

# COMPARATIVE POLITICS: POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS, PERSUASION, & ELECTORAL STRATEGIES

Professor: **Jonne KAMPHORST, Adrien DEGEORGES**

Session: **June 2026**

Language of instruction: **English**

Number of hours of class: **36h**

Format: **On campus**



## Course Description

This course examines how political campaigns persuade voters in a context of rising social and partisan polarization, widespread distrust of government, and fragmented media environments. It explores the determinants of party strategies and opinion formation, and how the relationship between the two helps explain vote choice. More specifically, the course focuses on the theories, research methods, and original field studies and datasets that allow us to analyze:

- i) short-term campaign strategies in the weeks leading up to elections (e.g., mobilization efforts, persuasion tactics, the role of campaign volunteers, moral appeals in campaign messages, digital campaigning and micro-targeting);
- ii) how elites' weaponization of distrust relates to citizens' perceptions of government as an inefficient and corrupt actor, and how distrust in turn impacts citizens' expectations of state action (e.g., regulation, taxation, social insurance, immigration, redistribution) and their vote choice.

Taking stock of the most recent empirical studies and methods on campaigns and persuasion, the course reassesses traditional theories and models of opinion formation and voting behavior (social-psychological, rational choice approaches...).

## Course format

This course combines lectures, readings and debate activities with a Campaign Lab (three projects). Lectures introduce the main theories, concepts, methods and empirical findings, while the lab sessions focus on group work around party strategies, campaigns, and applied political analysis. Students are expected to complete the readings in advance so that they can participate actively and

contribute fully to group work. Compulsory readings are marked by \*\*\* next to them. Before class, at a minimum, please also read the abstract of every assigned piece and skim the reading. Some readings will be done in-class (“in-depth readings”).

All course materials (readings, slides, guidelines...) will be uploaded on [the Course Drive folder](#). Access to the folder will be provided only to Sciences Po e-mail accounts. The professors may open a Slack channel for the class as a supplementary space for questions, practical information, discussion, and sharing resources.

### Pre-requisites

This course is open to students with some prior exposure to political science or another social science. Students should have a basic knowledge of government, elections, campaigns, political parties, and electoral democracy. Introductory statistical literacy is expected, including the ability to interpret descriptive statistics, simple tables and graphs, and a general understanding of the logic of survey research, statistical modelling (regression coefficients, p-values...) and randomized experiments. No advanced statistics, programming, or econometrics is required.

### Course validation

#### CAMPAIGN LAB

- **Two Group Presentations (30%).** Students will complete two in-class group projects and presentations, prepared during class. The first presentation will take place during Class 3 (afternoon of June 4th); the second will take place during Class 10 (afternoon of June 16th). See details in each session description.
- **Trust Lab Project and Presentation (30%).** Groups select a recent electoral campaign (2016-2026) by June 17th and write a post-electoral review in the form of a structured memo (2,000 words max.) regarding the role played by trust and distrust in the campaign’s persuasion strategy, and its effectiveness. Memos must identify at least two tensions between what the campaign did and what the research would have recommended and explain why that gap existed, according to them. Presentations of the memos will take place during Class 12 (afternoon of June 23rd). Memos must be turned in before the beginning of class that day, following the course submission requirements. More precise guidelines will be uploaded on [the Course Drive folder](#) by Class 7. The format of the final presentation can vary (slides, roleplay of campaign debriefs, podcast, social media thread, infographics, mock debate or press conferences, etc.)

#### FINAL EXAM

- **Final Exam (in-class, open-book) (40%).** Thursday, June 25th (9:30-11:30am). Room TBA. The final assignment will take the form of an in-class, individual, open-book/laptop (but offline) exam lasting two hours. It may consist of one or several essay questions or a case-based exercise. Students may be asked to write a short campaign or party strategy memo, critically assess competing strategic memos, conduct an online campaign autopsy, analyze a party’s strategic dilemma, etc. In all cases, the assignment will be designed to allow students to demonstrate i) their understanding of the main conceptual tensions in the readings, ii) their ability to assess empirical evidence and causal claims, and iii) their capacity to synthesize arguments across all blocks of

the course. Students will be expected to develop clear, well-supported arguments rather than simply reproduce lecture notes. Further details and guidelines will be communicated during the lectures.

### Submission requirements

All assignments (three presentation outputs, memo, final exam) must be i) uploaded to the course Drive and ii) submitted to both instructors' regular e-mails (see above) as well as iii) to both their Urkund addresses for plagiarism detection: [adrien.degeorges.scpo@analyse.urkund.com](mailto:adrien.degeorges.scpo@analyse.urkund.com) and [jonne.kamphorst@analyse.urkund.com](mailto:jonne.kamphorst@analyse.urkund.com). Assignments that do not comply with these submission requirements will not be graded.

## Course outline

### BLOCK 1: VOTER PERSUASION AND PARTY STRATEGIES

---

#### **Class 1 (Wednesday, June 3rd, 9:30-12:30pm) – Campaign Persuasion and Formal Models of Vote Choice**

This opening session introduces the core analytical tools of the course. We begin with formal models of vote choice with special attention given to spatial voting, issue voting, salience, valence issues, and issue ownership. These models help explain how voters react to parties' attempts to set the agenda, frame issues and candidates, and prime voters with specific issues. The second part of the session turns to campaign persuasion: do campaign messages, canvassing, and tactics actually change voters' choices? The session introduces a central tension of the course: campaigns are built around persuasion, but persuasion effects are often small, conditional, or difficult to detect. In the standard rational choice model of voting, voters choose based on distance to candidates. The issue and valence voting models extend this. Valence voting focuses on what happens if all voters and parties have the same positions: people choose who they find more competent. Issue voting asks what happens if voters choose on more than one dimension and attach different salience to different dimensions. Tomz discusses standard candidate positioning, Adams and Mendes discuss issue salience. Petitpas and Abou-Chadi discuss competence. The second part of the class focuses on persuasion. When does it work and how does it work? Kalla (2021) provides a good theoretical and empirical overview of different persuasion strategies. Hewitt and Kalla (2018) provide state-of-the-art evidence from large-scale studies on political persuasion. Pons provides evidence from France.

#### *First reading block:*

- Tomz, Michael, and Robert P. Van Houweling. 2008. "Candidate Positioning and Voter Choice." *American Political Science Review*.
- Adams, James, Samuel Merrill III, and Roi Zur. 2023. "How Much Does Issue Salience Matter? A Model with Applications to the UK Elections." *European Journal of Political Research*.

- Mendes, Mariana S., and James Dennison. 2021. "Explaining the Emergence of the Radical Right in Spain and Portugal: Salience, Stigma and Supply." *West European Politics*.
- Petitpas, Adrien, and Pascal Sciarini. 2022. "Competence Issue Ownership, Issue Positions and the Vote for the Greens and the Social Democrats." *Swiss Political Science Review*.

*Second reading block:*

- Hewitt, Luke, Broockman, David, et al. 2024. "How Experiments Help Campaigns Persuade Voters: Evidence from a Large Archive of Campaigns' Own Experiments." *American Political Science Review*.
- Kalla, Joshua, and David Broockman. 2018. "The Minimal Persuasive Effects of Campaign Contact in General Elections: Evidence from 49 Field Experiments." *American Political Science Review*.
- Pons, Vincent. 2018. "Will a Five-Minute Discussion Change Your Mind? A Countrywide Experiment on Voter Choice in France." *American Economic Review*.

*Activities:* Class debate

In small groups, students will first discuss the readings and then reconvene for a class debate, with two groups arguing opposite positions on whether campaigns can persuade voters. We will read the Kalla et al. and Pons et al. readings in class and then debate their findings.

## **Class 2 & 3 (Thursday, June 4th, 9:30 –12:30 & 14:00-17:00) – Party Positioning and Strategic Ambiguity**

This session examines the logics of party positioning from three angles. First, parties update their positions primarily in response to past electoral results rather than shifts in public opinion (Adams et al. 2004). Second, competitive shocks matter: when radical-right parties cross electoral thresholds, mainstream parties shift their positions on immigration — causal evidence that the supply side of politics responds to its competitors as much as to its voters (Abou-Chadi and Krause 2020). Third, mainstream parties systematically blur positions on cross-cutting issues while niche parties emphasize them (Rovny 2012) — a strategy that works until issue salience rises too high, at which point ambiguity becomes electorally costly (Kamphorst 2024).

*Readings*

- 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*.
- 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*.
- Rovny, Jan. 2012. "Who Emphasizes and Who Blurs? Party Strategies in Multidimensional Competition." *Party Politics*.
- Kamphorst, Jonne. 2024. "Too Important to Ignore? Why Ambiguity and Broad Appeals Fail with Rising Issue Salience." *The Journal of Politics*.

**Activities: \*\*[Group presentation #1]**

Students work in small groups to develop a short internal strategy memo advising a party on issue positioning and strategic ambiguity, drawing on course readings. Each group presents their memo.

## BLOCK 2: DATA LAB

---

### Class 4 (Friday, June 5th 930-1230) – Voter Mobilization and Experimental Campaign Data

This session examines what decades of field experiments tell us about get-out-the-vote strategies. Face-to-face canvassing is the most effective mobilization tool available to campaigns (Gerber and Green 2000); at sufficient scale, these individual-level effects aggregate into meaningful shifts in overall turnout (Enos and Fowler 2021). A third dimension is also often overlooked: the volunteers who conduct the canvassing have their own motivations that shape how the ground game actually operates in practice (Kamphorst and Larreguy).

#### Readings

- Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green. 2000. "The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review*.
- Enos, Ryan D., and Anthony Fowler. 2021. "Aggregate Effects of Large-Scale Campaigns on Voter Turnout." *Political Science Research and Methods*.

*Activities:* Data lab: students work directly with real field experimental data (GOTV) in R-Studio, applying the experimental logic discussed in class to actual campaign evidence.

**Before class, make sure you have R-studio installed on your computer.**

## BLOCK 3: IDENTITY, TRUST AND ELECTORAL BEHAVIOR

---

### Class 5 (Monday, June 8th, 9:30-12:30): Identity, Opinion Change and Electoral Behavior

Studies of persuasion often assume that public opinion matters for elections and policymaking, but they differ sharply on i) whether citizens hold real and stable attitudes and policy preferences, and ii) whose opinions matter most for predicting electoral outcomes and policymaking. If the public is so central to a common view of democracy ("folk theory of democracy"), should we assume that most citizens construct informed opinions about issues and reason ideologically about politics? Aren't opinion statements rather the expression of top-of-the-head considerations and external cues that simply activate social identities and

old predispositions (e.g., class, race, gender, ethnicity, party identification)? To answer these questions, this session will draw from recent elections in the United States and look at various theories of public opinion and voting behavior inspired by sociology, psychology and rational choice. We will also give particular attention to the research methods and data often employed by political scientists to tackle the issues of measurement, causal inference and validity (do our empirical observations extend to the real world?), especially when it comes to persuasion and voting behavior.

### Reading block 1

- Carnes Nick and Noam Lupu. 2021. "The White Working Class and the 2016 Election". *Perspectives on Politics* 19(1)
- \*\*\*Lenz, Gabriel S. 2009. "Learning and Opinion Change, Not Priming: Reconsidering the Priming Hypothesis." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (4): 821-837.
- \*\*\*Sides, John, Michael Tesler and Lynn Vavreck. 2017. *Identity Crisis: The 2016 Presidential Campaign and the Battle for the Meaning of America*. Princeton University Press. [chapter 1]
- Evans, Geoffrey and Aleksei Opacic. 2022. "How Social Class Influences Political Choices" in Danny Osborne and Chris Sibley (eds). *Handbook Political Psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bartels. 2010. "The Study of Electoral Behavior"

### Reading block 2

- Dinas, E. 2017. "The Evolving Role of Partisanship" in Arzheimer, K., Evans, J., & Lewis-Beck, M. S., Dinas, E. *The SAGE Handbook of electoral behaviour*. (Vols. 1-2). SAGE Publications,
- 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: 129–146.
- Achen, Christopher H., and Larry M. Bartels. 2017. *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [Chapter 1: "The Meaning of Elections," pp. 1–32]
- Berelson, Bernard, Paul Lazarsfeld and William McPhee. 1954. *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. Chicago University Press

#### Activities:

Class debate: Should voters be informed about political issues to form opinions and make a vote choice in line with their values and interests?

## **Class 6 (Tuesday, June 9th, 9:30-12:30) – Why Trust (and Distrust) Matter for Democratic Politics**

How much distrust in government can democracy truly bear? And aren't modern democracies built on a paradox — demanding both faith in institutions and skepticism toward authority?

This session clarifies what, exactly, we mean by trust, mistrust and distrust of government. It starts with how liberalism, republicanism and ascriptive ideologies (racism, sexism, etc.) give a different meaning to

political trust, allowing both the right and the left to politicize distrust to their advantage. The session draws from contemporary debates over the causes of distrust in government by examining how race, class, partisanship, macro-performance (e.g., inflation, unemployment, GDP) and quality of government (e.g., service delivery, impartiality, probity) shape trust across established and new democracies. In this session, special attention is given to conceptual and measurement strategies.

### Reading block 1

- \*\*\*Fried, Amy, and Douglas B. Harris. 2021. *At War with Government: How Conservatives Weaponized Distrust from Goldwater to Trump*. New York: Columbia University Press [chapter 1]
- \*\*\*Sabin, Paul. 2021. *Public Citizens: The Attack on Big Government and the Remaking of American Liberalism*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. [ch1, 3, Epilogue]
- \*\* (skim through) Citrin, J., & Stoker, L. (2018). *Political Trust in a Cynical Age*. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1), 49–70.
- Zmerli, Sonja, and Tom W.G. van der Meer, eds. 2017. *Handbook on Political Trust*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Filindra, Alexandra, Noah J. Kaplan, and Beyza E. Buyuker. 2022. "Beyond Performance: Racial Prejudice and Whites' Mistrust of Government." *Political Behavior* 44 (2): 961–979.
- OECD (2024), *OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions – 2024 Results: Building Trust in a Complex Policy Environment*, OECD Publishing.

### Reading block 2

- Bertou, E. (2019), "Rethinking Political Distrust", *European Political Science Review*, Vol. 11/2, pp. 213–230
- Warren, Mark E. 2018. "Trust and Democracy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Social and Political Trust*, edited by Eric M. Uslaner. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pettit, Philip. 1998. "Republican Theory and Political Trust." In *Trust and Governance*, edited by Valerie Braithwaite and Margaret Levi, 295–314. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

#### Activities:

Group activity: Work in groups and identify the campaign strategy of two political parties and their specific politicization of distrust (pick at least one party from the left and from the right).

## **Class 7 (9:30-12:30, Wednesday, June 10th) – A Political Account of the Consequences of Distrust for Electoral Behavior**

This session examines the political consequences of trust and distrust for welfare-state attitudes, immigration attitudes, and voting behavior. It asks whether distrust necessarily benefits conservative or populist politics, or whether it can also support progressive demands for accountability, redistribution, and democratic reform. By breaking down the different meanings of distrust over time for different social groups depending on class, race, and partisanship, the session connects macro-level debates on the crisis of democratic legitimacy to micro-level mechanisms of opinion formation. In this session, we will critique the

theory of political trust as a cognitive shortcut (or heuristic) to manage risk. We will look at recent electoral data since Trump's first victory (2016-2024) to examine how trust and distrust have shaped attitudes toward the role of government and vote choice.

### Readings

- \*\*\*Maxwell B. Allamong, "Political Alienation and the Trump Vote in the 2016 and 2020 US Presidential Elections", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Volume 88, Issue 1, Spring 2024, Pages 1–21
- \*\*\*Goubin, S., & Kumlin, S. (2022). "Political Trust and Policy Demand in Changing Welfare States: Building Normative Support and Easing Reform Acceptance?" *European Sociological Review*, 38(4), 590–604
- Devine, D. (2024). Does Political Trust Matter? A Meta-analysis on the Consequences of Trust. *Political Behavior*, 46, 2241–2262.
- Rudolph, T.J. 2017. "Political trust as a heuristic". in S Zmerli & TWG van der Meer (eds), *Handbook on Political Trust*. Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 197-211.
- Macdonald, D. (2021). "Political Trust and Support for Immigration in the American Mass Public". *British Journal of Political Science*, 51(4), 1402–1420.
- Hetherington, Marc J., and Thomas J. Rudolph. 2015. *Why Washington Won't Work: Polarization, Political Trust, and the Governing Crisis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [ch. On Obamacare]
- Valgarðsson, Viktor O., et al. 2025. "Revisiting the Link Between Political Trust and Political Participation." *Journal of Politics*.
- Stenner, Karen. 2005. *The Authoritarian Dynamic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (chapters 1, 9).

### Activities:

#### Trust Lab Practice Run:

Students will receive guidelines from the instructor on their final Trust Lab project. During this (short) practice run, groups of students will pick a campaign and the instructor will guide them through i) several methods and analytical tools to identify the tension between the academic literature, political punditry and real-life campaign events and strategies; ii) possible formats for their final project.

## BLOCK 4: Moral Persuasion, Online Spaces, and the Study of Activists

---

### Class 8 (Monday, June 15th, 9:30-12:30) – Online Political Campaigns

Does digital campaigning overcome the minimal persuasion effects documented in traditional campaigns? This session examines experimental evidence on online political advertising and microtargeting. Online ads produce no significant effect on vote choice in European electoral contexts (Hager 2019), a result consistent with the near-zero estimates from field experiments on campaign contact (Kalla and Broockman 2018). The marginal persuasive returns from microtargeting – matching messages to voter profiles – are

smaller than widely claimed, even under favorable targeting conditions (Tappin et al. 2023). Effects vary by platform, format, and electoral context, but are rarely large (Chu et al. 2024).

### Readings

- Hager, Anselm. 2019. "Do Online Ads Influence Vote Choice?" *Political Communication* 36(3): 376–393.
- Tappin, Ben, Chloe Wittenberg, Luke B. Hewitt, and David Rand. 2023. "Quantifying the Potential Persuasive Returns to Political Microtargeting." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
- Chu et al 2024. "Do Online Ads Sway Voters? Understanding the Persuasiveness of Online Political Ads." *Political Communication*.

### Activities:

#### Class discussion/debate.

In small groups, students debate whether online platforms structurally advantage outsider candidates — first drawing on the session's readings and cases such as Zohran Mamdani's insurgent New York City campaign and Călin Georgescu's TikTok-driven emergence in Romania. Arguments need not be restricted to the assigned material.

## **Class 9 & 10 (Tuesday, June 16th, 9:30-12:30 & 14:00-17:00) – Moral Values and Social Media**

While campaign effects are often small, can using moral appeals lead to larger persuasive effects?

The first part of this session examines moral reframing as a deliberate messaging strategy: translating political messages into the moral language of the target audience — drawing on care, fairness, loyalty, authority, or purity — can increase cross-partisan persuasion on both policy attitudes and candidate support (Feinberg and Willer 2019; Voelkel et al. 2023).

The second part complicates this optimism. Social media systematically amplifies moral outrage — rewarding its expression, lowering its cost, and biasing the information environment toward conflict rather than deliberation (Crockett 2017). Deliberately exposing citizens to cross-cutting political content on social media increases polarization rather than reducing it (Bail et al. 2018). The tool that makes moral reframing possible may be the same environment that makes it most likely to fail.

### Readings

- Feinberg, Matthew and Willer, Robb. 2019. "Moral reframing: A technique for effective and persuasive communication across political divides" *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*.
- Voelkel, Jan; Mernyk, Joseph and Willer, Robb. 2023. "Moral reframing increases support for economically progressive candidates" *PNAS Nexus*.
- Crockett, Molly J. 2017. "Moral Outrage in the Digital World." *Nature Human Behaviour*.
- Bail, Chris, et al. 2018. "Exposure to Opposing Views can Increase Political Polarization: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment on Social Media." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.

*Activities:*

**[Group Presentation #2]** In small groups, students design a moral appeal that can target the other side and present it to the class for critique.

## **Class 11 (Wednesday, June 17th, 9:30-12:30) – Party Activists and the Campaign Ground Game**

### **[course wrap-up]**

Campaigns do not run themselves. Behind every field operation stands a network of volunteers and party activists whose motivations, preferences, and demographic composition shape how campaigns are actually conducted — often in ways that diverge from headquarters strategy. This session examines the activist layer of political campaigns from three angles. First, what motivates citizens to volunteer their time for a party or candidate — and does it matter for campaign effectiveness? Second, the ground game presents a classic principal-agent problem: activists pursue their own priorities when contacting voters, which may systematically misalign with the campaign's strategic interests. Third, the composition of the activist base is not politically neutral — who volunteers, and in what numbers, has measurable consequences for political representation and the inclusiveness of democratic participation. Together, these perspectives show that understanding campaigns requires moving beyond messaging strategy to the organizational and human infrastructure that delivers it.

### *Readings*

- Enos Ryan, and Hersh Eitan. 2015. "Party Activists as Campaign Advertisers: The Ground Campaign as a Principal-Agent Problem." *American Political Science Review*.
- Gulzar, Saad et al. (forthcoming). "Can Party Elites Shape the Rank-and-File? Evidence from a Recruitment Campaign in India". *American Political Science Review*.
- Goyal, Tanushree. 2023. "Representation from Below: How Women's Grassroots Party Activism Promotes Equal Political Participation." *American Political Science Review*: 1–16.

*Activities:*

In-class (in-depth) reading and discussion of two core texts, followed by a lecture connecting activist dynamics to the course's broader arguments on campaign effectiveness.

+Some exam prep and guidelines

## **Class 12: (Tuesday, June 23rd – 2:00-5:00pm)**

**\*\*Group Presentation #3 - Trust Lab Project**

## Final Exam (in-class, open-book)

Thursday, June 25th, 9:30-  
11:30am (Room TBD)

### DISABILITY ACCOMMODATIONS

To benefit from Disability Accommodations and obtain an accommodation letter, please contact Sciences Po's Disability Services promptly at [pole.handicap@sciencespo.fr](mailto:pole.handicap@sciencespo.fr). Accommodations are not retroactive. If you wish to receive accommodations in this class, you will need to provide us with the accommodation letter from Sciences Po's Disability Services. We will then discuss specifically how to meet your needs. Letters received with too short notice prior to an assessment do not guarantee you access to your accommodations.

### ABSENCES

Attendance is mandatory and it is taken on a factual basis, in accordance with Science Po's Academic Rules and Regulations. If you are absent, you should inform us, but professors do not excuse absences. All absences, including those at rescheduled sessions, need to be justified with your academic office within 5 days of your absence with a medical note or equivalent official document from the date of your absence (backdated documents cannot be accepted). Extracurricular activities (work, conferences, internships, interviews, family celebrations, travel etc.) are not considered valid reasons to miss a session. Students are required to be available for rescheduled sessions and assessments throughout the semester and until the last official day of the semester.

### ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

It is vital that all the oral and written work you hand in and complete in class be your own and produced for this course only. Cheating and plagiarism are serious offenses that will not be tolerated. If you have any questions or concerns about what cheating and plagiarism comprise, recheck the online Academic Integrity Module, all documents related to Academic Integrity provided by Sciences Po and in particular, the Academic Integrity Charter. Please see us as well if you need to clarify how it applies to this course and our assignments. All written work needs to be submitted to our Urkund addresses: [adrien.degeorges.scpo@analyse.orkund.com](mailto:adrien.degeorges.scpo@analyse.orkund.com) and [jonne.kamphorst@analyse.orkund.com](mailto:jonne.kamphorst@analyse.orkund.com)