

POLIMETRICS

Syllabus for ATTENDING STUDENTS

(40h – 6 CFU)

Università degli Studi di Milano – Department of Social and Political Sciences

Academic Year 2021-2022

Prof. Andrea Ceron
andrea.ceron@unimi.it

Summary

The course aims to teach the basics of party competition, shedding light on different theories and strategies (ranging from the spatial theory of voting, to theories on issue competition, valence politics, populism, negative campaigning, and so on). In addition, students will learn the main techniques (manual or automated) that allow to measure political outcomes, with a focus on estimating the positions of political actors. With respect to this, peculiar attention will be devoted to social media as a source of data.

Structure of the course (attending students only)

The course is divided into four parts: 1) a theoretical section, in which themes and papers (related to 3 sub-categories) will be presented (they will constitute the object of the midterm exam); 2) the midterm oral exam; 3) a hands-on section, to be done using the statistical software R (<https://cran.r-project.org/>); 4) a collective brainstorming session related to the research projects (that have to be developed for the final evaluation).

The lectures will take place in a (real!) blended mode, both in class and on MS Teams (code to get access: **39ckzcs**). The lectures will be recorded and will be available on MS Teams even after the end of the course. You can attend either way. There are no specific advantages/disadvantages if you opt for one or the other mode.

The course has been thought to be intensive, in a “more effort = more learning” framework, with windows of opportunity for active participation (live and asynchronous). Students should follow and study day-by-day in order to get ready for the different steps of the evaluation (see below for further details). In light of this, students need to make a clear-cut choice around whether to take the exam as attending or non-attending students.

Enrollment

Due to the structure of the classes, students willing to take the exam as “attending students” **must enroll** to the course **through the SIFA** platform. Enrollment will be available **from 4 to 11 April** (included). This is crucial to schedule the oral exam and the brainstorming sessions (as well as to define the groups for the final research paper). Students that do not enroll in due time will be considered as non-attending students (no exceptions can be made).

Evaluation

The final mark will combine together four different types of evaluation, weighted as follows:

- **10%** class attendance and **active participation** on the **online Ariel forum**
- **40%** midterm **oral exam**
- **10%** research design “**brainstorming**”
- **40%** **research note/paper** (in **group**)

Forum

An online forum, available on ARIEL, has been created. The purpose of the Forum is twofold.

On the one hand, the Forum is a space in which students can elaborate on the contents of the lectures and on the readings, to make connections between different topics, to report their own ideas and to propose original and innovative viewpoints (about the themes of POLiMETRICS), also with an eye to real-world political events.

On the other hand, the Forum allows students to interact with each other and to provide mutual help. Students are encouraged to ask questions to their colleagues and anyone can answer.

The active online participation can be rewarded in the final evaluation.

Oral exam and readings

An oral exam is scheduled at the end of the theoretical section. Students will be divided in two slots (Monday & Tuesday). There is just one week between the last theoretical lecture and the exam, so I warmly suggest to study day-by-day.

The exam will be focused on the contents of all the required readings (all of them are available on ARIEL).

Following the classes day-by-day and reading the papers on time will be very helpful also to promptly define an idea for writing the research paper.

The “additional readings” are not compulsory, but they can be useful to get inspired in planning and writing the research paper (note that all these additional readings are compulsory for non-attending students). The “suggested readings” and the “companions” are not compulsory, but they can be useful to follow the “hands-on section” of the course.

Research note/Research paper

Students will be divided into small groups (approximately 3-5 students each, depending on the final class size) to write a brief analytical research paper (say, a research note: 2000-4000 words) using the methods learnt during the course, answering their own research question(s) by estimating the positions of political actors.

The first sketch of the research project has to be presented at the end of the course (see the next section for details). The final deadline for sending the whole paper is set on Wednesday 20/7, 23.59 (approximately one month after the end of the classes). The final paper must be sent to my email address (andrea.ceron@unimi.it) together with the dataset and the replication code. To register their final mark, students must enroll to the exam scheduled on Tuesday 20/7. Notice that the score of the research paper will be the same for each group member, unless the members agree on (and release) a different evaluation of their individual contributions.

Research design brainstorming

A) The last two days of the course will be devoted to host a “Research design brainstorming” (in two sessions). Each group will present, to the whole class, a draft of its intended project in a slide-show format. This draft should outline the research design, present the general idea and the research question(s), as well as the data (specifying where/how to get access to them) and the method(s) that the group is planning to use. The presentation should last approximately 20’ though the exact length will depend on the number of groups.

The slides and the presentation are not subjected to evaluation (no mark!).

B) All the other students, jointly with the professor, are required to give suggestions on how to improve the research design, request clarifications, discuss about other potential directions of the project and about further details that the project must consider.

This live participation, in a brainstorming mode, is subjected to evaluation!

C) Through these brainstorming sessions, students will learn how to define, present and defend a research project and how to reflect on, and deal with, criticism; they will also learn how to review and critically comment on someone else’s research; finally, they will experience that (political) science is a collective effort (check back your notes from the 1st year Political Science course). Taking into account the comments received by the audience, in the final research paper, is not mandatory. However, carefully pondering them and implementing those that seem more promising for improving the project might lead to bonus points for the group.

Course Schedule

1) Theoretical section

1A) Positions

Day 1: Course presentation & introduction

Monday 4/4, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Syllabus

Benoit, K., & Laver, M. (2006). Chapter 3: Empirical policy spaces. In: Benoit, K., & Laver, M. (2006). *Party Policy in Modern Democracies* (pre-print draft).

Additional readings:

Benoit, K., & Laver, M. (2006). Chapter 4: Measuring Policy Positions. In: Benoit, K., & Laver, M. (2006). *Party Policy in Modern Democracies* (pre-print draft).

Grofman, B. (2004). Downs and Two-Party Convergence. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7(1), 25-46 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104711>

Day 2: Expert surveys

Tuesday 5/4, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Bakker, R., de Vries, C., Edwards, E., Hooghe, L., Jolly, S., Marks, G., Polk, J., Rovny, J., Steenbergen, M., & Vachudova, M. A. (2015). Measuring party positions in Europe: The Chapel Hill expert survey trend file, 1999–2010. *Party Politics*, 21(1), 143–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068812462931>

Polk, J., Rovny, J., Bakker, R., Edwards, E., Hooghe, L., Jolly, S., Koedam, J., Kostelka, F., Marks, G., Schumacher, G., Steenbergen, M., Vachudova, M., & Zilovic, M. (2017). Explaining the salience of anti-elitism and reducing political corruption for political parties in Europe with the 2014 Chapel Hill Expert Survey data. *Research & Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168016686915>

Supplementary materials:

https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5975c9bfdb29d6a05c65209b/t/5fa04ec05d3c8218b7c91450/1604341440585/2019_CHES_codebook.pdf

https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5975c9bfdb29d6a05c65209b/t/5ed3029fe080e33f639e6e9a/1590887075513/CHES_UK_Qualtrics.pdf

https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5975c9bfdb29d6a05c65209b/t/603fbb4ee47d721eed0046a0/1614789457024/1999-2019_CHES_codebook.pdf

Day 3: Comparative manifesto project

Monday 11/4, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Volkens, A. (2007). Strengths and weaknesses of approaches to measuring policy positions of parties. *Electoral Studies*, 26(1), 108–120, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2006.04.003>.

Klingemann, H.-D., Volkens, A., Budge, I., Bara, J., & McDonald, M.D. (2006). Introducing the Manifesto Data: Background. In: Klingemann, H.-D., Volkens, A., Budge, I., Bara, J., & McDonald, M.D. (2006). *Mapping Policy Preferences II: Parties, Electorates and Governments in Eastern Europe and the OECD 1990-2003*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006.

Supplementary materials:

https://manifesto-project.wzb.eu/download/data/2021a/codebooks/codebook_MPDataset_MPDS2021a.pdf

Additional readings:

Merz, N., Regel, S., & Lewandowski, J. (2016). The Manifesto Corpus: A new resource for research on political parties and quantitative text analysis. *Research & Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168016643346>

Zulianello, M. (2014). Analyzing party competition through the comparative manifesto data: some theoretical and methodological considerations. *Quality and Quantity*, 48, 1723–1737. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-013-9870-0>

Klingemann, H.-D., Volkens, A., Budge, I., Bara, J., & McDonald, M.D. (2006). Chapter 4: Evaluating Validity with the Standard Left-Right Scale: Matching Measurements to Conceptual Intentions. In: Klingemann, H.-D., Volkens, A., Budge, I., Bara, J., & McDonald, M.D. (2006). *Mapping Policy Preferences II: Parties, Electorates and Governments in Eastern Europe and the OECD 1990-2003*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2006.

Day 4: Scaling methods (Wordfish & Wordscores)

Tuesday 12/4, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Ceron, A. (2015). The Politics of Fission: An Analysis of Faction Breakaways among Italian Parties (1946–2011). *British Journal of Political Science*, 45(1), 121-139. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123413000215>

Hjorth, F., Klemmensen, R., Hobolt, S., Hansen, M. E., & Kurrild-Klitgaard, P. (2015). Computers, coders, and voters: Comparing automated methods for estimating party positions. *Research & Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168015580476>

Additional readings:

Slapin, J.B., & Proksch, S.-O. (2008). A Scaling Model for Estimating Time-Series Party Positions from Texts. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52: 705-722. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2008.00338.x>

Grimmer, J., & Stewart, B.M. (2013). Text as data: The promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts. *Political Analysis*, 21(3):267–297. doi:10.1093/pan/mps028

Day 5: Ambiguity vs Clarity

Tuesday 26/4, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Rovny, J. (2012). Who emphasizes and who blurs? Party strategies in multidimensional competition. *European Union Politics*, 13(2), 269–292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116511435822>

Lo, J., Proksch, S., & Slapin, J. (2016). Ideological Clarity in Multiparty Competition: A New Measure and Test Using Election Manifestos. *British Journal of Political Science*, 46(3), 591-610. doi:10.1017/S0007123414000192

Additional readings:

Giebler, H., Lacewell, O.P., Regel, S., & Werner, A. (2018). Chapter 7: Decline or Change? Party Types and the Crisis of Representative Democracy. In: W. Merkel, S. Kneip (eds): *Democracy and Crisis. Challenges in Turbulent Times*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS

1B) Issues

Day 6: Issue competition & issue ownership

Monday 2/5, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Wagner, M., & Meyer, T.M. (2014). Which Issues do Parties Emphasise? Saliency Strategies and Party Organisation in Multiparty Systems. *West European Politics*, 37(5), 1019-1045, DOI: 10.1080/01402382.2014.911483

Additional readings:

De Sio, L., De Angelis, A., & Emanuele, V. (2018). Issue Yield and Party Strategy in Multiparty Competition. *Comparative Political Studies*, 51(9), 1208–38.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414017730082>

Day 7: Broad appeal strategy

Tuesday 3/5, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Somer-Topcu, Z. (2015). Everything to Everyone: The Electoral Consequences of the Broad-Appeal Strategy in Europe. *American Journal of Political Science*. 59, 841-854.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12165>

van Heck, S. (2018). Appealing broadly or narrowing down? The impact of government experience and party organization on the scope of parties' issue agendas. *Party Politics*. 24(4), 347–357.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068816657374>

Day 8: Niche parties & Nicheness

Monday 9/5, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Bischof, D. (2017). Towards a renewal of the niche party concept: Parties, market shares and condensed offers. *Party Politics*, 23(3), 220–235. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068815588259>

Additional readings:

Bischof, D., & Wagner, M. (2020). What Makes Parties Adapt to Voter Preferences? The Role of Party Organization, Goals and Ideology. *British Journal of Political Science*, 50(1), 391-401. doi:10.1017/S0007123417000357

Day 9: Topic models

Tuesday 10/5, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Genovese, F. (2015). Politics ex cathedra: Religious authority and the Pope in modern international relations. *Research & Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168015612808>

Ceron, A., & Greene, Z. (2019). Verba volant, scripta manent? Intra-party politics, party conferences, and issue salience in France. *Party Politics*, 25(5), 701–711. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068819836034>

Additional readings:

Lucas, C., Nielsen, R., Roberts, M., Stewart, B., Storer, A., & Tingley, D. (2015). Computer-Assisted Text Analysis for Comparative Politics. *Political Analysis*, 23(2), 254-277. doi:10.1093/pan/mpu019

1C) Other features

[valence, negativity, populism, unity, ...]

Day 10: Other rhetorical strategies

Monday 16/5, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Kosmidis, S., Hobolt, S. B., Molloy, E., & Whitefield, S. (2019). Party Competition and Emotive Rhetoric. *Comparative Political Studies*, 52(6), 811-837. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414018797942>

Rooduijn, M., & Pauwels, T. (2011). Measuring Populism: Comparing Two Methods of Content Analysis. *West European Politics* 34(6), 1272-1283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2011.616665>

Dolezal, M., Ennser-Jedenastik, L., Müller, W. C., Praprotnik, K., & Winkler, A. K. (2018). Beyond salience and position taking: How political parties communicate through their manifestos. *Party Politics*, 24(3), 240–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068816678893>

Additional readings:

Gründl, J. (2020). Populist ideas on social media: A dictionary-based measurement of populist communication. *New Media & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820976970>

Harmel, R. (2018). The how's and why's of party manifestos: Some guidance for a cross-national research agenda. *Party Politics*, 24(3), 229–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068816678880>

Day 11: Intra-party politics

Tuesday 17/5, 10.30-12.00

Required readings:

Ceron, A. (2017). Intra-party politics in 140 characters. *Party Politics*, 23(1), 7-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068816654325>

Schumacher, G., Hansen, D., van der Velden, M. A. C. G., & Kunst, S. (2019). A new dataset of Dutch and Danish party congress speeches. *Research & Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168019838352>

2) Road to evaluation (I)

Day 12: Oral exam (I)

Monday 23/5, 10.30-12.00

Day 13: Oral exam (II)

Tuesday 24/5, 10.30-12.00

3) Hands-on section

[bring your laptop]

Suggested readings:

Lucas, C., Nielsen, R., Roberts, M., Stewart, B., Storer, A., & Tingley, D. (2015). Computer-Assisted Text Analysis for Comparative Politics. *Political Analysis*, 23(2), 254-277. doi:10.1093/pan/mpu019

Grimmer, J., & Stewart, B.M. (2013). Text as data: The promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts. *Political Analysis*, 21(3):267–297. doi:10.1093/pan/mps028

Companions:

Watanabe, K., & Müller, S. (2021) *Quanteda Tutorials*. <https://tutorials.quanteda.io>.

Benoit, K., Watanabe, K., Wang, H., Nulty, P., Obeng, A., Müller, S., & Matsuo, A. (2018) quanteda: An R package for the quantitative analysis of textual data. *Journal of Open Source Software* 3(30), 774. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00774>. [OPEN ACCESS]

Day 14: Introduction to R

Monday 30/5, 10.30-12.00

+ Additional contents (that will be made available on ARIEL)

14b) Data collection: Manifesto, CHES, political texts

14c) How to write a research paper & hints for your research note

Break: No classes

Tuesday 31/5

Day 15: Introduction to Text Analysis

Monday 6/6, 10.30-12.00

Day 16: Basic Analysis, Dictionaries & Sentiment analysis

Tuesday 7/6, 10.30-12.00

Day 17: Scaling methods

Monday 13/6, 10.30-12.00

Day 18: Topic models

Tuesday 14/6, 10.30-12.00

4) Road to evaluation (II)

Day 19: Research design brainstorming (I)

Monday 20/6, 10.30-12.00

Day 20: Research design brainstorming (II)

Tuesday 21/6, 10.30-12.00

Mandatory deadline for sending the final research paper, dataset and replication code

Tuesday 20/7, 23.59

Remember:

To register their final mark, students must enroll to the exam scheduled on Tuesday 20/7.

Next scheduled exams (so far)

Wednesday **30/6**, 13.30, oral from remote (non-attending students only!)

Tuesday **20/7**, 9.30, oral from remote (non-attending students only!)

- attending students have to register but don't need to show up

Tuesday **14/9**, 8.30, oral from remote (non-attending students only!)

Additional dates TBD