

**POLS560**  
**American Politics Graduate Seminar**  
**Instructor: Dr. Alexandra Filindra**  
**Email: [aleka@uic.edu](mailto:aleka@uic.edu)**  
**Class hours: Wednesday 4-6:30pm**  
**Office hours: Tuesday-Thursday 2:00-4:00pm 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. Research design paper (1,200-1,500 words, including references). You will select one of the books to write a research design paper. **(20% of the grade)**
2. Two critical review papers of a book or article (1,200-1,500 words). **(30% of the grade)**
3. 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. **(20% of the grade)**
4. **Response papers (10% of grade):** On an alternate basis (one week the one and the next week the other), students who are not assigned to write a critical review or a research design paper should prepare 1) a short (no more than 500 words) critical summary of the readings; 2) a “reversed-engineered” research design for the week’s assigned reading.
5. **Response to classmates research designs (10% of grade):** Every class will begin with a half-hour discussion of the previous week’s research designs. Everyone except for the authors will submit one-two paragraph critiques of the previous week’s research designs. Bring copies for me and for the authors. This is a mini-peer review process, so be critical but also thoughtful, nice and helpful.
6. **10% of the grade is class participation and attendance.**

## Required Books

- Miller, Lisa (2010) *The Perils of Federalism: Race Poverty and the Politics of Crime Control*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Aldrich, John (1995) *Why Parties: The Origins and Transformation of Party Politics in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Karpf, David (2012) *The MoveOn Effect: The Unexpected Transformation of American Political Advocacy*. Oxford University Press
- John Zaller. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*.
- Lodge, Milton and Charles Taber (2013) *The Rationalizing Voter*. Cambridge University Press
- Arnold, D. (1992), *The Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Tessler, Michael and David Sears(2010) *Obama's Race: the 2008 Election and the Dream of a Post-Racial America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

**The Four Questions**  
**(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 Reverse Engineered Research Designs (adapted from Michael D. Shafer's IPE Syllabus)**

Books do not fall from heaven. In fact, the better the book, the less likely it is to have been immaculately conceived (though authors would love for you to think so!). The purpose of this assignment, therefore, is to get you to “reverse-engineer” the books we read, to figure out how they were made, and why they were made the way they were. Think of it as taking apart the machine and putting it back together piece-by-piece. As a budding political scientist, you need to be able to do this for two reasons: first, figuring out how books are written is an essential part of figuring out their strengths and weaknesses. Only if you understand what stuff they are made of, can you fully assess an empirical investigation's power. Second, understanding the mechanics of political science book-writing is part of the learning process. After all, your goal is to write one of these books, too.

Much like your answers to the “Four Questions,” your reverse engineered research designs should be short, tight sketches. They should, however, answer the following questions:

1. What is the author's big question? What's the conundrum (empirical/theoretical) that so intrigued the author that s/he *had to* write this book?
2. Given this conundrum, what hypotheses did the author develop to get at the big question (dependent variable; independent variables; intervening variables; asserted causal connections; etc)?
3. Given the author's conundrum, what were the alternative methods by which s/he could have puzzled out the answer?
4. Why did the author choose the method that s/he used?
5. How did the author define confirming/disconfirming data (i.e., how did s/he specify how s/he would KNOW if s/he was right?)

## **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, two of the papers that you have to prepare for this course will not be mere critiques of the work of others. They 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 statement of the “big question” including reference to the relevant, competing analytic approaches;
2. A statement of the method and its applicability to the question at hand;
3. 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);
4. Specification of the independent variable(s) and their characteristics and sources;
5. A statement of the hypothesized causal connection, the process that links the dependent and independent variables;
6. 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)
7. 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.

## Course in Detail

### Week 1 (August 27): No class

**\*\*\*Please identify the readings that you want to use for your presentations, research design and critical reviews. At least one paper has to be on a book not article.\*\*\***

### Week 2 (September 3): Introduction to American Politics

#### Readings

- Jane Mansbridge (2014) “What is Political Science For?” *Perspectives on Politics*, 12(1):8-17
- Hardin, Russell. 2002. “Whither Political Science?” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(2):183-86.
- Bacharach, Peter and Morton S. Baratz. 1962. “Two Faces of Power”. *American Political Science Review*. 56 (4): 947-952
- Robert Dahl. 1961. “The Behavioral Approach to Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest,” *American Political Science Review* 55:763-772.
- Theodore Lowi. 1992. “How We’ve Become What We Study.” *American Political Science Review*. 86: 1-7.
- Gosnell, H.F. 1933. Statisticians and Political Scientists. *American Political Science Review*, 27(3):392-403

### Week 3 (September 10): The Role of Ideas & Institutions in American Politics

- McClosky, Herbert. 1964. Consensus and Ideology in American Politics. *American Political Science Review*. 58(2):361-82
- 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(**on blackboard**)
- 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.

#### Recommended:

- *The Federalist Papers* (any edition), Numbers 10, 51, 70, 78
- 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 4 (September 17): Federalism

- Miller, Lisa (2010) *The Perils of Federalism: Race Poverty and the Politics of Crime Control*. New York: Oxford University Press
- 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)

#### Recommended:

- Derthick, Martha “Federalism and the Politics of Tobacco”, *Publius*, Vol. 31, No. 1, (Winter, 2001), pp. 47-63
- Mettler, Suzanne (1998) *Dividing Citizens: Gender and Federalism in New Deal Public Policies*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Volden, Craig (2005) “Intergovernmental Political Competition in American Federalism” *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (Apr., 2005), pp. 327-342
- Peterson, Paul (1995) *The Price of Federalism*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution

## **Week 5 (September 24): Pluralism & Elitism**

### **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

#### **Recommended:**

- 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*.

## **Week 6 (October 1): Representation**

#### **Required readings**

- Tali Mendelberg, et.al. (2014) “Gender Inequality in Deliberation: Unpacking the Black Box of Interaction”, *Perspectives on Politics* 12(1):18-44
- 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, 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

## **Week 7 (October 8): Political Parties**

#### **Required readings:**

- Aldrich, John (1995) *Why Parties: The Origins and Transformation of Party Politics in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Seymour Martin Lipset and Gary Marks (2000) *It Didn't Happen: Why Socialism Failed in the United States*. New York: Norton, Ch. 1-2
- Alan Ware (1987) "Parties and Democratic Theory," in *Citizens, Parties and the State: A Reappraisal*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1-29 (blackboard)
- Robert Michaels (1911) "Democracy and the Iron Law of Oligarchy," *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press (blackboard)

**Recommended:**

- James Madison, Federalist 10, <http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa10.htm>
- Robert Michaels (1911) Mechanical and Technical Impossibility of Direct Government by the Masses," *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press (blackboard)
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira .2002. "Political Parties and the Recruitment of Women to State Legislatures," *Journal of Politics* 64, (3): 791-809.
- Paul Frymer, 1999. *Uneasy Alliances: Race and Party Competition in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Ch. 1-4.
- John J. Coleman, "Unified Government, Divided Government, and Party Responsiveness." *American Political Science Review* vol. 93, no. 4 (Dec. 1999): 821-835.
- Anthony Downs. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*.

**Week 8 (October 15): Congress**

- Arnold, D. (1992), *The Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

**Week 9 (October 22): Interest Groups & Political Advocacy**

**Required Readings:**

- Karpf, David (2012) *The Move-On Effect: The Unexpected Transformation of American Political Advocacy*. Oxford University Press
- Jack Walker. 1983. "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in the United States." *American Political Science Review*. 77: 390-406.

**Recommended:**

- Baumgartner, Frank and Beth Leech (1998) *Basic Interests: The Importance of Groups in Politics and in Political Science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

**Week 10 (October 29): Judiciary**

- Cameron, Charles M., Jeffrey A. Segal, and Donald Songer. 2000. "Strategic Auditing in a Political Hierarchy: An Informational Model of the Supreme Court's Certiorari Decisions." *American Political Science Review*. Vol. 94, March .
- Jeffrey Segal and Harold Spaeth. 2002. *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited*. (Cambridge University Press) Chapters 3 and 8. (blackboard)
- Epstein, Lee, and Jack Knight. 2000. "Field Essay: Toward a Strategic Revolution in

Judicial Politics: A Look Back, A Look Ahead.” *Political Research Quarterly*. Vol. 53, No. 3 (Sep., 2000), pp. 625-661

### **Week 11 (November 5): Political Participation**

#### **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.
- 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

#### **Recommended:**

- 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 12 (November 12): Public Opinion**

- John Zaller. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Chapters 1-7, 10
- 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

#### **Recommended**

- 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

### **Week 13 (November 19) Political Psychology**

- Lodge & Taber The Rationalizing Public

### **Recommended**

- 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.
- 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.
- Samara Klar (2013) "The Influence of Competing Identity Primes on Political Preferences," *Journal of Politics* (blackboard)

### **Thanksgiving (November 26): NO CLASS**

### **Week 14 (December 3): Race and Ethnicity**

- Tessler, Michael and David Sears, Obama's Race
- Joel Olson "Whiteness and the Polarization of American Politics" *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (Dec., 2008), pp. 704-718

### **Recommended**

- 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
- 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