

**POLS560**  
**American Politics Graduate Seminar**  
**Instructor: Dr. Alexandra Filindra**  
**Email: [aleka@uic.edu](mailto:aleka@uic.edu)**  
**Class hours: Thursdays 2:30pm-5pm**  
**Office hours: Thursday 12-2pm and by appointment**

The purpose of this graduate seminar is to introduce students to the study of American politics and to political science methodology and theory. The study is aimed to provide relevant knowledge and training to both those who seek to specialize in American politics and comparativists who want to employ theories developed in the American context to other cases. The class aims to clarify and probe the character, puzzles, theories, methods, and evidence presented in the various texts and assess the contributions they make to an understanding of American politics and the broader development of social and political science. Among the key questions that we will be discussing are: 1) how do institutions such federalism and the separation of powers shape political outcomes? 2) what is the role of Congress, the Presidency and the Courts in American politics? 3) how does the interest group system work and what is its role in shaping policy? 4) how important is public opinion in American politics? 5) what factors shape public opinion? Why do people make the political choices that they do? 6) how does race and ethnicity structure American politics? Is the role of race epiphenomenal or substantive?

### **Course Policies**

Students are expected to read all assigned readings *prior* to coming to class. Attendance is required and so is participation in class discussion and in-class assignments. Students should be prepared to discuss the readings and introduce their own questions and critical comments to the topic at hand. All assignments are due on the specified day at the beginning of class. ***Late assignments will be penalized by a half-grade per day of delay.***

Students are expected to attend all classes and their grades will reflect their attendance record. Think of yourselves as training for a job and your job performance includes showing up. Should you need to be absent for a valid reason, please contact me *before* class to let me know that you will be absent and the reason for your absence. For multi-day absences I will need documentation.

Use of laptops in class is permitted as long as the computer is used for taking notes or for in-class exercises. Anyone discovered using the laptop for personal or other purposes (e.g. chatting, IMing, Facebook) will get a zero for a participation grade for the class. The first infraction will also lead me to ban computers from the classroom, so you will be responsible for your classmates' loss of this privilege.

### **Code of Conduct**

Plagiarism is a serious violation of the students' code of conduct and will be treated with equal severity. Students are required to use proper citation and sourcing for all written work. No exceptions. You can select any method (e.g., MLA, APA, Chicago) as long as you use it consistently throughout your work. Wikipedia and other similar sources of information should NEVER be used as a direct source! The information provided in Wikipedia is not always trustworthy since it is anonymously produced and not checked. If you use something you found on Wikipedia, go to the original source to check it out.

According to school policy which can be found at <http://www.uic.edu/depts/dos/studentconduct.html>, there are several types of violations of academic integrity. Below, I have copied and pasted the definitions of all types of violations as presented in the school handbook. Violations of the Academic Integrity Policy will include, but not be limited to the following examples:

1. **Cheating** during examinations includes any attempt to (1) look at another student's examination with the intention of using another's answers for attempted personal benefit; (2) communicate in any manner, information concerning the content of the examination during the testing period or after the examination to someone who has not yet taken the examination; (3) use any materials, such as notebooks, notes, textbooks or other sources, not specifically designated by the professor of the course for student use during the examination period or (4) engage in any other activity for the purpose of seeking aid not authorized by the professor.
2. **Plagiarism** is the copying from a book, article, notebook, video or other source, material whether published or unpublished, without proper credit through the use of quotation marks, footnotes and other customary means of identifying sources, or passing off as one's own, the ideas, words, writings, programs and experiments of another, whether or not such actions are intentional or unintentional. Plagiarism also includes submitting, without the consent of the professor, an assignment already tendered for academic credit in another course.
3. **Collusion** is working together in preparing separate course assignments in ways not authorized by the instructor. Academic work produced through a cooperative (collaborative effort) of two or more students is permissible only upon the explicit consent of the professor. The collaboration must also be acknowledged in stating the authorship of the report.
4. **Lying** is knowingly furnishing false information, distorting data or omitting to provide all necessary, required information to the University's advisor, registrar, admissions counselor, professor, etc. for any academically related purpose.

### Citations Guide

You can select any citation style (e.g., MLA, APA, Chicago) but for those of you who are not familiar with any specific citation style, please read through the following site which provides information on the Chicago style. It is commonly used in social sciences and easy to follow.

[http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools\\_citationguide.html](http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html)

According to the guidelines provided by the Library at American University, here are some instances when you need to use citations (<http://www.library.american.edu/tutorial/citation3.html>):

Citations not only locate a piece of writing within the **context** of a particular scholarly debate, they also allow writers to make claims based on the **authority of another expert**.

**For example:** a scientist researching the possibility of AIDS vaccines may rely on some data gathered by the Center for Disease Control. Using a citation, the scientist tells the reader **where the data was collected** and that the **authority** of the CDC **attests to its accuracy**.

Similarly in the Humanities, a scholar analyzing Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* may cite a philosopher or literary critic, like Michel Foucault. The scholar therefore identifies the **type of interpretive lens / theoretical framework** being brought to the analysis. Critics may or may not accept the validity of the interpretive lens, but the scholar **won't have to re-create** the entire philosophy.

### When do you need to use citations?

- When **quoting**
- When **paraphrasing** someone else's ideas
- When using a **statistic or direct fact**
- When you are using someone else's work as a **theoretical framework / interpretive lens**
- When you are relying upon **data collected by someone else**
- When you are relying upon **opinions or interpretations** articulated by someone else
- It will strengthen your case if you support any **key assertions** with citations to show support amongst experts for accepting the validity of those assertions

### When do you not need to use citations?

- When stating **common knowledge** (knowledge that can be found in many sources OTHER than those in the bibliography). If you aren't sure that something is common knowledge, it probably isn't.

- When the ideas, opinions, interpretations **are your own**, (although it strengthens your case if you are able to cite others who would agree with you or whose work leads to similar conclusions).

**REMEMBER:** Citations and giving credit to others strengthens your work because you bring to bear the authority of an “expert” to your findings and conclusions. The more people you cite, the more weight does your work have because you show that you have strong familiarity with the literature.

### **Course Requirements:**

#### **Readings**

The readings, though extensive and representative, are not comprehensive. Most sections in the syllabus balance classics with work representative of the best current research in the field. The class is conducted predominantly in a discussion format, although there will be lectures on various topics. Students are expected to have completed the assigned weekly reading before each class and to arrive prepared to contribute actively to all discussions. You should expect to be called on at any time, to discuss any reading in any session.

#### **Course requirements**

For this class, you will be expected to write several papers.

1. One critical review paper (1,500-2,000 words, including references). You will select one of the books for your critical review. The critical review is not simply a summary and description of the argument. It requires you to place the study in the context of the literature. This means that you should read everything in the required AND recommended lists so that you have a good grasp of the field **(15% of the grade)**
2. Research design paper (1,500-2,000 words, including references). You will select a book or article for this paper **(15% of the grade)**. The piece can be from the required or the recommended list but it needs to be based on data that are publicly available and replicable so that you can use for the final paper. I have highlighted papers for which data are easily available.
3. Midterm exam **(15% of the grade)**
4. Formal presentation of a book or article from the recommended list. You will pretend you are the author, presenting the work at a conference. You have to make a power point presentation. You will be given 30 minutes of the class, 15 minutes to present, 15 minutes for Q&A. Bring the presentation to me at least two days before class. You will be graded both by me and by your class mates. **(10% of the grade)**
5. Final research paper (7,000-8,000 words). This paper will test the alternative research design that you proposed for the research design paper. You can use ANES or other data to test your theory. **(30% of the grade)**.
6. Response to research designs **(5% of the grade)**
7. **10%** of the grade is class participation and attendance.

## **The Four Questions for a Stellar Critical Review (adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE Syllabus)**

Analyzing and critiquing political science works requires you to think about four key questions. Each week, in your papers you should address these questions. For those of you writing critical reviews, these questions should be the focus of your entire paper. For those of you writing response papers, these questions should be answered in 1-2 cogent paragraphs.

A critical review paper should include the following information:

- 1. What is the book's main argument or causal mechanism?**
- 2. How does the book fit in the literature, how does it mesh with what came before it?**
  - a. What literature does this book speak to?
  - b. How well does it fit in this literature?
  - c. How does the literature fit in with the broader literature in political science?
- 3. What is the author's research design and how well is it conceived?**
  - a. Dependent variable (s): what is it? How well is it specified? How are they operationalized?
  - b. Independent variables: What are they? How well are they specified? How are they operationalized?
  - c. What is the nature of the causal connection? Does the author infer correlation? Causation?
  - d. What is the method used? Is it appropriate given the question being asked? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology?
- 4. If the author was presenting this work at a conference what probing/devastating/reputation-making question would you pose to him/her?**
  - a. Evidence used? Evidence validity?
  - b. Alternative explanations unaccounted for?
  - c. Implications

**Guidelines for Writing Papers**  
**(adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE Syllabus)**

Good arguments and good writing are both essential to a good paper. Even if the argument is excellent, chances are that it will not be treated as such if the presentation is terrible. As a rule, bad writing is a sign of muddled thinking.

The purpose of these papers is to force you to think critically about how to understand and analyze public policy and theories of American politics. There are many different ways you can tackle a critical review assignment. For example, you may compare and contrast the ways two different authors approach the same problem. If you do that, you need to carefully specify the basis for your comparison (methodology, empirical evidence, etc) and show that you have apples-to-apples. You will also need to justify your selection of works to compare. Another option is to analyze an author's argument in light of the methodology used, seeking to illuminate us on whether given this methodology are the conclusions supported (i.e., does the author really connect dependent and independent variables? Are they specified in useful, meaningful ways? Is the connection plausible? Do you buy it?).

**Do not forget:** You only have 1,200-1,500 words which means no room for fluff. The introductory paragraph should: 1) state the big question; 2) define the contending perspectives on it; 3) identify the critical grounds on which they differ; 4) explain how you are going to test them; 5) summarize your conclusions and the basis for these conclusions.

**One final piece of advice:** When you are finished with your draft, read the introduction and the topic sentences of the rest of the paragraphs in the paper. If doing so does not give you an absolutely clear picture/outline of your argument, something is wrong. Fix it.

## **Guidelines for Research Designs** (adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE Syllabus)

The purpose of this course is not only to make you informed consumers of the American politics and public policy literature, but to get you ready to produce it. Thus, one of the papers that you have to prepare for this course will not be mere critique of the work of others. It will be research proposals that a political scientist may actually undertake. And to make this as realistic as possible, you will distribute copies of your research designs to everybody else and have to defend it for the first half hour of the next class. Furthermore, to keep everybody honest, all the other students in the class will give you (and me) a page of comments on your research design. Their comments will stress the following which are, by extension, the essential elements of a good research design. This is what you must keep in mind when preparing yours for them (and me) to critique.

1. A short critical review of the study with an eye for what is missing. A statement of the “big question” including reference to the relevant, competing analytic approaches;
2. A statement of the alternative theory/hypothesis and a short defense for it;
3. A statement of the method that you plan to use and its applicability to the question at hand;
4. A definition of the dependent variable (including for example the expected range of variance, the time period of variance, or whatever is relevant and appropriate, sources for data);
5. Specification of the independent variable(s) and their characteristics and sources;
6. A statement of the hypothesized causal connection, the process that links the dependent and independent variables;
7. A statement about the unit of analysis and a good justification for it (i.e., how and why is it appropriate to the type of analysis you are proposing)
8. A statement of the type of evidence you intend to study. How is it applicable to the question at hand? What will constitute confirming/disconfirming evidence?

**Guidelines for Presenters**  
(adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE syllabus)

Presenters have a lot of responsibility in this class. Collectively, we all depend on them to make the class work. You also have an individual incentive to make a great class presentation: part of your grade depends on it! Presentations should offer a very brief introduction and overview of the week's readings. *The main function of the presentations, however, is to raise the critical questions (substantive and methodological) that arise from the readings.* Presentations are not meant to be universally critical, but should be balanced assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the type of argument made in the readings, the variables used, the suggested causal mechanism, etc. Your presentation should consider the following questions, among others:

1. What is the literature that this week's readings talk to? How do they fit into this literature and more generally, how does this literature fit into the broader sweep of the literature we've covered so far?
2. What is the dependent variable? How (and how well) is it defined/specified? (I.e., what is this book about?)
3. What are the independent variables? How (and how well) are they defined/specified?
4. What is the nature of the causal connection that is hypothesized/asserted between independent and dependent variables and how, exactly, is it operationalized? (E.g., is this a correlational argument or is there a clear assertion of causation with the actual process of influence detailed?)
5. What is the method (game-theory, aggregate data, case study, etc)? How appropriate is it to the argument? What are the gains from its use-and what are the limitations it imposes?

**REMEMBER:** The purpose of your presentations is NOT to answer all these questions. It is to raise them. Nothing kills discussion quicker than the presentation of an open-and-shut case! And, to reemphasize the professional socialization theme, I will bore you with all semester, learning how to identify the core questions- and then pose them provocatively- is an essential skill if you are to succeed in the classroom and in political science more generally.

## **The Academic Whodunit, or How to Write the Perfect Formula Paper (adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE syllabus)**

Many students, including the former student teaching this course, have benefited greatly from Dr. Shafer's "formula." This is the official "whodunit" approach to writing academic papers. Follow it closely and it will save you much grief in the future.

What is the first thing that happens in your average or not so average whodunit? You find a body- sometimes in the first sentence, but almost inevitably within the first couple of paragraphs. This in turn, occasions a series of thoughts and questions on the part of the reader like: oh, look, a body; and "who is it?" and "what did she die of?" and "why where they killed?," and "whodunit?" And, of course, the rest of the book then provides the reader with a logical deductive process by which all these questions are slowly answered and the beastly murderer unmasked.

Now, as in all good whodunits, the first, most essential thing in writing a good paper is the body. Like Agatha Christie, you may want to take a sentence or two to "set the scene"- but no more. Remember, your readers, unlike hers, want to get to the meat (sorry) immediately. What's the "moral equivalent" of a body? Your "problem," your "issue," your "big question." From the very first sentence or two, you've got to make your reader sit up and think, "well, hello, what have we here?" Then in rapid succession, you have to raise all the other appropriate questions: what happened? Why? With what consequences? Having done so, you can now take the reader in hand and lead them gently through the unmasking process. And remember, it is a logical process (no surprises here!) that ought to proceed in precisely the order suggested by the first paragraphs which were skillfully conceived to aim your unsuspecting reader unerringly in the murderer's direction. (I've always detested whodunits that achieve their effect only by leaving the reader ignorant of the one essential clue and so unable to sleuth along with the sleuth.)

Finally, let us recall the all-so-important differences between a whodunit and your perfect paper. First, unlike the author of a whodunit, you've got to give the reader the answer (YOUR answer), your murderer, up front with no pussy-footing around. From the very beginning, your reader ought to know what the question is, why it is important, what the debate about it, how you intend to analyze it, and what your conclusion is. Second, unlike the author of a whodunit, your job is not to baffle and amuse by dragging in a clutter of interesting people, issues, data and other red herrings. This is why the hardest part of writing a good paper is writing the first, tight, perfect introductory paragraph or two- because they define rigorously what can and what cannot be included in what follows. The introduction should serve as a complete and easy to follow roadmap to your paper's argument and its architecture. If a given fact, issue, citation, etc. is not absolutely essential to unmasking the murderer, kill it! Remember, what impresses is not a tedious catalogue of all that you have read on the general subject of whatever, but a neat, efficient, no-frills presentation of just that which is essential to your case at hand.



## Suggested Literatures for Final Paper

### Gun Control

1. Braman, Donald, and Dan M. Kahan. 2006. "Overcoming the Fear of Guns, the Fear of Gun Control, and the Fear of Cultural Politics: Constructing a Better Gun Debate." *Emory Law Journal* 55:569-608.
2. Carlson, Jennifer. 2015. *Citizen-Protectors: The Everyday Politics of Guns in an Age of Decline*. New York: Oxford University Press.
3. Celinska, Katarzyna. 2007. "Individualism and Collectivism in America: The Case of Gun Ownership and Attitudes Toward Gun Control." *Sociological Perspectives* 50:229-247.
4. Filindra, Alexandra, and Noah J. Kaplan. 2015. "Racial Resentment and Whites' Gun Policy Preferences in Contemporary America." *Political Behavior*:1-21.
5. Hauser, Will, and Gary Kleck. 2013. "Guns and Fear: A One-Way Street?" *Crime & Delinquency* 59:271-291.
6. Kahan, Dan M. 2006. "Cultural Cognition and Public Policy." *Yale Law School Legal Scholarship Repository Paper* 103:147-170.
7. Kahan, Dan M., and Donald Braman. 2003. "More Statistics, Less Persuasion: A Cultural Theory of Gun Risk Perceptions." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 151:1291-1327.
8. Kahan, Dan M., Donald Braman, John Gastil, Paul Slovic, and C. K. Mertz. 2007. "Culture and Identity-Protective Cognition: Explaining the White-Male Effect in Risk Perception." *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* 4:465-505.
9. Kleck, Gary. 1996. "Crime, Culture Conflict and the Sources of Support for Gun Control: A Multilevel Application of the General Social Surveys." *American Behavioral Scientist* 39:387-404.
10. Kleck, Gary, Marc Gertz, and Jason Bratton. 2009. "Why do people support gun control?: Alternative explanations of support for handgun bans." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 37:496-504.
11. Kleck, Gary, Tomislav Kovandzic, Mark Saber, and Will Hauser. 2011. "The effect of perceived risk and victimization on plans to purchase a gun for self-protection." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 39:312-319.
12. Melzer, Scott. 2009. *Gun Crusaders: The NRA's Culture War*. New York: New York University Press.
13. O'Brien, Kerry, Walter Forrest, Dermot Lynott, and Michael Daly. 2013. "Racism, Gun Ownership and Gun Control: BIased Attitudes in US Whites May Influence Policy Decisions." *PLOSOne.org* (October 31, 2013) DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0077552 (<http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0077552>).

### State Immigration Policy

1. Boushey, Graeme, and Adam Luedtke. 2011. "Immigrants Across the U.S. Federal Laboratory: Explaining State-Level Innovation in Immigration Policy." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* (online view, October 7, 2011).
2. Creek, Heather M., and Stephen Yoder. 2010. "With a Little Help from Our Feds: Understanding State Immigration Enforcement Policy Adoption in American Federalism." *Policy Studies* 40:674-697 (Accessed on September 6, 2013. Available online at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2012.00469.x/abstract>).
3. Filindra, Alexandra. 2012. "Immigrant Social Policy in the American States: Race Politics and State TANF and Medicaid Eligibility Rules for Legal Permanent Residents." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* (online view, October 2012) <http://spa.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/1532440012454664v1>.
4. Filindra, Alexandra, and Shanna Pearson-Merkowitz. 2013. "Research Note: Stopping the Enforcement 'Tide': Descriptive Representation, Latino Institutional Empowerment, and State-Level Immigration Policy." *Politics & Policy* 41:814-832.

5. Graefe, Deborah R., Gordon F. De Jong, Matthew Hall, Samuel Sturgeon, and Julie VanEerden. 2008. "Immigrants' TANF Eligibility, 1996-2003: What Explains the New Across State Inequalities?" *International Migration Review* 42:89-133.
6. Hero, Rodney, and Robert Preuhs. 2007. "Immigration and the Evolving American Welfare State: Examining Policies in the U.S. States." *American Journal of Political Science* 51:498-517.
7. Marquez, Timothy, and Scot Schraufnagel. 2013. "Hispanic Population Growth and State Immigration Policy: An Analysis of Restriction (2008–12)." *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 43:347-367.
8. Monogan, James E. III. 2013. "The politics of immigrant policy in the 50 US states, 2005-2011." *Journal of Public Policy* 33:35-64.
9. Newman, Benjamin J., Christopher D. Johnston, April A. Strickland, and Jack Citrin. 2012. "Immigration Crackdown in the American Workplace." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 12:160-182.
10. Provine, D. Marie, and Jorge M. Chavez. 2009. "Race and the response of state legislatures to unauthorized immigrants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 623:78-92.
11. Rivera, Michael U. 2015. *The Politics of U.S. State Immigration Policy: Public Opinion and Representation*. (Unpublished manuscript).
12. Wallace, Sophia J. 2014. "Papers Please: State-Level Anti-Immigrant Legislation in the Wake of Arizona's SB 1070." *Political Science Quarterly* 129:261-291.
13. Ybarra, Vickie D., Lisa M. Sanchez, and Gabriel R. Sanchez. 2015. "Anti-immigrant Anxieties in State Policy: The Great Recession and Punitive Immigration Policy in the American States, 2005–2012." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*.
14. Zingher, Joshua N. 2014. "The Ideological and Electoral Determinants of Laws Targeting Undocumented Migrants in the U.S. States." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 14:90-117.

### **Political trust**

1. Albertson, Bethany, and Shana Kushner Gadarian. 2015. *Anxious Politics: Democratic Citizenship in a Threatening World*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
2. Avery, James M. 2007. "Race, Partisanship, and Political Trust Following Bush versus Gore (2000)." *Political Behavior* 29:327-342.
3. Bowler, Shaun, and Jeffrey A. Karp. 2004. "Politicians, Scandals, and Trust in Government." *Political Behavior* 26:271-287.
4. Chanley, Virginia A., Thomas J. Rudolph, and Wendy M. Rahn. 2000. "The Origins and Consequences of Public Trust in Government: A Time Series Analysis." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 64:239-256.
5. Citrin, Jack. 1974. "Comment: The Political Relevance of Trust in Government." *American Political Science Review* 68:976-977.
6. Cook, Timothy E., and Paul Gronke. 2005. "The Skeptical American: Revisiting the Meanings of Trust in Government and Confidence in Institutions." *Journal of Politics* 67:784-803.
7. Hetherington, Marc J. 1998. "The Political Relevance of Political Trust." *The American Political Science Review* 92:791-808.
8. ———. 1999. "The Effect of Political Trust on the Presidential Vote, 1968-96." *The American Political Science Review* 93:311-326.
9. Hetherington, Marc J., and Suzanne Globetti. 2002. "Political Trust and Racial Policy Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science* 46:253-275.
10. Hetherington, Marc J., and Thomas J. Rudolph. 2008. "Priming, Performance, and the Dynamics of Political Trust." *The Journal of Politics* 70:498-512.
11. Lubell, Mark. 2007. "Familiarity Breeds Trust: Collective Action in a Policy Domain." *The Journal of Politics* 69:237-250.
12. Maloy, J. S. 2009. "Two Concepts of Trust." *The Journal of Politics* 71:492-505.

13. Miller, Arthur H. 1974a. "Political Issues and Trust In Government: 1964-1970." *American Political Science Review* 68:951-972.
14. Nye, Joseph S., Philip D. Zelikow, and David C. King. 1997. *Why People Don't Trust Government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
15. Rudolph, Thomas J. 2009. "Political Trust, Ideology, and Public Support for Tax Cuts." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 73:144-158.
16. Rudolph, Thomas J., and Jillian Evans. 2005. "Political Trust, Ideology, and Public Support for Government Spending." *American Journal of Political Science* 49:660-671.
17. Rudolph, Thomas J., and Elizabeth Popp. 2010. "Race, Environment, and Interracial Trust." *The Journal of Politics* 72:74-89.

## **Welfare Policy**

### **References**

1. Barrilleaux, Charles, and Ethan Bernick. 2003. "Deservingness, Discretion, and the State Politics of Welfare Spending, 1990-96." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 3:1-22.
2. Brown, Michael. 1999. *Race, Money and the American Welfare State*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
3. Brown, Robert D. 1995. "Party Cleavages and Welfare Effort in the American States." *American Political Science Review* 46 (March 1995):23-33.
4. Dawson, R., and J. Robinson. 1963. "Inter-party Competition, Economic Variables and Welfare Policies in the American States." *Journal of Politics* 25:265-289.
5. Dodson, Marvin E. 2001. "Welfare generosity and location choices among new United States immigrants." *International Review of Law and Economics* 21:47-67.
6. Fellowes, Matthew C., and Gretchen Rowe. 2004. "Politics and the New American Welfare States." *American Journal of Political Science* 48:362-373.
7. Fox, Cybelle. 2004. "The Changing Color of Welfare? How Whites' Attitudes Toward Latinos Influence Support for Welfare." *American Journal of Sociology* 110:580-625.
8. Gornick, Janet C., Marcia K. Meyers, and Katherin E. Ross. 1996. "Supporting the Employment of Mothers: Policy Variation Across Fourteen Welfare States." *Sociology Paper 1* (<http://surface.syr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=soc>).
9. Howard, Christopher. 1999. "The American Welfare State, or States?" *Political Research Quarterly* 52:421-442.
10. Mettler, Suzanne. 2000. "States' Rights, Women's Obligations: Contemporary Welfare Reform in Historical Perspective." *Women and Politics* 21:1-34.
11. Mink, Gwendolyn. 1999. *Whose Welfare?* Pp. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
12. Preuhs, Robert R. 2007. "Descriptive Representation as a Mechanism to Mitigate Policy Backlash: Latino Incorporation and Welfare Policy in the American States." *Political Research Quarterly* 60:277-292.
13. Quadagno, Jill. 1994. *The Color of Welfare: How Racism Undermined the War on Poverty*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
14. Schneider, Sandra K. 1993. "Examining the Relationship between Public Policies: AFDC and Medicaid." *Public Administration Review* 53:368-380.
15. Schram, Sanford F. 2005. "Contextualizing Racial Disparities in American Welfare Reform: Toward a New Poverty Research." *Perspectives on Politics* 3:253-268.
16. Schram, Sanford F., and Samuel H. Beer. 1999. *Welfare Reform: A Race to the Bottom?* Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
17. Soss, Joe, Sanford F. Schram, Thomas P. Vartanian, and Erin O'Brien. 2001. "Setting the Terms of Relief: Explaining State Policy Choices in the Devolution Revolution." *American Journal of Political Science* 45:378-395.
18. Soss, Joe, Sanford Schram, and Richard C. Fording. 2003. *Race and the Politics of Welfare Reform*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

19. Volden, Craig. 1999. "Asymmetric Effects of Intergovernmental Grants: Analysis and Implications for U.S. Welfare Policy." *Publius* 29:51-73.
20. Zylan, Yvonne, and Sarah A. Soule. 2000. "Ending Welfare As We Know It (Again): Welfare State Retrenchment, 1989-1995." *Social Forces* 79:623-652.

### **Welfare Attitudes**

1. Federico, Christopher M. 2004. "When Do Welfare Attitudes Become Racialized? The Paradoxical Effects of Education." *American Journal of Political Science* 48:374-391.
2. Schneider, Sandra K., and William G. Jacoby. 2003. "A Culture of Dependence? The Relationship between Public Assistance and Public Opinion." *British Journal of Political Science* 33:213-231.
3. ———. 2005. "Elite Discourse and American Public Opinion: The Case of Welfare Spending." *Political Research Quarterly* 58:367-379
4. Layman, Geoffrey C., and Thomas M. Carsey. 2002. "Party Polarization and Party Structuring of Policy Attitudes: A Comparison of Three NES Panel Studies." *Political Behavior* 24:199-236.
5. Johnson, Martin. 2001. "The Impact of Social Diversity and Racial Attitudes on Social Welfare Policy." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 1:27-49.
6. Hussey, Laura S., and Shanna Pearson-Merkowitz. 2012. "The Changing Role of Race in Social Welfare Attitude Formation: Partisan Divides over Undocumented Immigrants and Social Welfare Policy." *Political Research Quarterly*.
7. Gilens, Martin. 1995. "Racial Attitudes and Opposition to Welfare." *The Journal of Politics* 57:994-1014.
8. ———. 1996a. "Race and Poverty in America: Public Misperceptions and the American News Media." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 60:515-541.
9. ———. 1996b. "'Race Coding' and White Opposition to Welfare." *The American Political Science Review* 90:593-604.
10. Peffley, Mark, Jon Hurwitz, and Paul M. Sniderman. 1997. "Racial Stereotypes and Whites' Political Views of Blacks in the Context of Welfare and Crime." *American Journal of Political Science* 41:30-60.

### **Criminal Justice**

1. Barkan, Steven E., and Steven F. Cohn. 2005. "Why Whites Favor Spending More Money to Fight Crime: The Role of Racial Prejudice." *Social Problems* 52:300-314.
2. Entman, Robert M. 1992. "Blacks in the News: Television, Modern Racism and Cultural Change." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 69:341-361.
3. Gilens, Martin. 2001. "Political Ignorance and Collective Policy Preferences." *The American Political Science Review* 95:379-396.
4. Gilliam, Franklin D., Nicholas A. Valentino, and Matthew N. Beckmann. 2002. "Where You Live and What You Watch: The Impact of Racial Proximity and Local Television News on Attitudes about Race and Crime." *Political Research Quarterly* 55:755-780.
5. Green, Eva G. T., Christian Staerklé, and David O. Sears. 2006. "Symbolic Racism and Whites' Attitudes towards Punitive and Preventive Crime Policies." *Law and Human Behavior* 30:435-454.
6. Hurwitz, Jon, and Mark Peffley. 1997. "Public Perceptions of Race and Crime: The Role of Racial Stereotypes." *American Journal of Political Science* 41:375-401.
7. Iyengar, Shanto. 1989. "How Citizens Think about National Issues: A Matter of Responsibility." *American Journal of Political Science* 33:878-900.
8. Johnson, Devon. 2001. "Punitive Attitudes on Crime: Economic Insecurity, Racial Prejudice, or Both?" *Sociological Focus* 34:33-54.
9. Moeller, Gertrude L. 1989. "Fear of Criminal Victimization: The Effect of Neighborhood Racial Composition." *Sociological Inquiry* 59:208-221.

10. Peffley, Mark, and Jon Hurwitz. 2002. "The Racial Components of "Race-Neutral" Crime Policy Attitudes." *Political Psychology* 23:59-75.
11. Peffley, Mark, Jon Hurwitz, and Paul M. Sniderman. 1997. "Racial Stereotypes and Whites' Political Views of Blacks in the Context of Welfare and Crime." *American Journal of Political Science* 41:30-60.
12. Stack, Steven. 2003. "Authoritarianism and Support for the Death Penalty: A Multivariate Analysis." *Sociological Focus* 36:333-352.
13. Unnever, James D., Francis T. Cullen, and James D. Jones. 2008. "Public Support for Attacking the "Root Causes" of Crime: The Impact of Egalitarian and Racial Beliefs." *Sociological Focus* 41:1-33.
14. Warr, Mark. 1995. "Public Opinion on Crime and Punishment." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 59:296-310.

## Course in Detail

### **Week 1 (January 14): The Role of Ideas & Institutions in American Politics**

The development of American politics is shaped both by ideas and institutions. This set of readings discusses how ideologies, often encapsulated in value systems and world views, influence the political thinking of the American public. At the same time, institutions encompass and promote these ideas in the long run affecting political and policy outcomes. For this week, think carefully about definitions: what are ideas and what are institutions in political science parlance?

- Smith, Rogers M. 1993. "Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The Multiple Traditions in America". *American Political Science Review*. 87(3):549-66
- Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics". In David Apter, editor, *Ideology and Discontent*, Glencoe: Free Press. pages 206-61  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/08913810608443650>
- Lieberman, Robert C. (2002) "Ideas, Institutions, and Political Order." *American Political Science Review* vol. 96, no. 4 (December 2002): 697-712.
- Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of History," *American Political Science Review* 94 (2): 251-268.
- Ward, Michael D., Katherine Stovel, and Audrey Sacks. 2011. "Network Analysis and Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 14: 245-264
- Grose, Christian R. (2014) "Field Experimental Work on Political Institutions," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 17, pp. 355-370
- Sheingate, Adam (2014) "Institutional Dynamics in American Political Development," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 17, pp. 461-477

#### **Recommended:**

- *The Federalist Papers* (any edition), Numbers 10, 51, 70, 78
- McClosky, Herbert. 1964. Consensus and Ideology in American Politics. *American Political Science Review*. 58(2):361-82
- Karen Orren and Stephen Skowronek, "The Study of American Political Development." In Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner, eds., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2002), pp. 722-754.

### **Week 2 (January 21): Federalism**

How does the architecture of federalism affect politics and policy in the United States? According to the Constitution, the federal and state governments have both independent and concurrent powers. Do states influence national political outcomes or does the federal government impose its will on states? Could both be the case depending on the issue and the political environment? What are the positive and negative effects of our federal architecture? How has American federalism affected the shape of the American welfare state? What about immigration policy?

- Miller, Lisa (2010) *The Perils of Federalism: Race Poverty and the Politics of Crime Control*. New York: Oxford University Press, Ch. 1-3, 6-7.
- Kelly, Nathan J and Christopher Witko (2012) "Federalism and American Inequality," *Journal of Politics* 74(2): 414-426
- Filindra, Alexandra (2013) "Immigrant Social Policy in the American States: Race Politics and State TANF and Medicaid Eligibility Rules for Legal Permanent Residents," *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 13 (1), pp. 26-48
- Peterson, Paul and Mark Rom (1989) "American Federalism, Welfare Policy and Residential Choices," *APSR*, 83(03): 711-728

- Clouser-McCann P.J., C.R. Shipan and C. Volden (2015) “Top-Down Federalism: State Policy Responses to National Government Discussion,” *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, online view.
- Bulman-Pozen (2014) “Patisan Federalism,” *Harvard Law Review* ([http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2291000](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Papers.cfm?abstract_id=2291000))

**Recommended:**

- [Creek, H. and S. Yoder \(2012\) “With a little help from our Feds: Understanding state immigration enforcement policy adoption in American federalism,” \*Policy Studies Journal\*, 40\(4\) 674-697](#)
- Derthick, Martha “Federalism and the Politics of Tobacco”, *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, Vol. 31, No. 1, (Winter, 2001), pp. 47-63
- LaCroix, Alison (2010) *The Ideological Origins of American Federalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Mettler, Suzanne (1998) *Dividing Citizens: Gender and Federalism in New Deal Public Policies*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Peterson, Paul (1995) *The Price of Federalism*. Washington, DC: Bookings Institution
- Riker William H. (1987) *The Development of American Federalism*. Boston: Kluwer
- Squire, P. (2014) “Electoral Career Movements and the Flow of Political Power in the American Federal System, *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* (online view)
- Tichenor, D. and A. Filindra (2013) “Raising Arizona v. United States: The Origins and Development of Immigration Federalism.” *Lewis and Clark Law Review*, 16(4), pp.1215-47
- Tiebout, Charles (1956) “A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures.” *Journal of Political Economy*. [http://www.unc.edu/~fbaum/teaching/PLSC541\\_Fall08/tiebout\\_1956.pdf](http://www.unc.edu/~fbaum/teaching/PLSC541_Fall08/tiebout_1956.pdf)
- Volden, Craig (2005) “Intergovernmental Political Competition in American Federalism,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(2):327-342

**Week 3 (January 28): Pluralism & Elitism: Theories of Interest Group Politics**

**Guest Lecturer: Andy McFarland**

**Required Readings:**

- McFarland, Andrew (2004) *Neopluralism: The Evolution of Political Process Theory*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas , Chapters 1-4
- Mancur Olson. 1966. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Chapters 1, 2, 5, and 6.
- Schattschneider, EE. (1960) *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist’s View of Democracy in America*. Chapters 1-2
- Lowi, Theodore (2009) *The End of Liberalism: The Second Republic of the United States*. New York: Norton & Norton, Chapter 4
- Jack Walker. 1983. “The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in the United States.” *American Political Science Review*. 77: 390-406.

**Recommended:**

- Karpf, David (2012) *The Move-On Effect: The Unexpected Transformation of American Political Advocacy*. Oxford University Press
- Dahl, Robert (2005) *Who Governs: Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Anthony Downs. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*.
- Baumgartner, Frank and Beth Leech (1998) *Basic Interests: The Importance of Groups in Politics and in Political Science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

- Browne, William P. (1998) *Groups, Interests and U.S. Public Policy*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press
- Rozell, Mark J, Clyde Wilcox, Michael M. Franz (2006) *Interest Groups in American Campaigns: The New Face of Electioneering*. New York: Oxford University Press

#### **Week 4 (February 4): How Race and Ethnicity Have Shaped American Politics and White Identities**

American politics has been shaped by the ideology of whiteness.

- Painter, Nell I (2010) *The History of White People*. New York: Norton & Norton, Chs. 13-15, 19-20, 23
- Gross, Ariella J. (2008) *What Blood Won't Tell*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Chs. 1-3
- Winant, H. (2004) "Behind Blue Eyes: Whiteness and Contemporary U.S. Racial Politics," in Michelle Fine, Lois Weis, Linda Powell-Pruitt, and April Burns (eds). *Off White: Readings on Power, Privilege and Resistance*. New York: Routledge
- [Abrajano M. and Zoltan L. Hajnal \(2015\) \*White Backlash: Immigration, Race and American Politics\*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Chs. 1-3](#)
- Craig M.A. and J.A. Richeson (2014) "On the Precipice of a 'Majority-Minority' America: Perceived Status Threat From the Racial Demographic Shift Affects White Americans' Political Ideology," *Psychological Science*, 25(6) 1189-1197
- [Schildkraut, Deborah J. \(2014\) "Boundaries of American Identity: Evolving Understandings of "Us". \*Annual Review of Political Science\*, Vol. 17, pp. 441-460](#)
- Joel Olson "Whiteness and the Polarization of American Politics" *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (Dec., 2008), pp. 704-718

#### **Recommended Readings:**

- Smith Rogers (1999) *Civic Ideals*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Schildkraut, D. (2007) "Defining American Identity: How Much 'There' is There?" *Journal of Politics*, 69(3): 597-615
- [Schildkraut, D. \(2011\) \*Americanism in the Twenty First Century: Public Opinion in the Age of Immigration\*. Cambridge University Press](#)
  - Schildkraut, D. (2005) *Press "One" for English: Language Policy, Public Opinion, and American Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

#### **Week 5 (February 11): Representation**

**Guest lecturer: Dr. Nadia Brown, Associate Professor of Political Science, Purdue University**

#### **Required readings**

- Nadia Brown (2014) *Sisters in the Statehouse*. Oxford University Press.

#### **Recommended Readings:**

- Griffin, John D. (2014) "When and Why Minority Legislators Matter?" *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol 17, pp. 327-336
- Tali Mendelberg, et.al. (2014) "Gender Inequality in Deliberation: Unpacking the Black Box of Interaction", *Perspectives on Politics* 12(1):18-44
- Lawless, Jennifer L. (2015) "Female Candidates and Legislators," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol 18, pp. 349-366
- Rehfeld, Andrew (2009) "Representation Rethought: On Trustees, Delegates, and Gyroscopes in the Study of Political Representation and Democracy," *APSR*, 103(2):214-230



- Jane Mansbridge (1999) Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent "Yes". *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 61, No. 3 (Aug., 1999), pp. 628-657
- John Griffin and Brian Newman (2007) The Unequal Representation of Latinos and Whites, *Journal of Politics*
- Beth Reingold and Jessica Harrell (2010) "The Impact of Descriptive Representation on Women's Political Engagement: Does Party Matter?" *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 63, No. 2 (June 2010), pp. 280-294
- [Hajnal, Zoltan \(2009\) "Who Loses in American Democracy? A Count of Votes Demonstrates the Limited Representation of African Americans," \*APSR\*, 103\(1\):37-57](#)
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2002. "Political Parties and the Recruitment of Women to State Legislatures." *Journal of Politics*, 64 (August): 791-809

### **Week 6 (February 18): Ideology, Partisanship & Polarization**

- [Green, D. B. Palmquist, E. Schickler \(2002\) \*Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters\*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chs. 2-3, 6,](#)
- [Carsey, T. M. and G C. Layman \(2006\) "Changing Sides or Changing Minds? Party Identification and Policy Preferences in the American Electorate," \*American Journal of Political Science\*, 50 \(2\):464-477](#)
- Stoker, L. and M. Kent Jennings (2008) "Of Time and the Development of Partisan Polarization," *AJPS*, 52(3): 619-35
- [Abramowitz, A. I. and K. L. Saunders \(2008\) "Is Polarization a Myth?" \*Journal of Politics\*, 70\(2\): 542-555](#)
- Carmines, E.G. and N. J. D'Amico (2015) "The New Look in Political Ideology Research," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol 18:205-216

### **Recommended Readings:**

- [Carmines E.G. and M. W. Wagner \(2006\) "Political Issues and Party Alignment: Assessing the Issue Evolution Perspective," \*Annual Review of Political Science\*, 9:67-81](#)
- [Fiorina, M. P. and S. J. Abrams \(2008\) "Political Polarization in the American Public," \*Annual Review of Political Science\*, Vol. 11, pp. 563-558](#)
- Abramowitz, Alan (1994) "Issue Evolution Reconsidered: Racial Attitudes and Partisanship in the U.S. Electorate," *American Journal of Political Science*, 38(1):1-24
- Carmines, E. and J. Stimson (1986) "On the Structure and Sequence of Issue Evolution," *APSR*, 80(3):901-920
- Layman, G. C., T.M. Carsey and J. Menasce-Horowitz (2006) "party Polarization in American Politics: Characteristics, Causes, and Consequences," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 8, pp. 83-110

### **Week 7 (February 25): Political Participation**

\*\*\*\*TAKE HOME MIDTERM\*\*\*\*

### **Required Readings:**

- William Riker and Peter Ordeshook. 1968. "A Theory of the Calculus of Voting." *American Political Science Review* 62: 25-42.
- Jack Citrin, Eric Schickler, and John Sides. 2003. "What if Everyone Voted? Simulating the Impact of Increased Turnout on Senate Elections." *American Journal of Political Science*. 47 (Jan.), pp. 75-90.
- Cox, Gary W. (2015) "Electoral Rules, Mobilization and Turnout," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 18, pp. 49-68

- [Panagopoulos Costas, C. Larimer and M. Condon \(2014\) "Social Pressure, Descriptive Norms, and Voter Mobilization," \*Political Behavior\*, 36\(2\): 451-469](#)
- Campbell, David (2013) "Social Networks and Political Participation," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 16, pp. 33-48
- Krupnikov, Y. (2011) "When Does Negativity Demobilize?" *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(4) 797-813

#### **Recommended:**

- Zaal, Maarten, C. Van Laar, T. Stahl, N. Ellmers, B. Denks (2011) "By Any Means Necessary: The Effects of Regulatory Focus and Moral Conviction on Hostile and Benevolent Forms of Collective Action," *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, pp. 67-89
- Quattrone, George and A. Tversky (1988) "Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analyses of Political Choice," *American Political Science Review*, 82 (3) 719-736
- Kam, Cindy (2012) "Risk Attitudes and Political Participation," *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(4):817-836
- Garcia-Bedolla, L. and Melissa R. Michelson (2012) *Mobilizing Inclusion: Transforming the Electorate through Get-out-the-Vote Campaigns*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Ch. 1-2
- Anthony Downs. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Chapter 14: "The Causes and Effects of Rational Abstention."
- Sidney Verba, Kay L. Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Chapters 16, 17.
- Robert D. Putnam. 1995. "Tuning in, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in American." *PS* 38 (December)
- Richard Niemi and Herbert Weisberg. 2001. *Controversies in Voting Behavior*. 4th ed. Chapter 2: "Why is Turnout so Low (And Why is it Declining?)"

#### **Week 8 (March 3) Voting and Elections**

\*\*\*\*RETURN TAKE HOME MIDTERM IN CLASS\*\*\*\*

- Druckman, James N. and A. Lupia (2016) Preference Change in Competitive Political Environments, *Annual Review of Political Science* (online view)
- [Jacobson, Gary C. \(2015\) "How Do Campaigns Matter?" \*Annual Review of Political Science\*, vol. 18, 31-47](#)
- [Grimmer, J., S. Messing and S. Westwood \(2013\) "How Words and Money Cultivate a Personal Vote," \*APSR\*, 106\(4\)](#)
- [Lau R. and D. Redlawsk \(1997\) "Voting Correctly," \*APSR\*, 91\(3\): 585-598](#)
- [Iyengar, S. and K. S. Hahn \(2009\) "Red Media, Blue Media: Evidence of Ideological Selectivity in Media Use," \*Journal of Communication\*, 59\(1\): 19-39](#)
- [Krupnikov, Y. \(2012\) "Negative Advertising and Voter Choice: Role of Ads in Candidate Selection," \*Political Communication\*, 29\(4\):387-413](#)

#### **Recommended Readings**

- Chong, D. and J. Druckman (2007) "Framing Theory," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 10: 103-126
- Iyengar, Shanto (2005) "Speaking of Values: The framing of American Politics," *The Forum*, Vol. 3, Issue 3.
- Scheufele, D.A. (2000) "Agenda Setting, Priming and framing revisited: Another Look at Cognitive Effects of Political Communication," *Mass Communication and Society*, 3(2-3):297-316
- Nelson, T.E., Zoe M. Oxley, R.A. Clawson (1997) "Toward a Psychology of Framing Effects," *Political Behavior*, 19(3): 22-1246

- Bennett, W. L. and S. Iyengar (2008) “A New Era of Minimal Effects?” *Journal of Communication*, 58(4):707-731

### **Week 9 (March 10) Money & the Politics of Inequality**

- [Gilens, Martin \(2012\) \*Affluence and Influence: Economic Inequality and Political Power in America\*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Ch. 1, 5, 6, 8](#)
- Erikson, Robert (2015) “Income Inequality and Policy Responsiveness,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol 18, pp. 11-29
- [Bonica, A. N. McCarty, K. Poole, H. Rosenthal \(2013\) “Why hasn’t Democracy Slowed Inequality?” \*Journal of Economic Perspectives\*, 27\(3\): 103-123](#)
- [Page, B.I., L.M. Bartels, S. Seawright \(2013\) “Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans,” \*Perspectives on Politics\*, 11\(1\):51-73](#)
- [Newman, B. \(2015\) “Breaking the Glass Ceiling: Local gender-Based Earnings Inequality and Women’s Belief in the American Dream,” \*American Journal of Political Science\*, \(online view\)](#)

### **Recommended Readings:**

- McCall, Leslie (2015) “Political and Policy Responses to problems of Inequality and Equality of Opportunity,” [http://www.gc.cuny.edu/CUNY\\_GC/media/LISCenter/Readings%20for%20workshop/Leslie-McCall-session.pdf](http://www.gc.cuny.edu/CUNY_GC/media/LISCenter/Readings%20for%20workshop/Leslie-McCall-session.pdf)
- Schlozman, K. S. Verba, H.E. Hardy (2012) *The Unheavenly Chorus: Unequal Political Voice and the Broken Promise of American Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Bartels, Larry (2010) *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

### **Week 10 (March 17<sup>th</sup>) Public Opinion**

- Lodge, M. and C. Taber (2013) *The Rationalizing Voter*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Lau, Richard R. and David P. Redlawsk. 2001. “Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Cognitive Heuristics in Political Decision Making,” *American Journal of Political Science* 45: 951-71.

### **Recommended Readings**

- John Zaller. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Chapters 1-3, 10
- [Lupia, Arthur. 1994. “Shortcuts Versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections.” \*American Political Science Review\* 88 \(March\): 63-76](#)
- Delli Carpini and Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why it Matters*. Chapters. 1, 2, 6.
- Jamie Druckman, James Kuklinski and Lee Sigelman (2009) “The Unmet potential of interdisciplinary research: political psychological approaches to voting and public opinion,” *Political Behavior*, 31(4): 485-510
- Martin Gilens (1995) “Racial Attitudes and Opposition to Welfare,” *Journal of Politics*, 57(4): 994-1014
- [Brad Gomez and J. Matthew Wilson \(2001\) “Political Sophistication and Economic Voting in the American Electorate,” \*American Journal of Political Science\*, 45\(4\):899-914](#)
- [Christopher Federico and J. Sidanius \(2002\) “Sophistication and the Antecedents of Whites’ Racial Policy Attitudes,” \*Public Opinion Quarterly\*, 66\(2\):145-176](#)
- [Marcus, George and Michael B. MacKuen, 1993. “Anxiety, Enthusiasm, and the Vote: The Emotional Underpinnings of Learning and Involvement during Presidential Campaigns,” \*American Political Science Review\* 87: 672-85.](#)
- Samara Klar (2013) “The Influence of Competing Identity Primes on Political Preferences,” *Journal of Politics*

\*\*\*March 24<sup>th</sup> SPRING BREAK NO CLASS\*\*\*

### **Week 11 (March 31) Congress & the Presidency**

Guest Lecturer: Dr. Noah Kaplan

Readings TBD.

### **April 7<sup>th</sup> (Week 12): The Judiciary**

Guest Lecturer: Dr. Evan McKenzie

Readings TBD.

### **April 14<sup>th</sup> (Week 13) State & Local Politics**

- [Lupia, A. et.al. \(2010\) "Why State Constitutions Differ in Their Treatment of Same-Sex Marriage." \*Journal of Politics\*, 72\(4\), pp. 1222-1235](#)
- Fiorina, Morris P. 1997. "Professionalism, Realignment, and Representation." *American Political Science Review* 91 (March): 156-162
- Gay, Claudine. 2007. "Legislating Without Constraints: The Effects of Minority Districting on Legislators' Responsiveness to Constituency Preferences." *Journal of Politics* 69 (May): 442-456
- Brown, Adam R. 2010. "Are Governors Responsible for the State Economy? Partisanship, Blame, and Divided Federalism." *Journal of Politics* 72 (July): 605-615
- Wright, Gerald and Brian F. Schaffner. 2002. "The Influence of Party: Evidence from the State Legislatures." *American Political Science Review* 96 (June): 367-379
- Tolbert, Caroline J. and Rodney E. Hero. 1996. "Race/Ethnicity and Direct Democracy: An Analysis of California's Illegal Immigration Initiative." *Journal of Politics* 58 (August): 806-818

#### **Recommended readings:**

- Gerber, Elisabeth R. 1996. "Legislative Response to the Threat of Popular Initiatives." *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (February): 99-128
- Barrilleaux, Charles and Michael Berkman. 2003. "Do Governors Matter? Budgeting Rules and the Politics of State Policymaking." *Political Research Quarterly* 56 (December): 409-417
- Hall, Melinda Gann. 2007. "Voting in State Supreme Court Elections: Competition and Context as Democratic Incentives." *Journal of Politics*, 69 (November): 1147-1159.
- Mooney, Christopher Z. 2009. "Term Limits as a Boon To Legislative Scholarship: A Review." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 9 (Summer): 79 -101
- Fiorina, Morris P. 1994. "Divided Government in the American States: A Byproduct of Legislative Professionalism?" *American Political Science Review* 88 (June): 304-31
- Erikson, Robert S., Gerald C. Wright, and John P. McIver. 1993. *Statehouse Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Meinke, Scott R. and Edward B. Hasecke. 2003. "Term Limits, Professionalization, and Partisan Control in U.S. State Legislatures." *Journal of Politics* 65 (August): 898-908
- Hogan, Robert E. 2004. "Challenger Emergence, Incumbent Success, and Electoral Accountability in State Legislative Elections." *Journal of Politics* 66 (November): 1283-1303
- McDermott, Monika L. 1998. "Race and Gender Cues in Low-Information Elections." *Political Research Quarterly* 51 (December): 895-918
- Tolbert, Caroline J., Daniel A. Smith, and John C. Green. 2009. "Strategic Voting and Legislative Redistricting Reform: District and Statewide Representational Winners and Losers." *Political Research Quarterly* 62 (March): 92-109
- Carsey, Thomas M., Robert A. Jackson, Melissa Stewart, and James P. Nelson. 2011. "Strategic Candidates, Campaign Dynamics, and Campaign Advertising in Gubernatorial Races." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 11 (September): 269-298

- Haider Markel, Donald P., Alana Querze, and Kara Lindaman. 2007. "Lose, Win, or Draw? A Reexamination of Direct Democracy and Minority Rights." *Political Research Quarterly* 60 (June): 304-314

#### **April 21 (Week 14) A Post-Racial America?**

- [Tessler, Michael and D.O. Sears \(2012\) \*Obama's Race: The 2008 Election and the Dream of a Post-Racial America\*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press, Chs. 1-2, 4-5](#)
- Pyszczynski, Tom, Carl Henthorn, Matt Motyl, K. Gerow (2010) "Is Obama the Anti Christ? Racial Priming, Extreme Criticisms of Barack Obama, and Attitudes Toward the 2008 U.S. Presidential Candidates," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(5): 863-866
- Plant, E. A., P.G. Devine, W. T.L. Cox, C. Columb, S.L. Miller, J. Goplen, & B. M. Peruche (2009) "The Obama Effect: Decreasing Implicit Prejudice and Stereotyping," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(4): 961-964
- [Appleby, J. and C. Federico \(2015\) "The Racialization of Electoral Fairness," \(manuscript\)](#)
- [Samuel Huntington "The Hispanic Challenge," \*Foreign Policy\* \(March/April 2004\), pp. 30-45](#)
- [Citrin, Jack et.al. 2007. "Testing Huntington: Is Hispanic Immigration a Threat to American Identity?" \*Perspectives on Politics\* 5\(1\), pp. 31-48](#)

#### **Recommended Readings:**

- Feldman, S. and L. Huddy (2004) "Racial resentment and White Opposition to Race-Conscious Programs: Principles or Prejudice?" *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(1):168-183
- [Tessler, Michael \(2012\) "The Spillover of Racialization into Healthcare: How president Obama Polarized Public Opinion by racial Attitudes and Race," \*American Journal of Political Science\*, 56\(3\): 690-704](#)
- Hero, Rodney. 2004. "Social Capital and Racial Inequality in America," *Perspectives on Politics* 1, (1): 113-122.
- Filindra, A. and J. Junn (2012) "Aliens and People of Color: The Multidimensional Relationship of Immigration Policy and Racial Classification in the U.S.," in D. Tichenor and M. Rosenblum, eds. *Oxford Handbook of International Migration*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 429-455

#### **April 28<sup>th</sup> (Week 15): What about those "others"?**

- Waters, Mary C. (1990) *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, Introduction and Ch 1-2.
- Masuoka, N. (2008) "Defining the Group: Latino Identity and Political Participation," *American Politics Research*,
- [Gay, Claudine \(2006\) "Seeing Difference: The Effect of Economic Disparity on Black Attitudes Toward Latinos," \*AJPS\*, 50\(4\):982-997](#)
- [McClain, P.D. et.al. \(2006\) "Racial Distancing in a Southern City Latino Immigrants' Views of Black Americans," \*The Journal of Politics\*, 68\(3\):571-584](#)
- Segura, G.N. and H.A. Rodrigues (2006) "Comparative Ethnic Politics in the United States: Beyond Black and White," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9:375-395

#### **Recommended Readings:**

- DeFrascisco Soto, V. and J.L. Merolla (2008) "Se Habla Espanol: Ethnic Campaign Strategies and Latino Voting Behavior," in Jane Junn and K. Haynie (eds.) *New Race Politics in America: Understanding Minority and Immigrant Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Barreto, M. and G. Segura (2004) "The Mobilizing Effects of Majority-Minority Districts on Latino Turn-out," *APSR*, 98(1): 65-75
- Junn, J. and K. L. Haynie (2008) *New Race Politics in America: Understanding Minority and Immigrant Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press

- Prewitt, Kenneth (2006) “Immigrants and the Changing Categories of Race,” in *Transforming Politics, Transforming America*. T. Lee, K. Ramakrishnan and R. Ramirez (eds). Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press
- Junn, J. (2006) “When Does Ethnicity Have Political Consequences?” (same)