

Lobbying and Political Advocacy:
Representing Societal Interests in Times of Turbulence

10th ECPR Summer School on Interest Group Politics

4 – 12 of July 2019

Venue: Leiden University – Campus The Hague

Address: Wijnhaven - Turfmarkt 99, 2511 DP The Hauge, The Netherlands

Contact: Adrià Albareda: a.albareda@fgga.leidenuniv.nl | +31.610.42.71.74.



**Universiteit
Leiden**
The Netherlands



UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM



**University
of Antwerp**

Summer School Program

Thursday 4th of July.....3

Friday 5th of July3

Saturday 6th of July.....6

Monday 8th of July.....9

Tuesday 9th of July11

Wednesday 10th of July12

Thursday 11th of July.....13

Friday 12th of July15

Thursday 4th of July

18.00 – 20.00: Welcome reception

- Address: Wijnhaven - Turfmarkt 99, 2511 DP The Hauge, room 4.78

Friday 5th of July

9.00 – 12.00: Influence production process: Caelesta Braun & Bert Fraussen

The first part of the session will address the influence production process and more specifically the different steps that interest groups undertake to achieve their goals. In addition, in this first part we will discuss the 'demand' side of the interest group – public official relationship.

The second part of the session focuses on (internal) agenda setting/issue prioritization of interest groups. More specifically, we will discuss how groups need (and try) to balance internal/organizational and external/political challenges.

Mandatory readings first part

- Lowery, D. and Virginia Gray. 2004. A Neopluralist Perspective on Research on Organized Interests, *Political Research Quarterly*, 57(1): 163-175
- Braun, C. (2012), 'The Captive or the Broker? Explaining public agency-interest group interactions', *Governance. An international journal of policy administration and institutions*, volume 25 (2): 291-314; <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2012.01567.x>

Mandatory readings second part

- Strolovitch, D. Z. (2006). Do Interest Groups Represent the Disadvantaged? Advocacy at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender. *Journal of Politics*, 68(4), 894-910.

- Halpin, D. R., Fraussen, B., & Nownes, A. J. (2018). The balancing act of establishing a policy agenda: Conceptualizing and measuring drivers of issue prioritization within interest groups. *Governance*, 31(2), 215-237.

13.30 – 16.30: Interest group mobilization: Marcel Hanegraaff

Why do interest groups mobilize globally? What are the most common strategies interest groups employ? Are interest groups influential at the transnational level? This lecture will try to answer some of these questions from different perspectives: International Relations and Comparative Politics. Depending on your point of departure we will learn that different – and often contradictory – answers are possible. Next, the lecture provides a guide how to make sense of key debates on these issues and how to frame your research in order to tap into the debate you want to contribute to.

Mandatory readings

- Berkhout, J., Hanegraaff, M., & Braun, C. (2017). Is the EU different? Comparing the diversity of national and EU-level systems of interest organisations. *West European Politics*, 40(5), 1109-1131.
- Hanegraaff, M., Beyers, J. A., & De Bruycker, I. (2016). Balancing inside and outside lobbying: The political strategies of lobbyists at global diplomatic conferences. *European Journal of Political Research*, 55(3), 568-588.
- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1999). Transnational advocacy networks in international and regional politics. *International social science journal*, 51(159), 89-101.
- Tallberg, J., Dellmuth, L. M., Agné, H., & Duit, A. (2018). NGO influence in international organizations: Information, access and exchange. *British Journal of Political Science*, 48(1), 213-238.

Optional readings

- Bexell, M., Tallberg, J., & Uhlin, A. (2010). Democracy in global governance: The promises and pitfalls of transnational actors. *Global Governance*, 81-101.

- Beyers, J., & Hanegraaff, M. (2017). Balancing friends and foes: Explaining advocacy styles at global diplomatic conferences. *The Review of International Organizations*, 12(3), 461-484.
- Hanegraaff, M. (2015). Transnational advocacy over time: business and NGO mobilization at UN climate summits. *Global Environmental Politics*, 15(1), 83-104.
- Hanegraaff, M., & Berkhout, J. (2019). More business as usual? Explaining business bias across issues and institutions in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 26(6), 843-862.
- Murdie, A. M., & Davis, D. R. (2012). Shaming and blaming: Using events data to assess the impact of human rights INGOs. *International Studies Quarterly*, 56(1), 1-16.
- Stroup, S. S., & Murdie, A. (2012). There's no place like home: Explaining international NGO advocacy. *The Review of International Organizations*, 7(4), 425-448.
- Tallberg, J., Sommerer, T., Squatrito, T., & Jönsson, C. (2014). Explaining the transnational design of international organizations. *International Organization*, 68(4), 741-774.

Saturday 6th of July

9.00 – 12.00: Political communication: Anne Binderkrantz

This session focuses on interest groups and political communication. Two main issues are pursued: First, we discuss the role of the news media as a political arena for groups. What theoretical frameworks may be applied to the study of interest group media strategies and of the media access obtained by groups? And how have recent studies enhanced our knowledge on interest groups and the media? Second, we focus on the content of group communication. How do groups frame their political communication and how does this reflect the political arena in question, the type of groups and the context of the debate?

Mandatory readings

- Binderkrantz, A. S., Chaqués-Bonafont, L., & Halpin, D. (2017). Diversity in the news? A study of interest groups in the media in the UK, Spain and Denmark. *British Journal of Political Science*.
- De Bruycker, I. (2017). Framing and advocacy: a research agenda for interest group studies. *Journal of European Public Policy*.

Optional readings

- Binderkrantz, A. S. (2019). Interest group framing in Denmark and the UK: Membership representation or public appeal? *Journal of European Public Policy*.
- De Bruycker, I., & Beyers, J. (2015). Balanced or Biased? Interest Groups and Legislative Lobbying in the European News Media. *Political Communication*, 32(3), 453-474.
- Van der Graaf, A., Otjes, S., & Rasmussen, A. (2016). Weapon of the weak? The social media landscape of interest groups. *European Journal of Communication*, 31(2), 120–135.

13.30 – 16.30: Methods section - Using text as data in interest group research: Ellis Aizenberg and Moritz Müller

The amount of text that is available to us is vast and ever growing. While text contains a lot of information, it comes with an inherent difficulty: unlike numeric or categorical data, text and natural language do usually not exist in a structured format. Instead, this type of data is often “noisy”, “messy”, and contains implicit meaning (that is, what we usually call “reading in between the lines”). The development of more powerful computers and more advanced computational methods enable us to extract valuable data from text, known as text mining. These advances are becoming more prominent in the social sciences and in interest group research. This session will provide you with an overview of what text mining is, when and how it can be applied, and where the field is currently moving towards. The method session also consists of a practical part where we will work with social media data and analyze patterns of how actors are related and which types of debates they engage in.

By using a combination of automatic text collection and analysis tools it is possible to identify large-scale interest group populations (Aizenberg & Hanegraaff, 2019). That is, it enables us to analyze communities of organized interests that are active in different contexts and over extensive time periods. Through web scraping, parliamentary hearings were collected and with the use of queries, organized interests were identified and modelled. The authors show that corporate access increases when the economy is in a downturn and when political opportunities increase. Overall, they have managed to illustrate that business interests have managed to expand their access, contributing to a fragmented interest group system.

Other methods enable us to look beyond the *meaning of individual words* towards the relationship *between multiple words* to understand what a unit of text is about. Braun and Müller (2019) combine dictionary-methods and topic models to investigate how the news media and the European Central Bank interact with each other across time.

In the last session, we will combine all the earlier puzzle pieces and move into the realm of big data by mining social media information. Using a direct access to Twitter, you will uncover networks of actors, how they relate to each other, what they talk about, and if this communication follows certain patterns. We will also use this session to discuss your questions and talk about more

advanced fields that are closely linked and often combined with text mining (e.g. machine learning, artificial intelligence, and big data).

Mandatory readings

- Aizenberg, E., & Hanegraaff, M. (2019). Is politics under increasing corporate sway? A longitudinal study on the drivers of corporate access. *West European Politics*, 1-22.
- Braun, C., & Müller, M. (2019). Leading or following the crowd? On agency responsiveness to collective issue attention. Working paper University of Leiden.

Optional readings

Using social media for content tracing

- Theocharis, Y., Barberá, P., Fazekas, Z., Popa, S. A., & Parnet, O. (2016). A bad workman blames his tweets: the consequences of citizens' uncivil Twitter use when interacting with party candidates. *Journal of communication*, 66(6), 1007-1031.

Assessing stakeholder prominence

- Fraussen, B., Graham, T., & Halpin, D. R. (2018). Assessing the prominence of interest groups in parliament: a supervised machine learning approach. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 24(4), 450-474.

Assessing policy positions and current discussions

- Klüver, H. (2009). Measuring Interest Group Influence Using Quantitative Text Analysis. *European Union Politics*, 10(4), 535–549.
- Bunea, A., & Ibenskas, R. (2015). Quantitative text analysis and the study of EU lobbying and interest groups. *European Union Politics*, 16(3), 429-455.
- Klüver, H. (2015). The promises of quantitative text analysis in interest group research: A reply to Bunea and Ibenskas. *European Union Politics*, 16(3), 456–466.

Monday 8th of July

9.00 – 12.00: The population ecology of interest representation: David Lowery & Joost Berkhout

In the morning we will discuss basic population ecology theory (density and diversity processes) (Lowery and Gray, 1995) and its implications for interest representation more broadly (bias, access, diversity, influence) (Hanegraaff and Berkhout, 2018). In the afternoon we will address the distinct merits and challenges related to different models and research design used in the study of interest groups: cross-system (Lowery et al 2008; Hanegraaff et al 2019), cross-section/guild (Lowery and Gray, 2005; Berkhout et al 2015) and time-series (Nownes, 2004).

Mandatory readings

- David Lowery and Virginia Gray. 1995. The Population Ecology of Gucci Gulch, or the Natural Regulation of Interest Group Numbers in the American States. *American Journal of Political Science*, 39 (February): 1-29.
- Hanegraaff, M. C., & Berkhout, D. J. (2018). More business as usual? Explaining business bias across issues and institutions in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 26(6), 843-862.

Optional readings

- Berkhout, J., Carroll, B. J., Braun, C., Chalmers, A. W., Destrooper, T., Lowery, D., Otjes, S. Rasmussen, A. (2015). Interest organizations across economic sectors: explaining interest group density in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(4), 462-480
- Hanegraaff, M. C., Berkhout, D. J. and van der Ploeg, J. (2019) Standing in a crowded room: Exploring the relation between interest group system density and access to policymakers, *Working Paper University of Amsterdam*
- Lowery, D., Poppelaars, C., & Berkhout, J. (2008). The European Union interest system in comparative perspective: a bridge too far? *West European Politics*, 31(6), 1231-1252

- Anthony Nownes. 2004. “The Population Ecology of Interest Group Formation.” *British Journal of Political Science*. 34 (1): 49-67.

13.30 – 16.30: Method section: Merits and challenges related to models and research designs of interest group research

In the afternoon we will address the distinct merits and challenges related to different models and research design used in the study of interest groups: cross-system (Lowery et al 2008; Hanegraaff et al 2019), cross-section/guild (Lowery and Gray, 2005; Berkhout et al 2015) and time-series (Nownes, 2004).

Mandatory readings

- David Lowery and Virginia Gray. 2005. “Sisyphus Meets the Borg: Economic Scale and the Inequalities in Interest Representation.” *Journal of Theoretical Politics*. 17 (1): 41-74.

Tuesday 9th of July

9.00 – 12.00 Internal dynamics of interest groups: William Maloney & Darren Halpin

Mandatory readings

- Halpin, D. (2006). The participatory and democratic potential and practice of interest groups: Between solidarity and representation. *Public Administration*, 84(4): 919-940.
- Maloney, W.A. (2012) The democratic contribution of professionalized representation. In J.W. van Deth and W.A. Maloney (eds.) *New Participatory Dimensions in Civil Society: Professionalization and individualized collective action*. New York: Routledge.
- Maloney, W.A. (2015) Much ado about something? Demand- and supply-side participation in a dysfunction democratic market. In T. Poguntke, S. Robteurscher, R. Schmitt-Beck, and S. Zmerli (eds.) *Citizenship and Democracy in an Era of Crisis*. New York: Routledge.
- Strolovitch, D.Z. (2006). Do Interest Groups Represent the Disadvantaged? Advocacy at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender. *The Journal of Politics*, 68(4): 894-910.

13.30 – 16.30 – Method section: Comparative case selection and case study analysis

Mandatory readings

- Frenreis, J.P. (1983). Explanation of variation and detection of covariation: The purpose and logic of comparative analysis. *Comparative Political Studies*, 16(2): 255-272.
- Gerring, J. (2009). The Case Study: What it is and What it Does. In C. Boix and S.C. Stokes (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wednesday 10th of July

9.00 – 12.00: Feedback session

Students will receive feedback on their papers from the different lecturers involved in the summer school. The exact format of the session will be presented during the summer school.

13.30 – 17.00: Conference with practitioners

Program

<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>	
13.45 – 14.00	<i>Welcoming remarks</i>	Caelesta Braun – Leiden University
14.00 – 14.45	<i>Lobbying for the public interest</i>	Shirin Musa – <i>Director of Femmes for Freedom</i> Jelle Klaas – <i>Litigation director of the NJCM & PILP</i> Lodewijk Kuiper – <i>Public affairs at Museumvereniging</i>
15.00 – 15.45	<i>Lobbying the European Union</i>	Mendeltje van Keulen – <i>Lector Changing Role of Europe, THUAS</i> Miriam Offermans – <i>Founder and owner public affairs consultancy Public@stake</i> Matti Van Hecke – <i>Public Affairs at Political Intelligence</i>
16.00 – 16.45	<i>Keynote speech</i>	David Lowery – <i>The Pennsylvania State University</i>
17.00 – 18.30	<i>Reception</i>	

Thursday 11th of July

9.00 – 12.00: Interest groups and Public Opinion: Anne Rasmussen

This session focuses on the relationship between interest groups and the public. In the first part, we look at congruence between interest groups and public opinion asking whether those types of interest groups and interest group communities subject to criticism in the academic literature and public debate are actually the ones least likely to represent the opinion of the general public. In the second part, we examine the relationship between public opinion and interest groups, first asking whether public opinion influences the lobbying success of groups before looking at the conditions under which groups manage to affect public opinion. In the third part, we consider the ability of groups to act as a transmission belt between citizens and policy-makers by stimulating opinion-policy congruence.

Mandatory readings

- Flöthe, L. and Rasmussen, A. (2019) 'Public Voices in the Heavenly Chorus? Group Type Bias and Opinion Representation', *Journal of European Public Policy* 26(6): 824-42.
- Rasmussen, Anne, Lars Mäder, Stefanie Reher (2018). 'With a Little Help From The People? The Role of Public Opinion in Advocacy Success', *Comparative Political Studies* 2(1):139-64.
- Andreas Dür (2019) 'How interest groups influence public opinion: Arguments matter more than the sources', *European Journal of Political Research* 58(2): 514-35.
- Rasmussen, A and Reher, S. (2019) 'Civil Society Engagement and Policy Representation in Europe', *Comparative Political Studies*, OnlineFirst

13.30 – 16.30: Lobbying Coalitions: Michael Heaney

This session examines the place of lobbying coalitions in the political process with attention to their motivation, formation, operation, and influence. We consider methods of studying coalitions empirically. Discussion will explore questions on this topic that remain open for scholarly research.

Mandatory readings

- Wiebke Marie Junk. 2019. "When Diversity Works: The Effects of Coalition Composition on the Success of Lobbying Coalitions." *American Journal of Political Science*, forthcoming.
- Michael T. Heaney and Philip Leifeld. 2018. "Contributions by Interest Groups to Lobbying Coalitions." *Journal of Politics* 80 (2): 494-509.

Optional readings

- Christine Mahoney. 2007. "Networking vs. allying: the decision of interest groups to join coalitions in the US and the EU." *Journal of European Public Policy* 14 (3): 366-383.
- Marie Hojnacki. 1997. "Interest Groups' Decisions to Join Alliances or Work Alone." *American Journal of Political Science* 41 (1): 61-87.

18.00 – 20.00: Farewell dinner with students at the [Culpepper](#)

Friday 12th of July

9.00 – 12.00: National Interest Groups in EU Policymaking: Andrea Pritoni & Meta Novak

The process of Europeanization had an important effect on the politics, institutions, administration, political culture and actors in Member States. It can be defined as a process in which governmental, parliamentary and nongovernmental actors change their attention and invest their resources and time to EU policymaking (Maurer et al. 2003: 54). This effect has been gradually increasing with the European Union (EU) having more competences and influence on diverse policy areas as well as with enlargement process. Lately we can thus notice also the increase of interest on Europeanization of national interest groups. Scholars predominantly focus on involvement of interest groups in EU policymaking, participation in EU umbrella organisations as well as the effects of EU funding on interest groups (e.g. Sanchez-Salgado, 2014; Johansson and Jacobsson, 2016; Pritoni, 2017; Fink-Hafner et al. 2015; Klüver, 2010; Maloney et al., 2018; Novak and Lajh, 2018; Sanchez-Salgado and Demidov, 2018).

Although EU institutions and public policies create additional opportunities for national organisations to influence public policies, not all national organisations decide to take advantage of EU access points (Beyers and Kerremans, 2007: 460). Level of interest groups involvement in EU policymaking when trying to pursue their goals is dependent with various factors (Lundberg and Sedelius, 2014: 323). While an important minority of interest groups represent their interests regularly at the EU level, most of groups (also those that represent business interests) remain predominantly active at the national level (Eising, 2008: 16).

In frame of this session, we will do a brief literature review on national interest groups' Europeanisation. Namely, we will be interested in effects of Europeanisation processes on national interest groups, networking with EU level organisations, the financing from European projects and programs, the use of dual strategy (lobbying at national and EU level) and use of other strategies for involvement in the EU policymaking processes. The session will also build on empirical data on Italian and Slovenian interest groups. The session will include the time for discussion.

In frame of the methods session, we will focus on identification of national populations of interest groups in Italy and Slovenia, identifying main challenges as well as characteristics of panel survey

that enable identifying differences and development over time. The method session will include time for discussion.

Mandatory readings

- Beyers J. (2002), 'Gaining and seeking access: The European adaptation of domestic interest associations, *European Journal of Political Research*, 41: 585-612.
- Beyers J. & B. Kerremans (2012), 'Domestic Embeddedness and the Dynamics of Multilevel Venue Shopping in Four EU Member States', *Governance*, 25: 263-290.

Optional readings

- Novak, M. & D. Lajh (2018), 'The participation of Slovenian civil society organisations in EU policymaking: explaining their different routes. *Journal of contemporary European research*, ISSN 1815-347X. <Online ed.>, 2018, vol. 14, no. 2, str. 105-122. <https://www.jcer.net/index.php/jcer/article/view/871/798>
doi: [10.30950/jcer.v14i2.871](https://doi.org/10.30950/jcer.v14i2.871).
- Pritoni A. (forthcoming), 'Europe First? Not So Much... The (limited) Europeanisation of Italian interest groups', *Italian Political Science Review*, paper accepted for publication.
- Ruzza, C. & E. Bozzini (2008). 'Organised Civil Society and European Governance: Routes of Contestation'. *European Political Science*, 7 (3): 296-303.

13.30 – 15.30: Methods session: Interest group mapping at the national level and panel data

In frame of the methods session, we will focus on identification of national populations of interest groups in Italy and Slovenia, identifying main challenges as well as characteristics of panel survey that enable identifying differences and development over time. The method session will include time for discussion.

Mandatory readings

- Novak, M. & D. Lajh (2019), Entering the Brussels arena: Slovenian interest groups and the pursuit of a dual strategy. *Journal of Southeast European & Black Sea studies*, ISSN 1468-3857, 2019, vol., no. 17 str., tabele. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14683857.2019.1568665>, doi: [10.1080/14683857.2019.1568665](https://doi.org/10.1080/14683857.2019.1568665).