

POL 410/2391 H(S): Topics in Comparative Politics III — Democracy and Responsiveness in Europe

Michael James Donnelly*

University of Toronto Department of Political Science

Winter 2015

Welcome to “Democracy and Responsiveness in Europe,” in which we will explore whether (or how well) democracy works in contemporary Europe. All of us (I presume) think democracy is important. How well it works is an open empirical question that we will try to answer. Relying on a variety of theories about how democracy does or should work, we will evaluate the relationships between the public, interest groups, political parties, bureaucracies, and policy outcomes. Since this class is aimed at advanced undergraduates and graduate students, we will address both substantive and methodological questions.

After examining some basic theories of democracies, we will ask four fundamental questions:

1. When and why are European governments held accountable for their performance?
2. Do changes in the preferences of European publics lead to changes in policy?
3. Are all European voters equally influential or do some get what they want while others are ignored?
4. How has the increase in the importance of sub-national and supra-national governance (at the expense of the nation-state?) affected democratic performance?

By the end of the semester, you will be able to **distinguish** between differing theories of democracy, to **evaluate** the quality of research done on democracy in Europe, to **argue** that democracy in Europe is healthy or that democratic institutions have failed to live up to their promise, and to **design** a research project that evaluates the quality of that democracy.

*Note the ‘James.’ There is a Michael W. Donnelly in the Department, so be careful about emails.

1 Contact Information

Office: Sidney Smith 3105
Office Phone: 416-978-0344
Email: mj.donnelly@utoronto.ca
URL: <http://www.MichaelJDonnelly.net>

2 Prerequisites

Please see the 2015-2016 Faculty of Arts and Sciences Calendar to see the list of prerequisites.

3 Logistics

- Class: W 12-2
- Michael's Office hours: Tuesday 12:30-2:30¹ Appointments by email are also available.
- Email policy: I try to respond to all emails within **two working days**. If I have not gotten back to you by then, feel free to send a reminder.

4 Course Requirements

Your final grade is based on participation, two short response papers, a book review and presentation, and a research design paper.

- **Participation (20%)**: I expect you to come to class having read the assigned materials and prepared to discuss them. Attendance is mandatory. If you expect to miss class, or if you miss class unexpectedly, it is essential that you communicate with me ahead of time.
 - I expect you to put your phones away when class starts. If you take notes on computers or tablets, you may keep them on your desk, but you may not check email, news sites, Facebook, etc. during class. If I notice you doing this, I will make a note and deduct all of your participation points for that week. If it happens again, you will lose two more weeks' points. If it happens a third time, I will ask you to leave and you will lose the full 20% of the final grade, making failure a very high probability event.
 - I expect classroom discussions to be **civil and respectful**. You will disagree with me, with the readings, and with each other quite frequently. That is good. It means we are all thinking hard about public policy, one of the most controversial topics we can study. When you participate in class, be careful to consider your tone. Racist, sexist, homophobic, or sectarian language or behavior will not be tolerated.
- **Response Papers (10% X 2)**: Twice over the course of the semester, you will write a 400 word (one side of one page, single-spaced) response paper. The due dates are flexible, though the first paper is due before Week 5 (February 10) Each paper should choose one article from that week's reading and evaluate it on three dimensions:

¹These hours are subject to change. Check Blackboard for announcements.

1. Quality of theory: does it make sense?
2. Quality of evidence: was the research well-designed and well-executed?
3. Overall quality of the article: how convinced are you?

- **Book Review & Presentation** (20% & 10%): In Week 2, I will assign each student a book to review. Between 1 and 3 students will be assigned to each book. The due dates of the book reviews and their associated presentations will vary. These due dates are **not** flexible, though if you can find a classmate to trade with, you may do so if you notify me in advance.

The week that your book review is due, you will, as a group, lead a class discussion on the topic. Since the rest of the class will have read related articles, but not the book, you should give a 30 minute presentation on the book's argument and evidence (this may be accompanied by slides).

The books to be reviewed are:

- Accountability
 - * February 3: Raymond M. Duch and Randy Stevenson. *The Economic Vote*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008
 - * February 10: Joshua Tucker. *Regional Economic Voting: Russia, Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic, 1990-1999*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006
- Responsiveness
 - * February 24: Arend Lijphart. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms & Performance in Thirty-six Countries*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012
 - * March 2: Clem Brooks and Jeff Manza. *Why Welfare States Persist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007
- Inequalities
 - * March 9: Aina Gallego. *Unequal Political Participation Worldwide*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014
 - * March 16: Pablo Beramendi and Christopher J. Anderson, eds. *Democracy, Inequality, and Representation*. New York: Russell Sage, 2011
- Multilevel governance
 - * March 23: Michael Keating. *Rescaling the European State: The Making of Territory and the Rise of the Meso*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013
 - * March 30: Sara B. Hobolt and James Tilley. *Blaming Europe? Responsibility without Accountability in the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
 - * April 6: Richard Rose. *Representing Europeans: A pragmatic approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015

A good book review uses about 2,500 words to

1. summarize the book's argument,
 2. describe the evidence the book presents,
 3. evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence, and
 4. suggest directions for future research.
- **Research Design Paper (30%)**: This paper will be an in depth (2-3,000 words) plan for a research project on a question about democracy in Europe. A rough draft (worth 5 of the 30 points) is due (on Blackboard) at 8am on March 23. The papers are due (on Blackboard) April 6 by 12pm.

A good research design paper uses about 2,500 words to

1. Identify an important and answerable causal question
2. Describe a method for answering that question
3. Describe the data-gathering process that you would use (be specific, what survey questions would you ask, what archives would you visit, what officials would you interview, etc.)
4. Identify challenges (data availability, cost, etc.) and potential solutions to those challenges
5. State why this method is preferable to other common approaches when answering your question

Rough drafts should be anonymized (as in, do not include your name on the paper) and will be graded for completeness, but not for content.

5 Plagiarism and Academic Integrity

Plagiarism and other violations of academic integrity will not be tolerated. See the university policies² for more details. The Writing Center³ can also assist you in avoiding plagiarism.

6 Submissions, Late Assignments and Appeals

- All submissions should be uploaded to Blackboard. If the syllabus does not list a due time, it must be turned in **before** class during the week it is due. All submissions should be in .pdf, .doc, or .docx format.
- Late assignments will receive deductions of 20% per day. Students are strongly advised to make rough drafts and hard copies before handing anything in and to keep those copies until after grades are posted on ROSI.

²<http://www.utoronto.ca/academicintegrity>

³<http://www.writing.utoronto.ca/home>

- Grade appeals must be made by email within 14 days of receiving the grade. They must include a 100-200 word statement of why the assignment deserves to be re-graded. “I tried hard” is not a good reason for an assignment to be regraded. The grade will change only in cases where the second grading is more than 10 points different from the first (i.e. a 60 will not be changed unless the second grading produces a score of 70+ or 50-). **Grades can go up or down on the second grading.**

7 Readings

Below, you will find a detailed listing of readings for each class session. Most classes will be based on two to four assigned articles or book chapters (typically about three hours worth of careful reading). You should read carefully and be prepared to discuss both the theory and the evidence. Some of the evidence is going to rely on knowledge - of history, politics, statistics, or past work - that you do not have. That is to be expected. If you read the evidence and cannot understand exactly what it means, make sure to bring that up in class.

If you are not sure what to make of the assigned readings, the additional readings may help, and if they are relevant to your response paper, book review, or research design paper, you should certainly read these items.

We will use the following book, available at various bookstores:

- Adam Przeworski, Sue Stokes, and Bernard Manin, eds. *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999

You are expected to own this book and whichever book you are assigned to review **in hard copy**. I realize many people prefer to read on a computer or e-reader, but you need to bring the physical books to class. I have found that students that have the physical copy are better able to participate in discussion without being distracted by laptops in class. This is good for me, for you, and for your classmates.

Feel free to buy the cheapest edition available, though you should check with me to make sure you are reading the right chapters. All other readings will be available through the library or posted to Blackboard.

8 Course Outline

Week 1: Introductions, logistics, etc.

January 13

- Introduction of Przeworski, Stokes, and Manin, *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*

Theories of responsiveness and accountability

Week 2: What do we mean by ‘responsiveness’ or ‘accountability’?

January 20

- Chapters 1 and 2 of Przeworski, Stokes, and Manin, *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*
- * Additional reading:

- Robert A Dahl. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1956
- Robert A Dahl. *On Democracy*. Yale: Yale University Press, 1998
- American Political Science Association. “Toward a more responsible two-party system, a report”. In: *American Political Science Review* 44.3 (1950), Supplement

Week 3: Is responsiveness possible?

January 27

- Chapters 5 and 9 of Przeworski, Stokes, and Manin, *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*
- * Additional reading:
 - Samuel L. Popkin. “Information Shortcuts and the Reasoning Voter”. In: *Information, Participation and Choice: An Economic Theory of Democracy in Perspective*. Ed. by Bernard Grofman. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993
 - Clement Attlee. “Civil servants, ministers, parliament and the public”. In: *Political Quarterly* 25.4 (1954), pp. 308–315
 - Peter A. Hall and Robert J. Franzese. “Mixed Signals: Central Bank Independence, Coordinated Wage Bargaining, and European Monetary Union”. In: *International Organization* 52.03 (1998), pp. 505–535

Accountability

Week 4: Who is held accountable?

February 3

- Michael Becher and Michael Donnelly. “Performance, Perceptions and Economic Voting: Examining the Causal Mechanism”. In: *Journal of Politics*. Working paper 75.4 (2013), pp. 968–979
- Raymond M Duch and Randy Stevenson. “Context and the Economic Vote: A Multi-level Analysis”. In: *Political Analysis* 13 (2005), pp. 387–409
- Book review: Duch and Stevenson, *The Economic Vote*
- * Additional reading:
 - Marta Fraile and Michael S Lewis-Beck. “Economic Voting in Spain: A 2000 Panel Test”. In: *Electoral Studies* 29.2 (2010), pp. 210–220
 - Michael S Lewis-Beck and Martin Paldam. “Economic Voting: An Introduction”. In: *Electoral Studies* 19.2-3 (2000), pp. 113–121
 - Geoffrey Evans and Mark Pickup. “Reversing the Causal Arrow: The Political Conditioning of Economic Perceptions in the 2000-2004 U.S. Presidential Election Cycle”. In: *Journal of Politics* 72.04 (2010), pp. 1236–1251

Week 5: Can accountability work in a complex world?

February 10

- G. Bingham Powell Jr and Guy D. Whitten. “A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context”. In: *American Journal of Political Science* 37.2 (1993), pp. 391–414

Last day
to turn
in RP 1

- Timothy Hellwig. “Globalization, Policy Constraints, and Vote Choice”. In: *The Journal of Politics* 70.04 (2008), p. 1128
- Book review: Tucker, *Regional Economic Voting: Russia, Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic, 1990-1999*
- * Additional reading:
 - Christopher J Anderson. “The End of Economic Voting? Contingency Dilemmas and the Limits of Democratic Accountability”. In: *Annual Review of Political Science* 10 (2007), pp. 271–296
 - Michael S. Lewis-Beck, Richard Nadeau, and Angelo Elias. “Economics, Party, and the Vote: Causality Issues and Panel Data”. In: *American Journal of Political Science* 52.1 (2008), pp. 84–95
 - Chapter 7 in Przeworski, Stokes, and Manin, *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*

*Note, no class February 17

Responsiveness

Week 6: Do parties respond to the electorate?

February 24

- James Adams and Zeynep Somer-Topcu. “Moderate Now, Win Votes Later: The Electoral Consequences of Parties Policy Shifts in 25 Postwar Democracies”. In: *The Journal of Politics* 71.02 (2009), p. 678
- Armen Hakhverdian. “Political Representation and its Mechanisms: A Dynamic Left-Right Approach for the United Kingdom, 19762006”. In: *British Journal of Political Science* 40.04 (2010), pp. 835–856
- Book review: Lijphart, *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms & Performance in Thirty-six Countries*
- * Additional reading:
 - Orit Kedar. “When Moderate Voters Prefer Extreme Parties: Policy Balancing in Parliamentary Elections”. In: *The American Political Science Review* 99.2 (2005), pp. 185–199
 - Torben Iversen and David Soskice. “Electoral Institutions and the Politics of Coalitions: Why some Democracies Distribute More than Others”. In: *American Political Science Review* 100.2 (2006)
 - Karen Long Jusko. “Electoral geography and redistributive politics”. In: *Journal of Theoretical Politics* Forthcomin. April (2014)

Week 7: Does policy move with preferences?

March 2

- Clem Brooks and Jeff Manza. “Social Policy Responsiveness in Developed Democracies”. In: *American Sociological Review* 71 (2006), pp. 474–494
- Lane Kenworthy. “The effect of public opinion on social policy generosity”. In: *Socio-Economic Review* 7.4 (2009), pp. 727–740

- Book review: Brooks and Manza, *Why Welfare States Persist*
- * Additional reading:
 - James A Stimson. *Public opinion in America: Moods, cycles, and swings*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991
 - Stuart N. Soroka and Christopher Wlezien. *Degrees of Democracy: Politics, Public Opinion, and Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010
 - Robert Erikson, Michael MacKuen, and James Stimson. *The Macro Polity*. Cambridge University Press, 2002

Inequalities

Week 8: To whom do parties respond?

March 9

- Zoe Lefkofridi, Nathalie Giger, and Kathrin Kissau. “Inequality and Representation in Europe”. In: *Representation* 48.1 (2012), pp. 1–11
- André Blais and Marc André Bodet. “Does Proportional Representation Foster Closer Congruence Between Citizens and Policy Makers?” In: *Comparative Political Studies* 39.10 (2006), pp. 1243–1262
- Book review: Gallego, *Unequal Political Participation Worldwide*
- * Additional reading:
 - Andrew Eggers and Jens Hainmueller. “MPs for Sale? Returns to Office in Postwar British Politics”. In: *American Political Science Review* 103.04 (2009), pp. 513–533
 - Manfred G Schmidt. “When parties matter : A review of the possibilities and limits of partisan influence on public policy”. In: *European Journal of Political Research* 30.September (1996), pp. 155–183
 - Jan Rosset, Nathalie Giger, and Julian Bernauer. “More Money, Fewer Problems? Cross-Level Effects of Economic Deprivation on Political Representation”. In: *West European Politics* 36.4 (2013), pp. 817–835

Week 9: To whom does policy respond?

March 16

- Yvette Peters and Sander J. Ensink. “Differential Responsiveness in Europe: The Effects of Preference Difference and Electoral Participation”. In: *West European Politics* April (2014), pp. 1–24
- Michael J. Donnelly and Zoe Lefkofridi. “Unequal Responsiveness in Europe”. Florence, 2014
- Book review: Beramendi and Anderson, *Democracy, Inequality, and Representation*
- * Additional reading:
 - Martin Gilens and Benjamin Page. “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens”. In: *Perspectives on Politics* 12.3 (2014), pp. 564–581

- Martin Gilens. *Affluence and Influence: Economic Inequality and Political Power in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012
- David L. Weakliem, Robert Andersen, and Anthony Heath. “By Popular Demand: The Effect of Public Opinion on Income Inequality”. In: *Comparative Sociology* 4.3-4 (2005)
- Robert A Dahl. *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. Second. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005

Multilevel governance

Week 10: Does decentralization help or hinder democracy?

March 23

RD
rough
drafts
due

- Cameron D Anderson. “Economic Voting and Multilevel Governance: A Comparative Individual-Level Analysis”. In: *American Journal of Political Science* 50.2 (2006), pp. 449–463
- B. Guy Peters and Jon Pierre. “Multi-level Governance and Democracy: A Faustian Bargain?” In: *Multi-level Governance*. Ed. by Ian Bache and Matthew Flinders. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004
- Book review: Keating, *Rescaling the European State: The Making of Territory and the Rise of the Meso*
- * Additional reading:
 - Kevin Arceneaux. “Does Federalism Weaken Democratic Representation?” In: *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 35.2 (2010), pp. 297–312
 - Christopher Wlezien and Stuart N. Soroka. “Federalism and public responsiveness to policy”. In: *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 41.1 (2011), pp. 31–52. ISSN: 00485950. DOI: [10.1093/publius/pjq025](https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjq025)

Week 11: Is the EU democratic?

March 30

- Andrew Moravcsik. “In Defence of the ‘Democratic Deficit’: Reassessing Legitimacy in the European Union”. In: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40.4 (2002), pp. 603–624
- Andreas Follesdal and Simon Hix. “Why there is a democratic deficit in the EU: A response to majone and moravcsik”. In: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44.3 (2006), pp. 533–562
- Book review: Hobolt and Tilley, *Blaming Europe? Responsibility without Accountability in the European Union*
- * Additional reading:
 - James Tilley and Sara B. Hobolt. “Is the Government to Blame? An Experimental Test of How Partisanship Shapes Perceptions of Performance and Responsibility”. In: *Journal of Politics* 73.02 (2011), pp. 316–330
 - Hermann Schmitt. “The European Parliament Elections of June 2004 : Still Second-Order ?” In: *West European Politics* 28.3 (2005), pp. 650–679

Week 12: Does the EU change democracy?

April 6 RD final
drafts
due

- Marco Steenbergen, Erica Edwards, and Catherine de Vries. “Whos Cueing Whom?” In: *European Union Politics* 8.1 (2007), p. 13. ISSN: 1465-1165
- Anna Grzymalaa-Busse and Abby Innes. “Great Expectations: The EU and Domestic Political Competition in East Central Europe”. In: *East European Politics and Societies* 17.1 (2003), pp. 64–73
- Book review: Rose, *Representing Europeans: A pragmatic approach*

* Additional reading:

- Donnelly and Lefkofridi 2016 (see Blackboard)
- B. Steunenbergh. “Is big brother watching? Commission oversight of the national implementation of EU directives”. In: *European Union Politics* 11.3 (2010), pp. 359–380