



POLITICAL REPRESENTATION IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Eri Bertsou, Prof. Daniele Caramani, Dr. Jelle Koedam

Seminar / Research Seminar

SYLLABUS (HS 2019 / FS 2020)

The course is taught English and is a *Wahlmodul* in the tracks “Democracy, Development and International Relations” and “Political Economy and Philosophy”, Master in Political Science, and a preparation seminar to the Research Seminar in the Spring Semester 2020.

Module no. 615515; Course no. 3812.

ECTS points: 6.0.

Contents

In today’s representative democracies the most critical task citizens perform is the (s)election of politicians to represent them. Yet citizens perceive their representatives as increasingly distant and feel poorly represented. Critics point to the difficulty of holding politicians accountable and their unresponsiveness to people’s demands. The unfolding crisis of representation and the failings of political parties to act as key democratic actors is very much a crisis of democracy itself fostering distrust and populism.

In the Fall Semester the seminar provides a basic and encompassing introduction to political representation as a concept and to representative government as a set of institutions and actors. The seminar aims therefore to have both a theoretical and empirical focus. It addresses the dimensions of accountability, responsibility, substantive vs. descriptive representation, responsiveness, the role of parties as well as representational roles (trustee, delegate, etc.). The structure of the seminar is based on the knowledge of classic volumes in the field, but swiftly moves over to the most important contributions and debates of the last years. What does it mean to be adequately represented? How can the quality of representation be evaluated? Should an ethnicity, a social class or women be represented through members from these groups? Is it right to exclude immigrants from representation, and what about citizens living abroad? How effectively can citizens hold politicians accountable and sanction them? The reading list is centred on social and political science texts, but addresses political representation from an interdisciplinary perspective.

In the Spring Semester the seminar continues and participants produce a research paper based on empirical analysis. The focus of the analysis is the on topics relating to political

representation. The goal of the Spring Semester is that each participant produces a paper of about 7,000 to 8,000 words. The topics of the Spring Semester follow closely those of the previous one and participants apply empirically what has been seen theoretically in the Fall Semester.

In this seminar participants are trained to undertake empirical research in the field of representation and to write a paper. In each step of the writing process, papers are discussed in class and accompanied by suggestions. The form of the course is that of a seminar and the basic principle is that participants learn from one another – both from strengths and mistakes. The success of the seminar thus strongly depends on the willingness of each participant to engage with others' work and to accept critiques and suggestions from peers in the group.

Goals

Students acquire the following knowledge and competence:

- Advanced understanding of the key concepts, relevant topics and current debates in the field of political representation
- Bridging empirical knowledge on representation with normative questions about the “why”, “who”, “what” and “how” of representation, as well as making own original contributions.
- Critical reading of challenging texts and ability to effectively synthesize and convey the most important information.
- Ability to link the scientific literature with current issues in world affairs.
- Analytical skills, production of graphs and tables, data analysis and text presentation of key findings.
- Planning and executing an original empirical research in comparative perspective in theoretically driven work with social and academic relevance.
- Writing skills in well written, clearly structured, challenging and provocative style.
- Present results effectively and concisely.

Time and Venue

The course meets weekly: Monday, 14.00–15.45 (venue: AFL-E-020).

Contact

Email: bertsou@ipz.uzh.ch; koedam@ipz.uzh.ch.

Office Hours

Office hours of Dr. Bertsou: Monday 12–14 at the Department of Political Science (IPZ), Affolternstrasse 56, 8050 Zurich, 3rd floor. Office no.: AFL-H-356. Students are asked to register for office hours by email.

Office hours of Dr. Koedam: Wednesday 14:00-16:00 at the Department of Political Science (IPZ), Affolternstrasse 56, 8050 Zurich, 3rd floor. Office no.: AFL-H-329.

Compulsory readings: Compulsory readings are listed below under “Schedule and Readings” and are available on OLAT. It is expected that participants read the texts in advance and take actively part in the discussions. Participants should attend every class.

The main books are on hold at the IPZ library (Affolternstrasse 56, 8050 Zurich, 1st floor).

Spring weekly contributions: The “Schedule” below specifies which material must be circulated in advance of the meetings. These can be uploaded on OLAT where participants also find further instructions.

Background readings:

Participants should be familiar in advance with the following texts from politically active thinkers at the time of the “invention” of representative government in three different countries. The following readings should be done in the first two weeks (they are available on OLAT):

Burke, Edmund (1774). *Speech to the Electors of Bristol (at the Conclusion of the Poll)*. Various publishers (available at www.ourcivilisation.com).

Madison, James (1787). “Federalist no. 10”. In Hamilton, Alexander, Madison, James and John Jay, *The Federalist Papers*. Various publishers (available through books.google).

Siéyès, Emmanuel Joseph (1789). *Vue sur les Moyens d’Exécution Dont les Représentans de la France pourront disposer en 1789* (pp. 1–39). Paris: unnamed publisher (available through books.google).

Course Organisation

The weekly meetings listed in under “Schedule and Readings” for the Fall Semester below take the form of seminars with students’ presentations. Students’ presentations are graded and count for 30% of the final grade. Presentations can be done in groups of a maximum of 3 students. Presentations also serve the purpose of launching the discussion in class. They must be carefully prepared and may be based on PowerPoint presentations.

Presentations summarize the main argument, design and results of the text. The presentation should stress the relevance of the text and link it to the more general field in order to establish its contribution. In general, presentations should confront texts critically and should launch a class discussion about the relevance and insights of these texts for democratic representation.

Presentations should not be longer than 20 minutes and must always include a title slide (information about the text, authors, etc.), a slide with the structure of the presentation and a conclusive slide which includes the main contribution of the text as well as the main critiques.

PowerPoint presentations must be uploaded on OLAT on the Monday of the presentation at 8am at the latest.

Evaluation Criteria

The final grade for the Fall Semester is composed of 70% by a final examination and 30% by the oral presentation in class as mentioned above.

The exam consists of an essay written on a topic relating to the readings. Important criteria for the evaluation of the essay are a well-defined topic with a clearly formulated argument. The paper should have a clear structure:

- (1) introduction where the main topic, argument and structure of the paper is spelled out;
- (2) two-three main sections in which the topic is developed;
- (3) conclusion where the main argument is summarized and further questions are formulated;

References to different authors and theories should be mentioned in the text and the text should highlight links between them.

Analysis and critique: The argument should be at university academic level including an analytical approach making use of concepts, typologies and theories seen in class and in the texts. It should also make use of additional literature researched by the students themselves. Definitions of concepts should be given when required and should be used in a consistent manner. The authors used should include the most important ones read in class. A critical perspective should be adopted in which students bring in their own point of view and are able to argue about the reasons of adopting a certain position.

Formal presentation: The essay should be written carefully and checked for spelling mistakes. Language should be appropriate and accurate. The presentation should be kept simple and orderly. Citations of the literature do not need references.

The date of the exam is December 2nd, 2019. Grades range from 1 to 6 with half-grades. Further information: www.ipz.uzh.ch/studium/bachelor/termine.html

Important criteria for the grade of the presentation include: the quality of the slides (clarity), the ability to convey important information and answer questions from the audience, links with other texts and the field more generally, raising an interesting discussion and proposing points for debate, a critical reading of the texts among other things.

Students receive a written feedback after the presentation.

Evaluation criteria in the Spring Semester

In the Spring Semester participants have the option of continuing the seminar and write a research paper of about 7-8,000 words all included. This paper is an empirical analysis of a research question related to political representation More information will be provided at the end of the Fall Semester.

The deadline for the papers is June 5th, 2020, 23:59.

Attendance

Participants are expected to attend each weekly session. In case of absence a written notification in advance to caramani@ipz.uzh.ch is required. Participants come prepared to each session having read the texts and noted points for discussion, critique, clarification, etc. Laptops are tolerated in class only insofar as they serve the goal of having texts and notes in front of them. Other usages are not tolerated. Mobile devices must be switched off and stored away.

SCHEDULE AND READINGS

FALL SEMESTER

Session 1 (19.09.2019): Introduction and task assignment.

Please read the texts in advance. The introduction is done by the lecturer.

Manin, Bernard (1997). *The Principles of Representative Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Introduction, Chapters 5 and 6).

Pitkin, Hanna F. (1967). *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: The University of California Press (Chapters 7 and 8).

Powell, Bingham G. (2000). *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New Haven: Yale University Press (pp. 7–17).

Additional reading:

Urbainati, Nadia (2006). *Representative Democracy: Principles and Genealogy*. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press (Introduction and Chapter 1).

Session 2 (23.09.2019): Introduction (continued).

The literature is the same as for the previous session.

Session 3 (30.09.2019): Historical origins.

No session but readings are nonetheless required.

Manin, Bernard (1997). *The Principles of Representative Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Chapter 2) → for descriptive representation.

Morgan, Edmund S. (1988). *Inventing the People: The Rise of Popular Sovereignty in England and America*. New York: Norton (Chapter 2) → for symbolic representation.

Additional readings:

Manow, Philip (2010). *In the King's Shadow: The Political Anatomy of Democratic Representation*. New York: Wiley.

Session 4 (07.10.2019): The theoretical debate on representation (please read in chronological order).

Mansbridge, Jane (2003). Rethinking Representation. *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 515–28.

Rehfeld, Andrew (2009). Representation Rethought: On Trustees, Delegates, and Gyroscopes in the Study of Political Representation and Democracy. *American Political Science Review* 103(2): 214–30.

Additional reading:

Mansbridge, Jane (2011). Clarifying the Concept of Representation. *American Political Science Review* 105(3): 621–30.

Rehfeld, Andrew (2011). The Concepts of Representation. *American Political Science Review* 105(3): 631–41.

Session 5 (14.10.2019): Descriptive and self-representation.

Mansbridge, Jane (1999). Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent “Yes”. *Journal of Politics* 61(3): 628–57.

Phillips, Anne (1995). *The Politics of Presence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Chapter 1).

Additional reading:

Young, Iris Marion (1997). “Deferring Group Representation”. In Shapiro, Ian and Will Kymlicka (eds.), *Ethnicity and Group Rights*. New York: New York University Press (Chapter 12).

Caramani, Daniele, Celis, Karen and Bram Wauters (2014). “The Representation of Old and New Groups”. In Deschouwer, Kris and Sam Depauw (eds.), *Representing the People: A Survey of Members of Statewide and Sub-State Parliaments*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Chapter 3).

Williams, Melissa S. (1998). *Voice, Trust, and Memory: Marginalized Groups and the Failings of Liberal Representation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (Introduction, pp. 23–29 from Chapter 1, pp. 92–95 from Chapter 6, pp. 233–38 from Chapter 7, Conclusion).

Session 6 (21.10.2019): Substantive representation: responsiveness, dynamic representation.

McDonald, Michael D., Mendes, Silvia M. and Ian Budge (2004). What Are Elections For? Conferring the Median Mandate. *British Journal of Political Science* 34(1): 1–26.

Powell, Bingham G. (2000). *Elections as Instruments of Democracy: Majoritarian and Proportional Visions*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press (Chapter 7).

Additional reading:

Schmitt, Hermann and Jacques J.A. Thomassen (2000). Dynamic Representation: The Case of European Integration. *European Union Politics* 1(3): 318–39.

Session 7 (28.10.2019): Delegation: congruence.

Andeweg, Rudy B. (2011). “Approaching Perfect Policy Congruence: Measurement, Development, and Relevance for Political Representation”. In Rosema Martin, Denters

- Bas and Kees Aarts (eds.), *How Democracy Works: Political Representation and Policy Congruence in Modern Societies*. Amsterdam: Pallas Publications (Chapter 3).
- Powell, Bingham G. (2009). The Ideological Congruence Controversy: The Impact of Alternative Measures, Data, and Time Periods on the Effects of Election Rules. *Comparative Political Studies* 42(12): 1475–97.
- Golder, Matt and Jacek Stramski (2010). Ideological Congruence and Electoral Institutions. *American Journal of Political Science* 54(1): 90–106 → first half of the article only!

Session 8 (04.11.2019): The Responsible Party Model and challenges.

- Mair, P. (2008) 'The Challenge to Party Government', *West European Politics*, 31 (1–2), 211–34.
- Van Biezen, I., Mair, P. and Poguntke, T. (2012) Going, Going, ... Gone? The Decline of Party Membership in Contemporary Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 51 (1), 24–56.

Additional readings:

- Dalton, Russell J. (1985). Political Parties and Political Representation: Party Supporters and Party Elites in Nine Nations. *Comparative Political Studies* 18(3): 267–99.
- Miller, Warren E. et al. (1999). *Policy Representation in Western Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Chapter 2).
- Lawson, K. and Merkl, P. H. (1988) *When Parties Fail: Emerging Alternative Organizations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Session 9 (11.11.2019): Technocracy and Populism as representation

- Caramani (2017) Will Versus Reason: The Populist and Technocratic Challenge to the Party Model of Political Representation. *American Political Science Review* 111(1): 1–14.
- Bickerton, C. and C. Invernizzi Accetti. 2016. Populism and Technocracy: Opposites or Complements? *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 20(2): 186–206.

Additional readings:

- Wlezien, Christopher, and Stuart N. Soroka (2012). Political Institutions and the Opinion–Policy Link. *West European Politics* 35(6): 1407–32.
- Scharpf, Fritz (1999) *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rohrschneider, Robert, and Stephen Whitefield (2012). Institutional Context and Representational Strain in Party–Voter Agreement in Western and Eastern Europe. *West European Politics* 35(6): 1320–40.

Session 10 (18.11.2019): Citizen's perspective of technocratic representation

Bertsou, Eri and Daniele Caramani (2020), "People Haven't had Enough of Experts: Technocratic Attitudes among European Citizens." *American Journal of Political Science* (forthcoming).

Hibbing, John R. and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse (2002) *Stealth Democracy: Americans' Beliefs about How Government Should Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Introduction and Chapter 6).

Additional readings:

Font, Wojcieszak and Navarro (2015) Participation, Representation and Expertise: Citizen Preferences for Political Decision-Making Processes. *Political Studies* 63(1), 153-172

Bertsou Eri and Giulia Pastorella (2017), Technocratic Attitudes: A Citizens' Perspective of Technocracy, *West European Politics* 40(2): 430–58.

Session 11 (25.11.2019): Non-partisan Representation

Neto, O. A. and Strøm, K. (2006) 'Breaking the Parliamentary Chain of Delegation: Presidents and Non-Partisan Cabinet Members in European Democracies', *British Journal of Political Science*, 36 (4), 619–43

Alexiadou, D. (2015) 'Ideologues, Partisans, and Loyalists Cabinet Ministers and Social Welfare Reform in Parliamentary Democracies', *Comparative Political Studies*, 48 (8), 1051-1086.

Additional readings:

White, J. and Ypi, L. E. A. (2011) 'On Partisan Political Justification', *American Political Science Review*, 105 (2), 381–96

Ezrow, Laurence (2010). *Linking Citizens and Parties: How Electoral Systems Matter for Political Representation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Chapters 1 and 3).

Session 12 (02.12.2019): Inclusiveness: citizenship and right to vote.

Bauböck, Rainer (2005). Expansive Citizenship: Voting Beyond Territory and Membership. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 38(4): 683–87.

Caramani, Daniele and Oliver Strijbis (2012). Discrepant Electorates: The Inclusiveness of Electorates and Its Impact on the Representation of Citizens. *Parliamentary Affairs* 65(1): 1–21.

López-Guerra, Claudio (2005). Should Expatriates Vote? *Journal of Political Philosophy* 13(2): 216–34.

Additional readings:

Blais, André, Massicote Louis and Antoine Yoshinaka (2001). Deciding Who Has the Right to Vote: A Comparative Analysis of Election Laws. *Electoral Studies* 20(1): 41–62.

- Earnest, David C. (2008). *Old Nations, New Voters: Nationalism, Transnationalism, and Democracy in the Era of Global Migration*. Albany: State University of New York Press (Chapters 1–3).
- Shaw, Jo (2007). *The Transformation of Citizenship in the European Union: Electoral Rights and the Restructuring of Political Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Chapters 1 and 3).
- Song, Sarah (2009). Democracy and Non-Citizen Voting Rights. *Citizenship Studies* 13(6): 607–20.

Also during this session, the materials for the **exam** are announced and discussed, and the form of the exam is presented in detail. Attendance of this session is particularly important for the performance in the essay.

Session 13 (09.12.2019): Final examination.

The exam (writing an essay) takes place during the usual seminar hours in the same room.

Sessions 14 (16.12.2019): Feedback and discussion on essays

These two sessions are reserved to the discussion of the essay by the participants. Participants will have the possibility to read each other's' essays. During the sessions, each will briefly present the core thesis of their essay, receive feedback from the lecturers and from other participants, discuss their arguments. The focus of the last part of the seminar is therefore the participants' work.

Readings in preparation to Spring Semester on “Technocracy”

(in addition to the readings done in the Fall Semester)

- Alexiadou, D. (2015) Ideologues, Partisans, and Loyalists Cabinet Ministers and Social Welfare Reform in Parliamentary Democracies. *Comparative Political Studies* 48(8): 1051-86.
- Centeno, M. A. (1993) The New Leviathan: The Dynamics and Limits of Technocracy. *Theory and Society* 22(3): 307–35.
- Centeno, M. (1994). *Democracy within Reason: Technocratic Revolution in Mexico*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Culpepper, P. (2014). The Political Economy of Unmediated Democracy: Italian Austerity under Mario Monti. *West European Politics* 37(6): 1264–81.
- Dahl, R.A. (1985). *Controlling Nuclear Weapons: Democracy vs. Guardianship*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Dargent, E. (2015). *Technocracy and Democracy in Latin America: The Experts Running Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fischer, F. (2009). *Democracy and Expertise*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fischer, F. (1990). *Technocracy and the Politics of Expertise*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McDonnell, D. and Valbruzzi, M. (2014). Defining and Classifying Technocrat-Led and Technocratic Governments. *European Journal of Political Research* 53(4): 654–71.
- Meynaud, J. (1969). *Technocracy*. New York: Free Press.
- Pasquino, G. and M. Valbruzzi (2012). Non-Partisan Government Italian-Style: Decision-Making and Accountability. *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 17(5): 612–29.
- Pastorella, G. (2015). Technocratic Governments in Europe: Getting the Critique Right. *Political Studies* 64(4): 948–65.
- Pettit, P. (2004). Depoliticizing Democracy. *Ratio Juris* 17(1): 52–65.
- Schudson, M. (2006) The Trouble with Experts – and Why Democracies Need Them. *Theory and Society* 35(5–6): 491–506.
- Rosanvallon, P. (2011). *Democratic Legitimacy: Impartiality, Reflexivity, Proximity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shapiro, M. (2005). Deliberative, “Independent” Technocracy v. Democratic Politics: Will the Globe Echo the EU? *Law and Contemporary Problems* 68(3–4): 341–56.
- Torre, de la C. (2013). Technocratic Populism in Ecuador. *Journal of Democracy* 24(3): 33–46.

SCHEDULE

Spring Semester 2020

Session 1: Introduction and organization (17.02.2020)

Presentation of the course and organisational matters. The lecturers provide an explanation of the schedule and of how the semester leading to the paper is organized. At this stage participants have already written the research design and should have a clear idea of what they plan for their paper.

Session 2: No meeting (24.02.2020)

This week is used to prepare the following weeks.

Session 3: Definition of topic, research question, research design, data sources and method (02.03.2020)

In this session participants define the topic of their paper and the research question (that is, they formulate the hypotheses). They also specify their research design – meaning case selection, operationalisation, sources of data and methods used for the analysis (for example, econometric, text analysis, interviews, Boolean algebra, etc.) and justify why. This is done on one page to be uploaded on OLAT before the meeting:

- Topic and research question.
- Case selection and time frame.
- Data, sources, material, documents that are needed for research, availability and difficulties to obtain it.
- Theoretical approach and hypotheses.
- Method by which the analysis should be conducted and operationalization of indicators
- Expected results.

Session 4: Title, abstract and keywords (09.03.2020)

Each participant drafts a paper of 2-3 pages to be uploaded on OLAT before the meeting. For this session participants present a title, an abstract (max. 200 words), and five keywords. These are then discussed in class with the aim to improve them in terms of clarity, conciseness, amount of information and effective communication of the main argument of the paper. Participants also present the Structure of the paper with indication of weights of different parts in %. The structure should include sections and sub-sections with a short indication of the contents (2-3 lines per sub-section).

Session 5: Theory and hypotheses (16.03.2020)

In this session participants present their theory and hypotheses. It is important that student formulate testable hypotheses, which clearly derive from theory. Students need to make sure that their predictions can be tested using the data and methodological tools available. Each participant drafts a paper of 2 pages to be uploaded on OLAT before the meeting. They must specify the theory/ theories used, the hypotheses to be tested and expectations about results.

Session 6: Literature review (23.03.2020)

In this session participants present the bulk of literature to which their topic and research question relates. Most importantly they clarify what type of contribution their paper makes in the literature, either through new data, a different approach, a different set of cases, etc. Each participant drafts a paper of 2 pages to be uploaded on OLAT before the meeting. The paper must specify (1) which aspects of representation are addressed by the specific literature, (2) what are the crucial contributions in these fields and what the main findings are and (3) what is the participant's own contribution through his/her paper. The paper must include between 10 and 20 most important bibliographical references.

Session 7: Data and methods (30.03.2020)

Each participant drafts a paper of about a page to be uploaded on OLAT before the meeting with an indication of type of data, material, documents, sources that are needed for research and where the data are available from with which difficulties or hurdles. It should also indicate the nature of the data (individual survey data, aggregate data, text, etc.). Participants must also indicate which methods they plan to use in their paper (text analysis, QCA, regression, loglinear analysis, etc.) and on which software they will rely to perform the analysis. They should justify the reason why they think that a specific method is suitable for the research question and the data.

Session 8: Synopsis and intermediate assessment (06.04.2020)

Participants print what they have written so far and discuss progress in class. They should realistically indicate how much more work is needed before the deadline.

In this session participants present the structure of their paper and a brief synopsis – meaning a brief summary of the contents of each section and sub-section of the paper (about 10 lines for each section or sub-section).

Spring Break

Session 9: Sechseläuten - No session (20.04.2020)

Session 10: No meeting (27.04.2020)

The free time this week is devoted to the preparation of the next meeting. Individual supervision may be requested and takes place in the usual lecture room and does not require registration. Supervision (upon request) follows a first-come-first-serve principle.

Session 11: Drafts, part I (04.05.2020)

In this session we will discuss first drafts of the papers. It is important that these drafts are circulated in advance for participants to be able to read one another's papers. Each participant presents the first results of his/her research. Each participant is allocated 10 minutes for presentation. Discussants for each paper will be assigned. Presenters answer questions from the peers.

Session 12: (11.05.2020)

No session.

Session 13: Drafts, part II. (18.05.2020)

This meeting is a continuation of the previous one.

Session 14: Class presentation. (25.05.2020)

Presentation of research papers in class. More information will be provided during the semester.