

ADVANCED TOPICS IN AMERICAN POLITICS (84-421)

AMERICAN POLITICS GRADUATE SEMINAR (84-721)

Instructor: Dr. Jonathan Cervas - cervas@cmu.edu

Location: DH1209 ([Link](#))

Time: Tuesday and Thursday: 1:25-2:45 PM EST

Office Hours by appointment

SCOPE AND PURPOSE:

- This course examines prominent classical and contemporary works in the two major subfields in American politics, political institutions, and political behavior.
- This seminar will address topics such as Congress, presidency, bureaucracy, and courts, but also public opinion, elections, campaigns, political parties, and the importance of geography, wealth, ethnicity, gender, and religion in politics, among other subjects.
- There will be an emphasis on analyzing and appraising the theory, methodology, and contributions of the selected readings.
- This course will include advanced undergraduates as well as graduate students.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

- The purpose of this course is to introduce students to major themes and some of the best scholarships from political science literature. This course emphasizes breadth over depth.
- To facilitate discussion, it is important that you write as well as read and think in advance about how the readings address the overall topic for that session. I will infuse the course with empirical data to better examine theoretical questions and to situate the course in modern politics and current events.
- The two most important skills that introductory graduate students need to master are the abilities to understand the development of literature and the ability to write critically, succinctly, and objectively about these literatures. To this end, the main writing requirements for this course are papers that seek to help students develop these skills. These papers are not summaries or personal responses (thus, lines of thoughts and phrases such as "I really liked...", "My feelings on the matter..." etc. are irrelevant to these assignments).

IMPORTANT DATES (ASSIGNMENTS DUE BY 11:59PM):

- August 31 – First day of class
- September 12 – op-ed topic due
- September 26 – First Draft of op-ed due, circulated for comments
- October 3 – Return draft to your classmate
- October 14 – Final Draft of op-ed due, Mid-semester break, no class
- October 17 – Topic selection for area specialization & Book review papers due
- November 14 – Book Summary due
- November 25 – Thanksgiving break, no class
- November 30 – Area Specialization Paper due
- December 2 – Last Day of class

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

20% – Participation (In person attendance where applicable, or attending Zoom meetings)

20% – Additional Reading Assignments

Op-ed/Editorial/Blog

5% – (*first draft*)

15% – (*final draft*)

15% – Book Summary

25% – Area Specialization Paper

PARTICIPATION:

It is important that you discuss the readings with your fellow students (who benefit from hearing how others interpret the literature); you will also be expected to contribute to the overall knowledge of the class. Your perspective on the political world, the news media you consume, and your interpretation of both historical and contemporary politics are different than others, and I expect that you will share those. To this end, you will be encouraged to track presidential approval ratings, political polls, election forecast predictions, economic indicators (like unemployment), and other such data. Following current events will help facilitate discussion throughout the semester.

Everyone will be reading excerpts from two core texts:

[A Different Democracy](#) -- Taylor, Steven L., Matthew Soberg Shugart, Arend Lijphard, and Bernard Grofman. 2014. *A Different Democracy: American Government in a 31-Country Perspective*. Yale University Press. ([Purchase here](#))

[American Voter Revisited](#) -- Lewis-Beck, Michael, Helmut Norpoth, William Jacoby, and Herbert Weisberg. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/fulcrum.zp38wd48w>

[Electoral Connection](#) -- Mayhew, David R. 2004. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. Second Edi. Yale University Press.

[Logic of Collective Action](#) -- Olson, Mancur. 1965. *Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. ([Purchase on Amazon](#))

Everyone has an equal voice in this course. When you disagree, challenge, or respond to the idea, not the person. Nobody has a monopoly on opinion or time, and I will do my best to allow each of you to speak your mind and adjust the course accordingly so that everyone gets value from their time. My main goal is to give you value, and I am open to changes that allow for that.

I have divided the class into 10 sections/topics, some of which are reflected in the required readings, and others which are only part of the optional readings. Unfortunately, we will not have enough time to cover all topics pertinent to American politics in full.

WRITING ASSIGNMENTS:

(1) Weekly additional "optional" reading: Every week (starting week 2, Sept 7), you are to select one paper from the list of optional readings at the end of this syllabus, or one not on the list but that fits the section we are currently focused on. You will read this paper and create an outline (a bullet point outline, literally) that tells us the thesis, findings, and conclusions. You may write in prose (should not exceed one page, max), but it is not required. We will share these with the class for others to use when preparing their area specialization papers. My hope is, because you all have a variety of interests, that we will get significant variation on papers to cover most of those I have listed, or others you find interesting. That said, it is okay if several people read the same paper, though, that would give me more reason to make those papers part of the regular discussion!

The purpose of this is to help you find the key insights from the readings, understand the empirical or intellectual contribution, and how it fits into the field more broadly. This is additionally helpful because it will allow for quick reference if you are writing a term paper on the subject. This is the equivalent of an annotated bibliography, but you can structure them in whatever way is most helpful for you. These are the notes you take while you read. I am not interested in grading grammar or spelling for this task. We will combine everyone's contribution in a shared, editable document, so each person has a summary of all articles assigned this quarter and can contribute additional insights. You will present your article to the class two times to help us understand their unique contribution.

(2) Mini-lecture: On two occasions you will present one of these papers to the class; a mini “lecture.” PowerPoints are not necessary, though you are welcome to use any additional presentation skills, including analyzing new data or sharing YouTube videos, PowerPoint, and other visual aids, if applicable.

(2) Op-ed/Editorial/Blog: prepare a short essay advocating for (or against) any social or political issue of your choosing (topics relating to American politics) should be approved by the professor within the first two weeks of the semester). The idea is that you will write something that can be submitted to a newspaper or internet blog. There is a strict 1,250-word limit. Concise arguments made for a more general audience are the goal of this assignment; something your parents can read and understand. The use of data and visualizations is strongly encouraged. We will circulate drafts on September 26 to one other graduate student who will offer critiques and/or proof reading. On October 13 we will circulate all the final drafts. These will be the reading assignments for November 30.

(3) Book Review: You are to choose one book of your choice of academic nature, regarding any subject on American politics. I have a wide selection of books you can choose from, or you can utilize the library to find a book. Your instructor will help you find something that is relevant to your interests along with being germane to the subjects in the course. In total, the book review should be no longer than 6-8 pages, double-spaced. It should tell the reader the subject of the book, what it did well, what it left out, and your own thoughts about its relevance or importance. You should choose a book that can help give insight into your area specialization paper.

(3) Area Specialization Paper: In lieu of a final exam, you are to choose either one of the subjects we explore during the course or a topic of your choosing (see below) and do a literature review and develop one, or several, hypotheses. The professor can help you find relevant articles and provide strategies for conducting research. You will submit a 5-8 single-spaced page paper (not including references and title page) that does the following:

- Synthesizes the contributions made by the assigned readings to current scholarly understanding in the specific field area (e.g., campaigns and elections)
- Identifies one or two lingering questions raised by the readings and explains specifically why those questions are important to furthering our understanding of the field area
- Outlines and discusses a research design with the potential to answer the lingering question(s). Explain why the design is optimal for addressing the question(s) and acknowledge limitations of the design.

The specialization paper will help you build your skills in the areas of synthesizing works for a literature review, formulating research questions and devising appropriate methodologies for answering those questions. This paper is a critical evaluation that explains the literature's strengths and weaknesses with respect to the goals and process of social scientific research and that charts their impact on subsequent research. Students may find it helpful to consult many published articles in preparing their papers. Any information taken from these sources must be cited appropriately and is used to augment students' own analysis. To create a literature review you need not read every paper you cite thoroughly, just well enough to make the connection between your through/story and their findings. Though I am asking you to produce a research design which proposes tests to one or several hypotheses, you will not need to conduct empirical analyses (though you certainly may and I encourage you to, if possible). The paper you write in this class may be the basis of your master's thesis or other future publication. Formatting should be consistent throughout, though no style is required. (**Graduate Students** – You will, during the final week, give the class a presentation of your papers, summarizing the book and articles you have read. ~20 mins)

Examples of deep dives topics include incumbency advantage in American elections, state legislative professionalization, polarization (mass and elite), economic inequality, racial resentment, election forecasting, women in politics, segregation and other spatial context issues, gerrymandering, policy diffusion, and so on. The amount of research done on American politics is infinite, so we cannot cover everything during the semester. This assignment allows us to dial into a topic you find most interesting.

READINGS:

The assigned readings present only a starting point for people looking to specialize in American politics. You should consult the instructors for recommendations of further essential readings beyond those assigned here. It is expected that every week you will have engage the readings closely and critically, and that you come to class prepared to participate in rigorous discussion of them. Specifically, you should be able to address the following upon reading each work.

- What are the main themes of the work?
- What are the main contributions of this work to our understanding of politics?
- What are the limitations of or areas for improvement for this work (focusing on its theoretical argument, hypotheses, evidence, analysis, interpretation of results, etc.)?
- What did you not understand about this work?
- What next steps can you envision to effectively build on the major contributions of this work?

Readings will draw heavily from the Annual Review of Political Science, a journal that “covers significant developments in the field of Political Science.” This allows you to get a considerable overview of the field, while not costing you any money!

My expectation is they you will “read” all the assigned articles, but I recognize that I have assigned quite a lot. You should minimally *skim* all the assigned readings. Learning good skimming skills is particularly important; arguably, the most important thing you can learn as a graduate student. Journal articles follow a very formulaic outline, which makes skimming easy. You will need to be sure to capture enough of the content to discuss the article with your peers.

Like American democracy itself, this syllabus is subject to amendment. The process of amendment is as follows: (1) all students and the professor get one vote; (2) a simple majority of voters agree to a change; (2) a student's vote is weighted as $1/n$ where n =number of students and a professor has a vote weighted as $n+1$. All amendments will be announced publicly, and no student shall be injured by changes.

Class will be organized under several general topics, ranging from theory and design of American democracy to polarization, identity formation, political communication, and others. The readings listed below are required. You are also expected to choose from the other reading list a series of articles throughout the semester, as detailed above.

CLASS SCHEDULE:

- Tuesday, August 31
 - Introductions and discussion of the semester & syllabus
 - **American Democracy Theory and Design**
 - September 2
 - How democratic is the American Constitution? Dahl, R. A. (2003). Yale University Press. (digital copy) - Quick and dirty read
 - September 7
 - A Different Democracy (Chapter 1, 2, & 3)
 - September 9
 - Fiorina, M. P. (2016). A Historical Perspective. *A Hoover Institution Essay on Contemporary American Politics*, Ser. 9. <https://www.hoover.org/research/historical-perspective>
 - September 14
 - A Different Democracy (Chapter 4, 5, & 6)
 - September 16
 - Fiorina, M. P. (2016). Is the US Experience Exceptional? A Hoover Institution Essay on Contemporary American Politics, Ser. 8. <https://www.hoover.org/sites/default/files/research/docs/fiorinaistheusexperienceexcep8pdf.pdf>
 - September 21
 - A Different Democracy (Chapter 7, 8, 9, & 10)
 - **Ideology and Opinion Formation; Cognition, Information, and Knowledge; Groups, Self-Interest, and Symbolic Politics**
 - September 23
 - Converse, P. E. (2006). The nature of belief systems in mass publics (1964). *Critical Review*, 18(1–3), 1–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08913810608443650>
- September 26 - First Drafts of op-ed/editorial/blog post due and circulated

- September 28
 - American Voter Revisited (Section I & II)
- September 30
 - Berinsky, A. J. (2017). Measuring Public Opinion with Surveys. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 20(1), 309–329. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-101513-113724>
- October 3 – *Return op-ed to your classmates with feedback and corrections*
- October 5
 - American Voter Revisited (Section III, Chap. 6, 7, & 8)
- October 7
 - Continue American Voter Revisited
- October 12
 - American Voter Revisited (Section III, Chap. 9 & 10)
- October 13 - *Op-ed/editorial/blog post final draft due*
- October 14 – **Mid-Semester Break, no class**
 - American Voter Revisited (Section IV, V, & Afterword)
- October 17 – *Topic selection for book review and area specialization due*
- **Party Identification and Polarization**
 - October 19
 - Dalton, R. J. (2016). Party Identification and Its Implications. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.72>
 - Dalton, R. J. (2020). The blinders of partisanship. In *Research handbook on political partisanship* (pp. 74–88).
 - October 21
 - Abramowitz, A. I., & Webster, S. W. (2018). Negative Partisanship: Why Americans Dislike Parties But Behave Like Rabid Partisans. *Political Psychology*, 39(S1), 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12479>
 - Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., & Westwood, S. J. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051117-073034>
- **Political Communication & Media**
 - October 26
 - Popkin, Samuel L. 2006. “Changing Media, Changing Politics.” *Perspectives on Politics* 4(02): 327–41. http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1537592706060245
 - Prior, Markus. 2013. “Media and Political Polarization.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 16(1): 101–27. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-polisci-100711-135242>.
 - October 28
 - Levendusky, M. S. (2013). Why Do Partisan Media Polarize Viewers? *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(3), 611–623. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12008>
 - Guess, Andrew M. 2021. “(Almost) Everything in Moderation: New Evidence on Americans’ Online Media Diets.” *American Journal of Political Science* 00(00): 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12589>
- **Collective Action**
 - November 2
 - Logic of Collective Action (Sections I, II, III)
 - November 4
 - Logic of Collective Action (Sections IV, V, VI)
- **Political Participation**
 - November 9
 - Riker, W. H., & Ordeshook, P. C. (1968). A Theory of the Calculus of Voting. *American Political Science Review*, 62(1), 25–42. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1953324>
 - November 11
 - ANOLL, A. P. (2018). What Makes a Good Neighbor? Race, Place, and Norms of Political Participation. *American Political Science Review*, 112(3), 494–508. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055418000175>
 - Putnam, R. D. (1995). Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 28(4), 664. <https://doi.org/10.2307/420517>
- November 14 – *Book Summary Due*
- **Campaigns and Elections**
 - November 16
 - Electoral Connection - (quick and dirty)
 - November 18

- Jacobson, G. C. (2015). How Do Campaigns Matter? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18(1), 31–47. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-072012-113556>
- **Social Influence and Context**
 - November 23
 - Trounstein, J. (2016). Segregation and Inequality in Public Goods. *American Journal of Political Science*, 60(3), 709–725. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12227>
 - Enos, R. D. (2014). Causal effect of intergroup contact on exclusionary attitudes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(10), 3699–3704. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1317670111>
 - November 25 (Thanksgiving Week) - No Class
 - November 30 - *Area Specialization paper due*
 - Read Final Drafts of op-eds/editorials/blogs for all your classmates
 - We will discuss area specialization papers
 - December 2 (Last Class)
 - No Readings
 - We will continue to discuss area specialization papers

The readings below are optional, organized by section.

- **American Democracy Theory and Design**
 - The Federalist Papers, Numbers 10, 51, and 70 – *these are important foundational documents for understanding American political institutions*
 - The Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution – *you should be familiar with these documents*
 - Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Part I, Sections 2, 3, and 5; Part II, Sections 3-9 (all from Volume 1)
 - Mansbridge, Jane. 2014. "What Is Political Science For?" *Perspectives on Politics* 12(1): 8–17.
 - Schmitter, Philippe C, and Terry Lynn Karl. 1991. "What Democracy Is... and Is Not." *Journal of Democracy* 2(3): 75–88. http://muse.jhu.edu/content/crossref/journals/journal_of_democracy/v002/2.3schmitter.pdf
 - Miller, Warren E., and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57(1): 45–56. https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055400240203/type/journal_article.
 - Fiorina, M. P. (2016). An Era of Tenuous Majorities. *A Hoover Institution Essay on Contemporary American Politics, Ser. 1*. <https://www.hoover.org/research/era-tenuous-majorities-historical-context>
 - Lutz, Donald S. 1994. "Toward a Theory of Constitutional Amendment." *American Political Science Review* 88(2): 355–70. https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055400092789/type/journal_article.
 - MacGilvray, E. (2016). Robert Dahl, A Preface to Democratic Theory. In J. T. Levy (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Classics in Contemporary Political Theory*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198717133.013.30>
 - Carpini, Michael X Delli, and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. Yale University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1cc2kv1>.
- **Ideology and Opinion Formation; Cognition, Information, and Knowledge; Groups, Self-Interest, and Symbolic Politics**
 - Zaller, J., & Feldman, S. (1992). A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(3), 579. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111583>
 - Freeder, Sean, Gabriel S. Lenz, and Shad Turney. 2019. "The Importance of Knowing 'What Goes with What': Reinterpreting the Evidence on Policy Attitude Stability." *Journal of Politics* 81(1): 274–90.
 - Lenz, G. S. (2009). Learning and opinion change, not priming: Reconsidering the priming hypothesis. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(4), 821–837. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2009.00403.x>
 - Tesler, M. (2015). Priming Predispositions and Changing Policy Positions: An Account of When Mass Opinion Is Primed or Changed. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(4), 806–824. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12157>

- Tesler, M. (2012). The Spillover of Racialization into Health Care: How President Obama Polarized Public Opinion by Racial Attitudes and Race. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(3), 690–704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2011.00577.x>
 - Lupia, A. (1994). Shortcuts Versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections. *American Political Science Review*, 88(1), 63–76. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2944882>
 - Simon, H. A. (1985). Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science. *American Political Science Review*, 79(2), 293–304. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1956650>
 - Warshaw, C. (2019). Local Elections and Representation in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22(1), 461–479. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-050317-071108>
 - Bonica, A. (2014). Mapping the Ideological Marketplace. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(2), 367–386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12062>
 - Gilens, Martin. 2001. "Political Ignorance and Collective Policy Preferences." *American Political Science Review* 95(2): 379–96. https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055401002222/type/journal_article.
 - Levendusky, M. S. (2010). Clearer Cues, More Consistent Voters: A Benefit of Elite Polarization. *Political Behavior*, 32(1), 111–131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-009-9094-0>
 - Delli Carpini, M. X. (2005). An Overview of the State of Citizens' Knowledge About Politics. In M. S. McKinney, L. L. Kaid, D. G. Bystrom, & D. B. Carlin (Eds.), *Communicating politics: Engaging the public in democratic life* (pp. 27–40). Peter Lang. http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers
 -
- **Party Identification and Polarization**
 - Fiorina, M. P. (2016). Has the American public polarized? A Hoover Institution Essay on Contemporary American Politics, Ser. 2. <https://www.hoover.org/research/has-american-public-polarized>
 - Bafumi, J., & Shapiro, R. Y. (2009). A New Partisan Voter. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381608090014>
 - Grofman, B. (2004). Downs and Two-Party Convergence. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7(1), 25–46. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104711>
 - Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., & Westwood, S. J. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051117-073034>
 - Iyengar, S., & Westwood, S. J. (2015). Fear and Loathing across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(3), 690–707. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12152>
 - Bullock, J. G., & Lenz, G. (2019). Partisan bias in surveys. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, 325–342. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051117-050904>
 - Fiorina, M. P., Abrams, S. A., & Pope, J. C. (2008). Polarization in the American Public: Misconceptions and Misreadings. *The Journal of Politics*, 70(2), 556–560. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002238160808050X>
 - Bankert, A. (2020). Partisan Identity and Political Decision Making. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1027>
 - Abramowitz, A., & McCoy, J. (2018). United States: Racial Resentment, Negative Partisanship, and Polarization in Trump's America. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 681(1), 137–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716218811309>
 - Pildes, R. H. (2011). Why the Center Does Not Hold: The Causes of Hyperpolarized Democracy in America. *California Law Review*, 99(2). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23018603>
 - Druckman, J. N., & Levendusky, M. S. (2019). What Do We Measure When We Measure Affective Polarization? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 83(1), 114–122. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfz003>
 - **Representation & Public Opinion**
 - Laver, M. (2014). Measuring Policy Positions in Political Space. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17(1), 207–223. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-061413-041905>
 - M. DYNES, A., & HOLBEIN, J. B. (2020). Noisy Retrospection: The Effect of Party Control on Policy Outcomes. *American Political Science Review*, 114(1), 237–257. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055419000649>

- Sides, J., Tausanovitch, C., Vavreck, L., & Warshaw, C. (2020). On the Representativeness of Primary Electorates. *British Journal of Political Science*, 50(2), 677–685. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000712341700062X>
 - Broockman, D. E. (2016). Approaches to Studying Policy Representation. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 41(1), 181–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsg.12110>
 - BAFUMI, J., & HERRON, M. C. (2010). Leapfrog Representation and Extremism: A Study of American Voters and Their Members in Congress. *American Political Science Review*, 104(3), 519–542. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000316>
 - G. S. Lenz, *Follow the Leader? How Voters Respond to Politicians' Policies and Performance* (University of Chicago Press, 2013).
 - Stimson, J. A., Mackuen, M. B., & Erikson, R. S. (1995). Dynamic Representation. *American Political Science Review*, 89(3), 543–565. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2082973>
 - Tufte, E. R. (1973). The Relationship between Seats and Votes in Two-Party Systems. *American Political Science Review*, 67(2), 540–554. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1958782>
 - Rehfeld, Andrew. 2009. "Representation Rethought: On Trustees, Delegates, and Gyroscopes in the Study of Political Representation and Democracy." *American Political Science Review* 103(2): 214–30.
 - Erikson, R. S. (2015). Income Inequality and Policy Responsiveness. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18(1), 11–29. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-020614-094706>
 - Gilens, M. (2005). Inequality and Democratic Responsiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 69(5), 778–796. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pog/nfi058>
 - Mansbridge, J. (1999). Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent "Yes." *The Journal of Politics*, 61(3), 628–657. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2647821>
 - Broockman, David E. 2014. "Distorted Communication, Unequal Representation: Constituents Communicate Less to Representatives Not of Their Race." *American Journal of Political Science* 58(2): 307–21.
 - Lax, J. R., & Phillips, J. H. (2012). The Democratic Deficit in the States. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(1), 148–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2011.00537.x>
 - Piketty, T., & Saez, E. (2003). Income Inequality in the United States. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(1), 1913–1998. www.nber.org/papers/W8467
 - Gilens, M., & Page, B. I. (2014). Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens. *Perspectives on Politics*, 12(3), 564–581. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592714001595>
 - Lax, J. R., Phillips, J. H., Beber, B., Beim, D., Domi, T., Erikson, R., Gelman, A., Haider-Markel, D., Harris, F., Huber, J., Kastellec, J., Kousser, T., McCarty, N., Rader, K., Shapiro, R., Schwartzberg, M., Su, Y.-S., & Wright, G. (2020). Gay Rights in the States: Public Opinion and Policy Responsiveness. *American Political Science Review*, 103(3). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409990050>
 - Hainmueller, J., & Hopkins, D. J. (2014). Public Attitudes Toward Immigration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17(1), 225–249. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-102512-194818>
- **Political Participation**
 - McDonald, M. P., & Popkin, S. L. (2001). The Myth of the Vanishing Voter. *American Political Science Review*, 95(4), 963–974. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055400400134>
 - Cox, G. W. (2015). Electoral Rules, Mobilization, and Turnout. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18(1), 49–68. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-060414-035915>
 - Uhlaner, C. J., Cain, B., & Kiewiet, D. R. (1989). Political Participation of Ethnic Minorities in the 1980s. *Political Behavior*, 11(3), 195–231. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/586152%0A>
 - Shino, E., & Smith, D. A. (2020). Mobilizing the Youth Vote? Early Voting on College Campuses. *Election Law Journal: Rules, Politics, and Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1089/elj.2019.0596>
 - Szewczyk, J., & Crowder-Meyer, M. (123 C.E.). Community Income Inequality and the Economic Gap in Participation. *Political Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-020-09621-6>
 - Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper & Row.
 - **Campaigns and Elections**
 - Enos, R. D., & Hersh, E. D. (2017). Campaign Perceptions of Electoral Closeness: Uncertainty, Fear and Over-Confidence. *British Journal of Political Science*, 47(3), 501–519. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123415000435>
 - Huber, G. A., & Arceneaux, K. (2007). Identifying the persuasive effects of presidential advertising. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(4), 957–977. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00291.x>

- Gelman, A. (2007). Rich State, Poor State, Red State, Blue State: What's the Matter with Connecticut? *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 2(4), 345–367. <https://doi.org/10.1561/100.00006026>
- Gelman, A., Goel, S., Rivers, D., & Rothschild, D. (2016). The Mythical Swing Voter. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 11(1), 103–130. <https://doi.org/10.1561/100.00015031>
- Gelman, A., & King, G. (1993). Why Are American Presidential Election Campaign Polls So Variable When Votes Are So Predictable? *British Journal of Political Science*, 23(04), 409. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123400006682>
- Abramowitz, A., & Panagopoulos, C. (2020). Trump on the Trail: Assessing the Impact of Presidential Campaign Visits on Voting Behavior in the 2018 Midterm Elections. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, psq.12664. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psq.12664>
- GERBER, A. S., GIMPEL, J. G., GREEN, D. P., & SHAW, D. R. (2011). How Large and Long-lasting Are the Persuasive Effects of Televised Campaign Ads? Results from a Randomized Field Experiment. *American Political Science Review*, 105(1), 135–150. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541000047X>
- Uhlaner, C. J. (1989). Rational Turnout: The Neglected Role of Groups. *American Journal of Political Science*, 33(2), 390. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111153>
- Bartels, L. M. (1996). Uninformed Votes: Information Effects in Presidential Elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(1), 194. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111700>
- Green, D P, and A S Gerber. 2019. *Get Out the Vote: How to Increase Voter Turnout*. Brookings Institution Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=IPlyDwAAQBAJ>.
- Kinder, D. R., & Kiewiet, D. R. (1981). Sociotropic Politics: The American Case. *British Journal of Political Science*, 11(2), 129–161. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123400002544>
- Kalla, Joshua L., and David E. Broockman. 2018. "The Minimal Persuasive Effects of Campaign Contact in General Elections: Evidence from 49 Field Experiments." *American Political Science Review* 112(1): 148–66.
- Fiorina, M. P. (2017). The 2016 Presidential Election — Identities, Class, and Culture. Hoover Institution. <https://www.hoover.org/research/2016-presidential-election-identities-class-and-culture>
- **Collective Action**
 - Lupia, Arthur, and Gisela Sin. 2003. "Which Public Goods Are Endangered." *Public Choice*: 315–31. <http://link.springer.com/10.1023/B:PUCH.0000003735.07840.c7>
 - Congleton, Roger D. 2015. "The Logic of Collective Action and Beyond." *Public Choice* 164(3–4): 217–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-015-0266-7>
 - Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
 - Axelrod, R., & Hamilton, W. D. (1981). The evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 27, 1390–1396. <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~axe/research/Axelrod%20and%20Hamilton%20EC%201981.pdf>
- **Social Influence and Context**
 - Enos, R. D., Kaufman, A. R., & Sands, M. L. (2019). Can Violent Protest Change Local Policy Support? Evidence from the Aftermath of the 1992 Los Angeles Riot. *American Political Science Review*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055419000340>
 - Lupton, R. N., & McKee, S. C. (2020). Dixie's Drivers: Core Values and the Southern Republican Realignment. *The Journal of Politics*, 82(3), 921–936. <https://doi.org/10.1086/707489>
 - HOPKINS, D. J. (2010). Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1), 40–60. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409990360>
 - HOPKINS, D. J. (2010). Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1), 40–60. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409990360>
 - Enos, R. D. (2016). What the Demolition of Public Housing Teaches Us about the Impact of Racial Threat on Political Behavior. *American Journal of Political Science*, 60(1), 123–142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12156>
- **Politics of Race and Ethnicity**
 - Acharya, A., Blackwell, M., & Sen, M. (2016). The Political Legacy of American Slavery. *The Journal of Politics*, 78(3), 621–641. <https://doi.org/10.1086/686631>

- Valentino, N. A., & Sears, D. O. (2005). Old Times There Are Not Forgotten: Race and Partisan Realignment in the Contemporary South. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(3), 672–688. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2005.00136.x>
- Griffin, J. D. (2014). When and Why Minority Legislators Matter. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17(1), 327–336. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-033011-205028>
- Cramer, K. (2020). Understanding the Role of Racism in Contemporary US Public Opinion. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 23(1), 153–169. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-060418-042842>
- RENY, T., & NEWMAN, B. J. (2018). Protecting the Right to Discriminate: The Second Great Migration and Racial Threat in the American West. *American Political Science Review*, 112(4), 1104–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055418000448>
- **Political Communication & Media**
 - M. Levendusky, *How Partisan Media Polarize America* (University of Chicago Press, 2013).
 - Graber, Doris A. and Johanna Dunaway. 2014. *Mass Media and American Politics*, Washington D.C.: CQ Press.
 - Zaller, J. (1992). *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion* (Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511818691
 - Barberá, Pablo et al. 2019. “Who Leads? Who Follows? Measuring Issue Attention and Agenda Setting by Legislators and the Mass Public Using Social Media Data.” *American Political Science Review* 113(4): 883–901. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/who-leads-who-follows-measuring-issue-attention-and-agenda-setting-by-legislators-and-the-mass-public-using-social-media-data/D855849CE288A241529E9EC2E4FBD3A8>
 - C. R. Sunstein, *#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media* (Princeton University Press, 2017).
 - M. Prior, *Post-Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections* (Cambridge University Press, 2007)
 - Gentzkow, Matthew, and Jesse M Shapiro. 2008. “Competition and Truth in the Market for News.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 22(2): 133–54.
 - Xenos, Michael A., and Amy B. Becker. 2009. “Moments of Zen: Effects of the Daily Show on Information Seeking and Political Learning.” *Political Communication* 26(3): 317–32.
 - Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. “Framing Theory.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 10: 103–26.
 - Druckman, J. N. (2004). Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects. *American Political Science Review*, 98(4), 671–686. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055404041413>
 - Jones, Jennifer J. 2016. “Talk Like a Man: The Linguistic Styles of Hillary Clinton, 1992–2013.” *Perspectives on Politics* 14(3): 625–42.
 - Guess, Andrew M., Pablo Barberá, Simon Munzert, and Jung Hwan Yang. 2021. “The Consequences of Online Partisan Media.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 118(14): 1–8. <https://www.pnas.org/content/118/14/e2013464118>
 - Price, Vincent, and John Zaller. 2008. “Who Gets the News? Alternative Measures of News Reception and Their Implications for Research.” *Public Opinion* 57(2): 133–64.
 - Druckman, James N., Matthew S. Levendusky, and Audrey McLain. 2018. “No Need to Watch: How the Effects of Partisan Media Can Spread via Interpersonal Discussions.” *American Journal of Political Science* 62(1): 99–112.
 - J. Ladd, *Why Americans Hate the Media and How It Matters* (Princeton University Press, 2011)
 - DellaVigna, Stefano, and Ethan Kaplan. 2007. “The Fox News Effect: Media Bias and Voting.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122(3): 1187–1234.
 - Khudabukhsh, Ashiqur R, Rupak Sarkar, Mark S Kamlet, and Tom M Mitchell. 2021. FRINGE NEWS NETWORKS: DYNAMICS OF US NEWS VIEWERSHIP FOLLOWING THE 2020 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION A PREPRINT. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/04/us/politics/trump-fox-news-arizona.html> (August 19, 2021).
- **Election Law; Gerrymandering**
 - Gelman, A., & King, G. (1994). Enhancing Democracy Through Legislative Redistricting. *American Political Science Review*, 88(3), 541–559. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2944794>
 - McGhee, E. (2020). Partisan Gerrymandering and Political Science. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 23(1), 171–185. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-060118-045351>

- Cervas, J. R., & Grofman, B. (2020). Tools for identifying partisan gerrymandering with an application to congressional districting in Pennsylvania. *Political Geography*, 76, 102069. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.102069>
- Stephanopoulos, N. O., & Warshaw, C. (2020). The Impact of Partisan Gerrymandering on Political Parties. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 12276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsg.12276>
- Hasen, R. L. (2019). Polarization and the Judiciary. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, 261–276. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051317>
- Grofman, Bernard, and Gary King. 2007. "The Future of Partisan Symmetry as a Judicial Test for Partisan Gerrymandering after LULAC v. Perry." *Election Law Journal* 6(1): 2–35. <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/bgrof-> (March 22, 2019).
- Katz, Jonathan N., Gary King, and Elizabeth Rosenblatt. 2020. "Theoretical Foundations and Empirical Evaluations of Partisan Fairness in District-Based Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 114(1): 164–78. https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S000305541900056X/type/journal_article.
- Wang, Samuel, Jonathan Cervas, Bernard Grofman, and Keena Lipsitz. 2021. "A Systems Framework for Remedying Distortions in U.S. Democracy." *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://www.ssrn.com/abstract=3800433>.
-

FACIAL COVERINGS:

We will follow whatever protocol is provided by the university.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY:

Academic Integrity is a core CMU value, and as a member of the CMU community, it is important that the work you turn in for this class is wholly your own. As your instructor, I will strive to ensure that you develop the necessary knowledge and skills to meet the learning objectives for this class, just as it is your task to put in the effort to complete the work and ask for help if you need it. In this hybrid/remote environment for Fall 2020, you might have questions about what is and is not acceptable. Insert statement or paragraph about what cheating/plagiarism/unauthorized assistance or collaboration looks like for your specific course. Add the consequences of not abiding by those conditions

As a reminder all students should follow CMU's Academic Integrity Policy.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:

If you have a disability and have an accommodation letter from the Disability Resources office, I encourage you to discuss your accommodation and needs with me as early in the semester as possible. I will work with you to ensure that accommodation is provided as appropriate. If you suspect that you may have a disability and would benefit from accommodations but are not yet registered with the Office of Disability Resources, I encourage you to contact them at access@andrew.cmu.edu.

STUDENT WELLNESS:

As a student, you may experience a range of challenges that can interfere with learning, such as strained relationships, increased anxiety, substance use, feeling down, difficulty concentrating and/or lack of motivation. These mental health concerns or stressful events may diminish your academic performance and/or reduce your ability to participate in daily activities. CMU services are available, and treatment does work. You can learn more about confidential mental health services available on campus at: <http://www.cmu.edu/counseling/>. Support is always available (24/7) from Counseling and Psychological Services: 412-268-2922

DIVERSITY STATEMENT:

It is my intent that students from all diverse backgrounds and perspectives be well served by this course, that students' learning needs be addressed both in and out of class, and that the diversity that students bring to this class be viewed as a resource, strength, and benefit. It is my intent to present materials and activities that are respectful of diversity: gender, sexuality, disability, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, and culture. Your suggestions are encouraged and appreciated. Please let me know ways to improve the effectiveness of the course for you personally or for other students or student groups. In addition, if any of our class meetings conflict with your religious events, please let me know so that we can plan accordingly.

LATE WORK:

In general, submitting assignments on time lets me provide feedback in a more timely and efficient manner. Assignments build on each other, so timely submissions are crucial to your progress in the class. However, sometimes life happens. If you cannot submit an assignment on time, the default will be that you will be eligible for 90% of the grade the first 48 hours that the assignment is late. If you must submit beyond 48 hours past the due date, please contact me cervas@uci.edu as soon as possible so we can plan.