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.
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 Faculty of Arts and Sciences Calendar to see the list of prerequisites.

3 Logistics

- Class: W 12-2, UC 148
- Michael’s Office hours: Tuesday 12:30-2:30\(^1\) 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 politics, 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 8) Each paper should choose one article from that week’s reading and evaluate it on three dimensions:

\(^1\)These 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

- Responsiveness

- Inequalities

- Multilevel governance
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 22. The papers are due (on Blackboard) April 5 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 policies\(^2\) for more details. The Writing Center\(^3\) 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:


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 11

- 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 18

- Chapters 1 and 2 of Przeworski, Stokes, and Manin, Democracy, Accountability, and Representation

* Additional reading:
Week 3: Is responsiveness possible? January 25

- Chapters 5 and 9 of Przeworski, Stokes, and Manin, *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*

* Additional reading:
- Clement Attlee. “Civil servants, ministers, parliament and the public”. In: *Political Quarterly* 25.4 (1954), pp. 308–315

Accountability

Week 4: Who is held accountable? February 1

- Book review: Duch and Stevenson, *The Economic Vote*

* Additional reading:

Week 5: Can accountability work in a complex world? February 8

• 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:
  - Chapter 7 in Przeworski, Stokes, and Manin, Democracy, Accountability, and Representation

Responsiveness

Week 6: Do parties respond to the electorate? February 15


• Book review: Lijphart, Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms & Performance in Thirty-six Countries

* Additional reading:

*Note, no class February 22

Week 7: Does policy move with preferences? March 1


• Book review: Brooks and Manza, *Why Welfare States Persist*

* Additional reading:

**Inequalities**

**Week 8: To whom do parties respond?**

March 8

- One or two articles from the special issue that Lefkofridi, Giger, and Kissau4 introduce.
- Book review: Gallego, *Unequal Political Participation Worldwide*

* Additional reading:

**Week 9: To whom does policy respond?**

March 15

- Book review: Beramendi and Anderson, *Democracy, Inequality, and Representation*

* Additional reading:


Multilevel governance

Week 10: Does decentralization help or hinder democracy? March 22

• Book review: Keating, Rescaling the European State: The Making of Territory and the Rise of the Meso

* Additional reading:

Week 11: Is the EU democratic? March 29

• 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:
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Week 12: Does the EU change democracy?  


- 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)

Week 13: No class, research design papers due  

April 12