

The Changing German Voter

Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger; Roßteutscher, Sigrid; Schoen, Harald; Weißels, Bernhard; Wolf, Christof

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Sammelwerksbeitrag / collection article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB)

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Schmitt-Beck, R., Roßteutscher, S., Schoen, H., Weißels, B., & Wolf, C. (2022). The Changing German Voter. In R. Schmitt-Beck, S. Roßteutscher, H. Schoen, B. Weißels, & C. Wolf (Eds.), *The Changing German Voter* (pp. 313-336). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198847519.003.0015>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC-ND Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell-Keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC-ND Licence (Attribution-Non Commercial-NoDerivatives). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>

Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger; Roßteutscher, Sigrid; Schoen, Harald; Weßels, Bernhard; Wolf, Christof

Book Part — Published Version

The Changing German Voter

Provided in Cooperation with:

WZB Berlin Social Science Center

Suggested Citation: Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger; Roßteutscher, Sigrid; Schoen, Harald; Weßels, Bernhard; Wolf, Christof (2022) : The Changing German Voter, In: Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger; Roßteutscher, Sigrid; Schoen, Harald; Weßels, Bernhard; Wolf, Christof (Ed.): The Changing German Voter, ISBN 978-0-19-884751-9, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 313-336, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198847519.003.0015>

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/253438>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

The Changing German Voter

*Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Harald Schoen,
Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf¹*

Introduction

After decades of slow and gradual change, the German electorate's behavior has undergone a massive transformation over the three federal elections of 2009, 2013, and 2017. Vote choices have become much more volatile and accordingly less predictable. This resulted in rapid differentiation of the party system, which in turn renders decision-making for voters at subsequent elections harder. With regard to important structural parameters such as volatility and the fragmentation of the party system, German electoral politics today shows features that resemble its character at the very first federal election, 70 years ago. Thus, in important ways, Germans' electoral behavior appears to have come full circle. At the same time, these developments are not unique to Germany. In many respects, they mirror processes that also affect other advanced industrial democracies in Western Europe as well as in other parts of the world (Przeworski 2019: 83–7, 138–9). In the early 21st century, in democracies around the globe electoral politics appears to have entered a new era of instability.

In the German setting, long-term processes of social and cultural modernization of the kind typical for all advanced industrial democracies but also the unique historical event of formerly Socialist East Germany's accession to the German Federal Republic's liberal democratic regime contributed to this development. In addition, during the past decade, the German parties and their voters were confronted with an unprecedented succession of dramatic political challenges that may have profoundly affected the elections conducted during this time. Whereas the 2009 federal election took place just one year after the world's most serious financial and economic crisis since the 1930s, the 2013 election was overshadowed by the long-term fallout of this crisis, the European sovereign debt crisis. The 2017 federal election, in turn, took place in the aftermath of the European

¹ The following reflections were completed in July 2020.

refugee crisis that had peaked in 2015. In the course of this period of electoral turmoil, Germany's second democracy forfeited an element of exceptionality that for decades had set it apart from comparable countries. After several failed attempts to establish a right-wing populist party in previous decades, the country's national parliament now for the first time also includes a sizable number of representatives from such a party (the AfD).

How did the turbulences that increasingly characterize German electoral politics come about? How did they in turn condition voters' decision-making? How were electoral attitudes and choices affected by situational factors that pertained to the specifics of particular elections? These are the questions addressed by this book. The following section summarizes the study's findings on the behavior of changing voters in the context of changing parties, campaigns, and media during the period of its hitherto most dramatically increased fluidity. Subsequently, it will be discussed what consequences these developments entail for the polarization of the party system and the formation of governments under the German parliamentary system of governance. The chapter closes with some necessarily lofty speculations about the prospects of electoral politics in Germany.

An Electorate in Flux

A Fragmenting Party System

How did the turbulences that increasingly characterize German electoral politics come about? Chapters 2 to 5 present facets of evidence that together provide an account of the processes that spurred the recent boost in party system fragmentation. Chapter 2 retraces the long-term process of cleavage decline that prepared the stage for the recent reconfiguration of German electoral politics. Focusing on the traditionally dominant center-right and center-left parties, the SPD and the CDU/CSU, the chapter shows how the traditional conflict dimensions that the second German democracy had inherited from the founding period of the party system in the late 19th century eroded and weakened their grip on voters. After a long period of gradually diminishing voter support, the most recent elections saw a dramatic slump in both parties' electoral outcomes. At first, the Social Democrats, but also with some delay and thus far less dramatic, the Christian Democrats, suffered major vote losses, calling into question their established role as gravitation centers of party competition (see Chapter 1). Examining survey data from all federal elections since 1949, the chapter shows how the socio-economic cleavage and the religious cleavage lost their structuring power for electoral behavior. The past decades saw not only a substantial shrinking of both parties' traditional core voter groups in the course of ongoing socio-economic and cultural modernization. The chapter also finds that these groups' inclination to support "their"

respective parties at the ballots decreased substantially. Indeed, for the parties' electoral fate, the latter process appears as the more significant one (see Goldberg 2020 for similar findings in other countries). Counterfactual simulation analyses suggest that the deterioration of the Social Democrats' and Christian Democrats' electoral standing is mainly attributable to waning loyalties on the part of traditional core groups whose remaining members appear to see these parties no longer as unquestionably self-evident choices.

This protracted weakening of traditional social-structural alignments rendered the traditional centrist parties' electoral basis increasingly precarious. Yet, elections are zero-sum games. Voters who desert parties need to go someplace else. Shrinking support for certain parties must be mirrored by increasing vote shares for other parties. Importantly, even after the fading of Germany's traditional cleavage structure, a two-dimensional perspective on party competition is necessary to make sense of these movements. It still distinguishes a socio-economic and socio-cultural dimension of contestation, but the content of the latter has changed (Rovny and Polk 2019). Of the many issues that pertain to this dimension and have over the years been more or less salient in public political debate (Kriesi et al. 2008), immigration has in recent years proven particularly divisive.

As Chapters 3 and 4 point out, vote losses of Western European center-right and center-left parties during the past two decades have often been accompanied by an upswing of parties with pronounced positions on the socio-cultural dimension of conflict, in more recent years in particular right-wing populist parties (Przeworski 2019: 87–100). Germany experienced this process with some delay, when the AfD, which had already scored close to 5 percent of the votes when it first ran at the 2013 federal election, was able to enter the national parliament as the strongest opposition party at the subsequent election of 2017. From an internationally comparative point of view, Chapter 3 characterizes this development as a normalization process. Somewhat belatedly, it repeated patterns of electoral change that had been observable for some time already in other Western European countries, although not in Germany, despite similar preconditions on the demand side of voters (Bornschieer 2012).

Taken together, the evidence presented in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 suggests that the ground for this development had indeed been laid much earlier but required special conditions to become manifest at elections. According to Chapter 4, already before the 2009 federal election, a shift in issue salience from socio-economic to socio-cultural concerns had occurred among German voters (see also Dalton 2018), rendering this conflict dimension more salient and divisive than topics of redistributive policies (Franzmann et al. 2020). In particular, a large part of the electorate deemed immigration policy increasingly important (see also Chapter 6). The chapter demonstrates that this advantaged the AfD at the ballots in two ways: directly, as voters concerned about immigration showed a clear tendency to support this party, and indirectly, as the topic's high salience also boosted voting based

on positional proximity regarding demarcationist vs. integrationist stances on this issue (Pappi et al. 2019). The electorate's mean position on this issue tended toward the demarcationist pole, and this changed overall rather little during the past decade. From 2013 on, the AfD catered to this demand. Nonetheless, it was not self-evident that it would profit from voters' opposition to immigration. That immigration-critical voters opted in increasing numbers for the AfD had also to do with programmatic changes of the mainstream parties.

This is demonstrated by Chapter 3, which draws attention to the dynamic interplay between voter demand and party supply as a precondition of electoral volatility. It finds that the growing electoral success of right-wing populist parties, in Germany just as in other Western European countries, was a response to shifts of mainstream center-left and center-right parties to the left on the new socio-cultural dimension of conflict. This did not lead to a convergence between these parties, to be sure. But their tandem moves to the left opened up a representation gap in political space that could be occupied by new political entrepreneurs from the right. While not yet clearly committed to a nativist agenda in the beginning, the AfD resolutely seized this opportunity during the refugee crisis of 2015—an event that amounted to a veritable “electoral shock” (Fieldhouse et al. 2020) with the power to undermine even strong party attachments, as is shown by Chapter 5. Accordingly, Chapter 3 demonstrates how voters' likelihood to support right-wing populist parties, in particular the AfD, increased when the parties they had previously chosen moved away from them in policy space. From this perspective, the emergence and establishment of the AfD appear as a result of mainstream parties' failure to address the more traditional socio-cultural preferences held by significant segments of the electorate.

While Chapter 3 applies a wide-angle lens and does not zoom in on the specific issue content that drove these processes, Chapter 4 suggests that the controversy about more restrictive or liberal immigration policies played a pivotal role. It demonstrates that, over time, the immigration issue became more and more consequential for electoral behavior. Chapter 5 provides further detail to this picture by showing that the refugee crisis of 2015 played a major role as a catalyst in these processes (see also Mader and Schoen 2019; Schoen and Gavras 2019). With a focus on partisanship, it attests to the increasingly disruptive power of conflicts on the socio-cultural dimension that revolve around questions of societal openness and demarcation, notably over the issue of immigration. The chapter departs from the premise that urgently pressing crises with far-reaching implications often impose policies on governing parties that do not conform to their images and which they otherwise would not have chosen—and which faithful partisans might profoundly dislike. Comparing the European sovereign debt crisis and the refugee crisis, two events for which this was clearly the case, the chapter finds that the latter, but not the former has led to a major shake-up of party attachments. Partisans that held no strong preferences on immigration policy followed their parties' lead and adapted

their positions to the policies pursued by them. But in cases of more intensely felt discrepancies, partisans tended to devalue their parties, sometimes to the point of abandoning them for good. Intensely negative immigration attitudes most clearly undermined identifications with the CDU, but to some extent also leftist, more immigration-friendly parties. Sometimes they even led to switching allegiances, and it was the AfD that profited from these defections.

Challenged Voters

The emergence and ascent of the AfD and the progressive fragmentation of the party system that it brought about are results of voters' choices. At the same time, these developments in turn have made choosing more challenging for voters. They raised the complexity of electoral decision-making, thus rendering it more difficult for electors to make up their minds about how to vote (Weßels et al. 2014). How did these changed conditions feedback into voters' decision-making? This is explored by Chapters 6 to 9. Chapter 6 examines how the AfD affected the underlying structure of inter-party electoral competition, conceived in terms of the availability of each party's voters for other parties. It reveals a remarkable process of double-sided electoral closure. Already when the AfD first ran in 2013, but even more pronounced at the 2017 election, its supporters were hardly available for other parties. Mirroring this self-encapsulated position within the party system, the other parties' support bases were also not open for the AfD. Thus, in voters' minds, the establishment of the AfD led to a segmentation of party competition. Suggesting that the advent of the AfD may have rendered party competition even more complex than conceived by the two-dimensional conception utilized by the previous chapters, the analysis further indicates that voters' patterns of electoral openness and closure were not only structured by the socio-economic and socio-cultural issue dimensions but also by a new divide between populist and pluralist orientations.

Complementing Chapter 6 with an interpersonal perspective, Chapter 7 reveals similar patterns in voters' social interactions. The focus of the chapter is on the prevalence of partisan agreement and disagreement in voters' everyday conversations about politics, conceived as talks with core network members that supported either the same or other parties than voters themselves. The character of these experiences is a joint product of voters' desire to seek out like-minded discussion partners, and the more or less limited availability of such persons within shared local contexts that serve as reservoirs of potential interaction partners. The reconfiguration of the party system discussed in Chapter 1 translated into an object of voters' social experience by way of changes in the partisan composition of the local contexts within which they resided (demonstrated by the chapter at the level of electoral districts). Comparing the partisan structuration of voters' discussant

networks at the 2009, 2013, and 2017 federal elections, the chapter shows how the increasing fragmentation of the party system led to more everyday political talk across party lines. But AfD supporters displayed particularly strong selectivity. More than others, these voters tended to encapsulate themselves in highly homogenous conversation networks.

Drawing on Lau and Redlawsk's (2006) notion of "correct" voting, Chapter 8 studies implications of the emergence and establishment of the AfD for the consistency of voters' electoral choices with their political attitudes and preferences. It detects a remarkably stable amount of attitude-consistent voting for the three elections of 2009, 2013, and 2017. However, this seemingly unchanged surface concealed significant shifts in the ways voters arrived at their decisions. The 2013 federal election stood out in this regard. The 2009 and 2017 elections displayed the well-known pattern of inconsistent voting being strongly associated with low levels of political knowledge. In 2013, by contrast, inconsistent choices reflected "insurgent party protest voting." They seem to have purposively not been driven by the intent to vote in line with one's preferences. When deciding which party to choose, some citizens apparently let general discontent about the course of politics override standard factors of the voting calculus. Accordingly, inconsistent choices were strongly associated with dissatisfaction with political elites and the performance of democracy as well as sympathy for the AfD as a populist party that from early on was heavily and across the board critical of established parties and their leaders (Lewandowsky et al. 2016).

Coalition governments have always been an important feature of German politics. Chapter 9 investigates how voters navigated the complexities of coalition politics under the increasingly challenging circumstances of the fragmenting party system. The chapter analyses the role of voters' coalition considerations at the 2009, 2013, and 2017 federal elections in a dynamic perspective. It confirms that government coalitions (and options for alternative coalitions) are important political objects for voters to which they relate in consistent ways, even in times of a rapidly changing political environment. In addition, the chapter reports independent, remarkably stable effects of coalition preferences on vote choices at each of the three elections. Overall, its findings indicate that voters are neither fully instrumental nor fully expressive. They suggest that, as the party system expanded and the number of possible coalitions increased, coalition considerations have become even more important for voters.

Situational Voting

The dealignment perspective entails the expectation that as the structuration of electoral behavior through traditional cleavages and partisan affiliations recedes, voting decisions become increasingly contextually contingent (Schoen

et al. 2017b) and short-term in nature. With partisanship and other traditional politicized identities eroding, voters are no longer able to resort to the internalized guideposts of political predispositions to make sense of politics. In the long run, the filter effect of biased information processing on the part of “rationalizing voters” (Lodge and Taber 2013) should therefore evaporate. Instead, dealigned electorates should respond more strongly to the ever-changing situational peculiarities of elections. Chapters 10 to 14 examine how situational factors resonated with voters at the 2009, 2013, and 2017 federal elections. They focus on the fall-out of the crises that preceded these elections (Chapter 10), the role of the parties’ lead candidates (Chapter 11), media effects (Chapters 12 and 13), and campaign effects (Chapter 14). For lack of data covering an appropriate time span, none of these chapters can prove that short-term factors have actually become more influential in the long run. However, pointing to a greater sensitivity of apartisan voters for the politics of the moment, they provide evidence on a necessary condition for a more prominent role of situational voting under conditions of ongoing dealignment.

Building on an event-driven model of crisis-related vote change, Chapter 10 examines the role of the world financial and economic crisis, the Euro crisis, and the refugee crisis for electoral volatility at the 2009, 2013, and 2017 federal elections. It finds that the proposed causal chain from crisis experiences over changing problem priorities and shifting competence attributions to altered electoral choices has been quite tenuous at all three crises. To begin with, voters’ problem priorities were not fully aligned with the crises’ sequence. Moreover, changes in problem priorities did not always go along with changes in competence attributions. Rather, the latter to some extent reflected voters’ political predispositions. Last, although the impact of these changed attitudes on vote choices was noticeable, it remained limited. Altered party competence attributions did promote vote switching, but other factors, such as shifts in candidate evaluations (studied in more detail in Chapter 11), were also important. The chapter confirms that, through changes in problem priorities and party competence attributions, the three crises did contribute to the high electoral volatility that characterized the 2009, 2013, and 2017 federal elections. But their impact was only moderate. The massively increased mobility of voters at these elections was only to a limited extent attributable to the crises that preceded them.

Studying the role of parties’ lead candidates for voters’ choices in detail, Chapter 11 provides nuanced evidence for personalized decision-making as a driver of electoral volatility. It shows how alterations in candidate evaluations—whether they originated from improving or deteriorating views of repeatedly nominated identical candidates, or differing views of a party’s current candidate in comparison to his or her predecessor at the previous election—stimulated voters to reconsider choices taken at the previous election. As a result, they tended to abandon parties they had supported in the past when they held their candidates

in lower esteem (push effects) and moved toward other parties when they viewed their candidates more positively than the ones before (pull effects). Importantly, this concerned not only the lead candidates of the two large parties, CDU/CSU and SPD, which traditionally were considered the only serious contenders for the office of head of government. To a lesser extent, voters' likelihood to switch votes between parties was also influenced by their views of the lead candidates of the smaller parties that served as faces of their parties during the campaigns but did not compete for particular offices.

Zooming in on the Christian Democrats' and Social Democrats' chancellor candidates, Chapter 12 demonstrates the effects of these politicians' televised debates on party preferences. Such media events are a staple of campaign communication across the globe. In Germany, the so-called "TV duels" were introduced in 2002 and immediately became core elements of federal election campaigns. Attracting huge audiences and obtaining a lot of news coverage renders them the single most important communication event in federal election campaigns. The chapter finds that the TV debates of 2009, 2013, and 2017 exerted significant direct and indirect effects on voters. Both immediate exposure to these media events (at which impressions of winning or losing the "duel" were particularly relevant) and—similarly strongly—exposure to follow-up communications in the news media and within voters' networks of family, friends, and acquaintances affected the vote intentions of sizable parts of these broadcasts' audiences. Politically unsophisticated voters appeared most open to both direct and indirect debate effects.

For the same set of elections, Chapter 13 examines the electorate's responsiveness to persuasive influences of news. It shows that news coverage that was favorably or unfavorably valenced toward parties or candidates—either through the intensity and direction of its evaluative tone (statement bias) or the amount of reporting devoted to them (coverage bias)—affected voters' electoral attitudes. These media effects reached not only voters who followed the news but also individuals who did not attend to the news, presumably by means of secondary diffusion through audience members who "spread the news" further to their fellow citizens. Both TV news and the press appeared influential, though the former more clearly than the latter. Importantly, apartisan voters were more sensitive to news content than those identifying with a party (cf. Shehata and Strömbäck 2020: 64–8). However, due to the way the news media presented politics during the examined election campaigns, these effects do not seem to have affected the outcomes of the three elections. In line with the general logic of democratic-corporatist media systems (Hallin and Mancini 2004), they displayed common patterns of selectivity with regard to the amount of coverage devoted to the parties and their candidates, presumably resulting from similar criteria of newsworthiness across different media that were strongly guided by power differences between parties. At the same time, the news media showed considerable restraint with regard to evaluative content and do not seem to have treated the competing parties

and candidates in systematically unequal ways. Due to mutual cancellation, much of the news media's potential impact on voters thus remained muted.

Examining campaign dynamics of public opinion at the 2005 to 2017 federal elections, Chapter 14 widens the scope beyond specific sources of electoral information. It proposes a four-way decomposition of the voting function depending on the variability of explanatory factors between elections and within campaigns. The chapter finds that for partisans—which despite partisan dealignment still form a majority of the electorate—election campaigns mainly served as forces of activation (Lazarsfeld et al. 1944). This rendered successive elections more similar to one another and, together with economic perceptions, contributed to their predictability. Importantly, however, with growing numbers of parties, situation-specific defection from party identities has become more ubiquitous. Thus, the fragmentation of the party system has turned partisan activation into a more contingent process because partisans increasingly may choose from a broader menu of ideologically proximate parties. In line with this less strict and automatic conception of activation, coalition expectations and voting intentions for small parties fluctuated strongly both between elections and within campaigns. The chapter concludes that, although generalized patterns still dominated pre-electoral short-term dynamics, certain numerically modest situation-driven shifts may have been pivotal around the electoral threshold, with implications for the feasibility of coalitions. This suggests that, with weakened connections between citizens and parties, campaigns increasingly manifest themselves as games of strategy in which seemingly small changes can make a big difference.

A Political System in Flux

An Era Coming to a Close

After the 2017 federal election, the roller-coaster of German electoral politics did not stop—quite to the contrary. Polling data suggest that about a year after the election, an era finally came to a close (Figure 15.1): The duopoly of two mainstream “people’s parties,” one center-right, the other center-left, which for seven decades had defined electoral contests as the main competitors and sole aspirants to the chancellorship, has ended. Despite its massive vote losses, this yet does not so much concern the CDU/CSU, which once again took over the leading role in the federal government under its chairperson Angela Merkel as chancellor. For most of the electoral cycle, it maintained a rather stable support base at about the level it had scored at the 2017 election, amounting to about a third of the electorate. By contrast, about a year after the election the SPD’s support base virtually imploded. It stabilized at a floor amounting to just about half the size of the Christian Democrats’ voter base.




Fig. 15.1 Party support after the 2017 federal election (percent)

Note: Data on “political mood” from Politbarometer polls conducted monthly by the Forschungsgruppe Wahlen for the Second German Public TV channel (ZDF). The indicator was chosen because of its relative closeness to the raw data generated by vote intention questions (so-called “Sunday questions”).

Source: https://www.forschungsgruppe.de/Umfragen/Politbarometer/Langzeitentwicklung_-_Themen_im_Ueberblick/Politik_I/2_Stimmung_1.xlsx (accessed on 14 July, 2020).

Even more importantly, the collapse of the Social Democrats was complemented by an unprecedented ascent of the Greens that from then on constantly surpassed them in the polls by a considerable margin. For about eighteen months, the Greens scored in a range not much below the CDU/CSU. However, this near parity ended with a sharp surge of the Christian Democrats to a level last seen after the 2013 federal election. It occurred in spring 2020 and can be directly attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic, an event that, like previous crises, immediately turned into an “hour of the executive.” Compared to many other democracies, Germany came relatively little scathed through the first wave of the pandemic. As it seems, voters credited the leading government party (but not its junior partner) for the Grand Coalition’s handling of the crisis (Bol et al. 2020 demonstrate this phenomenon also for other countries).

Unsurprisingly, these were also years in which all parties, with the possible exception of the Greens, were deeply absorbed in—often highly divisive—internal controversies about how to adapt best to the changing conditions of declining loyalty and rising volatility on the part of voters. Leadership questions were high on the agenda. Both the Christian Democrats and the Social Democrats exchanged their party leaders (thereby divorcing leadership positions from government offices), not once, but repeatedly. The newly elected chairpersons were met with

great hopes—but also high expectations and little patience. Once in office, the new leaders' honeymoon period was invariably short, as major improvements of the parties' electoral standing failed to materialize. Questions of policy were also highly salient, and often connected to debates about the right choices for leadership. Some parties were deeply torn on matters of substantive strategy, indicating that today's complex structure of political conflicts is not only divisive between parties but also within parties.

The mainstream parties' internal debates mainly took the form of traditionalists seeking to stand their ground against increasingly dominant (socio-cultural) modernizers. By contrast, the AfD took several distinct moves further right by re-enacting the script of its redefining moment in 2015, i.e., leadership struggles where radicals prevailed over (relatively) moderates. In some states, the AfD's leadership consists of barely concealed right-wing extremists. Last, there have also been intense debates about coalition strategies. After painfully embarking on another Grand Coalition, the Social Democrats continued to debate almost uninterruptedly whether to continue their cooperation with the CDU/CSU or end it during the electoral cycle (see below). Within the AfD, more moderate leaders would like to see the party pursuing its agenda in government coalitions, but the radicals prefer a strategy of both parliamentary and extra-parliamentary obstruction (Schroeder and Weßels 2019b). For the other parties, the AfD is out of bounds as a coalition partner at all levels of the political system, although among some East German Christian Democrats this demarcation appears less principled. The Left, by contrast, is considered an acceptable coalition partner at least in state governments, except for the CDU.

Increasing Polarization

These latest developments imply that, after the 2017 federal election, the long-term process of party system fragmentation has continued to progress in leaps and bounds. In comparative research, party system fragmentation (Schmitt and Franzmann 2020) and more specifically the rise of populist parties (Wagschal 2020) have been found to give rise to the polarization of party systems, i.e., increasing divergence between parties and coherence within them. Traditionally, party system polarization has been conceived as a policy-related phenomenon, in which parties are viewed as objects characterized by particular ideological positions and corresponding policy profiles. It has thus typically been studied in terms of the parties' left–right positions and the distances between them. Sartori (1976: 131–216) has famously attributed the breakdown of Germany's first democracy to its party system's "polarized pluralism," that is, a pattern characterized by significant anti-system parties to the left and right and centrifugal political competition that is fought over non-negotiable principles so that it is difficult to strike bargains on

policies and form stable government coalitions. High ideological polarization thus impairs the working of democracy because it makes it harder or even impossible for parties to cooperate in governance. By undermining constructive politics polarization may damage the functioning and ultimately the stability of democratic regimes.

In democracies around the globe, political life seems to be affected by an escalating process of polarization (McCoy and Somer 2019). Yet, how polarized was Germany's party system at the 2009 to 2017 elections? Did it become more polarized over the course of these three elections? The left–right dimension allows for obtaining an impression of the party system's ideological polarization (see Wagner 2019 for a detailed evaluation of the criteria of polarized pluralism). To begin with some background, Figure 15.2 shows the distribution of voters' ideological orientations. It reveals a stable unimodal distribution of left–right positions. There is no indication of any movement in the direction of the dreaded bimodal distribution, in which significant segments of the electorate are located at the extremes rather than at the moderate center of the ideological scale (Lelkes 2016: 395–8). If there was any change at all, it consisted in the gravitation center of voters' ideological leanings moving very slightly to the left from 2009 (mean: 5.51) over 2013 (5.42) to 2017 (5.34).

Neither conceived as a state nor as a trend (Lelkes 2016: 393) does polarization thus characterize the ideological preferences of the German electorate. Yet,




Fig. 15.2 Left–right positions of voters, 2009 to 2017 (percent)

Note: Data are weighted by region and demographics.

Sources: CrossSec09_Cum, CrossSec13_Cum, CrossSec17_Cum.

Table 15.1 Ideological polarization of voters, 2009 to 2017

	2009	2013	2017
Index of ideological polarization	3.59	3.25	3.85
Parties' perceived left–right positions			
Left	2.09	2.11	2.15
Greens	4.24	4.25	4.28
SPD	4.70	4.67	4.54
FDP	6.66	6.68	5.95
CDU/CSU	7.49	7.22	6.35
AfD	-	6.95	9.64
Left–right range of party system	5.40	5.11	7.49
Left–right range of party system (AfD excluded)	5.40	5.11	4.20

Note: Index of ideological polarization calculated according to the formula by Dalton (2008); analyses based on eleven-point left–right scale (range 1–11); data are weighted by region and demographics.
Sources: CrossSec09_Cum, CrossSec13_Cum, CrossSec17_Cum.

polarization is often originating not from voters but from political elites who use polarizing strategies to pursue political objectives (McCoy and Somer 2019). Table 15.1 provides data on the ideological polarization of the party system. The grand picture is supplied by Dalton's (2008) aggregate index of ideological party system polarization. It is derived from voters' perceptions of the parties' locations on the left–right dimension, weighted by their election results. In his seminal study, Dalton (2008: 907) registered a rather low, though slowly increasing degree of polarization for the German parties in the early 2000s. The level reported in Table 15.1 is one full point higher on the polarization scale. It is thus still not high in absolute terms, but the data signal a further small increase at the 2017 election compared to the two earlier elections. This suggests that—overall—the ideological polarization of the German party system is on the rise, although not dramatically.

The lower panels of the table provide more nuanced insights. They show how voters placed each of the parties on the left–right scale at each of the three elections. The Left and the Greens remained steadfast in place on the far respectively moderate left. The SPD and the FDP maintained their center-left and centrist locations between 2009 and 2013 but moved somewhat to the left in 2017. The CDU/CSU moved continuously to the left across all three elections, particularly strongly in 2017. This echoes the findings of Chapter 3. When the AfD emerged in 2013, voters located it slightly to the left of the CDU/CSU and right of the FDP. Yet, at the subsequent election, it was clearly perceived as a right-wing party, located not far from the endpoint of scale. This led to a considerable expansion of the range occupied by the parties on the left–right scale. At the 2009 and 2013 elections,

it amounted to less than half of the scale width, but at the 2017 election the range between the left-most party (the Left) and the party located furthest on the right—now the AfD—was much larger, amounting to three-quarters of the scale. This considerably widened spread was entirely due to the AfD's shift to the right. The span occupied by all other parties was much more restricted. In fact, in 2017, the other parties' ideological positions differed considerably less than in 2009 when the AfD did not yet exist. At the 2017 federal election, the party system thus was characterized by a very peculiar ideological structure, consisting of a rather dense cluster of established parties, ranging from the Left to the Christian Democrats and the AfD as a clear outlier, located quite a distance away from all other parties.

In recent years, the traditional policy-related conception of party system polarization in ideological terms has been supplemented by a second perspective. It views parties as objects of identification that evoke positive or negative emotional reactions, thus giving rise to “affective” polarization (Iyengar et al. 2012; 2019). Here, parties are understood as emotionally valenced group objects. As in-groups that generate a sense of identity and belongingness, they give rise to positive feelings among their members; as out-groups, they may evoke more or less intense negative feelings. Affective polarization has important ramifications for social life. Societies that are affectively polarized on party terms tend to split up into hostile camps that conceive political life in irreconcilable “us-versus-them” terms. Citizens then withdraw into echo chambers of like-minded associates, and dialogue across lines of difference is at risk of breaking down. Under such circumstances, self-reinforcing spirals of encapsulation that turn political opponents into enemies may be set in motion. Developments of this kind may ultimately endanger democracy itself as a system of governance in which societies' pluralism is managed in peaceful ways on the basis of its members' acceptance of the basic norm of “agreeing to disagree” (Kelsen 2013; Przeworski 2010). Eroding approval of this principle appears as part and parcel of an encompassing, worldwide crisis of liberal democracy. Polarized societies' hostile “tribalism” appears as an important driver of democratic backsliding and decay (McCoy and Somer 2019).

Table 15.2 presents indications of affective polarization in the German party system. Our global measure of the party system's overall polarization is a variant of an index recently proposed by Reiljan (2019). Adapting the logic of the standard measure used by studies of the American two-party system to the conditions of multi-party systems, it is based on voters' evaluations of parties on like-dislike thermometer scales, weighted by the parties' vote shares. Whereas Reiljan's (2019) index refers to partisan groups (and ignores a-partisans), our version is constructed on the basis of vote choices. Accordingly, the index aggregates information on how electors saw each of the parties they did not choose in comparison to the one they voted for. This seems appropriate for the study of a dealigning electorate in which many voters hold no party identification and in which, in particular, not enough time has yet passed to build up genuine attachments with the AfD as a young party.

Table 15.2 Affective polarization of voters, 2009 to 2017

	2009	2013	2017
Index of affective polarization	3.56	3.70	3.51
Party thermometer scores by vote choice:			
<i>Most positive score (in-party)</i>			
CDU/CSU	8.89	9.29	9.71
SPD	8.33	8.90	9.34
FDP	8.69	8.34	9.17
Greens	8.94	9.15	9.36
Left	8.87	9.42	9.23
AfD	-	8.78	8.60
Average across parties	8.74	8.81	9.23
Average across parties (AfD excluded)	8.74	9.02	9.36
<i>Most negative score (in brackets: AfD excluded)</i>			
CDU/CSU	3.00	3.45	2.26 (4.39)
SPD	4.72	3.66 (3.92)	2.04 (5.77)
FDP	3.08	3.67	2.41 (4.50)
Greens	4.79	4.29 (4.35)	1.56 (5.97)
Left	3.67	3.26	2.18 (5.14)
AfD	-	3.76	3.77
Average across parties	3.85	3.67	2.37
Average across parties (AfD excluded)	3.85	3.73	5.15
<i>Difference between most positive and most negative score (in brackets: AfD excluded)</i>			
CDU/CSU	5.89	5.84	7.45 (5.32)
SPD	3.61	5.24 (4.98)	7.30 (3.75)
FDP	5.61	4.67	6.76 (4.67)
Greens	4.15	4.86 (4.80)	7.80 (3.39)
Left	5.20	6.16	7.05 (4.09)
AfD	-	5.02	4.83
Average across parties	4.89	5.30	6.86
Average across parties (AfD voters excluded)	4.89	5.35	7.27
Average across parties (AfD + AfD voters excluded)	4.89	5.29	4.24

Note: Index of affective polarization based on eleven-point thermometer scales (range 1–11; CSU for Bavarian respondents, CDU for others), calculated according to the formula by Reiljan (2019), but based on vote choices instead of partisanship (second votes, small parties excluded from base for vote share calculation); data are weighted by region and demographics.

Sources: CrossSec09_Cum, CrossSec13_Cum, CrossSec17_Cum.

The index values displayed in Table 15.2 suggest that the overall intensity of affective polarization among voters was somewhat lower than among the committed partisans studied by Reiljan (2019: 11). On the other hand, it was by no means negligible. In longitudinal perspective, however, the data signal little variability across elections and no linear increase from 2009 to 2017.

Yet, more fine-grained data again show more than meets the eye when looking only at the global index. It is hardly surprising that the thermometer scores given by voters to the parties they chose were invariably the most positive ones. More interestingly, from election to election, most parties were liked better by their respective electorates. The exception is the AfD which departs from this picture in two ways. Its voters were always on average less enthusiastic about their party than the supporters of all other parties, and there was no increase over time. Particularly revealing are the data on the most negative evaluations and the differences between the most positive and most negative evaluations, which can be interpreted as measures of the affective distances between parties. They uncover further aspects that render the status of the AfD special within the German party system. At the 2013 election, only for two voter groups the AfD was the least liked and thus emotionally most distant party: supporters of the SPD and the Greens. By 2017, the picture was completely different. Now the AfD was most strongly disliked by the voters of all established parties, and its scores were also much lower than the most negative ones given to any party at previous elections. Together, these data indicate a gap that widened constantly from election to election—rather modestly between 2009 and 2013 but dramatically from 2013 to 2017. AfD voters themselves appear peculiar, however, since especially in 2017 their affective distance from the party they liked least was considerably smaller than was the case for all other parties' voters. Another interesting piece of evidence can be obtained by omitting the AfD from the calculations (by excluding AfD voters and evaluations of the AfD if this party was the least liked one). This counterfactual restriction of the analysis to the traditional parties leads to a picture of affective polarization that was not increasing but indeed decreasing over time.

These observations illustrate that both the ideological polarization and the affective polarization of the German party system increased between the 2009 and 2017 elections, although overall only slightly, and thus below or at the edge of the sensitivity levels of the global aggregate indices. The driver of this development was the emergence and ideological radicalization of the AfD. This triggered a process of party system segmentation that was not yet apparent in 2013 but came fully to the fore in 2017. At this election, both faces of party system polarization displayed a similar, distinct structure. Its defining feature is an antagonism between all established parties on the one hand and the AfD on the other. In terms of ideological polarization, this dual pattern takes the form of a rather densely spaced cluster of established parties, ranging from the far left to the center-right, and the AfD, occupying a remote position on the far right. The development of affective

polarization was characterized by moves of the voters of the Left, Greens, SPD, FDP, and CDU/CSU closer to one another, and away from the AfD. At the 2017 federal election, this party occupied an isolated position whose emotional distance to all established parties' voters was larger than it had been for any pair of parties in 2009 or even 2013. Together, these findings suggest that the AfD's determined move to the right since 2015 initiated assimilation-contrast dynamics (Bless and Schwarz 1998) on the part of supporters of the established parties. They underline the results of Chapter 6 about the lack of availability of other parties' voters for the AfD but suggest that this constellation was not fully reciprocated by the AfD's voters. Perhaps, given the right circumstances and above all intelligent strategies that distinguish between AfD elites and voters and imply neither policy mimicking nor undifferentiated demonization on the part of established parties (Meguid 2007), these voters are not lost for good.

Precarious Government

The progressive fragmentation and polarization of the German party system, which intensified after 2005, adds considerable complexity to the electoral process. When even the customary distinction between large and small parties appears increasingly meaningless (Poguntke 2014) and voters no longer grant sufficient majorities to the traditional, ideologically consistent bipolar alternatives of "black-yellow" (CDU/CSU-FDP) and "red-green" (SPD-Greens) two-party alliances, the formation of governments becomes more and more difficult (Dalton 2018: 230–1). Coalition taboos concerning the AfD and the Left (at the federal level) raise additional hurdles, especially when voters grant these parties strong parliamentary presences. New, more complex scenarios of governmental cooperation beyond the long-established models need to be developed. This requires parties to think outside the box—and provide adequate rationales to their voters in order not to alienate them. Beyond that, inevitably rising intra-governmental conflict potentials and rising transaction costs of cooperation will render the emerging governments' capacity to function smoothly, act decisively, and remain stable precarious (Kropp 2010). This, in turn, might resonate negatively with voters.

A look at government formations in the German states gives an impression of what this means. As second-order elections, in which less is at stake (Reif and Schmitt 1980), state elections have always made it easier for voters to deviate from customary patterns of choice and experiment with their votes. As a consequence, the rising complexity of the party system manifested itself in the states earlier and more massively (Niedermayer 2012). At the same time, since many areas of policy are outside the states' remit, the conflict potential between parties is lower and they find it easier to cooperate. State governments have therefore repeatedly served as testbeds for innovative party cooperations that later on were also adopted at the

federal level. In recent years, this led to a wide proliferation of different kinds of governments.

During the 1980s, the world of state governments had still been very clearly structured (Table 15.3). Almost two out of three governments were in the hands of just one party. Most others consisted of coalitions of two ideologically connected parties, corresponding to the established formulas of federal governments. After the creation of the five new East German states in 1990, the situation changed. This had to do with the emergence but also considerable electoral strength of the East German newcomer to the party system, the PDS (later the Left), which was at first considered unacceptable as a coalition partner. From then on, single-party governments became less common, whereas coalition governments of two parties from the same side, but increasingly also from opposite sides of the left–right spectrum (Spier 2010), became more frequent. During the same decade, the first coalitions emerged that included three partners and crossed the ideological divide. After 2000, single-party governments rapidly turned into infrequent minority phenomena whereas ideologically congenial two-party coalitions became the modal category.

In the second decade of the new millennium, the situation shifted to yet another degree of complexity. Single-party governments now became truly exceptional, whereas the rest consisted of (ideologically consistent) intra- and (inconsistent) inter-camp coalitions to almost equal shares. Grand Coalitions are a special case of the latter. They first appeared in the 1990s (Kropp 2010). Straddling the ideological divide and coupling the party system's main antagonists in a joint government, they are typically not sought for by any of the participants and created more out of necessity than desire, when no alternative appears feasible (Müller 2008; Spier 2015). Nonetheless, their share increased sharply to about one out of four state governments during the following decade. After a more hesitant start, the number of three-party coalitions also expanded greatly, ultimately amounting to about one out of five governments and including cases in which even a Grand Coalition needed support from a third party to reach a majority in its state's parliament. The traditional bipolar ideological camp logic thus appears to have lost its hold on parties' coalition considerations.

As a result of the AfD's growing popularity in the East, government formation became even harder at the most recent East German state elections. The Thuringian election of October 2019 provides telling anecdotal evidence of the electoral quagmires that may loom under conditions of intensifying fragmentation but also polarization and segmentation of the party system (Oppelland 2020). This election was the first at which, following vote gains of the Left and especially the AfD, not even CDU, SPD, FDP, and Greens together would have reached a parliamentary majority. An attempt to continue the previous left-of-center coalition of Left, SPD, and Greens at least as a minority government on the basis of a relative majority of parliamentary votes failed spectacularly when—in a stunningly

Table 15.3 Composition of state governments, 1980–2020

	1980s	1990s	2000s	2010s
Single-party governments:				
CDU or CSU	15	10	8	2
SPD	11	14	1	1
FDP				1
Intra-block coalitions:				
CDU or CSU and FDP	9	9	8	7
CDU, FDP, and PRO			1	
CSU and FW				1
SPD and Greens	1	10	5	11
SPD, Greens, and SSW				1
SPD and Left		1	3	3
SPD, Left, and Greens				4
Inter-block coalitions:				
Grand Coalition		9	10	13
CDU and Greens			1	4
SPD and FDP	5	3	1	
SPD, Greens, and FDP		2		1
CDU, FDP, and Greens				2
Grand Coalition and Greens			1	2
Single-party governments (%)	63.4	41.4	23.1	7.5
Intra-block coalitions (%)	24.4	34.5	43.6	50.9
Inter-block coalitions (%)	12.2	24.1	33.3	41.5
(Pure) Grand Coalitions (%)	0.0	15.5	25.6	24.5
Coalitions of three parties (%)	0.0	3.4	5.1	18.9
Total (N)	41	58	39	53

Notes: Units are Cabinets.

Source: Own calculations based on [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Landesregierung_\(Deutschland\)](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Landesregierung_(Deutschland)).

surprising turn of events—a counter candidate of the FDP was elected head of the state government with one parliamentary vote more than the previous incumbent of the Left. As a result, for the first time, the FDP assumed the position of a head of government, which was all the more bizarre since the party had gained just seventy-five votes more than necessary to pass the 5 percent threshold and commanded only five seats in parliament. The CDU's MPs openly supported this candidate to express their rejection of the planned leftist government but that he won was due to votes from the AfD—which had also nominated a candidate of its own but obviously only to deceive the other parties because he received not a single vote.

After massive public criticism and pressure from national party leaders (including his own), which deemed a government grace of the AfD unacceptable, the new head of government stepped down after a few days without attempting to form a government (which is why this episode is counted as single-party government

of the FDP in Table 15.3). In the end, the Christian Democrats helped to install the initially planned minority government of the three leftist parties, in exchange for their commitment to seek new elections within a year. Of course, when called to the polls again, voters can be expected to take their recent experiences into account, thus creating a feedback loop from the parties' parliamentary maneuvering to the electorate's choices at the next election. Whether its outcome will render government formation any easier is impossible to tell but does not appear likely. What the events witnessed by voters will certainly not produce is more trust in the functioning of the democratic process. Given that lacking support for the democratic system is an important ingredient of voting for the AfD (Schmitt-Beck et al. 2017), the party's obstruction of unwritten rules of fair play in parliament might thus in the end be even rewarded at the polls.

State politics has often foreshadowed processes later reaching the federal level as well. As outlined in Chapter 1, at the 2005 federal election, a Grand Coalition appeared as the only feasible way to form a viable government. Whereas in 2009, the seat distribution for once enabled the CDU/CSU and FDP to reactivate the traditional model of a "black–yellow" coalition, parliamentary seat shares yet again allowed for neither this nor the alternative "red–green" option at the two subsequent elections. Both yet again led to Grand Coalitions. From the perspective of electoral accountability, Grand Coalitions are not desirable because they tend to undercut the competition by blurring the alternatives. They also weaken the parliamentary opposition, especially if they command a large majority, as was the case in 2013, although due to the Christian Democrats' and Social Democrats' massive vote losses not any more in 2017. Moreover, they tend to undermine the respective junior partner's electoral prospects to the advantage of the senior partner because voters tend to attribute the successes of governments to the parties of the respective heads of government (Debus et al. 2013). The weakness of the SPD since 2009 may in part have resulted from these dynamics.

In the immediate aftermath of the 2017 election, fear of yet another such outcome of their joining a Grand Coalition indeed motivated the Social Democrats to entrench themselves in a stance of strict rejection of any further collaboration with the Christian Democrats. The only conceivable alternative was therefore a three-party coalition. Such a scenario, although during the past decade not uncommon in the states (Table 15.3), had never been seriously considered at the national level. After the 2017 federal election, for the first time, an effort was undertaken to assess the feasibility of a coalition between CDU/CSU, FDP, and Greens. However, in the end, no agreement could be accomplished, and all eyes were therefore yet again on the Social Democrats. This time, they complied and for the fourth time joined a Grand Coalition under the leadership of the Christian Democrats (Blinzler et al. 2019).

However, even though it thus led to yet another reiteration of a meanwhile established model for organizing the federal government, the 2017 election was unique.

For the first time in the country's post-war history, it appeared seriously doubtful whether the federal parliament would be able to fulfill its crucial electoral function of creating a new government (Bagehot 2001). For almost six months, and thus exactly twice as long as during the hitherto most complicated process of government formation (which had followed the previous election), Germany and its international partners had to get by with a caretaker government without the ability and mandate to act on important issues and the lingering fear that a new election might need to be called to leave it to the electorate to cut the Gordian knot that it had laced in the first place (Siefken 2018; Bräuninger et al. 2019; Linhart and Switek 2019). After the government had finally set to work, the tension hardly eased, and the possibility of premature cessation of the coalition was always in the air. Bitter struggles over immigration policy called the decades-old cooperation between CDU and CSU into question, and the SPD's internal debates about whether to continue or abandon the coalition never ceased—at least until the arrival of SARS-CoV-2.

Hazy Prospects

There is no magic crystal ball that allows us to gaze into the future, and even educated guessing is difficult with so many parameters of coming elections not fixed but variable. With progressing globalization, German voters find themselves more and more exposed to the challenging conditions of today's "VUCA world" (Mack and Khare 2016), in which parties' ability to steer clear courses in line with their manifestos is more and more constricted by events and developments outside their control (Sassen 1996; Hellwig 2015; Vowles and Xezonakis 2016). But through their behavior, voters also contribute their own fair share to the "Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, and Ambiguity" of contemporary politics. Over the last federal elections, they have brought about a massive transformation of the party system. The erstwhile highly concentrated party system, in which competition revolved around two mainstream "people's parties" that aggregated the preferences of the vast majority of voters, has mutated into a six-party system. Three years after the last federal election, only one party—the CDU/CSU—still stands out as clearly stronger than the others, but even that only with a share of the electorate that is a far cry from what it scored in its heyday.

The situational context of the next elections cannot be known yet, but voters' greater sensitivity to these circumstances can be taken as a given. At some subliminal level, how voters relate to the parties seems to be changing. Arguably, a subtle shift from expressive to more instrumental electoral behavior is underway (Brennan and Lomasky 1993; Mair 2013). As traditional cleavage politics turns into a distant echo from the past, voters appear less inclined to support parties for their own sake, drawing reward from the mere act of displaying their partisan

identities. Instead, they appear more sensitive to the parties' policies. In particular, they seem to have become more impatient with parties pursuing courses of action they dislike. While voters "began to choose" already decades ago (Rose and McAllister 1986), their behavior at the most recent elections suggests that they have become less tolerant over time with what they perceive as policy aberrations and failures to perform on the part of parties. To some extent, partisan identities seem to have given way to an understanding of parties as political service agencies that are easily abandoned if they do not deliver.

At the same time, parties—pressured to respond to developments outside their control and forced to engage in complex, multi-layered, and apparently "messy" processes of negotiating and bargaining (often semantically vilified by journalists as "bickering")—encounter increasing difficulties to offer policies that appear consistent, efficient, easy to comprehend, and visibly in line with voters' preferences. Accordingly, the likelihood of voter dissatisfaction is systematically rising (Dalton 2004: 128–54; Stoker 2017). On the part of voters, diminishing deference to authorities and recourse to elite-challenging behavior is no longer primarily a domain of leftist-libertarian "critical citizens" (Norris 2011; Campbell 2019). Protest politics has become more ubiquitous (Giugni and Grasso 2019). Its complement in institutionalized participation is electoral behavior characterized by a rising readiness to desert parties and shift to others, thus turning one's back on previous suppliers of policy if they are found wanting, in order to try out others.

Each of the three federal elections since 2009 was overshadowed by a massive crisis, and the analyses presented in this book have shown how they shook up voters' decision-making. As the first election after the end of the Christian Democratic–Social Democratic duopoly is coming up in fall 2021, the next major crisis is already well underway, and it will probably entail more far-reaching long-term consequences than any of its precursors. How the COVID-19 pandemic will play out electorally is highly uncertain. In Germany, the public health challenge of the outbreak was, to date, better under control than in most other Western democracies (Yuan et al. 2020), and federal and state governments swiftly enacted wide-ranging measures to ease immediate economic hardship on the part of businesses and employees (Elgin et al. 2020). Public controversies arose mainly about the extent to which the state legitimately could restrict its citizens' civil liberties. Arguably, in terms of policy conflicts, this crisis initially related more strongly to the socio-cultural than the socio-economic dimension.

However, as the material fallout of the months-long domestic lockdown and the worldwide economic downturn will make itself more strongly felt, this may change. By the time of the next election, rising unemployment and a stumbling economy may well have shifted issue emphasis back from the hitherto dominant socio-cultural dimension to socio-economic "bread and butter" concerns. The last decade's salience-induced electoral realignment was arguably more strongly driven by value-based identity conflicts than by interest conflicts between clear-cut

social groups (Norris and Inglehart 2019). If that is true, the new conflict constellation may turn out to be more responsive to current politics and policies than the institutionalized cleavages originating from the beginnings of democratic mass politics (Dalton 2018: 228–31). As a consequence, the pendulum might swing back, away from the parties advantaged by the salience of cultural conflict—the AfD and the Greens. In recent polls, these two parties already appear weakened (Figure 15.1). It seems not completely out of the question that a significant part of the AfD's greatly increased electorate could be nudged back to one of the established parties.

Partisanship has declined in Germany, but it has not disappeared for good. About six out of ten voters still feel attached to a party, although not necessarily strongly. Such identities have traditionally been seen as an anchor and restraint of electoral behavior that—through the “normal vote” mechanism (Converse 1966)—defines a corridor within which election results fluctuate when conditions are not too far out of the ordinary. This mechanism has not simply vanished. As shown in this book, the activation of partisans is still the dominant process during election campaigns. Partisans have also been found to be less responsive to the situational aspects of elections. This observation needs to be qualified, however, since partisans nowadays appear to defect more easily from straight in-party voting to ideologically adjacent parties, and that renders normal votes somewhat less likely. Moreover, we have also seen that the ways parties deal with major crises—of which yet another one will in all likelihood dominate the next election's agenda—may undermine some of their partisans' attachments, and this entails more profound long-term implications for electoral behavior.

At the next federal election, one important factor will also be turned into a variable that has been a constant at all three elections on which this volume focused. The incumbent chancellor Angela Merkel has vowed not to run again. Candidate effects have occasionally been very strong at federal elections, and during Merkel's long incumbency, the Christian Democrats always profited strongly from their leader's constantly high popularity (Hansen and Olsen 2020). Whether her successor will deliver his (there are several aspirants, all of them male) party the same advantage remains to be seen, but it is certainly not preordained. Given the changed strength relationships between the parties, it is open which of them will nominate candidates for the chancellorship and as a consequence also whether and in which format those competing for the chancellorship will have the chance to present themselves to voters during a televised debate. These broadcasts have regularly garnered larger audiences than any other campaign event, and the analysis presented above has shown that they in principle may move party preferences, depending on the participants' perceived performance. However, the increasingly fragmented party system no longer suits their basic logic as a “duel” of two evident competitors for the chancellorship. How parties and broadcasters will cope with these changing conditions remains to be seen.

As regards TV news and the press, it does not appear likely that they become more openly one-sided in their coverage, in particular not across all the many outlets which together compose the still dominant traditional pillars of the German media system. Mutual cancellation of differently valenced messages can be expected to remain a core characteristic of media-induced persuasion, thus delimiting its net impact (Zaller 1996). What creates uncertainty, however, is the strengthening role of online media. Their audience is growing at the expense of traditional news outlets (Staudt and Schmitt-Beck 2019). Moreover, the parties, with the AfD as *avant-garde*, are increasingly setting up their own more or less professional online facilities for direct information provision that circumvent the news media's editorial filters. Against the background of the increasing polarization of the party system, these developments open up the possibility of a segmentation of the media audience and the retreat of certain parties' supporters into digital echo chambers (Pickel 2019: 171). Such a development might further strengthen the polarization of the party system (Dvir-Gvirsman 2016).

Coalition politics is bound to become even more complicated than in the past. The parties will need to reflect on innovative scenarios for government formation that may involve straddling the ideological divide, shedding taboos, including more than two partners, or ways to create a workable minority government. These are not only challenges of post-election bargaining. Coalition preferences are an important ingredient of vote choices, but parties will have strong incentives to remain ambiguous and circumvent coalition questions in their campaigns. This might undermine the instrumental value of coalition preferences for electoral choices and render expressively motivated coalition preferences pointless, thus frustrating an electorate socialized into expecting clear coalition statements from its parties. Ultimately, moreover, the new complexity of coalition politics might also contribute to voter alienation by further blurring governmental accountability.

The one thing that is certain, however, is that no terminal station is in sight for the roller-coaster of German electoral politics. This does not preclude future election results that resemble the more concentrated ones of the past. However, as proven by the 2013 federal election, in which this was last the case, such outcomes do not signal a return to a latent equilibrium. They only show that high electoral volatility does not always lead to more fragmentation. It may also reduce it—albeit only temporarily.

References

- Aarts, Kees and André Blais. 2013. "Pull or Push?" In Kees Aarts, André Blais, and Hermann Schmitt (eds), *Political Leaders and Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 165–186.
- Aarts, Kees, André Blais, and Hermann Schmitt (eds). 2013. *Political Leaders and Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aarts, Kees and Bernhard Weßels. 2005. "Wahlbeteiligung in Deutschland und bei europäischen Nachbarn." In Jürgen W. Falter, Oscar W. Gabriel, and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler. Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2002*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 595–617.
- Abedi, Amir. 2017. We Are Not in Bonn Anymore: The Impact of German Unification on Party Systems at the Federal and Land levels. *German Politics* 26 (4): 457–479.
- Abou-Chadi, Tarik. 2015. "Das Thema europäische Integration und die Wahlentscheidung bei der Bundestagswahl 2013." In Heiko Giebler and Aiko Wagner (eds), *Wirtschaft, Krise und Wahlverhalten*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 84–106.
- Abou-Chadi, Tarik and Werner Krause. 2020. The Causal Effect of Radical Right Success on Mainstream Parties' Policy Positions: A Regression Discontinuity Approach. *British Journal of Political Science* 50 (3): 829–847.
- Abramowitz, Alan I. 2013. *The Polarized Public? Why American Government is so Dysfunctional*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Achen, Christopher H. 2002. Parental Socialization and Rational Party Identification. *Political Behavior* 24 (2): 151–170.
- Achen, Christopher H. and Larry M. Bartels. 2016. *Democracy for Realists*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Adam, Silke and Michaela Maier. 2010. "Personalization of Politics: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research." In Charles T. Salmon (ed.), *Communication Yearbook 34*. New York: Routledge, 213–257.
- Adams, James. 2012. Causes and Electoral Consequences of Party Policy Shifts in Multi-party Elections: Theoretical Results and Empirical Evidence. *Annual Review of Political Science* 15 (1): 401–419.
- Adams, James, Michael Clark, Lawrence Ezrow, and Garrett Glasgow. 2004. Understanding Change and Stability in Party Ideologies: Do Parties Respond to Public Opinion or to Past Election Results? *British Journal of Political Science* 34 (4): 589–610.
- Adams, James, Lawrence Ezrow, and Somer-Topcu Zeynep. 2014. Do Voters Respond to Party Manifestos or to a Wider Information Environment? An Analysis of Mass-Elite Linkages on European Integration. *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (4): 967–978.
- Adams, James and Zeynep Somer-Topcu. 2009. Policy Adjustment by Parties in Response to Rival Parties' Policy Shifts: Spatial Theory and the Dynamics of Party Competition in Twenty-Five Post-War Democracies. *British Journal of Political Science* 39 (4): 825–846.
- Akkerman, Tjitske, Sarah L. de Lange, and Matthijs Rooduijn (eds). 2016. *Radical Right-Wing Populist Parties in Western Europe: Into the Mainstream?*, *Routledge Studies in Extremism and Democracy*. London; New York, NY: Routledge.

- Albright, Jeremy J. 2009. Does Political Knowledge Erode Party Attachments?: A Review of the Cognitive Mobilization Thesis. *Electoral Studies* 28 (2): 248–260.
- Alonso, Sonia and Sara Claro da Fonseca. 2011. Immigration, Left and Right. *Party Politics* 18 (6): 865–884.
- Alvarez, R. Michael. 1997. *Information and Elections*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Alvarez, R. Michael, D. Roderick Kiewiet, and Lucas Núñez. 2018. A Taxonomy of Protest Voting. *Annual Review of Political Science* 21 (1): 135–154.
- Alvarez, R. Michael and Jonathan Nagler. 1998. When Politics and Models Collide: Estimating Models of Multiparty Elections. *American Journal of Political Science* 42 (1): 55–96.
- Alvarez, R. Michael and Jonathan Nagler. 2004. Party System Compactness: Measurement and Consequences. *Political Analysis* 12 (1): 46–62.
- Anders, Lisa H., Henrik Scheller, and Thomas Tuntschew (eds). 2018. *Parteien und die Politisierung der Europäischen Union*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Anderson, Christopher J. and Frank Brettschneider. 2003. The Likable Winner versus the Competent Loser. *German Politics and Society* 21 (1): 95–118.
- Anderson, Christopher J. and Jason D. Hecht. 2012. Voting When the Economy Goes Bad, Everyone Is in Charge, and No One Is to Blame: The Case of the 2009 German Election. *Electoral Studies* 31 (1): 5–19.
- Armington, Klaus and Lisa Schädel. 2015. Social Inequality in Political Participation: The Dark Sides of Individualisation. *West European Politics* 38 (1): 1–27.
- Arndt, Christoph and Alexander Gattig. 2005. *Dokumentation zur Erstellung eines kumulierten Datensatzes aus den Studien der Bundestagswahlen 1949 bis 2005*. ZA-number 4519. DOI: 10.4232/1.4519.
- Arnold, Felix, Ronny Freier, and Martin Kroh. 2015. Geteilte politische Kultur auch 25 Jahre nach der Wiedervereinigung? *Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW)*, Berlin: *DIW-Wochenbericht* 82 (37): 803–814.
- Arzheimer, Kai. 2006. “Dead Men Walking?” Party Identification in Germany, 1977–2002. *Electoral Studies* 25 (4): 791–807.
- Arzheimer, Kai. 2009. Contextual Factors and the Extreme Right Vote in Western Europe, 1980–2002. *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (2): 259–275.
- Arzheimer, Kai. 2013. “Twenty Years After: Sozial- und wirtschaftspolitische Einstellungen von Ost- und Westdeutschen im Vergleich.” In Silke I. Keil and S. Isabell Thaidigsmann (eds), *Zivile Bürgergesellschaft und Demokratie: Aktuelle Ergebnisse der empirischen Politikforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 299–336.
- Arzheimer, Kai. 2015. The AfD: Finally a Successful Right-Wing Populist Eurosceptic Party for Germany? *West European Politics* 38 (3): 535–556.
- Arzheimer, Kai. 2016. “Wahlverhalten in Ost-West-Perspektive.” In Harald Schoen and Bernhard Weißels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler: Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2013*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 71–89.
- Arzheimer, Kai. 2017. Another Dog that Didn’t Bark? Less Dealignment and more Partisanship in the 2013 Bundestag Election. *German Politics* 26 (1): 49–64.
- Arzheimer, Kai and Carl C. Berning. 2019. How the Alternative for Germany (AfD) and Their Voters Veered to the Radical Right, 2013–2017. *Electoral Studies* 60: 102040.
- Arzheimer, Kai and Jürgen W. Falter. 2005. “Goodbye Lenin?” Bundes- und Landtagswahlen seit 1990: Eine Ost-West-Perspektive.” In Jürgen W. Falter, Oscar W. Gabriel, and Bernhard Weißels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler: Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2002*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 244–283.

- Arzheimer, Kai and Markus Klein. 2000. "Gesellschaftspolitische Wertorientierungen und Staatszielvorstellungen im Ost-West-Vergleich." In Jürgen W. Falter, Oscar W. Gabriel, and Hans Rattinger (eds), *Wirklich ein Volk? Die politischen Orientierungen von Ost- und Westdeutschen im Vergleich*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 363–402.
- Arzheimer, Kai and Harald Schoen. 2005. Erste Schritte auf kaum erschlossenem Terrain: Zur Stabilität der Parteidentifikation in Deutschland. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 46 (4): 629–654.
- Arzheimer, Kai and Harald Schoen. 2007. "Mehr als eine Erinnerung an das 19. Jahrhundert? Das sozioökonomische und das religiös-konfessionelle Cleavage und Wahlverhalten 1994–2005." In Hans Rattinger, Oscar W. Gabriel, and Jürgen W. Falter (eds), *Der gesamtdeutsche Wähler: Stabilität und Wandel des Wählerverhaltens im wiedervereinigten Deutschland*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 89–112.
- Bachl, Marko. 2013. "Die Wirkung des TV-Duells auf die Bewertung der Kandidaten und die Wahlabsicht." In Marko Bachl, Frank Brettschneider, and Simon Ottler (eds), *Das TV-Duell in Baden-Württemberg 2011: Inhalte, Wahrnehmungen und Wirkungen*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 171–198.
- Baer, Christian Klaus and Erwin Faul. 1953. *Das deutsche Wahlwunder*. Offenbach: Bollwerk-Verlag.
- Bagehot, Walter. 2001. *The English Constitution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, Kendall L., Russell J. Dalton, and Kai Hildebrandt. 1981. *Germany Transformed. Political Culture and the New Politics*. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- Bargsted, Matias A. and Orit Kedar. 2009. Coalition-Targeted Duvergerian Voting: How Expectations Affect Voter Choice under Proportional Representation. *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (2): 307–323.
- Baring, Arnulf. 1982. *Machtwechsel. Die Ära Brandt - Scheel*. Stuttgart: DVA.
- Barisione, Mauro. 2009. So, What Difference Do Leaders Make? Candidates' Images and the "Conditionality" of Leader Effects on Voting. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 19 (4): 473–500.
- Barker, David C. and Adam B. Lawrence. 2006. Media Favoritism and Presidential Nominations: Reviving the Direct Effects Model. *Political Communication* 23 (1): 41–59.
- Bartels, Larry M. 1986. Issue Voting Under Uncertainty: An Empirical Test. *American Journal of Political Science* 30 (4): 709–728.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2002. Beyond the Running Tally. Partisan Bias in Political Perceptions. *Political Behavior* 24 (2): 117–150.
- Bartle, John. 2005. Homogeneous Models and Heterogeneous Voters. *Political Studies* 53 (4): 653–675.
- Bartolini, Stefano. 1999. Collusion, Competition and Democracy: Part I. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 11 (4): 435–470.
- Bartolini, Stefano. 2000. Collusion, Competition and Democracy: Part II. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 12 (1): 33–65.
- Bartolini, Stefano and Peter Mair. 1990. *Identity, Competition, and Electoral Availability. The Stabilisation of European Electorates 1885–1985*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baum, Matthew A. and Angela S. Jamison. 2006. The Oprah Effect: How Soft News Helps Inattentive Citizens Vote Consistently. *The Journal of Politics* 68 (4): 946–959.
- Bélanger, Éric and Bonnie M. Meguid. 2008. Issue Salience, Issue Ownership, and Issue-based Vote Choice. *Electoral Studies* 27 (3): 477–491.

- Bellucci, Paolo. 2006. Tracing the Cognitive and Affective Roots of 'Party Competence': Italy and Britain, 2001. *Electoral Studies* 25 (3): 548–569.
- Bendor, Jonathan B., Daniel Diermeier, David A. Siegel, and Michael M. Ting. 2011. *A Behavioral Theory of Elections*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Berbuir, Nicole, Marcel Lewandowsky, and Jasmin Siri. 2015. The AfD and Its Sympathisers: Finally a Right-Wing Populist Movement in Germany? *German Politics* 24 (2): 154–178.
- Berelson, Bernard R., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. 1954. *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bergbower, Matthew L. 2013. Campaign Intensity and Voting Correctly in Senate Elections. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 24 (1): 90–114.
- Bergbower, Matthew L., Scott D. McClurg, and Thomas Holbrook. 2015. Presidential Campaign Spending and Correct Voting from 2000 to 2008. *Social Science Quarterly* 96 (5): 1196–1213.
- Berglund, Frode, Sören Holmberg, Hermann Schmitt, and Jacques Thomassen. 2005. "Party Identification and Party Choice." In Jacques Thomassen (ed.), *The European Voter: A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 106–124.
- Best, Heinrich. 1991. "Die Genese politischer Konfliktstrukturen: Modelle und Befunde zur Entstehung von Fraktionen und Parteien in West- und Mitteleuropa." In Hans-Dieter Klingemann, Richard Stöss, and Bernhard Weißels (eds), *Politische Klasse und politische Institutionen*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 107–121.
- Best, Robin E. 2011. The Declining Electoral Relevance of Traditional Cleavage Groups. *European Political Science Review* 3 (2): 279–300.
- Bieber, Ina and Sigrid Roßteutscher. 2019. "Deutschland und die Welt in Aufruhr – Zur Ausgangslage der Bundestagswahl 2017." In Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weißels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beharrung: Die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 15–32.
- Bieber, Ina, Sigrid Roßteutscher, and Philipp Scherer. 2018. Die Metamorphosen der AfD-Wählerschaft: Von einer euroskeptischen Protestpartei zu einer (r)echten Alternative? *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 59 (3): 433–461.
- Bisgaard, Martin. 2015. Bias Will Find a Way: Economic Perceptions, Attributions of Blame, and Partisan-Motivated Reasoning During Crisis. *Journal of Politics* 77 (3): 849–860.
- Bittner, Amanda. 2011. *Platform or Personality? The Role of Party Leaders in Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blais, André, John H. Aldrich, Indridi H. Indridason, and Renan Levine. 2006. Do Voters Vote for Government Coalitions?: Testing Downs' Pessimistic Conclusion. *Party Politics* 12 (6): 691–705.
- Blais, André and M. Martin Boyer. 1996. Assessing the Impact of Televised Debates: The Case of the 1988 Canadian Election. *British Journal of Political Science* 26 (2): 143–164.
- Blais, André, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Neil Nevitte. 2004. Where Does Turnout Decline Come From? *European Journal of Political Research* 42 (2): 221–236.
- Blätte, Andreas, Simon Gehlhar, Jan Gehrman, Andreas Niederberger, Julia Rakers, and Eva Weiler. 2019. "Migrationspolitik im Bundestagswahlkampf 2017: Die Kluft zwischen Entscheidungs- und Darstellungspolitik." In Karl-Rudolf Korte and Jan Schoofs (eds), *Die Bundestagswahl 2017: Analysen der Wahl-, Parteien-, Kommunikations- und Regierungsforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer, 363–387.
- Bless, Herbert and Norbert Schwarz. 1998. Context Effects in Political Judgement: Assimilation and Contrast as a Function of Categorization Processes. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 28 (2): 159–172.

- Blinzler, Katharina, Manuela Blumenberg, and Hannah Bucher. 2019. "Die Regierungsbildung." In Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beharrung: Die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 357–374.
- Blumenberg, Johannes N. and Manuela S. Blumenberg. 2017. The Kretschmann Effect: Personalisation and the March 2016 Länder Elections. *German Politics* 27 (3): 359–379.
- Blumenstiel, Jan Eric. 2011. "Abstürze, Rekorde, Überhänge und andere Superlative: Das Ergebnis der Bundestagswahl 2009." In Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Zwischen Langeweile und Extremen: Die Bundestagswahl 2009*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 59–76.
- Blumenstiel, Jan Eric. 2014a. "Merkmals Triumph und der Albtraum der FDP: Das Ergebnis der Bundestagswahl 2013." In Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Fragmentierung und Konzentration: Die Bundestagswahl 2013*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 101–117.
- Blumenstiel, Jan Eric. 2014b. "Voter Fragmentation and the Differentiation of Vote Functions." In Bernhard Weßels, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (eds), *Voters on the Move Or on the Run? Oxford*: Oxford University Press, 17–39.
- Blumenstiel, Jan Eric and Thomas Plischke. 2015. Changing Motivations, Time of the Voting Decision, and Short-term Volatility – The Dynamics of Voter Heterogeneity. *Electoral Studies* 37: 28–40.
- Blumenstiel, Jan Eric and Elena Wiegand. 2014. "Wechselwähler." In Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Fragmentierung und Konzentration: Die Bundestagswahl 2013*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 133–144.
- Bol, Damien, Marco Giani, André Blais, and Peter John Loewen. 2020. The Effect of COVID-19 Lockdowns on Political Support: Some Good News for Democracy? *European Journal of Political Research*: DOI: 10.1111/1475-6765.12401.
- Boninger, David S., Jon A. Krosnick, and Matthew K. Berent. 1995. Origins of Attitude Importance: Self-Interest, Social Identification, and Value Relevance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68 (1): 61–80.
- Books, John W. and Charles L. Prysby. 1991. *Political Behavior and the Local Context*. New York: Praeger.
- Boomgaarden, Hajo G. and Holli A. Semetko. 2007. "Duell Mann gegen Frau?! Geschlechterrollen und Kanzlerkandidaten in der Wahlkampfberichterstattung." In Frank Brettschneider, Oskar Niedermayer, and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Die Bundestagswahl 2005*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 171–196.
- Boomgaarden, Hajo and Holli A. Semetko. 2012. "Nachrichten-Bias: Medieninhalte, Bevölkerungswahrnehmungen und Wahlentscheidungen bei der Bundestagswahl 2009." In Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (ed.), *Wählen in Deutschland. Politische Vierteljahresschrift (PVS)* Baden-Baden: Nomos, 345–370.
- Bornschieer, Simon. 2010. *Cleavage Politics and the Populist Right: The New Cultural Conflict in Western Europe*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bornschieer, Simon. 2012. Why a Right-wing Populist Party Emerged in France but not in Germany: Cleavages and Actors in the Formation of a New Cultural Divide. *European Political Science Review* 4 (1): 121–145.
- Bornschieer, Simon. 2018. "Globalization, Cleavages, and the Radical Right." In Jens Rydgren (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Radical Right*. New York: Oxford University Press, 212–238.

- Brady, Henry E. and Richard Johnston. 2006. "The Rolling Cross-Section and Causal Attribution." In Henry E. Brady and Richard Johnston (eds), *Capturing Campaign Effects*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 164–195.
- Brambor, Thomas, William Roberts Clark, and Matt Golder. 2006. Understanding Interaction Models: Improving Empirical Analyses. *Political Analysis* 14 (1): 63–82.
- Brandenburg, Heinz and Marcel Van Egmond. 2012. Pressed into Party Support? Media Influence on Partisan Attitudes during the 2005 UK General Election Campaign. *British Journal of Political Science* 42 (2): 441–463.
- Bräuninger, Thomas, Marc Debus, Jochen Müller, and Christian Stecker. 2019. Party Competition and Government Formation in Germany: Business as Usual or New Patterns? *German Politics* 28 (1): 80–100.
- Bräuninger, Thomas and Nathalie Giger. 2018. Strategic Ambiguity of Party Positions in Multi-Party Competition. *Political Science Research and Methods* 6 (3): 527–548.
- Brennan, Geoffrey and Loren Lomasky. 1993. *Democracy and Decision: The Pure Theory of Electoral Preference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brettschneider, Frank. 2001. "Candidate-Voting. Die Bedeutung von Spitzenkandidaten für das Wählerverhalten in Deutschland, Großbritannien und den USA von 1960 bis 1998." In Hans-Dieter Klingemann and Max Kaase (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 351–400.
- Brettschneider, Frank. 2002. *Spitzenkandidaten und Wahlerfolg*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Brettschneider, Frank and Oscar W. Gabriel. 2002. "The Nonpersonalization of Voting Behavior in Germany" In Anthony King (ed.), *Leaders' Personalities and the Outcomes of Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 127–157.
- Brettschneider, Frank, Katja Neller, and Christopher J. Anderson. 2006. Candidate Images in the 2005 German National Election. *German Politics* 15 (4): 481–499.
- Brody, Richard A. and Benjamin L. Page. 1972. Comment: The Assessment of Policy Voting. *American Political Science Review* 66 (2): 450–458.
- Brooks, Clem, Paul Nieuwbeerta, and Jeff Manza. 2006. Cleavage-Based Voting Behavior in Cross-national Perspective: Evidence from Six Postwar Democracies. *Social Science Research* 35 (1): 88–128.
- Budge, Ian and Dennis J. Farlie. 1983. *Explaining and Predicting Elections: Issue Effects and Party Strategies in Twenty-Three Democracies*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Bulmer, Simon. 2014. Germany and the Eurozone Crisis: Between Hegemony and Domestic Politics. *West European Politics* 37 (6): 1244–1263.
- Bundeswahlleiter. 2018. *Ergebnisse früherer Bundestagswahlen*. https://www.bundeswahlleiter.de/dam/jcr/397735e3-0585-46f6-a0b5-2c60c5b83de6/btw_ab49_gesamt.pdf. 14–09–2019.
- Bundeswahlleiter. 2019. *Briefwahl*. <https://www.bundeswahlleiter.de/service/glossar/b/briefwahl.html>. 14–09–2019.
- Burnell, Peter and Andrew Reeves. 1984. Persuasion as a Political Concept. *British Journal of Political Science* 14 (4): 393–410.
- Bytzek, Evelyn and Sascha Huber. 2011. "Koalitionen und strategisches Wählen." In Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Zwischen Langeweile und Extremen: Die Bundestagswahl 2009*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 247–264.
- Camerra-Rowe, Pamela. 2004. Agenda 2010: Redefining German Social Democracy. *German Politics & Society* 22 (1 (70)): 1–30.

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: Wiley.
- Campbell, James E. 2008. *The American Campaign: U.S. Presidential Campaigns and the National Vote*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- Campbell, Ross. 2019. *Popular Support for Democracy in Unified Germany: Critical Democrats*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carmines, Edward G. and James A. Stimson. 1989. *Issue Evolution: Race and the Transformation of American Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Christian, Ben. 2017. Correct Voting at the 2013 German Federal Election: An Analysis of Normatively Desirable Campaign Effects. *German Politics* 26 (1): 170–186.
- Clark, Terry N. and Seymour M. Lipset. 1991. Are Social Classes Dying? *International Sociology* 6 (4): 397–410.
- Clark, Terry N., Seymour M. Lipset, and Michael Rempel. 1993. The Declining Political Significance of Class. *International Sociology* 8 (3): 293–316.
- Clarke, Harold D., David Sanders, Marianne C. Stewart, and Paul Whiteley. 2004. *Political Choice in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clarke, Harold D., David Sanders, Marianne C. Stewart, and Paul Whiteley. 2009. *Performance Politics and the British Voter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, Harold D., Thomas J. Scotto, and Allan Kornberg. 2011. Valence Politics and Economic Crisis: Electoral Choice in Canada 2008. *Electoral Studies* 30 (3): 438–449.
- Converse, Phillip E. 1966. “The Concept of a Normal Vote.” In Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, Donald E. Stokes (ed.), *Elections and the Political Order*. New York, London, Sydney: Wiley, 9–39.
- Copelovitch, Mark, Jeffry Frieden, and Stefanie Walter. 2016. The Political Economy of the Euro Crisis. *Comparative Political Studies* 49 (7): 811–840.
- Cox, Gary W. 1997. *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World’s Electoral Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crewe, Ivor and David Denver. 1985. *Electoral Change in Western Democracies: Patterns and Sources of Electoral Volatility*. London: Croom Helm.
- CSES. 2019a. The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (www.cses.org). CSES INTEGRATED MODULE DATASET (IMD) [dataset and documentation]. October 17, 2019 version. doi:10.7804/cses.imd.2019-10-17.
- CSES. 2019b. The Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (www.cses.org). CSES MODULE 5 FIRST ADVANCE RELEASE [dataset and documentation]. May 21, 2019 version. doi:10.7804/cses.module5.2019-05-21.
- D’Alessio, Dave and Mike Allen. 2000. Media Bias in Presidential Elections: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Communication* 50 (4): 133–156.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*. 17th printing ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. 1988. *The Modern Social Conflict: An Essay on the Politics of Liberty*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Dalton, Russell J. 1984a. Cognitive Mobilization and Partisan Dealignment in Advanced Industrial Democracies. *Journal of Politics* 46 (1): 264–284.
- Dalton, Russell J. 1984b. “The West German Party System between Two Ages.” In Russell J. Dalton, Scott C. Flanagan, and Paul Allen Beck (eds), *Electoral Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies. Realignment or Dealignment?* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 104–133.
- Dalton, Russell J. 1993. *Politics in Germany*, second edition. New York: HarperCollins.

- Dalton, Russell J. 2000. Citizen Attitudes and Political Behavior. *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (6–7): 912–940.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2002. “The Decline of Party Identifications.” In Russell J. Dalton and Martin P. Wattenberg (eds), *Parties Without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 19–36.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2004. *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices: The Erosion of Political Support in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2008. The Quantity and the Quality of Party Systems. *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (7): 899–920.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2012. Apartisans and the Changing German Electorate. *Electoral Studies* 31 (1): 35–45.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2013. *The Apartisan American: Dealignment and Changing Electoral Politics*. Thousand Oaks: CQ Press.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2014. “Partisan Dealignment and Voting Choice.” In Stephen Padgett, William E. Paterson, and Reimut Zohlnhöfer (eds), *Developments in German Politics 4*. London: Macmillan Education UK, 57–77.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2017. *The Participation Gap. Social Status and Political Inequality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2018. *Political Realignment: Economics, Culture, and Electoral Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalton, Russell J. 2020. “The Blinders of Partisanship.” In Henrik Oscarsson and Sören Holmberg (eds), *Research Handbook on Political Partisanship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 74–88.
- Dalton, Russell J., Paul A. Beck, and Robert Huckfeldt. 1998. Partisan Cues and the Media: Information Flows in the 1992 Presidential Election. *American Political Science Review* 92 (1): 111–126.
- Dalton, Russell J., Paul Allen Beck, and Scott C. Flanagan. 1984a. “Electoral Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies.” In Russell J. Dalton, Scott C. Flanagan, and Paul Allen Beck (eds), *Electoral Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies. Realignment or Dealignment?* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3–22.
- Dalton, Russell J. and Wilhelm Bürklin. 2003. Wähler als Wandervogel: Dealignment and the German Voter. *German Politics & Society* 21 (1): 57–75.
- Dalton, Russell J., Scott C. Flanagan, and Paul A. Beck (eds). 1984b. *Electoral Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies: Realignment or Dealignment?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dalton, Russell J. and Willy Jou. 2010. Is There a Single German Party System? *German Politics & Society* 28 (2): 34–52.
- Dalton, Russell J. and Manfred Küchler (eds). 1990. *Challenging the Political Order. New Social and Political Movements in Western Democracies*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Dalton, Russell J., Ian McAllister, and Martin P. Wattenberg. 2002. “The Consequences of Partisan Dealignment.” In Russell J. Dalton and Martin P. Wattenberg (eds), *Parties Without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 37–63.
- Dalton, Russell J. and Martin P. Wattenberg. 1993. “The Not So Simple Act of Voting.” In Ada W. Finifter (ed.), *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*. Washington: APSA, 193–218.
- Dalton, Russell J. and Martin P. Wattenberg (eds). 2002. *Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. New York Oxford University Press.
- Damore, David F. 2004. The Dynamics of Issue Ownership in Presidential Campaigns. *Political Research Quarterly* 57 (3): 391–397.

- Damore, David F., Mallory M. Waters, and Shaun Bowler. 2012. Unhappy, Uninformed, or Uninterested? Understanding “None of the Above” Voting. *Political Research Quarterly* 65 (4): 895–907.
- Dassonneville, Ruth. 2012. Electoral Volatility, Political Sophistication, Trust and Efficacy: A Study on Changes in Voter Preferences During the Belgian Regional Elections of 2009. *Acta Politica* 47 (1): 18–41.
- Dassonneville, Ruth. 2014. Political Sophistication and Vote Intention Switching: The Timing of Electoral Volatility in the 2009 German Election Campaign. *German Politics* 23 (3): 174–195.
- Dassonneville, Ruth. 2016. Volatile Voters, Short-Term Choices? An Analysis of the Vote Choice Determinants of Stable and Volatile Voters in Great Britain. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 26 (3): 273–292.
- Dassonneville, Ruth and Yves Dejaeghere. 2014. Bridging the Ideological Space: A Cross-national Analysis of the Distance of Party Switching. *European Journal of Political Research* 53 (3): 580–599.
- Dassonneville, Ruth, Marc Hooghe, and Bram Vanhoutte. 2012. Age, Period and Cohort Effects in the Decline of Party Identification in Germany: An Analysis of a Two Decade Panel Study in Germany (1992–2009). *German Politics* 21 (2): 209–227.
- Dassonneville, Ruth and Marc Hooghe. 2017. Voter turnout decline and stratification: Quasi-experimental and comparative evidence of a growing educational gap. *Politics* 37 (2): 181–200.
- Davis, Otto A., Melvin J. Hinich, and Peter C. Ordeshook. 1970. An Expository Development of a Mathematical Model of the Electoral Process. *American Political Science Review* 64 (2): 426–448.
- De Vreese, Claes and Hajo Boomgaarden. 2003. Valenced news frames and public support for the EU. *Communications* 28 (4): 361–381.
- De Vreese, Claes H., Mark Boukes, Andreas Schuck, Rens Vliegthart, Linda Bos, and Yph Lelkes. 2017. Linking Survey and Media Content Data: Opportunities, Considerations, and Pitfalls. *Communication Methods and Measures* 11 (4): 221–244.
- De Vries, Catherine E. 2018. The Cosmopolitan-Parochial Divide: Changing Patterns of Party and Electoral Competition in the Netherlands and Beyond. *Journal of European Public Policy* 25 (11): 1541–1565.
- Debus, Marc. 2010. Soziale Konfliktlinien und Wahlverhalten: Eine Analyse der Determinanten der Wahlabsicht bei Bundestagswahlen von 1969 bis 2009. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 62: 731–749.
- Debus, Marc and Jochen Müller. 2014. Expected Utility or Learned Familiarity? The Formation of Voters’ Coalition Preferences. *Electoral Studies* 34: 54–67.
- Debus, Marc, Mary Stegmaier, and Jale Tosun. 2013. Economic Voting under Coalition Governments: Evidence from Germany. *Political Science Research and Methods* 2 (1): 49–67.
- Dejaeghere, Yves and Patrick van Erkel. 2017. The Importance of Issue-Ownership and Salience for Voters’ Knowledge of Parties’ Issue Positions. *Electoral Studies* 46: 15–25.
- Detjen, Stephan. 2014. *Rechtsprechung in Zeiten der Eurokrise*. https://www.deutschlandfunk.de/esm-urteil-rechtsprechung-in-zeiten-der-eurokrise.724.de.html?dram:article_id=280467. 07.06.2014.
- Deutschmann, Paul J. 1962. “Viewing, Conversation, and Voting Intentions.” In Sidney Kraus (ed.), *The Great Debates Kennedy vs. Nixon, 1960*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 232–252.
- Dietz, Melanie and Sigrid Roßteutscher. 2019. “Von Bruchlandungen und Höhenflügen: Das Ergebnis der Bundestagswahl 2017.” In Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck,

- Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weißels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beherrschung: die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 123–143.
- Dilliplane, Susanna. 2014. Activation, Conversion, or Reinforcement? The Impact of Partisan News Exposure on Vote Choice. *American Journal of Political Science* 58 (1): 79–94.
- Dobrzynska, Agnieszka, André Blais, and Richard Nadeau. 2003. Do the Media Have a Direct Impact on the Vote? The Case of the 1997 Canadian Election. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 15 (1): 27–43.
- Dogan, Mattei. 1995. Erosion of Class Voting and of the Religious Vote in Western Europe. *International Social Science Journal* 47 (4): 525–538.
- Donsbach, Wolfgang. 2002. Sechs Gründe gegen TV-Duelle: Zur politischen Bewertung einer medialen Inszenierung. *Die politische Meinung* 396 (2): 19–25.
- Donsbach, Wolfgang and Olaf Jandura. 2005. “Urteile mit Verfallsdatum: Einflüsse auf die Wahrnehmung des ersten Fernsehduells.” In Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, Wolfgang Donsbach, and Hans Mathias Kepplinger (eds), *Wählerstimmungen in der Mediendemokratie: Analysen auf der Basis des Bundestagswahlkampfs 2002*. Freiburg: Alber, 141–163.
- Donsbach, Wolfgang, Olaf Jandura, and Matthias Hastall. 2004. “Neues aus der Fernsehdemokratie: Wahrnehmung und Wirkung des ersten Fernsehduells.” In Heinrich Oberreuter (ed.), *Der versäumte Wechsel: Eine Bilanz des Wahljahres 2002*. München: Olzog, 136–156.
- Downs, Anthony 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Druckman, James N. and Michael Parkin. 2005. The Impact of Media Bias: How Editorial Slant Affects Voters. *Journal of Politics* 67 (4): 1030–1049.
- Druckman, James N., Erik Peterson, and Rune Slothuus. 2013. How Elite Partisan Polarization Affects Public Opinion Formation. *American Political Science Review* 107 (1): 57–79.
- Duch, Raymond M., Jeff May, and David A. Armstrong. 2010. Coalition-directed Voting in Multiparty Democracies. *American Political Science Review* 104 (4): 698–719.
- Duverger, Maurice. 1954. *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dvir-Gvirsman, Shira. 2016. Media Audience Homophily: Partisan Websites, Audience Identity and Polarization Processes. *New Media & Society* 19 (7): 1072–1091.
- Easton, David. 1965. *A Framework for Political Analysis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Easton, David. 1975. A Re-Assessment of the Concept of Political Support. *British Journal of Political Science* 5 (4): 435–457.
- Eberl, Jakob-Moritz, Hajo G. Boomgaarden, and Markus Wagner. 2017. One Bias Fits All? Three Types of Media Bias and Their Effects on Party Preferences. *Communication Research* 44 (8): 1125–1148.
- Elff, Martin. 2000. “Neue Mitte oder alte Lager? Welche Rolle spielen sozioökonomische Konfliktlinien für das Wahlergebnis von 1998?” In Jan W. van Deth, Hans Rattinger, and Edeltraud Roller (eds), *Die Republik auf dem Weg zur Normalität? Wahlverhalten und politische Einstellungen nach acht Jahren Einheit*. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 67–92.
- Elff, Martin. 2007. Social Structure and Electoral Behavior in Comparative Perspective: The Decline of Social Cleavages in Western Europe Revisited. *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (2): 277–294.
- Elff, Martin. 2009. Social Divisions, Party Positions, and Electoral Behaviour. *Electoral Studies* 28 (2): 297–308.

- Elff, Martin. 2013. "Social Divisions and Political Choices in Germany, 1980-2006." In Geoffrey Evans and Nan Dirk de Graaf (eds), *Political Choice Matters: Explaining the Strength of Class and Religious Cleavages in Cross-National Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 277-308.
- Elff, Martin and Sigrid Roßteutscher. 2009. "Die Entwicklung sozialer Konfliktlinien in den Wahlen von 1994 bis 2005." In Jürgen W. Falter, Oscar W. Gabriel, and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler. Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2005*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 307-327.
- Elff, Martin and Sigrid Roßteutscher. 2011. Stability or Decline? Class, Religion and the Vote in Germany. *German Politics* 20 (1): 107-127.
- Elff, Martin and Sigrid Roßteutscher. 2017. Social Cleavages and Electoral Behaviour in Long-Term Perspective: Alignment without Mobilisation? *German Politics* 26 (1): 12-34.
- Elff, Martin, Merlin Schaeffer, Jan Paul Heisig, and Susumu Shikano. 2020. Multilevel Analysis with Few Clusters: Improving Likelihood-based Methods to Provide Unbiased Estimates and Accurate Inference. *British Journal of Political Science*: DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/Z65S4.
- Elgin, Ceyhun, Gokce Basbug, and Abdullah Yalaman. 2020. Economic Policy Responses to a Pandemic: Developing the Covid-19 Economic Stimulus Index. *CEPR Covid Economics: Vetted and Real-Time Papers* 1 (3): 40-53.
- Elliott, William R. and Jayanthi Sothirajah. 1993. Post-Debate Analysis and Media Reliance: Influences on Candidate Image and Voting Probabilities. *Journalism Quarterly* 70 (2): 321-335.
- Enderlein, Henrik. 2010. "Finanzkrise und große Koalition: Eine Bewertung des Krisenmanagements der Bundesregierung." In Christoph Egle and Reimut Zohlnhöfer (eds), *Die zweite Große Koalition. Eine Bilanz der Regierung Merkel 2005-2009*. Wiesbaden: VS, 234-253.
- Enelow, James and Melvin J. Hinich. 1981. A New Approach to Voter Uncertainty in the Downsian Spatial Model. *American Journal of Political Science* 25 (3): 483-493.
- Engler, Fabian, Svenja Bauer-Blaschkowski, and Reimut Zohlnhöfer. 2019. Disregarding the Voters? Electoral Competition and the Merkel Government's Public Policies, 2013-17. *German Politics* 28 (3): 312-331.
- Enyedi, Zsolt. 2005. The Role of Agency in Cleavage Formation. *European Journal of Political Research* 44: 697-720.
- Erikson, Robert and John H. Goldthorpe. 1992. *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erisen, Elif and Cengiz Erisen. 2012. The Effect of Social Networks on the Quality of Political Thinking. *Political Psychology* 33 (6): 839-865.
- Evans, Geoffrey. 2010. Models, Measures and Mechanisms. An Agenda for Progress in Cleavage Research. *West European Politics* 33 (3): 634-647.
- Evans, Geoffrey and Nan Dirk de Graaf (eds). 2013. *Political Choice Matters: Explaining the Strength of Class and Religious Cleavages in Cross-National Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Geoffrey and Mark Pickup. 2010. Reversing the Causal Arrow: The Political Conditioning of Economic Perceptions in the 2000-2004 U.S. Presidential Election Cycle. *The Journal of Politics* 72 (4): 1236-1251.
- Evans, Geoffrey and James Tilley. 2012. The Depoliticization of Inequality and Redistribution: Explaining the Decline of Class Voting. *Journal of Politics* 74 (4): 963-976.
- Eveland Jr, William P. and Myiah Hutchens Hively. 2009. Political Discussion Frequency, Network Size, and "Heterogeneity" of Discussion as Predictors of Political Knowledge and Participation. *Journal of Communication* 59 (2): 205-224.

- Faas, Thorsten and Sascha Huber. 2015. Haben die Demoskopen die FDP aus dem Bundestag vertrieben? Ergebnisse einer experimentellen Studie. *Zeitschrift für Palamentsfragen* 46 (4): 746–759.
- Faas, Thorsten and Tristan Klingelhöfer. 2019. The More Things Change, the More They Stay the Same? The German Federal Election of 2017 and Its Consequences. *West European Politics* 42 (4): 914–926.
- Faas, Thorsten and Jürgen Maier. 2004. Mobilisierung, Verstärkung, Konversion? Ergebnisse eines Experiments zur Wahrnehmung der Fernsehduelle im Vorfeld der Bundestagswahl 2002. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 45 (1): 55–72.
- Falco-Gimeno, Albert. 2012. Preferences for Political Coalitions in Spain. *South European Society and Politics* 17 (3): 487–502.
- Falter, Jürgen. 1981. Kontinuität und Neubeginn. Die Bundestagswahl 1949 zwischen Weimar und Bonn. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 22 (3): 235–263.
- Falter, Jürgen and Markus Klein. 2003. *Der lange Weg der Grünen*. München: Beck.
- Faus, Rainer and Simon Storks. 2019. *Im vereinten Deutschland geboren—in den Einstellungen gespalten? OBS-Studie zur ersten Nachwendegeneration*. Frankfurt am Main: Otto-Brenner-Stiftung.
- Festinger, Leon. 1957. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Fieldhouse, Edward, Jane Green, Geoffrey Evans, Jonathan Mellon, Christopher Prosser, Hermann Schmitt, and Cees van der Eijk. 2020. *Electoral Shocks. The Volatile Voter in a Turbulent World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Finifter, Ada W. 1974. The Friendship Group as a Protective Environment for Political Deviants. *American Political Science Review* 68 (2): 607–625.
- Finkel, Steven E. 1993. Reexamining the Minimal Effects Model in Recent Presidential Campaigns. *Journal of Politics* 55 (1): 1–21.
- Finkel, Steven E. and Peter R. Schrott. 1995. Campaign Effects on Voter Choice in the German Election of 1990. *British Journal of Political Science* 25 (3): 349–377.
- Fiorina, Morris P. 1978. Economic Retrospective Voting in American National Elections: A Micro-Analysis. *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (2): 426–443.
- Fischer, Claude S. 1982. *To Dwell among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Flanagan, Scott C. and Russell J. Dalton. 1984. Parties under Stress: Realignment and Dealignment in Advanced Industrial Societies. *West European Politics* 7 (1): 7–23.
- Flanagan, Scott C. and Aie-Rie Lee. 2003. The New Politics, Culture Wars, and the Authoritarian-Libertarian Value Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies. *Comparative Political Studies* 36 (3): 235–270.
- Flaxman, Seth, Sharad Goel, and Justin M. Rao. 2016. Filter Bubbles, Echo Chambers, and Online News Consumption. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80 (S1): 298–320.
- Forschungsgruppe Wahlen, Mannheim. 2019. *Politbarometer. Langzeitentwicklung: Wirtschaft und Soziales*. https://www.forschungsgruppe.de/Umfragen/Politbarometer/Langzeitentwicklung_-_Themen_im_Ueberblick/Wirtschaft_und_Soziales/#WirtschEnt. July 1, 2019.
- Forschungsgruppe Wahlen, Mannheim. 2020. *Partial Cumulation of Politbarometers 1977–2018*. edited by GESIS Data Archive. Cologne.
- Fournier, Patrick, Richard Nadeau, André Blais, Elisabetz Gidengil, and Neil Nevitte. 2004. Time-of-voting Decision and Susceptibility to Campaign Effects. *Electoral Studies* 23 (4): 661–681.
- Frankland, E. Gene and Donald Schoonmaker. 1992. *Between Protest and Power. The Green Party in Germany*. Boulder/Col.: Westview.

- Franklin, Mark N. 2004. *Voter Turnout and the Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Established Democracies since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Franklin, Mark N., Thomas Mackie, and Henry Valen et al. 1992. *Electoral Change: Responses to Evolving Social and Attitudinal Structures in Western Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Franzmann, Simon T., Heiko Giebler, and Thomas Poguntke. 2020. It's No Longer the Economy, Stupid! Issue Yield at the 2017 German Federal Election. *West European Politics* 43 (3): 610–638.
- Fredén, Annika. 2017. Opinion Polls, Coalition Signals and Strategic Voting: Evidence from a Survey Experiment. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 40 (3): 247–264.
- Friedland, Lewis A. 2016. Networks in Place. *American Behavioral Scientist* 60 (1): 24–42.
- Fuchs, Dieter. 1991. “Zum Wandel politischer Konfliktlinien: Ideologische Gruppierungen und Wahlverhalten.” In Werner Süß (ed.), *Die Bundesrepublik in den achtziger Jahren*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 69–86.
- Fuchs, Dieter and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. 1989. “The Left-Right Schema.” In M. Kent Jennings and Jan W. Deth (eds), *Continuities in Political Action*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 203–234.
- Gabriel, Oscar W., Silke I. Keil, and S. Isabell Thaidigsmann. 2009. “Kandidatenorientierungen und Wahlentscheid bei der Bundestagswahl 2005.” In Oscar W. Gabriel, Bernhard Weßels, and Jürgen W. Falter (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler. Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2005*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 267–303.
- Gabriel, Oscar W., Jürgen Maier, and Thorsten Faas. 2020. “Politikwissenschaftliche Einstellungs- und Verhaltensforschung.” In Thorsten Faas, Oscar W. Gabriel, and Jürgen Maier (eds), *Politikwissenschaftliche Einstellungs- und Verhaltensforschung*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 17–89.
- Gabriel, Oscar W. and Katja Neller. 2005. “Kandidatenorientierungen und Wahlverhalten bei den Bundestagswahlen 1994–2002.” In Jürgen W. Falter, Oscar W. Gabriel, and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler 2002. Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2002*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 213–243.
- Gallego, Aina. 2015. *Unequal Political Participation Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gallup, George, Jr. 1987. “The Impact of Presidential Debates on the Vote and Turnout.” In Joel L. Swerdlow (ed.), *Presidential Debates and Beyond*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, 34–42.
- Galston, William A. 2018. *Anti-Pluralism: The Populist Threat to Liberal Democracy*. London: Yale University Press.
- Gärtner, Lea and Alexander Wuttke. 2019. “Eingeschlossen in der Filter Bubble? Politische Kommunikationsnetzwerke im Wahlkampf.” In Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beharrung: Die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 97–110.
- Gattig, Alexander. 2006. Klasseneinflüsse auf das Wahlverhalten und die Wahlbeteiligung. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 58 (3): 510–533.
- Geer, John G. 1988. The Effects of Presidential Debates on the Electorate's Preferences for Candidates. *American Politics Quarterly* 16 (4): 486–501.
- Geers, Sabine and Linda Bos. 2017. Priming Issues, Party Visibility, and Party Evaluations: The Impact on Vote Switching. *Political Communication* 34 (3): 344–366.
- Geers, Sabine and Jesper Strömbäck. 2019. Patterns of Intra-election Volatility: The Impact of Political Knowledge. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 29 (3): 361–380.

- Geiges, Lars. 2018. Wie die AfD im Kontext der "Flüchtlingskrise" mobilisierte. Eine empirisch-qualitative Untersuchung der "Herbstoffensive 2015". *Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 28 (1): 49–69.
- Geiß, Stefan and Svenja Schäfer. 2017. Any Publicity or Good Publicity? A Competitive Test of Visibility- and Tonality-Based Media Effects on Voting Behavior. *Political Communication* 34 (3): 444–467.
- Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, David Doherty, and Conor M. Dowling. 2012. Disagreement and the Avoidance of Political Discussion: Aggregate Relationships and Differences across Personality Traits. *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (4): 849–874.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giebler, Heiko and Aiko Wagner. 2019. "Populistische Einstellungen." In Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beharrung: Die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 295–308.
- Gill, Jeff. 2005. An Entropy Measure of Uncertainty in Vote Choice. *Electoral Studies* 24 (3): 371–392.
- Gimpel, James G. and Iris S. Hui. 2015. Seeking Politically Compatible Neighbors? The Role of Neighborhood Partisan Composition in Residential Sorting. *Political Geography* 48: 130–142.
- Giugni, Marco G. and Maria T. Grasso. 2019. *Street Citizens. Protest Politics and Social Movement Participation in the Age of Globalization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Glinitzer, Konstantin and Nils Jungmann. 2019. "Spitzenkandidaten." In Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beharrung: Die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 247–262.
- Goldberg, Andreas C. 2020. The Evolution of Cleavage Voting in Four Western Countries: Structural, Behavioural or Political Dealignment? *European Journal of Political Research* 59 (1): 68–90.
- Goldthorpe, John H., David Lockwood, Frank Bechhofer, and Jennifer Platt. 1968. *The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabow, Karsten and Viola Neu (eds). 2018. *Das Ende der Stabilität? Parteien und Parteiensystem in Deutschland*. Sankt Augustin und Berlin: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung.
- Graefe, Andreas. 2015. German Election Forecasting: Comparing and Combining Methods for 2013. *German Politics* 24 (2): 195–204.
- Grande, Edgar and Hanspeter Kriesi. 2012. "The Transformative Power of Globalization and the Structure of Political Conflict in Western Europe." In Hanspeter Kriesi, Edgar Grande, Martin Dolezal, Martin Helbling, Dominic Höglinger, Swen Hutter, and Bruno Wüest (eds), *Political Conflict in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–35.
- Grande, Edgar, Tobias Schwarzbözl, and Matthias Fatke. 2019. Politicizing Immigration in Western Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy* 26 (10): 1444–1463.
- Gray, Mark and Miki Caul. 2000. Declining Voter Turnout in Advanced Industrial Democracies, 1950 to 1997. The Effects of Declining Group Mobilization. *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (9): 1091–1122.
- Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Green, Jane and Sarah Hobolt. 2008. Owning the Issue Agenda: Party Strategies and Vote Choices in British Elections. *Electoral Studies* 27 (3): 460–476.

- Green, Jane and Will Jennings. 2017a. Party Reputations and Policy Priorities: How Issue Ownership Shapes Executive and Legislative Agendas. *British Journal of Political Science* 49 (2): 443–466.
- Green, Jane and Will Jennings. 2017b. *The Politics of Competence: Parties, Public Opinion and Voters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grimm, Robert. 2015. The Rise of the German Eurosceptic Party Alternative für Deutschland, between Ordoliberal Critique and Popular Anxiety. *International Political Science Review* 36 (3): 264–278.
- Gschwend, Thomas. 2007. Ticket-splitting and Strategic Voting under Mixed Electoral Rules: Evidence from Germany. *European Journal of Political Research* 46 (1): 1–23.
- Gschwend, Thomas, Michael F. Meffert, and Lukas F. Stoetzer. 2017. Weighting Parties and Coalitions: How Coalition Signals Influence Voting Behavior. *Journal of Politics* 79 (2): 642–655.
- Gschwend, Thomas, Lukas Stoetzer, and Steffen Zittlau. 2016. What Drives Rental Votes? How Coalitions Signals Facilitate Strategic Coalition Voting. *Electoral Studies* 44: 293–306.
- Guardian. 2019. How Populism Emerged as an Electoral Force in Europe. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/ng-interactive/2018/nov/20/how-populism-emerged-as-electoral-force-in-europe>, 10.11.2019.
- Hainmüller, Jens and Michael J. Hiscox. 2007. Educated Preferences: Explaining Attitudes toward Immigration in Europe. *International Organization* 61 (2): 399–442.
- Hall, Peter A. 2012. The Economics and Politics of the Euro Crisis. *German Politics* 21 (4): 355–371.
- Hallin, David C. and Paolo Mancini. 2004. *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hameleers, Michael, Linda Bos, and Claes H. de Vreese. 2017. “They Did It”: The Effects of Emotionalized Blame Attribution in Populist Communication. *Communication Research* 44 (6): 870–900.
- Hansen, Michael A. and Jonathan Olsen. 2020. Rhapsody in Beige: The Impact of SPD Candidate Evaluations on Vote Choice in the 2009, 2013, and 2017 Federal Elections. *German Politics* 29 (2): 223–243.
- Hastie, Trevor J. and Robert J. Tibshirani. 1990. *Generalized Additive Models*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Häusermann, Silja and Hanspeter Kriesi. 2015. “What Do Voters Want? Dimensions and Configurations in Individual-Level Preferences and Party Choice.” In Pablo Beramendi, Silja Häusermann, Herbert Kitschelt, and Hanspeter Kriesi (eds), *The Politics of Advanced Capitalism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 202–230.
- Heath, Oliver. 2018. “Trends in Partisanship.” In Justin Fisher, Edward Fieldhouse, Mark Franklin, Rachel Gibson, Marta Cantijoch, and Christopher Wlezien (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Elections, Voting Behavior and Public Opinion*. New York: Routledge, 158–169.
- Hegelich, Simon, David Knollmann, and Johanna Kuhlmann. 2011. *Agenda 2010. Strategien - Entscheidungen - Konsequenzen*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Heimann, Siegfried. 1986. “Die Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands.” In Richard Stöss (ed.), *Parteihandbuch. Die Parteien der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1945–1980, Band 4*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 2025–2216.
- Heiss, Raffael and Jörg Matthes. 2019. Stuck in a Nativist Spiral: Content, Selection, and Effects of Right-Wing Populists’ Communication on Facebook. *Political Communication* 37 (3): 303–328.

- Hellwig, Timothy. 2014. The Structure of Issue Voting in Postindustrial Democracies. *The Sociological Quarterly* 55 (4): 596–624.
- Hellwig, Timothy. 2015. *Globalization and Mass Politics: Retaining the Room to Maneuver*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Henninger, Anette and Angelika von Wahl. 2019. “Verstetigung des Modernisierungskurses bei Gegenwind von rechts. Bilanz der Familien- und Gleichstellungspolitik 2013–2017.” In Reimut Zohlnhöfer and Thomas Saalfeld (eds), *Zwischen Stillstand, Politikwandel und Krisenmanagement. Eine Bilanz der Regierung Merkel 2013–2017*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 469–486.
- Herrmann, Michael. 2014. Polls, Coalitions and Strategic Voting under Proportional Representation. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 26 (3): 442–467.
- Hibbs, Douglas A. 1977. Political Parties and Macroeconomic Policy. *American Political Science Review* 71 (4): 1467–1487.
- Hobolt, Sara B. and Jeffrey A. Karp. 2010. Voters and Coalition Governments. *Electoral Studies* 29 (3): 299–307.
- Hölig, Sascha and Uwe Hasebrink. 2018. Nachrichtennutzung und soziale Medien. Befunde aus dem Reuters Institute Digital News Survey 2018. *Media Perspektiven* 2018 (12): 574–582.
- Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks. 2018. Cleavage Theory Meets Europe’s Crises: Lipset, Rokkan, and the Transnational Cleavage. *Journal of European Public Policy* 25 (1): 109–135.
- Hooghe, Liesbet, Gary Marks, and Carole J. Wilson. 2002. Does Left/Right Structure Party Positions on European Integration? *Comparative Political Studies* 35 (8): 965–989.
- Hopmann, David Nicolas, Rens Vliegthart, Claes De Vreese, and Erik Albæk. 2010. Effects of Election News Coverage: How Visibility and Tone Influence Party Choice. *Political Communication* 27 (4): 389–405.
- Huber, Sascha. 2014. “Coalitions and Voting Behavior in a Differentiating Multiparty System.” In Bernhard Weßels, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (eds), *Voters on the Move or on the Run?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 65–88.
- Huber, Sascha. 2017. Instrumental and Expressive Coalition Voting: The Case of the FDP in the 2009 and 2013 German Federal Elections. *German Politics* 26 (1): 104–123.
- Huckfeldt, Robert. 1983. Social Contexts, Social Networks, and Urban Neighborhoods: Environmental Constraints on Friendship Choice. *American Journal of Sociology* 89 (3): 651–669.
- Huckfeldt, Robert, Paul Allen Beck, Russell J. Dalton, and Jeffrey Levine. 1995. Political Environments, Cohesive Social Groups, and the Communication of Public Opinion. *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (4): 1025–1054.
- Huckfeldt, Robert, Ken’ichi Ikeda, and Franz Urban Pappi. 2005. Patterns of Disagreement in Democratic Politics: Comparing Germany, Japan, and the United States. *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (3): 497–514.
- Huckfeldt, Robert, Paul Johnson, and John Sprague. 2004a. *Political Disagreement. The Survival of Diverse Opinions within Communication Networks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huckfeldt, Robert, Jeanette Morehouse Mendez, and Tracy Osborn. 2004b. Disagreement, Ambivalence, and Engagement: The Political Consequences of Heterogeneous Networks. *Political Psychology* 25 (1): 65–95.
- Huckfeldt, Robert and John Sprague. 1988. Choice, Social Structure, and Political Information: The Information Coercion of Minorities. *American Journal of Political Science* 32 (2): 467–482.

- Huckfeldt, Robert and John Sprague. 1995. *Citizens, Politics and Social Communication: Information and Influence in an Election Campaign*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Huddy, Leonie, Lilliana Mason, and Lene Aarøe. 2015. Expressive Partisanship: Campaign Involvement, Political Emotion, and Partisan Identity. *American Political Science Review* 109 (1): 1–17.
- Hutter, Swen, Edgar Grande, and Hanspeter Kriesi (eds). 2016. *Politicising Europe: Integration and Mass Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ignazi, Piero. 1992. The Silent Counter-revolution: Hypotheses on the Emergence of Extreme Right-wing Parties in Europe. *European Journal of Political Research* 22 (1): 3–34.
- Ikeda, Ken'ichi and Sean Richey. 2009. The Impact of Diversity in Informal Social Networks on Tolerance in Japan. *British Journal of Political Science* 39 (3): 655–668.
- Indridason, Indridi H. 2011. Proportional Representation, Majoritarian Legislatures, and Coalitional Voting. *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (4): 955–971.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1977. *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles among Western Publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1983. Traditionelle politische Trennungslinien und die Entwicklung der neuen Politik in westlichen Gesellschaften. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 24 (2): 139–165.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1987. Value Change in Industrial Societies. *American Political Science Review* 81 (4): 1289–1303.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization. Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton/NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 2018. *Cultural Evolution: People's Motivations are Changing, and Reshaping the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald and Pippa Norris. 2016. *Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash*. HKS working paper no. RWP16–026.
- Inglehart, Ronald and Pippa Norris. 2017. Trump and the Populist Authoritarian Parties: The Silent Revolution in Reverse. *Perspectives on Politics* 15 (2): 443–454.
- Inglehart, Ronald and Christian Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Irwin, Galen A. and Joop J.M. van Holsteyn. 2012. Strategic Electoral Considerations under Proportional Representation. *Electoral Studies* 31 (1): 184–191.
- Ivarsflaten, Elisabeth. 2005. The Vulnerable Populist Right Parties: No Economic Realignment Fuelling Their Electoral Success. *European Journal of Political Research* 44 (3): 465–492.
- Iyengar, Shanto, Kyu S. Hahn, Jon A. Krosnick, and John Walker. 2008. Selective Exposure to Campaign Communication: The Role of Anticipated Agreement and Issue Public Membership. *The Journal of Politics* 70 (1): 186–200.
- Iyengar, Shanto, Yphtach Lelkes, Matthew Levendusky, Neil Malhotra, and Sean J. Westwood. 2019. The Origins and Consequences of Affective Polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science* 22 (1): 129–146.
- Iyengar, Shanto, Gaurav Sood, and Yphtach Lelkes. 2012. Affect, Not Ideology: A Social Identity Perspective on Polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76 (3): 405–431.
- Jacoby, William G. 2014. Is There a Culture War? Conflicting Value Structures in American Public Opinion. *American Political Science Review* 108 (4): 754–771.

- Jäger, Kai. 2019. When Do Party Supporters Abandon the Party Leader? The Intraparty Conflict of the Alternative for Germany. *Party Politics* 27 (3): 478–488.
- Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. 2015. The Discipline's Debate Contributions: Then, Now, and Next. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 101 (1): 85–97.
- Jansen, Giedo, Geoffrey Evans, and Nan Dirk de Graaf. 2013. Class Voting and Left-Right Party Positions: A Comparative Study of 15 Western Democracies, 1960–2005. *Social Science Research* 42 (2): 376–400.
- Jennings, M. Kent and Gregory B. Markus. 1984. Partisan Orientations over the Long Haul: Results from the Three-Wave Political Socialization Panel Study. *American Political Science Review* 78 (4): 1000–1018.
- Jennings, Will and Christopher Wlezien. 2016. The Timeline of Elections: A Comparative Perspective. *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (1): 219–233.
- Jerit, Jennifer and Jason Barabas. 2012. Partisan Perceptual Bias and the Information Environment. *The Journal of Politics* 74 (3): 672–684.
- Jesse, Eckhard. 2013. "Das 'Parteiensystem' der DDR." In Oskar Niedermayer (ed.), *Handbuch Parteienforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 711–737.
- Jesse, Eckhard. 2018. Die Bundestagswahl 2017 und die Regierungsbildung. *Zeitschrift für Politik* 65 (2): 168–194.
- Johann, David and Christian Glantschnigg. 2013. "Correct Voting" bei der Nationalratswahl 2008. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 42 (4): 373–390.
- Johann, David, Katharina Kleinen-von Königslöw, Sylvia Kritzinger, and Kathrin Thomas. 2018. Intra-Campaign Changes in Voting Preferences: The Impact of Media and Party Communication. *Political Communication* 35 (2): 261–286.
- Johann, David and Sabrina Jasmin Mayer. 2019. "Effekte spezifischen politischen Wissens auf einstellungskongruente Wahlentscheidungen." In Bettina Westle and Markus Tausendpfund (eds), *Politisches Wissen*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 263–288.
- John, Robert. 2010. Measuring Issue Salience in British Elections: Competing Interpretations of "Most Important Issue". *Political Research Quarterly* 63 (1): 143–158.
- Johnston, Richard and Henry E. Brady. 2002. The Rolling Cross-Section Design. *Electoral Studies* 21: 283–295.
- Johnston, Richard, Michael G. Hagen, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 2004. *The 2000 Presidential Election and the Foundations of Party Politics*. Cambridge/Mass: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnston, Richard, Julia Partheymüller, and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck. 2014. "Activation of Fundamentals in German Campaigns." In Bernhard Weßels, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (eds), *Voters on the Move or on the Run?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 217–237.
- Johnston, Ron and Charles Pattie. 2006. *Putting Voters in Their Place: Geography and Elections in Great Britain*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Joslyn, Mark R. and Steve Ceccoli. 1996. Attentiveness to Television News and Opinion Change in the Fall 1992 Presidential Campaign. *Political Behavior* 18 (2): 141–170.
- Kaase, Max. 1984. The Challenge of the "Participatory Revolution" in Pluralist Democracies. *International Political Science Review* 5 (3): 299–318.
- Kaase, Max. 1994. Is there Personalization in Politics? Candidates and Voting Behavior in Germany. *International Political Science Review* 15 (3): 211–230.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin and Patrick J. Kenney. 2002. The Slant of the News: How Editorial Endorsements Influence Campaign Coverage and Citizens' Views of Candidates. *American Political Science Review* 96 (2): 381–394.

- Kahneman, Daniel and Amos Tversky. 1972. Subjective Probability: A Judgment of Representativeness. *Cognitive Psychology* 3 (3): 430–454.
- Karvonen, Lauri. 2010. *The Personalisation of Politics: A Study of Parliamentary Democracies*. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Katz, Elihu and Jacob J. Feldman. 1962. “The Debates in the Light of Research: A Survey of Surveys.” In Sidney Kraus (ed.), *The Great Debates Kennedy vs. Nixon, 1960*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 173–223.
- Kayser, Mark A. and Arndt Leininger. 2016. A Predictive Test of Voters’ Economic Benchmarking: The 2013 German Bundestag Election. *German Politics* 25 (1): 106–130.
- Kayser, Mark A. and Arndt Leininger. 2017. A Länder-based Forecast of the 2017 German Bundestag Election. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (3): 689–692.
- Kedar, Orit. 2005. When Moderate Voters Prefer Extreme Parties: Policy Balancing in Parliamentary Elections. *American Political Science Review* 99 (2): 185–199.
- Kedar, Orit. 2012. Voter Choice and Parliamentary Politics: An Emerging Research Agenda. *British Journal of Political Science* 42 (3): 537–553.
- Keele, Luke. 2008. *Semiparametric Regression for the Social Sciences*. Chichester: Wiley Online Library.
- Kelsen, Hans. 2013. *The Essence and Value of Democracy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Key, V. O. 1959. Secular Realignment and the Party System. *The Journal of Politics* 21 (2): 198–210.
- Kießling, Andreas. 1999. *Politische Kultur und Parteien im vereinten Deutschland. Determinanten der Entwicklung des Parteiensystems*. München: Forschungsgruppe Deutschland: Schriftenreihe Vol. 11.
- Kinder, Donald R. 1998. Communication and Opinion. *Annual Review of Political Science* 1 (1): 167–197.
- King, Anthony (ed.). 2002a. *Leaders’ Personalities and the Outcomes of Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- King, Anthony. 2002b. “Do Leaders’ Personalities Really Matter?” In Anthony King (ed.), *Leaders’ Personalities and the Outcomes of Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–43.
- King, Anthony. 2002c. “Conclusions and Implications” In Anthony King (ed.), *Leaders’ Personalities and the Outcomes of Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 210–221.
- Kirchheimer, Otto. 1966. “The Transformation of the Western European Party System.” In Joseph LaPalombara and Myron Weiner (eds), *Political Parties and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 177–200.
- Kitschelt, Herbert and Anthony J. McGann. 1995. *The Radical Right in Western Europe. A Comparative Analysis*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Klapper, Joseph T. 1960. *The Effects of Mass Communication*. Glencoe/Ill.: The Free Press.
- Klein, Markus. 2005a. Der Einfluss der beiden TV-Duelle im Vorfeld der Bundestagswahl 2002 auf die Wahlbeteiligung und die Wahlentscheidung. Eine log-lineare Pfadanalyse auf der Grundlage von Paneldaten. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 34 (3): 207–222.
- Klein, Markus. 2005b. “Die TV-Duelle: Events ohne Effekt?” In Manfred Güllner, Hermann Dülmer, Markus Klein, Dieter Ohr, Markus Quandt, Ulrich Rosar, and Hans-Dieter Klingemann (eds), *Die Bundestagswahl 2002: Eine Untersuchung im Zeichen hoher politischer Dynamik*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 143–159.
- Klein, Markus and Manuela Pötschke. 2005. “Haben die beiden TV-Duelle im Vorfeld der Bundestagswahl 2002 den Wahlausgang beeinflusst? Eine Mehrebenenanalyse auf der

- Grundlage eines 11-Wellen-Kurzfristpanels." In Jürgen W. Falter, Oscar W. Gabriel, and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler: Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2002*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 357–370.
- Klein, Markus and Ulrich Rosar. 2007. Wirkungen des TV-Duells im Vorfeld der Bundestagswahl 2005 auf die Wahlentscheidung. *KZfJSS Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 59 (1): 81–104.
- Klein, Markus and Ulrich Rosar. 2016. "Problem-Peer und die (Über-) Mutter der Nation: Kanzlerkandidaten und Wahlentscheidung bei der Bundestagswahl 2013." In Harald Schoen and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler. Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2013*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 91–109.
- Klein, Markus, Frederik Springer, Lena Masch, Dieter Ohr, and Ulrich Rosar. 2019. Die politische Urteilsbildung der Wählerschaft im Vorfeld der Bundestagswahl 2017. Eine empirische Analyse in der Tradition von "The People's Choice". *Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen* 50 (1): 22–41.
- Klofstad, Casey A., Anand Sokhey, and Scott D. McClurg. 2013. Disagreeing about Disagreement: How Conflict in Social Networks Affects Political Behavior. *American Journal of Political Science* 57 (1): 120–134.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, Silvia and Jingbo Meng. 2009. Looking the Other Way: Selective Exposure to Attitude-Consistent and Counterattitudinal Political Information. *Communication Research* 36 (3): 426–448.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, Silvia, Cornelia Mothes, and Nick Polavin. 2017. Confirmation Bias, Ingroup Bias, and Negativity Bias in Selective Exposure to Political Information. *Communication Research* 47 (1): 104–124.
- Konzelmann, Laura, Corina Wagner, and Hans Rattinger. 2012. Turnout in Germany in the Course of Time: Life Cycle and Cohort Effects on Electoral Turnout from 1953 to 2009. *Electoral Studies* 31 (2): 250–261.
- Koschmieder, Carsten and Oskar Niedermayer. 2015. "Steiler Aufstieg und tiefer Fall: die Piratenpartei Deutschland." In Oskar Niedermayer (ed.), *Die Parteien nach der Bundestagswahl 2013*. Wiesbaden: Springer, 209–235.
- Kraft, Patrick. 2012. Correct Voting in Deutschland: Eine Analyse der Qualität individueller Wahlentscheidungen bei der Bundestagswahl 2009. In *MZES Working Papers (148)*. Mannheim: Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung.
- Kraft, Patrick and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck. 2013. "Helfen politische Gespräche, 'korrekt' zu wählen? Eine Analyse zur Bundestagswahl 2009." In Silke I. Keil (ed.), *Zivile Bürgergesellschaft und Demokratie*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 117–138.
- Kratz, Agatha. 2019. "Politische Sachfragen." In Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beharrung: Die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 229–246.
- Kratz, Agatha and Harald Schoen. 2017. "Just Like Leaves in the Wind? Exploring the Interplay of Media Coverage and Personal Characteristics in Affecting Issue Salience." In Harald Schoen, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Voters and Voting in Context: Multiple Contexts and the Heterogeneous German Electorate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 43–70.
- Krause, Birgit and Volker Gehrau. 2007. Das Paradox der Medienwirkung auf Nichtnutzer. *Publizistik* 52 (2): 191–209.
- Krewel, Mona. 2014. "Die Wahlkampagnen der Parteien und ihr Kontext." In Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf et al. (eds), *Zwischen Fragmentierung und Konzentration: Die Bundestagswahl 2013*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 35–46.

- Krewel, Mona, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, and Ansgar Wolsing. 2011. The Campaign and its Dynamics at the 2009 German General Election. *German Politics* 20 (1): 28–50.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter. 2010. Restructuration of Partisan Politics and the Emergence of a New Cleavage Based on Values. *West European Politics* 33 (3): 673–685.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter. 2012. The Political Consequences of the Financial and Economic Crisis in Europe: Electoral Punishment and Popular Protest. *Swiss Political Science Review* 18 (4): 518–522.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter. 2013. *Political Conflict in Europe in the Shadow of the Great Recession*. EUI, Florence.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter. 2018. The 2017 French and German Elections. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 56 (S1): 51–62.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgar Grande, Martin Dolezal, Marc Helbling, Dominic Höglinger, Swen Hutter, and Bruno Wüest. 2012. *Political Conflict in Western Europe*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgar Grande, Romain Lachat, Martin Dolezal, Simon Bornschier, and Timotheos Frey. 2006. Globalization and the Transformation of the National Political Space: Six European Countries Compared. *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (6): 921–956.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgar Grande, Romain Lachat, Martin Dolezal, Simon Bornschier, and Timotheos Frey. 2008. *West European Politics in the Age of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. 2004. Reliability in Content Analysis. Some Common Misconceptions and Recommendations. *Human Communication Research* 30 (3): 411–433.
- Kropp, Sabine. 2010. The Ubiquity and Strategic Complexity of Grand Coalition in the German Federal System. *German Politics* 19 (3–4): 286–311.
- Krosnick, Jon A. 1989. Attitude Importance and Attitude Accessibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 15 (3): 297–308.
- Krosnick, Jon A. 1990. Government Policy and Citizen Passion: A Study of Issue Publics in Contemporary America. *Political Behavior* 12 (1): 59–92.
- Kuechler, Manfred. 1991. Issues and Voting in the European Elections 1989. *European Journal of Political Research* 19 (1): 81–103.
- Kuhn, Ursina. 2009. Stability and Change in Party Preference. *Swiss Political Science Review* 15 (3): 463–494.
- Laakso, Markku and Rein Taagepera. 1979. Effective Number of Parties: A Measure with Application to West Europe. *Comparative Political Studies* 12 (1): 3–27.
- Lachat, Romain. 2007. *A Heterogenous Electorate: Political Sophistication, Predisposition Strength and the Voting Decision Process*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Lachat, Romain. 2008. The Impact of Party Polarization on Ideological Voting. *Electoral Studies* 27 (4): 687–698.
- Lachat, Romain. 2011. Electoral Competitiveness and Issue Voting. *Political Behavior* 33 (4): 645–663.
- Lachat, Romain. 2017. “Value Cleavages.” In Kai Arzheimer, Jocelyn Evans, and Michael S. Lewis-Beck (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Electoral Behaviour*. London: SAGE, 561–583.
- Lachat, Romain and Aiko Wagner. 2018. How Party Characteristics Drive Voters’ Evaluation Criteria. *Electoral Studies* 55: 11–20.
- Lahav, Gallya. 1997. Ideological and Party Constraints on Immigration Attitudes in Europe. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 35 (3): 377–406.
- Lane, Jan-Erik and Svante Ersson. 1997. Parties and Voters: What Creates the Ties? *Scandinavian Political Studies* 20 (2): 179–196.

- Lang, Gladys E. and Kurt Lang. 1978a. "The Formation of Public Opinion: Direct and Mediated Effects of the First Debate." In George F. Bishop, Robert Meadow, and Marilyn Jackson-Beeck (eds), *The Presidential Debates: Media, Electoral, and Policy Perspectives*. New York: Praeger, 61–80.
- Lang, Gladys E. and Kurt Lang. 1978b. Immediate and Delayed Responses to a Carter-Ford Debate: Assessing Public Opinion. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 42 (3): 322–341.
- Lange, Nico, Franziska Fislage, and Theresa Saetzler. 2014. *Positionen der Parteien zur Europawahl*. https://www.kas.de/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=ec643a4f-5b21-d129-9e60-052ed5d931dc&groupId=252038. 07.06.2019.
- Lasswell, Harold. 1936. *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. New York: Whittlesey House.
- Lau, Richard R. 2013. Correct Voting in the 2008 U.S. Presidential Nominating Elections. *Political Behavior* 35 (2): 331–355.
- Lau, Richard R., David J. Andersen, and David P. Redlawsk. 2008. An Exploration of Correct Voting in Recent U.S. Presidential Elections. *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (2): 395–411.
- Lau, Richard R., Parina Patel, Dalia F. Fahmy, and Robert R. Kaufman. 2014. Correct Voting Across Thirty-Three Democracies: A Preliminary Analysis. *British Journal of Political Science* 44 (2): 239–259.
- Lau, Richard R. and David P. Redlawsk. 1997. Voting Correctly. *American Political Science Review* 91 (3): 585–598.
- Lau, Richard R. and David P. Redlawsk. 2006. *How Voters Decide. Information Processing during Election Campaigns*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lau, Richard R. and David P. Redlawsk. 2008. Older but Wiser?: Effects of Age on Political Cognition. *The Journal of Politics* 70 (1): 168–185.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet. 1944. *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Leeper, Thomas J. and Rune Slothuus. 2014. Political Parties, Motivated Reasoning, and Public Opinion Formation. *Political Psychology* 35 (S1): 129–156.
- Lees, Charles. 2011. Coalition Formation and the German Party System. *German Politics* 20 (1): 146–163.
- Lees, Charles. 2018. The "Alternative for Germany": The Rise of Right-wing Populism at the Heart of Europe. *Politics* 38 (3): 295–310.
- Lehmann, Pola, Theres Matthieß, and Sven Regel. 2019. "Rechts der anderen: Themen und Positionen der AfD im Parteienwettbewerb." In Wolfgang Schröder and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Smarte Spalter. Die AfD zwischen Bewegung und Parlament*. Bonn: Dietz, 170–199.
- Lelkes, Yphtach. 2016. Mass Polarization: Manifestations and Measurements. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80 (S1): 392–410.
- Lemert, James B., William R. Elliot, James M. Bernstein, William L. Rosenberg, and Karl L. Nestvold. 1991. *News Verdicts, the Debates, and Presidential Campaigns*. New York: Praeger.
- Lenz, Gabriel S. 2012. *Follow the Leader? How Voters Respond to Politicians' Policies and Performance*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewandowsky, Marcel, Heiko Giebler, and Aiko Wagner. 2016. Rechtspopulismus in Deutschland. Eine empirische Einordnung der Parteien zur Bundestagswahl 2013 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der AfD. *PVS Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 57 (2): 247–275.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S., Richard Nadeau, and Angelo Elias. 2008a. Economics, Party, and the Vote: Causality Issues and Panel Data. *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (1): 84–95.

- Lewis-Beck, Michael S., Richard Nadeau, and Martial Foucault. 2013. The Compleat Economic Voter: New Theory and British Evidence. *British Journal of Political Science* 43 (2): 241–261.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S., Helmut Norpoth, William G. Jacoby, and Herbert F. Weisberg. 2008b. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S. and Tom W. Rice. 1992. *Forecasting Elections*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Linhart, Eric. 2009. A Rational Calculus of Voting Considering Coalition Signals: The 2005 German Bundestag Election as an Example. *World Political Science Review* 5 (1): 1–28.
- Linhart, Eric. 2014. “Räumliche Modelle der Politik: Einführung und Überblick.” In Eric Linhart, Bernhard Kittel, and André Bächtiger (eds), *Jahrbuch für Handlungs- und Entscheidungstheorie*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 3–44.
- Linhart, Eric and Niko Switek. 2019. “Am Ende doch wieder Schwarz-Rot – Die Koalitionsfindung nach der Bundestagswahl 2017 aus koalitions-theoretischer Perspektive.” In Karl-Rudolf Korte and Jan Schoofs (eds), *Die Bundestagswahl 2017: Analysen der Wahl-, Parteien-, Kommunikations- und Regierungsforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 485–511.
- Lipset, Seymour M. and Stein Rokkan. 1967. “Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments. An Introduction.” In Seymour M. Lipset and Stein Rokkan (eds), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-national Perspectives*. New York: Free Press, 1–64.
- Lodge, Milton and Charles S. Taber. 2013. *The Rationalizing Voter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lowe, Will, Kenneth Benoit, Slava Mikhaylov, and Michael Laver. 2011. Scaling Policy Preferences from Coded Political Texts. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 36 (1): 123–155.
- Lowry, Dennis T., Janet A. Bridges, and Paul A. Barefield. 1990. Effects of TV “Instant Analysis and Querulous Criticism:” following the First Bush-Dukakis Debate. *Journalism Quarterly* 67 (4): 814–825.
- Lucassen, Geertje and Marcel Lubbers. 2012. Who Fears What? Explaining Far-Right-Wing Preference in Europe by Distinguishing Perceived Cultural and Economic Ethnic Threats. *Comparative Political Studies* 45 (5): 547–574.
- Lupu, Noam. 2015. Party Polarization and Mass Partisanship: A Comparative Perspective. *Political Behavior* 37 (2): 331–356.
- Luskin, Robert C., John P. McIver, and Edward G. Carmines. 1989. Issues and the Transmission of Partisanship. *American Journal of Political Science* 33 (2): 440–458.
- Mack, Oliver and Anshuman Khare. 2016. “Perspectives on a VUCA World.” In Oliver Mack, Anshuman Khare, Andreas Krämer, and Thomas Burgartz (eds), *Managing in a VUCA World*. Cham: Springer, 3–19.
- MacKuen, Michael B., Robert S. Erikson, and James A. Stimson. 1989. Macropartisanship. *The American Political Science Review* 83 (4): 1125–1142.
- Madeley, John. 1982. Politics and the Pulpit: The Case of Protestant Europe. *West European Politics* 5 (2): 149–171.
- Mader, Matthias and Harald Schoen. 2019. The European Refugee Crisis, Party Competition, and Voters’ Responses in Germany. *West European Politics* 42 (1): 67–90.
- Maier, Jürgen. 2006. “Deutschland auf dem Weg zur “Kanzlerdemokratie”? Zur Bedeutung der Kanzlerkandidaten für das Wahlverhalten bei den Bundestagswahlen 1990 bis 2005.” In Jürgen W. Falter, Oscar W. Gabriel, Hans Rattinger, and Harald Schoen (eds), *Sind wir ein Volk? Ost- und Westdeutschland im Vergleich*. München: C.H. Beck, 158–187.
- Maier, Jürgen. 2007a. “Wahlkampfkommunikation und Wahlverhalten.” In Hans Rattinger, Oscar W. Gabriel, and Jürgen W. Falter (eds), *Der gesamtdeutsche Wähler: Stabilität und*

- Wandel des Wählerverhaltens im wiedervereinigten Deutschland*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 382–411.
- Maier, Jürgen and Thorsten Faas. 2003. The Affected German Voter: Televised Debates, Follow-up Communication and Candidate Evaluations. *Communications* 28 (4): 383–404.
- Maier, Jürgen and Thorsten Faas. 2005. “Schröder gegen Stoiber: Wahrnehmung, Verarbeitung und Wirkung der Fernsehdebatten im Bundestagswahlkampf 2002.” In Jürgen W. Falter, Oscar W. Gabriel, and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler 2002. Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2002*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften 77–101.
- Maier, Jürgen and Thorsten Faas. 2011a. “Das TV-Duell 2009 – langweilig, wirkungslos, nutzlos? Ergebnisse eines Experiments zur Wirkung der Fernsehdebatte zwischen Angela Merkel und Frank-Walter Steinmeier.” In Heinrich Oberreuter (ed.), *Am Ende der Gewissheiten: Wähler, Parteien und Koalitionen in Bewegung*. München: Olzog, 147–166.
- Maier, Jürgen and Thorsten Faas. 2011b. “Miniature Campaigns” in Comparison: The German Televised Debates, 2002–09. *German Politics* 20 (1): 75–91.
- Maier, Jürgen and Thorsten Faas. 2019. *TV-Duelle, Grundwissen Politische Kommunikation*. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Maier, Michaela. 2007b. “Verstärkung, Mobilisierung, Konversion: Wirkungen des TV-Duells auf die Wahlabsicht.” In Marcus Maurer, Carsten Reinemann, Jürgen Maier, and Michaela Maier (eds), *Schröder gegen Merkel: Wahrnehmung und Wirkung des TV-Duells 2005 im Ost-West-Vergleich*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 145–165.
- Maier, Michaela. 2007c. “Viel Spielraum für die eigene Interpretation: Wahrnehmung und Wirkung der Nachberichterstattung.” In Marcus Maurer, Carsten Reinemann, Jürgen Maier, and Michaela Maier (eds), *Schröder gegen Merkel: Wahrnehmung und Wirkung des TV-Duells 2005 im Ost-West-Vergleich*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 195–227.
- Mair, Peter. 2013. *Ruling the Void: The Hollowing of Western Democracy*. London: Verso Trade.
- Manow, Philip. 2018. *Die Politische Ökonomie des Populismus*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Mauerer, Ingrid, Paul W. Thurner, and Marc Debus. 2015. Under Which Conditions Do Parties Attract Voters’ Reactions to Issues? Party-Varying Issue Voting in German Elections 1987–2009. *West European Politics* 38 (6): 1251–1273.
- Maurer, Marcus and Carsten Reinemann. 2003. *Schröder gegen Stoiber: Nutzung, Wahrnehmung und Wirkung der TV-Duelle*. 1 ed. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Maurer, Marcus and Carsten Reinemann. 2006. *Medieninhalte, Studienbücher zur Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaft*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Mazzoleni, Gianpietro. 1987. Media Logic and Party Logic in Campaign Coverage: The Italian General Election of 1983. *European Journal of Communication* 2 (1): 81–103.
- McAllister, I., R.J. Johnston, C.J. Pattie, H. Tunstall, D.F.L. Dorling, and D.J. Rossiter. 2001. Class Dealignment and the Neighbourhood Effect: Miller Revisited. *British Journal of Political Science* 31 (1): 41–59.
- McClurg, Scott D., Casey A. Klofstad, and Anand Edward Sokhey. 2017. “Discussion Networks.” In Jennifer Nicoll Victor, Alexander H. Montgomery, and Lubell Mark (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Networks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 515–536.
- McCombs, Maxwell. 2014. *Setting the Agenda. The Mass Media and Public Opinion*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- McCoy, Jennifer and Murat Somer. 2019. Toward a Theory of Pernicious Polarization and How It Harms Democracies: Comparative Evidence and Possible Remedies. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 681 (1): 234–271.
- McGuire, William J. 1973. “Persuasion, Resistance, and Attitude Change.” In Ithiel de Sola Pool, Frederick W. Frey, Wilbur Schramm, Nathan Maccoby, and Edwin B. Parker (eds), *Handbook of Communication*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 216–252.
- McKinney, Mitchell S. and Diana B. Carlin. 2004. “Political Campaign Debates.” In Lynda Lee Kaid (ed.), *Handbook of Political Communication Research*. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 203–234.
- McKinney, Mitchell S., Elizabeth A. Dudash, and Georgine Hodgkinson. 2003. “Viewer Reactions to the 2000 Presidential Debates: Learning Issue and Image Information.” In Lynda Lee Kaid, John C. Tedesco, Dianne G. Bystrom, and Mitchell S. McKinney (eds), *The Millennium Election: Communication in the 2000 Campaign*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 43–58.
- McKinney, Mitchell S. and Benjamin R. Warner. 2013. Do Presidential Debates Matter? Examining a Decade of Campaign Debate Effects. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 49 (4): 238–258.
- McLeod, Jack M., Jean A. Durrall, Dean A. Ziemke, and Carl R. Bybee. 1979. “Reactions of Young and Older Voters: Expanding the Context of Effects.” In Sidney Kraus (ed.), *The Great Debates: Carter vs. Ford, 1976*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 348–367.
- McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M. Cook. 2001. Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27 (1): 415–444.
- Meffert, Michael F. and Thomas Gschwend. 2010. Strategic Coalition Voting: Evidence from Austria. *Electoral Studies* 29 (3): 339–349.
- Meguid, Bonnie. 2007. *Party Competition between Unequals: Strategies and Electoral Fortunes in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Messina, Anthony M. 2007. *The Logics and Politics of Post-WWII Migration to Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, Warren Edward and J. Merrill Shanks. 1996. *The New American Voter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Min, Young, Salma I. Ghanem, and Dixie Evatt. 2007. Using a Split-Ballot Survey to Explore the Robustness of the “MIP” Question in Agenda-Setting Research: A Methodological Study. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 19 (2): 221–236.
- Minkenberg, Michael. 1998. *Die neue radikale Rechte im Vergleich*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Minozzi, William, Hyunjin Song, David M. J. Lazer, Michael A. Neblo, and Katherine Ognyanova. 2020. The Incidental Pundit: Who Talks Politics with Whom, and Why? *American Journal of Political Science* 64 (1): 135–151.
- Mintzel, Alf. 1984. *Die Volkspartei*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Mood, Carina. 2010. Logistic Regression: Why We Cannot Do What We Think We Can Do, and What We Can Do About It. *European Sociological Review* 26 (1): 67–82.
- Morgan, Stephen L. and Christopher Winship. 2014. *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. 2 ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mudde, Cas. 2004. The Populist Zeitgeist. *Government and Opposition* 39 (4): 541–563.
- Mudde, Cas. 2007. *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mudde, Cas. 2014. Fighting the System? Populist Radical Right Parties and Party System Change. *Party Politics* 20 (2): 217–226.

- Mudde, Cas. 2019. *The Far Right Today*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Mughan, Anthony. 2000. *Media and the Presidentialization of Parliamentary Elections*. London: Palgrave.
- Müller-Rommel, Ferdinand (ed.). 1995. *New Politics*. Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Müller, Jan-Werner. 2016. *What Is Populism?* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Müller, Wolfgang C. 2008. Warum Große Koalition? Antworten aus koalitionstheoretischer Sicht. *Zeitschrift für Staats- und Europawissenschaften* 6 (3): 499–523.
- Mummolo, Jonathan and Clayton Nall. 2017. Why Partisans Do Not Sort: The Constraints on Political Segregation. *The Journal of Politics* 79 (1): 45–59.
- Münch, Ursula and Heinrich Oberreuter (eds). 2015. *Die neue Offenheit: Wahlverhalten und Regierungsoptionen im Kontext der Bundestagswahl 2013*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Mushaben, Joyce Marie. 2017. Wir schaffen das! Angela Merkel and the European Refugee Crisis. *German Politics* 26 (4): 516–533.
- Mutz, Diana C. 2002. Cross-cutting Social Networks: Testing Democratic Theory in Practice. *The American Political Science Review* 96 (1): 111–126.
- Mutz, Diana C. 2006. *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative Versus Participatory Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Myles, John. 1990. “Labour Markets and Life Cycles.” In Roger Friedland and A. F. Robertson (eds), *Beyond the Marketplace: Rethinking Economy and Society*. New York: De Gruyter, 271–298.
- Nadeau, Richard, Ruth Dassonneville, Michael S. Lewis-Beck, and Philippe Mongrain. 2020. Are Election Results More Unpredictable? A Forecasting Test. *Political Science Research and Methods* 8 (4): 764–771.
- Neu, Viola. 2007. “Linkspartei.PDS (Die Linke).” In Frank Decker and Viola Neu (eds), *Handbuch der deutschen Parteien*. Wiesbaden: VS, 314–328.
- Neundorf, Anja, Daniel Stegmueller, and Thomas J. Scotto. 2011. The Individual-Level Dynamics of Bounded Partisanship. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75 (3): 458–482.
- Newton, Kenneth. 2019. *Surprising News: How the Media Affect—and Do Not Affect—Politics*. Boulder/Col.: Lynne Rienner.
- Nezi, Roula. 2012. Economic Voting under the Economic Crisis: Evidence from Greece. *Electoral Studies* 31 (3): 498–505.
- Nezi, Roula and Alexia Katsanidou. 2014. From Valence to Position: Economic Voting in Extraordinary Conditions. *Acta Politica* 49 (4): 413–430.
- Nicholson, Stephen P. 2012. Polarizing Cues. *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (1): 52–66.
- Nicolet, Sarah and Pascal Sciarini. 2006. When Do Issue Opinions Matter, and to Whom? The Determinants of Long-Term Stability and Change in Party Choice in the 2003 Swiss Elections. *Swiss Political Science Review* 12 (4): 159–190.
- Niedermayer, Oskar. 2008. “Das fluide Fünfparteiensystem nach der Bundestagswahl 2005.” In Oskar Niedermayer (ed.), *Die Parteien nach der Bundestagswahl 2005*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 9–35.
- Niedermayer, Oskar. 2012. “Regionalisierung des Wahlverhaltens und des Parteiensystems auf der Bundesebene 1949 bis 2009.” In Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (ed.), *Wählen in Deutschland. PVS Sonderheft 45*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 134–156.
- Niedermayer, Oskar. 2013. “Das Parteiensystem der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.” In Oskar Niedermayer (ed.), *Handbuch Parteienforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 739–764.
- Niedermayer, Oskar. 2015. “Nichts ist mehr, wie es einmal war: Das Parteiensystem nach der Bundestagswahl 2013.” In Ursula Münch and Heinrich Oberreuter (eds), *Die neue*

- Offenheit. Wahlverhalten und Regierungsoptionen im Kontext der Bundestagswahl 2013.* Frankfurt: Campus, 311–326.
- Niedermayer, Oskar. 2016. Flüchtlingskrise und Parteiensystem. Die Veränderung des Parteiensystems und die möglichen Folgen für die Bundestagswahl 2017. *Gesellschaft, Wirtschaft, Politik* 65 (3): 297–308.
- Niedermayer, Oskar. 2018. “Die Entwicklung des bundesdeutschen Parteiensystems.” In Frank Decker and Viola Neu (eds), *Handbuch der deutschen Parteien*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 97–125.
- Nieuwbeerta, Paul. 1996. The Democratic Class Struggle in Postwar Societies: Class Voting in Twenty Countries. *Acta Sociologica* 39 (4): 345–383.
- Noelle-Neumann, Elisabeth. 1974. The Spiral of Silence. A Theory of Public Opinion. *Journal of Communication* 24 (2): 43–51.
- Norpoth, Helmut and Thomas Gschwend. 2013. Chancellor Model Picks Merkel in 2013 German Election. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46 (3): 481–482.
- Norpoth, Helmut and Thomas Gschwend. 2017. Chancellor Model Predicts a Change of the Guards. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (3): 686–688.
- Norris, Pippa. 2011. *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart. 2019. *Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nyhuis, Dominic and Carolina Plescia. 2018. The Nonideological Component of Coalition preferences. *Party Politics* 24 (6): 686–697.
- Oesch, Daniel. 2013. “The Class Basis of the Cleavage between the New Left and the Radical Right: An Analyses for Austria, Denmark, Norway and Switzerland.” In Jens Rydgren (ed.), *Class Politics and the Radical Right*. London: Routledge, 31–51.
- Ohr, Dieter. 2000. “Wird das Wählerverhalten zunehmend personalisierter, oder: Ist jede Wahl anders? Kandidatenorientierungen und Wahlentscheidung in Deutschland von 1961 bis 1998.” In Markus Klein, Wolfgang Jagodzinski, Ekkehard Mochmann, and Dieter Ohr (eds), *50 Jahre Empirische Wahlforschung in Deutschland: Entwicklung, Befunde, Perspektiven, Daten*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag 272–308.
- Ohr, Dieter, Hermann Dülmer, and Markus Quandt. 2009. “Kognitive Mobilisierung oder nicht-kognitive De-Mobilisierung? Eine längsschnittliche Analyse der deutschen Wählerschaft für die Jahre 1976 bis 2005.” In Oscar W. Gabriel, Bernhard Weßels, and Jürgen W. Falter (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler, Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2005*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 536–558.
- Ohr, Dieter, Markus Klein, and Ulrich Rosar. 2013. “Bewertungen der Kanzlerkandidaten und Wahlentscheidung bei der Bundestagswahl 2009.” In Bernhard Weßels, Harald Schoen, and Oscar W. Gabriel (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler. Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2009*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften 206–230.
- Olsen, Jonathan. 2007. The Merger of the PDS and WASG: From Eastern German Regional Party to National Radical Left Party? *German Politics* 16 (2): 205–221.
- Oppelland, Torsten. 2019. “Profilierungsdilemma einer Regierungspartei in einem fragmentierten Parteiensystem. Die CDU in der Regierung Merkel III.” In Reimut Zohlnhöfer and Thomas Saalfeld (eds), *Zwischen Stillstand, Politikwandel und Krisenmanagement. Eine Bilanz der Regierung Merkel 2013–2017*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 63–86.
- Oppelland, Torsten. 2020. Die thüringische Landtagswahl vom 27. Oktober 2019: Das nächste Experiment – eine rot-rot-grüne Minderheitsregierung mit Verfallsdatum. *Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen* 51 (2): 325–348.

- Oskarson, Maria. 2005. "Social Structure and Party Choice." In Jacques Thomassen (ed.), *The European Voter: A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 84–105.
- Oskarson, Maria and Marie Demker. 2015. Room for Realignment: The Working-Class Sympathy for Sweden Democrats. *Government and Opposition* 50 (4): 629–651.
- Pappi, Franz Urban. 1973. Parteiensystem und Sozialstruktur in der Bundesrepublik. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 14 (2): 191–213.
- Pappi, Franz Urban. 1977. "Sozialstruktur, gesellschaftliche Wertorientierungen und Wahlabsicht." In Max Kaase (ed.), *Wahlsoziologie heute. Analysen aus Anlaß der Bundestagswahl 1976*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 195–229.
- Pappi, Franz Urban. 1985. "Die konfessionell-religiöse Konfliktlinie in der deutschen Wählerschaft. Entstehung, Stabilität und Wandel?" In Dieter Oberndörfer, Hans Rattinger, and Karl Schmitt (eds), *Wirtschaftlicher Wandel, Religiöser Wandel und Wertwandel*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 263–290.
- Pappi, Franz Urban, Anna-Sophie Kurella, and Thomas Bräuninger. 2019. Die Etablierung neuer Parlamentsparteien. Wählerpräferenzen als Erfolgsfaktor für die Alternative für Deutschland 2017 und die Grünen 1986. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 60 (2): 273–298.
- Pappi, Franz Urban and Susumu Shikano. 2001. Personalisierung der Politik in Mehrparteiensystemen am Beispiel deutscher Bundestagswahlen seit 1980. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 42 (3): 355–387.
- Pappi, Franz Urban and Paul W. Thurner. 2002. Electoral Behaviour in a Two-vote System: Incentives for Ticket Splitting in German Bundestag Elections. *European Journal of Political Research* 41 (2): 207–232.
- Pardos-Prado, Sergi, Bram Lancee, and Iñaki Sagarzazu. 2014. Immigration and Electoral Change in Mainstream Political Space. *Political Behavior* 36 (4): 847–875.
- Parker-Stephen, Evan. 2013. Tides of Disagreement: How Reality Facilitates (and Inhibits) Partisan Public Opinion. *The Journal of Politics* 75 (4): 1077–1088.
- Partheymüller, Julia. 2017. "Agenda-Setting Dynamics during the Campaign Period." In Harald Schoen, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Voters and Voting in Context: Multiple Contexts and the Heterogeneous German Electorate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 13–42.
- Partheymüller, Julia. 2018. *Campaign Dynamics at German Federal Elections, 2005–2013*. Mannheim: University of Mannheim. Dissertation.
- Partheymüller, Julia and Anne Schäfer. 2013. Das Informationsverhalten der Bürger im Bundestagswahlkampf 2013. *Media Perspektiven* (12): 574–588.
- Partheymüller, Julia, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, and Christian Hoops. 2013. Kampagnendynamik bei der Bundestagswahl 2013: Die Rolling Cross-Section-Studie im Rahmen der "German Longitudinal Election Study" 2013. *MZES Working Papers – Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung* (154).
- Paterson, William E. and David Southern. 1991. *Governing Germany*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Patterson, Thomas E. 1993. *Out of Order: How the Decline of the Political Parties and the Growing Power of the News Media Undermine the American Way of Electing Presidents*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Pattie, Charles J. and Ron J. Johnston. 2008. It's Good To Talk: Talk, Disagreement and Tolerance. *British Journal of Political Science* 38 (4): 677–698.
- Pattie, Charles J. and Ron J. Johnston. 2011. A Tale of Sound and Fury, Signifying Something? The Impact of the Leaders' Debates in the 2010 UK General Election. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 21 (2): 147–177.

- Payne, John W., Eric J. Johnson, and James R. Bettman. 1993. *The Adaptive Decision Maker*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pedersen, Mogens N. 1979. The Dynamics of European Party Systems: Changing Patterns of Electoral Volatility. *European Journal of Political Research* 7 (1): 1–26.
- Petrocik, John R. 1991. “Divided Government: Is It All in the Campaigns?” In Gary W. Cox and Samuel Kernell (eds), *The Politics of Divided Government*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 13–38.
- Petrocik, John R. 1996. Issue Ownership in Presidential Elections, with a 1980 Case Study. *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (3): 825–850.
- Petrocik, John R., William L. Benoit, and Glenn J. Hansen. 2003. Issue Ownership and Presidential Campaigning, 1952–2000. *Political Science Quarterly* 118 (4): 599–626.
- Picard, Robert G. 2015. “Understanding the Crisis.” In Robert G. Picard (ed.), *The Euro Crisis in the Media: Journalistic Coverage of Economic Crisis and European Institutions*. London: I.B. Tauris, 1–18.
- Pickel, Susanne. 2019. “Die Wahl der AfD: Frustration, Deprivation, Angst oder Wertekonflikt.” In Karl-Rudolf Korte and Jan Schoofs (eds), *Die Bundestagswahl 2017- Analysen der Wahl-, Parteien-, Kommunikations- und Regierungsforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 145–175.
- Plasser, Fritz and Günther Lengauer. 2010. “Wahlkampf im TV-Studio: Konfrontation in der Medienarena.” In Fritz Plasser (ed.), *Politik in der Medienarena: Praxis politischer Kommunikation in Österreich*. Wien: facultas.wuv, 193–240.
- Plescia, Carolina and Magdalena Staniek. 2017. In the Eye of the Beholder: Voters’ Perceptions of Party Policy Shifts. *West European Politics* 40 (6): 1288–1309.
- Plischke, Thomas and Michael Bergmann. 2012. “Entscheidungsprozesse von Spätscheidern bei der Bundestagswahl 2009.” In Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (ed.), *Wählen in Deutschland. PVS Sonderheft 45*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 489–513.
- Poguntke, Thomas. 1987. New Politics and Party Systems: The Emergence of a New Type of Party? *West European Politics* 10 (1): 76–88.
- Poguntke, Thomas. 1993. *Alternative Politics. The German Green Party*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Poguntke, Thomas. 1999. “Die Bündnisgrünen in der babylonischen Gefangenschaft der SPD?” In Oskar Niedermayer (ed.), *Die Parteien nach der Bundestagswahl 1998*. Wiesbaden: VS, 83–101.
- Poguntke, Thomas. 2014. Towards a New Party System: The Vanishing Hold of the Catch-all Parties in Germany. *Party Politics* 20 (6): 950–963.
- Poguntke, Thomas and Paul Webb. 2005. “The Presidentialization of Politics in Democratic Societies: A Framework for Analysis.” In Thomas Poguntke and Paul Webb (eds), *The Presidentialization of Politics: A Comparative Study of Modern Democracies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1–25.
- Preißinger, Maria and Harald Schoen. 2016. It’s Not Always the Campaign: Explaining Inter-election Switching in Germany, 2009–2013. *Electoral Studies* 44: 109–119.
- Przeworski, Adam. 2010. *Democracy and the Limits of Self-Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam. 2019. *Crises of Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam and John Sprague. 1986. *Paper Stones: A History of Electoral Socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pürer, Heinz. 2015. *Medien in Deutschland. Presse - Rundfunk - Online*. Konstanz: UTB.
- Rae, Douglas. 1968. A Note on the Fractionalization of Some European Party Systems. *Comparative Political Studies* 1 (3): 413–418.

- Rae, Douglas and Michael Taylor. 1970. *The Analysis of Political Cleavages*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rahat, Gideon and Tamir Sheafer. 2007. The Personalization(s) of Politics: Israel, 1949–2003. *Political Communication* 24 (1): 65–80.
- Rapeli, Lauri. 2018. Does Sophistication Affect Electoral Outcomes? *Government and Opposition* 53 (2): 181–204.
- Rattinger, Hans, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, and Bernhard Weßels et al. 2011. *Zwischen Langeweile und Extremen: Die Bundestagswahl 2009*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Rattinger, Hans and Harald Schoen. 2009. “Ein Schritt vorwärts, zwei zurück: Stabiles und wechselndes Wahlverhalten bei den Bundestagswahlen 1994 bis 2005.” In Oscar W. Gabriel, Bernhard Weßels, and Jürgen W. Falter (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler. Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2005*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 78–102.
- Rattinger, Hans and Elena Wiegand. 2014. “Volatility on the Rise? Attitudinal Stability, Attitudinal Change, and Voter Volatility.” In Bernhard Weßels, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (eds), *Voters on the Move or on the Run?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 287–307.
- Redlawsk, David P. 2002. Hot Cognition or Cool Consideration? Testing the Effects of Motivated Reasoning on Political Decision Making. *Journal of Politics* 64 (4): 1021–1044.
- Redlawsk, David P., Andrew J. W. Civettini, and Karen M. Emmerson. 2010. The Affective Tipping Point: Do Motivated Reasoners Ever “Get It”? *Political Psychology* 31 (4): 563–593.
- Reif, Karlheinz and Hermann Schmitt. 1980. Nine Second-Order National Elections—A Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of European Election Results. *European Journal of Political Research* 8 (1): 3–44.
- Reiljan, Andres. 2019. “Fear and Loathing across Party Lines” (also) in Europe: Affective Polarisation in European Party Systems. *European Journal of Political Research* 59 (2): 376–396.
- Rennwald, Line and Geoffrey Evans. 2014. When Supply Creates Demand: Social Democratic Party Strategies and the Evolution of Class Voting. *West European Politics* 37 (5): 1108–1135.
- RePass, David E. 1971. Issue Salience and Party Choice. *American Political Science Review* 65 (2): 389–400.
- RePass, David E. 1976. Comment: Political Methodologies in Disarray: Some Alternative Interpretations of the 1972 Election. *American Political Science Review* 70 (3): 314–331.
- Richey, Sean. 2008. The Social Basis of Voting Correctly. *Political Communication* 25 (4): 366–376.
- Richey, Sean. 2012. Random and Systematic Error in Voting in Presidential Elections. *Political Research Quarterly* 66 (3): 645–657.
- Rivers, Douglas. 1988. Heterogeneity in Models of Electoral Choice. *American Journal of Political Science* 32 (3): 737–757.
- Roberts, Kenneth M. 2017. “Populism and Political Parties.” In Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser, Paul A. Taggart, Paulina Ochoa Espejo, and Pierre Ostiguy (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 390–413.
- Rohrschneider, Robert. 1993. New Party versus Old Left Realignments: Environmental Attitudes, Party Policies, and Partisan Affiliations in Four West European Countries. *The Journal of Politics* 55 (3): 682–701.

- Rohrschneider, Robert. 2002. Mobilizing versus Chasing: How Do Parties Target Voters in Election Campaigns? *Electoral Studies* 21 (3): 367–382.
- Rohrschneider, Robert, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, and Franziska Jung. 2012. Short-term Factors versus Long-term Values: Explaining the 2009 Election Results. *Electoral Studies* 31 (1): 20–34.
- Rohrschneider, Robert and Stephen Whitefield. 2017. Party Positions about European Integration in Germany: An Electoral Quandary? *German Politics* 26 (1): 83–103.
- Romer, Daniel, Kate Kenski, Paul Waldman, Christopher Adasiewicz, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 2004. *Capturing Campaign Dynamics: The National Annenberg Election Survey*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rosar, Ulrich and Hanna Hoffmann. 2015. “Einflüsse der Bewertung der Kanzlerkandidaten Steinbrück und Merkel auf die Wahlchancen ihrer Parteien bei der Bundestagswahl 2013: War er der Falsche, war sie die Richtige?” In Karl-Rudolf Korte (ed.), *Die Bundestagswahl 2013*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 119–139.
- Rose, Richard and Ian McAllister. 1986. *Voters Begin to Choose: From Closed-Class to Open Elections in Britain*. London: Sage.
- Rosenstein, Aviva W. and August E. Grant. 1997. Reconceptualizing the Role of Habit: A New Model of Television Audience Activity. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 41 (3): 324–344.
- Rosenstone, Steven. 1983. *Forecasting Presidential Elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rössler, Patrick. 1997. *Agenda-Setting: Theoretische Annahmen und empirische Evidenzen einer Medienwirkungstheorie*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Roßteutscher, Sigrid. 2009. *Religion, Zivilgesellschaft, Demokratie. Eine internationale vergleichende Studie zur Natur religiöser Märkte und der demokratischen Rolle religiöser Zivilgesellschaften*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Roßteutscher, Sigrid. 2012. Die konfessionell-religiöse Konfliktlinie zwischen Säkularisierung und Mobilisierung. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* Special Issue 45: 111–133.
- Roßteutscher, Sigrid, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf et al. 2019. *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beharrung: die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag.
- Roßteutscher, Sigrid and Daniel Stegmüller. 2014. “Network Politicization and Political Integration: From Grand Cleavage Structures to the Social Capital of Private Networks.” In Bernhard Weßels, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (eds), *Voters on the Move or on the Run?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 167–192.
- Roth, Dieter. 1990. Die Wahlen zur Volkskammer der DDR – Versuch einer Erklärung. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 31 (3): 369–393.
- Rovny, Jan. 2012. Who Emphasizes and Who Blurs? Party Strategies in Multidimensional Competition. *European Union Politics* 13 (2): 269–292.
- Rovny, Jan and Jonathan Polk. 2019. New Wine in Old Bottles: Explaining the Dimensional Structure of European party systems. *Party Politics* 25 (1): 12–24.
- Rucht, Dieter. 1994. *Modernisierung und neue soziale Bewegungen*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Rudi, Tatjana and Harald Schoen. 2013. “Verwählt? Eine Analyse des Konzepts ‘korrektes Wählen’ bei der Bundestagswahl 2009.” In Bernhard Weßels, Harald Schoen, and Oscar W. Gabriel (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 407–425.
- Ryan, John Barry. 2011. Social Networks as a Shortcut to Correct Voting. *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (4): 753–766.

- Rydgren, Jens (ed.). 2018. *The Oxford Handbook of the Radical Right*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Saalfeld, Thomas and Harald Schoen. 2015. "Party Politics and Electoral Behaviour." In Sarah Colvin (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of German Politics & Culture*. London: Routledge, 105–118.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1976. *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sassen, Sakia. 1996. *Losing Control? Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schäfer, Armin, Sigrid Roßteutscher, and Simone Abendschön. 2020. Rising Start-up Costs of Voting: Political Inequality among First-time Voters. *West European Politics* 43 (4): 819–844.
- Scharkow, Michael and Marko Bachl. 2017. How Measurement Error in Content Analysis and Self-Reported Media Use Leads to Minimal Media Effect Findings in Linkage Analyses: A Simulation Study. *Political Communication* 34 (3): 323–343.
- Schenker, Nathaniel and Jane F. Gentleman. 2001. On Judging the Significance of Differences by Examining the Overlap between Confidence Intervals. *The American Statistician* 55 (3): 182–186.
- Scherer, Philipp. 2011. "Jenseits von Links und Rechts: Spielt Ideologie für Parteien und Wähler keine Rolle mehr?" In Evelyn Bytzek and Sigrid Roßteutscher (eds), *Der unbekannte Wähler?* Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 23–42.
- Scherer, Philipp and Lars-Christopher Stövsand. 2019. "Ideologie." In Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beharrung: Die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 219–228.
- Scheufele, Bertram, Julia Schünemann, and Hans-Bernd Brosius. 2005. Duell oder Berichterstattung? *Publizistik* 50 (4): 399–421.
- Scheufele, Dietram A., Bruce W. Hardy, Dominique Brossard, Israel S. Waismel-Manor, and Erik Nisbet. 2006. Democracy Based on Difference: Examining the Links Between Structural Heterogeneity, Heterogeneity of Discussion Networks, and Democratic Citizenship. *Journal of Communication* 56 (4): 728–753.
- Schilpp, Jan. 2018. "Welchen Einfluss haben populistische Einstellungen auf die Wahlentscheidung? Eine Fallstudie am Beispiel der Bundestagswahl." Unpublished BA thesis, University of Mannheim.
- Schmidt, Manfred G. 1985. Allerweltparteien in Westeuropa? Ein Beitrag zu Kirchheimers These vom Wandel des westeuropäischen Parteiensystems. *Leviathan* 13 (3): 376–397.
- Schmidt, Manfred G. 2007. "Die Sozialpolitik der zweiten rot-grünen Koalition (2002–2005)." In Christoph Egle and Reimut Zohlnhöfer (eds), *Ende des rot-grünen Projektes: Eine Bilanz der Regierung Schröder 2002 – 2005*. Wiesbaden: VS, 295–312.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger. 2008. "Bandwagon Effect." In Wolfgang Donsbach (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. New York: Wiley, 57–61.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger. 2009. "Kampagnendynamik im Bundestagswahlkampf 2005." In Oscar W. Gabriel, Bernhard Weßels, and Jürgen W. Falter (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler: Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2005*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 146–176.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger. 2014. Euro-Kritik, Wirtschaftspessimismus und Einwanderungskepsis: Hintergründe des Beinah-Wahlerfolges der Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) bei der Bundestagswahl 2013. *Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen* 45 (1): 94–112.

- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger. 2017. The “Alternative für Deutschland in the Electorate”: Between Single-Issue and Right-Wing Populist Party. *German Politics* 26 (1): 124–148.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger and Thorsten Faas. 2009. Federal Parliament Election 2005 Campaign Dynamics: Pre- and Post-Election Study. *GESIS Data Archive ZA4991*: Data file Version 1.0.0.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger, Thorsten Faas, and Christian Holst. 2006. Der Rolling Cross-Section Survey: Ein Instrument zur Analyse dynamischer Prozesse der Einstellungsentwicklung: Bericht zur ersten deutschen RCS-Studie anlässlich der Bundestagswahl 2005. *ZUMA-Nachrichten* 30 (58): 13–49.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger, Thorsten Faas, and Ansgar Wolsing. 2010a. Kampagnendynamik bei der Bundestagswahl 2009: Die Rolling-Cross-Section-Studie im Rahmen der “German Longitudinal Election Study” 2009. *MZES Working Papers – Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung* (134).
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger and Patrick Kraft. 2014. “Political Information Flows and Consistent Voting: Personal Conversations, Mass Media, Party Campaigns, and the Quality of Voting Decisions at the 2009 German Federal Election.” In Bernhard Weßels, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (eds), *Voters on the Move or on the Run?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 193–216.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger and Oana Lup. 2013. Seeking the Soul of Democracy: A Review of Recent Research into Citizens’ Political Talk Culture. *Swiss Political Science Review* 19 (4): 513–538.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger and Julia Partheymüller. 2012. Why Voters Decide Late: A Simultaneous Test of Old and New Hypotheses at the 2005 and 2009 German Federal Elections. *German Politics* 21 (3): 299–316.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, and Bernhard Weßels. 2010b. “Die deutsche Wahlforschung und die German Longitudinal Election Study.” In Frank Faulbaum and Christof Wolf (eds), *Gesellschaftliche Entwicklungen im Spiegel der empirischen Sozialforschung*. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag, 141–172.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf et al. 2014. *Zwischen Fragmentierung und Konzentration: Die Bundestagswahl 2013*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger, Jan van Deth, and Alexander Staudt. 2017. Die AfD nach der rechtspopulistischen Wende. Wählerunterstützung am Beispiel Baden-Württembergs. *Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 27 (3): 273–303.
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger, Stefan Weick, and Bernhard Christoph. 2006. Shaky Attachments: Individual-level Stability and Change of Partisanship among West German Voters, 1984–2001. *European Journal of Political Research* 45 (4): 581–608.
- Schmitt, Hermann. 2009. “Partisanship in Nine Western Democracies: Causes and Consequences.” In John Bartle and Paolo Bellucci (eds), *Political Parties and Partisanship: Social Identity and Individual Attitudes*. London: Routledge, 75–87.
- Schmitt, Hermann and Sören Holmberg. 1995. “Political Parties in Decline?” In Hans-Dieter Klingemann and Dieter Fuchs (eds), *Citizens and the State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 95–133.
- Schmitt, Hermann and Andreas M. Wüst. 2006. The Extraordinary Bundestag Election of 2005: The Interplay of Long-Term Trends and Short-Term Factors. *German Politics and Society* 24 (1): 27–46.
- Schmitt, Johannes and Simon T. Franzmann. 2020. “The Origins of Party System Polarisation: How Parties and Voters Shape the Ideological Spread in Party Systems.” In

- Sebastian Bukow and Uwe Jun (eds), *Continuity and Change of Party Democracies in Europe*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 59–90.
- Schmollinger, Horst W. 1986. "Die Nationaldemokratische Partei." In Richard Stöss (ed.), *Parteienhandbuch. Die Parteien der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1945–1980, Band 4*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1892–1921.
- Schoen, Harald. 1999. Split-ticket Voting in German Federal Elections, 1953–90: An Example of Sophisticated Balloting? *Electoral Studies* 18 (4): 473–496.
- Schoen, Harald. 2003. *Wählerwandel und Wechselwahl. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung*. 1 ed. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Schoen, Harald. 2007. Campaigns, Candidate Evaluations, and Vote Choice: Evidence from German Federal Election Campaigns, 1980–2002. *Electoral Studies* 26 (2): 324–337.
- Schoen, Harald. 2014. "Wechselwahl." In Jürgen Falter and Harald Schoen (eds), *Handbuch Wahlforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 489–522.
- Schoen, Harald. 2019a. Not a Powerful Electoral Issue Yet: On the Role of European Integration in the 2017 German Federal Election. *Journal of European Public Policy* 26 (5): 717–733.
- Schoen, Harald. 2019b. "Wechselwähler." In Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beharrung: Die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 145–154.
- Schoen, Harald and Konstantin Gavras. 2019. "Eher anhaltende Polarisierung als vorübergehende Verstimmung." In Reimut Zohlnhöfer and Thomas Saalfeld (eds), *Zwischen Stillstand, Politikwandel und Krisenmanagement: Eine Bilanz der Regierung Merkel 2013–2017*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 17–37.
- Schoen, Harald, Hans Rattinger, Maria Preißinger, Konstantin Gavras, and Markus Steinbrecher. 2017a. *Election Campaigns and Voter Decision-Making in a Multi-Party System: The 2009 and 2013 German Federal Elections*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Schoen, Harald, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds). 2017b. *Voters and Voting in Context. Multiple Contexts and the Heterogeneous German Electorate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schoen, Harald and Agatha Rudnik. 2016. "Wirkungen von Einstellungen zur europäischen Schulden- und Währungskrise auf das Wahlverhalten bei der Bundestagswahl 2013." In Harald Schoen and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler. Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2013*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 135–160.
- Schoen, Harald and Bernhard Weßels. 2016. "Die Bundestagswahl 2013 - eine Zäsur im Wahlverhalten und Parteiensystem?" In Harald Schoen and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler. Analysen aus Anlass der Bundestagswahl 2013*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 3–19.
- Schönbach, Klaus and Holli A. Semetko. 2000. "'Gnadenlos professionell': Journalisten und die aktuelle Medienberichterstattung in Bundestagswahlkämpfen 1976–1998." In Hans Bohrmann, Otfried Jarren, Gabriele Melischek, and Josef Seethaler (eds), *Wahlen und Politikvermittlung durch Massenmedien*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 69–78.
- Schönhoven, Klaus. 2014. "Geschichte der deutschen Gewerkschaften: Phasen und Probleme." In Wolfgang Schroeder (ed.), *Handbuch Gewerkschaften in Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 57–83.
- Schroeder, Alan. 2008. *Presidential Debates: Fifty Years of High-Risk TV*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Schroeder, Wolfgang and Bernhard Weßels. 2019a. "Rechtspopulistische Landnahme in der Öffentlichkeit, im Elektorat und in den Parlamenten." In Wolfgang Schroeder and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Smarte Spalter. Die AfD zwischen Bewegung und Parlament*. Bonn: Dietz, 9–43.
- Schroeder, Wolfgang and Bernhard Weßels (eds). 2019b. *Smarte Spalter. Die AfD zwischen Bewegung und Parlament*. Bonn: Dietz.
- Schuessler, Alexander A. 2000. *A Logic of Expressive Choice*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schultze, Rainer-Olaf. 2018. Realignment oder das Ende normaler Politik? Wahlen im Wandel des historisch-politischen Kontextes. *Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen* 49 (4): 729–743.
- Schumacher, Gijs, Catherine E. de Vries, and Barbara Vis. 2013. Why Do Parties Change Position? Party Organization and Environmental Incentives. *The Journal of Politics* 75 (2): 464–477.
- Schwander, Hanna and Philip Manow. 2017. "Modernize and Die"? German Social Democracy and the Electoral Consequences of the Agenda 2010. *Socio-Economic Review* 15 (1): 117–134.
- Seeberg, Henrik Bech, Rune Slothuus, and Rune Stubager. 2017. Do Voters Learn? Evidence That Voters Respond Accurately to Changes in Political Parties' Policy Positions. *West European Politics* 40 (2): 336–356.
- Semetko, Holli A. and Klaus Schönbach. 1994. *Germany's "Unity Election". Voters and the Media*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press.
- Settle, Jaime E. and Taylor N. Carlson. 2019. Opting Out of Political Discussions. *Political Communication* 36 (3): 476–496.
- Shah, Dhavan V., Jaeho Cho, William P. Eveland Jr, and Nojin Kwak. 2005. Information and Expression in a Digital Age: Modeling Internet Effects on Civic Participation. *Communication Research* 32 (5): 531–565.
- Shaw, Daron R. 1999. A Study of Presidential Campaign Event Effects from 1952 to 1992. *The Journal of Politics* 61 (2): 387–422.
- Shayo, Moses and Alon Harel. 2012. Non-consequentialist Voting. *Journal of Economic Behaviour & Organization* 81 (1): 299–313.
- Shehata, Adam and Jesper Strömbäck. 2020. "Media and Political Partisanship." In Henrik Oscarsson and Sören Holmberg (eds), *Research Handbook on Political Partisanship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 60–73.
- Shikano, Susumu, Michael Herrmann, and Paul W. Thurner. 2009. Strategic Voting under Proportional Representation: Threshold Insurance in German Elections. *West European Politics* 32 (3): 634–656.
- Shikano, Susumu and Konstantin Käppner. 2016. "Valenz im ideologischen Parteienwettbewerb während des Bundestagswahlkampfes 2013." In Harald Schoen and Bernhard Weßels (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 245–270.
- Siaroff, Alan. 2003. Two-and-a-Half-Party Systems and the Comparative Role of the "Half". *Party Politics* 9 (3): 267–290.
- Sides, John and Jack Citrin. 2007. European Opinion about Immigration: The Role of Identities, Interests and Information. *British Journal of Political Science* 37 (3): 477–504.
- Siefken, Sven T. 2018. Regierungsbildung "wider Willen" – der mühsame Weg zur Koalition nach der Bundestagswahl 2017. *Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen* 49 (2): 407–436.

- Simpson, Gavin. 2014a. *Confidence Intervals for Derivatives of Splines in GAMs*. <https://www.fromthebottomoftheheap.net/2014/06/16/simultaneous-confidence-intervals-for-derivatives/>. 01–03–2019.
- Simpson, Gavin. 2014b. *Identifying Periods of Change in Time Series with GAMs*. <https://www.fromthebottomoftheheap.net/2014/05/15/identifying-periods-of-change-with-gams/>. 01–03–2019.
- Sinnott, Richard. 1998. Party Attachment in Europe: Methodological Critique and Substantive Implications. *British Journal of Political Science* 28 (4): 627–650.
- Skitka, Linda J., Elizabeth Mullen, Thomas Griffin, Susan Hutchinson, and Brian Chamberlin. 2002. Dispositions, Scripts, or Motivated Correction? Understanding Ideological Differences in Explanations for Social Problems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 83 (2): 470.
- Smets, Kaat. 2012. A Widening Generational Divide? The Age Gap in Voter Turnout Through Time and Space. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 22 (4): 407–430.
- Smith, Jeffrey A., Miller McPherson, and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 2014. Social Distance in the United States: Sex, Race, Religion, Age, and Education Homophily among Confidants, 1985 to 2004. *American Sociological Review* 79 (3): 432–456.
- Sniderman, Paul M., Louk Hagendoorn, and Markus Prior. 2004. Predisposing Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities. *The American Political Science Review* 98 (1): 35–49.
- Somer-Topcu, Zeynep. 2015. Everything to Everyone: The Electoral Consequences of the Broad-Appeal Strategy in Europe. *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (4): 841–854.
- Spier, Tim. 2010. “Das Ende der Lagerpolarisierung?” In Karl-Rudolf Korte (ed.), *Die Bundestagswahl 2009: Analysen der Wahl-, Parteien-, Kommunikations- und Regierungsforschung*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 298–319.
- Spier, Tim. 2013. “Realisierbare Koalitionsoption im Zeithorizont 2013/2017? Perspektiven von Rot-Rot-Grün.” In Frank Decker and Eckhard Jesse (eds), *Die deutsche Koalitionsdemokratie vor der Bundestagswahl 2013*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 369–389.
- Spier, Tim. 2015. “Große Koalitionen in den deutschen Bundesländern 1949–2013.” In Ursula Münch and Heinrich Oberreuter (eds), *Die neue Offenheit. Wahlverhalten und Regierungsoptionen im Kontext der Bundestagswahl 2013*. Frankfurt: Campus, 359–385.
- Spier, Tim, Felix Butzlaff, Matthias Micus, and Franz Walter. 2007. *Die Linkspartei: Zeitgemäße Idee oder Bündnis ohne Zukunft?* Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Spoon, Jae-Jae and Heike Klüver. 2019. Party Convergence and Vote Switching: Explaining Mainstream Party Decline across Europe. *European Journal of Political Research* 58 (4): 1021–1042.
- Staudt, Alexander and Julia Partheymüller. 2020. R Package “smoothit”. *Version: 1.0*.
- Staudt, Alexander and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck. 2018. Kampagnendynamik bei der Bundestagswahl 2017: Die Rolling Cross-Section-Studie im Rahmen der “German Longitudinal Election Study” 2017. *MZES Working Papers – Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung* (172).
- Staudt, Alexander and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck. 2019. “Nutzung traditioneller und neuer politischer Informationsquellen im Bundestagswahlkampf 2017.” In Sigrid Roßteutscher, Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Harald Schoen, Bernhard Weßels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Polarisierung und Beharrung: Die Bundestagswahl 2017*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 63–79.
- Steeper, Frederick T. 1978. “Public Responses to Gerald Ford’s Statement on Eastern Europe in the Second Debate.” In George F. Bishop, Robert Meadow, and Beeck Jackson (eds),

- The Presidential Debates: Media, Electoral, and Policy Perspectives*. New York: Praeger, 81–101.
- Steinbrecher, Markus. 2014. “Wirtschaftliche Entwicklung und Eurokrise.” In Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, Bernhard Weißels, and Christof Wolf (eds), *Zwischen Fragmentierung und Konzentration: Die Bundestagswahl 2013*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 225–238.
- Steiner, Nils D. and Claudia Landwehr. 2018. Populistische Demokratiekonzeptionen und die Wahl der AfD: Evidenz aus einer Panelstudie. *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 59 (3): 463–491.
- Stier, Sebastian, Nora Kirkizh, Caterina Froio, and Ralph Schroeder. 2020. Populist Attitudes and Selective Exposure to Online News: A Cross-Country Analysis Combining Web Tracking and Surveys. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 25 (3): 426–446.
- Stoker, Gerry. 2017. *Why Politics Matters: Making Democracy Work*. 2nd ed. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stokes, Donald E. 1963. Spatial Models of Party Competition. *American Political Science Review* 57 (2): 368–377.
- Stroud, Natalie Jomini. 2008. Media Use and Political Predispositions: Revisiting the Concept of Selective Exposure. *Political Behavior* 30 (3): 341–366.
- Stroud, Natalie Jomini. 2010. Polarization and Partisan Selective Exposure. *Journal of Communication* 60 (3): 556–576.
- Stroud, Natalie Jomini. 2011. *Niche News: The Politics of News Choice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stubager, Rune. 2018. What Is Issue Ownership and How Should We Measure It? *Political Behavior* 40 (2): 345–370.
- Stubager, Rune and Rune Slothuus. 2013. What Are the Sources of Political Parties’ Issue Ownership? Testing Four Explanations at the Individual Level. *Political Behavior* 35 (3): 567–588.
- Sunstein, Cass. 2007. Republic.com 2.0. *Princeton University Press, JSTOR*.
- Taber, Charles S. and Milton Lodge. 2006. Motivated Skepticism in the Evaluation of Political Beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (3): 755–769.
- Teney, Céline, Onawa Promise Lacewell, and Pieter De Wilde. 2014. Winners and Losers of Globalization in Europe: Attitudes and Ideologies. *European Political Science Review* 6 (4): 575–595.
- Thomeczek, Jan Philipp, Michael Jankowski, and André Krouwel. 2019. “Die politische Landschaft zur Bundestagswahl 2017.” In Karl-Rudolf Korte and Jan Schoofs (eds), *Die Bundestagswahl 2017: Analysen der Wahl-, Parteien-, Kommunikations- und Regierungsforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer, 267–291.
- Tiemann, Guido. 2019. The Shape of Utility Functions and Voter Attitudes towards Risk. *Electoral Studies* 61: 102051.
- Tillie, Jean. 1995. *Party Utility and Voting Behavior*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Tooze, Adam. 2018. *Crashed: How a Decade of Financial Crises Changed the World*. London: Penguin.
- Träger, Hendrik and Jan Pollex. 2016. Das Großstadttrauma der CDU bei Oberbürgermeisterwahlen: Warum verlieren die Kandidaten der Christdemokraten so oft? *Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 26 (3): 279–300.
- Tsfati, Yariv. 2003. Debating the Debate: The Impact of Exposure to Debate News Coverage and Its Interaction with Exposure to the Actual Debate. *International Journal of Press/Politics* 8 (3): 70–86.

- Tversky, Amos and Daniel Kahneman. 1974. Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science* 185 (4157): 1124–1131.
- Ulbig, Stacy G. and Carolyn L. Funk. 1999. Conflict Avoidance and Political Participation. *Political Behavior* 21 (3): 265–282.
- van der Brug, Wouter, Meindert Fennema, and Jean Tillie. 2000. Anti-immigrant Parties in Europe: Ideological or Protest Vote? *European Journal of Political Research* 37 (1): 77–102.
- van der Eijk, Cees, Mark Franklin, and Michael Marsh. 1996. What Voters Teach Us about Europe-Wide Elections: What Europe-Wide Elections Teach Us about Voters. *Electoral Studies* 15 (2): 149–166.
- van der Eijk, Cees, Mark N. Franklin, Thomas Mackie, and Henry Valen. 1992. “Cleavages, Conflict Resolution and Democracy.” In Mark N. Franklin, Thomas Mackie, and Henry Valen (eds), *Electoral Change. Response to Evolving Social and Attitudinal Structures in Western Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 406–431.
- van der Eijk, Cees and Broer Niemöller. 1983. *Electoral Change in the Netherlands. Empirical Results and Methods of Measurement*. Amsterdam: CT Press.
- van der Meer, Tom WG, Erika van Elsas, Rozemarijn Lubbe, and Wouter van der Brug. 2015. Are Volatile Voters Erratic, Whimsical or Seriously Picky? A Panel Study of 58 Waves into the Nature of Electoral Volatility (The Netherlands 2006–2010). *Party Politics* 21 (1): 100–114.
- van der Waal, Jeroen, Peter Achterberg, and Dick Houtman. 2007. Class Is Not Dead—It Has Been Buried Alive: Class Voting and Cultural Voting in Postwar Western Societies (1956–1990). *Politics & Society* 35 (3): 403–426.
- Vavreck, Lynn. 2009. *The Message Matters: The Economy and Presidential Campaigns*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Volkens, Andrea, Werner Krause, Pola Lehmann, Theres Matthieß, Nicolas Merz, Sven Regel, and Bernhard Weißels. 2018. Manifesto Project Dataset (MRG/CMP/MARPOR). Version 2018b. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB).
- Volkens, Andrea, Werner Krause, Pola Lehmann, Theres Matthieß, Nicolas Merz, Sven Regel, and Bernhard Weißels. 2019a. The Manifesto Data Collection. Manifesto Project (MRG/CMP/MARPOR). Version 2019b. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB).
- Volkens, Andrea, Werner Krause, Pola Lehmann, Theres Matthieß, Nicolas Merz, Sven Regel, and Bernhard Weißels. 2019b. The Manifesto Data Collection. Manifesto Project (MRG/CMP/MARPOR). Version 2019b. Codebook. Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB).
- von Schoultz, Åsa. 2017. “Party Systems and Voter Alignments.” In Kai Arzheimer, Jocelyn Evans, and Michael S. Lewis-Beck (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Electoral Behaviour*. London: SAGE, 30–55.
- Wowles, Jack and Georgios Xezonakis (eds). 2016. *Globalization and Domestic Politics: Parties, Elections, and Public Opinion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wagner, Aiko. 2017. A Micro Perspective on Political Competition: Electoral Availability in the European Electorates. *Acta Politica* 52 (4): 502–520.
- Wagner, Aiko. 2019. Typwechsel 2017? Vom moderaten zum polarisierten Pluralismus. *Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen* 51 (1): 114–129.
- Wagner, Aiko and Bernhard Weißels. 2012. Kanzlerkandidaten – Wie beeinflussen sie die Wahlentscheidung? *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* (Sonderheft 45): 345–370.
- Wagschal, Uwe. 2020. “Polarisierung der Parteiensysteme in Zeiten des Populismus.” In Romana Careja, Patrick Emmenegger, and Nathalie Giger (eds), *The European Social Model*

- under Pressure: Liber Amicorum in Honour of Klaus Armingeon*. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 365–382.
- Ware, Alan. 1996. *Political Parties and Party Systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wattenberg, Martin P. 1991. *The Rise of Candidate-Centered Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Wattenberg, Martin P. 2008. *Is Voting for Young People?* New York: Pearson Longman.
- Weber, Till and Mark N. Franklin. 2018. A Behavioral Theory of Electoral Structure. *Political Behavior* 40 (4): 831–856.
- Weischenberg, Siegfried, Maja Malik, and Armin Scholl. 2005. Journalismus in Deutschland 2005. *Media Perspektiven* 7: 346–361.
- Weßels, Bernhard. 1991. *Erosion des Wachstumsparadigmas: Neue Konfliktstrukturen im politischen System der Bundesrepublik?* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Weßels, Bernhard. 1994. “Gruppenbindung und rationale Faktoren als Determinanten der Wahlentscheidung in Ost- und Westdeutschland.” In Hans-Dieter Klingemann and Max Kaase (eds), *Wahlen und Wähler. Analysen aus Anlaß der Bundestagswahl 1990*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 123–157.
- Weßels, Bernhard. 2000. “Gruppenbindung und Wahlverhalten: 50 Jahre Wahlen in der Bundesrepublik.” In Markus Klein, Wolfgang Jagodzinski, Ekkehard Mochmann, and Dieter Ohr (eds), *50 Jahre empirische Wahlforschung in Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 129–158.
- Weßels, Bernhard, Hans Rattinger, Sigrid Roßteutscher, and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (eds). 2014. *Voters on the Move or on the Run?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weßels, Bernhard and Hermann Schmitt. 2008. Meaningful Choices, Political Supply, and Institutional Effectiveness. *Electoral Studies* 27: 19–30.
- Whiteley, Paul, Harold D. Clarke, David Sanders, and Marianne C. Stewart. 2013. *Affluence, Austerity and Electoral Change in Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiesendahl, Elmar. 2016. Der Kulturkonflikt um die Flüchtlingskrise und die politischen Folgen. *Zeitschrift für Staats- und Europawissenschaften* 14 (1): 53–79.
- Wiesenthal, Helmut. 2014. “Gewerkschaften in Politik und Gesellschaft: Niedergang und Wiederkehr des ‘Modells Deutschland’” In Wolfgang Schroeder (ed.), *Handbuch Gewerkschaften in Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 395–421.
- Wilke, Jürgen. 2009. “Historische und intermediale Entwicklungen von Leitmedien.” In Daniel Müller, Annemone Ligensa, and Peter Gendolla (eds), *Leitmedien. Konzepte – Relevanz – Geschichte*. Bielefeld: transcript, 29–52.
- Wirth, Werner and Rinaldo Kühne. 2013. “Grundlagen der Persuasionsforschung.” In Wolfgang Schweiger and Andreas Fahr (eds), *Handbuch Medienwirkungsforschung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 313–332.
- Wlezien, Christopher. 2005. On the Salience of Political Issues: The Problem with “Most Important Problem”. *Electoral Studies* 24 (4): 555–579.
- Wolf, Christof and Sigrid Roßteutscher. 2013. Religiosität und politische Orientierung? Radikalisierung, Traditionalisierung oder Entkopplung? *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 65 (1): 149–181.
- Wood, Simon. 2006. *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R*. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Wood, Simon. 2011. Fast Stable Restricted Maximum Likelihood and Marginal Likelihood Estimation of Semiparametric Generalized Linear Models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series (B)* 73: 3–36.
- Wood, Simon. 2016. R Package ‘mgcv’. Version: 1.7, <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/mgcv/mgcv.pdf>.

- Wuttke, Alexander. 2020. New Political Parties through the Voters' Eyes. *West European Politics* 43 (1): 22–48.
- Yuan, Jing, Minghui Li, Gang Lv, and Z. Kevin Lu. 2020. Monitoring Transmissibility and Mortality of COVID-19 in Europe. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 95: 311–315.
- Zajonc, Robert B. 1968. Attitudinal Effects of Mere Exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 9 (2): 1–27.
- Zaller, John. 1996. "The Myth of Massive Media Impact Revived: New Support for a Discredited Idea." In Diana C. Mutz, Paul M. Sniderman, and Richard A. Brody (eds), *Political Persuasion and Attitude Change*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 17–78.
- Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zimmermann, Hubert. 2014. A Grand Coalition for the Euro: The Second Merkel Cabinet, the Euro Crisis and the Elections of 2013. *German Politics* 23 (4): 322–336.
- Zohlnhöfer, Reimut. 2011. The 2009 Federal Election and the Economic Crisis. *German Politics* 20 (1): 12–27.
- Zohlnhöfer, Reimut and Thomas Saalfeld (eds). 2015. *Politik im Schatten der Krise: Eine Bilanz der Regierung Merkel 2009–2013*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Zohlnhöfer, Reimut and Thomas Saalfeld (eds). 2019. *Zwischen Stillstand, Politikwandel und Krisenmanagement: Eine Bilanz der Regierung Merkel 2013–2017*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.