

John Bullock  
Political Science  
[john.bullock@northwestern.edu](mailto:john.bullock@northwestern.edu)  
Office: Scott Hall 304  
Fall 2021

# Public Opinion and Representation in the United States

Political Science 395 (16565)  
Scott Hall 107 (Burdick Room), Tuesdays, 200pm-450pm  
<https://canvas.northwestern.edu/courses/150580>  
Syllabus date: October 11, 2021 (8:25am)

This course is about Americans' views of political issues ("public opinion") and the extent to which their views influence elected officials ("representation"). The first and larger part of the course takes up public opinion. The second part takes up representation.

This is not a course about statistics. That said, background in statistics or econometrics is sure to help, as many of the assigned readings contain statistical analyses of data on public opinion or representation.

## Assignments and Grades

In October, each student must evaluate a hypothetical reading response that I will post to Canvas. The evaluation is limited to two pages and graded on a pass-fail basis; it accounts for 5% of the overall grade. In addition, each student must write two reading responses, each 2-3 pages long and accounting for 10% of the overall grade. Discussion accounts for 30% of the final grade. A final paper, 12 to 18 pages long, accounts for 45% of the final grade.

## CALENDAR OF DEADLINES

Evaluation of a hypothetical reading response .....	200pm, October 18th
First reading response .....	200pm, October 25th
Office-hours meeting .....	October 29th
Second reading response .....	200pm, November 22nd
Final paper .....	800am, December 6th

## DISCUSSION

Discussion will be based heavily on the readings, and perfect attendance does not guarantee a satisfactory discussion grade. If you rarely speak in class, or if you speak regularly in ways that suggest that you haven't thought about the readings, you will receive a low grade.

There is no formal penalty for missing a class. But you cannot contribute to class discussion if you do not attend, so it will be hard to get a high discussion grade if you miss more than a few classes.

You are required to lead the first part of discussion in two different classes. In each of these classes, you should come prepared to speak about the assigned reading for 10 minutes at the beginning of class. You should also be prepared—even more than in a normal class—to answer specific questions about the readings.

When you lead discussion, it may make sense to begin class with a brief overview of the assigned reading, but as with the reading responses, the emphasis should be on analysis rather than summary. (As a rule of thumb, spend no more than 60 seconds summarizing any particular reading.) The discussion grade is based on discussion throughout the term, but I will weight these presentations heavily as I determine the discussion grade.

In some weeks, more than one student may be assigned to discuss. In those cases, each student must be prepared to talk for 15 minutes. Students should also coordinate with each other to ensure that their comments don't overlap much.

At least 24 hours before the start of class, students who are going to present must post at least one page of notes on their presentations to the "Discussions" section of the Canvas site. These notes will be part of the final discussion grade for the term.

## READING RESPONSES

Each student must write two reading responses. These responses should be 2-3 pages long. They should analyze—not summarize—at least one of the assigned readings from the current week or the previous week. They may focus on a small part of the assigned reading. I encourage you to talk about the readings with each other, but each of you should write responses on your own.

Excerpts from a textbook by Erikson and Tedin are assigned in many classes. Do not write reading responses about these excerpts.

Whenever you refer to a specific passage or claim in the assigned readings, be sure to mention the relevant page numbers. You can do this briefly and informally: “Smith says X (page 92).” You must cite the page numbers in the printed text, not the page numbers of the PDF file or any other page numbers.

Responses are due 24 hours before the beginning of class. They should be posted in the appropriate thread of the “Discussions” section of the course web site—not sent by e-mail.

You must submit your first response by October 25th. You may turn in only one response per week, and I will not grant deadline extensions for the responses. Remember, you need to write only two of them.

By the end of November, I expect that I will have graded and returned only those responses that you wrote by the end of October.

#### FINAL PAPER

It should be 12 to 18 pages long. It’s due at 800am on December 6th. Please discuss potential topics with me in office hours: I don’t want you to take on topics that are too big. Upload the paper through the “Assignments” section of the Canvas site. Do not send a copy by e-mail.

*I will not reply to email about the final paper that is sent after November 26th unless the questions are about formatting or are purely procedural in some other way. Please plan accordingly.*

#### WRITING FOR ME

I’ve posted memos about the [writing](#) and [formatting](#) of papers. They set forth rules and guidelines for written assignments in my courses. Please read them carefully, and be sure to read every item in the list at the end of the writing memo. If there is something in the memos that you don’t understand, just ask me about it.

If you don’t follow the rules and guidelines—and you can’t explain why—you will do poorly in this course.

I prefer that you submit assignments as .docx files; if you do that, it’s a little easier for me to leave comments on specific passages. But if you prefer to submit assignments as PDF files, please feel free to do so.

#### AWARDS

Your final paper may be eligible for several national awards. I have in mind the [ICPSR Research Paper Competitions](#) and the [Seymour Sudman Student Paper Award](#), which is given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR).

## MAPPING BETWEEN NUMBERS AND LETTER GRADES

All of the grades that you receive in this course will be letter grades, e.g., A, B+. To compute an average grade for the semester that I can report to the Registrar's Office, I will translate those letter grades into numbers, average the numbers, and then translate the average back into a letter grade. This is the mapping between letter grades and numbers: below 60 = F, 60 to 63 = D-, 63 to 67 = D, 67 to 70 = D+, 70 to 73 = C-, 73 to 77 = C, 77 to 80 = C+, 80 to 83 = B-, 83 to 87 = B, 87 to 90 = B+, 90 to 93 = A-, 93 and above = A.

## GRADES WILL NOT BE ROUNDED UP

Grades will not be rounded up. For example, a final grade of 92.9 will be reported to the Registrar as an A-.

## Readings

Required readings are marked with an asterisk (\*) in the pages that follow. There is no required book that you need to purchase.

I expect to make small changes to the reading list throughout the term. Whenever I make changes especially worth noting, I'll send an announcement via email.

## FINDING THE READINGS

There is no packet of course readings, and you should print or acquire the readings yourself. Most are available online, either from URLs that are given in this syllabus or from the course website. If there is no URL in the syllabus and the course website doesn't have the article, please search for it online. *You are responsible for locating every one of the assigned readings.*

I find most of the course readings (except those available through Canvas) by searching Google Scholar. To use it effectively, you may need to use an on-campus computer or to connect through the Northwestern VPN. If you don't know what a VPN is, see <http://www.it.northwestern.edu/oncampus/vpn/>.

## CAN YOU REPRODUCE THE AUTHORS' RESULTS?

Most of the readings on the syllabus involve some form of data analysis. The authors are making empirical claims about the world, and they are backing up their claims with analyses of data. Sometimes the data are from the authors' own studies; sometimes they are from studies that others have conducted.

How confident should you be that the authors' claims are correct? Part of the answer lies with the availability of the data and the code (i.e., the statistical programs) that the authors wrote

to analyze the data. Even if you don't understand data and code at all, you should care about whether they are available to the public. Professors often make mistakes, and if the data and code are not available, they cannot be checked for mistakes or otherwise investigated in any way. In addition, many authors are more careful when they know that their code and data will be available for inspection.

In political science, norms of data-sharing and code-sharing are very strong. As a result, it is difficult to publish in respectable political science journals if you are unwilling to put your data and your code online so that others are free to analyze them. But this has been true for less than a decade. Norms for data-sharing and code-sharing were weaker in political science in the past, and they remain weaker in other disciplines. The upshot is that you should be extremely skeptical of any contemporary political-science research for which the data and code are not available. Temper your skepticism when considering other fields, and especially when considering older work.

You will see that entries for some of the readings on this syllabus are preceded by CNA or DNA. These entries stand for “code not available” and “data not available.” They indicate that I have been unable to locate the authors' code or data. Some readings rely on both public and private datasets; in these cases, I have tended not to apply a DNA tag.

## WHAT WE WON'T COVER THIS YEAR

In this course, we take up ideas from research about public opinion and from research about representation. And we do it all in a quarter rather than a semester. This set of circumstances requires some tough compromises.

Perhaps the toughest compromises are the omissions of weeks on media effects and on public opinion about war. I will bring these topics into our discussions when appropriate, and you shouldn't hesitate to ask about them. But we won't have a full class devoted to either of these topics.

## RECOMMENDED READINGS

Almost all of my recommendations are topic-specific, and they therefore appear below, in the sections on specific topics. But I also recommend two general texts to you:

Kinder, Donald R. 1998. “Opinion and Action in the Realm of Politics.” In *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, ed. Daniel T. Gilbert and Susan T. Fiske. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill. A little difficult if you haven't read any of this material before, but a masterful overview.

Wlezien, Christopher. 2011. “Public Opinion and Public Policy in Advanced Democracies.” *Oxford Bibliographies*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780199756223-0045>. Annotated bibliography. Very helpful for those who want to study representation.

## BACKGROUND READINGS IN STATISTICS

There is no statistics prerequisite, but many of the assigned articles use simple statistics. If you want to better understand the statistical methods that you encounter in the articles, I recommend:

Levitt, Steven D., and Stephen J. Dubner. 2005. *Freakonomics*. New York: Harper Perennial. Pages 162-68 are a very casual introduction to regression analysis.

Angrist, Joshua D., and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2014. *Mastering 'Metrics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. The focus is on the application of quantitative methods to practical problems.

Freedman, David, Robert Pisani, and Roger Purves. 1998. *Statistics*. 3rd ed. New York: W. W. Norton. Presumes almost no background. There is now a fourth edition; I haven't read it.

Freedman, David A. 2009. *Statistical Models: Theory and Practice*. Revised ed. New York: Cambridge University Press. This is better than *Statistics* but also more advanced. Chapters 1-5 are excellent for self-study if you do the exercises.

## Office Hours

Office hours will be held at my office: Scott Hall 304. Please make appointments through <https://slotted.co/2021fall>. When you make an appointment, please add a comment indicating what you would like to talk about when we meet.

By October 29th, you are required to have met me at least once in office hours. We will speak for at least part of the time about your ideas for a final paper—please come prepared.

Apart from the required meeting, you do not need to make an appointment in advance. But I prefer that you do. Making an appointment also reduces the probability that you will need to wait while I'm meeting with other students.

If all office-hours slots are full—you can tell by checking the URL—I generally will not be able to meet with you during or immediately after office hours.

## September 21 (Tue): Intro; Should We Care about Public Opinion?

### INTRODUCTION

\*Freedman, David, Robert Pisani, and Roger Purves. 1998. *Statistics*. 3rd ed. New York: W. W. Norton. Chapters 19-21. Focus on the parts about surveys. In the files for each chapter, I've omitted a few pages that have no relevant information.

\*Levitt, Steven D., and Stephen J. Dubner. 2005. *Freakonomics*. New York: Harper Perennial. Pages 162-68. A very casual introduction to regression analysis. Those who are already comfortable with regression can skip this reading.

\* CNA Stimson, James A. 2015. *Tides of Consent*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-2.

\*Lee, Hermione. 1996. *Virginia Woolf*. New York: Knopf. Pages 286-87. Read from “At the time, in fact . . .” to “the specialist in abnormality.”

\*This syllabus—please read all of it before coming to class.

Cohn, Nate. 2016 January 07. “Why Polls Have Been Wrong Recently.” *New York Times*. <http://nyti.ms/1JwXWcF>.

### SHOULD WE CARE ABOUT PUBLIC OPINION?

Each reading required for this part of the class can be seen as offering a reason why we should *not* care about public opinion. For each reading, try to figure out what the reason is. And in light of these reasons, why should we care about public opinion?

\* DNA CNA Bishop, George F. 2005. *The Illusion of Public Opinion*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield. Chapters 1-2. Skim pages 1-8, picking up on page 8 with “Far from an isolated example . . .”

\*Hibbs, Jr., Douglas A. 2008. “Implications of the ‘Bread and Peace’ Model for the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election.” *Public Choice* 137 (September): 1-10. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/f533t53183x419wl/?p=fce77dfbc1834fe6989ce602f9dee31b>.

Key, Jr., V.O. 1960. “The Politically Relevant in Surveys.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 24 (1): 54-61. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2746665>. Read 54-56 and 60-61; you can skim the rest.

\*Hacker, Jacob S. 2010. “The Road to Somewhere: Why Health Reform Happened.” *Perspectives on Politics* 8 (3): 861-76. <http://journals.cambridge.org/production/action/cjoGetFulltext?fulltextid=7874748>. Focus on pages 869-70; skim the rest.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors’ data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors’ results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

\*Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. 2005b. *Off Center: The Republican Revolution and the Erosion of American Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapter 5. Focus on pages 149-62, which are about “backlash insurance.” Skim the rest.

Achen, Christopher H., and Larry M. Bartels. 2004. “Musical Chairs: Pocketbook Voting and the Limits of Democratic Accountability.” Presented at the Annual Conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago. <https://my.vanderbilt.edu/larrybartels/files/2011/12/musical-chairs.pdf>.

DNA CNA Lauderdale, Benjamin E, and Drew A Linzer. 2015. “Under-performing, Over-performing, or Just Performing? The Limitations of Fundamentals-Based Presidential Election Forecasting.” *International Journal of Forecasting* 31 (July-September): 965-79. Read it partly as a response to Hibbs.

Lee, David S., Enrico Moretti, and Matthew J. Butler. 2004. “Do Voters Affect or Elect Policies? Evidence from the U.S. House.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 119 (August): 807-59. <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1162/0033553041502153>. Very difficult.

## September 28 (Tue): Socialization, Family Influences, and Education

### SOCIALIZATION AND FAMILY INFLUENCES

\*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 123-31 and pages 142-54. In the latter part, skip the short section entitled “Generations and Political Polarization.”

\*Jennings, M. Kent, Laura Stoker, and Jake Bowers. 2009. “Politics across Generations: Family Transmission Reexamined.” *Journal of Politics* 71 (3): 782-99. <http://jakebowers.org/PAPERS/JenStokBow2009.pdf>.

\*Healy, Andrew, and Neil Malhotra. 2013. “Childhood Socialization and Political Attitudes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment.” *Journal of Politics* 75 (4): 1023-37. In the second column of page 1033, “6.6%” should be “6.6 percentage points.” And in the first column of page 1034, “9.2%” should be “9.2 percentage points.”

Glynn, Adam N., and Maya Sen. 2015. “Identifying Judicial Empathy: Does Having Daughters Cause Judges to Rule for Women’s Issues?” *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (1): 37-54.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors’ data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors’ results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.



Washington, Ebonya L. 2008. "Female Socialization: How Daughters Affect Their Legislator Fathers' Voting on Women's Issues." *American Economic Review* 98 (March): 311-32. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29729973>. This article is mainly about representation, but I am sneaking it into the public opinion part of the course.

Jennings, M. Kent, and Richard G. Niemi. 1968. "The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child." *American Political Science Review* 62 (March): 169-84. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1953332>.

Jennings, M. Kent, and Richard G. Niemi. 1971. "The Division of Political Labor Between Mothers and Fathers." *American Political Science Review* 65 (March): 69-82. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1955044>.

Barker, David C., and James D. Tinnick III. 2006. "Competing Visions of Parental Roles and Ideological Constraint." *American Political Science Review* 100 (May): 249-63. [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0003055406062149](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055406062149).

Freese, Jeremy, Brian Powell, and Lala Carr Steelman. 1999. "Rebel Without a Cause or Effect: Birth Order and Social Attitudes." *American Sociological Review* 64 (April): 207-31. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2657528>.

#### SOCIALIZATION AND EDUCATION

\* CNA Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Pages 204-206. There is an important idea in these three pages, and I will be asking you about it.

\*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 131-138. Do not write a reading response that is mainly about this reading.

\* CNA Fisher, Patrick. 2014. *Demographic Gaps in American Political Behavior*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Pages 40-42. Do not write a reading response that is mainly about this reading.

\*Marshall, John. 2019. "The Anti-Democrat Diploma: How High School Education Decreases Support for the Democratic Party." *American Journal of Political Science* 63 (1): 67-83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12409>.

Bullock, John G. 2021. "Education and Attitudes toward Redistribution in the United States." *British Journal of Political Science* 51 (July): 1230-1250. <https://doi.org/f8gm>.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

Mendelberg, Tali, Katherine T. McCabe, and Adam Thal. 2017. "College Socialization and the Economic Views of Affluent Americans." *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (3): 606-623. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12265>.

CNA  Dee, Thomas S. 2004. "Are There Civic Returns to Education?" *Journal of Public Economics* 88 (9-10): 1697-1720.

DNA CNA  Hainmueller, Jens, and Michael J. Hiscox. 2006. "Learning to Love Globalization: Education and Individual Attitudes toward International Trade." *International Organization* 60 (2): 469-98. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3877900>.

CNA  Key, Jr., V. O. 1961. *Public Opinion and American Democracy*. New York: Knopf. Chapter 13, "The Educational System."

Stouffer, Samuel A. 1955. *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties*. New York: Doubleday. Chapters 4 and 5. Dated, but deservedly influential.

DNA CNA  Sullivan, John L., James Piereson, and George E. Marcus. 1982. *Political Tolerance and American Democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Pages 114-126.

MacMullen, Ian. 2011. "On Status Quo Bias in Civic Education." *Journal of Politics* 73 (July): 872-86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0022381611000521>. An excellent political theory article.

Merelman, Richard M. 1980. "Democratic Politics and the Culture of American Education." *American Political Science Review* 74 (June): 319-32. This article is a work of political theory. Some of the ideas in it are radical. Some are ridiculous. Some are profound. There are short follow-ups to this article in the same issue of the APSR, but I don't find them edifying.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

## October 05 (Tue): “Nonattitudes” and Political Sophistication

You will find some of the assigned readings difficult. But if you work at them, you may also find them exceptionally rewarding. Please set aside much more than the ordinary amount of time for them, and struggle to understand as much as you can.

We’ll first consider political sophistication and nonattitudes. Then we’ll turn to the possibility that “source cues” can be used as “shortcuts” to help uninformed people act as they would if they were informed.

### POLITICAL SOPHISTICATION AND NONATTITUDES

\*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 57-69.

\*Kinder, Donald R. 1998. “Opinion and Action in the Realm of Politics.” In *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, ed. Daniel T. Gilbert and Susan T. Fiske. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill. Pages 795-97. Introduction to the topic. Note that, on page 795, Kinder overstates the strength of the evidence in Feldman’s 1989 essay.

\* CNA Converse, Philip E. [1964] 2006. “The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics.” *Critical Review* 18 (Winter-Summer): 1-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08913810608443650>. Read only Section VII (pages 44-52).

\* CNA Ansolabehere, Stephen, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Snyder, Jr. 2008. “The Strength of Issues: Using Multiple Measures to Gauge Preference Stability, Ideological Constraint, and Issue Voting.” *American Political Science Review* 102 (May): 215-32. [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0003055408080210](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0003055408080210). This is a difficult article. Most of the math is simple, but there is a lot of it. Try reading the article twice before lecture: read first to get the gist; the second time, try to work through the math. I’ve posted a few notes to the "Files > Miscellany" section of Canvas that may help you if you try to work through the covariance algebra.

\*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. <https://doi.org/10.1086/700005>. See also the [corrections to the published version](#). They are not substantively important, but when you’re trying to figure out exactly how the authors analyzed the data, they may help.

CNA Converse, Philip E. 1970. “Attitudes and Non-Attitudes: Continuation of a Dialogue.” In *The Quantitative Analysis of Social Problems*, ed. Edward R. Tufte. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Elaboration of the nonattitudes argument in Converse’s 1964 essay.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors’ data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors’ results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

[CNA] Achen, Christopher H. 1975. "Mass Political Attitudes and the Survey Response." *American Political Science Review* 69 (December): 1218-31. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1955282>. A criticism of Converse's (1964, 1970) work on nonattitudes. See also three critical responses and Achen's rejoinder in the December 1976 APSR: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1959386?seq=10>.

[CNA] Erikson, Robert S. 1979. "The SRC Panel Data and Mass Political Attitudes." *British Journal of Political Science* 9 (January): 89-114.

Converse, Philip E. 2000. "Assessing the Capacity of Mass Electorates." *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 331-53. Pages 336-46 contain pointed criticisms of the Achen and Erikson arguments.

[DNA] [CNA] Hill, Jennifer L., and Hanspeter Kriesi. 2001. "An Extension and Test of Converse's 'Black-and-White' Model of Response Stability." *American Political Science Review* 95 (June): 397-413.

[CNA] Luskin, Robert C. 1987. "Measuring Political Sophistication." *American Journal of Political Science* 31 (November): 856-99. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2111227>. Read the first eight pages; skim the remainder.

[CNA] Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 3.

[CNA] Dobrzynska, Agnieszka, and André Blais. 2008. "Testing Zaller's Reception and Acceptance Model in an Intense Election Campaign." *Political Behavior* 30 (2): 259-75. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/062977q481183807/>.

Wilson, Timothy D., Samuel Lindsey, and Tonya Y. Schooler. 2000. "A Model of Dual Attitudes." *Psychological Review* 107 (January): 101-26.

[CNA] Luskin, Robert C. 1990. "Explaining Political Sophistication." *Political Behavior* 12 (December): 331-61.

[CNA] Gilens, Martin. 2001. "Political Ignorance and Collective Policy Preferences." *American Political Science Review* 95 (2): 379-96.

[CNA] Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Still the most comprehensive treatment of what Americans know and don't know about politics. And it is not as dated as you might think: this story doesn't change much over time.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. [DNA] indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and [CNA] indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

## CUES AS SHORTCUTS

\*Somin, Ilya. 1998. "Voter Ignorance and the Democratic Ideal." *Critical Review* 12 (4): 413-58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08913819808443511>. I recommend the entire article, but you are required to read only to page 431.

\*Lupia, Arthur. 1994. "Shortcuts versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections." *American Political Science Review* 88 (March): 63-76. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2944882>.

\*CNA Bartels, Larry M. 1996. "Uninformed Votes: Information Effects in Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (February): 194-230. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2111700>. The "Resources" section of the course web site contains a page of notes on this article that may be helpful.

Kuklinski, James H., and Paul J. Quirk. 2000. "Reconsidering the Rational Public: Cognition, Heuristics, and Mass Opinion." In *Elements of Reason*, ed. Arthur Lupia, Mathew D. McCubbins, and Samuel L. Popkin. New York: Cambridge University Press.

CNA Althaus, Scott L. 2003. *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Part 2.

## October 12 (Tue): Income and Voting

Of late, there has been a lot of interest in the link between income and representation: are rich citizens better represented than others? We will take up this question—but later in the course, when we take up representation. Our focus this week has more to do with the ways in which income may shape the attitudes and preferences of ordinary citizens.

\*Goldstein, Dan. 2016 March 07. "The Wall Street Journal Uses the Word 'Percentile' Incorrectly." <http://www.decisionsciencenews.com/?p=5562>.

\*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 185-92.

\*CNA Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Chapter 7. <http://goo.gl/UwPuq>. Note an error: on page 213, where the authors write that "bigger countries should be more likely to believe that luck determines income," they mean "less likely."

DNA CNA Bartels, Larry M., and John Zaller. 2001. "Presidential Vote Models: A Recount." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 34 (1): 9-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/>

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

[S1049096501000026](#). Interesting and important, but difficult to understand if you do not have prior experience with regression analysis.

CNA McCarty, Nolan, Keith T. Poole, and Howard Rosenthal. 2006. *Polarized America: The Dance of Ideology and Unequal Riches*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Especially Chapter 3.

Roemer, John E. 1998. "Why the Poor Do Not Expropriate the Rich: An Old Argument in New Garb." *Journal of Public Economics* 70 (December): 399-424. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727\(98\)00042-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2727(98)00042-5).

Hersh, Eitan D, and Clayton Nall. 2016. "The Primacy of Race in the Geography of Income-Based Voting: New Evidence from Public Voting Records." *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (2): 289-303.

Scheve, Kenneth, and David Stasavage. 2010. "The Conscription of Wealth: Mass Warfare and the Demand for Progressive Taxation." *International Organization* 64 (4): 529-61. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0020818310000226>.

Walsh, Katherine Cramer. 2012. "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 106 (August): 517-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000305>.

Shapiro, Ian. 2002. "Why the Poor Don't Soak the Rich." *Daedalus* 131 (Winter): 118-28. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20027743>.

## THE ESTATE TAX CUTS OF 2001

These tax cuts engendered a lot of interesting scholarship.

\*CNA Bartels, Larry M. 2005. "Homer Gets a Tax Cut: Inequality and Public Policy in the American Mind." *Perspectives on Politics* 3 (March): 15-31. <http://journals.cambridge.org/production/action/cjoGetFulltext?fulltextid=286250>.

\*Lupia, Arthur, Adam Seth Levine, Jesse O. Menning, and Gisela Sin. 2007. "Were Bush Tax Cut Supporters 'Simply Ignorant?' A Second Look at Conservatives and Liberals in 'Homer Gets a Tax Cut'." *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (December): 773-84. [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S1537592707072210](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1537592707072210).

\*Bartels, Larry M. 2007. "Homer Gets a Warm Hug: A Note on Ignorance and Extenuation." *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (December): 785-90. [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S1537592707072222](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1537592707072222).

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. 2005a. "Abandoning the Middle: The Bush Tax Cuts and the Limits of Democratic Control." *Perspectives on Politics* 3 (March): 33-53.

Graetz, Michael J., and Ian Shapiro. 2005. *Death by a Thousand Cuts: The Fight over Taxing Inherited Wealth*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bartels, Larry M. 2008. *Unequal Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapter 7, "The Strange Appeal of Estate Tax Repeal." Part of this chapter is a direct criticism of the Graetz-Shapiro book.

Walsh, Katherine Cramer. 2012. "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 106 (August): 517-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000305>.

## October 19 (Tue): Tolerance and Democratic Values

Twenty-four hours before this class begins, each student must submit a one- or two-page analysis of a hypothetical reading response that I'll post to Canvas. The reading response will be about Jacoby's 2006 article.

\*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 155-62.

\*Sullivan, John L., and John E. Transue. 1999. "The Psychological Underpinnings of Democracy: A Selective Review of Research on Political Tolerance, Interpersonal Trust, and Social Capital." *Annual Review of Psychology* 50: 625-50. <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.625>. Good review of classic literature. The empirical analyses in the classic works are often quite bad, but the ideas are important. You may skip pages 635-38 and 646-48.

\*Hopkins, Daniel J. 2010. "Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition." *American Political Science Review* 104 (1): 40-60.

\* DNA CNA Jacoby, William G. 2006. "Value Choices and American Public Opinion." *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (July): 706-23. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3694244>. Don't worry about interpreting the confidence interval in the first row of Table 2; as best I can tell, it's just an error.

Jacoby, William G. 2014. "Is There a Culture War? Conflicting Value Structures in American Public Opinion." *American Political Science Review* 108 (4): 754-71.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

Andersen, Robert, and Tina Fetner. 2008a. "Cohort Differences in Tolerance of Homosexuality: Attitudinal Change in Canada and the United States, 1981-2000." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72 (Summer): 311-30. <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/72/2/311>.

Andersen, Robert, and Tina Fetner. 2008b. "Economic Inequality and Intolerance: Attitudes toward Homosexuality in 35 Democracies." *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (October): 942-58.

Citrin, Jack, Donald P. Green, Christopher Muste, and Cara Wong. 1997. "Public Opinion Toward Immigration Reform: The Role of Economic Motivations." *Journal of Politics* 59 (August): 858-81. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2998640>.

Davis, James A. 1992. "Changeable Weather in a Cooling Climate Atop the Liberal Plateau: Conversion and Replacement in Forty-Two General Social Survey Items, 1972-1989." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 56 (Autumn): 261-306. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2749152>.

## October 26 (Tue): Race and Racism

Many of the recommended readings in this unit are not about race; instead, they are about tolerance and about other kinds of intergroup attitudes.

\* CNA Fisher, Patrick. 2014. *Demographic Gaps in American Political Behavior*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Chapter 5.

\* CNA Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Chapter 6.

\*Kinder, Donald R., and Allison Dale-Riddle. 2012. *The End of Race? Obama, 2008, and Racial Politics in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapter 2. Read pages 26-38 and 46-56. Skim the rest.

\* CNA Hopkins, Daniel J. 2009. "No More Wilder Effect, Never a Whitman Effect: When and Why Polls Mislead about Black and Female Candidates." *Journal of Politics* 71 (July): 769-81. <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=5962084>.

CNA Sniderman, Paul M., and Edward G. Carmines. 1997. *Reaching Beyond Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Chapter 2. The authors' argument is built around several simple figures. Think about the simple and complex interpretations that could be assigned to each figure, and think about how defensible those interpretations are.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.



[CNA] Huddy, Leonie, and Stanley Feldman. 2009. "On Assessing the Political Effects of Racial Prejudice." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12: 423-47. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.062906.070752>. Mainly about different measures of racism. Read up to 434; skim the rest.

Enos, Ryan D. 2017. *The Space Between Us: Social Geography and Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Acharya, Avidit, Matthew Blackwell, and Maya Sen. 2018. *Deep Roots: How Slavery Still Shapes Southern Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kuziemko, Ilyana, and Ebonya Washington. 2018. "Why Did the Democrats Lose the South? Bringing New Data to an Old Debate." *American Economic Review* 108 (10): 2830-67.

## November 02 (Tue): Partisanship and Partisan Polarization in the Mass Public

### PARTISANSHIP

\*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 81-89.

\* [CNA] Lewis-Beck, Michael S., William G. Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, and Herbert F. Weisberg. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chapter 6. The book is an update of *The American Voter*, a highly influential but now rather dated book. You may also want to examine Chapter 4 ("Partisan Choice"), but it is not required.

[DNA] [CNA] Hersh, Eitan D. 2015. *Hacking the Electorate: How Campaigns Perceive Voters*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Especially Chapter 5. What can campaigns predict about you if they know your party registration, and how well can they predict it?

Green, Donald P. 2013. "Breaking Empirical Deadlocks in the Study of Partisanship: An Overview of Experimental Research Strategies." *Politics and Governance* 1 (1): 6-15. <https://doi.org/10.12924/pag2013.01010006>. Somewhat advanced. Useful framing of the pre-experimental literature, and a nice introduction to Gerber, Huber, and Washington (2010).

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. [DNA] indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and [CNA] indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, and Ebonya Washington. 2010. "Party Affiliation, Partisanship, and Political Beliefs: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 104 (November): 720-44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000407>. Think about how to manipulate partisanship in an experiment. In this article, the authors show you how to do it rather simply.

[CNA] Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapters 1, 2, and 8. Available from the course web site. The authors' main argument is that party identification is very stable over time.

[CNA] Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 2002. *The Macro Polity*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 4 and 5. [http://resources.library.yale.edu/ereserves/default.asp?class=PLSC238A&File=PLSC\\_238A\\_2.pdf](http://resources.library.yale.edu/ereserves/default.asp?class=PLSC238A&File=PLSC_238A_2.pdf).

McGrath, Mary C. 2017. "Economic Behavior and the Partisan Perceptual Screen." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 11 (4): 363-83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/100.00015100>.

Bullock, John G. 2011. "Elite Influence on Public Opinion in an Informed Electorate." *American Political Science Review* 105 (September): 496-515. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055411000165>.

## PARTISAN POLARIZATION IN THE MASS PUBLIC

\*Fiorina, Morris P. 2017. *Unstable Majorities: Polarization, Party Sorting & Political Stalemate*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press. Read Chapters 1-5. The rest is good but not assigned.

\*Gelman, Andrew. 2015 November 29. "Where's the Partisan Polarization on Abortion?" <https://goo.gl/Uk9rPP>. Focus above all on the first figure.

\* [CNA] Fiorina, Morris P., and Samuel J. Abrams. 2008. "Political Polarization in the American Public." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 563-88. Read pages 574-82, focusing on the "Polarized Choices" and "Party Sorting" sections. Be sure that you understand the arguments in both sections or that you come to class with specific questions about them.

\* [CNA] Iyengar, Shanto, and Sean J Westwood. 2015. "Fear and Loathing across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization." *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (3): 690-707.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. [DNA] indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and [CNA] indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

Klar, Samara, Yanna Krupnikov, and John Barry Ryan. 2018. "Affective Polarization or Partisan Disdain? Untangling a Dislike for the Opposing Party from a Dislike of Partisanship." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82 (2): 379-90.

[CNA] Ansolabehere, Stephen, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Snyder, Jr. 2006. "Purple America." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20 (2): 97-118. <http://www.stanford.edu/~jrodden/jep.20.2.pdf>.

[CNA] Abramowitz, Alan I., and Kyle L. Saunders. 2008. "Is Polarization a Myth?" *Journal of Politics* 70 (April): 542-55. [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0022381608080493](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0022381608080493).

[CNA] Fiorina, Morris P., Samuel A. Abrams, and Jeremy C. Pope. 2008. "Polarization in the American Public: Misconceptions and Misreadings." *Journal of Politics* 70 (April): 556-60. [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S002238160808050X](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S002238160808050X). This article is a response to Abramowitz.

[CNA] Fiorina, Morris P. 2011. *Culture War?* 3rd ed. New York: Pearson Longman. Dated, but it remains a classic. Highly readable.

[CNA] Jacobson, Gary C. 2006. *A Divider, Not a Uniter: George W. Bush and the American People*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Hill, Seth J., and Chris Tausanovitch. 2015. "A Disconnect in Representation? Comparison of Trends in Congressional and Public Polarization." *Journal of Politics* 77 (4): 1058-75.

Of late, there has been particular interest in partisan polarization with respect to survey responses, especially responses to questions about factual beliefs. You may be interested in:

Prior, Markus, Gaurav Sood, and Kabir Khanna. 2015. "You Cannot Be Serious: The Impact of Accuracy Incentives on Partisan Bias in Reports of Economic Perceptions." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 10 (4): 489-518.

Bullock, John G., Alan S. Gerber, Seth J. Hill, and Gregory A. Huber. 2015. "Partisan Bias in Factual Beliefs about Politics." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 10 (December): 519-78.

Bullock, John G., and Gabriel Lenz. 2019. "Partisan Bias in Surveys." *Annual Review of Political Science* 22: 325-42. <http://www.annualreviews.org/eprint/XZMKVBCB4SIASFEDJJ2C/full/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051117-050904>.

Schaffner, Brian F., and Samantha Luks. 2018. "Misinformation or Expressive Responding? What an Inauguration Crowd Can Tell Us about the Source of Political Misinformation in Surveys." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82 (1): 135-47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfx042>.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. [DNA] indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and [CNA] indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

## November 09 (Tue): Theoretic Foundations of Representation

\*Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman. Pages 307-14.

\*Lepore, Jill. 2013. "Long Division." *The New Yorker*, December 2. <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2013/12/02/long-division> (accessed August 23, 2015). There is some editorializing here. For our purposes, focus on the summaries of specific research efforts by social scientists.

\*Mayhew, David R. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Introduction and Part 1.

\*Stewart, Charles III. 2001. *Analyzing Congress*. New York: W. W. Norton. Chapter 1 through page 35, and pages 45-49.

\*Broockman, David E. 2016. "Approaches to Studying Policy Representation." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 41 (1): 181-215. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/lsq.12110>.

Grofman, Bernard. 2004. "Downs and Two-Party Convergence." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 25-46. <http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104711>. Shows how the assumptions of Downs' formulation of the median voter theorem often fail to hold in practice.

### MEASURING REPRESENTATION

Miller, Warren E., and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57 (1): 45-56.

Achen, Christopher H. 1977. "Measuring Representation: Perils of the Correlation Coefficient." *American Journal of Political Science* 21 (November): 805-815. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2110737>. A critique of Miller and Stokes (1963).

Ellenberg, Jordan. 2001. "The Mathematical Evidence for Congress' Growing Polarization." *Slate*, December 26. [http://www.slate.com/articles/life/do\\_the\\_math/2001/12/growing\\_apart.single.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/life/do_the_math/2001/12/growing_apart.single.html) (accessed August 24, 2015). An introduction to NOMINATE.

CNA McCarty, Nolan, Keith T. Poole, and Howard Rosenthal. 2006. *Polarized America: The Dance of Ideology and Unequal Riches*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Chapters 1 and 2. Aim to understand the measurement methods. I am not assigning this material so that you will understand the argument of the book; to do that, you would need to read more chapters.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

Achen, Christopher H. 1978. "Measuring Representation." *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (August): 475-510. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2110458>. The methodological message of Achen (1977) but with more detail.

Jones, Philip Edward. 2011. "Which Buck Stops Here? Accountability for Policy Positions and Policy Outcomes in Congress." *The Journal of Politics* 73 (July): 764-82.

Ansolabehere, Stephen, James M. Snyder, Jr., and Charles Stewart III. 2001. "Candidate Positioning in U.S. House Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (January): 136-59. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2669364>.

Clinton, Joshua D. 2006. "Representation in Congress: Constituents and Roll Calls in the 106th House." *Journal of Politics* 68 (May): 397-409. <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-2508.2006.00415.x>.

## November 16 (Tue): Income and Representation

\*Shapiro, Robert Y. 2011. "Public Opinion and American Democracy." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75 (5): 982-1017.

\*CNA Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. 2014. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics* 12 (September): 564-81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1537592714001595>. Skim the early section on "Four Theoretical Traditions"; read the rest.

\*Matthews, Dylan. 2016 May 9. "Remember that study saying America is an oligarchy? 3 rebuttals say it's wrong." <http://www.vox.com/2016/5/9/11502464/gilens-page-oligarchy-study>.

\*Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. 2016 May 23. "Critics argued with our analysis of U.S. political inequality. Here are 5 ways they're wrong." <http://wapo.st/1TDPnzE>.

\*Patty, John. 2014. "It's Better To Fight When You Can Win, Or At Least Look Like You Did." <https://goo.gl/ZmFgR2> (accessed April 2, 2018).

\*Brunner, Eric, Stephen L. Ross, and Ebonya Washington. 2013. "Does Less Income Mean Less Representation?" *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 5 (May): 53-76. <http://doi.org/cm2>. Note an error in Tables 2 and 3. The word "percentile" occurs seven times in those tables; in every case, it should be "tercile."

CNA Gilens, Martin. 2012. *Affluence and Influence*. New York: Russell Sage. Impressive and the product of an enormous effort. Some people find the first chapter

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

dull, but if you know the background—if you realize that Gilens is using the chapter to join a long debate about the importance of public opinion—you probably won't agree.

*Boston Review* published a symposium on Gilens' book. I recommend the contributions by Bartels, Yglesias, and Ferejohn. You can find links to those responses at <http://goo.gl/Cywco3>.

Bashir, Omar S. 2015. "Testing Inferences about American Politics: A Review of the "Oligarchy" Result." *Research & Politics* 2 (4).

CNA Erikson, Robert S. 2015. "Income Inequality and Policy Responsiveness." *Annual Review of Political Science* 18 (May): 11-29. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-020614-094706>.

CNA Wlezien, Christopher, and Stuart N. Soroka. 2011. "Inequality in Policy Responsiveness." In *Who Gets Represented?*, ed. Peter K. Enns and Christopher Wlezien. New York: Russell Sage.

## November 23 (Tue): Descriptive and Substantive Representation

The first two required readings for this unit are theoretical, not empirical.

\*Burke, Edmund. 1774. "Speech to the Electors of Bristol." <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch13s7.html> (accessed August 24, 2015).

\*Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes'." *Journal of Politics* 61 (3): 628-657. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2647821>.

\*Butler, Daniel M., and David W. Nickerson. 2011. "Can Learning Constituency Opinion Affect How Legislators Vote? Results from a Field Experiment." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 6 (1): 55-83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1561/100.00011019>.

\*Bafumi, Joseph, and Michael C. Herron. 2010. "Leapfrog Representation and Extremism: A Study of American Voters and Their Members in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 104 (August): 519-42. <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=7909409>. Read most of the article, but feel free to just skim "Consistency Checks on Voter Ideal Point Estimates" (527-28). Be sure that you understand Figure 2. It is simple and very important to the paper.

Mansbridge, Jane. 2003. "Rethinking Representation." *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 515-528. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000856>. I prefer Mansbridge's 1999 article; I find the argument in this one to be somewhat muddled.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.

But it does have some useful ideas. Read Table 1 (page 525) immediately after reading the introduction.

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. <http://journals.cambridge.org/production/action/cjoGetFulltext?fulltextid=5832116>. A response to Mansbridge (2003).

DNA CNA Lax, Jeffrey R., and Justin H. Phillips. 2012. "The Democratic Deficit in the States." *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (January): 148-66. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2011.00537.x/abstract>.

CNA Canes-Wrone, Brandice, Michael C. Herron, and Kenneth W. Shotts. 2001. "Leadership and Pandering: A Theory of Executive Policymaking." *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (July): 532-550. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2669237>.

Canes-Wrone, Brandice, David W. Brady, and John F. Cogan. 2004. "Out of Step, Out of Office." *American Political Science Review* 96 (March): 127-140. <http://journals.cambridge.org/production/action/cjoGetFulltext?fulltextid=208468>.

Readings marked by an asterisk (\*) are required; all others are optional. DNA indicates that the authors' data do not seem to be available online, and CNA indicates that the code needed to reproduce the authors' results does not seem to be available online. See page 4 for details.