



Course Syllabus

COURSE CODE : CMM 252G/346E

Lobbying in the EU

Number of ECTS credits: 6

Contact Details for Professor

E-mail: Dr. Rachel Barlow; rachelbarlow_advice@yahoo.com

Office hours: F r i d a y s 1130 to 1230

Course Description

Lobbying is an integral part of the EU decision making process. Set in the context of wider problems of EU legitimacy, heightened by Brexit, this course will describe the participatory model of EU policy making based around agents of participation. Indeed, actors representing State and non-governmental interests engage with European Commission decision makers and members of the European Council and of the European Parliament on a daily basis. Lobbying is therefore perceived as a legitimate tool of pluralist bargaining in which interest representatives are perceived as a source of data and practical expertise, informing and improving policy development.

This course will explore the EU's revamped institutional, and the application of the Better Regulation package as well as the formal decision making processes, from legal sources, through the consultation stage and parliamentary debate to final adoption. It will address major trends in the culture of EU interest representation such as the need for "transparency" and the use of coalition and alliance building.

Finally, from a practical perspective, the course will deal directly with lobbying techniques ranging from the legal drafting of amendments to the use of social media and civil society supported activities and events. Students will be encouraged to debate, use role play and hone their negotiation skills on self-researched hot topics.

The diversity of actors, be they corporations, business interests or non-governmental organisations, and their differentiated approaches to influence and advocacy, will be addressed directly with lobbyist external guest speakers. The means and effects of influence will be described at its respective stages by speakers from the European

institutions as part of visits to the European Commission and the European Parliament respectively.

Course Prerequisites

None.

Learning Objectives

The course has the following learning objectives. Between parentheses, the corresponding learning objective from the Communication Program is indicated.

Knowledge:

The acquiring of knowledge on the EU governance structure and formal and informal decision making procedures are a pre-requisite to interacting in a lobbying context (DLO 1).

The particular media landscape of Brussels interests and often competing national media priorities will be examined from an influence perspective (DLO 2, 8).

Applying knowledge and understanding research:

Students will be expected to devise, develop the tools for and implement a strategic lobbying plan for an identified cause (DLO 5, 9). This will be undertaken via a project based exercise on behalf of a specific organisation that will require internal organisational analysis and deep understanding of communication dynamics (DLO 6, 7).

Participants will acquire practical and scientific knowledge on the limits to lobbying activities, the ethics of influence and the adversarial positioning of both institutional and private interests in an increasingly complex political arena (DLO 11).

Students will demonstrate their understanding of procedures and mechanisms applied in an EU institutional decision making process and co-related lobbying campaign (DLO 4).

Course Materials

Textbook: No text book required (refer to reading list and documents on Pointcarré)
Course materials (syllabus, support materials, important messages, etc) will be uploaded on the Vesalius website, Pointcarré. Students are expected to visit the site regularly to keep abreast of course changes and evolutions.

Research methods

The method for this course rests in critical content analysis of course documents.

Course schedule:

N.B. The mid-term paper is due on Friday 10th November.

<u>Week</u>	<u>Date and time</u>	<u>Content / presentation and readings</u>
Week 1	Friday 1/9 0830-1130	<p>Introduction to the course: What? Why? How? Who?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Setting out the influence context: overview of process, opportunities and challenges •Quid lobbying? Definition and practices •The actors <p>Required reading:</p> <p>-Greenwood, J (2014) 'Interest Groups and Patterns of Lobbying in Brussels', in J Magone (eds.) Handbook of European Politics (London: Routledge), chapter 43, 793-806.</p> <p>Additional reading:</p> <p>-Heidbreder, E (2012) Civil Society Participation in EU Governance, Living Reviews in European Governance, vol. 7, (2012), No. 2, http://www.livingreviews.org/lreg-2012-2</p> <p>-Klüver H, Braun C & Beyers J (2015) Legislative lobbying in context: towards a conceptual framework of interest group lobbying in the European Union, Journal of European Public Policy, 22:4, 447-461.</p>
Week 2	Friday 8/9 0830-1130	<p>EU institutional decision making and lobbying patterns and junctures (1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EU process step by step: the “ordinary legislative procedure” <p>Required reading/viewings:</p> <p>- <i>Film</i>: the Brussels Business</p> <p>-Dür A, Bernhagen P & Marshall D (2015) 'Interest Group Success in the European Union: when & why does business lose?' Comparative Political Studies, 48, 8, 951-983.</p> <p>Additional reading:</p> <p>- Rasmussen, M (2014) 'The Battle for Influence: The Politics of Business Lobbying in the European Parliament', Journal of Common Market Studies, 53, 2, 365-382</p>

Week 3	Friday 15/9 0830 to 1130	Visit to European Commission Number TBC Timing: TBC Visitor Centre, Charlemagne building, Rue de la loi 170, 1000 Brussels.
Week 4	Friday 22/9 0830-1130	The role and activity of the European Parliament: •Function and input to process •The EP and democratic legitimacy Guest speaker: Louise Knops, assistant to MEP Philippe Lambert, Psdt of Green Alliance Required readings: - Busby, A (2013) 'Normal Parliament: Exploring the Organization of Everyday Political Life in an MEPs Office, Journal of Contemporary European Research, 9, 1, 94-115. Additional reading: - Busby, A and Belkacem K (2013) Coping with the information overload: An exploration of assistants' backstage role in the everyday practice of European Parliament politics, European Integration Online Papers, 17, 1. http://eiop.or.at/eiop/pdf/2013-004.pdf accessed on 29 December 2015. - Marshall, D (2014) Explaining Interest Group Interactions with Party Group Members in the European Parliament: Dominant Party Groups and Coalition Formation, Journal of Common Market Studies, 53, 2, 311-329.
Week 5	Friday 29/9 0830-1130 Discussion on research question for written paper. Students to consider topics for the paper and bring proposals.	EU institutional decision making and lobbying patterns and junctures (2): • E U process step by step cont'd: comitology • Guest speaker: presentation of case study and SEAP Board Hans Craen, Vice President Kellen Europe. Required readings: - Reshaping European lobbying, Daniel Guéguen, Europolitics, pp. 24-40. - Burson Marsteller (2013, 5 th edtn.) 'A Guide to Effective Lobbying in Europe', http://lobbyingsurvey.burson-marsteller.eu/ accessed on 29 December 2015, pp 1-22. Additional reading: Busby, A (2013) 'Normal Parliament: Exploring the Organization of Everyday Political Life in an MEPs Office, Journal of Contemporary European Research, 9, 1, 94-115.

Week 8	Friday 20 October 0830-1130 DISCUSSION ABOUT WRITTEN PAPER	The European Citizens' Initiative: revision and other effects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Role play moot on Brexit (actual stage of talks) Review of topic of last session. Required readings: -Bouza Garcia, L (2015) 'The Effect of the European Citizens' Initiative in the Field of European Civil Society', in Håkan Johansson & Sara Kalm (eds) EU Civil Society: Patterns of Cooperation, Competition and Conflict (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), pp.175-192.
Week 9	Friday 27 October 0830-1130	Business interest and influence: Required reading: Boräng, F. & Daniel Naurin (2015): 'Try to see it my way!' Frame congruence between lobbyists and European Commission officials, Journal of European Public Policy, DOI:10.1080/13501763.2015.1008555 Additional reading: - Klüver H, Mahoney C & Opper M (2015) 'Framing in context: how interest groups employ framing to lobby the European Commission', Journal of European Public Policy, DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2015.1008550 -
Week 10	Friday 10 November 0830-1130 WRITTEN PAPER DUE	NGO/ CSO role and activities: Required reading: -Kohler-Koch, B (2010) 'Civil society and EU democracy: 'astroturf' representation?' Journal of European Public Policy 17 (1) Additional reading: -Sanchez Salgado, R (2014) Rebalancing EU Interest Representation? Associative Democracy and EU Funding of Civil Society Organizations, Journal of Common Market Studies, 52, 3. 337–353.

Week 11	Friday 17 November	<p>-Feedback on marked papers.</p> <p>-Lobby case study role play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Background research documents handed out in class – use of computers permitted. - 2 case studies: 2 NGO lobbies and 2 business lobbies. - Students to prepare short position paper and oral advocacy of their issue in adversarial context.
Week 12	Friday 24 November 0830-1130 POP UP QUIZZ (2)	<p>Media: the EU conundrum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National v. Brussels media • Use of media in lobbying • Focus on social media <p>Required reading:</p> <p>- Politico.eu</p> <p>- Bierhoff, J. (2012), 'The EU information machine. High Time for Refuelling' in <i>The European Public Sphere from critical thinking to Responsible Action</i>, Morganti and Bekemans (Eds.), PIE Peter Lang.</p> <p>Additional reading:</p> <p>Lecheler, S. (2008). EU membership and the press. An analysis of the Brussels correspondents from the new member states. <i>Journalism</i>, 9(4), 443–464. doi:10.1177/1464884908091294</p>
Week 13	Friday 1 December 0830-1130	<p>The profession of lobbying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role, skill set, career development and employment. <p>Guest Speaker: the lobbying headhunter, Mark Dober, Managing Director Brussels, Ellwood Atfield</p>
Week 14	Friday 8 December 0830-1130	<p>. Revision, summary and dealing with outstanding questions</p>
Week 15	Friday 15 December 0830-1130	Written exam 0900-1100

References books

There is no single course reference book

Case Studies and Additional Sources:

- http://europa.eu/eu-law/decision-making/procedures/index_en.htm
- http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/civil_society/public_consultation_en.htm
- <http://www.seap.be/>
- <http://epaca.org/>
- <http://corporateeurope.org/tags/alter-eu>
- <http://www.euractiv.com/>

Course Assessment

The students will be evaluated on the basis of their performance as follows

In class participation	10%
Pop up quizzes	20%
Midterm paper	35%
Final examination	35%
TOTAL	100%

Grading Scale of Vesalius College

Vesalius College grading policy, in line with the Flemish Educational norms, is now as follows:

Letter grade	Scale of 20	Scale of 100
A	17.0-20.0	85-100
A-	16.1-16.9	81-84
B+	15.3-16.0	77-80
B	14.5-15.2	73-76
B-	13.7-14.4	69-72
C+	13.1-13.6	66-68
C	12.3-13.0	62-65
C-	11.5-12.2	58-61
D+	10.7-11.4	54-57
D	10.0-10.6	50-53
F	0-9.9	0-49

Description of activities and Grading Criteria

Class format and participation (10%):

The course emphasizes the importance of knowledge building, in-class interaction, debate and discussion. Lobbying is about the power of influence. Rather than simply listening to lectures, you are asked to actively engage in class activities.

I will hold a lecture that provides an overview and information in the topic. You will need to prepare for this lecture with the help of the readings so that you are able to follow the lecture, underpin your knowledge and participate in the discussion.

It is most crucial that you attend and actively participate in the lectures. Participation means attending class and actively contributing to class discussions. For each class, you will receive a grade based on your preparation and active participation in class discussion. If you are not able to attend class you should inform me via email as soon as possible.

Readings / Pop-up Quizzes (20%):

It is very important that you listen carefully to external speakers, take notes and ask questions. The required reading on course topics must be undertaken on a regular basis. During this course, you will take two short knowledge tests (pop-up quizzes) in which you will have to answer short questions in writing.

Mid-term written research paper (35%):

You are asked to write 2500 words and elaborate on a topic related to the course outline, to be determined. The paper is due for everybody in week 10. Please discuss the subject matter and elaborate the topic with the help of a research question. You need to use at least 10 academic peer reviewed articles of which up to 4 can be sourced externally, i.e. be non-course material.

Research method of the written paper:

The main goal of the written paper is to carry out independent research. You will apply a qualitative research method for your paper. Just to give you a first idea, qualitative research is embedded in the concept of interpretivism as a framework within which qualitative data is gathered. There are multiple qualitative research

methods in the framework of interpretivism. For your paper, you will gather data by using content analysis.

You will analyze your data from the perspective of a qualitative researcher. On these grounds reality is experienced internally and takes your (constructed) research perspective into consideration (Sarantakos, 2005). As a result, and in contrast to quantitative research methods, such as statistical analysis, your research will be dynamic and subject-centred. This means that you describe your research topic 'from inside out'. To be more precise, qualitative research methods take the subject's viewpoint (the researcher – you) into consideration. You interpret the data by applying your perspective. However, you always have to clearly demonstrate how you reach a certain viewpoint by applying academic sources that re-trace your string of argumentation. It is not sufficient to just state an argument without providing a source. You can certainly draw conclusions but they must be based on solid academic research! A paper without in-text references/footnotes does not meet academic standards and will be graded with F.

You begin with content analysis of academic literature to gain a solid base of information:

- Read the selected academic sources carefully
- Always bear your research question in mind
- Make notes and write little summaries on the text – with your research question in mind
- Filter the information you need – what kind of information helps you to elaborate your topic?
- Use your own words – don't copy and paste and include a reference!
- Before you start writing – read your notes, compare them with other texts and cross-check the results
- With the help of your notes, you structure your paper and answer the research question

After you have selected all your data (content analysis) you start to write up your paper:

- Give a short introduction to the subject matter
- Elaborate critically on the subject matter

Summarize your elaboration and state your perspective clearly. The paper should be structured as follows:

- Title page
- Introduction of research question
- Literature review

- Discussion / critical elaboration
- Summary
- List of References

N.B. Papers can only be submitted once. Only the first version received will be marked. All footnotes must be included in the word count, but annexes, cover page and bibliography are excluded.

Word limit: 1 point /20 will be deducted from the mark that would have been awarded for every 100 words (or part thereof) either below 2000 words or above 2500 words.

Late submissions: for every 24 hours of delay, or part thereof, after the specified submission deadline, 2 points will be deducted from the final mark of the paper.

Grading form for written assignments (35% of the final grade)

Criterion	Insufficient (0.0-9.9)	Adequate (10.0-14.9)	Good (15.0-17.5)	Excellent (17.6-20.0)
Introduction (15%)	No clear / relevant / evaluative statement. No clear position. No specific example. No discussion of relevance.	Introduction mentions - Statement; - Position of author; - Specific example related to statement; - Relevance	Requirement for adequate, but either relevance or example are compelling & creative.	Requirement for adequate, but both relevance <i>and</i> example are compelling and creative.
Argumentation (50%)	Fewer than two well-argued arguments. Connections to literature are unclear, or misrepresent the literature. Clear logical gaps are present.	At least 3 well-argued arguments are present. Connections to literature are present but not always convincing. No clear logical gaps or misrepresentations present.	Requirement for adequate + - At least one convincing counter argument (that is refuted). - Almost all arguments are convincingly backed up by literature.	Requirement for good + - More than three arguments + multiple counter arguments (that are refuted); - All arguments are convincingly backed up by literature.
Conclusion (15%)	Conclusion does not mention statement, position or a short recap of the key arguments.	Conclusion mentions statement, position and briefly describes the key arguments.	Requirement for adequate + Conclusion addresses broader relevance of statement.	Requirement for adequate, but relevance and recap of arguments are compelling.
References (10%)	Several references have formatting errors. No references	No more than one reference has a formatting error. Non-course	Same as adequate + uses at least four non-course references, and uses all relevant	Same as good, but uses more than six non-course references.

	beyond course material included.	references are used, and almost all relevant course material is used.	course material.	
Writing (10%)	More than one spelling mistake that could be avoided using spell checker. More than one half finished sentence.	Spelling mistakes almost absent.	Requirement for Adequate + max of two sentences that are unclear or difficult to understand.	Requirement for Good + No typos, grammar errors, and clear writing throughout.

Academic Honesty Statement

Academic dishonesty is **NOT** tolerated in this course.

Turnitin must be used at each submission stage with a fully completed report. Academic honesty is not only an ethical issue but also the foundation of scholarship.

Cheating and plagiarism are therefore serious breaches of academic integrity.

Following the College policy, cheating and plagiarism cases will be communicated in writing to the Associate Dean for Students and submitted to the Student Conduct Committee for disciplinary action.

If you refer to someone else's work, appropriate references and citations must be provided. Grammar, spelling and punctuation count, so use the tools necessary to correct before handing in assignments.

Final exam format and procedure: 35% of overall score:

The final exam will take a written form and last 2 hours. The exam is worth 100 points.

The format will be:

- two medium/short open questions (half a page) – each worth 20%; AND
- a long question on comparing/contrasting approaches (one page) – worth 25%; AND
- a medium essay question (a page and a half to two pages) – worth 35%.

Grading criteria of Exam tasks

Short questions:

Criterion	Insufficient (0.0-2.4)	Adequate (2.5-3.4)	Good (3.5-4.5)	Excellent (4.6-5.0)
Accuracy (80%)	The answer incorrectly reflects the concept or theory as discussed in	The answer correctly reflects the basic tenets of the concept or theory as	Requirement for Adequate + The answer completely covers the	Requirement for Good, but the answer contains no errors whatsoever.

	class or readings.	discussed in class or readings.	concept or theory, and contains no major errors.	Comparisons of multiple sources, conceptualizations and interpretations of theories result in a higher grade.
Structure / Language (20%)	The structure is confusing and makes it hard to make out the key points made. Use of language is poor, and contains several errors.	Overall structure is clear, with maximum two unclear sentences. Use of language is ok, with maximum two errors.	Structure is clear throughout, with no unclear sentences. Good use of language, with no errors.	Requirement for Good, plus the structure and use of language are exceptionally clear.

Long Question (comparing and contrasting):

Criterion	Insufficient (0.0-2.4)	Adequate (2.5-3.4)	Good (3.5-4.5)	Excellent (4.6-5.0)
Accuracy (30%)	The answer incorrectly reflects the concepts or theories as discussed in class or readings.	The answer correctly reflects the basic tenets of the concepts or theories as discussed in class or readings.	Requirement for Adequate + The answer completely covers the concepts or theories, and contains no major errors.	Requirement for Good, but the answer contains no errors whatsoever.
Comparison & Application (50%)	Real world example question: The answer does not contain a specific example, or the example is not linked to the concept / theory. Theory comparison question: The answer does not explicitly compare the two theories.	Real world example question: The answer contains a specific example, and provides at least one specific link with the concept/ theory. Theory comparison question: The answer contains at least one substantial and specific comparison between the two theories.	Requirement for Adequate + Real world example question: answer provides at least two specific links. Theory comparison question: The answer contains at least two specific comparisons between the two theories.	Requirement for Good + Real world example question: answer contains more than two links / example is exceptionally creative. Theory comparison question: The answer contains three or more specific comparisons between the two theories.

Structure / Language (20%)	<p>The structure is confusing and makes it hard to make out the key points made.</p> <p>Use of language is poor, and contains several errors.</p>	<p>Overall structure is clear, with maximum two unclear sentences.</p> <p>Use of language is ok, with maximum two errors.</p>	<p>Structure is clear throughout, with no unclear sentences.</p> <p>Good use of language, with no errors.</p>	<p>Requirement for Good, plus the structure and use of language are exceptionally clear.</p>
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	--

The medium essay grading criteria are the same for the final exam as for written assignments above at page 12.

Dr Rachel Barlow 2nd June 2017