



Seminar 615774:

Invasive Parties: Where new parties come from and how they change party systems

Chair of Comparative Politics

Term: Spring term 2018

Time: Wed 10.15 am – 12.00 am

Lecture Room: AFL-H-376

ECTS: 6.0

Lecturer: Daniel Bischof

Office: AFL-H-329

Office hours: Wed 09.00 am – 10.00 am

E-mail: bischof@ipz.uzh.ch

Course description:

- MA seminar
- 2 WSS
- Language: English
- Grading:
 1. Literature review (20 %)
 2. Presentation of research idea (20 %)
 3. Term paper (\approx 4000 words) (60 %)

Modern democracies are unthinkable without political parties. Parties help to overcome collective action costs, reduce transaction costs in parliaments and thereby ensure that delegation and accountability works. Yet, since the early 1980s new parties have emerged, challenging established parties and as a side product also questioning the functionality of the existing system of delegation and accountability: Green parties forced environmental concerns and anti-growth politics on the political agenda, radical right parties questioned the openness of nation states for migrants and lately populist parties aim to unite the masses against the “evil and parasitic” elites. However, research on parties and party systems still lacks an exhaustive understanding how invasive parties changed established party systems, altered parties and even impacted society: How did societies and public opinion change after the emergence of new parties? How did established parties react to the challenges coming with invasive parties? And how can we disentangle the causes for the emergence of invasive parties from their consequences? This seminar provides a careful look into the existing literature on parties and party competition. We will try to understand which questions the literature has raised so far and which questions still need to be addressed. To this end each student will a) write a critical report on a published paper b) attempt a replication of an existing analysis by advancing the arguments made in existing research.

Introductory Readings:

- **General readings:** The following readings are helpful to support you in the process of conducting your own research assignments throughout your studies. Specifically the readings on how to write appear to have a crucial impact on the quality of your writing.

Writing:

1. Graff, G. and Birkenstein, C. (2014). *They Say, I Say – The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing*. W.W. Norton Company, New York
2. Zinsser, W. (2001). *On Writing Well*. Quill
3. Plümper, T. (2012). *Effizient Schreiben: Leitfaden zum Verfassen von Qualifizierungsarbeiten und Wissenschaftlichen Texten*. Oldenbourg, München

Research Design:

4. Imai, K. (2018b). *Quantitative Social Science: An Introduction*. Princeton University Press, Princeton
5. Angrist, J. D. and Pischke, J.-S. (2008). *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Number March
6. Gelman, A. and Imbens, G. (2013). Why Ask Why? Forward Causal Inference and Reverse Causal Questions. *Inconnu*, pages 1–7
7. Holland, P. W. (1986). Statistics and Causal Inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(396):945–960

Theories, concepts, mechanisms:

8. Golder, M. (2016). Far Right Parties in Europe. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19(1):477–497
9. Benoit, K. (2007). Electoral Laws as Political Consequences: Explaining the Origins and Change of Electoral Institutions. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10(1):363–390
10. Adams, J. (2012). Causes and Electoral Consequences of Party Policy Shifts in Multiparty Elections: Theoretical Results and Empirical Evidence. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15(1):401–419

- **Non-scientific reading:** Besides the academic readings I can highly recommend reading: **Philip Roth, “The Plot Against America”**. Great novel, timely, and a great piece of counterfactual thinking in contemporary literature.

Expectations:

- Students write a **literature review** (\approx 400-500 words; font size 12; 1.5 spacing) that critically discuss the reading of one seminar session. It is not sufficient to repeat the key arguments of the readings. Instead students need to *a)* reproduce the key arguments/concepts/mechanisms in the readings, *b)* discuss potential shortcomings/contradictions in the readings (logic of argumentation; empirical & methodological concerns) and *c)* present the key contributions/strength of one reading assigned in the course.

As such the literature review is similar to the typical literature reviews used in journal articles. I will share some example texts and instructions in the first three meetings of the seminar.

One week before the literature review is due students need to come to my office hour to discuss their literature review with me. Potential re-drafting of the literature review might apply after the meeting. These changes need to be implement until the Monday of the week when the literature review is due.

- The **presentation** (10 minutes) takes place at the end of the term. Content of the presentation should be each student's individual research idea. Thus, students should not present a literature review, but aim to provide a first insight about the ideas they want to work on in their term papers.
- The **term paper** is a written paper to be submitted at the end of the course (≈ 4000 words; font size 12; 1.5 spacing). Term papers should develop an original argument and test this argument empirically. A suitable starting point for a term paper should be the arguments and analyses conducted in a published paper. Term papers can then advance the existing study theoretically and/or empirically. Term papers contain an 1) introduction 2) literature review 3) theoretical argument 4) research design 5) results 6) conclusion section. It is key to re-capture the original arguments/discussion in the academic literature, to develop an own argument on the subject and to test this argument rigorously. Thereby, the paper needs to be based on a student's presentation and might as well be based on the literature review.
- Active participation

Grading:

- Each assignment will be graded. Students will receive written feedback on their literature reviews and presentations. Term papers can be discussed in length and detail during the term break in my office hours. Grading will be based on:
 - **Literature review:** 1) Adequate repetition of arguments provided by reading 2) quality of discussion/shortcomings of reading 3) discussion of contribution/strength of reading
 - **Presentation:** 1) Discussion of existing arguments in the literature 2) adequate criticism of existing research 3) quality of own argument/hypotheses 4) logical derivation of own argument 5) quality of research question 6) quality and style of presentation (e.g. language; slides; rhetoric).
 - **Term paper:** 1) Motivation of research questions (academically and beyond) 2) structure and logic of argumentation 3) quality of literature review (e.g. debate covered exhaustively; quality of discussion; structure) 4) adequate expansion of readings used in the seminar 5) quality of theoretical argument (e.g. mechanisms clear; logical derivation of hypotheses) 6) formality (e.g. citation; quality of language).

Work load (an example):

- 1 ECTS = 30 hours ([Richtlinie Umsetzung des Bologna-Prozesses an UZH](#))
- 6 ECTS \times 30 hours = 180 hours
- Weekly = 180 hours / 14 term weeks \approx 12.9 hours per week

Table 1: Work load, an example:

	week	term
Seminar attendance	1.75	24.5
Readings	5	70
Literature Review		4
Presentation		9
Term paper	4	56
Σ	10.75	163.5

Prerequisites:

- Knowledge of key concepts in political science, more specifically in Comparative Politics.
- Knowledge of basic quantitative methods in political science (OLS regression (*needed*); panel data analysis (*preferred*); intro to causal inferences (*at best*))

Key dates!!!:

1. Discussion of literature review **7 days** before the session for which the reading is assigned in the syllabus
2. Presentation slots **16.05.18** or **23.05.18** or **30.05.18**
3. Handing in of term paper **01.07.2018**

Contents

21.02. Organization	5
Introductory lectures	5
28.02. Intro lecture: Why would we care about the emergence of new parties?	5
07.03. Intro lecture: Methodological intro to studying parties	5
How new parties emerge & survive	6
14.03. Institutions	6
21.03. Bottom-up approaches: Public opinion & social movements	6
28.03. How parties survive	6
29.03. – 07.04. Spring break; no coursework	6
Studying the consequences of new party emergence	6
11.04. How the public reacts to new parties	6
18.04. Does the media care about new parties & their positions?	7
25.04. How new competitors affect the issues debated in party systems	7
How new, extreme parties challenge existing democracies and their institutions	8
02.05. How extreme competitors challenge and shape democratic institutions (theory)	8
09.05. How extreme competitors challenge and shape democratic institutions (cases)	8
Mini conferences	8
16.05. Mini conference I	8
23.05. Mini conference II	8
30.05. Mini conference III & evaluation	9

Detailed course outline

Each session is based on up to three readings. Out of these three readings usually two readings are assigned to be read by each student *before* the session takes place. It is expected that students not only read the texts, but also critically engage with them. You should be able to summarize the key arguments of each assigned reading and come-up with at least three discussion points for each reading.

21.02. Organization

- Logistics
- How to find a research question & how to write a paper

reading Gelman, A. and Imbens, G. (2013). Why Ask Why? Forward Causal Inference and Reverse Causal Questions. *Inconnu*, pages 1–7

lit Bischof, D. (2016). How to Write a Paper Paper

lit Graff, G. and Birkenstein, C. (2014). *They Say, I Say – The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing*. W.W. Norton Company, New York

Introductory lectures

28.02. Intro lecture: Why would we care about the emergence of new parties?

- This session aims to motivate the reasons why we should study new, emerging parties
- Why would we care about the causes and consequences of new party emergence?

reading Levitsky, S. and Ziblatt, D. (2018). Chapter 1: Fateful Alliances. In *How Democracies Die*. Crown, New York

lit Mudde, C. (2013). The 2012 Stein Rokkan Lecture Three decades of populist radical right parties in Western Europe: So what ? *European Journal of Political Research*, 52(1):1–19

lit Paluck, E. L., Shepherd, H., and Aronow, P. M. (2016). Changing Climates of Conflict: A social Network Experiment in 56 schools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(3):566–571

podcast [The Ezra Klein show: “How Democracies Die”](#)

07.03. Intro lecture: Methodological intro to studying parties

- How can we approach the study of political parties?
- Which data sources can students use for their own research
- What are the advantages/shortcomings of different research designs

reading Imai, K. (2018a). Chapter 2: Causality. In *Quantitative Social Science: An Introduction*. Princeton University Press, Princeton

lit Zulianello, M. (2014). Analyzing party competition through the comparative manifesto data: some theoretical and methodological considerations. *Quality & Quantity*, 48(3):1723–1737

lit Bakker, R., Vries, C. D., Edwards, E., Hooghe, L., Jolly, S., Marks, G., Polk, J., Rovny, J., Steenbergen, M. R., and Vachudova, M. A. (2015). Measuring Party Positions in Europe: The Chapel Hill Expert Survey Trend File, 1999-2010. *Party Politics*, 21(1):143–152

How new parties emerge & survive

14.03. Institutions

- Which formal institutions affect new party emergence?
- How do different institutions affect new party emergence?

reading Tavits, M. (2008). Party Systems in the Making: The Emergence and Success of New Parties in New Democracies. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38(1):113–133

reading Boix, C. (1999). Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies. *American Political Science Review*, 93(3):609–624

lit Golder, M. (2003). Explaining Variation In The Success Of Extreme Right Parties In Western Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 36(4):432–466

21.03. Bottom-up approaches: Public opinion & social movements

- How public opinion changed since World War II
- The relationship between parties and cleavages
- The relationship between parties and social movements

reading Bustikova, L. (2014). Revenge of the Radical Right. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(12):1738–1765

reading Inglehart, R. (1971). The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies. *American Political Science Review*, 65(04):991–1017

lit Harmel, R. and Robertson, J. D. (1985). Formation and Success of New Parties: A Cross-National Analysis. *International Political Science Review*, 6(4):501–523

28.03. How parties survive

- Which factors affect party survival
- How much does funding, patronage and access to parliamentary resources affect party survival?

reading Dinas, E., Riera, P., and Roussias, N. (2015). Staying in the First League: Parliamentary Representation and the Electoral Success of Small Parties. *Political Science Research & Methods*, 3:187–204

reading Bolleyer, N. and Bytcek, E. (2016). New Party Performance after Breakthrough: Party Origin, Building and Leadership. *Party Politics*, 23(6):772–782

lit Folke, O., Hirano, S., and Snyder, J. M. (2011). Patronage and elections in U.S. States. *American Political Science Review*, 105(3):567–585

29.03. – 07.04. Spring break; no coursework

Studying the consequences of new party emergence

11.04. How the public reacts to new parties

- Do voters adapt their issue positions after the emergence of new parties?

- Does the public perception of issue importance change?
- If party systems polarize will voters polarize as well?

reading Gabel, M. and Scheve, K. (2007). Estimating the Effect of Elite Communications on Public Opinion Using Instrumental Variables. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(4):1013–1028

reading Bischof, D. and Wagner, M. (2018). Do voters polarize when extreme parties enter parliament? *Working paper presented at the American Political Science Association Meeting and the European Political Science Association Conferences 2017*

lit de Vries, C. E., Hakhverdian, A., and Lancee, B. (2013). The Dynamics of Voters' Left/Right Identification: The Role of Economic and Cultural Attitudes. *Political Science Research & Methods*, 1(02):223–238

18.04. Does the media care about new parties & their positions?

- Is the media agenda affected by new party emergence?
- How much attention does the media give to emerging parties, their issues and positions?
- And in turn, might the media agenda also affect voters and their preferences?
- How can we test the causal relationship between the media and the rise of new political parties?

reading Vliegthart, R., Boomgaarden, H. G., and van Spanje, J. (2012). Anti-Immigrant Party Support and Media Visibility: A Cross-Party, Over-Time Perspective. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 22(3):315–358

reading Ladd, J. M. and Lenz, G. S. (2009). Exploiting a Rare Communication Shift to Document the Persuasive Power of the News Media. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(2):394–410

lit Bos, L., van der Brug, W., and de Vreese, C. (2011). How the media shape perceptions of right-wing populist leaders. *Political Communication*, 28(2):182–206

25.04. How new competitors affect the issues debated in party systems

- Do established parties react to new competitors?
- If so, how do they react?
- How can we find an appropriate identification strategy to learn about the causal mechanisms between new parties and mainstream parties reactions?

reading Meguid, B. M. (2005). Competition Between Unequals: The Role of Mainstream Party Strategy in Niche Party Success. *American Political Science Review*, 99(3):347–359

reading Hobolt, S. B. and de Vries, C. E. (2015). Issue Entrepreneurship and Multiparty Competition. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(9):1159–1185

lit Wagner, M. and Meyer, T. M. (2017). The Radical Right as Niche Parties? The Ideological Landscape of Party Systems in Western Europe, 1980-2014. *Political Studies*, 65(1):84–107

How new, extreme parties challenge existing democracies and their institutions

02.05. How extreme competitors challenge and shape democratic institutions (theory)

- What are the most drastic and longterm consequences of new competitors?
- Could institutional settings change due to the emergence of extreme competitors?
- When and how do extreme competitors erode democratic norms and institutions?
- How important are parties and party elites as gatekeepers for extreme candidates?

reading Luebbert, G. M. (1987). Social Foundation of Political Order in Interwar Europe. *World Politics*, 39(4):449–478

reading Linz, J. J. and Stepan, A. (1978). *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes*. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore

lit Ziblatt, D. (2017a). Chapter 1 & Chapter 2. In *Conservative Parties and the Birth of Democracy*, pages 1–53. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

09.05. How extreme competitors challenge and shape democratic institutions (cases)

- Which prominent historical cases can be identified fitting the theoretical arguments discussed in the last session?
- Which cases show strikingly similarities but did not end-up in democratic downfall?
- How do parties matter before, during and after democratic breakdown?

reading Poland: Fomina, J. and Kucharczyk, J. (2016). Populism and Protest in Poland. *Journal of Democracy*, 27(4):58–68

reading Weimar Republic: Ziblatt, D. (2017b). Chapter 8. In *Conservative Parties and the Birth of Democracy*, pages 259–296. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

lit Levitsky, S. and Way, L. (2002). The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism. *Journal of Democracy*, 13(2):51–65

Mini conferences

16.05. Mini conference I

- Presentation & discussion of research ideas

23.05. Mini conference II

- Presentation & discussion of research ideas

30.05. Mini conference III & evaluation

- Presentation & discussion of research ideas
- Course evaluation

References

- Adams, J. (2012). Causes and Electoral Consequences of Party Policy Shifts in Multiparty Elections: Theoretical Results and Empirical Evidence. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15(1):401–419.
- Angrist, J. D. and Pischke, J.-S. (2008). *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Number March.
- Bakker, R., Vries, C. D., Edwards, E., Hooghe, L., Jolly, S., Marks, G., Polk, J., Rovny, J., Steenbergen, M. R., and Vachudova, M. A. (2015). Measuring Party Positions in Europe: The Chapel Hill Expert Survey Trend File, 1999-2010. *Party Politics*, 21(1):143–152.
- Benoit, K. (2007). Electoral Laws as Political Consequences: Explaining the Origins and Change of Electoral Institutions. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10(1):363–390.
- Bischof, D. (2016). How to Write a Paper Paper.
- Bischof, D. and Wagner, M. (2018). Do voters polarize when extreme parties enter parliament? *Working paper presented at the American Political Science Association Meeting and the European Political Science Association Conferences 2017*.
- Boix, C. (1999). Setting the Rules of the Game: The Choice of Electoral Systems in Advanced Democracies. *American Political Science Review*, 93(3):609–624.
- Bolleyer, N. and Bytzek, E. (2016). New Party Performance after Breakthrough: Party Origin, Building and Leadership. *Party Politics*, 23(6):772–782.
- Bos, L., van der Brug, W., and de Vreese, C. (2011). How the media shape perceptions of right-wing populist leaders. *Political Communication*, 28(2):182–206.
- Bustikova, L. (2014). Revenge of the Radical Right. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(12):1738–1765.
- de Vries, C. E., Hakhverdian, A., and Lancee, B. (2013). The Dynamics of Voters' Left/Right Identification: The Role of Economic and Cultural Attitudes. *Political Science Research & Methods*, 1(02):223–238.
- Dinas, E., Riera, P., and Roussias, N. (2015). Staying in the First League: Parliamentary Representation and the Electoral Success of Small Parties. *Political Science Research & Methods*, 3:187–204.
- Folke, O., Hirano, S., and Snyder, J. M. (2011). Patronage and elections in U.S. States. *American Political Science Review*, 105(3):567–585.
- Fomina, J. and Kucharczyk, J. (2016). Populism and Protest in Poland. *Journal of Democracy*, 27(4):58–68.
- Gabel, M. and Scheve, K. (2007). Estimating the Effect of Elite Communications on Public Opinion Using Instrumental Variables. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(4):1013–1028.
- Gelman, A. and Imbens, G. (2013). Why Ask Why? Forward Causal Inference and Reverse Causal Questions. *Inconnu*, pages 1–7.
- Golder, M. (2003). Explaining Variation In The Success Of Extreme Right Parties In Western Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 36(4):432–466.
- Golder, M. (2016). Far Right Parties in Europe. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19(1):477–497.
- Graff, G. and Birkenstein, C. (2014). *They Say, I Say – The Moves That Matter in Academic Writing*. W.W. Norton Company, New York.
- Harmel, R. and Robertson, J. D. (1985). Formation and Success of New Parties: A Cross-National Analysis. *International Political Science Review*, 6(4):501–523.

- Hobolt, S. B. and de Vries, C. E. (2015). Issue Entrepreneurship and Multiparty Competition. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(9):1159–1185.
- Holland, P. W. (1986). Statistics and Causal Inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(396):945–960.
- Imai, K. (2018a). Chapter 2: Causality. In *Quantitative Social Science: An Introduction*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Imai, K. (2018b). *Quantitative Social Science: An Introduction*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Inglehart, R. (1971). The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies. *American Political Science Review*, 65(04):991–1017.
- Ladd, J. M. and Lenz, G. S. (2009). Exploiting a Rare Communication Shift to Document the Persuasive Power of the News Media. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(2):394–410.
- Levitsky, S. and Way, L. (2002). The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism. *Journal of Democracy*, 13(2):51–65.
- Levitsky, S. and Ziblatt, D. (2018). Chapter 1: Fateful Alliances. In *How Democracies Die*. Crown, New York.
- Linz, J. J. and Stepan, A. (1978). *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes*. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Luebbert, G. M. (1987). Social Foundation of Political Order in Interwar Europe. *World Politics*, 39(4):449–478.
- Meguid, B. M. (2005). Competition Between Unequals: The Role of Mainstream Party Strategy in Niche Party Success. *American Political Science Review*, 99(3):347–359.
- Mudde, C. (2013). The 2012 Stein Rokkan Lecture Three decades of populist radical right parties in Western Europe: So what? *European Journal of Political Research*, 52(1):1–19.
- Paluck, E. L., Shepherd, H., and Aronow, P. M. (2016). Changing Climates of Conflict: A social Network Experiment in 56 schools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(3):566–571.
- Plümper, T. (2012). *Effizient Schreiben: Leitfaden zum Verfassen von Qualifizierungsarbeiten und Wissenschaftlichen Texten*. Oldenbourg, München.
- Tavits, M. (2008). Party Systems in the Making: The Emergence and Success of New Parties in New Democracies. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38(1):113–133.
- Vliegenthart, R., Boomgaarden, H. G., and van Spanje, J. (2012). Anti-Immigrant Party Support and Media Visibility: A Cross-Party, Over-Time Perspective. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 22(3):315–358.
- Wagner, M. and Meyer, T. M. (2017). The Radical Right as Niche Parties? The Ideological Landscape of Party Systems in Western Europe, 1980-2014. *Political Studies*, 65(1):84–107.
- Ziblatt, D. (2017a). Chapter 1 & Chapter 2. In *Conservative Parties and the Birth of Democracy*, pages 1–53. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ziblatt, D. (2017b). Chapter 8. In *Conservative Parties and the Birth of Democracy*, pages 259–296. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Zinsser, W. (2001). *On Writing Well*. Quill.
- Zulianello, M. (2014). Analyzing party competition through the comparative manifesto data: some theoretical and methodological considerations. *Quality & Quantity*, 48(3):1723–1737.