

GOV 2305: American Politics Field Seminar

Fall 2018

Thursdays, 9-11am

Location: Knafel 108

9.06.18 – to Canvas

Instructors:

Jennifer Hochschild

Office hours are Monday, 2-4pm, CGIS K156

hochschild@gov.harvard.edu

Jon Rogowski

Office hours are Thursdays, 2-4pm, CGIS K420

rogowski@fas.harvard.edu

The purpose of this course is to introduce doctoral students to the major themes and some of the best scholarship in the political science literature on American Politics. The readings for 2305 typically form the core of students' subsequent reading lists for major or minor general exams in American politics. The most important requirement of the course, therefore, is to read the publications for each week carefully and critically. They will be the focus of our discussions. Keep in mind that your reading of some items will affect your reading of others, whether in the current or some other week; we will make a point of discussing those links. More generally, the readings will provide us, as a group, with common terms of reference upon which good discussions will depend.

One initial caveat, however: much in the study of American politics is not represented here, and there are many issues that political scientists have not yet taken up – so along the way, we will want to identify important but neglected questions. What issues should motivate the next generation of research in this field? What theoretical and methodological approaches might be appropriate to studying them? What do we now know that will enable us to engage with new issues, evidence, or methods?

To fulfill the goals of this course, it is important that you write as well as read and discuss. In particular, we aspire for this course to help you to make the transition from being mostly a consumer of scholarship to also being a producer, as well as a good disciplinary citizen. We have three ways to encourage you to achieve those goals:

Weekly memos: For five of the substantive weeks, you will write a brief (no more than 400 words) historiographic note about the readings for that session (you may include readings from earlier sessions if appropriate). The focus will be on the intellectual trajectory from the earliest publication(s) to later ones – where did this literature start? How did it develop, and why in that direction(s)? What continues to be important in the earlier work, and what has been superseded? What do political scientists now know that we didn't know XX years ago? (the answer might be "not much"). Conversely, where has the more recent literature gone wrong?

What ideas do the most recent publications for that session open up for our discussions, further research, etc.?

Of course, you can't address all of these issues in one brief memo; the idea is to get you thinking about them so our class discussion can be well informed and thoughtful. You may also find that some readings in a given week don't fit into a nice historiographical time line – that is sometimes intentional, and it will be equally interesting to analyze what does not fit into a given intellectual trajectory as what does. Read each other's notes, and come prepared to discuss their ideas and insights.

AND

On five of the weeks (we suggest roughly every other session), you will write a brief (no more than 400 words) memo on how you would develop new research growing out of the material in that session. Put differently, if the previous set of memos starts in the past and moves to the present, this set of memos starts in the present and moves toward the future of research.

As you develop these memos, think about what project you would be interested in exploring, growing out of this set of readings. What is the big analytic or normative question, and why is it worth answering?¹ What kinds of evidence would you use to study it? What kinds of methods? What would be the biggest difficulty in developing this research agenda? Of what do you hope to persuade your readers?

Each weekly submission will be due by Wednesday at 6 p.m, before each Thursday class. There will be folders for each week on the Canvas website for your upload. Please be sure to read and think about all of the memos submitted for each class session; you are invited to offer online comments on each other's memos before the session meets, and we will certainly discuss your ideas and proposals during the session itself.

AND

Journal submission reviews: Peer review is central to the academic enterprise and the accumulation of knowledge. Our course is as good a time as any to gain familiarity with this process, from the perspective of both a reviewer and an author. Several working papers from (anonymized) authors outside of Harvard will be distributed via Canvas. Students should choose two papers; for one, you will act as a reviewer and provide critical but helpful and honest feedback as if you were reviewing for a top journal in the discipline. (We suggest no more than two pages, single-spaced.) For the second, students should respond to the reviews provided as if you were the paper's author. Engage with the review and outline the revisions you have undertaken in response--and those that you are not undertaking, explaining in that case why. (We recommend no more than four pages, single-spaced.)

¹ If your response is "to fill a gap in the literature," you will immediately fail the course.

The manuscript review is due on October 18, 2018, and the response to a manuscript review is due on November 29, 2018. Please email each to the instructors in Word format.

AND

Development of research proposal: for a capstone activity, you will develop one of your five brief research memos into a more sustained research proposal (no more than 8 single-spaced pp.). It is likely to follow along the same lines – explaining your research question, persuading the reader of its importance, pointing toward the most important literature or evidentiary base (selectively, not exhaustively), and laying out your work agenda. The latter should include some reason to believe that the evidence you need actually exists or can be gathered, a description of the methods you will use, and something as close to testable hypotheses as you can get. (For those of you doing more qualitative, archival, or normative proposals, you may want to substitute “demonstrable propositions” for “testable hypotheses.”). *The final paper will be due on the last day of reading period, December 14.*

A general note about writing: having smart ideas and good methods is no excuse for poor writing – in fact, nothing is. Our evaluations will include attention to the quality of your prose (we can discuss what that means if you wish). Here are three resources to help you develop clear and interesting writing:

- GSAS Center for Writing and Communicating Ideas
<https://gsas.harvard.edu/center-writing-and-communicating-ideas>
- Francis-Noël Thomas and Mark Turner, *Clear and Simple As the Truth*, 2nd ed, Princeton University Press, 2011.
- William Zinsser, *On Writing Well*, Harper, 2016 (or earlier edition)

Course grades will depend on participation in the seminars, weekly memos, quality of the paper reviews, and quality of the final research proposal, with each of the four components weighted equally.

Required readings are available on the Canvas website for the course. The following books are also available at the Coop for purchase or rental (and most can be found at Amazon.com or elsewhere in used copies). Our decision rule was to include on this list any book with three or more chapters assigned, if it is *not* available online at Hollis:

Christopher Achen and Larry Bartels, *Democracy for Realists*: Princeton University Press, 2016.

John Aldrich, *Why Parties? A Second Look*. University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Robert Dahl, *Who Governs?* Yale University Press, 2005 [1961].

Jennifer Hochschild, *What's Fair*, Harvard University Press, 1981

John Kingdon, *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, Longman, 2003.

David Mayhew, *Congress: The Electoral Connection*, Yale University Press, 1974.

Jamilla Michener, *Fragmented Democracy: Medicaid, Federalism, and Unequal Politics*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
Markus Prior, *Post-Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
Jeffrey Segal and Harold Spaeth. *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
Theda Skocpol, *Diminished Democracy*, University of Oklahoma Press, 2004
John Zaller, *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Reading Assignments

September 6: Institutional and Normative Foundations of the American Order

James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay, *The Federalist Papers*, Nos. 10, 14, 23, 39, 51, 52, 62, 70, and 78.

any unabridged edition; one easy place to find them is:

<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-federalist-papers/>

Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (any unabridged edition)

Vol. I, part 2, Ch. 5, "The People's Choice...", "Elements Which May Provide...",

Vol. I, part 2, Ch. 7, "Tyranny of the Majority," "The Power Exercised by the Majority...",
"The Greatest Danger to..."

Vol. 1, part 2, Ch. 9, "How the Enlightenment, Habits..."

Vol. II, part 2, Chs. 1, 2, 8

Vol. II, part 4, Chs. 2, 6

Robert Dahl. 1977. "On Removing Certain Impediments to Democracy in the United States." *Political Science Quarterly* 92(1): 1-20.

September 13: Information, Ideology, and Opinion Formation

Phillip Converse, 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics," in David Apter, ed., *Ideology and Discontent*. Free Press of Glencoe, pp. 206-61.

Jennifer Hochschild, 1986 *What's Fair?* Harvard University Press. Chs. 2, 6 and 8.

John Zaller, 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 2, 3, 6, 7.

Elizabeth Noelle-Neumann, 1974. "The Spiral of Silence," *Journal of Communication* 24 (2): 43-51

Dan Kahan, 2015. "Climate-Science Communication and the Measurement Problem," *Advances in Political Psychology* 36, Suppl. 1.

Dan Kahan et al. 2017. "Motivated Numeracy and Enlightened Self-Government," *Behavioral Public Policy* 1 (1): 54-86.

September 20: Political Parties and Partisanship

- Anthony Downs. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper & Row. Chs. 3, 7-8.
- John Aldrich, 2011. *Why Parties? A Second Look*. University of Chicago Press. Chs. 1-4, 6.
- APSA Committee on Political Parties. 1950. "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System: A Report of the Committee on Political Parties." *American Political Science Review* 44(3): 1-96.
- Kathleen Bawn, Martin Cohen, David Karol, Seth Maskett, Hans Noel, and John Zaller, 2012, "A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands and Nominations in American Politics," *Perspectives on Politics* 10 (3): 571-591.
- Donald Green, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler, 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identity of Voters*. Yale University Press, Chs. 1-2.
- Leonie Huddy, Lilliana Mason, and Lene Aarøe. 2015. "Expressive Partisanship: Campaign Involvement, Political Emotion, and Partisan Identity." *American Political Science Review* 109(1): 1-17.

September 27: Groups, Identities, and Politics

- Jennifer Hochschild and Brenna Powell, 2008. "Racial Reorganization and the United States Census 1850-1930: Mulattoes, Half-Breeds, Mixed Parentage, Hindoos, and the Mexican Race," *Studies in American Political Development*, 22 (1): 59-96
- Paul Frymer, 2005. "Racism Revised: Courts, Labor Law, and the Institutional Construction of Racial Animus," *APSR*, 99 (3); 373-387.
- Michael Tesler, 2012. "The Spillover of Racialization into Health Care: How President Obama Polarized Public Opinion by Race and Racial Attitudes." *AJPS* 56(3): 690-704.
- Amy Lerman and Vesla Weaver. 2010. "The Political Consequences of the Carceral State," *APSR* 104(4): 817-833.
- Jon Rogowski and Sophie Schuit, 2018. "Electoral Institutions and Democratic Legitimacy," *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 82 (2): 343-365.
- Aristide Zolberg, 2008. *A Nation by Design*. Harvard University Press, Chs. 1, Conclusion

October 4: Congressional Institutions

- David Mayhew, *Congress: The Electoral Connection*, pp 1-77.
- Nolan McCarty, Keith Poole, and Howard Rosenthal, 2016. *Polarized America*, 2nd ed. Chs. 2, 4
- Kenneth Shepsle and Barry Weingast. 1987, "The Institutional Foundations of Committee Power," *APSR*, 81:1.
- Gary Cox and Mathew McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives*. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 2, 4, 5, and 6.
- Frances Lee. 2009. *Beyond Ideology: Politics, Principles, and Partisanship in the U. S. Senate*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chs. 1, 3, and 4.

- Eric Schickler and Andrew Rich. 1997. "Controlling the Floor: Parties as Procedural Coalitions in the House." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(4): 1340-1375.
- Keith Krehbiel, 1998. *Pivotal Politics*, University of Chicago Press, Chs. 1, 2.
- David Bateman, Joshua Clinton, and John Lapinski. 2017. "A House Divided? Roll Calls, Polarization, and Policy Differences in the U.S. House, 1877–2011." *American Journal of Political Science* 61(3): 698-714.

October 11: Presidency and the Executive Branch

- Richard Neustadt, 1960. *Presidential Power*, Ch. 1.
- Charles Cameron, 2000. *Veto Bargaining*, Cambridge University Press. Chs. 1, 2.
- William Howell, 2003. *Power without Persuasion: The Politics of Direct Presidential Action*, Princeton University Press, Chs. 1, 2, and 3.
- Brandice Canes-Wrone and Scott De Marchi. 2002. "Presidential Approval and Legislative Success." *Journal of Politics*. 64 (2): 491-509.
- Terry Moe, 1989. "The Politics of Bureaucratic Structure," in John Chubb and Paul Peterson, eds., *Can the Government Govern?* The Brookings Institution, pp. 267-329.
- Matthew McCubbins and Thomas Schwartz, 1984, "Congressional Oversight Overlooked," *AJPS*, 28 (1): 165-179.
- Daniel Carpenter, 2001. *Forging Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputation, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928*. Princeton University Press, Ch. 1.

October 18: Democratic Accountability, Representation, and Responsiveness

- Warren Miller and Donald Stokes, 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress," *APSR* 57 (1): 43-56.
- Christopher Achen and Larry Bartels, 2016. *Democracy for Realists*, Chs. 8, 9, 10, 11
- David Lee, Enrico Moretti, and Matthew Butler. "Do Voters Affect or Elect Policies? Evidence from the U. S. House." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 119 (3): 807-859.
- Scott Ashworth and Ethan Bueno de Mesquita. 2014. "Is Voter Competence Good for Voters? Information, Rationality, and Democratic Performance." *American Political Science Review* 108(3): 565-587.
- Brandice Canes-Wrone, David Brady, and John Cogan. 2002. "Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting." *American Political Science Review* 96 (1): 127-140.
- Douglas Kriner and Andrew Reeves. 2015. "Presidential Particularism and Divide-the-Dollar Politics." *American Political Science Review* 109 (1): 155-171.
- Jane Mansbridge, 2003. "Rethinking Representation." *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 515-528.
- Claudine Gay. 2002. "Spirals of Trust? The Effect of Descriptive Representation on the Relationship between Citizens and Their Government." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (4): 717-732.

October 25: Policymaking and the Politics of Military and Social Policy

- John Kingdon, 2003. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, Longman. Chs. 5, 6, 7, and 8
- Eric Patashnik, 2008. *Reforms at Risk*. Princeton University Press, Chs. 2 and 9.
- R. Shep Melnick, 2018. *The Transformation of Title IX*. Brookings Institution Press, Chs. 1, 11, and 13.
- Jacob Hacker, Paul Pierson, and Kathleen Thelen. 2015. "Drift and Conversion: Hidden Faces of Institutional Change," in *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis*. Ed. James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen. Cambridge University Press, pp. 180-209
- David Mayhew, 2005. "Wars and American Politics," *Perspectives on Politics*. 3 (3): 473-493.
- William Howell, Saul Jackman, and Jon Rogowski, 2013. *The Wartime President: Executive Influence and the Nationalizing Politics of Threat*. University of Chicago Press. Chs. 3, 4, 5.

November 1: Legal Process and the Courts

- Robert Dahl, 1957. "Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as National Policy Maker," *Journal of Public Law* 6: 279-295.
- Keith Whittington, 2005. "'Interpose Your Friendly Hand': Political Supports for the Exercise of Judicial Review by the United States Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review*. 99 (4): 583-596.
- Gregory Caldeira and James Gibson. 1992. "The Etiology of Public Support for the US Supreme Court." *AJPS* 36(3): 635-664.
- Benjamin Lauderdale and Tom Clark, 2012. "The Supreme Court's Many Median Justices," *APSR* 106 (4): 847-866
- Pamela Brandwein, 1999. *Reconstructing Reconstruction: The Supreme Court and the Production of Historical Truth*, Duke University Press: Ch. 1.
- Jeffrey Segal and Harold Spaeth. 2002. *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited*. Cambridge University Press, Chs. 1, 2, and 3.

November 8: Subnational Politics: States, Regions, and Federalism

- Ira Katznelson, 2013. *Fear Itself*. Norton. Chs 4, 5.
- Eric Schickler, 2016. *Racial Realignment*. Princeton University Press, Ch. 7.
- Arthur Lupia, et al, 2010. "Why State Constitutions Differ in their Treatment of Same-Sex Marriage," *Journal of Politics*, 72 (4): 1222-35
- Jennifer Hochschild, 2018. "What's New? What's Next? Threats to the American Constitutional Order," in *Constitutional Democracies in Crisis*, eds. Mark Graber, Sanford Levinson, and Mark Tushnet. Oxford University Press, Ch. 6.

Elisabeth Gerber. 1996. "Legislative Response to the Threat of Popular Initiatives," *AJPS*, 40(1): 99-128.

Jeffrey Lax and Justin Phillips. 2012. "The Democratic Deficit in the States," *AJPS* 56: 148-166.

November 15: Subnational Politics: Local Governance and Participation

Robert Dahl, 2005 [1961] *Who Governs?* Yale University Press, Chs. 7, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 27, 28.

Douglas Rae, 2005. *City*. Yale University Press, Chs. 8, 11, 12.

Jessica Trounstine, 2016. "Segregation and Inequality in Public Goods," *AJPS*, 60 (3): 709-725.

Katherine Cramer, 2016. *The Politics of Resentment*, University of Chicago Press, Chs. 5 and 6

Charles Shipan and Craig Volden, 2008. "The Mechanisms of Policy Diffusion," *AJPS* 52(4): 840-854.

Dan Hopkins, 2018, *The Increasingly United States*, University of Chicago Press, Chs. 4 and 5.

November 22: University holiday; no class

November 29: Social Movements and Political Participation

Andrea Campbell, *How Policies Make Citizens*, Chs 1-2, 4-6.

Henry Brady, Sydney Verba, and Kay Schlozman, 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation", *APSR*, 89 (2): 271-294

Donald Green and Alan Gerber, 2000 "The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment," *APSR* 94 (3): 653-663.

Mancur Olson, *The Logic of Collective Action*, selections TBA.

Theda Skocpol, *Diminished Democracy*, Chs. 2-4, 7.

Dara Strolovitch, 2006. "Do Interest Groups Represent the Disadvantaged? Advocacy at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender." *Journal of Politics* 68 (4): 893-908.

Jamila Michener. 2018. *Fragmented Democracy: Medicaid, Federalism, and Unequal Politics*. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 2-4.

December 6: Political Communication and the Media

Markus Prior, 2007. *Post-Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections*. Princeton University Press. Chs. 2, 3, 7, 8.

Stephen Ansolabehere, Shanto Iyengar, Adam Simon, Nicholas Valentino, 1994. "Does Attack Advertising Demobilize the Electorate?" *American Political Science Review* 88(4): 829-838.

Gregory Martin and Joshua McCrain, 2018. "Local News and National Politics." Working paper; available at <https://web.stanford.edu/~gjmartin/papers/localnews.pdf>.

- Diana Mutz and Byron Reeves, 2005. "The New Videomalaise: Effects of Televised Incivility on Political Trust." *American Political Science Review* 99(1): 1-15.
- Alexander Coppock, Emily Ekins, and David Kirby, 2018. "The Long-lasting Effects of Newspaper Op-Eds on Public Opinion." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 13: 59-87.
- Andrew Guess, Brendan Nyhan, and Jason Reifler, 2018. "Selective Exposure to Misinformation: Evidence from the Consumption of Fake News during the 2016 U.S. Presidential Campaign." Working paper; available at <https://www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/fake-news-2016.pdf>.
- James Druckman, Matthew Levendusky, and Audrey McLain, 2018. "No Need to Watch: How the Effects of Partisan Media Can Spread via Interpersonal Discussions." *American Journal of Political Science* 62 (1): 99-112.