

Interest Group Politics

ECTS: 5

Seminar Schedule: Monday 12:00 – 13:30 ARTS 5052

Office Hours: 15:00 – 17:00 (4.04 by appointment)

Office: TRISS common space

Lecturer: Michele Crepaz, Dr

Email: crepazm@tcd.ie

Overview

This course brings together students interested in the interaction between non-state actors, such as organised interests, and policymakers. Over the past decades the number of non-state actors active in modern day democratic systems has exploded. To cite a familiar example, in Brussels an estimated 30,000 lobbyists are active at the EU level with almost 12,000 interest groups registered in the Joint Transparency Register of the European Union. Despite the size of European lobbying industry, the US is still the largest lobbying environment of the world with more than 50,000 active lobbyists across all states, 11,000 lobbyists in DC only a surprising lobbying expenditure of \$3.42 billion in 2018.

Many have suggested that this ever-growing involvement of non-state actors in the day-to-day practices of policymakers has a corrupting effect on decision-making process. The term ‘lobbying’ has been in fact for decades associated to corruption and undue influence. If we had to draw a portrait of a lobbyist popular in Netflix series, such as House of Cards, we would picture a person with excellent communication skills, deep knowledge of the policy-making process, connections with the world of politics and means to influence the decision-making process through rhetoric, pressure, blackmail or bribe. This picture is however not only false for 99% of the industry, but also misleading for the public and policymakers themselves.

Lobbying is in reality a highly professionalised activity that is important for policymakers. Scholars do not fail to stress the importance of the information lobbyists supply in political process. Without it, many modern day democracies could not fully function. This does, however, not mean that corruption is absent in lobbying. Even

when the profession of lobbyist is carried in an ethical way, scholarly work showed that business often wins. In a democracy in which corporate lobbying has a strong influence on public policy, special interests tend to prevail over diffuse ones, with obvious negative consequences on inequality and participatory democracy.

Keeping normative implications aside, it is beyond doubt that we are currently witnessing an unparalleled structure of interdependence between non-state actors and policymakers which increasingly defines political systems across the globe. We differentiate different types of actors such as business interest associations, professional associations, firms and social movement organizations. These have found different ways to organise and represent their interests, such as protest, lobbying, policy monitoring, and mobilization. This course seeks to explain the role of interest groups in political systems, across interest group type and mobilization strategy.

Module Aim:

The aim of the course is to provide the student with an eclectic appreciation and understanding of key societal issues that directly and indirectly inform analysis, affect decision making and shape implementation of strategy in political organisations.

In the early years of the degrees offered by the Department of Political Science, students are provided with a theoretical foundation in a broad range of functional areas and apply the conceptual frameworks. This course provides the broader, interdisciplinary contextual framework for considering the environment of organisations and the issues that may impinge on organisations directly and indirectly.

To acquire knowledge about

- The role of non-state actors in political processes and various policy fields, in relation to
- Patterns of Europeanization and globalization, and, more specifically,
- Studies into practices of interest representation, related to basic differences between types of
- Actors such as business interest associations, firms, social movement organizations, bureaucratic actors, and so on.

To improve

- Research design skills, especially those needed in the first steps of the empirical cycle
- Effective writing skills
- Applied methodological skills, and
- Academic and practical presentation skills

Course content

The course is structured around a set of seminars – these seminars focus on interactive discussion of the assigned materials and media coverage of contemporary news events while blending with some lecture materials. Given the seminar format, students are expected to keep up-to-date with the readings and topical issues in the arena. The reading list includes required material to be discussed during the weekly seminars and provides additional recommended materials that may be of particular use for the larger written assignments. Students are nevertheless expected to go beyond the list of required and recommended readings for their main written assignment (see below). This will prove the students' ability to access sources independently from what dictated by the course contents. There are one core reading each week (typically articles published in academic journals, book chapters, newspaper articles). These are selected in a way to encourage a diverse, lively discussion. The required and recommended readings may provide accessible examples for you to draw on in class, in your discussion points or in the completion of your continuous assignments. The seminars are 'participatory', in the sense that the opinion of students is sought directly and consistently. Attendance at the seminars is compulsory as it links to credit for the Participation/Discussion Points set out below.

Module Assessment:

The course is examined by continuous assessment. There is no exam! The following is for 100% grade of the Interest Group Politics module (5 ECTS).

1. Participation and Discussion Points (20% of total module grade)

By 6.00 pm on the evening before the seminar (a part from Week 3 and 12 – introduction class and practitioner class), students should submit a 600-700 words

response paper containing at least 3 discussion points concerning the readings to be found in the *required readings list* (students are free to include discussion points concerning the recommended reading list). Response papers are to be submitted via Blackboard which links to our plagiarism detector software Turnitin (access TCD plagiarism policy here <https://www.tcd.ie/teaching-learning/assets/pdf/PlagiarismPolicy%2002-06-2016.pdf>). In order to qualify as valid submission, students must then attend to discuss these points the following day in the seminar. If a student has submitted a response paper but has failed to attend the seminar, the submission is to be considered as not valid. During the seminar, students will be asked to provide a concise discussion or analysis of the reading material. They are required to raise some analytical points or questions about the week's readings, critically engage with the material, provide insights for future research on the discussed topic. These points will form the basis of in-class discussion and will be used to guide the seminar discussion.

Each response paper should contain at least 3 points (not more than 5); each point should be at least a paragraph or two in length. Response papers and discussion points will be graded based on the originality in insights, reference to theoretical debates present in the literature, ability to criticise theories based on new evidence. Further details about how to write a response paper will be discussed during the introductory seminar.

There are 11 seminar weeks in one teaching term. Students should submit response papers for five out of the eleven weeks. Students are free to submit each week if they wish but only the best five will be considered for the calculation of the overall grade (W3 and W12 not available for submission). The final grade for this assessment component will be an average of the best five grades. Consider also employing the discussion points and associated feedback as a testing ground for possible research questions for your Research Project discussed below.

2. One Group Project Assignment (20% of the total grade)

By 11pm on the evening before the seminar (except for Week 3 and 12 – introduction class and practitioner class), groups formed by students are required to submit one copy of their group project assignment in .pdf format via Blackboard linked to Turnitin. This

is not dissimilar from your discussion points, but in form of a group project; each group member is expected to submit their copy of the project. Each group will have 3 members (TBA, size of group can change depending on the number of students enrolled in the module). Projects submitted by groups with fewer or more members than what indicated (or agreed with lecturer) are not accepted and will be marked as zero. I trust that students act responsibly and show independence in the formation and management of their group. I also encourage students to come to my office hours if groups encounter non-collaborative behaviour from one or more group members. Office hours are also here to help resolve this sort of issues.

Group projects are not too dissimilar from discussion points and response papers. I expect from students to provide an interactive discussion of required and recommended readings using the format of a short essay containing at least 6 discussion points (1000-1200 words). I expect groups to review the state of the art (considering at both required and recommended readings), provide novel insights into the analysis of the topic, apply existing theoretical frameworks correctly, offer sharp critique of the literature and suggest avenues for better future research.

During the seminar, the groups are expected to lead the discussion around the chosen topic. There is no rigid format to this as long as an active discussion is kept between all students and the lecturer. Students of the group are free to use **short** written, video and audio material if this helps them to better illustrate their point. If this is the case, the group should contact the lecturer beforehand in order to organise the use of visual and audio material. The objective of the group assignment is to collaborate, coordinate work and produce a valuable output than can inform your peers about the state of the art on a given topic (beyond the required readings). Groups are free to choose topics from Week 4 to 14 (no Week 3 and no Week 12 on the Practitioner's perspective). See course structure for more details. The grade for the project will be assigned at the group level. Remember that you are not allowed to submit your group assignment on the same topic for which you have submitted a response paper.

3. Research paper (60% of total grade)

This final assignment of the semester requires students to think of a topic related to the interest group politics in Ireland and develop and answer a research question about that

area. The literature on Irish interest groups is heavily underdeveloped and offers the students the opportunity to apply research frameworks employed in other countries. If necessary, students can also conduct a comparative work (comparing Ireland to another jurisdiction) but this is not necessary and should be considered carefully given the limited word count.

Students should before Week 11 propose a critical research question tying to one of the major theoretical and analytical debates or issue areas discussed in the module. These are:

- Lobbying good or bad for democracy
- Collective action problems and mobilization
- Social Movements, Civil Society and Protest politics
- Lobbying Strategies
- Interest Group Networks
- Access
- Influence
- Ties that count
- Corruption and Lobbying Regulations

Based on the above topics, students are expected to apply an existing theoretical framework, develop hypotheses and outline and implement a basic research strategy. The study can be a case study or comparative in nature but needs to focus on the Irish example. Consider questions such as: How can the theoretical arguments from the course literature be extended/developed/improved upon? What are the limitations of the theories prevalent in the literature? What aspects of the causal mechanics and dynamics are missing? What variables have been neglected or omitted in previous studies? Could the discussed studies benefit from an improvement in the choice of measurements? Are there deviant cases that disprove or undermine the validity of existing theories? Are there understudied cases that help us to develop a new theory or refine existing ones?

We will discuss examples of how this can be done in class but for now students should try to think about building a theoretical approach that would address some of these issues. A good way of doing this is to take notes in class with the idea of developing a

research strategy. Conceptually, what sort of data could be used to test your theory? What can be used to refine existing or develop new theory?

These are all aspects that students should consider in the development of the research paper. We will discuss available sources of data in more detail during class. I strongly recommend students to discuss your topic with me by the end of Week 11 at the latest. The essay is due at 11.59pm on Friday of Week 16 (Dec 13th). An assignment should not exceed 3,000 words in length. These 3,000 words are inclusive of notes, appendices and bibliography. If a student submits a written assignment that is more than 10% above/below the word limit, penalties will be applied. Please provide the word count at the beginning of each essay. All late work, unless excused in advance will be penalized at a rate of five per cent per day. It is critical to let the lecturer know as soon as possible if there will be an issue in submitting a paper on time. If a student requires extra days due to medical issues or other personal circumstances, there must be a request in advance via the student's tutor. Under no circumstances will work be accepted after the set work has been marked and handed back to other students, or after the end of the teaching term. Essays must be submitted through the Assignments section on Blackboard which links to Turnitin.

The weekly readings are listed below – some of these are academic works and some are more popular/journalistic materials as befits the course. As noted above, you should also read a major news source each week. The reading in **bold** is the weekly **core reading** that everyone should read. Readings marked with * are required (necessary for the response paper and for the group assignment), those marked with - are recommended (necessary for the group assignment). I will try to post as many materials as possible each week to Blackboard or circulate links. If there is anything you come across online (or elsewhere) that you think would be interesting for the class or relates to a topic we have discussed or will discuss, please do send them on by email and I will consider circulating.

The course follows a seminar structure. This means that I do not use slides that summarise the contents of the discussion in class. It is the students' responsibility to prepare the required readings and take notes in class during the discussion of the required readings.

Course Structure

Indicative Structure in Teaching Weeks

<i>Week 3</i>	<i>Introduction: IG Politics - Definitions</i>
<i>Week 4</i>	<i>IG and Lobbying: Good or Bad for Democracy</i>
<i>Week 5</i>	<i>Mobilization and Collective Action</i>
<i>Week 6</i>	<i>Social Movements and Protest Politics</i>
<i>Week 7</i>	<i>Mobilization Strategies: Inside vs. Outside</i>
<i>Week 8</i>	<i>IG and Networking</i>
<i>Week 9</i>	<i>Study Week</i>
<i>Week 10</i>	<i>Access</i>
<i>Week 11*</i>	<i>The Question of Influence</i>
<i>Week 12</i>	<i>Practitioner's perspective on lobbying</i>
<i>Week 13</i>	<i>Ties that count</i>
<i>Week 14</i>	<i>Corruption and the Regulation of Lobbying</i>
<i>Week 15</i>	<i>Week used for revision</i>
<i>Week 16**</i>	<i>Term ends</i>

* Discuss idea for research paper with me

** Submit research paper

Some resources that you should regularly consult

Scholarly

<http://socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/regulatingcivilsociety/>

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/>

<https://www.cigsurvey.eu/>

<http://interarena.dk/default.asp?l=eng>

<http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/usappblog/>

Governments and IOs

<http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do>

<http://www.oecd.org/gov/ethics/lobbying.htm>

<https://www.coe.int/en/web/cdcj/activities/lobbying>

<https://www.opengovpartnership.org/>

<https://www.lobbying.ie/>

<https://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov/>

<http://registrarofconsultantlobbyists.org.uk/>

<https://www.hatvp.fr/en/>

Media and NGOs

<https://www.politico.com/>

<https://www.alter-eu.org/>

<https://corporateeurope.org/>

<https://www.lobbycontrol.de/>

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/m0006l9m> (tales from the Lobby - BBC 4 radio podcast on Lobbying in the UK)

Indicative Reading List

Week 3 – Introduction to interest group and interest group research

Required:

* Look for several articles in the news about interest groups. “Interest groups” are sometimes also called “pressure groups” or “organised interests”. Use also the terms “special interests” and “lobby groups” and see in what way your search outputs change. Make sure that you are able to refer to them in class.

Examples of interesting search outputs:

<https://www.politico.eu/article/pressure-groups-become-a-political-force/>

<https://www.thejournal.ie/business-lobbyists-ireland-3-4100109-Jul2018/>

<http://www.aalep.eu/functions-lobby-groups>

* Baroni, L., Carroll, B. J., Chalmers, A. W., Marquez, L. M. M., & Rasmussen, A. (2014). Defining and classifying interest groups. *Interest Groups & Advocacy*, 3(2), 141-159.

* Murphy, G. (2010). Influencing political decision - making: interest groups and elections in independent Ireland. *Irish Political Studies*, 25(4), 563-580.

* **Beyers, J., Eising, R. & Maloney, W.A. (2008) Researching Interest Group Politics in Europe and Elsewhere: Much we Study, Little we Know? *West European Politics*, 31(6): 1103-1128.**

Recommended:

- Jordan, G., & Maloney, W. (2007). *Democracy and interest groups: enhancing participation?*. Springer. Chapter 1.
- Mahoney, C., & Baumgartner, F. (2008). Converging perspectives on interest group research in Europe and America. *West European Politics*, 31(6), 1253-1273.

Week 4 – Interest groups and Lobbying: good or bad for democracy?

Required

* Lowery, D. (2007). ‘Why Do Organized Interests Lobby? A Multi-Goal, Multi-Context Theory of Lobbying.’ *Polity*, Vol. 39 No. 1: 29-54.

* Bernhagen, P., & Chari, R. (2011). Financial and economic crisis: theoretical explanations of the global sunset. *Irish Political Studies*, 26(4), 455-472.

* Maloney, W.A. (2009) Interest Groups and the Revitalisation of Democracy: Are we Expecting Too Much? *Representation*, 45(3): 277-287.

* How PhRMA finally lost: the inside story of the group’s biggest lobbying failure in years – statnews.com <https://www.statnews.com/2019/01/02/how-phrma-finally-lost-the-inside-story-of-the-groups-biggest-lobbying-failure-in-years/>

* Many interest groups are more in line with public preferences than commonly thought. By Flöthe and Rasmussen.

<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2018/11/23/interest-groups-are-more-in-line-with-public-preferences-than-commonly-thought/>

Recommended:

- Lowery, D. and V. Gray. (2004). ‘A Neopluralist Perspective on Research on Organized Interests,’ *Political Research Quarterly*, 57 (1): 163-175.
- Greenwood, J. (2017). *Interest representation in the European Union*. Macmillan International Higher Education. Chapter 1.
- Lowery, D., Baumgartner, F. R., Berkhout, J., Berry, J. M., Halpin, D., Hojnacki, M., Klüver, H., Kohler-Koch, B, Richardson, J., Scholzman, K. L.

(2015). Images of an unbiased interest group system. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 22(8), 1212-1231.

Week 5 – Interest Groups, Mobilization and Collective Action

Required:

* Olson, M. (1993) *The Logic of Collective Action*. Richardson, J.J. (ed) *Pressure Groups*. , Oxford University Press, USA: 23-37

* Jordan, G. and W.A. Maloney. (2006). ‘Letting George Do It’: Does Olson Explain Low Levels of Participation?’ *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, Vol. 16, No. 2: 115-139.

* **M.C. Hanegraaff (2015). *Transnational Advocacy over Time: Business and NGO Mobilization at UN Climate Summits. Global Environmental Politics*, 15 (1).**

* The Unlikely Activists Who Took On Silicon Valley — and Won. The New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/14/magazine/facebook-google-privacy-data.html>

Recommended:

- Schlozman, Key Lehman, Sidney Verba, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. Participation’s Not a Paradox: The View from American Activists. *British Journal of Political Science* 25: 1–36.
- Walsh, Edward J. and Rex H. Warland. 1983. Social Movement Involvement in the Wake of a Nuclear Accident: Activists and Free Riders in the TMI Area. *American Sociological Review* 48: 764-80.
- Bièvre, D. D., Poletti, A., Hanegraaff, M., & Beyers, J. (2016). International institutions and interest mobilization: The WTO and lobbying in EU and US trade policy. *Journal of World Trade*, 50(2), 289-312.

Week 6 – Civil Society Organisations, Social Movements and Protest

Required

* Sanchez Salgado, R. (2014). Rebalancing EU interest representation? Associative democracy and EU funding of civil society organizations. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(2), 337-353.

* Lewis, D. C. (2019). Organization and advocacy for LGBTQ rights. *Interest Group & Advocacy*.

* **Norris, P., Walgrave, S., & Van Aelst, P. (2005). Who demonstrates? Antistate rebels, conventional participants, or everyone?. *Comparative politics*, 189-205.**

Recommended:

- Sánchez-Salgado, R. (2007). Giving a European dimension to civil society organizations. *Journal of Civil Society*, 3(3), 253-269.

- Lipsky, M. (1968) Protest as a Political Resource. *American Political Science Review*, 62(4): 1144- 1158.

- Kriesi, H., Koopmans, R., Duyvendak, J.W. & Giugni, M. (1992) New Social Movements and Political Opportunities in Western Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 22(2): 219- 244.

Week 7 – Advocacy Strategies: Inside vs. Outside

Required:

* **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.**

* Thrall, T.A. (2006). The myth of the outside strategy: Mass media news coverage of interest groups. *Political Communication* 23: 407–420.

* Weiler, F., & Brändli, M. (2015). Inside versus outside lobbying: How the institutional framework shapes the lobbying behaviour of interest groups. *European Journal of Political Research*, 54(4), 745-766.

Recommended:

- Tresch, A., & Fischer, M. (2015). In search of political influence: Strategic choices and media coverage of political parties, interest groups and social movements in Western European countries. *International Political Science Review*, 36(4), 355-372.

- Colli, F. (2019). Beyond the inside–outside divide: fuzzy-set measurement of configurations of strategies in NGO campaigns. *Interest Groups & Advocacy*, 1-33.

- Trapp, N. L., & Laursen, B. (2017). Inside out: interest groups' 'outside' media work as a means to manage 'inside' lobbying efforts and relationships with politicians. *Interest Groups & Advocacy*, 6(2), 143-160.

Week 8 – Interest Groups and Networking

Required:

- * Mahoney, C. (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.
- * **Hanegraaff, M., & Pritoni, A. (2019). United in fear: Interest group coalition formation as a weapon of the weak?. *European Union Politics*, 1465116518824022.**
- * Gray, V. and D. Lowery (1998). "To Lobby Alone or in a Flock. Foraging Behavior Among Organized Interests." *American Politics Quarterly* 26(1): 5-34
- * Framing and lobbying success: Why it pays to work as a team. By Junk and Rasmussen. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/euoppblog/2018/09/20/framing-and-lobbying-success-why-it-pays-to-work-as-a-team/>

Recommended:

- Beyers, J. and C. Braun (2014). "Ties that count. Explaining interest group access to policymakers." *Journal of Public Policy* 34(1): 34(1):93-121.
- Beyers, J., & De Bruycker, I. (2018). Lobbying makes (strange) bedfellows: explaining the formation and composition of lobbying coalitions in EU legislative politics. *Political Studies*, 66(4), 959-984.
- Klüver, H. (2011). Lobbying in coalitions: Interest group influence on European Union policy-making. *Nuffield's Working Papers Series in Politics*, 1-38.

Week 9 – reading week

Week 10 – Access

Required:

* Dür, A., & Mateo, G. (2010). Irish associations and lobbying on EU legislation: resources, access points, and strategies. *Irish Political Studies*, 25(1), 107-122.

* **Binderkrantz, A. S., Christiansen, P. M., & Pedersen, H. H. (2015). Interest group access to the bureaucracy, parliament, and the media. *Governance*, 28(1), 95-112.**

* Eising, R. (2007). The access of business interests to EU institutions: towards élite pluralism?. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 14(3), 384-403.

Recommended:

- Dür, A., & Mateo, G. (2013). Gaining access or going public? Interest group strategies in five European countries. *European Journal of Political Research*, 52(5), 660-686.

- Bouwen, P. (2002). Corporate lobbying in the European Union: the logic of access. *Journal of European public policy*, 9(3), 365-390.

- Binderkrantz, A. S., Pedersen, H. H., & Beyers, J. (2017). What is access? A discussion of the definition and measurement of interest group access. *European Political Science*, 16, 306-321.

Week 11 – The Question of Influence

Required:

* **Mahoney, C. (2007). Lobbying success in the United States and the European Union. *Journal of Public Policy*, 27(1), 35-56.**

* Dür, Andreas (2008): Measuring interest group influence in the EU: A note on methodology, *European Union Politics*, 9(4): 559–576.

* Dür, A., Bernhagen, P., & Marshall, D. (2015). Interest group success in the European Union: When (and why) does business lose?. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(8), 951-983.

Recommended:

- Lowery, David (2013): Lobbying influence: Meaning, measurement and missing, *Interest groups & Advocacy*, 2(1): 1-26.

- Woll, C. (2007) Leading the Dance? Power and Political Resources of Business Lobbyists. *Journal of Public Policy*, 27(01): 57-78.

- David and Goliath in Brussels: Lobbying strategies and success in the EU. By De Bruyker, <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2016/06/02/david-and-goliath-in-brussels-lobbying-strategies-and-success-in-the-eu/>
- New York Times article about NRA lobbying success. <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/15/magazine/inside-the-power-of-the-nra.html>

Week 12 – The Perspective of Practitioners

Required:

- * Tales from the Lobby, BBC Radio. Full episodes 1 and 2 (about 50min each). <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/m0006l9m>
- * Visit and browse website of PRII, PRCA and Ibec (collect information about the organisation, its members, its training programs, careers in public affairs in Ireland and Europe)
- * Navigating the lobby labyrinth: A guide to transparency and ethics for MEPs. ALTER-EU: <https://www.alter-eu.org/documents/2019/07/navigating-the-lobby-labyrinth>

Week 13 – Ties that count

Required:

- * Fraussen, B., Beyers, J., & Donas, T. (2015). The expanding core and varying degrees of insidership: Institutionalised interest group access to advisory councils. *Political Studies*, 63(3), 569-588.
- * Baturó, A., & Arlow, J. (2018). Is there a ‘revolving door’ to the private sector in Irish politics?. *Irish Political Studies*, 33(3), 381-406.
- * **Allern, E. H., Aylott, N., & Christiansen, F. J. (2007). Social Democrats and trade unions in Scandinavia: The decline and persistence of institutional relationships. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(5), 607-635.**

Recommended:

- LaPira, T. M., & Thomas, H. F. (2014). Revolving door lobbyists and interest representation. *Interest Groups & Advocacy*, 3(1), 4-29.
- Allern, E. H., Hansen, V. W., Otjes, S., Rasmussen, A., Røed, M., & Bale, T. (2019). All about the money? A cross-national study of parties' relations with trade unions in 12 western democracies. *Party Politics*.
- Berkhout, J., Hanegraaff, M., & Statsch, P. (2019). Explaining the patterns of contacts between interest groups and political parties: Revising the standard model for populist times. *Party Politics*.

Week 14 – Corruption and the Regulation of Lobbying

Required:

- * Campos, N. F., & Giovannoni, F. (2007). Lobbying, corruption and political influence. *Public Choice*, 131(1-2), 1-21
- * **Crepaz, M. (2017). Why do we have lobbying rules? Investigating the introduction of lobbying laws in EU and OECD member states. *Interest Groups & Advocacy*, 6(3), 231-252.**
- * Crepaz, M., Chari, R., Hogan, J., & Murphy, G. (2019). International Dynamics in Lobbying Regulation. In *Lobbying in the European Union* (pp. 49-63). Springer, Cham.
- * Why lobbying in Brussels is not always an obscure activity. De Bruyker. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2018/11/27/why-lobbying-in-brussels-is-not-always-an-obscure-activity/>

Recommended:

- Thomas, H. F., & LaPira, T. M. (2017). How many lobbyists are in Washington? Shadow lobbying and the gray market for policy advocacy. *Interest Groups & Advocacy*, 6(3), 199-214.
- Ozymy, J. (2013). Keepin' on the sunny side: Scandals, organized interests, and the passage of legislative lobbying laws in the American states. *American Politics Research*, 41(1), 3-23.
- Navigating the lobby labyrinth: A guide to transparency and ethics for MEPs. ALTER-EU: <https://www.alter-eu.org/documents/2019/07/navigating-the-lobby-labyrinth>