

**PO-119**  
**Politics & the People**  
*Department of Political & Cultural Studies*  
*Teaching Block 2, 2016/2017*  
*Lecturer: Dr. Miriam Sorace*

**Mondays 10:00 to 11:00 – Talbot Room 39**  
**Thursdays 17:00 to 18:00 – Faraday Theatre K**  
**14<sup>th</sup> February 2017 – 11:00 to 12:00 Faraday Theatre M**

*Course Code: PO-119*  
*Semester: 2*  
*Credit Rating: 20*

**Module Guideline**

**Index**

<i>Office Hours</i> .....	2
<i>Module Description</i> .....	2
<i>Aims and objectives</i> .....	2
<i>Learning outcomes</i> .....	3
<i>Transferable Skills</i> .....	3
<i>Teaching Methods</i> .....	3
<i>Workloads, private study and expectations</i> .....	4
<i>Assessment</i> .....	5
Coursework (40%): DUE April 7 <sup>th</sup> , 2017 4pm .....	5
Closed Exam (60%) .....	6
<i>Academic integrity and misconduct</i> .....	6
<i>Lecture and Seminar Topics</i> .....	8
<i>Readings</i> .....	9
Main Textbook: .....	9
Readings by Topic .....	9
Seminar Readings .....	14

## ***Office Hours***

Dr Sorace's office hours are: Mondays 14:00 to 16:00  
Room 033 James Callaghan

If you would like to make an appointment outside of these hours please contact Dr Sorace via email at: [miriam.sorace@swansea.ac.uk](mailto:miriam.sorace@swansea.ac.uk).

## ***Module Description***

This module takes as its key focus a desire to understand how we – the people - relate to politics. It is an issue brought ever more sharply in to focus whenever there is a new cause for disillusion with the political process. The outcome of the 2016 US Presidential Elections, the focus on the UK referendum results in 2016, and the rising nationalist and eurosceptic tide in Europe are all cases in point.

This module considers some of the key issues of the relation between 'the people' and the political system from a comparative perspective. The module addresses the nature and role of political parties in aggregating political preferences; types of parties and party systems; and the way in which parties seek to represent the people. We then assess the politics of elections and voting behaviour exploring the key characteristics of voting behaviour; why do people vote, and, if they do, why do they vote the way they do?

The course furthermore assesses key institutional contexts of the relationship between politics and the people. We explore different types of electoral system and their qualities in addressing the potentially conflicting aims of providing for fair representation and good government; the role of legislatures in providing for the representation of the people; the relation between executives and legislatures as well as the judiciary. Finally the course looks at media systems and political communication.

Overall, the module introduces students to ways of addressing and analysing different political systems to understand the 'what is', 'why' and 'how' of politics.

## ***Aims and objectives***

This module has two aims:

*Firstly*, to introduce students to key concepts and issues of comparative politics: Students will be exposed to some of the core questions in this field.

*Secondly*, students will be introduced to systematic comparisons of political systems, institutions and behaviours. Applying a comparative perspective increases the knowledge of other democratic political systems, helps in identifying similarities and differences between for example voting behaviour or legislatures but it will also help students to understand better the political system they know well already. Competing approaches and methods that scholars apply to answer their research questions will be reviewed. This will enable students to make use of a comparative perspective.

### *Learning outcomes*

By the end of the module, students will be able to:

1. show familiarity with key texts in the field of comparative politics;
2. demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of key concepts and issues in the study of politics and political systems;
3. articulate an informed view about current debates and questions surrounding comparative politics;
4. and critically analyse political processes and developments in comparative perspective.

### *Transferable Skills*

By the end of the module you will have developed the following transferable skills:

1. Oral and written communication skills.
2. The ability to formulate and defend arguments; the ability to contribute with own ideas to an academic debate.
3. The ability to understand and critically evaluate theories and concepts.
4. Analytical skills and the ability to relate ideas and concepts to practices.
5. Experience of participating in group work and group discussions.
6. Self-motivation in a working environment

### *Teaching Methods*

The course is taught using a combination of lectures and tutorials. There will be a **total of 20 lectures** (1h), **8 seminars** (1h) and **two exam revision sessions**. **Attendance** at lectures and seminars is **compulsory** and will be monitored.

Lectures provide an introduction to individual topics and concepts of comparative politics. In the lectures, we will clarify key terms and main arguments of the literature. The lectures form the bases from which you can develop your work on the module and deepen your understanding of concepts and topics. Starting on the 6<sup>th</sup> of February 2016, **Lectures are held on Mondays at 10am in Talbot, Room 39 and on Thursdays at 5pm in Faraday, Room K**. Please note that the class of Feb 16<sup>th</sup> **has been moved to February 14<sup>th</sup> 2017 at – 11:00 to 12:00 Faraday Theatre M**.

Seminars are devoted to discuss selected topics and questions in greater depth. Exercises and group discussions will give students the opportunity to develop their own ideas and practice communication and arguing skills. Please **sign up for a seminar group** on the 'Politics and the People' **blackboard site**.

*Attendance at all lectures, seminars, language classes and tutorials is compulsory (students will be expected to complete attendance registers when asked to do so). Students who are not able to attend at lecture or seminar, for whatever reason, should let the module convenor and relevant seminar tutor know in advance. If your attendance is deemed to be unsatisfactory*

*and you are absent from any specified engagement you will be contacted by the College and asked to explain your absence (COAH Handbook for UG students)*

### ***Behaviour Guidelines***

Student-led discussion groups must abide by the rules of conduct that apply in the rest of the university life. At all times students must conduct themselves in a civilised way. It is good to argue and debate but there must be no instances of behaviour that could be experienced as threatening. Furthermore, the university cannot tolerate prejudice of any kind. In joining a class, students commit to working with each other, supporting each other and making sure that each person can participate fully. Students will attend each scheduled class and will arrive promptly.

### ***Workloads, private study and expectations***

How much time you devote to studying your module is a personal decision. As a guideline, a 20 credit module carries a minimum expectation of 200 hours of work over its duration. How you organise this commitment is up to you. Over a ten-week teaching semester you will be expected to complete for each module approximately twenty hours private study per week. Outside the teaching semester you will have to do preparatory reading, and revise for examinations.

## *Assessment*

This module will be assessed in two parts.

### **Coursework (40%): DUE April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017 4pm**

You are required to **write a 2000 word** essay on **one of the questions** listed below. Essay questions are related to the themes of the module. The assignment is to be submitted by **4 PM on Friday 7<sup>th</sup> of April 2017**. You must submit an **electronic copy via turnitin** on the course blackboard site.

### **Essay Questions**

Choose **ONE** of the following questions:

1. *What are the consequences of electoral thresholds (and, relatedly, of seat bonuses)? Discuss and exemplify by comparing two European countries.*
2. *What are the main objections to referendums? Exemplify these objections with appropriate case studies of recently held referendums.*
3. *'The European Union is not a typical representative democracy'. Discuss by comparing institutions in 'traditional' representative democracies with EU institutions.*

It is required that this assignment is accompanied by a bibliography of at least 7 sources (excluding webpages or blogs!) and that these sources are referenced correctly. The more you reference (and read!!) the more meaningful and concise your essay! You can source these texts from the citations made by authors from the list of readings provided and/or from texts that you have come across in your own search for literature.

### ***Note on Writing Essays***

Do the simple things well:

- Answer the question. ***Read the question carefully***. Work out what you want to say, and make your points explicitly.
- A good introduction shows that you understand the context and significance of the question to be addressed, and helps the reader by explaining how you will answer it. Each paragraph should be coherent in itself and in relation to others; pay particular attention to the first sentence of a paragraph.
- Ensure you provide a good explanation of the key concepts addressed by the question and your argument/analysis.
- Avoid too much description. You should be offering informed and coherent arguments connected to the question. You should ***not*** be telling the story of what happened, when, etc. at single events or cases.

- Your conclusion should be consistent with the material and argument you present. Don't introduce new ideas into your conclusion – use it to draw together the main strands of your argument.

### **Closed Exam (60%)**

There will also be a two-hour examination in May/June (date to be defined). It consists of two essay-type questions that can be chosen from a list of eight presented for the exam. The exam will test your knowledge of the lecture topics, and your ability to construct coherent discussions on the concepts that you are exposed to on the course, incorporate theories and present evidence for your arguments.

For the exam, it is important to **read the question carefully and to answer the question**. An **introduction** to your answer should be included outlining your argumentation. The main body should have a **clear structure** and the arguments should be **coherent**. The **conclusion** should be consistent with the arguments presented in the main body of your answer.

### ***Academic integrity and misconduct***

From the College of Arts and Humanities, UG Handbook:

Academic misconduct occurs when the principles and values of academic integrity are not adhered to and will often include an attempt by a student to gain an unfair advantage in assessment.

*“Academic misconduct is defined as any act whereby you attempt to obtain for yourself, or for another person, an unpermitted advantage. This shall apply whether you act alone or in conjunction with another/others. An action or actions shall be deemed to fall within this definition whether occurring during, or in relation to, a formal examination, a piece of coursework, or any other form of assessment undertaken in pursuit of an academic or professional qualification at Swansea University.”*

Examples of Academic Misconduct in Non-examination Conditions (Coursework) are: Plagiarism; Self-plagiarism; collusion; commissioning of work produced by another; falsification of the results of laboratory, field-work or other forms of data collection and analysis.

Please check the guides on Blackboard for proper referencing and avoiding plagiarism.

*“Plagiarism is defined as using, without acknowledgment, another person's work and submitting it for assessment as though it were one's own work; for instance, through copying or unacknowledged paraphrasing. This constitutes plagiarism whether it is intentional or unintentional.”* (Swansea University, Code of Practice, 2015, 7).

***Plagiarism is cheating and you should not underestimate the consequences associated with this.***

*“The penalties imposed on students vary but if you take the risk and are found guilty the likelihood is that all your marks for the Session will be cancelled i.e.0% for each module. You might even find that you are required to withdraw and be disqualified from any further University examinations, particularly if it was your second attempt or if the act*

*was of an extremely serious nature e.g. purchasing an essay, impersonating another student or allowing oneself to be impersonated. Colleges suspecting students of engaging in Unfair Practice shall be authorized to use appropriate means to gain evidence on the allegations, such as using plagiarism detection software or examining the student orally.” (COAH, UG Handbook).*

### *Lecture and Seminar Topics*

<b>Week</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>
1 (week 20)	Lecture 1	06/02/2017	Course introduction
	Lecture 2	09/02/2017	The Comparative Method: What do we compare? How do we compare?
2 (week 21)	Lecture 3	13/02/2017	Electoral Systems: types
	Lecture 4	<b>14/02/2017</b>	Electoral Systems: consequences
3 (week 22)	Lecture 5	20/02/2017	Referendums
	Lecture 6	23/02/2017	Political Parties: Internal Organisation, Functions and Decline
	<i>Seminar 1</i>		<i>Reforming the electoral system: is proportional representation better?</i>
4 (week 23)	Lecture 7	27/02/2017	Party families
	Lecture 8	02/03/2017	Party systems & cleavages
	<i>Seminar 2</i>		<i>Under what conditions are referendums advisable? What are their pitfalls?</i>
5 (week 24)	Lecture 9	06/03/2017	The Executive
	Lecture 10	09/03/2017	The Legislature: structure and functions
	<i>Seminar 3</i>		<i>Political parties and party systems: do we need political parties?</i>
6 (week 25)	Lecture 11	13/03/2017	Presidential vs. Parliamentary Democracy
	Lecture 12	16/03/2017	The Judiciary
	<i>Seminar 4</i>		<i>Government formation: when does it deviate from 'rationality'?</i>
7 (week 26)	Lecture 13	20/03/2017	The Bureaucracy and Interest Groups
	Lecture 14	23/03/2017	Federalism
	<i>Seminar 5</i>		<i>Should we limit the influence of non-elected officials/groups in decision-making? Why? Why not?</i>
8 (week 27)	Lecture 15	27/03/2017	The European Union
	Lecture 16	30/03/2017	Voters and voting behaviour
	<i>Seminar 6</i>		<i>How should the EU be reformed?</i>
9 (week 28)	Lecture 17	03/04/2017	Political participation
	Lecture 18	06/04/2017	Political communication: media systems
	<i>Seminar 7</i>		<i>Why do people participate?</i>
10 (week 32)	Lecture 19	04/05/2017	Political communication: media and public opinion.
	Lecture 20	08/05/2017	Political representation & its consequences
	<i>Seminar 8</i>		<i>When do people get represented and does it make a difference?</i>
11 (week 33)	Lecture 21	11/05/2017	Exam revisions I
	Lecture 22	15/05/2017	Exam revisions II



## **Readings**

### **Main Textbook:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, M. Mair, P. (2011) *Representative Government in Modern Europe* McGraw Hill

The library has copies of this but make sure you purchase the textbook as library copies may be insufficient. For the additional readings listed below each topic, please check if they are available on iFind. If they are not available on iFind, please have a look on the Blackboard page of this course in the folder "Readings".

### **Readings by Topic**

---

#### Lecture 1 – Course Introduction

---

n/a

---

#### Lecture 2 – The Comparative Method

---

##### **Required:**

- Hague, R., Harrop, M. and McCormick (2016) *Comparative Government and Politics* – Chapter 6

##### **Recommended:**

- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – Chapters 2 & 3
- Lijphart, A. (1971) "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method" *American Political Science Review* 65(3).

---

#### Lecture 3 – Electoral Systems: Types

---

##### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – pp. 369-387

##### **Recommended:**

- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – pp. 181-188
- Golder, M. (2005) "Democratic Electoral Systems around the World, 1946-2000." *Electoral Studies* 24, no. 1:103-21.

---

#### Lecture 4 – Electoral Systems: Consequences

---

##### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – pp. 389-398
- Blais, A. & Massicotte, L. (2002) "Electoral Systems" in: in Leduc et al. *Comparing democracies 2 : New challenges in the study of elections and voting*, Sage. – pp. 56-66

##### **Recommended:**

- Gallagher, M and Mitchell, P. (2005) *The Politics of Electoral Systems* OUP – Chapter 2
-

## Lecture 5 – Referendums

### **Required:**

- Setälä, M. (1999). *Referendums and democratic government normative theory and the analysis of institutions* Palgrave. – Chapter 4 & Conclusion

### **Recommended:**

- LeDuc (2002) “Referendums and Initiatives: The Politics of Direct Democracy” in Leduc et al. *Comparing democracies 2 : New challenges in the study of elections and voting*, Sage.
- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – pp.188-195

## Lecture 6 – Political Parties: Internal Organisation, Functions and Decline

### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – Chapter 10

### **Recommended:**

- Aldrich, J.H., 2011 *Why Parties? A second look*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press – Chapter 1

## Lecture 7 – Party Families

### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – Chapter 8

### **Recommended:**

- Mair, P. and Mudde, C. (1998) “The Party Family and Its Study” *Annual Reviews of Political Science* 1 pp.211-229

## Lecture 8 – Party Systems and Cleavages

### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – Chapters 7 & pp. 278-292

### **Recommended:**

- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – Chapter 13
- Lipset and Rokkan, S. (1990) “Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments” in Mair, P. *The West European Party System*, pp. 91-119.

## Lecture 9 – The Executive

### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – Chapter 12

### **Recommended:**

- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – pp. 141-149

## Lecture 10 – Legislatures: Structure and Functions

### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – Chapter 3

### **Recommended:**

- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – Chapter 7
- Massicotte, Louis. "Legislative unicameralism: a global survey and a few case studies." *Journal of Legislative Studies* 7.1 (2001): 151-170.
- Riker, William H. (1992) "The justification of bicameralism." *International Political Science Review* 13:1, 101-116.

## Lecture 11 – Presidential vs. Parliamentary Democracy

### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – Chapter 2

### **Recommended:**

- Cheibub, A. (2007) *Presidentialism, Parliamentarism and Democracy* Cambridge University Press – Chapters 1 and 2

## Lecture 12 – The Judiciary

### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – Chapter 4

### **Recommended:**

- Dahl, R. (1957). "Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as a National Policy-Maker." *Journal of Public Law*. 6(279).
- Rosenberg, Gerald. (2008). *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change?* University of Chicago Press – Chapter 1

## Lecture 13 – The Bureaucracy and Interest Groups

### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – Chapter 13 until p. 473
- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – pp. 155-160 and Chapter 14

### **Recommended:**

- Guy Peters, B.(2001) *The Politics of Bureaucracy* – Chapters 1, 3 and 5

## Lecture 14 – Federalism

### **Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – Chapter 6

### **Recommended:**

- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – Chapter 11

- Filipov, M. P. C. Ordershook and O. Shvetsova, (2004) *A Theory of Self-Sustainable Federal Institutions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press – Chapters 1 and 9

#### Lecture 15 – The European Union

**Required:**

- Gallagher, M., Laver, P. and Mair, P. (2011) – Chapter 5
- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – Chapter 23

**Recommended:**

- Hix, S. (2005). *The political system of the European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hix, S. (2008). *What's wrong with the European Union and how to fix it*. Malden, MA: Polity.

#### Lecture 16 – Voters and voting behaviour

**Required:**

- Clarke, H. D., Sanders, D., Stewart, M.C & Whiteley, P (2004) *Political Choice in Britain* Oxford: OUP – Chapters 2 & 6

**Recommended:**

- Dalton (2008) *Citizen politics: Public opinion and political parties in advanced industrial democracies*. SAGE – Chapters 2 & 8-10

#### Lecture 17 – Political participation

**Required:**

- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – Chapter 18

**Recommended:**

- Clarke, H. D., Sanders, D., Stewart, M.C & Whiteley, P (2004) *Political Choice in Britain* Oxford: OUP – Chapters 7 & 8
- Dalton (2008) *Citizen politics: Public opinion and political parties in advanced industrial democracies*. SAGE – Chapter 3 & 4

#### Lecture 18 – Political communication: media systems

**Required:**

- Caramani, D. (2011) *Comparative Politics* – Chapter 19

**Recommended:**

- Hallin, D. & Mancini, P. (2004) *Comparing media systems three models of media and politics* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – Part I & Part II
- Gunther, Richard and Anthony Mughan. Eds. (2000). *Democracy and the Media: A Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press – Chapters 1 and 12

---

Lecture 19 – Political communication: media and public opinion

---

**Required:**

- Downing, J. (2004). *The SAGE handbook of media studies* Thousand Oaks: SAGE – Chapters 9 & 17.

**Recommended:**

- Kinder, D. (1998). “Communication and Opinion”. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 1(1), 167-197.
- Bartels, Larry M. (1993). “Messages Received: The Political Impact of Media Exposure”. *American Political Science Review* 87.2

---

Lecture 20 – Political representation & its consequences

---

**Required:**

- Gallagher et al (2011) – Chapter 14

**Recommended:**

- Powell, Jr., G. Bingham. (2004). Political representation in comparative politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 273-296.
- Powell, G. (2004). The Chain of Responsiveness. *Journal of Democracy*, 15(4), 91-105.
- Mayne, Q., & Hakhverdian, A. (2016). Ideological Congruence and Citizen Satisfaction: Evidence From 25 Advanced Democracies. *Comparative Political Studies*
- Rohrschneider, Robert. (2002). “The Democracy Deficit and Mass Support for an EU wide Government.” *American Journal of Political Science* 46(2): 463-475

---

Lecture 21 – Exam Revision

---

n/a

---

Lecture 22 – Exam Revision

---

n/a

---

## Seminar Readings

Please read at least two articles for each seminar. Be prepared to answer questions and discuss in the seminars.

---

### *Seminar 1 – Reforming the electoral system: Is Proportional Representation Better?*

---

1. Norris, P. (1997). “Choosing Electoral Systems: Proportional, Majoritarian and Mixed Systems”. *International Political Science Review* , 18(3), 297-312.
2. Mair, Peter. (1992). “The question of electoral reform. (UK)”. *New Left Review*, (194), 75.
3. Norris, P. (2001). “The Twilight of Westminster? Electoral Reform and its Consequences”. *Political Studies*, 49(5), 877-900.

---

### *Seminar 2 – Under what conditions are referendums advisable? What are their pitfalls?*

---

1. Vasilopoulou, S. (2016). UK Euroscepticism and the Brexit Referendum. *Political Quarterly*, 87(2), 219-227.
2. Watch: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3p9hxtGltIU>
3. Marsh, M. (2015). “Voting on Europe, again and again: Stability and change in the Irish experience with EU referendums”. *Electoral Studies*, 38, 170-182.
4. Garry, J. (2014). Emotions and voting in EU referendums. *European Union Politics*, 15(2), 235-254.
5. Hobolt, S. (2007). Taking Cues on Europe? Voter competence and party endorsements in referendums on European integration. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(2), 151-182.

---

### *Seminar 3 – Political parties and party systems: do we need political parties?*

---

1. Lipset, S.M. (2000), The Indispensability of Political Parties. *Journal of Democracy*, 11(1), pp. 48-55.
2. Levitsky, Steven and Maxwell A. Cameron, September (2003). “Democracy Without Parties? Political Parties and Regime Change in Fujimori’s Peru”, *Latin American Politics and Society* 45(3), pp. 1-33.
3. Aldrich, J.H., 2011 *Why Parties? A second look*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press – Chapter 1

---

*Seminar 4 – Government formation: when does it deviate from ‘rationality’?*

---

1. Lewin, L. (1998). “Majoritarian and Consensus Democracy: The Swedish Experience”. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 21(3), 195-206.
2. Proksch, Sven-Oliver and Jonathan Slapin (2006) “Institutions and their Effects on Coalition Formation: the German Election of 2005” *West European Politics* 29(3):540-559.
3. Laver, Michael and Norman Schofield. 1998. *Multiparty Government: The Politics of Coalition in Europe*. Oxford University Press. Chapter 4 \*\*\*

---

*Seminar 5 – Should we limit the influence of non-elected officials/groups in decision-making? Why? Why not?*

---

1. Della Porta, Donatella. 2001. “A Judges’ Revolution? Political Corruption and the Judiciary in Italy”, *European Journal of Political Research*, 39:1-21.
2. Bilder, M. (2006). “The Corporate Origins of Judicial Review”. *The Yale Law Journal*, 116(3), 502-566.
3. Craig, R. (2016) “Casting Aside Clanking Medieval Chains: Prerogative, Statute and Article 50 after the EU Referendum” *The Modern Law Review* 79(6)
4. Phillipson, G. (2016). “A Dive into Deep Constitutional Waters: Article 50, the Prerogative and Parliament”. *Modern Law Review*, 79(6), 1064-1089.
5. Guy Peters, B.(2001) *The Politics of Bureaucracy* – Chapter 5

---

*Seminar 6 – How should the EU be reformed?*

---

1. Hix, S. (2008). *What's wrong with the European Union and how to fix it*. Malden, MA: Polity – Chapter 1
2. Scharpf, F. (2015). “Democracy large and small: Reforming the EU to sustain democratic legitimacy on all levels”. *Juncture*, 21(4), 266-272.
3. Zweifel, T. (2002). “...Who is without sin cast the first stone: The EU's democratic deficit in comparison”. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9(5), 812-840.
4. Follesdal, A., & Hix, S. (2006). “Why There is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik”. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(3), 533-562.

---

*Seminar 7 – Why do people participate?*

---

1. Blais, A. 2006. “What Affects Voter Turnout?” *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 111-25.
  2. Powell Jr, G. Bingham. "American voter turnout in comparative perspective." *The*
-

---

*American Political Science Review* (1986): 17-43.

3. Riker, W., & Ordeshook, Peter C. (1968). "A theory of the calculus of voting". *American Political Science Review*, 62(1), 25-42.
4. Darmofal, D. (2010). "Reexamining the Calculus of Voting". *Political Psychology*, 31(2), 149-174.

---

*Seminar 8 - When do people get represented and does it make a difference?*

---

1. Powell, Jr., G. Bingham. (2004). Political representation in comparative politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 273-296.
  2. Bowler, Shaun, and Donovan, Todd. (2002). "Democracy, Institutions, and Attitudes about Citizen Influence on Government" *British Journal of Political Science*, vol. 32, pp. 371-390.
  3. Rohrschneider, Robert. (2002). "The Democracy Deficit and Mass Support for an EU wide Government." *American Journal of Political Science* 46(2): 463-475
  4. Dalton, R. (2015). "Party representation across multiple issue dimensions". *Party Politics*.
-