



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; Autumn Trimester 2021

Parties and Party Competition (POL30720)

Draft (Version: August 30, 2021)

Latest version at: <https://muellerstefan.net/teaching/2021-autumn-ppc.pdf>

Time: Tuesday 11:00–11:45 & Thursday 11:00–11:45

- Tue: [E2.16-SCE \(O'Brien Science Centre East\)](#)
- Thu: [B003-CSI \(Computer Science Centre\)](#)

ECTS: 10

Format: Lecture; in-class discussions

Module coordinator: Stefan Müller, PhD

stefan.mueller@ucd.ie

<https://muellerstefan.net>

Office: Newman Building, G312

Office hours: Tue 13:00–14:00

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. Based on these methodological approaches, we identify the circumstances under which parties change their positions and issue emphasis. Finally, we briefly discuss 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 covered in this course: 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: 20%
- Descriptive data analysis: assess and interpret data on party competition in Europe (1,000 words): 20%
- 2,500–3,000 word essay from a choice set of questions: 60%

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 20% 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 via [Brightspace](#) no later than **Tuesday, 9am 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 a star may not 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 have only one argument in these papers.
 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. 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 20% of the final grade. Questions will be allocated in Week 3 of the course and more details on the expectations will be provided in class and on [Brightspace](#). The descriptive data analysis should not exceed 1,000 words.
- Finally, you submit an **essay** which counts towards 60% of the final grade. The essay must not exceed 2,500–3,000 words (including bibliography, captions, and footnotes) and will tackle one of the ‘discussion questions’ listed below. For this essay, you are required to (i) draw on academic literature (articles and/or books) and (ii) properly cite the academic literature you use to prepare your essay, focusing on [peer-reviewed journals from political science](#). 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 **17 December 2021 (8:00pm CET)**. More information on the essay will be provided in the seminar. 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.

For the essay, I recommend to pay 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 papers usually average between one and two distinct references per double-spaced page. For a 2,500–3,000-word essay, this will amount to approximately 10–15 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/>.

Essay Questions

Please choose **one** of the three questions below and make sure to follow the essay guidelines described above.

1. Are governments in which parties keep higher percentages of their previous campaign pledges more democratic than governments in which parties keep fewer pledges? Discuss the reasons for positive *and* negative answers to this question.
2. Political parties have transformed over time and new types of party organizations have emerged (Katz and Mair 1995, 2009). By referring to the academic literature and by providing examples answer the following questions: Which democratic functions of political parties have declined? And which democratic functions have been better fulfilled by modern political parties.
3. Does retrospective performance voting provide a useful mechanism of holding political parties accountable, or are the fears about ‘blind retrospection’ justified?

Plagiarism is an issue we take very serious here in UCD. Please familiarize yourself with the definition of plagiarism on UCD’s website and make sure not to engage in it.

Late Submission Policy

All written work must be submitted on or before the due dates. Students will lose one point of a grade for work up to 5 working days late (*B–* becomes *C+*). Students will lose two grade points for work between 5 and 10 working days late (*B–* becomes *C*). When an extension of more than two weeks is necessary, the student will need to apply for extenuating circumstances application via the SPIRe Programme Office.

Student effort hours	
Student effort type	Hours
Seminars	22
Autonomous Student Learning	196
Total	220

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.
- 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 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.

Additional Covid-19 Guidelines

Covid-19 continues to pose a threat to our well-being and health. We all need to follow UCD's guidelines, which involves wearing masks in the lecture rooms. I will also wear a mask at all times. If you come to my office hours in person, please make sure to wear a mask. If you are unwilling or unable to wear a mask, we can meet virtually. If you are not feeling well, stay home! I try to make all relevant materials available to everyone: I live-record all lectures, provide the slides, and upload all readings. Protecting everyone's health is most important. Should you be sick or need a longer period of absence, please get in touch and I happily work with you to ensure your success in this module. We are in this together – let's try our very best in the months to come and support each other.

Course Structure

Week 1: Conceptualising Representative Democracy (14 Sept & 16 Sept 2021)	6
Week 2: Parties and Party Systems (21 Sept & 23 Sept 2021)	6
Week 3: Party Competition (28 Sept & 30 Sept 2021)	6
Week 4: Governments and Coalitions (5 Oct & 7 Oct 2021)	7
Week 5: Parties in Government and Challenger Parties (12 Oct & 14 Oct 2021)	8
Week 6: The Mandate Model of Democracy (19 Oct & 21 Oct 2021)	8
Week 7: READING WEEK	9
Week 8: Measuring Party Positions and Issue Salience (2 Nov & 4 Nov 2021)	9
Week 9: Responsiveness (9 Nov & 11 Nov 2021)	9
Week 10: The (Ir)Rational Voter? (16 Nov & 18 Nov 2021)	10
Week 11: Participation Beyond Political Parties (23 Nov & 25 Nov 2021)	10

Week 1: Conceptualising Representative Democracy (14 Sept & 16 Sept 2021)

- 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.
- H. Bulsara and B. Kissane (2009). “Arend Lijphart and the Transformation of Irish Democracy”. *West European Politics* 32 (1): 172–195.

Week 2: Parties and Party Systems (21 Sept & 23 Sept 2021)

- 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: Party Competition (28 Sept & 30 Sept 2021)

- 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.
- T. Böhmelt, L. Ezrow, R. Lehrer, and H. Ward (2016). “Party Policy Diffusion”. *American Political Science Review* 110 (2): 397–410.
- S. Müller and A. Regan (Forthcoming). “Are Irish Voters Moving to the Left?”. *Irish Political Studies*.

Week 4: Governments and Coalitions (5 Oct & 7 Oct 2021)

- How do we distinguish types of government coalitions?
- Which government types are most frequent across Europe? What could explain the 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.
- 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 (2021). “Voter Expectations of Government Formation in Coalition Systems: The Importance of the Information Context”. *European Journal of Political Research* published ahead of print (DOI: 10.1111/1475-6765.12441).
- S. N. Golder (2006). “Pre-Electoral Coalition Formation in Parliamentary Democracies”. *British Journal of Political Science* 36 (2): 193–212.
- G. B. Powell (2006). “Election Laws and Representative Governments: Beyond Votes and Seats”. *British Journal of Political Science* 36 (2): 291–315.
- J. M. Carey and M. S. Shugart (1995). “Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: A Rank Ordering of Electoral Formulas”. *Electoral Studies* 14 (4): 417–439.

Week 5: Parties in Government and Challenger Parties (12 Oct & 14 Oct 2021)

- 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.

Week 6: The Mandate Model of Democracy (19 Oct & 21 Oct 2021)

- 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

- B. Manin, A. Przeworski, and S. C. Stokes (1999). “Elections and Representation”. *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Ed. by A. Przeworski, S. C. Stokes, and B. Manin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 29–54.* (not suitable for response paper)

- 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.
- R. Thomson and H. Brandenburg (2019). “Trust and Citizens’ Evaluations of Promise Keeping by Government Parties”. *Political Studies* 67 (1): 249–266.

Week 7: READING WEEK

Week 8: Measuring Party Positions and Issue Salience (2 Nov & 4 Nov 2021)

- 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.

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.
- 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)

Week 9: Responsiveness (9 Nov & 11 Nov 2021)

- 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.
- G. B. Powell (2004). “The Chain of Responsiveness”. *Journal of Democracy* 15 (4): 91–105.* (not suitable for response paper)
- B. I. Page and R. Y. Shapiro (1983). “Effects of Public Opinion on Policy”. *American Political Science Review* 77 (1): 175–190.
- J. A. Stimson, M. B. Mackuen, and R. S. Erikson (1995). “Dynamic Representation”. *American Political Science Review* 89 (3): 543–565.

Week 10: The (Ir)Rational Voter? (16 Nov & 18 Nov 2021)

- 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*.

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* published ahead of print (doi: 10.1017/S0003055421000861).

Week 11: Participation Beyond Political Parties (23 Nov & 25 Nov 2021)

- 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. Landmore, 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

- D. Altman (2011). *Direct Democracy Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: ch. 1–3.* (not suitable for response paper)
- 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.
- P. Mair (2013). *Ruling the Void: The Hollowing of Western Democracy*. London: Verso.* (not suitable for response paper)
- 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 (30 Nov & 2 Dec 2021)

- 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

- F. Foos and D. Bischof (2021). “[Tabloid Media Campaigns and Public Opinion: Quasi-Experimental Evidence on Euroscepticism in England](#)”. *American Political Science Review* published ahead of print (doi: 10.1017/S000305542100085X).
- 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* published ahead of print (DOI: 10.1080/10584609.2021.1910390).
- F. Gilardi (Forthcoming). *Digital Technology, Politics, and Policy-Making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.* (not suitable for response paper)