

Course manual

The Social Bases of Politics

2017-2018



Contents

General information	3
Course description.....	3
Learning objectives.....	3
Staff.....	4
Assessment	6
Attendance	7
Course overview	8
Weekly programme	9
Readings.....	17
Appendix A: Evaluation criteria individual paper assignment	20

General information

Course description

This first course in the Politics & Society specialisation familiarises students with the sociological study of politics, focusing on social patterns in public attitudes and political behaviour. How can we understand social differences in support for various value orientations, ideologies, and political parties? And how can we explain social inequalities in political trust and political involvement, both in the formal political domain and in non-institutional politics? There has been a marked decline in Western societies from the 1960s onwards in encompassing political ideologies and the political salience of classic group identities such as classes and religions – a process often referred to as individualisation. This does, however, not imply that value conflicts, voting behaviour, and participation in social movements are no longer socially shaped. On the contrary: old social fault lines have given way to new ones. Systematically combining theories from both political sociology and political science with findings from empirical research, this course addresses the contemporary political relevance of these social cleavages. What are their present-day implications? Which groups currently clash over which issues, why is this the case, and how is this related to support for political parties? How can we interpret social differences in anti-immigrant sentiments, political trust, voter turnout, and political protest? And how are these political attitudes and behaviours influenced by social networks?

Note: basic knowledge of quantitative social-scientific methods is needed in order to understand a substantial part of the mandatory literature.

Learning objectives

After successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

- Discuss the political salience of old and new social divisions and cleavages;
- Discuss what public opinion is and reflect on ways of measuring it;
- Explain social-scientific theories on social differences in citizens' political attitudes and behaviours;
- Apply social-scientific theories on social differences in citizens' political attitudes and behaviours to contemporary social phenomena;
- Critically reflect on social-scientific theories on social differences in citizens' political attitudes and behaviours.

Staff

Course coordinators

Dr. Willem de Koster is Associate Professor of Sociology. Methodologically, his research ranges from in-depth qualitative case studies to analyses of large-scale internationally comparative survey data and survey experiments. Substantively, his research program consists of three branches.

First, he focuses on value polarisation in western countries, scrutinising for instance public conflicts on issues of migration and integration, social order, crime and punishment, gender, and sexuality. Questions of interest are: how did opinions on these issues change over the years, which groups are pitted against each other, and what are the causes and consequences of these social conflicts, for instance when it comes to societal discontents and voting behaviour?

Second, Willem concentrates on the way in which characteristics of cities and neighbourhoods impact citizens' fear, discontents, health, value orientations and voting behaviour. In exploring these issues, he pays ample attention to the way in which contextual and individual-level factors interact.

Third, he analyses how cultural predispositions shape the way in which new information underlies a change in attitudes and behaviours, addressing a wide range of issues, from food and water intake to public opinion on suspended sentences.

In addition to his research and teaching, Willem serves on the editorial boards of two peer-reviewed journals: *Sociologie* and *Sociologos*.

Email: dekoster@fsw.eur.nl | | Website: www.willemdekoster.nl

Dr. Eefje Steenvoorden is Assistant Professor of Political Sociology. She graduated in Sociology at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (2008) and worked as a researcher at The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP) from 2008-2011 on public opinion. From 2011-2015, she conducted her PhD research at the University of Amsterdam into societal pessimism, for which she also spend time at UC Berkeley and American University in the USA.

Her research focuses on public opinion, especially social pessimism, political trust, national identification, and political behaviour, such as voting behaviour and participation. Questions that guide her research are: what is the current discontent about politics and society at large about, what causes can we find for these attitudes, and which social cleavages underlie such attitudes? Also, why do people engage in politics, and in what way? For instance, why do they vote for certain parties, and why do they participate in demonstrations?

Email: steenvoorden@fsw.eur.nl

For questions about this course, please contact Willem de Koster.

Tutor

Babs Broekema, MSc. is PhD candidate in the Department of Public Administration and Sociology. Previously, she studied Political Science and International Relations at Leiden University and Public Administration at Erasmus University. She graduated cum laude with a thesis investigating how the municipality of Rotterdam could increase efficiency and effectivity in assigning aid for the most vulnerable citizens by researching the possibility to categorize them at the intake. Currently, her research focuses on the impact of devolution of social policies on local politics, local governance and citizens' views of local governance in terms of trust and voting behaviour. Methodologically, her research ranges from qualitative to quantitative analyses, and from national to international case studies.

Email: broekema@fsw.eur.nl

Assessment

Your final grade will be determined by a closed-book examination (70%), and an individual paper assignment (30%).

The **closed-book exam** (see SocWeb for date, time and location) will consist of open essay questions. These questions will not only test your knowledge of the literature and the information covered in the lectures, but will also test your ability to apply this knowledge to contemporary social phenomena and your ability to critically reflect on different theories on political attitudes and political behaviour. The skills required to succeed in the examination are listed in this course's learning objectives.

For the **individual paper assignment** we ask you to write a scientific essay between 1,350 and 1,650 words (references are required but not included in the word count), in which you systematically discuss a puzzling social phenomenon of your own choosing using the theories of this course. You should minimally use two theories discussed in this course and apply them to your case. You need to 1) introduce your case, i.e. the social phenomenon you want to discuss; 2a) explain the two theories you want to use 2b) discuss how those two theories explain your case. Then, you include a third theory, which is at odds with your case: you 3a) explain this third theory and 3b) discuss how your case contradicts this theory.

Your essay will be graded based on the evaluation criteria that are provided in Appendix A.

Please notice that part 2 is most important, as follows from the distribution of points included in the Appendix.

Note that there are *three deadlines* involved in this assignment:

- 1) As a first step, you should submit you the **subject of your paper** on 8 October (before midnight) on SocWeb. You will get feedback from your tutor on whether your subject is appropriate for the assignment. You have to indicate which puzzling social phenomenon you want to study and why. This means you have to upload a document of 200-400 words containing: a description of the social phenomenon you aim to address and an indication of the theories you think are relevant.
As examples of adequate cases you can consider the ones that you analysed in Tutorial 2 on Public Opinion. Your topic should not be already discussed at length in the course, nor be very broad since you only have about 1500 words.
- 2) A second step is to submit your **draft paper**, in order to receive personal feedback from your tutor on your line of argumentation and your academic writing. Please make sure to submit a well-developed draft version, as to get optimal feedback on both aspects of your paper. You should submit your draft paper on SocWeb and also sign in on a time slot on SocWeb to discuss your outline with your tutor in an individual meeting (deadline for both: 15 October at midnight).

- 3) The **deadline** for uploading the **final version of your paper** to SocWeb is 12 November at midnight.

Please note that all deadlines indicate the *latest* moment you should submit your work, and that it is of course allowed to submit your work at a moment of your convenience prior to this deadline.

Attendance

- 1) Satisfactory participation in tutorials includes being well-prepared, i.e. having thoroughly read all readings for that week.
- 2) Prior to tutorials 1 and 8, you have to submit an assignment. If you do not properly and timely submit these assignments, you do not satisfactorily participate in the tutorial and the tutor will register you as absent.
- 3) You can be absent in **maximum 2** tutorials
- 4) If you are registered as absent from a tutorial, you are required to complete a catch-up assignment. You should summarise the key research puzzles, theories, and insights from the literature for the week in which you were absent at the tutorial. The minimum word count is 1,500.
- 5) **Catch-up assignments** can be uploaded through Mystudy on **SocWeb**, where the deadline is indicated as well.

Course overview

Week	Topic lecture	Topic tutorial	Deadlines
1	Introduction	Dissecting empirical research articles	Thursday 7 September (midnight): assignment (on SocWeb)
2	Public opinion	Analysing special cases of public opinion	
3	Political trust	Practicing exam questions	
4	Social divisions and social cleavages	Theorising on structural differences	
5	Value conflicts	Conference presentations	Sunday 8 October (midnight): subject of paper (on SocWeb)
6	Institutional political participation	Defending 'your' article	
7	Non-institutional political participation	Optional individual feedback on paper outline	Sunday 15 October (midnight): sign up for personal feedback + submit draft paper (on SocWeb)
8	Social influences on political attitudes and behaviours	Developing exam questions	Wednesday 25 October (midnight): one exam question (on SocWeb)
9	Exam		See information on SocWeb
10	Deadline for final paper		12 November (midnight): final paper assignment (on SocWeb)

Weekly programme

Week 1

Preparation: thoroughly read all of this week's literature + upload an assignment

Tutorial assignment deadline: 7 September (midnight) [instructions provided below]

Lecture: Introduction

This first lecture serves as a stepping stone to both this specific course and the remainder of the master programme *Politics & Society*. We will discuss the similarities and differences between political sociology and political science and reflect on how these disciplines can be helpful in providing an understanding of the interrelationship between politics and society. Then, we will discuss the general approach that is advanced in this master programme. We will pay attention to the relationship between academic social science and society, and we will reflect on key analytical distinctions (such as between empirical generalisations and middle-range theories, and between statistical associations and social mechanisms) that will prove indispensable throughout the programme.

Tutorial: Dissecting empirical research articles

This week we practice how to thoroughly read and interpret social-scientific research articles. In contrast to most other tutorials (except week 8), you have to make a tutorial assignment and upload it 7 September. We focus on distinguishing between the theoretical and empirical level, clarifying theoretical arguments and assessing which (discriminatory) hypotheses are deduced from different theories. Furthermore, you will practice with drafting conceptual models of theoretical arguments, and develop alternative hypotheses.

Tutorial assignment

The assignment consists of two parts. Make sure to include both parts into one document, clearly indicating which answers belong to which part.

Part A:

Before you start, thoroughly read the following article:

Van Ingen, E., & van der Meer, T. (2016). Schools or pools of democracy? A longitudinal test of the relation between civic participation and political socialization. *Political Behavior*, 38(1), 83-103.

Then answer the following questions, and indicate for each question whether it addresses the theoretical or the empirical level, or both:

- a. Which statistical relationship, which has been demonstrated by dozens of studies, is the focus of this article?
- b. If this relationship has been demonstrated numerous times, why do the authors devote their study to it?
- c. What are, according to the authors, the two main theoretical interpretations of this relationship? Make sure to explain both theories in your own words.
- d. Explain for each of the two theories discussed above how these inspire testable hypotheses.
- e. Which research findings are produced by the authors and how do they interpret these with regard to the tenability of the two theories discussed above?
- f. Formulate at least one additional hypothesis (that is, a hypothesis not explicitly formulated and tested by the authors) that could be deduced from the schools of democracy theory, and reflect on the question whether it does or does not also follow from the second theory.

Part B:

Before you start, thoroughly read the following article:

Van der Brug, W. (2003). How the LPF fuelled discontent: Empirical tests of explanations of LPF support. *Acta Politica* 38(1), 89-106.

Then answer the following questions, and indicate for each question whether it addresses the theoretical or the empirical level, or both:

- a. What political sociological phenomenon does the article aim to explain?
- b. Which three theoretical models are tested, what is the logic of these models, and to what extent have these models been successful in previous research?
- c. The author did not formulate hypotheses. Formulate at least one hypothesis for each theoretical model. Reflect on whether or not these are discriminatory hypotheses.
- d. Which indicators are used by the author in his analyses? Draw a conceptual model of the analyses that are performed in the first part of the article's results section (i.e., the regression part (pp.7-9) and not the second part which uses structural equation modelling).
- e. What are the results of the regression analyses and what conclusions does the author reach on the tenability of the three models of voting for anti-immigrant parties? Draw a conceptual map of the effective results.
- f. What are the results of the structural equation model, which investigates the causality of political cynicism and political efficacy in relationship with voting for the LPF?
- g. Formulate at least one additional hypothesis (that is, a hypothesis not explicitly formulated and tested by the author) that could be deduced from one of the three theoretical models of voting for anti-immigrant parties and reflect on the question of whether it does or does not also follow from the other two models.

Week 2

Preparation: thoroughly read all of this week's literature

Assignment deadlines: none

Lecture: Public opinion

In this course, the attitudes of groups of citizens are often the central focus. However, before studying such attitudes substantively, you need to know the basics of measuring such attitudes. Therefore, this lecture pays attention to the ways survey research yields information about the attitudes we are interested in, and discusses what pitfalls and reservations need to be taken into account. For example, the sample that is drawn, the way in which questions are asked, and the way people tend to answer questions.

Tutorial: Analysing special cases of public opinion

This week we want you to discuss two cases in public opinion and use the assigned literature and the information presented in the lecture to develop understanding of these two phenomena. Your tutor will hand you the cases in the tutorial.

Week 3

Preparation: thoroughly read all of this week's literature

Assignment deadlines: none

Lecture: Political trust

One important concept that is object of political-sociological research is political trust. The lecture of today pays attention to the meaning and measurement of and the development in political trust. There are different ways to conceptualise political trust, which root in different theoretical perspectives and result in different measurements and outcomes. The lecture will introduce students to these different perspectives and will discuss their similarities and differences. It also addresses the debate in the literature on whether there is such a thing as a decline in political trust in recent decades. And if there is a decline, whether that means that there is a crisis of democracy, or instead that such a decline is a sign of a critical but engaged citizenry.

Tutorial: Practicing exam questions

To give you an idea of the type of questions you can expect in the closed-book exam, and to provide you with an opportunity to practise answering such questions, you will practise with two examples of exam questions. The tutor will present these questions during the tutorial and you will formulate the answers only then. Therefore, the best preparation for this tutorial is to study the readings of this week in the way you would prepare for an actual written exam.

While answering exam questions (both during the tutorial and the actual exam), keep the following guidelines in mind:

- Do not include everything you know about the subject in your answer: focus on answering the specific question that is asked.
- Make sure to answer each question by means of an analytical and coherent argument. A list of key words or bullet points is not a valid answer.
- Do not leave any analytical steps out or implicit within your answer.

Week 4

Preparation: thoroughly read all of this week's literature

Assignment deadlines: none

Lecture: Social divisions and social cleavages

A major premise of analyses of the social bases of politics is that political attitudes and behaviours are not simply personal, individual characteristics. Instead, they have social roots. Different social groups hold different political views, which may inspire a sense of collective identity, social organisations and collective political actions. In this week's lecture, we will discuss which social divisions and cleavages can be distinguished and we will reflect on their contemporary relevance. This is especially relevant because various influential social theorists hold that contemporary western countries are highly individualised, suggesting that social divisions and cleavages have become irrelevant for understanding politics and society.

Tutorial: Theorising on structural differences

Sociological theorising is something that is not only for celebrated scholars and intellectuals. Instead, students often have new, original ways of thinking about social phenomena. And above all, you need to practice it in order to become good at it. That is what we do today. In this tutorial we practice the way of thinking and theorising discussed in the course's introductory lecture, by theorising yourself about the links between structural differences and concrete political attitudes. The tutor will assign each group a specific attitude during the tutorial.

To give you an indication, you will theorise on a specific attitude by answering the following questions:

- Which structural differences could be salient for this political attitude? (Technically speaking: which x 's can you think of that underlie or cause this y).
- What are the underlying mechanisms? (Technically speaking: *how* are the x 's related to or cause y ; what kind of mediation takes place?). Note that it is likely that multiple mechanisms are involved for each structural difference.
- Capture these mechanisms in a conceptual model.
- Are the different structural differences involved cross-cutting or reinforcing?
- How would you empirically test whether your ideas are right? Make sure to pay attention to:
 - o Specific hypotheses to be tested
 - o Confounders
 - o Moderators

Week 5

Preparation: thoroughly read all of this week's literature + upload an assignment

Paper assignment deadline: 9 October (midnight) [for instructions, see above in this manual, under "Assessment"]

Bring: a laptop with PowerPoint installed

Lecture: Value conflicts

Crucial for insight into the social bases of politics is that all western countries are characterised by value conflicts between social groups. In this week's lecture, we will discuss which types of value conflicts can be distinguished, and which social groups clash over which political values. We will pay in-depth attention to a particularly salient value conflict in contemporary western societies: a clash between the less and the more educated over issues of cultural diversity and social order. The fact that there is an outspoken educational gap here is well-documented, but how can this be understood? We will critically review various influential theories that could account for this well-known empirical relationship.

Tutorial: Conference presentations

Presenting an article in a brief amount of time is central to academic conferences. Moreover, in many work environments you have to be able to concisely make your point, summarising

complex and comprehensive information to an audience which has only little time to listen to you. In this tutorial, you will practice this.

In four groups, you will prepare a conference presentation. For the presentation, you summarise the central elements of one of the assigned readings of this week and briefly present these to the group. This exercise will provide insight into this week's readings for all students, but also provides opportunity to practice both addressing the core elements of a research article and presenting complex information to a group in a very small time slot. The tutor will time all presentations, to make sure you stay within the allocated time.

The central elements that students must include in their presentation are the following:

- What is the motivation for the article? 1) Which social phenomenon, social problem or social puzzle do the authors address, 2) what is the central research question relating to this, 3) and why is this question scholarly relevant?
- Which theories do the authors use? Make sure that you not only mention the 'names' of the theories involved: also briefly explain it.
- What are the key findings presented in the article?
- What are the scholarly implications of the article?

Week 6

Preparation: thoroughly read all of this week's literature

Assignment deadlines: none

Bring: a laptop with PowerPoint installed

Lecture: Institutional political participation

One of the reasons why we study attitudes in political sociology, is that we assume those attitudes to result in particular behaviour. This week, the lecture pays attention to one category of political behaviour, namely institutional political participation. We will discuss what types of behaviour that includes, and what theories explain such behaviour. Furthermore, we will reflect on the social divisions related to institutional political participation. For example, why do some people vote, and others do not? Why do some people vote for left-wing parties, and others for right-wing ones?

Tutorial: Defending 'your' article

This week's tutorial is a follow up on Tutorial 5. Again, you will present an article with a group of students, but today the focus is on providing constructive-critical feedback to the presentations of your fellow students and responding to such feedback on 'your' article. You will concisely present one of the assigned readings, after which another group will provide

feedback. Then, in contrast to week 4, you will have to defend your article and the choices that have been made. This format is widely used in the academic ceremonies, in which for instance master or PhD theses are defended. But giving critical yet constructive criticism, and properly reacting to such criticism, is a skill that is equally important in many other professional environments.

For the critical yet constructive reflection on an article presented by one of your fellow students, each group should consider the following questions:

- What elements could use improvement? (What are the limitations of the study beyond those mentioned by the authors themselves)? For instance: theoretical argumentation, formulation of hypotheses, operationalisation (construct validity), type of analyses, interpretation of results (and of non-effects), external validity of the article.
- What are the broader implications of the article? What does it mean for theories on this and other social phenomena, which new questions does it raise that could be investigated in future research?

Week 7

Preparation: thoroughly read all of this week's literature + upload an assignment

Paper assignment deadlines: 15 October (midnight) [instructions provided below]

Lecture: Non-institutional political participation

This week's lecture picks up on the topic of last week, and discusses other types of political participation, ones that take place outside the institutional setting. Such participation for instance involves acts like demonstrating, signing a petition, but also online participation in political movements. In these types of participation, identity and lifestyle are important factors. The lecture pays attention to different types of participation, how many people are involved in these activities, and the characteristics of the (social groups of the) participants.

Tutorial: Optional individual feedback on draft paper

In this week, we do not have a tutorial, but instead an opportunity to individually discuss your draft paper with your tutor. This can provide you with feedback on both your argumentation and your academic writing. Therefore we strongly recommend you to use this opportunity. If you would like to make an appointment, you have to:

- 1) sign in for a time slot (on SocWeb, 15 October, midnight)
- 2) submit your draft paper (on SocWeb, 15 October, midnight)

Week 8

Preparation: thoroughly read all of this week's literature + upload an assignment

Tutorial assignment deadline: 25 October (midnight) [instructions provided below]

Bring: a laptop with PowerPoint installed

Lecture: Social influences on political attitudes and behaviours

For a proper understanding of the social bases of politics, an important insight is that people's social environments matter for their political attitudes and behaviours. People's political beliefs and actions are partly shaped by social influences. But how exactly? In this week's lecture, we will discuss three ways in which this could work. Next to the role of socially transmitted information, we will pay attention to theories addressing the importance of responding to social pressure and the role of internalising beliefs and modes of action in processes of socialisation.

Tutorial: Developing exam questions

In this tutorial, you will discuss exam questions together. To this end, everyone needs to **formulate one exam question** in advance, and submit it on SocWeb (before October 25, midnight).

In the tutorial, you will discuss and improve the exam questions that were submitted, and you will try to answer a subset of them. If you develop good questions, we might use one of these in the actual exam.

Keep the following in mind:

- Your exam question should be 'open' (that is, invite essay-like answers). Multiple choice questions are not allowed.
- It should follow an 'a,b,c format' (that is, a question with sub questions).
- It should relate or oppose two elements to each other, for instance two theories, or two phenomena (that seem contradictory). Preferably, these two elements come from different lectures and/or tutorials.
- Besides testing knowledge, at least one of the sub questions should ask to apply, or critically reflect on, one or more theories discussed in the course.
- If you look for examples, consider the exam questions you answered in tutorial 5.
- In answering the questions, take the guidelines mentioned in the overview of week 3 into account.

Readings

We do not use a single textbook that covers all the basics. Instead, we aim for in-depth insights and relating social-scientific theories to empirical research by drawing on various research articles and book chapters. The articles and chapters that you will need to read each week are listed here below.

Week 1

- Burawoy, M. (2005). For public sociology. *American sociological review*, 70(1), 4-28. (**ONLY p. 9-11**)
- Hedstrom, P., & Swedberg, R. (1998). Social mechanisms: An introductory essay. In Hedström, P. & Swedberg R. (1998). *Social mechanisms: an analytical approach to social theory* (pp. 1–25). Cambridge University Press.
- Merton, R. K. (1949). On sociological theories of the middle range. In Calhoun, et al. (eds.) (2007). *Classical sociological theory* (pp. 448–459). John Wiley & Sons.
- Sartori, G. (1969). From the sociology of politics to political sociology. *Government and Opposition*, 4(2): 195–214
- Van der Brug, W. (2003). How the LPF fuelled discontent: Empirical tests of explanations of LPF support. *Acta Politica*, 38(1), 89-106.
- Van Ingen, E., & van der Meer, T. (2016). Schools or pools of democracy? A longitudinal test of the relation between civic participation and political socialization. *Political Behavior*, 38(1), 83-103.

Week 2

- Bolsen, T., Druckman, J. N., & Cook, F. L. (2014). The influence of partisan motivated reasoning on public opinion. *Political Behavior*, 36(2), 235-262.
- De Koster, W., Achterberg, P., & Ivanova, N. (2014). Reconsidering the impact of informational provision on opinions of suspended sentences in the Netherlands. The importance of cultural frames. *Crime & Delinquency*, doi 0011128714551405.
- Laurison, D. (2015). The willingness to state an opinion: Inequality, don't know responses, and political participation. *Sociological Forum*, 30(4), 925-948.
- Lupia, A. (1994). Shortcuts versus encyclopedias: Information and voting behavior in California insurance reform elections. *American Political Science Review*, 88(1): 63-76.
- Van der Meer, T. W., Hakhverdian, A., & Aldering, L. (2016). Off the fence, onto the bandwagon? A large-scale survey experiment on effect of real-life poll outcomes on subsequent vote intentions. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 28(1), 46-72.

Week 3

- Easton, D. (1975). A re-assessment of the concept of political support. *British Journal of Political Science*, 5(4), 435-457.

- Hakhverdian, A., & Mayne, Q. (2012). Institutional trust, education, and corruption: A micro-macro interactive approach. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(3), 739-750.
- Hooghe, M., Dassonneville, R., & Marien, S. (2015). The impact of education on the development of political trust: Results from a five-year panel study among late adolescents and young adults in Belgium. *Political Studies*, 63(1), 123-141.
- Mishler, W., & Rose, R. (2001). What are the origins of political trust? Testing institutional and cultural theories in post-communist societies. *Comparative Political Studies*, 34(1), 30-62.
- Van Elsas, E. (2015). Political trust as a rational attitude: A comparison of the nature of political trust across different levels of education. *Political Studies*, 63(5), 1158-1178.

Week 4

- Best, R. E. (2011). The declining electoral relevance of traditional cleavage groups. *European Political Science Review*, 3(2), 279-300.
- De Beer, P. (2007). How individualized are the Dutch? *Current sociology*, 55(3), 389-413.
- Freire, A. (2006). Bringing social identities back in: The social anchors of left-right orientation in Western Europe. *International Political Science Review*, 27(4), 359-378.
- Spruyt, B., & Kuppens, T. (2015). Education-based thinking and acting? Towards an identity perspective for studying education differentials in public opinion and political participation. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, 2(3-4), 291-312.

Week 5:

- De Koster, W., & Van der Waal, J. (2007). Cultural value orientations and Christian religiosity: On moral traditionalism, authoritarianism, and their implications for voting behavior. *International Political Science Review*, 28(4), 451-467.
- Frølund Thomsen, J. P. (2012). How does intergroup contact generate ethnic tolerance? The contact hypothesis in a Scandinavian context. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 35(2), 159-178.
- Hjerm, M., & Nagayoshi, K. (2011). The composition of the minority population as a threat: Can real economic and cultural threats explain xenophobia? *International Sociology*, 26(6), 815-843.
- Van der Waal, J., & De Koster, W. (2015). Why do the less educated oppose trade openness? A test of three explanations in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, 2(3-4), 313-344.

Week 6

- Achterberg, P., & Houtman, D. (2006). Why do so many people vote 'unnaturally'? A cultural explanation for voting behaviour. *European Journal of Political Research*, 45(1), 75-92.
- Bovens, M., & Wille, A. (2010). The education gap in participation and its political consequences. *Acta Politica*, 45(4), 393-422.

- Oesch, D. (2008). Explaining workers' support for right-wing populist parties in Western Europe: Evidence from Austria, Belgium, France, Norway, and Switzerland. *International Political Science Review*, 29(3), 349-373.
- Stolle, D., & Hooghe, M. (2011). Shifting inequalities: Patterns of exclusion and inclusion in emerging forms of political participation. *European Societies*, 13(1), 119-142.

Week 7

- Kemmers, R. (2017). Channelling discontent? Non-voters, populist party voters, and their meaningful political agency. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, Online first: DOI:10.1080/23254823.2017.1339203
- Klandermans, B. (2002). How group identification helps to overcome the dilemma of collective action. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(5), 887-900.
- Oser, J., Hooghe, M., & Marien, S. (2013). Is online participation distinct from offline participation? A latent class analysis of participation types and their stratification. *Political Research Quarterly*, 66(1), 91-101.
- Van der Meer, T., Te Grotenhuis, M. & Scheepers, P. L. (2009). Three types of voluntary associations in comparative perspective: The importance of studying associational involvement through a typology of associations in 21 European countries. *Journal of Civil Society*, 5(3), 227-241.

Week 8

- Dinas, E. (2014). Why does the apple fall far from the tree? How early political socialization prompts parent-child dissimilarity. *British Journal of Political Science*, 44(4), 827-852.
- Gerber, A. S., Green, D. P., & Larimer, C. W. (2008). Social pressure and voter turnout: Evidence from a large-scale field experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 102(1), 33-48.
- Mutz, D. C. (2002). Cross-cutting social networks: Testing democratic theory in practice. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1), 111-126.
- Sinclair, B. (2012). 'Introduction: Social Pressure and Participatory Democracy' In Sinclair, B. *The social citizen: Peer networks and political behavior* (pp. 1-19). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Appendix A: Evaluation criteria individual paper assignment

Evaluation criteria	Points
1) Introduction of empirical case:	15
A clear description of the puzzling social phenomenon of your choosing	
2) Theories explaining your case:	50
2a) A clear and systematic discussion of at least two theories that feature in this course: what is the general idea of each theory, which mechanisms are theorized and how do these work exactly?	
2b) An discussion of how these theories explain your case	
3) Theory rejected by your case	25
3a) A clear and systematic discussion of at least one theory that features in this course: what is the general idea of this theory, which mechanism(s) is/are theorized and how do(es) these/this work exactly?	
3b) A discussion of why your case contradicts this theory	
General:	10
Academic style of writing	
Total	100

Formal requirements

Adequate spelling, grammar, and syntax

Adequate use of references in APA style (both throughout the text and in the reference list)

Consistent formatting (font, font size, paragraphing, page numbers)

Complete overall structure (which should include: Title page including name, student ID, date, and word count; main text; reference list)

Word count (excluding references) between 1,350 and 1,650

If your paper does not meet these formal requirements, it might not be graded or points might be deducted from your grade

