

**Proseminar in American Politics**  
**POLS 5703**  
**Fall 2013**  
**Murray 341**  
**W 4:30-7:10pm**

<b>Professor</b>	Eve M. Ringsmuth	Brandon Lenoir
<b>Instruction Period</b>	August 19-October 9, 2013	October 14-December 11, 2013
<b>Office</b>	204 Murray Hall	202 Murray Hall
<b>Office Hours</b>	9-11am MWF	2-4pm T & TH
<b>Email</b>	eve.ringsmuth@okstate.edu	brandon.lenoir@okstate.edu

**Course Description**

This course is designed to introduce students to the study of American politics at the graduate level. The course is a survey and, by necessity, will be unable to cover any one topic in great detail, or even all of the major topics in American politics. The course will be split into two major sections. The first part of the course will focus on American political institutions. This includes brick and mortar institutions such as Congress and the Supreme Court but more generally refers to the study of how the “rules of the game” (procedural and legal requirements, norms, etc.) and the structure of the American political system shape outcomes.

The second half of the seminar is devoted to coverage of mass political behavior. What this means, very generally, is that we will explore literatures, controversies, and theories of the behavior of non-elite actors. “Behavior,” in this seminar, is interpreted quite broadly and includes psychological attachments, affect, cognitions, perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, and values. You should be aware that far more topics germane to mass behavior will be excluded from coverage than will be included in this seminar. Consider this a *gentle* introduction to the political behavior universe. While the first half of the seminar focused on the institutions of the American political system, thus defining the rules for which political actors operate, this section focuses on the ways people interpret and function within those institutions. To use a sports analogy, football has a set of rules, but not every coach or player approaches Game Day the same way. As such, knowing the rules provides you with only half the picture. The second half of the seminar will help you better understand the political environment in the U.S. setting.

**Required Texts**

Perry, H.W. 1994. *Deciding to Decide: Agenda Setting in the United States Supreme Court*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mayhew, David. 2004. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

By Lewis-Beck, Michael S., Helmut Norpoth, William G. Jacoby, and Herbert F. Weisberg. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*, 2nd Edition. University of Michigan Press.

Neustadt, Richard. 1990. *Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership from Roosevelt to Reagan*, Revised Edition. New York: The Free Press.

Kernell, Samuel. 2006. *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

**Additional Books (Not Available at the University Bookstore. Order Online)**

Mutz, Diana C. *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative Versus Participatory Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Prior, Markus. *Post-Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections*. Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Zaller, John. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

\* Note there will be other assigned readings available online and from the course website on D2L.

**Grading**

Participation	30%
Simulated Comprehensive Exam 1	35%
Simulated Comprehensive Exam 2	35%

*Grading Scale*

- A=90-100
- B=80-89.9
- C=70-79.9
- D=60-69.9
- F=0-59.9

**Course Requirements and Expectations**

This course will be run as a seminar; class time will be devoted to discussions of the readings, with lectures kept to a minimum. For each topic, please be prepared to discuss the following:

1. What are the major theoretical perspectives that structure the debate?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each perspective?
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the major methodological strategies applied to the topic? What methodologies are most appropriate given the subject of inquiry?
4. To what degree are substantive conclusions dependent upon the methods employed?
5. What are the major implications of the findings for democratic theory and the study of American politics?

Each student will be prepared to discuss EACH of the assigned readings. For each of the weeks a student(s) will be assigned as discussion leader. That student will provide a brief overview of the topic for the week, and will be responsible for facilitating the class discussion. This requires the discussant to be fully versed on each reading assigned for their week. This does not, however, mean the students not assigned to be the discussant have the week off. If the discussant calls on a student and that student is unprepared (did not do the reading) their participation points will be negatively affected. Bottom line: DO YOUR READING!

Since this is a seminar style course that meets once a week, your attendance is vital. Your weekly participation in discussion, as well as your turn(s) serving as discussion leader, will be graded and count as 30% of your final grade for the course. If you miss more than one class session, you will lose 10% of your participation grade for each additional class meeting missed.

At the end of each half of the semester, you will receive a simulated comprehensive exam on the topics covered in this section. The exam will be your opportunity to demonstrate your understanding of the subjects covered, your ability to tie the topics together, and your ability to support your conclusions with the literature assigned. We will discuss the format of the exam in more detail as we get closer to the end of each section.

### **Communication Professor Availability**

We encourage students to take advantage of office hours. If you would like to speak with either of us outside of class time, you are welcome to stop by during regularly scheduled office hours. If you are unable to meet during office hours, we can set up an alternate appointment time via email or by talking after class. Email is the best way to reach us, and we will do our best to respond in a timely manner.

### **Academic Integrity**

Academic dishonesty is broadly defined as submitting work that is not your own without attribution, and is not acceptable in this or any other academic course. This also includes copying portions or all of assignments and collaborating on assignments without the expressed permission of the professor. Any willful violations of the University's academic integrity standards will result in serious consequences such as receiving 0 for the assignment, exam, or course. In cases of violations of the academic integrity policy, we reserve the right to determine whether the case warrants a penalty on the assignment that is less severe than a 0 on the assignment. Such penalties may include, but are not limited to, a deduction of points from the assignment (up to a 0 on the assignment), and/or the completion of an additional assignment. We will make this determination based on the extent of the academic dishonesty on a case-by-case basis. If we determine that the academic dishonesty warrants a stronger response, we will adhere to the procedures detailed in Oklahoma State University's academic integrity policy. Either when determining the extent of any academic dishonesty, any resulting penalty, or whether to follow Oklahoma State University's academic integrity policy, the initial determination is strictly up to the instructors. We will meet with the student to discuss any case of an academic integrity violation, and the student may indicate at this meeting if he or she prefers to follow the procedures detailed in Oklahoma State University's academic integrity policy. Please consult the University's standards regarding academic integrity and the resulting sanctions (at <http://academicintegrity.okstate.edu>).

**Course Introduction** – August 21

**Representation** – August 28

Pitkin, Hanna. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Los Angeles: University of California Press. (p. 1-12, 92-103, and 209-213)

Mansbridge, Jane. “Rethinking Representation.” *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 515-528.

Fenno, Jr., Richard F. 1977. “U.S. House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration.” *American Political Science Review* 71(3): 883-917.

Mayhew, David. 2004. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (p. 1-78)

Stimson, James A., Michael B. MacKuen, and Robert S. Erickson. “Dynamic Representation.” *American Political Science Review* 89(3): 543-565.

**Congress** – September 4

Cox, Gary and Jonathan N. Katz. 1996. “Why Did the Incumbency Advantage in U.S. House Elections Grow?” *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 478-497.

Shepsle, Kenneth A. and Barry W. Weingast. 1994. “Positive Theories of Democratic Institutions.” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 19: 149-179.

Aldrich, John H. and David W. Rohde. 2001. “The Logic of Conditional Party Government: Revisiting the Electoral Connection.” *Congress Reconsidered*. Ed. Lawrence C. Dodd and Bruce I. Oppenheimer. 7th ed., Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Cox, Gary and Matthew D. McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. (Chapters 2 and 4)

Krehbiel, Keith. 1993. “Where’s the Party?” *British Journal of Political Science* 23(2): 235-266.

Lee, Frances E. 1998. “Representation and Public Policy: The Consequences of Senate Apportionment for the Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds,” *Journal of Politics* 60(February): 34-62.

**Presidency** – September 11

Neustadt, Richard. 1990. *Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership from Roosevelt to Reagan, Revised Edition*. New York: The Free Press. (p. 3-127, 150-151)

Kernell, Samuel. 2006. *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. (Chapters 1-4, 8)

MacKuen, Michael B., Robert S. Erickson, and James A. Stimson. 1992. "Peasants or Bankers? The American Electorate and the U.S. Economy." *American Political Science Review* 86(3): 597-611.

King, Gary. 2009. "The Methodology of Presidential Research," in *Researching the Presidency*, George C. Edwards, John H. Kessel, and Bert A. Rockman, Eds. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.

Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Melanie Burns. 2004. "The Second Face of the Public Presidency: Presidential Polling and the Shift from Policy to Personality Polling." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 34(3): 536-56.

### **Judiciary** – September 18

Perry, H.W. 1994. *Deciding to Decide: Agenda Setting in the United States Supreme Court*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Black, Ryan C. and Ryan J. Owens. 2009. "Agenda Setting in the Supreme Court: The Collision of Policy and Jurisprudence." *Journal of Politics* 71(3): 1062-1075.

Spriggs, James F., II and Thomas G. Hansford. 2002. "The U.S. Supreme Court's Incorporation and Interpretation of Precedent." *Law & Society Review* 36(1): 139-160.

Maltzman, Forrest, and Paul J. Wahlbeck. 1996. "Strategic Policy Considerations and Voting Fluidity on the Burger Court." *American Political Science Review* 90 (September): 581-592.

Bonneau, Chris W., Thomas H. Hammond, Forrest Maltzman, and Paul J. Wahlbeck. 2007. "Agenda Control, the Median Justice, and the Majority Opinion on the U.S. Supreme Court." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4): 890-905.

### **Separation of Powers** – September 25

Cameron, Charles. 2000. *Veto Bargaining*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapters 1 and 6)

Lee, Frances E. 2008. "Dividers, Not Uniters: Presidential Leadership and Senate Partisanship, 1981-2004." *Journal of Politics* 70 (October): 914-928.

Edwards III, George C. and B. Dan Wood. 1999. "Who Influences Whom? The President, Congress, and the Media." *American Political Science Review* 93(2): 327-344.

Ferejohn, John and Charles Shipan. 1990. "Congressional Influence on Bureaucracy." *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 6: 1-20.

Johnson, Timothy R. and Jason Roberts. 2005. "Pivotal Politics, Presidential Capital, and Supreme Court Nominations." *Congress and the Presidency* 32(1): 31-48.

Clark, Tom S. 2009. "The Separation of Powers, Court-curbing and Judicial Legitimacy." *American Journal of Political Science* 53(4):971-989.

### **Interest Groups – October 2**

Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Chapters 1-2)

Schlozman, Kay. 1984. "What Accent the Heavenly Chorus? Political Equality and the American Pressure System." *Journal of Politics* 46(4): 1006-1032.

Hall, Richard L. and Frank W. Wayman. 1990. "Buying Time: Moneyed Interests and the Mobilization of Bias in Congressional Committees." *American Political Science Review* 84(3): 797-820.

Smith, Richard A. 1995. "Interest Group Influence in the U.S. Congress." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 20: 89-139.

Collins, Jr., Paul M. 2007. "Lobbyists before the U.S. Supreme Court: Investigating the Influence of Amicus Curiae Briefs." *Political Research Quarterly* 60(1): 55-70.

### **Parties, Campaigns, and Elections – October 9**

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper Collins Publishers. (Chapter 8)

Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins. 1993. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*. Berkely: Unveristy of California Press. (Chapters 4-5)

Petrocik, John R. 1996. "Issue Ownership in Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 40(3): 825-850.

Holbrook, Thomas M. and Scott D. McClurg. 2005. "The Mobilization of Core Supporters: Campaigns, Turnout, and Electoral Composition in United States Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(4): 689-703.

Gimpel, James G., Frances E. Lee, and Joshua Kaminski. 2006. "The Political Geography of Campaign Contributions." *Journal of Politics* 68 (August): 626-639.

### **The Conceptualization and Measurement of Attitudes and Beliefs – October 16**

J. Krosnick. 1999. "Survey Research." *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50: 537-67

J. Miller and D. Peterson. 2004. "Theoretical and Empirical Implications of Attitude Strength." *Journal of Politics*, 66: 847-67

S. Feldman. 1995. "Answering Survey Questions: The Measurement and Meaning of Public Opinion." In M. Lodge and K. McGraw (Eds.), *Political Judgment: Structure and Process*.

A. Downs. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Chpts. 1-3. (Scanned copies will be posted on D2L)

A. Campbell. 2002. "Self-Interest, Social Security, and the Distinctive Participation Patterns of Senior Citizens." *American Political Science Review*, 96: 565-74

D. Sears and C. Funk. 1990. "Self-Interest in Americans' Political Opinion." In J. Mansbridge (Ed.), *Beyond Self-Interest*.

### **Ideology – October 23**

M. Delli Carpini and S. Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why it Matters*. Chpts. 1,2, and 6. (Scanned copies will be posted on D2L)

M. Lodge, M. Steenbergen, and S. Brau. 1995. "The Responsive Voter: Campaign Information and the Dynamics of Candidate Evaluation." *American Political Science Review*, 89: 309-26.

P. Goren. 2004. "Political Sophistication and Policy Reasoning: A Reconsideration." *American Journal of Political Science*, 48: 462-78.

Lewis-Beck, M.S. *The American Voter Revisited*. University of Michigan Press, 2008.

### **Principles and Values – October 30**

P. Goren. 2005. "Party Identification and Core Political Values." *American Journal of Political Science*, 49:881-96.

W. G. Jacoby. 2006. "Value Choices and American Public Opinion." *American Journal of Political Science*, 50: 706-23.

H. F. Weisberg. 2005. "The Structure and Effects of Moral Predispositions in Contemporary American Politics." *Journal of Politics*, 67: 646-68.

C. M. Federico. 2006. "Race, Education, and Individualism Revisited." *Journal of Politics*, 68: 600-10.

T. Broder, N. Valentino, and E. Suhay. 2008. "What Triggers Public Opposition to Immigration? Anxiety, Group Cues, and Immigration Threat." *American Journal of Political Science*, 52: 959-78.

### **Sources of Political Beliefs and Attitudes: Biological and Personality Based Models; Elites – November 6**

J. Fowler and C. Dawes. 2008. "Two Genes Predict Voter Turnout." *Journal of Politics*, 70: 579-94.

P. Hatemi, et al. 2009. "Genetic and Environmental Transmission of Political Attitudes Over a Life Time." *Journal of Politics*, 71: 1141-56.

J. Zaller. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*.

**Sources of Political Beliefs and Attitudes: Contextual and Social Influences** – November 13

Huckfeldt, Robert and John Sprague. "Networks in Context: The Social Flow of Political Information." *The American Political Science Review* 81, no. 04 (1987): 1197-216.

Wald, Kenneth D., Dennis E. Owen and Samuel S. Hill, Jr. "Churches as Political Communities." *The American Political Science Review* 82, no. 02 (1988): 531-48.

Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green and Christopher W. Larimer. "Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 102, no. 01 (2008): 33-48.

Mutz, Diana C. *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative Versus Participatory Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

**Mass Media: Knowledge and Information** -- November 20

Prior, Markus. *Post-Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections*. Cambridge Studies in Public Opinion and Political Psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Joslyn, Mark R. "The Determinants and Consequences of Recall Error About Gulf War Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science* 47, no. 03 (2003): 440-52.

Barabas, Jason and Jennifer Jerit. "Estimating the Causal Effects of Media Coverage on Policy-Specific Knowledge." *American Journal of Political Science* 53, no. 01 (2009): 73-89.

Ladd, Jonathan McDonald and Gabriel S. Lenz. "Exploiting a Rare Communication Shift to Document the Persuasive Power of the News Media." *American Journal of Political Science* 53, no. 02 (2009): 394-410.

**No Class on 11/27, Thanksgiving Break**

**Mass Media: Subtle Effects (priming, framing and agenda setting)** – December 4

Krosnick, Jon A. and Donald R. Kinder. "Altering the Foundations of Support for the President through Priming." *The American Political Science Review* 84, no. 02 (1990): 497-512.

Miller, Joanne M. and Jon A. Krosnick. "News Media Impact on the Ingredients of Presidential Evaluations: Politically Knowledgeable Citizens Are Guided by a Trusted Source." *American Journal of Political Science* 44, no. 02 (2000): 301-15.

Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson and Zoe M. Oxley. "Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance." *The American Political Science Review* 91, no. 03 (1997): 567-83.

Gilliam, Franklin D., Jr. and Shanto Iyengar. "Prime Suspects: The Influence of Local Television News on the Viewing Public." *American Journal of Political Science* 44, no. 03 (2000): 560-73.

Valentino, Nicholas A., Hutchings, Vincent L. and Ismail K. White. "Cues That Matter: How Political Ads Prime Racial Attitudes During Campaigns." *American Political Science Review* 96, no. 01 (2002): 75-90.

Mutz, Diana C. and Byron Reeves. "The New Videomalaise: Effects of Televised Incivility on Political Trust." *American Political Science Review* 99, no. 01 (2005): 1-15.

Groeling, Tim and Matthew A. Baum. "Crossing the Water's Edge: Elite Rhetoric, Media Coverage, and the Rally-Round-the-Flag Phenomenon." *The Journal of Politics* 70, no. 04 (2008): 1065-85.