

John Bullock
Political Science
john.bullock@northwestern.edu
Office: Scott Hall 304
Spring 2018

Public Opinion and Representation in the United States

Political Science 490 (33112)
Scott Hall 319, Mondays, 300pm-550pm
<https://canvas.northwestern.edu/courses/72435>
Syllabus date: May 21, 2018 (8:04am)

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 or computing. 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

Each student must write two 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 50% of the final grade.

Perfect attendance does not ensure that you will get a satisfactory discussion grade. If you always attend class but rarely speak, or if you speak regularly in ways that suggest that you haven't thought about the readings, you will receive a low discussion grade—perhaps an F. In the

past, most discussion grades have been in the B range, and C grades have sometimes been more common than A grades.

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.

DISCUSSION

Discussion will be based heavily on the readings.

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 15 minutes at the beginning of class. It may make sense to begin with a brief overview of the assigned reading, but as with the reading responses, the emphasis should be on critique rather than summary. (As a rule of thumb, spend no more than 90 seconds summarizing any particular reading.) The discussion grade is based on discussion throughout the semester, 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.

Students who are going to present in a given class must post at least one page of notes on their presentations to the "Discussions" section of the Canvas site. These notes will not be graded, but they must be posted at least 24 hours before the start of class.

READING RESPONSES

Each student must write two reading responses. These responses should be 2-3 pages long. They should critique—not summarize—at least one of the assigned readings. They must pertain chiefly to the current week's reading. 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.

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 May 13th. You may turn in only one response per week. I will not grant deadline extensions for the reading responses. Remember, you need to write only two of them.

By early June, I expect that I will have graded and returned only those responses that you wrote by early May.

See the “Format of Assignments” section of this syllabus for further instructions. If you fail to follow those formatting instructions, I will automatically lower your grade: an A will become an A–, a B will become a B–, and so on.

FINAL PAPER

It should be 12 to 18 pages long. It’s due at 900am on June 14th. Please meet me before May 14th to discuss potential topics: I don’t want you to take on topics that are too big. Upload the paper through the “Assignments” section of the Canvas site and slip hard copy under the door of my office. Do not send a copy by e-mail.

I will not reply to email about the final paper that is sent after June 3rd unless the questions are about formatting or are otherwise purely procedural. Please plan accordingly.

WRITING FOR ME

I’ve posted [a memo](#) that sets forth rules and guidelines to follow when you write papers in my courses. Please read every word, including every item in the long list at the end of the memo. If there is something in the memo 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.

FORMAT OF ASSIGNMENTS

All assignments must be double-spaced and set in a 12-to-13-point font. The font must be serifed; this rules out Arial, Calibri, Helvetica, and other sans-serif fonts. The font must not be monospaced; this rules out, e.g., Courier. Margins must be between 1” and 1.33” on each side.

Your name, the date of submission, and “PLSC 490: Public Opinion and Representation,” should appear in the upper right-hand corner of the first page of every assignment. For reading responses, also include the name of the unit as given in this syllabus (e.g., “Tolerance”). The upper right-hand corner of every subsequent page should bear your last name, the page number, and “PLSC 490: Reading Response” or “PLSC 490: Final Paper.”

AWARDS

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

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. The other readings in the syllabus are recommended but not required.

There is one required book: Morris Fiorina's *Culture War*, 3rd ed., ISBN 978-0205779888. The book will not be available from the Northwestern Bookstore, but it is available from online booksellers. Please order a copy soon; "it was out of stock" is not an adequate excuse for not having the book.

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/uncampus/vpn/>.

WHAT WE WON'T COVER THIS YEAR

In this course, we take up both ideas and findings in public opinion research and ideas and findings in representation research. 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 notice that we don't have a full class devoted to any 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:

Erikson, Robert S., and Kent L. Tedin. 2015. *American Public Opinion*. 9th ed. Longman.

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:

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 take place on the times specified at <https://www.slotted.co/2018spring>. They will be held at my office: Scott Hall 304. 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.

You cannot sign up for my office hours through Canvas. Instead, please make appointments through <https://www.slotted.co/2018spring>. When you make an appointment, please add a comment indicating what you would like to talk about when we meet.

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

April 3 (Tue): Introduction; 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.

*Stimson, James A. 2015. *Tides of Consent: How Public Opinion Shapes American Politics*. 2nd ed. New York: 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." There is a direct link between this reading and the Stimson reading. What is it? Come to class with an answer: I may put the question to you, and "I don't know" will not be an acceptable response.

*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?

*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.

*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>.

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.

April 9 (Mon): 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.

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.

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.

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

*Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford. 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.

*Fisher, Patrick. 2014. *Demographic Gaps in American Political Behavior*. 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*. https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/jmarshall/files/the_anti-democrat_diploma_v4.pdf.

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). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12265>.

Dee, Thomas S. 2004. "Are There Civic Returns to Education?" *J. Pub. Econ* 88: 1697-1720.

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>.

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.

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.

April 16 (Mon): Political Sophistication, Nonattitudes, and Cues as "Information Shortcuts"

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

*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.

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

*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. 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.

Converse, Philip E. [1964] 2006. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." *Critical Review* 18 (Winter-Summer): 1-74. <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/ftinterface~content=a791297569~fulltext=713240930>.

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.

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>.

Converse, Philip E. 2000. "Assessing the Capacity of Mass Electorates." *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 331-53.

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.

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.

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

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

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.

CUES AS SHORTCUTS

*Somin, Ilya. 1998. "Voter Ignorance and the Democratic Ideal." *Critical Review* 12 (4): 413-58. <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a791282780~db=all>. 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>.

*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.

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

April 23 (Mon): 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.

*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* (Campbell et al. 1960), a highly influential but now rather dated book. You may also want to examine Chapter 4 ("Partisan Choice"), but it is not required.

*Iyengar, Shanto, Gaurav Sood, and Yphtach Lelkes. 2012. "Affect, Not Ideology: A Social Identity Perspective on Polarization." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76 (Fall): 405-31. Skip 421-27. And note that there is an error on page 412: see <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/content/76/4/819.full.pdf+html>.

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. Somewhat advanced. Useful framing of the pre-experimental literature, and a nice introduction to Gerber, Huber, and Washington (2010).

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.

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.

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.

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. 2011. *Culture War?* 3rd ed. New York: Pearson Longman. Read the whole book, except for this: you can choose whether to read the abortion chapter or the gay rights chapter, and you should skip Chapter 3, Chapter 8, and the epilogue.

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

*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.

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

April 30 (Mon): Tolerance and Democratic Values

*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.

*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.

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>.

May 7 (Mon): Racial Attitudes

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

*Fisher, Patrick. 2014. *Demographic Gaps in American Political Behavior*. Westview Press. Chapter 5.

*Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford. 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.

*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>.

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.

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.

May 14 (Mon): 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://goo.gl/gyNa6l>.

*Alesina, Alberto, and Edward L. Glaeser. 2004. *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford. 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.”

*Page, Benjamin I., Larry M. Bartels, and Jason Seawright. 2013. “Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans.” *Perspectives on Politics* 11 (1): 51-73. <http://goo.gl/oB3A9n>. This article is about wealth, not income.

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

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/S1049096501000026>. Interesting and important, but difficult to understand if you do not have prior experience with regression analysis.

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).

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.

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.

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.

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 is a direct criticism of Graetz and Shapiro (2005).

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>.

May 21 (Mon): Theoretic Foundations of Representation

*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. N.d. "Approaches to Studying Policy Representation." Forthcoming in *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. <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 (accessed August 24, 2015). An introduction to NOMINATE.

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.

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>.

June 4 (Mon): 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>.

Readings marked by an asterisk (*) are required. All others are optional.

*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 thinking in this one to be somewhat muddled. 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).

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>.

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>.