quiet. If $c < 10$, then the game is still a Prisoner’s Dilemma. If $c = 10$, then the player would be indifferent between talking and being quiet.

10c. The Mafia plays the role of a “third-party enforcer” in that it is not one of the two players in the game (hence, a “third party”) but it does play a role in enforcing punishments for talking. Thus, the Mafia can change the payoff structure of the game. By enforcing punishments that are large enough to deter what it sees as bad behavior (that is, having its members cooperate with the police), the Mafia is able to keep its members cooperating with its own rules. This is exactly the same as the role of the state in the Civil Society Game discussed in the chapter.
11a. The United States’ preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of the United States [listed first] and the European Union [listed second] that produce the outcome):

   Do nothing; Preempt > Preempt; Preempt > Do nothing; Do nothing > Preempt; Do nothing

The European Union’s preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of the United States [listed first] and the European Union [listed second] that produce the outcome):

   Preempt; Do nothing > Preempt; Preempt > Do nothing; Do nothing > Do nothing; Preempt

11b. Nash equilibrium: (Do nothing; Do nothing).

11c. Yes, both players have a dominant strategy to do nothing.

11d. The United States’ preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of the United States [listed first] and the European Union [listed second] that produce the outcome):

   Deter; Do nothing > Do nothing; Do nothing > Deter; Deter > Do nothing; Deter

The European Union’s preference ordering (where each outcome is described by the actions of the United States [listed first] and the European Union [listed second] that produce the outcome):

   Do nothing; Deter > Do nothing; Do nothing > Deter; Deter > Deter; Do nothing

11e. Nash equilibrium: (Deter; Deter).

11f. Yes, both players have a dominant strategy to deter.

11g. Nash equilibrium: (Deter; Deter).

11h. Yes, both players have a dominant strategy to deter.

11i. Yes, the Nash equilibrium outcome in this game is suboptimal, because both players get a payoff of −2. They could do better if both chose to do nothing (both would get a payoff of 0) or if both chose to preempt (both would get a payoff of 2).

11j. If any state invests in preemption, then all states benefit from this investment whether they paid for it or not; only the state that invests in preemption actually pays the cost for it. As a result, many states choose to underinvest in preemption and “free ride” on the preemption policies adopted by other states. If all states think like this, though, then investment in preemption will be suboptimal—there will be less than is socially desired. In contrast, states tend to overinvest in deterrence because states cannot free ride and benefit from the deterrence expenditures of other states—states actually have to pay for deterrence themselves if they want to deter terrorists.
12a. See payoffs in figure below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US</th>
<th>Impose new tariffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce tariffs</td>
<td>3, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impose New Tariffs</td>
<td>4, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12b. Prisoner’s Dilemma Game.

12c. The Nash equilibrium is (Impose new tariffs; Impose new tariffs). The expected outcome is that both the United States and the European Union will impose new tariffs.

12d. Both players have a dominant strategy to impose new tariffs.

12e. Present value of reducing tariffs: \(3/(1 - d)\).

12f. Present value of imposing new tariffs: \(4 + 2d/(1 - d)\).

12g. Yes. If the discount rate is high enough that the present value of reducing tariffs is higher than what a player can get from deviating (which would yield a payoff of 4 in the first round in which she imposed new tariffs, and a payoff of 2 in every subsequent round), then the cooperative equilibrium can be maintained. This is the case if \(d > \frac{1}{2}\). To see why, refer to Box 4-1, where this example is laid out in detail.

12h. In the one-shot Free Trade Game, no economic cooperation over tariff reduction is possible. In the infinitely repeated game, cooperation in the form of reduced tariffs is possible, but only if both players are sufficiently patient and value their future payoffs highly enough. This suggests that countries should take care to maintain good relations with their trading partners so that everyone believes that the economic relationship will last indefinitely. If one actor is uncertain about the continued good behavior of the other actor, this might lead her to value future payoffs less highly (that is, her discount factor would decrease) because these future payoffs might not materialize. In such circumstances, the cooperative equilibrium in which both players reduce tariffs will be more difficult to maintain.

13a. Answers will vary.

13b. Answers will vary.
Chapter 5

1. Answers will vary.

2. Answers will vary.

3. Answers will vary.

4. Answers will vary.

5. Yes, the analyst should use DD because the level of “equality of opportunity” is included in the Freedom House measure itself. If countries have a higher level of equality of opportunity, then they are considered to be more democratic. Thus, using Freedom House would make the hypothesis tautological rather than falsifiable. According to DD, regime type is unrelated to equality of opportunity and thus using DD would make the hypothesis falsifiable.

6. No, the analyst could use either DD or Freedom House and the hypothesis would be falsifiable. This is because there are no aspects of the signing of international treaties that are related to the construction of either measure of democracy.

7. Answers will vary.

8. Answers will vary.

9a. Answers will vary.
9b. Answers will vary.
9c. Answers will vary.

10a. The three ways of conceptualizing congruence are one-to-one relationships, one-to-many relationships, and many-to-many relationships. Answers will vary in how these three conceptualizations are described.

10b. There are three different ways of conceptualizing and thus measuring the many-to-one relationship, referred to as absolute median citizen congruence, absolute citizen congruence, relative citizen congruence. Each of them find a way to characterize the ideological distance between the government’s ideological position and that of the citizens’ positions. The many-to-many measure compares the distribution of
citizens’ preferences with the distribution of representatives in the legislature. Answers will vary about how well these measures capture their underlying concepts.

11a. Answers will vary.
11b. Answers will vary.
11c. Substantive.
12. Answers will vary.
13a. Interval.
13b. Nominal.
13c. Ordinal.
13d. Interval.
13e. Answers will vary. One could use a nominal measure (blue, green, brown, gray, violet) or an interval measure (using chromaticity with a spectroradiometer), for example.
13f. A nominal measure might be comfortable versus uncomfortable. An ordinal measure might be cold, cool, warm, hot. An interval measure might be 37.6 ° Celsius.
14. Answers will vary.
15. Measure B is more reliable because the coding yields values that are more tightly clustered together than is the case for measure A. That is, using measure B, three of the coders came up with a value of 6, and the fourth came up with a value of 7, quite close to the value chosen by the others. However, using measure A, the coders displayed much greater variation in the values they chose. They ranged from a low of 3 to a high of 6.
16. Measure A is more valid because the coders chose values that, on average, yield the true value of 5, whereas measure B led to values that were biased toward a higher level of violations than was the case in reality. The average of the different coders’ values was (3+4+6+7)/4 = 5 for measure B and (5+6+6+7)/4 = 6 for measure A.
Chapter 6

1a. Traditional societies are characterized by economies with a small service sector, small industrial sector, and a large agricultural sector. Politically, they are characterized by dictatorships. Modern societies have large industrial and service sectors and a small agricultural sector, and are democratic.

1b. Answers will vary.

1c. Short answer: because rich people are risk averse. Longer answers will vary.

1d. Increased wealth makes the emergence of democracy more likely.

1e. Increased wealth makes the survival of democracy more likely.

2a. Democracy emerges because the state relies on groups who have become economic elites and who have exit options – thus the state agrees to some limits on its own power in order to keep these groups happy.

2b. Both the English and the French monarchs were reliant on their economic elites, but in the English case the economic elites had credible exit options whereas in the French case they did not. Thus, the English kings had to make concessions to limit their power in order to keep their elites happy but the French kings did not.

2c. Country B is likely to be more democratic than Country A because the leaders of Country B are more likely to be dependent on their citizens for revenue and to keep the economy performing well.

2d. If increased globalization leads to more people having credible exit options, then it should also increase the likelihood of democratization (at least in countries with leaders who depend on their economic elites).

2e. The basic argument is that economic elites will not want to democratize if society is highly unequal, because the masses of poor people will use the ballot box to expropriate their riches through higher taxation. According to the variant on modernization theory presented in the chapter, the rich will not worry about democratization if they have credible exit options. In turn, the poor, if given the right to vote, will not choose to expropriate the rich because they would rather that the economic elites keep their wealth in the country. Thus, economic inequality will only be bad for the prospects of democratization when economic elites do not have exit options (and thus they could be expected to resist any democratizing attempts).

3a. When $L < 1$ and $E > 0$, the subgame perfect equilibrium is (Disinvest, Disinvest; Reject limits). We would get dictatorship and poor economic performance.

3b. When $L < 1$ and $E < 0$, the subgame perfect equilibrium is (Pay taxes, Pay taxes; Reject limits). We would get dictatorship and good economic performance.

3c. For democracy to emerge, it must be the case that the citizens (economic elites, parliamentarians, and the like) have a credible exit option. However, this is not sufficient (though it is necessary). The other important element in the democratization process is a state (leader, Crown, and so on) that is dependent. If the state is autonomous—for instance, because it receives foreign aid and does not have to rely on revenue from its own citizens—then it has no incentive to accept limits on its power, even if its citizens have a credible exit threat. The result is the scenario outlined in answer 3a above. Note that foreign aid should
have no effect on democratization prospects in countries in which the citizens have no credible exit threat (scenario 3b above)—the state will not need to agree to any limits on its power whether it is dependent or autonomous.

4a. Credible commitment problems occur when (i) what is in someone’s interest to promise today may not be in his interest to do in the future and (ii) power is in the hands of those who make the promise and not in the hands of those who expect to benefit from the promise.

4b. Answers will vary.
4c. Answers will vary.

5b. IV: bad economic performance. DV: incumbents losing elections.
5c. IV: economic development. DV: democratization.
5d. IV: eating too much food. DV: obesity.
5e. IV: wealth. DV: stable democracy.
5f. IV: citizens with mobile assets. DV: no government exploitation.
5g. IV: poverty. DV: crime.
5h. IV: economic inequality. DV: poor democratic performance.
5i. IV: high levels of natural resources. DV: lower chances of democracy.
5j. IV: hard work. DV: good grades.
5k. IV: rain. DV: turnout.
5l. IV: partisan shift in control of government. DV: government spending.
5m. IV: number of parties in government. DV: government spending.

6a. Ross’s DV is the level of democracy, and he uses Polity IV to measure it. The main IV is whether a state is oil reliant and is measured by the export value of mineral-based fuels as a percentage of a country’s GDP.

6b. The main hypothesis is that countries with higher levels of reliance on oil will have lower levels of democracy. This hypothesis would be falsified if it was found that oil reliance made no difference to democracy scores, or that countries that were reliant on oil were more likely to be democratic than non-oil-reliant ones.

6c. Oil could be detrimental for democracy for three reasons, which Ross refers to as the rentier effect, the repression effect, and the modernization effect. The rentier story is that resource-rich governments are less accountable. The repression story is that resource-rich governments can spend a great deal of money on
building up internal security forces. The modernization story is that economic growth based on oil and minerals does not lead to the kind of economic development necessary to produce pressure for democratization.

6d. The coefficient on the main IV (oil) is predicted to be negative. The results indicate that it is, in fact, negative. You can tell that the coefficient is significant because the standard error is very small compared with the coefficient (or you can look at the stars and, because there are three, you know that the effect of a change in the IV is highly significant).

6e. No, Ross finds that being an oil producer hinders the development of democracy in the Middle East and elsewhere.

6f. Yes, the results from Table 3 in Ross’s article (p. 341) indicate that nonfuel minerals also hinder the development of democracy.
Chapter 7

1a. Valid.
1b. Denying the consequent.

2a. Invalid.
2b. Affirming the consequent.

3. Sufficient.

4a. The DV is the level of democracy in a country. It is measured using Freedom House as well as Polity IV, though the main source is Freedom House. The main IV is whether Islamic religious tradition is predominant in a country. This is a dummy variable, coded as a 1 if there is a majority or a clear plurality of citizens who are Muslim, and coded 0 otherwise.

4b. The main hypothesis is that Islamic countries have lower levels of democracy than non-Islamic countries. This hypothesis would be falsified if evidence were to show that Islamic religious tradition has no effect on regime type or that Islamic countries are more likely to be democratic than non-Islamic countries.

4c. Possible reasons why Islam might be detrimental for democracy: (i) Muslim countries are more prone to political violence than other countries, which hinders democratic development; (ii) Muslim countries are characterized by lower levels of interpersonal trust than other countries; (iii) Muslim countries are less secular than other countries, and secularization is thought to help democratic performance; and (iv) women are subordinated to an unusual degree in Muslim countries, and their subordinate role hinders democratic development.

4d. Fish predicts that the coefficient on Islamic religious tradition will be negative. He finds that it is negative. The coefficient is significantly different from zero, as can be seen by looking at the number of stars (3) or comparing the size of the standard error with that of the coefficient. In other words, Fish finds that countries with an Islamic religious tradition have lower scores on the Freedom House (FH) democracy measure than countries without Islamic religious traditions do, and that the difference in democracy scores is statistically significant.

4e. Of the four possible causal mechanisms linking Islam and (a lack of) democracy, the only one that Fish finds support for (that is, cannot reject) is the one that hypothesizes that the subordination of women leads to lower democracy scores.
4f. Using FH might be problematic in this case because the FH scores themselves are based in part on how equally women are treated in society.¹ For example, in section F (Rule of Law), under no. 4, “Do laws, policies, and practices guarantee equal treatment of various segments of the population?” one element of this question is, “Do women enjoy full equality in law and in practice as compared to men?” Under section G (Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights), no. 3, “Are there personal social freedoms, including gender equality, choice of marriage partners, and size of family?” there are several questions relating directly to women.

4g. Looking only at one period of time might lead you to draw misleading inferences about the actual relationship between Islam (and other religions) and democracy. That most Islamic countries are not democracies today does not necessarily mean that Islamic countries will not be democracies in the future. As we noted in this chapter, Catholicism was historically viewed as antithetical to democracy because few Catholic countries were democracies prior to the 1970s; today, however, most Catholic countries are democratic and few would argue any longer that Catholicism is inimical to democracy. Moreover, the very question of whether Islam is incompatible with the emergence and the survival of democracy would seem to necessitate a temporal component to any empirical analysis–the terms “emergence” and “survival” imply observations across time.

5a. Development indicators for women in Afghanistan are “among the worst in the world”. It is a dangerous country for women, and they are typically excluded from economic, social, and political activities. (p. 540)

5b. The NSP is a government program designed to promote representative institutions and service delivery in rural areas. Promoting gender equality is one of the goals of the program. Local councils composed of equal numbers of men and women are elected, and the election must have at least 60% participation to be valid (meaning that women must participate in the election). The grants given to the local council must fund at least one project targeted at women.

5c. Answers will vary.

5d. The hypotheses state that a development program requiring female participation will: lead to greater acceptance of women in local government (H1); increase socialization among women (H2a); increase women’s participation in economic activities (H2b); increase women’s engagement in household decision-making (H3); and improve perceptions of women’s social status (H4).

5e. Survey, observations by monitors, and interview data were all used. Two survey were conducted in the 500 villages (250 treatment villages and 250 control villages). The first survey was conducted during August – September 2007, covering almost 14,000 male and female villagers as well as the village leaders. A follow-up survey was conducted between May and October 2009. Monitors observed the council elections and conducted interviews of almost 1250 subjects from 131 randomly-selected villages. Demographic data were also gathered, and villagers were asked about their preferences for different projects and about the participation of women.

5f. The researchers concluded that the intervention had a positive effect on women’s socialization and their involvement in income-gathering activities. Villagers were more accepting of women’s participation in

¹. Although Fish uses both Polity IV and Freedom House for his initial empirical analyses, he presents evidence using Freedom House only when evaluating, in more detail, how the unequal treatment of women affects the level of democracy in a country.
local governance but there was no change in attitudes about women’s household roles. They found evidence that was consistent with the expectations of Hypotheses 1 and 2b. The evidence for H2a might be called unclear, and there was no evidence to support Hypotheses 3 or 4.

5g. Answers will vary.

6a. Ordinal.
6b. Answers will vary.

7a. Answers will vary.
7b. Answers will vary.
7c. Answers will vary.

8a. Answers will vary.
8b. Answers will vary.
8c. Answers will vary.
8d. Answers will vary.

9a. Answers will vary.
9b. Answers will vary.
9c. Answers will vary.

10a. Answers will vary, but should refer to the creation of identical resumés (that is, the skill sets of the applicants are identical) that differ only by some characteristic such as race, ethnicity, religion, gender, etc. Correspondence testing is designed to allow researchers to examine labor market discrimination.

10b. Most immigrants in France are from a single country or region with a dominant religion which means that it is hard to know if any effects are based on geographic region of origin or on religion.

10c. Answers will vary but should mention something about the selection of immigrant communities of different religions from the same country (in this case, Catholic and Muslim immigrants from Senegal). Immigrants from both groups had similar economic situations and arrived in France around the same time. Potential employers were given two of three resumés (CVs); either a CV with a ‘Republican French’ name (suggesting no recent immigrant status or religious affiliation) or a CV with a name suggesting a Senegalese origin. The Senegalese CVs came in two types, one suggesting the applicant was Catholic and the other that the applicant was Muslim. All other information on the resumés was identical. By comparing a Catholic applicant of Senegalese origin with a French Republican applicant, it is possible to see if perceived immigration status matters for employment. By also comparing a Muslim applicant of Senegalese origin
with a French Republican applicant, it is possible to see if this religious affiliation affects employment prospects differently than being Catholic (the dominant religion in France).

10d. The result was that immigrant background is not significant, but being Muslim is; the authors conclude that there is “significant religious discrimination” (p.22388).

11a. Nash equilibria: (Acquiesce; Acquiesce) and (Challenge; Challenge), where the first action refers to the action taken by group A (row player) and the second action refers to the one taken by group B (column player).

11b. The expected outcome associated with the Nash equilibrium (Acquiesce; Acquiesce) is No challenge. The payoff to the state is 8, the payoff to group A is 2, and the payoff to group B is 2. The expected outcome associated with the Nash equilibrium (Challenge; Challenge) is a Successful challenge. The payoff to the state is 0, the payoff to group A is 7, and the payoff to group B is 7.

11c. If the state thinks that the two groups of citizens will acquiesce, then it will transgress against them and receive a payoff of 8 rather than 2 (the payoff to the state if it does not transgress). However, if it thinks that the two groups of citizens will challenge, then it will prefer to not transgress (because 2 > 0).

11d. In this game, citizens are able to prevent predatory actions taken by the state only if separate groups can coordinate. If these different groups do not have cultural norms or practices that allow them to coordinate with each other, then the state can more easily transgress against them and prevent democratization.

11e. If higher numbers of distinct ethnic or cultural groups exist in a society, then the likelihood that cultural clashes occur might go up as well. Cultural differences might lessen the citizens’ ability to coordinate effectively against predatory actions on the part of the state.

11f. If the state could transgress against only one group, this should make it harder for the groups to coordinate. This should make it less likely for democracy to survive.
1a. Answers will vary.

1b. The logic of free riding suggests that it might be better to need 60 percent than 30 percent because more people would feel obliged to turn out in the latter scenario (the incentive to free ride becomes greater, the larger the difference between $K$ and $N$).

1c. The group with 5,000 members will be more likely to have a successful protest than the group with 10,000 members. This is because larger groups tend to be characterized by higher levels of free riding and a lower likelihood that collective action will be successful.

2a. Answers will vary, but will hopefully mention the citizen’s movement “Balai citoyen”.

2b. Answers will vary.

3a. Period 1, apolitical: radio has no effect on political opinions  
   Period 2, pro-Weimar govt: radio increases support for govt, decreases support for Nazi party  
   Period 3: pro-Nazi radio: increased support for Nazi party, lower support for Weimar parties  

   In periods 2 and 3, voters in areas with radio access should show more support for the side promoted on the radio.

3b. Answers will vary, but should mention the use of variation in access to radio broadcasts. The researchers find that voters who had access to radio were more likely to vote for the party or parties promoted by the radio.

3c. No, they find that anti-Semitic propaganda on the radio (in Period 3) was more effective in areas with a population that was thought to be more anti-Semitic in the first place (measured by the historical record of anti-Jewish pogroms and votes for extreme nationalists etc.). In areas where the local population was not anti-Semitic, the propaganda seemed to backfire.

4a. Answers will vary, but might include that initially people with grievances (like the mothers of missing children) were isolated and the regime was repressive so costs of protesting were high. Groups that might have more easily coordinated against the regime (like trade unions) had been banned.

4b. The reasons provided in 4a suggest that revolutionary thresholds for the mothers should initially have been high on average. Once word spread of the meetings in the Plaza de Mayo, this could have lowered the thresholds of some of the mothers, or they could have seen a sufficiently large group to trigger their participation for the first time. The fact that these women came from different networks suggests that encountering the protests at the Plaza de Mayo could lead to an effective dissemination of information to disparate communities, possibly prompting more women to protest. Repressive regime reactions to these protests might be expected to lead to increases in the thresholds of some participants, as well.
5a. See payoffs in figure below. The Nash equilibrium is (Radical approach; Radical approach). The expected outcome is a civil war (no amnesty). Both players receive a payoff of 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shiites (Supporters of New Regime)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical Approach (No Amnesty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnis (Authoritarian Supporters)</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5b. Both players would prefer the outcome of limited democracy, which would happen if both chose Moderate approaches. This is not part of an equilibrium, however, because if the Sunnis did choose a Moderate approach, then the Shiites’s best response would be to take a Radical approach.

5c. See payoffs in figure below. The Nash equilibria are (Radical approach; Radical approach) and (Moderate approach; Moderate approach). The expected outcomes are either a civil war (no amnesty) or a limited democracy. Both players receive a payoff of 2 if the outcome is civil war (no amnesty). If the outcome is limited democracy, then the Sunnis receive a payoff of 4 while the Shiites get a payoff of 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shiites (Supporters of New Regime)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical Approach (No Amnesty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnis (Authoritarian Supporters)</td>
<td>2, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5d. Yes, limited democracy.

5e. Answers will vary, but given that students are basing their answers on the games they were just solving, then they should conclude that the only way to get to a consolidated democracy is if all actors are willing to take a moderate approach. If de-Baathification policies are not seen as a helpful part of a moderate approach, then the conclusion would be that such orders should not have been issued.

5f. Answers will vary.

5g. Answers will vary.

5h. Answers will vary but one potential reason is that democratic reformers are willing to take a moderate approach toward the former dictatorial elites by making institutional concessions that appease the old elites. In return, the dictatorial elites are willing to make a moderate approach too and allow a peaceful transition to a limited form of democracy. This line of reasoning helps to explain why democratic transitions that
occur through pacts or negotiations often end up with democracies that have an institutional legacy from the dictatorship.

Part II.

6a. Preference orderings over expected outcomes for the three players.

Regime:
Democratic consolidation > Continued dictatorship > New religious dictatorship

Moderate Religious Party:
Democratic consolidation > New religious dictatorship > Continued dictatorship

Radical Religious Party:
New religious dictatorship > Democratic consolidation > Continued dictatorship

6b. Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Hold elections; Pursue moderate policy). Expected outcome: Democratic consolidation. Payoffs are 25 to both the Regime and the (moderate) Religious Party.

6c. Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Cancel elections; Pursue radical policy). Expected outcome: Continued dictatorship. Payoffs are 20 to the Regime and 5 to the (radical) Religious Party.

6d. EU_{Regime}(Cancel elections) = p \times 20 + (1 - p) \times 20 = 20.

6e. EU_{Regime}(Hold elections) = p \times 25 + (1 - p) \times 5 = 20p + 5.

6f. Probability at which Regime will choose to hold elections: anything greater than 0.75.

\[ EU_{Regime}(\text{Hold elections}) > EU_{Regime}(\text{Cancel elections}) \]
\[ 20p + 5 > 20 \]
\[ p > \frac{3}{4} \]

Regime will hold elections if it believes that the Religious Party is moderate with a probability greater than \( \frac{3}{4} \).

6g. The Regime will be indifferent because 0.75 is exactly the critical probability.

6h. The Regime will hold elections because 0.8 is higher than the critical probability.

6i. The Regime will cancel elections because 0.5 is lower than the critical probability.

6j. A moderate religious party wants the Regime to think that it is moderate.

6k. A radical religious party wants the Regime to think that it is moderate.

6l. Claiming to be moderate is not credible because both types of religious party want the regime to believe that they are moderate.
Answer key for problems at the end of chapters in Clark, Golder & Golder (2017) *Principles of Comparative Politics* (3rd Edition)

7a. Preference orderings over expected outcomes for the three players.

   Newspaper:
   - Free speech > Private censorship > State repression

   Regime that doesn’t value its international reputation:
   - Private censorship > State repression > Free speech

   Regime that does value its international reputation:
   - Private censorship > Free speech > State repression

7b. Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Suppress; Repress). Expected outcome: Private censorship. Payoffs are 6 to the Newspaper and 10 to the Regime.

7c. Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Publish; Ignore). Expected outcome: Free speech. Payoffs are 10 to the Newspaper and 4 to the Regime.

7d. No, because the Newspaper only publishes if it anticipates that it will not be repressed for doing so.

7e. $\text{EU}_{\text{Newspaper}}(\text{Suppress}) = p \times 6 + (1 - p) \times 6 = 6$.

7e. $\text{EU}_{\text{Newspaper}}(\text{Publish}) = p \times 2 + (1 - p) \times 10 = 10 - 8p$.

7f. Probability at which Newspaper will choose to publish stories critical to the Regime rather than privately censor them: anything greater than 0.5.

   $\text{EU}_{\text{Newspaper}}(\text{Publish}) > \text{EU}_{\text{Newspaper}}(\text{Suppress})$

   $10 - 8p > 6$

   $p < \frac{1}{2}$

The Newspaper will publish the critical stories if it believes that the Regime cares about its international reputation with a probability greater than $\frac{1}{2}$.

7g. The Newspaper will be indifferent because 0.5 is exactly the critical probability.

7h. The Newspaper will suppress the stories because 0.7 is higher than the critical probability.

7i. The Newspaper will publish the stories because 0.4 is lower than the critical probability.

7k. Yes, if the Newspaper thinks that the Regime cares more about its international reputation than it does, it might publish stories that are critical of the regime and then be repressed in response.

7l. It would increase the estimate of $p$, that is, make it more likely that the Regime does not care about its international reputation. The Newspaper should respond by being less likely to publish stories critical of the Regime.
Chapter 9

1. Answers will vary.

2. Answers will vary, but the basic story is as follows: Countries with the rule of law protect property rights. Stable property rights encourage investors to invest since the rule of law protects the profits that they make on their investment. Because of investment, there is economic growth. The weakest link, both theoretically and empirically, in the causal story is the claim that democracy is more likely to produce the rule of law than dictatorships. Theoretically, the Meltzer-Richards model calls this link into question. And empirically, the evidence presented by Barro (2000) is that there is no obvious link between democracy and the rule of law. He finds a connection between rule of law and stable property rights, stable property rights and investment, and investment and growth; however, he finds no strong link between democracy and the rule of law. Overall, there is no compelling theoretical or empirical evidence to suggest that democracies produce higher economic growth than dictatorships.

3. Answers will vary.

4. Answers will vary, but the main idea is that the “triangular” data in 9.4 indicates that the relationship between regime type and performance is not as simple as an increase in democracy leads to an increase in performance. The “triangular” nature of the data comes from the fact that although democracies perform well, dictatorships have varying levels of performance. Explaining the relationship between regime type and performance requires understanding the variation within dictatorships as well as the high level of performance of democracies. Answers for the second part of the question, the possible causes of the variability in performance among certain countries, and about factors not captured in the Polity IV measure of democracy that might affect material well-being, will vary.

5. Answers will vary depending on the argument presented in the second part of question 4 (above).
1a. Preference orderings over possible outcomes (technically these are preferences over the action profiles, each of which is associated with an outcome) for both players.

Intervener faction:
(Launch coup; Launch coup) > (Stay out; Stay out) > (Stay out; Launch coup) > (Launch coup; Stay out)

Professional faction:
(Stay out; Stay out) > (Launch coup; Launch coup) > (Launch coup; Stay out) > (Stay out; Launch coup)

1b. Figure 10.9 with the payoffs filled in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional faction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Launch coup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervener faction</td>
<td>4, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1c. The NE are (Launch coup; Launch coup) and (Stay out; Stay out). The outcome could be a successful coup or the military maintaining an apolitical position. We can’t say which outcome will occur.

1d. Extensive form of Military Intervention Game, with Intervener faction moving first.

---

**Military Intervention Game**

```
  Launch coup
     /     |
  Prof.  Interv. faction
     |
  Launch coup
     /     |
  Prof.  Stay out
     |
  Launch coup
     /     |
  Prof.  Interv. faction
     |
  Launch coup
     /     |
  Prof.  Stay out
     |
  Launch coup
     /     |
  Prof.  Interv. faction
     |
  Launch coup
     /     |
  Prof.  Stay out
     |
  Launch coup
     /     |
  Prof.  Interv. faction
     |
  Launch coup
     /     |
  Prof.  Stay out
     |
  Launch coup
     /     |
  Prof.  Interv. faction
     |
```
1e. The subgame perfect equilibrium is (Launch coup; Launch coup, Stay out). The expected outcome is a successful coup.

1f. Yes, it makes a difference whether the two factions decide on their actions simultaneously or sequentially; by moving first, the Intervener faction can get the outcome it wants (a successful coup) whereas if the two factions move at the same time it is not clear which outcome will occur.

2a. Preference orderings over possible outcomes for both players.

Regime:
Status quo > No party, failed coup > Party, no coup > Party, failed coup > No party, successful coup

Challenger:
No party, successful coup > Status quo > Party, no coup > No party, failed coup > Party, failed coup

2b. Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Do nothing; Do nothing, Do nothing). The expected outcome is the Status quo, so the Regime gets a payoff of 5 and the Challenger gets a payoff of 4.

2c. Subgame perfect equilibrium: (Launch party; Launch coup, Do nothing). The expected outcome is a Party and No coup, so both the Regime and the Challenger get payoffs of 3.

2d. \( \text{EU}_{\text{Regime}}(\text{Do nothing}) = p \times 5 + (1 - p) \times 1 = 4p + 1 \).

2e. \( \text{EU}_{\text{Regime}}(\text{Launch party}) = p \times 3 + (1 - p) \times 3 = 3 \).

2f. Probability at which Regime will choose to launch a party: anything less than 0.5.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{EU}_{\text{Regime}}(\text{Launch party}) &> \text{EU}_{\text{Regime}}(\text{Do Nothing}) \\
3 &> 4p + 1 \\
p &< \frac{1}{2}
\end{align*}
\]

The Regime will launch a party if it believes that the Challenger is weak with a probability less than ½.

2g. The Regime will do nothing, because 0.75 is higher than the critical probability.

2h. The Regime will launch a party, because 0.25 is lower than the critical probability.

2i. The Regime will be indifferent between doing nothing and launching a party, because 0.5 is exactly the critical probability.

2j. The Regime would be better off in a world of complete information so that it could launch a party if and only if it were needed. If it knew a Challenger was weak for sure, then it would not have to waste resources launching a party. If it knew a Challenger was strong, then it would not expose itself to a coup by failing to launch a party.

2k. A weak Challenger would prefer that the Regime knew that it was weak (no uncertainty), because it would be better off if the Regime did not bother to launch a party.
2l. A strong Challenger would prefer a world in which the Regime was uncertain, because the Regime might miscalculate and decide to do nothing.

3. [Note that some of the contemporary examples could have different classifications that what is listed below if the political situation in a country changes after the book’s publication.]

3a. Guinea Bissau – large S, large W. Explanations will vary.


3c. The United States in 1776 – small S, small W. Explanations will vary.

3d. The United Arab Emirates – small S, small W. Explanations will vary.

3e. Chile under Augusto Pinochet – small S, small W. Explanations will vary.

3f. Argentina – large S, large W. Explanations will vary.

3g. South Africa under apartheid (pre-1991) – small S, small W. Explanations will vary.

3h. Mongolia – large S, large W. Explanations will vary.

3i. Jordan – small S, small W. Explanations will vary.

4a. Answers will vary.

4b. Answers will vary.

5a. $1,000,000,000/250,000 = $4,000.

5b. A leader would choose to provide only private goods in this situation because the value of the private goods to the members of his winning coalition exceeds the value of the public goods. A leader who offered only public goods would be defeated by a challenger who offered members of the winning coalition private goods worth more than the $2,000 they would receive from public goods.

5c. $1,000,000,000/750,000 = $1,333.

5d. A leader would choose to provide only public goods in this situation because the value of the public goods to the members of his winning coalition exceeds the value of the private goods. A leader who offered private goods would be defeated by a challenger who offered members of the winning coalition public goods worth more than the $1,333 they would receive from private goods.

5e. The value of private goods to members of the winning coalition decreases with the size of the winning coalition but the value of public goods does not. As a result, public goods will be worth more to members of the winning coalition than private goods when the winning coalition is sufficiently large. Because democracies have large winning coalitions, democratic leaders will prefer to provide public goods rather than private goods.

5f. Unlike leaders in democracies, leaders in dictatorships are generally in a position to use private goods to keep the support of their winning coalition because the winning coalition in dictatorships tends to be
small. As a result, the value of private goods to members of the winning coalition in dictatorships tends to be larger than the value of public goods.

6a. $1,000,000,000/250,000 = $4,000.
6b. 0
6c. $250,000/50,000,000 = 0.005.
6d. 1 - 0.005 = 0.995.
6e. ($4,000 \times 0.005) + (0 \times 0.995) = $20.
6f. $20 (or a little bit more than $20).
6g. $4,000 - $20 = $3,980 (or a little bit less than $3,980).
6h. $250,000/1,000,000 = 0.25.
6i. 1 – 0.25 = 0.75.
6j. ($4,000 \times 0.25) + (0 \times 0.75) = $1,000.
6k. $1,000 (or a little bit more than $1,000).
6l. $4,000 - $1,000 = $3,000 (or a little bit less than $3,000).

6m. The larger the selectorate compared with the winning coalition, the less leaders have to pay the members of their winning coalition to keep them loyal. Rigged-election systems have large selectorates and small winning coalitions; as a result, leaders in rigged-election dictatorships can buy off the members of their winning coalition cheaply and pocket the remaining revenue.

7a. No, because the Selectorate Theory would predict that changing leaders will have little effect on leadership behavior if the institutional incentives remain the same. Getting rid of Moi in favor of Kibaki does little if the institutions (the size of W and S) remain the same.

7b. The implications of the Selectorate Theory suggest that providing economic development aid to small W systems, without demanding any institutional changes, is like throwing money down a hole.
Chapter 11

1. Answers will vary.

2. The preference ordering is complete because for any pair of options you can say whether you prefer one option or whether you are indifferent between them. The ordering is not transitive, because if you prefer rock to scissors and you prefer scissors to paper, then you should prefer rock to paper.

3. Answers will vary.

4. Answers will vary.

5. Answers will vary.

6a. Each finalist wins one pair-wise contest. There is no Condorcet winner, because a Condorcet winner is defined as an option that beats all others in a series of pair-wise contests. Using pair-wise voting, thus, does not identify a clear winner, because each finalist wins one and only one contest.

6b. Given your preference ordering, you want the finalist who sang the Irish folk song to win. To end up with this result, you should order the voting agenda so that the judges first vote between the ballad and the heavy metal song and then vote on the winner from that contest against the Irish folk song. Assuming everyone votes sincerely, the heavy metal song will win the first vote and the Irish folk song will win the second, and final, vote.

7a. Answers will vary.

7b. If the answer to the previous question was CrossFit, then the agenda should be Friends Marathon versus Battle Reenactment (round 1) and then the winner versus CrossFit (round 2).

If the answer to the previous question was Battle Reenactment, then the agenda should be Friends Marathon versus CrossFit (round 1) and then the winner versus Battle Reenactment (round 2).

If the answer to the previous question was Friends Marathon, then the agenda should be CrossFit versus Battle Reenactment (round 1) and then the winner versus Friends Marathon (round 2).

8a. The median voter is D and her ideological position is 4.

8b. If $P_1$ locates at 2 and $P_2$ locates at 7, then $P_1$ will get 4 votes and $P_2$ will get 3 votes. Thus $P_1$ wins the election and implements a policy at 2. The parties will not stay at these same positions for the next election;
P₂ will move farther left in an attempt to get more votes, and P₁ should move rightward in an attempt to prevent the loss of votes (in response to P₂’s action).

8c. If both parties locate at 4, then the election will be tied (and the final outcome will be decided by the flip of a coin). Neither party will want to change positions, because if either moves even a tiny distance away from 4, the other party will get D’s vote and win the election.

8d. See answer to 6b, above.

8e. See answer to 6c, above.

8f. No, both office-seeking and policy-seeking parties will act the same way because the best they can do is to locate at the ideological position of the median voter.

8g. Both parties should locate at 5, the position of the median voter D.

8h. Both parties should locate at 3, the position of the median voter D.

8i. No, the parties converge to the position of the median voter and the actual distribution of the other voters’ ideal points does not matter.

8j. If three parties are at the position of the median voter, then one would have an incentive to move slightly to the left or the right, thereby getting almost half of the votes while leaving the other two parties to split the remaining votes. The party that moved would win a plurality of the votes. Of course, all of the parties would face this same incentive, and so all should move, which would necessitate further movements, and so on. There is no equilibrium in this situation and parties continue to “leapfrog” each other in search of the most votes.

8k. Yes, the Median Voter Theorem (MVT) result depends on there being only two parties; more parties (such as three) mean that all parties locating at the position of the median voter will not be a stable outcome.

9a. The president prefers policies between 2 and 12.

9b. The legislature prefers policies between 2 and 6.

9c. Yes, the preferred-to-status-quo (SQ) points overlap between 2 and 6. This is the set of points preferred by both actors to the status quo policy.

9d. The legislature would propose a new policy at 4, its own ideal point, and the president would accept it because she prefers 4 to the current SQ.

9e. The president prefers policies between 2 and 6.

9f. The legislature prefers policies between 2 and 12.

9g. Yes, the preferred-to-SQ points overlap between 2 and 6. This is the set of points preferred by both actors to the status quo policy.

9h. The legislature will propose a new policy at 6 (assuming that the president is willing to accept the new policy when she is indifferent between the new policy and the status quo).

9i. The president prefers policies between 0 and 2.
9j. The legislature prefers policies between 2 and 6.

9k. No, the preferred-to-SQ points do not overlap. There is no set of points preferred by both actors to the status quo policy.

9l. The legislature cannot make a successful proposal to change the SQ policy. The only new policies that the president would accept are ones that the legislature would be unwilling to propose.

9m. Policy will be stable if the president and legislature have ideal points on opposite sides of the status quo. If they both prefer policy to be moved in the same direction, however, then it will be moved. How much policy can be changed depends on how far both actors’ ideal points are from the status quo.

10. Answers will vary.

11. Answers will vary, but should discuss the higher level of difficulty in achieving group transitivity (a stable outcome) when the decision is based on unanimity rather than majority rule.
1a. Semi-presidential, because the president is elected by universal and direct suffrage (Article 37) and because the cabinet is responsible to the legislature (Articles 62, 114-5).

1b. Semi-presidential, because the president is elected by “direct vote of the people” (Article 12) and because the cabinet is responsible to the legislature (Article 28).

1c. Presidential, because the government is not responsible to the legislature (Article 32).

1d. Parliamentary, because the government is responsible to the legislature (Articles 66 and 69) and the head of state (the Emperor) is not popularly elected for a fixed term in office.

2. Croatia has a semi-presidential system, because its government is responsible to the legislature and its president is popularly elected.

3. False. Semi-presidential democracies have popularly-elected presidents.

4. A constructive vote of no confidence requires legislators to approve the dismissal of the current cabinet (vote of no confidence) at the same time that they approve the appointment of a new cabinet (investiture vote).

5. (b); a government declares that a vote on a piece of legislation is also a vote of support for the cabinet itself.

6. Answers will vary.

7. (b); a pre-electoral coalition probably formed.

8. Likud will probably be appointed the formateur party because it is the largest party (both in terms of votes and in terms of seats).

9a. If South Korea were parliamentary, then the leader of the MPK is most likely to be appointed formateur because that party won the most seats.

9b. The formateur would come from the SP party (the president’s party), because governments in a presidential democracy are responsible only to the president and she gets to choose the cabinet.
10. Answers will vary.

11a. A minority coalition (together the two parties control 295 seats, and 302 are needed for a majority).
11b. A minimal winning coalition (together the two parties control 306 seats, and 302 are needed for a majority).
11c. A surplus majority government, since the PDS could be kicked out of the coalition and the remaining members would still be able to maintain their majority.

12. Answers will vary.

13. True, because parties have less of a need to be in the government to influence policy in legislatures that allow opposition parties more power.

14. Presidents in presidential democracies have no constitutional imperative to form majority cabinets – they can form minority cabinets when they want. Some of these minority governments will rule with the support of an implicit legislative majority, just like minority governments in parliamentary democracies. Other minority presidential governments, however, will rule without this kind of support. This second type of minority government is not possible in a parliamentary system because of the existence of legislative responsibility. This difference suggests, all things being equal, that minority governments will be more frequent in presidential systems than in parliamentary ones.

15. Answers will vary.

16a. Delegation scenarios.

Scenario 1
(i) range of policies acceptable to the principal: -1 to 5
(ii) the policy proposed by the agent: 2
(iii) the agency loss: 0
(iv) whether delegation was successful: yes

Scenario 2a
(i) range of policies acceptable to the principal: 1 to 9
(ii) the policy proposed by the agent: 3
(iii) the agency loss: 2
(iv) whether delegation was successful: yes

Scenario 2b
(i) range of policies acceptable to the principal: 2 to 8
(ii) the policy proposed by the agent: 7
(iii) the agency loss: 2
(iv) whether delegation was successful: yes

Scenario 2c
(i) range of policies acceptable to the principal: 4 to 6
(ii) the policy proposed by the agent: 6
(iii) the agency loss: 1
(iv) whether delegation was successful: no, in that the principal is still one unit away from the proposed policy.

Scenario 3
(i) range of policies acceptable to the principal: 5 to 13
(ii) the policy proposed by the agent: 5
(iii) the agency loss: 4
(iv) whether delegation was successful: no

16b. In Scenario 3, the agent (agenda setter) had no power to move the status quo. In Scenarios 1, 2a and 2b, the agent had the power to choose her own preferred policy. In Scenario 2c, the agent had only limited power and was able to move policy in her preferred direction but was not able to choose her own preferred policy.

16c. Agency loss is likely to be low when the principal’s preferred policy is not far from the status quo and/or when the agent’s preferred policy is close to that of the principal (assuming both agree on the direction in which policy should be moved). It is likely to be high otherwise. The agency loss can never be higher than what the principal experiences with the status quo, since the principal would reject any alternative policy proposal that is farther from her preferred policy than the status quo is.

17a. The final outcome in Scenario 1 is 8 and the final outcome in Scenario 2 is 10.

17b. Answers might vary here, depending on how one interprets the idea of delegation working better.

18a. The final outcome in Scenario 1 is 2 and the final outcome in Scenario 2 is 3.

18b. Scenario 2 better represents a situation in which the principal used a screening mechanism to alleviate the problem of adverse selection, which is when the principal has incomplete information about an agent’s type.
19. Junior minister and legislative committees are ex post mechanisms or the police-patrol variety. These actors are used to ‘keep tabs’ on the actions of members of another political party and they are in a position to do so continuously. Delegation problems facing members of coalition governments would decrease if the parties in government have similar policy preferences; ex ante mechanisms are not as crucial because potential agents have ‘good’ policy preferences, and ex post mechanisms are not as important because the agents have similar goals to the principal and should be working to produce policy that the principal likes even if the principal is not monitoring the agent’s behavior.

20a. Answers will vary.

20b. Answers will vary.
Chapter 13

1. Answers will vary.

2a. Answers will vary.
2b. Answers will vary.
2c. The more seats, the more proportionally (or “fairly”) seats can be allocated.

3a. 2014 legislative elections in Iraq: answers may well vary according to different sources used.

IPU Parline (http://www.ipu.org/parline/reports/2151_B.htm) provides the following information about the electoral rules in place for the 2014 election, based on Election Law No. (45) of 2 December 2013:

- Directly elected, 320; Other, 8
- Constituencies 18 governorate-based constituencies for 328 seats including 8 seats reserved for minorities.
- Breakdown for the 320 seats apportioned to each governorate:
  - Anbar: 15
  - Babil: 17
  - Baghdad: 71 (including 1 seat for Christians and 1 seat for the Sabean)
  - Basra: 25
  - Diyala: 14
  - Dahuk: 11 (including 1 seat for Christians)
  - Erbil: 15 (including 1 seat for Christians)
  - Karbala: 11
  - Kirkuk: 14 (including 1 seat for Christians)
  - Missan: 10
  - Muthana: 7
  - Najaf: 12
  - Ninewa: 35 (including 1 seat for Christians, 1 seat for the Yazidi and 1 seat for the Shabak)
  - Qadissiya: 11
  - Salahaddin: 12
  - Sulaymaniya: 18
  - Dhi-Qar: 19
  - Wassit: 11

- Voting system: Proportional: Proportional representation system
  - Seats shall be allocated according to the Sainte-Laguë method.
  - The candidate who secures the highest number of votes on the list shall be elected while ensuring that a woman candidate is elected after every three winning male candidates, thereby allotting 25 per cent of seats to women.
  - Voting is not compulsory.

3b. Answers will vary.
3c. Answers will vary.
4a. 2010 legislative elections in Afghanistan: answers may well vary according to different sources. There were 34 districts. According to paragraph 3 of Article 12 of the 20102 electoral law, “For Wolesi Jirga elections, each province shall be one constituency and for Nomads, the whole of the country shall be one single constituency.” According to Article 19, “The Wolesi Jirga shall have 249 seats. Of the allocated seats, 10 seats are reserved for nomads, and 239 seats are allocated for the provinces in proportion to population. On average, out of the total number of seats in each province at least two female members shall be elected to the Wolesi Jirga.” Of the 249 legislative seats, 68 are reserved for women. Article 22, paragraph 1: “In each province, seats shall be awarded to the candidates who receive the most votes. The allocated seats for women are exempted from this provision.” Article 23, paragraph 1: “In order to determine the minimum number of female candidates to represent each province, the Commission shall develop procedures and formulae, based on the population of each province, to determine the number of female candidates to represent each province in accordance with the requirements of Article 83 of the Constitution of Afghanistan, according to which the number of female representatives shall be at least twice the number of existing provinces of the country.” District magnitudes range from 2 to 33.

3 districts with DM = 2 (Nimroz, Nooristan, Panjshir)
2 districts with DM = 3 (Urozgan, Zabul)
9 districts with DM = 4 (Badghis, Bamyian, Daikondi, Kapisa, Kunar, Laghman, Logar, Paktika, Parwan, Samangan,)
6 districts with DM = 5 (Farah, Juzjan, Khost, Paktia, Sar-i-Pul, Wardak)
1 districts with DM = 6 (Ghor)
2 districts with DM = 8 (Baghlan, Helmand)
4 districts with DM = 9 (Badakhshan, Faryab, Kunduz, Takhar)
3 districts with DM = 11 (Balkh, Ghazni, Kandahar)
1 districts with DM = 14 (Nangerhar)
1 districts with DM = 17 (Herat)
1 districts with DM = 33 (Kabul)

1 districts with DM = 10 (Kuchi), but note that unlike the other districts that are based on provinces, the Kuchi are Pashtun nomads, who elect 10 members as a nationwide constituency.


4b. Answers will vary. For one explanation of why SNTV is a poor choice in Afghanistan, here is a quotation from the International Crisis Group (Asia Report N°117, 23 Feb 2011):

“The Single Non-Transferable Vote (SNTV) system remains the most pressing issue to be tackled in a revised electoral law, as evidenced by the 2005 provincial council and National Assembly elections. SNTV appears simple: each voter indicates one favoured candidate. In many singleseat constituency, Westminster-based systems, each voter also casts a ballot for one candidate. However, distortions arise in multi-seat constituencies. If a large proportion of citizens votes for one candidate, this large group will elect a single representative, while a much smaller number of voters will disproportionately elect favoured candidates. In Afghanistan, multi-member constituencies see representatives elected with wildly varying mandates since seats can be won in large provinces with even small numbers and small margins of votes. SNTV is particularly unsuited to Afghanistan because political parties lack capacity and discipline. The absence of disciplined political parties to carefully analyse prospects and to ensure that their votes are evenly
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distributed among candidates results more often than not in inequitable political representation. There can either be large numbers of “surplus” votes for individual candidates or political groups can split their votes between multiple candidates and get far fewer seats than their power base represents. Individual, as opposed to party-based candidates in Afghanistan is problematic. Large, unwieldy ballot papers are difficult both for voters and electoral administrators. The system also creates a number of barriers to broad political participation while blunting the potential power of political parties. Candidates stand as individuals with either nominal or substantial backing from political parties but cannot later be held accountable for party positions.”

(https://www.crisisgroup.org/asia/south-asia/afghanistan/afghanistan-s-elections-stalemate-0)

4c. Answers will vary.

5a. The Hare quota is valid votes/valid seats, or 308,834/17 = 18,166.71, so each party needs 18,167 votes to obtain a seat. See table below for seat allocations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005 Legislative Elections in Oslo, Norway – Hare Quota with Largest Remainders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes/Quota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder Seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5b. The Droop quota is equal to the Hagenbach-Bischoff quota plus one, with any “decimal part” removed. The Hagenbach-Bischoff in this district is valid votes/(valid seats +1), or 308,834/18 = 17,157.44. If we add one, we have 17,158.44. We now remove the “decimal part” and we see that the Droop quota is 17,158. See table below for seat allocations.
2005 Legislative Elections in Oslo, Norway – Droop Quota with Largest Remainders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>KrF</th>
<th>Kyst</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Ap</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>FrP</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>11,168</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>61,130</td>
<td>97,246</td>
<td>28,639</td>
<td>41,434</td>
<td>53,280</td>
<td>12,116</td>
<td>308,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quota</td>
<td>17.158</td>
<td>17.158</td>
<td>17.158</td>
<td>17.158</td>
<td>17.158</td>
<td>17.158</td>
<td>17.158</td>
<td>17.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes/Quota</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>3.563</td>
<td>5.668</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td>2.415</td>
<td>3.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic Seats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder Seats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Seats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6a. d’Hondt Divisor method. See table below for quotients and seat allocations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>KrF</th>
<th>Kyst</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Ap</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>FrP</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>11,168</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>61,130</td>
<td>97,246</td>
<td>28,639</td>
<td>41,434</td>
<td>53,280</td>
<td>12,116</td>
<td>308,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3270.0</td>
<td>11168.0</td>
<td>551.0</td>
<td>61130.0</td>
<td>97246.0</td>
<td>28639.0</td>
<td>41434.0</td>
<td>53280.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1635.0</td>
<td>5584.0</td>
<td>275.5</td>
<td>30565.0</td>
<td>48623.0</td>
<td>14319.5</td>
<td>20717.0</td>
<td>26640.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1090.0</td>
<td>3722.7</td>
<td>183.7</td>
<td>20376.7</td>
<td>32415.3</td>
<td>9546.3</td>
<td>13811.3</td>
<td>17760.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>817.5</td>
<td>2792.0</td>
<td>137.8</td>
<td>15282.5</td>
<td>24311.5</td>
<td>7159.8</td>
<td>10358.5</td>
<td>13320.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>654.0</td>
<td>2233.6</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>12226.0</td>
<td>19449.2</td>
<td>5727.8</td>
<td>8286.8</td>
<td>10656.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>545.0</td>
<td>1861.3</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>10188.3</td>
<td>16207.7</td>
<td>4773.2</td>
<td>6905.7</td>
<td>8880.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Seats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6b. St. Lagüe Divisor method. See table below for quotients and seat allocations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>KrF</th>
<th>Kyst</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Ap</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>FrP</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>11,168</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>61,130</td>
<td>97,246</td>
<td>28,639</td>
<td>41,434</td>
<td>53,280</td>
<td>12,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3270.0</td>
<td><strong>11168.0</strong></td>
<td>551.0</td>
<td><strong>61130.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>97246.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>28639.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>41434.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>53280.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1090.0</td>
<td>3722.7</td>
<td>183.7</td>
<td><strong>20376.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>32415.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9546.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>13811.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>17760.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>654.0</td>
<td>2233.6</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td><strong>12226.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>19449.2</strong></td>
<td>5727.8</td>
<td>8286.8</td>
<td><strong>10656.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>467.1</td>
<td>1595.4</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>8732.9</td>
<td><strong>13892.3</strong></td>
<td>4091.3</td>
<td>5919.1</td>
<td>7611.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>363.3</td>
<td>1240.9</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>6792.2</td>
<td><strong>10805.1</strong></td>
<td>3182.1</td>
<td>4603.8</td>
<td>5920.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>297.3</td>
<td>1015.3</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>5557.3</td>
<td><strong>8840.5</strong></td>
<td>2603.5</td>
<td>3766.7</td>
<td>4843.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Seats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified St. Lagüe Divisor method. See table below for quotients and seat allocations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>KrF</th>
<th>Kyst</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Ap</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>FrP</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>11,168</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>61,130</td>
<td>97,246</td>
<td>28,639</td>
<td>41,434</td>
<td>53,280</td>
<td>12,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2335.7</td>
<td>7977.1</td>
<td>393.6</td>
<td><strong>43664.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>69461.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>20456.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>29595.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>38057.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1090.0</td>
<td>3722.7</td>
<td>183.7</td>
<td><strong>20376.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>32415.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9546.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>13811.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>17760.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>654.0</td>
<td>2233.6</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td><strong>12226.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>19449.2</strong></td>
<td>5727.8</td>
<td>8286.8</td>
<td><strong>10656.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>467.1</td>
<td>1595.4</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td><strong>8732.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>13892.3</strong></td>
<td>4091.3</td>
<td>5919.1</td>
<td>7611.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>363.3</td>
<td>1240.9</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>6792.2</td>
<td><strong>10805.1</strong></td>
<td>3182.1</td>
<td>4603.8</td>
<td>5920.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>297.3</td>
<td>1015.3</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>5557.3</td>
<td><strong>8840.5</strong></td>
<td>2603.5</td>
<td>3766.7</td>
<td>4843.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Seats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6c. The most proportional of the divisor systems is the St. Lagüe method. The quota systems seem more proportional than the divisor ones, and the Hare seems the most proportional method. The results here seem to fit what one would expect, based on Table 13.11 in the chapter.

7a. The three main types of gender quotas mentioned are (i) reserved seats, (ii) legal candidate quotas, and (iii) political party quotas. Answer will vary for the explanations and examples of each.

7b. Answers will vary.

7c. Answers will vary.
Chapter 14

1a. The effective number of electoral parties is 2.27. The effective number of legislative parties is 2.26.

1b. The actual (raw) number of electoral parties that competed in the elections is 31. The raw number of parties that won seats is 13. Answers will vary on the comparison of the usefulness of actual versus effective numbers of parties.

1c. One-party dominant.

1d. No, the translation of vote percentages into seat percentages seems pretty proportional. The electoral system must be quite permissive, because a party won a seat after winning only 0.17 percent of the vote.

2a. Different parties compete within various Indian states--the party system is not nationalized.

2b. Because only one candidate is elected from each district, the mechanical effect of the electoral rule is to magnify the success of the plurality winner and to discriminate against candidates from smaller parties. This mechanical effect prompts voters to vote strategically for their most preferred candidate out of the set of candidates with an actual chance of winning, and prompts candidates to enter strategically as well--those from small parties or with little support will prefer not to enter in the first place. Thus, within a given district, we should expect to see two main parties (and two main candidates from those parties).

2c. Answers will vary. A likely response would be that government spending was more centralized in the 1970s than in other periods.

3a. It would be difficult to predict a person’s racial group if you know only that he or she speaks English. If you know that someone is Latino, it would be difficult to predict which language, Spanish or English, that person speaks. Likewise, if you know that someone is Asian, it would be difficult to predict whether that person speaks English or Korean. Based on these answers, the hypothetical community seems to have cross-cutting attributes.

3b. The two identity categories that form minimal winning coalitions are English speakers (55 percent) and Latinos (51 percent). The logic of minimal winning coalitions suggests that the least minimal winning coalition, the Latinos, should be the most likely to be politicized.

3c. English-speaking Latinos are members of both minimal winning coalitions, which should give them an advantage. They should be able to get more policy concessions out of their coalition partner(s) because they have an exit option--they could leave and form a part of a different MWC.
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Chapter 15

1. Answers will vary.

2. Answers will vary.

3. Answers will vary.

4. Answers will vary.

5. Answers will vary.

6. Answers will vary.

7. Answers will vary.

8. If the country has fewer veto players, then it should be easier, on average, to change existing policy. It should never be more difficult. If the remaining veto players are on opposite sides of the status quo, then policy will not change, but fewer veto players means that there will be times when policy change is more likely to occur than would have been the case with more veto players. On average, the more veto players in a scenario, the higher the chances that at least one will be unwilling to agree to a policy change.

9a. The median voter (MV) prefers policies between 3 and 9 to the status quo policy. The MV would propose a new policy of 6, and the outcome would be 6.

9b. The MV in the lower chamber prefers policies between 3 and 9 to the status quo policy. The MV in the upper chamber prefers policies between 3 and 5 to the status quo policy. The overlapping range that both prefer to the status quo is policies between 3 and 5.

9c. The lower chamber would propose 5. If the upper chamber were the agenda setter, it would propose 4.

9d. The MV in the lower chamber prefers policies between 5 and 7 to the status quo policy. The MV in the upper chamber prefers policies between 3 and 5 to the status quo policy. The overlapping range that both prefer to the status quo does not exist. In this case, both houses would be indifferent between doing nothing and proposing 5, the SQ policy.

10a. The legislature will set policy at 7, its ideal point.
10b. The legislative committee (LC) prefers policies between 3 and 7 to the status quo policy.

10c. The LC will initiate legislation if the agency’s policy is outside of the range 3 to 7. If the policy is within this range, then it will not initiate legislation. (We assume that if policy is proposed at exactly 3 or 7, then the committee would be indifferent between the new policy and the status quo and would accept the new policy.)

10d. At 3 (or the student might choose 3.1 so that the LC is not indifferent).

10e. The LC would initiate legislation to change the SQ, and the legislature would propose a new policy of 7. If the court strikes down the agency policy, the final policy outcome would be 7.

10f. The court would not strike it down because 3.1 is closer to its ideal point (4) than 7 is.

10g. Because 3.1 is closer to the LC’s ideal point (5) than 7 is.

10h. 3.1, for the reasons given above.

10i. Policies between 5 and 7.

10j. The agency should implement policy at 5 (if we assume that new policies are always accepted over the status quo when actors are indifferent) or at 5.1 (if we assume that policies can be implemented in 0.1 increments along the policy space). This will be the final policy outcome because neither the LC nor the court would prefer the status quo policy to the proposed new policy.

10k. The court prefers all policies between 7 and 9 to the ideal point of the median voter in the legislature.

10l. The agency should implement policy at 7, and this will be the final outcome. All actors aside from the agency prefer 7 to the status quo, and 7 is where the legislature will produce the new policy if given a chance. So the agency can do no better than to implement policy at 7 in the first place.

10m. Yes, a court with the power of judicial review can affect policy outcomes, and no, the court does not have to actually do anything (such as make rulings) to affect policy outcomes.

10n. In these scenarios, policy gets moved toward the median voter in the legislature.

10o. No, because when policy gets moved by the court (or due to the anticipation of court actions), it seems to move toward the median voter in the legislature. In other words, the court is not able to simply choose policy wherever it likes regardless of the preferences of the elected members of the legislature.
11a. See the figure below.

![Figure 15.13 Two Veto Players](image)

**Notes:** There are two veto players, A and B, and a Status Quo policy, SQ.

11b. Answers will vary.

12a. See the figure below.

![Figure 15.14: Three Veto Players](image)

**Notes:** There are three veto players, A, B and C, and a Status Quo policy, SQ.
12b. The winset in the second figure is smaller – this means that there are fewer alternatives that all actors prefer to the status quo policy.

13a. See the figure below. Notice that there is no winset. This means that there are no policies preferred to the SQ policy by all actors.

13b. See the figure below. Notice that there is now a winset. This means that there are policies preferred to the SQ policy by all actors.
13c. The farther apart the ideal points of the veto players, the larger the unanimity core. The larger the unanimity core, the higher the level of policy stability.

13d. No, an additional player within the existing unanimity core will not change the size of the unanimity core; the additional player is “absorbed.”

13e. Yes, it would get larger.

13f. No.

14a. See unanimity core drawn in figure below.

![Figure 15.16: Activist Judges with Agenda-Setting Power](image_url)

14b. $J_1$ should interpret statutes at her ideal point, because her ideal point is within the unanimity core and the legislative veto players will be unable to change her policies.

14c. If $J_2$ interprets statutes at her ideal point, the legislative veto players will be able to move it. She should interpret statutes at the point within the unanimity core (or on the edge of the core) that is closest to her ideal point.

14d. If the ideal points of the legislative veto players were farther apart, the unanimity core would be larger and the agenda-setting power of judges would also increase. The larger the unanimity core, the greater the amount of discretion judges are likely to be able to exercise.

14e. We should see higher levels of judicial activism in countries that employ federal and bicameral institutions because such institutions produce more veto players, which makes it more likely that there will be a sizable unanimity core.
Chapter 16

1. Answers will vary, but should capture the idea that descriptive representation is about representatives who resemble their constituents with respect to some characteristic such as gender, race, class, religion, etc. The representatives “stand for” their constituents. Substantive representation, in contrast, is about representatives who “act for” their constituents and promote their interests. (Descriptive representation is about who represents, while substantive representation is about how the representatives act.)

2a. Answers will vary.

2b. Answers will vary.

2c. Answers will vary, but should address “social meaning and de facto legitimacy.” First, descriptive representation can be useful in cases where a particular group has held a lower status, or “second-class citizenship”, with its members not being seen as able to rule. Descriptive representation can change these “social facts”. Second, increasing descriptive representation can lead to increased legitimacy of the polity itself in the eyes of citizens. It is possible that the idea that all groups are included (via representatives) in the policy-making process makes policies seem more democratically legitimate (even if individuals do not personally agree with the policy).

2d. Answers will vary.

3. Answers will vary.

4a. Answers will vary, but the three mechanisms are (i) preferences, (ii) technology, and (iii) strategy selection. Preferences is about having a commonality of tastes (over goods, for example) with co-ethnics, or wanting goods to be directed to a co-ethnic rather than a non-co-ethnic, or wanting to work with co-ethnics rather than non-co-ethnics. Technology is about the increased efficacy of dealing with a co-ethnic rather than a non-co-ethnic (increased cultural knowledge, shared language, networks, etc.). Strategy selection is about playing different strategies when confronted with a co-ethnic versus non-co-ethnic person.

4b. The authors use a dictator game (with an anonymous proposer) to test the first mechanism, a puzzle game for the second mechanism, and a dictator game (with an identified proposer) to test the third mechanism. Explanations of how these experiments work will vary.

4c. The authors find results that are consistent with the strategy selection mechanism. People are more likely to provide public goods when the recipient is a co-ethnic and when their actions are observed (and when they can thus more easily be sanctioned). The technology mechanism, specifically “findability” within one’s ethnic network, increases the likelihood of knowing who should be sanctioned if goods are not provided.
5. Increases in GDP per capita and in Growth in GDP per capita both lead to increased democratic survival. (Note that the coefficients on each are positive and significant.) If a country is an oil producer, this has no effect on democratic survival (notice that the coefficient on Oil producer is insignificant).

6. Answers will vary.

7. Answers will vary.

8. Answers will vary.