



Stefan Müller, PhD

Assistant Professor and Ad Astra Fellow
School of Politics and International Relations
University College Dublin
Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland
✉ stefan.mueller@ucd.ie
🌐 <https://muellerstefan.net>

Level 3 Module; Spring Trimester 2023

Parties and Party Competition (POL30720)

Version: January 23, 2023

Latest version at: <https://muellerstefan.net/teaching/2023-spring-ppc.pdf>

Time: Tuesday 14:00–14:50 & Thursday 12:00–12:50

- Tue: B002-CSI (Computer Science)
- Thu: G-08.AG (Agriculture and Food Science)

Credits: 10.0

Format: Lecture; in-class discussions

Module coordinator: Stefan Müller, PhD

stefan.mueller@ucd.ie
<https://muellerstefan.net>

Office: Newman Building, G312

Office hours: Tue, 11:15–13:00 ([sign up here](#))

Module Description

How can we identify differences between party systems, determine party positions, and measure public opinion? Do parties keep their promises, or are politicians “pledge breakers”? Are promises in certain policy areas more likely to be fulfilled? In what policy areas do parties differ in terms of their positions and issue emphasis? And do parties respond to changes in public opinion?

In this module, we first discuss the main functions of political parties, outline features of representative democracies, and identify ways of measuring public opinion. Next, we assess whether parties keep their promises, whether the “mandate model of democracy” is a desirable and realistic mode of political representation, and how we could improve existing studies on election pledge fulfilment. Afterwards, we investigate parties’ willingness and capacity to respond to changes in public opinion. Fourth, we discuss different approaches to measuring party positions, political ideology, and the salience of policy areas. Finally, we assess alternative types of political participation that go beyond representative government and electoral democracy.

Learning Outcomes

1. Extensive knowledge of central theories of representation, the mandate model of democracy, and party competition
2. Detailed insights into past and current approaches to study questions about pledge fulfilment, party positions, responsiveness, and issue ownership
3. Critical reading and discussing complex academic literature and diverse quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches

Indicative Module Content

The following topics will be discussed in this module: parties and party systems; the “mandate model of democracy”; measuring and aggregating public opinion; economic voting; the cost of governing; responsiveness; party competition; party positions, salience, and issue ownership; campaign pledges; parties’ online communication and campaigning

Approaches to Teaching and Learning

- Active and task-based learning
- Group work and discussions
- In-class debates
- Problem-based learning

Overview of Assessment

- 1,000 word response paper: 30%; submission throughout the term (see details below)
- Descriptive data analysis: summarise and interpret data on party competition in Europe: 10% (pass/fail grade); submission deadline: 27 March 2023
- 2,500 word essay; question to be selected by student from a defined set of possible questions (shared during term): 60%; submission deadline: 5 May 2023

Expectations and Guidelines

- You are expected to read the papers or chapters assigned under **mandatory readings**. These readings serve as the basis for in-class discussions.
- You submit one **response paper** (1,000 words) throughout the course, which counts towards 30% of the grade. By Week 3, everyone will have been assigned a week where they will prepare a response paper. Response papers must be submitted as a PDF file via [Brightspace](#) no later than **Tuesday, 11am of the respective week**, meaning that the assignment has to be submitted *before* the texts are discussed in class. You are required to choose *one* of the *required or suggested* readings for that week (readings marked with an asterisk and the not ‘not suitable for response paper’ cannot be used). Response papers must contain the following two aspects:
 1. Identify either a limitation of the paper (e.g., how a variable is measured, or an unreasonable/unnecessary assumption) or a possible extension. Either way, you should focus on only *one* limitation or extension.
 2. Suggest a possible solution to that limitation or describe how you would carry out the extension. Note that what you propose should be feasible (ideally, you should be able to conduct the suggested research proposal). If, for example, you find the author’s data weak, then you should identify better data, or at least propose a plausible way of collecting these data. If you think the method is wrong, explain why and suggest a better one. If the conclusions do not follow from the premises, discuss what conclusions are actually supported. A specific course of action should be outlined. Note that I am *not* interested in a summary of the selected paper. The idea is to develop innovative ideas for future research projects.
- You also submit a **descriptive data analysis**. Based on a new interactive collection of materials and data about party competition in Europe, you will explore an empirical question by using existing

tools to interpret quantitative data. You do not require prior knowledge of coding or statistical programming languages. The descriptive data analysis counts toward 10% of the final grade and will be assessed on the pass/fail grading scale. Questions will be allocated in Week 4 of the course and more details on the expectations will be provided in class and on [Brightspace](#). The answers to the questions should not exceed 800 words (in total, not per question). The data exercise must be submitted via [Brightspace](#) as a PDF document before **27 March 2023 (8:00pm CET)**.

- Finally, you will submit an **essay** which counts towards 60% of the final grade. The essay must not exceed 2,500 words (including bibliography, captions, and footnotes) and will tackle one of the ‘discussion questions’. You need to (i) draw on academic literature (articles and/or books) from the syllabus and beyond, and (ii) properly cite the academic literature you use to prepare your essay, focusing on [peer-reviewed journals from political science](#). To reiterate, you should read beyond the reading list for this essay and attach an *alphabetised* bibliography to your essay. The essay must be submitted via [Brightspace](#) as a PDF document before **5 May 2023 (8:00pm CET)**. More information on the essay and the list of discussion questions will be provided in a separate document. For information on academic writing, I recommend the following sources:

- P. Dunleavy (2014). *How to Write Paragraphs in Research Texts (Articles, Books and PhDs)*. URL: <https://medium.com/advice-and-help-in-authoring-a-phd-or-non-fiction/how-to-write-paragraphs-80781e2f3054>.
- S. B. Heard (2016). *The Scientist’s Guide to Writing: How to Write More Easily and Effectively Throughout Your Scientific Career*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

I recommend paying special attention to the following aspects:

- *Focus on argumentation, demonstrate critical thinking:* Your essay will be judged primarily on your ability to make nuanced arguments and to demonstrate your understanding of the nuances of the arguments presented by the authors discussed in the course and readings that go beyond the syllabus. While you are expected to engage with the material in the course during your essay, a good essay will do so in a creative way where your own voice comes through clearly. This can be done by critically commenting on the arguments of others; creatively combining arguments from others to make a case; and/or presenting your own original arguments in attempting to improve upon shortcomings in the literature that you have identified.
- *Read deeply, read widely:* Reading deeply is the most important thing for developing your essay. **But you should also read widely, consulting sources both within and beyond the syllabus.** It is possible to write a great paper by focusing on just a small number of sources. But this is rare enough. As a rule of thumb, well-researched essays usually average between one and two distinct references per double-spaced page. For a 2,500-word essay, this will amount to approximately 8–12 distinct references to texts that you have read and analysed closely.
- *Presentation:* Be attentive to the presentation of your essay, including consistent referencing-style (with page numbers provided), a bibliography, and a consistent layout. Learning how to deliver well-presented and polished-looking work is part of your undergraduate training and a highly transferable skill. Take it seriously. Poor presentation will result in lost marks. If you require information on proper citation style, please refer to the guidelines of the American Political Science Association: APSA Committee on Publications (2018). *Style Manual for Political Science (Revised 2018 Version)*. URL: <https://connect.apsanet.org/stylemanual/>.

Office Hours

We can meet either in person (Room G312, Newman Building) or online during my office hour on Tuesdays from 11:15–13:00. Please sign up for a meeting at <https://calendly.com/mueller-ucd/office-hours>.

Plagiarism

Although this should be obvious, plagiarism – copying someone else’s text without acknowledgement or beyond ‘fair use’ quantities – is not allowed. Plagiarism is an issue we take very serious here in UCD. Please familiarize yourself with the definition of plagiarism on UCD’s website¹ and make sure not to engage in it.

Late Submission Policy

If a student submits an assignment late, the following penalties will be applied:

- Coursework received at any time within two weeks of the due date will be graded, but a penalty will apply.
 - Coursework submitted at any time up to one week after the due date will have the grade awarded reduced by two grade points (for example, from *B–* to *C*).
 - Coursework submitted more than one week but up to two weeks after the due date will have the grade reduced by four grade points (for example, from *B–* to *D+*). Where a student finds they have missed a deadline for submission, they should be advised that they may use the remainder of the week to improve their submission without additional penalty.
- Coursework received more than two weeks after the due date will not be accepted. Regulations regarding extenuating circumstances apply.

Student effort hours	
Student effort type	Hours
Seminars	22
Autonomous Student Learning	176
Total	200

Dignity and Respect

UCD is committed to the promotion of an environment for work and study which upholds the dignity and respect of all members of the UCD community and which supports your right to study and/or work in an environment which is free of any form of bullying, harassment or sexual misconduct (including sexual harassment and sexual violence).

There are a number of supports in place if you are experiencing bullying, harassment or sexual misconduct and you are strongly encouraged to come forward to seek confidential support and guidance on the range of informal options and formal options for resolving issues as appropriate. Reports of bullying, harassment or sexual misconduct can also be made anonymously through UCD’s Report and Support tool.

UCD is actively promoting a culture where bullying, harassment and sexual misconduct is not tolerated, where everyone is respected and feels valued, included and that they belong in UCD.

You can find more details on UCD’s Dignity and Respect Website at: <https://www.ucd.ie/equality/support/dignityrespect/>.

¹<https://libguides.ucd.ie/academicintegrity>.

Grading Criteria

In essence, markers assess four crucial elements in any answer:

- Analysis/understanding
- Extent and use of reading
- Organisation/structure
- Writing proficiency

The various grades/classifications listed below reflect the extent to which an answer displays essential features of each of these elements (and their relative weighting). At its simplest: the better the analysis, the wider the range of appropriate sources consulted, the greater the understanding of the materials read, the clearer the writing style, and the more structured the argument, the higher will be the mark.

The following provides an indicative outline of the criteria used by markers to award a particular grade/classification. If you are in any confusion about how to correctly approach referencing and bibliography issues, please refer to the following guidelines: APSA Committee on Publications (2018). *Style Manual for Political Science (Revised 2018 Version)*. URL: <https://connect.apsanet.org/stylemanual/>.

Proper referencing is ESSENTIAL in a good assignment.

Grade Explanation

Grade: A (Excellent Performance)

A deep and systematic engagement with the assessment task, with consistently impressive demonstration of a comprehensive mastery of the subject matter, reflecting:

- A deep and broad knowledge and critical insight as well as extensive reading
- A critical and comprehensive appreciation of the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- An exceptional ability to organise, analyse and present arguments fluently and lucidly with a high level of critical analysis, amply supported by evidence, citation or quotation;
- A highly-developed capacity for original, creative and logical thinking
- An extensive and detailed knowledge of the subject matter
- A highly-developed ability to apply this knowledge to the task set
- Evidence of extensive background reading
- Clear, fluent, stimulating and original expression
- Excellent presentation (spelling, grammar, graphical) with minimal or no presentation errors
- Referencing style consistently executed in recognised style

Grade: B (Very Good Performance)

A thorough and well organised response to the assessment task, demonstrating:

- A thorough familiarity with the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- Well-developed capacity to analyse issues, organise material, present arguments clearly and cogently well supported by evidence, citation or quotation;
- Some original insights and capacity for creative and logical thinking
- A broad knowledge of the subject matter

- Considerable strength in applying that knowledge to the task set
- Evidence of substantial background reading
- Clear and fluent expression
- Quality presentation with few presentation errors
- Referencing style for the most part consistently executed in recognised style

Grade: C (Good Performance)

An intellectually competent and factually sound answer with, marked by:

- Evidence of a reasonable familiarity with the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- Good developed arguments, but more statements of ideas
- Arguments or statements adequately but not well supported by evidence, citation or quotation
- Some critical awareness and analytical qualities
- Some evidence of capacity for original and logical thinking
- Adequate but not complete knowledge of the subject matter
- Omission of some important subject matter or the appearance of several minor errors
- Capacity to apply knowledge appropriately to the task albeit with some errors
- Evidence of some background reading
- Clear expression with few areas of confusion
- Writing of sufficient quality to convey meaning but some lack of fluency and command of suitable vocabulary
- Good presentation with some presentation errors
- Referencing style executed in recognised style, but with some errors

Grade: D (Satisfactory Performance)

An acceptable level of intellectual engagement with the assessment task showing:

- Some familiarity with the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- Mostly statements of ideas, with limited development of argument
- Limited use of evidence, citation or quotation
- Limited critical awareness displayed
- Limited evidence of capacity for original and logical thinking
- Basic grasp of subject matter, but somewhat lacking in focus and structure
- Main points covered but insufficient detail
- Some effort to apply knowledge to the task but only a basic capacity or understanding displayed
- Little or no evidence of background reading
- Several minor errors or one major error
- Satisfactory presentation with an acceptable level of presentation errors
- Referencing style inconsistent

Grade: D– (Acceptable)

The minimum acceptable of intellectual engagement with the assessment task which:

- The minimum acceptable appreciation of the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- Ideas largely expressed as statements, with little or no developed or structured argument

- Minimum acceptable use of evidence, citation or quotation
- Little or no analysis or critical awareness displayed or is only partially successful
- Little or no demonstrated capacity for original and logical thinking
- Shows a basic grasp of subject matter but may be poorly focused or badly structured or contain irrelevant material
- Has one major error and some minor errors
- Demonstrates the capacity to complete only moderately difficult tasks related to the subject material
- No evidence of background reading
- Displays the minimum acceptable standard of presentation (spelling, grammar, graphical)
- Referencing inconsistent with major errors

Grade: E (Fail [marginal])

A factually sound answer with a partially successful, but not entirely acceptable, attempt to:

- Integrate factual knowledge into a broader literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework develop arguments
- Support ideas or arguments with evidence, citation or quotation
- Engages with the subject matter or problem set, despite major deficiencies in structure, relevance or focus
- Has two major error and some minor errors
- Demonstrates the capacity to complete only part of, or the simpler elements of, the task
- An incomplete or rushed answer (e.g. the use of bullet points through part/all of answer)
- Little or no referencing style evident

Grade: F (Fail [unacceptable])

An unacceptable level of intellectual engagement with the assessment task, with:

- No appreciation of the relevant literature or theoretical, technical or professional framework
- No developed or structured argument
- No use of evidence, citation or quotation
- No analysis or critical awareness displayed or is only partially successful
- No demonstrated capacity for original and logical thinking
- A failure to address the question resulting in a largely irrelevant answer or material of marginal relevance predominating
- A display of some knowledge of material relative to the question posed, but with very serious omissions / errors and/or major inaccuracies included in answer
- Solutions offered to a very limited portion of the problem set
- An answer unacceptably incomplete (e.g. for lack of time)
- A random and undisciplined development, layout or presentation
- Unacceptable standards of presentation, such as grammar, spelling or graphical presentation
- Evidence of substantial plagiarism
- No referencing style evident

Grade: G (Fail [wholly unacceptable])

No intellectual engagement with the assessment task

- Complete failure to address the question resulting in an entirely irrelevant answer
- Little or no knowledge displayed relative to the question posed
- Little or no solution offered for the problem set
- Evidence of extensive plagiarism
- No referencing style evident

Grade: NG (No Grade)

No work was submitted by the student or student was absent from the assessment, or work submitted did not merit a grade.

Introductory Readings

The seminar does not build on a single text book, but relies on peer-reviewed papers and book chapters. For a general overview of the course content, I recommend the following books. Note that I do *not* expect you to buy any of these books since the required and optional readings for this module will be almost exclusively freely available online through your UCD Library account.

- C. E. De Vries, S. B. Hobolt, S.-O. Proksch, and J. B. Slapin (2021). *Foundations of European Politics: A Comparative Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Full e-book available for UCD students at: <https://doi-org.ucd.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/hepl/9780198831303.001.0001>.
- R. Costello and N. Robinson (2020). *Comparative European Politics: Distinctive Democracies, Common Challenges*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- G. B. Powell (2000). *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Technical Background and Prerequisites

The course requires basic knowledge of general approaches and theories of political science. The following books provide very good introductions to research design and applied quantitative methods.

Research Design and Quantitative Methods

- P. M. Kellstedt and G. D. Whitten (2018). *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- E. Llaudet and K. Imai (Forthcoming). *Data Analysis for Social Science: A Friendly Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Syllabus Modification Rights

I reserve the right to reasonably alter the elements of the syllabus at any time by adjusting the reading list to keep pace with the course schedule. Moreover, I may change the content of specific sessions depending on the participants' prior knowledge and research interests.

Course Structure

Week 1: Conceptualising Representative Democracy (24 Jan & 26 Jan 2023)	9
Week 2: Parties and Party Systems (31 Jan & 2 Feb 2023)	9
Week 3: Parties and Electoral Competition (7 Feb & 9 Feb 2023)	10
Week 4: Governments and Coalitions (14 Feb & 16 Feb 2023)	10
Week 5: Parties in Government and Challenger Parties (21 Feb & 23 Feb 2023)	11
Week 6: The Mandate Model of Democracy (28 Feb & 2 Mar 2023)	12
Week 7: Measuring Party Positions and Issue Salience (7 Mar & 9 Mar 2023)	12
Study Period (13 March–26 March 2023)	13
Week 8: Responsiveness (28 Mar & 30 Mar 2023)	13
Week 9: Economic Voting and the Cost of Governing (4 Apr & 6 Apr 2023)	14
Week 10: The (Ir)Rational Voter? (11 Apr & 13 Apr 2023)	14
Week 11: Participation Beyond Political Parties (18 Apr & 20 Apr 2023)	15
Week 12: Political Parties, the Media, and Digital Democracy (25 Apr & 27 Apr 2023)	15

Week 1: Conceptualising Representative Democracy (24 Jan & 26 Jan 2023)

- Expectations
- Discussion of syllabus
- What are the main differences between the majoritarian and proportional visions of democracy?

Mandatory Readings

- G. B. Powell (2000). *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New Haven: Yale University Press: ch. 1–2.

Optional

- R. S. Katz (2017). “Political Parties”. *Comparative Politics*. Ed. by D. Caramani. 4th edition. Oxford University Press: 207–223.

Week 2: Parties and Party Systems (31 Jan & 2 Feb 2023)

- What are political parties?
- How can we classify different types of democracies?

Mandatory Readings

- R. S. Katz and P. Mair (1995). “Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy: The Emergence of the Cartel Party”. *Party Politics* 1 (1): 5–28
- P. Mair (2008). “The Challenge to Party Government”. *West European Politics* 31 (1–2): 211–234.

Optional

- R. S. Katz and P. Mair (2009). “The Cartel Party Thesis: A Restatement”. *Perspectives on Politics* 7 (4): 753–766.
- A.-K. Kölln (2015). “The Value of Political Parties to Representative Democracy”. *European Political Science Review* 7 (4): 593–613.

Week 3: Parties and Electoral Competition (7 Feb & 9 Feb 2023)

- What goals do parties and politicians pursue?
- What does Lijphart mean by the Westminster Model of Democracy and the Consensus Model of Democracy?

Mandatory Readings

- K. Strøm (1990). “A Behavioral Theory of Competitive Political Parties”. *American Journal of Political Science* 34 (2): 565–598.
- A. Lijphart (2012). *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. 2nd edition. New Haven: Yale University Press: ch. 1–3.

Optional

- Z. Somer-Topcu (2015). “Everything to Everyone: The Electoral Consequences of the Broad-Appeal Strategy in Europe”. *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (4): 841–854.
- D. E. Stokes (1963). “Spatial Models of Party Competition”. *American Political Science Review* 57 (2): 368–377.
- M. Tavits (2007). “Principles vs. Pragmatism: Policy Shifts and Political Competition”. *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (1): 151–165.
- H. Bulsara and B. Kissane (2009). “Arend Lijphart and the Transformation of Irish Democracy”. *West European Politics* 32 (1): 172–195.

Week 4: Governments and Coalitions (14 Feb & 16 Feb 2023)

- How do we distinguish types of government coalitions?
- Which government types are most frequent across Europe? What could explain variation over time and across countries?
- Can voters accurately predict the government formed after an election?

Mandatory Readings

- C. E. De Vries, S. B. Hobolt, S.-O. Proksch, and J. B. Slapin (2021). *Foundations of European Politics: A Comparative Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: ch. 10.* (not suitable for response paper)
- L. W. Martin and R. T. Stevenson (2001). “Government Formation in Parliamentary Democracies”. *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (1): 33–50.

Optional

- S. Bowler, G. McElroy, and S. Müller (2022). “Voter Expectations of Government Formation in Coalition Systems: The Importance of the Information Context”. *European Journal of Political Research* 61 (1): 111–133.
- S. N. Golder (2006). “Pre-Electoral Coalition Formation in Parliamentary Democracies”. *British Journal of Political Science* 36 (2): 193–212.

Week 5: Parties in Government and Challenger Parties (21 Feb & 23 Feb 2023)

- How do incumbent parties react to challenger parties or new parties?
- Why do parties join a coalition?
- What happens when populist parties enter parliament?

Mandatory Readings

- H. Klüver and J.-J. Spoon (2020). “Helping or Hurting? How Governing as a Junior Coalition Partner Influences Electoral Outcomes”. *The Journal of Politics* 82 (4): 231–242.
- T. Abou-Chadi and W. Krause (2020). “The Causal Effect of Radical Right Success on Mainstream Parties’ Policy Positions: A Regression Discontinuity Approach”. *British Journal of Political Science* 50 (3): 829–847.

Optional

- D. Fortunato (2019). “The Electoral Implications of Coalition Policy Making”. *British Journal of Political Science* 49 (1): 59–80.
- P. V. Warwick and J. N. Druckman (2006). “The Portfolio Allocation Paradox: An Investigation into the Nature of a Very Strong but Puzzling Relationship”. *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (4): 635–665.
- D. Bischof and M. Wagner (2020). “What Makes Parties Adapt to Voter Preferences? The Role of Party Organization, Goals and Ideology”. *British Journal of Political Science* 50 (1): 391–401.

Note: The seminar on Thursday, 23 February will be delivered by Prof Camilo Negri (University of Brasília and currently a visiting researcher at UCD). Prof Negri will discuss recent developments in Brazil, and respond to your questions on Brazilian politics.

Week 6: The Mandate Model of Democracy (28 Feb & 2 Mar 2023)

- What is the ‘democratic mandate’?
- How can we measure campaign promises/pledges?
- Do parties fulfil their promises?

Mandatory Readings

- J. Mansbridge (2003). “[Rethinking Representation](#)”. *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 515–528.
- R. Thomson, T. J. Royed, E. Naurin, J. Artés, R. Costello, L. Ennser-Jedenastik, M. Ferguson, P. Kostadinova, C. Moury, F. Pétry, and K. Praprotnik (2017). “[The Fulfillment of Parties’ Election Pledges: A Comparative Study on the Impact of Power Sharing](#)”. *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (3): 527–542.
- S. Müller (2020). “[Media Coverage of Campaign Promises Throughout the Electoral Cycle](#)”. *Political Communication* 37 (5): 696–718.

Optional

- R. Thomson and R. Costello (2016). “[Governing Together in Good and Bad Economic Times: The Fulfilment of Election Pledges in Ireland](#)”. *Irish Political Studies* 31 (2): 182–203.
- T. Matthieß (2020). “[Retrospective Pledge Voting: A Comparative Study of the Electoral Consequences of Government Parties’ Pledge Fulfilment](#)”. *European Journal of Political Research* 59 (4): 774–796.
- J. Mellon, C. Prosser, J. Urban, and A. Feldman (2021). “[Which Promises Actually Matter? Election Pledge Centrality and Promissory Representation](#)”. *Political Studies* published ahead of print (doi: 10.1177/00323217211027419).

Week 7: Measuring Party Positions and Issue Salience (7 Mar & 9 Mar 2023)

- What are differences between positions, salience, and issue ownership?
- How can we measure latent policy positions?
- What are methodological difficulties when measuring party positions?

Mandatory Readings

- M. Laver (2014). “[Measuring Policy Positions in Political Space](#)”. *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 207–223.
- I. Budge (2015). “[Issue Emphases, Saliency Theory and Issue Ownership: A Historical and Conceptual Analysis](#)”. *West European Politics* 38 (4): 761–777.* (not suitable for response paper)

Optional

- S. Mikhaylov, M. Laver, and K. Benoit (2012). “[Coder Reliability and Misclassification in the Human Coding of Party Manifestos](#)”. *Political Analysis* 20 (1): 78–91.
- S.-O. Proksch and J. B. Slapin (2010). “[Position Taking in European Parliament Speeches](#)”. *British Journal of Political Science* 40 (3): 587–611.
- S. Müller and A. Regan (2021). “[Are Irish Voters Moving to the Left?](#)”. *Irish Political Studies* 36 (4): 535–555.
- K. Benoit (2020). “[Text as Data: An Overview](#)”. *Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations*. Ed. by L. Curini and R. Franzese. Thousand Oaks: Sage: 461–497.* (not suitable for response paper)

Study Period (13 March–26 March 2023)

Week 8: Responsiveness (28 Mar & 30 Mar 2023)

- What is democratic responsiveness?
- Do parties and parties and politicians react to public opinion? And from a normative perspective, should political actors change their positions and policies depending on citizens’ preferences?

Mandatory Readings

- S. N. Soroka and C. Wlezien (2019). “[Tracking the Coverage of Public Policy in Mass Media](#)”. *Policy Studies Journal* 47 (2): 471–491.
- H. Klüver and J.-J. Spoon (2016). “[Who Responds? Voters, Parties and Issue Attention](#)”. *British Journal of Political Science* 46 (3): 633–654.

Optional

- C. Wlezien (1995). “[The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending](#)”. *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (4): 981–1000.
- S. Walgrave, A. Jansen, J. Sevenans, K. Soontjens, J.-B. Pilet, N. Brack, F. Varone, L. Helfer, R. Vliegthart, T. van der Meer, C. Breunig, S. Bailer, L. Sheffer, and P. J. Loewen (2023). “[Inaccurate Politicians: Elected Representatives’ Estimations of Public Opinion in Four Countries](#)”. 84 1 (209-222).
- M. M. Pereira (2021). “[Understanding and Reducing Biases in Elite Beliefs About the Electorate](#)”. *American Political Science Review* 115 (4): 1308–1324.
- J. A. Stimson, M. B. Mackuen, and R. S. Erikson (1995). “[Dynamic Representation](#)”. *American Political Science Review* 89 (3): 543–565.
- G. B. Powell (2004). “[The Chain of Responsiveness](#)”. *Journal of Democracy* 15 (4): 91–105.* (not suitable for response paper)

Week 9: Economic Voting and the Cost of Governing (4 Apr & 6 Apr 2023)

- What is democratic accountability?
- Why do government parties regularly lose public support?

Mandatory Readings

- C. J. Anderson (2000). “Economic Voting and Political Context: A Comparative Perspective”. *Electoral Studies* 19 (2–3): 151–170.
- S. Müller and T. Louwerse (2020). “The Electoral Cycle Effect in Parliamentary Democracies”. *Political Science Research and Methods* 8 (4): 795–802.

Optional

- M. Marsh and J. Tilley (2010). “The Attribution of Credit and Blame to Governments and Its Impact on Vote Choice”. *British Journal of Political Science* 40 (1): 115–134.
- C. Wlezien (2017). “Policy (Mis)Representation and the Cost of Ruling: U.S. Presidential Elections in Comparative Perspective”. *Comparative Political Studies* 50 (6): 711–738.
- A. Herzog and K. Benoit (2015). “The Most Unkindest Cuts: Speaker Selection and Expressed Government Dissent During Economic Crisis”. *The Journal of Politics* 77 (4): 1157–1175.

Week 10: The (Ir)Rational Voter? (11 Apr & 13 Apr 2023)

- Are voters rational decision-makers, as assumed in many theories of representation?
- Under what circumstances do voters behave (ir)rationally? What are consequences of irrational voting behaviour on political processes and decisions?

Mandatory Readings

- C. H. Achen and L. M. Bartels (2016). *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: ch. 5.
- A. J. Healy, N. Malhotra, and C. H. Mo (2010). “Irrelevant Events Affect Voters’ Evaluations of Government Performance”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS)* 107 (29): 12804–12809.
- S. Müller and L. Kneafsey (2021). “Evidence for the Irrelevance of Irrelevant Events”. *Political Science Research and Methods* published ahead of print (doi: 10.1017/psrm.2021.52).

Optional

- M. W. Sances (2017). “Attribution Errors in Federalist Systems: When Voters Punish the President for Local Tax Increases”. *The Journal of Politics* 79 (4): 1286–1301.
- A. Fowler and A. B. Hall (2018). “Do Shark Attacks Influence Presidential Elections? Reassessing a Prominent Finding on Voter Competence”. *The Journal of Politics* 80 (4): 1423–1437.

- M. R. Holman, J. L. Merolla, and E. J. Zechmeister (2021). “[The Curious Case of Theresa May and the Public That Did Not Rally: Gendered Reactions to Terrorist Attacks Can Cause Slumps Not Bumps](#)”. *American Political Science Review* 116 (1): 249–264.

Week 11: Participation Beyond Political Parties (18 Apr & 20 Apr 2023)

- What are problems associated with representative politics?
- What other forms of participation exist? What are their strengths and weaknesses?
- How can these alternative forms of participation supplement representative democracy?

Mandatory Readings

- J. S. Dryzek, A. Bächtiger, S. Chambers, J. Cohen, J. N. Druckman, A. Felicetti, J. S. Fishkin, D. M. Farrell, A. Fung, A. Gutmann, H. Landemore, J. Mansbridge, S. Marien, M. A. Neblo, S. Niemeyer, M. Setälä, R. Slothuus, J. Suiter, D. Thompson, and M. E. Warren (2019). “[The Crisis of Democracy and the Science of Deliberation](#)”. *Science* 363 (6432): 1144–1146.* (not suitable for response paper)
- D. M. Farrell (2014). “[‘Stripped Down’ or Reconfigured Democracy](#)”. *West European Politics* 37 (2): 439–455.* (not suitable for response paper)
- R. Parthasarathy, V. Rao, and N. Palaniswamy (2019). “[Deliberative Democracy in an Unequal World: A Text-As-Data Study of South India’s Village Assemblies](#)”. *American Political Science Review* 113 (3): 623–640.

Optional

- S. Bowler, T. Donovan, and J. A. Karp (2007). “[Enraged or Engaged? Preferences for Direct Citizen Participation in Affluent Democracies](#)”. *Political Research Quarterly* 60 (3): 351–362.
- C. Colombo (2018). “[Justifications and Citizen Competence in Direct Democracy: A Multilevel Analysis](#)”. *British Journal of Political Science* 48 (3): 767–806.
- S. Hug (2009). “[Some Thoughts About Referendums, Representative Democracy, and Separation of Powers](#)”. *Constitutional Political Economy* 20: 251–266.* (not suitable for response paper)

Week 12: Political Parties, the Media, and Digital Democracy (25 Apr & 27 Apr 2023)

- How does the internet change democratic decision making and representation?
- Do politicians and parties react to online discussions?

Mandatory Readings

- G. King, B. Schneer, and A. White (2017). “[How the News Media Activate Public Expression and Influence National Agendas](#)”. *Science* 358 (6364): 776–780.
- A. Guess, J. Nagler, and J. A. Tucker (2019). “[Less Than You Think: Prevalence and Predictors of Fake News Dissemination on Facebook](#)”. *Science Advances* 5 (1): eaau4586.

Optional

- E. Grossman (2022). “Media and Policy Making in the Digital Age”. *Annual Review of Political Science* 25: 443–461.* (not suitable for response paper)
- F. Foos and D. Bischof (2022). “Tabloid Media Campaigns and Public Opinion: Quasi-Experimental Evidence on Euroscepticism in England”. *American Political Science Review* 116 (1): 19–37.
- P. Barberá, A. Casas, J. Nagler, P. J. Egan, R. Bonneau, J. T. Jost, and J. A. Tucker (2019). “Who Leads? Who Follows? Measuring Issue Attention and Agenda Setting by Legislators and the Mass Public Using Social Media Data”. *American Political Science Review* 113 (4): 883–901.
- F. Gilardi, T. Gessler, M. Kubli, and S. Müller (2021). “Social Media and Political Agenda Setting”. *Political Communication* 39 (1): 39–60.

References

- Abou-Chadi, T. and W. Krause (2020). “The Causal Effect of Radical Right Success on Mainstream Parties’ Policy Positions: A Regression Discontinuity Approach”. *British Journal of Political Science* 50 (3): 829–847.
- Achen, C. H. and L. M. Bartels (2016). *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Anderson, C. J. (2000). “Economic Voting and Political Context: A Comparative Perspective”. *Electoral Studies* 19 (2–3): 151–170.
- APSA Committee on Publications (2018). *Style Manual for Political Science (Revised 2018 Version)*. URL: <https://connect.apsanet.org/stylemanual/>.
- Barberá, P., A. Casas, J. Nagler, P. J. Egan, R. Bonneau, J. T. Jost, and J. A. Tucker (2019). “Who Leads? Who Follows? Measuring Issue Attention and Agenda Setting by Legislators and the Mass Public Using Social Media Data”. *American Political Science Review* 113 (4): 883–901.
- Benoit, K. (2020). “Text as Data: An Overview”. *Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations*. Ed. by L. Curini and R. Franzese. Thousand Oaks: Sage: 461–497.
- Bischof, D. and M. Wagner (2020). “What Makes Parties Adapt to Voter Preferences? The Role of Party Organization, Goals and Ideology”. *British Journal of Political Science* 50 (1): 391–401.
- Bowler, S., T. Donovan, and J. A. Karp (2007). “Enraged or Engaged? Preferences for Direct Citizen Participation in Affluent Democracies”. *Political Research Quarterly* 60 (3): 351–362.
- Bowler, S., G. McElroy, and S. Müller (2022). “Voter Expectations of Government Formation in Coalition Systems: The Importance of the Information Context”. *European Journal of Political Research* 61 (1): 111–133.
- Budge, I. (2015). “Issue Emphases, Saliency Theory and Issue Ownership: A Historical and Conceptual Analysis”. *West European Politics* 38 (4): 761–777.
- Bulsara, H. and B. Kissane (2009). “Arend Lijphart and the Transformation of Irish Democracy”. *West European Politics* 32 (1): 172–195.
- Colombo, C. (2018). “Justifications and Citizen Competence in Direct Democracy: A Multilevel Analysis”. *British Journal of Political Science* 48 (3): 767–806.
- Costello, R. and N. Robinson (2020). *Comparative European Politics: Distinctive Democracies, Common Challenges*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Vries, C. E., S. B. Hobolt, S.-O. Proksch, and J. B. Slapin (2021). *Foundations of European Politics: A Comparative Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dryzek, J. S., A. Bächtiger, S. Chambers, J. Cohen, J. N. Druckman, A. Felicetti, J. S. Fishkin, D. M. Farrell, A. Fung, A. Gutmann, H. Landemore, J. Mansbridge, S. Marien, M. A. Neblo, S. Niemeyer, M. Setälä, R. Slothuus, J. Suiter, D. Thompson, and M. E. Warren (2019). “The Crisis of Democracy and the Science of Deliberation”. *Science* 363 (6432): 1144–1146.
- Dunleavy, P. (2014). *How to Write Paragraphs in Research Texts (Articles, Books and PhDs)*. URL: <https://medium.com/advice-and-help-in-authoring-a-phd-or-non-fiction/how-to-write-paragraphs-80781e2f3054>.
- Farrell, D. M. (2014). “‘Stripped Down’ or Reconfigured Democracy”. *West European Politics* 37 (2): 439–455.
- Foos, F. and D. Bischof (2022). “Tabloid Media Campaigns and Public Opinion: Quasi-Experimental Evidence on Euroscepticism in England”. *American Political Science Review* 116 (1): 19–37.

- Fortunato, D. (2019). “The Electoral Implications of Coalition Policy Making”. *British Journal of Political Science* 49 (1): 59–80.
- Fowler, A. and A. B. Hall (2018). “Do Shark Attacks Influence Presidential Elections? Reassessing a Prominent Finding on Voter Competence”. *The Journal of Politics* 80 (4): 1423–1437.
- Gilardi, F., T. Gessler, M. Kubli, and S. Müller (2021). “Social Media and Political Agenda Setting”. *Political Communication* 39 (1): 39–60.
- Golder, S. N. (2006). “Pre-Electoral Coalition Formation in Parliamentary Democracies”. *British Journal of Political Science* 36 (2): 193–212.
- Grossman, E. (2022). “Media and Policy Making in the Digital Age”. *Annual Review of Political Science* 25: 443–461.
- Guess, A., J. Nagler, and J. A. Tucker (2019). “Less Than You Think: Prevalence and Predictors of Fake News Dissemination on Facebook”. *Science Advances* 5 (1): eaau4586.
- Healy, A. J., N. Malhotra, and C. H. Mo (2010). “Irrelevant Events Affect Voters’ Evaluations of Government Performance”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS)* 107 (29): 12804–12809.
- Heard, S. B. (2016). *The Scientist’s Guide to Writing: How to Write More Easily and Effectively Throughout Your Scientific Career*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Herzog, A. and K. Benoit (2015). “The Most Unkindest Cuts: Speaker Selection and Expressed Government Dissent During Economic Crisis”. *The Journal of Politics* 77 (4): 1157–1175.
- Holman, M. R., J. L. Merolla, and E. J. Zechmeister (2021). “The Curious Case of Theresa May and the Public That Did Not Rally: Gendered Reactions to Terrorist Attacks Can Cause Slumps Not Bumps”. *American Political Science Review* 116 (1): 249–264.
- Hug, S. (2009). “Some Thoughts About Referendums, Representative Democracy, and Separation of Powers”. *Constitutional Political Economy* 20: 251–266.
- Katz, R. S. (2017). “Political Parties”. *Comparative Politics*. Ed. by D. Caramani. 4th edition. Oxford University Press: 207–223.
- Katz, R. S. and P. Mair (1995). “Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy: The Emergence of the Cartel Party”. *Party Politics* 1 (1): 5–28.
- Katz, R. S. and P. Mair (2009). “The Cartel Party Thesis: A Restatement”. *Perspectives on Politics* 7 (4): 753–766.
- Kellstedt, P. M. and G. D. Whitten (2018). *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- King, G., B. Schneer, and A. White (2017). “How the News Media Activate Public Expression and Influence National Agendas”. *Science* 358 (6364): 776–780.
- Klüver, H. and J.-J. Spoon (2016). “Who Responds? Voters, Parties and Issue Attention”. *British Journal of Political Science* 46 (3): 633–654.
- Klüver, H. and J.-J. Spoon (2020). “Helping or Hurting? How Governing as a Junior Coalition Partner Influences Electoral Outcomes”. *The Journal of Politics* 82 (4): 231–242.
- Kölln, A.-K. (2015). “The Value of Political Parties to Representative Democracy”. *European Political Science Review* 7 (4): 593–613.
- Laver, M. (2014). “Measuring Policy Positions in Political Space”. *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 207–223.
- Lijphart, A. (2012). *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. 2nd edition. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Llaudet, E. and K. Imai (Forthcoming). *Data Analysis for Social Science: A Friendly Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mair, P. (2008). “The Challenge to Party Government”. *West European Politics* 31 (1–2): 211–234.
- Mansbridge, J. (2003). “Rethinking Representation”. *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 515–528.
- Marsh, M. and J. Tilley (2010). “The Attribution of Credit and Blame to Governments and Its Impact on Vote Choice”. *British Journal of Political Science* 40 (1): 115–134.
- Martin, L. W. and R. T. Stevenson (2001). “Government Formation in Parliamentary Democracies”. *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (1): 33–50.
- Matthieß, T. (2020). “Retrospective Pledge Voting: A Comparative Study of the Electoral Consequences of Government Parties’ Pledge Fulfilment”. *European Journal of Political Research* 59 (4): 774–796.

- Mellon, J., C. Prosser, J. Urban, and A. Feldman (2021). “Which Promises Actually Matter? Election Pledge Centrality and Promissory Representation”. *Political Studies* published ahead of print (doi: 10.1177/003232172111027419).
- Mikhaylov, S., M. Laver, and K. Benoit (2012). “Coder Reliability and Misclassification in the Human Coding of Party Manifestos”. *Political Analysis* 20 (1): 78–91.
- Müller, S. (2020). “Media Coverage of Campaign Promises Throughout the Electoral Cycle”. *Political Communication* 37 (5): 696–718.
- Müller, S. and L. Kneafsey (2021). “Evidence for the Irrelevance of Irrelevant Events”. *Political Science Research and Methods* published ahead of print (doi: 10.1017/psrm.2021.52).
- Müller, S. and T. Louwerse (2020). “The Electoral Cycle Effect in Parliamentary Democracies”. *Political Science Research and Methods* 8 (4): 795–802.
- Müller, S. and A. Regan (2021). “Are Irish Voters Moving to the Left?”. *Irish Political Studies* 36 (4): 535–555.
- Parthasarathy, R., V. Rao, and N. Palaniswamy (2019). “Deliberative Democracy in an Unequal World: A Text-As-Data Study of South India’s Village Assemblies”. *American Political Science Review* 113 (3): 623–640.
- Pereira, M. M. (2021). “Understanding and Reducing Biases in Elite Beliefs About the Electorate”. *American Political Science Review* 115 (4): 1308–1324.
- Powell, G. B. (2000). *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Powell, G. B. (2004). “The Chain of Responsiveness”. *Journal of Democracy* 15 (4): 91–105.
- Proksch, S.-O. and J. B. Slapin (2010). “Position Taking in European Parliament Speeches”. *British Journal of Political Science* 40 (3): 587–611.
- Sances, M. W. (2017). “Attribution Errors in Federalist Systems: When Voters Punish the President for Local Tax Increases”. *The Journal of Politics* 79 (4): 1286–1301.
- Somer-Topcu, Z. (2015). “Everything to Everyone: The Electoral Consequences of the Broad-Appeal Strategy in Europe”. *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (4): 841–854.
- Soroka, S. N. and C. Wlezien (2019). “Tracking the Coverage of Public Policy in Mass Media”. *Policy Studies Journal* 47 (2): 471–491.
- Stimson, J. A., M. B. Mackuen, and R. S. Erikson (1995). “Dynamic Representation”. *American Political Science Review* 89 (3): 543–565.
- Stokes, D. E. (1963). “Spatial Models of Party Competition”. *American Political Science Review* 57 (2): 368–377.
- Strøm, K. (1990). “A Behavioral Theory of Competitive Political Parties”. *American Journal of Political Science* 34 (2): 565–598.
- Tavits, M. (2007). “Principles vs. Pragmatism: Policy Shifts and Political Competition”. *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (1): 151–165.
- Thomson, R. and R. Costello (2016). “Governing Together in Good and Bad Economic Times: The Fulfilment of Election Pledges in Ireland”. *Irish Political Studies* 31 (2): 182–203.
- Thomson, R., T. J. Royed, E. Naurin, J. Artés, R. Costello, L. Ennser-Jedenastik, M. Ferguson, P. Kostadinova, C. Moury, F. Pétry, and K. Praprotnik (2017). “The Fulfillment of Parties’ Election Pledges: A Comparative Study on the Impact of Power Sharing”. *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (3): 527–542.
- Walgrave, S., A. Jansen, J. Sevenans, K. Soontjens, J.-B. Pilet, N. Brack, F. Varone, L. Helfer, R. Vliegthart, T. van der Meer, C. Breunig, S. Bailer, L. Sheffer, and P. J. Loewen (2023). “Inaccurate Politicians: Elected Representatives’ Estimations of Public Opinion in Four Countries”. *84* 1 (209–222).
- Warwick, P. V. and J. N. Druckman (2006). “The Portfolio Allocation Paradox: An Investigation into the Nature of a Very Strong but Puzzling Relationship”. *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (4): 635–665.
- Wlezien, C. (1995). “The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending”. *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (4): 981–1000.
- Wlezien, C. (2017). “Policy (Mis)Representation and the Cost of Ruling: U.S. Presidential Elections in Comparative Perspective”. *Comparative Political Studies* 50 (6): 711–738.