

PLSI 710: SEMINAR IN AMERICAN POLITICS
Fall 2006, San Francisco State University

Instructor: Francis Neely
Office: HSS 128
Office hours: Mon. 9:00 – 10:30, Wed. 4:00 – 5:30
Phone: 415/338-1522

Wednesday 6:10 – 9:50
Room: HSS 156
fneely@sfsu.edu
<http://bss.sfsu.edu/fneely>

This is a course in American Politics, a subfield of Political Science, and is a core requirement for the M.A. degree in Political Science at SFSU. We have two main goals:

- (1) To obtain a broad understanding of the topics in American Politics and the manner in which they have been studied, and
- (2) To critically review the research to develop ideas about how the work in the various areas might be improved.

The first goal is similar to that of any college course on a substantive topic. The second requires another step in thinking and reflects the fact that this is a graduate course.

Students enter this course with varying degrees of knowledge about American Politics. A minimum expectation is that you are familiar with the U.S. political system, its philosophical bases, the institutions of government, and the links between citizens and government. If you have doubts about your preparation for this course, please review an introductory textbook on American government. I have placed one on reserve in the library.

Course Requirements

Attendance and Participation: You are expected to attend class, complete the readings before class, and participate in class discussions. You are allowed one absence without penalty. Beginning with the second absence, you will lose three of the ten attendance/participation points for each absence. If you happen to miss a class, then you should get notes from a classmate since our discussions will range beyond the material in the readings.

The value of a seminar format relies on everyone's contribution. Participation, therefore, is not optional. I expect that everyone will be involved in our discussions. Up to 10% of your grade is based on that participation.

Readings: Some of the readings are contained in books that you are expected you to buy. The rest of the readings are academic journal articles and book chapters that are either held in the library's electronic reserve system or linked on the course web page. Many of the articles are also available through the JSTOR and EBSCO Host data bases, or in the stacks and current periodicals sections of the library. You should print a copy of the assigned readings and bring them to class to refer to during discussions.

Discussion Leaders: Each week I will offer an introduction to the topic. Please take notes on these short lectures since they will provide a useful context for each set of readings. The discussion that follows will be facilitated by students. Each student will serve as discussion leader once during the term for 10% of the course grade. On that week you will finish the readings early and write a set of discussion questions that is detailed and organized in some thematic way. Email your plans to me by 9:00 a.m. on the Monday preceding the class meeting. I'll review them and return them with comments by 5:00 p.m. that day.

Five Integrative Essays: Throughout the semester you will write five three-to-four page integrative essays on a week's readings. These will contribute 35% to the course grade. One caveat on your choice of weeks applies: you may not write an essay the week you are a discussion leader. The purpose of the essays is to help you embed the information and to prompt you to think about the topics before the class meets. An integrative essay

is not a simple summary of the readings. Instead, it should draw connections between the readings and synthesize the material. For instance, you may choose to critically compare or contrast the substantive findings and the methods used to study some topic. However you approach these essays, be sure to provide a critical discussion. The essays should be type-written in a normal font with one-inch margins, space-and-a-half or double-spaced. They are due at the start of class.

Research Paper or Final Exam: You have the choice between taking a take-home comprehensive final exam and writing a literature review and research proposal. Either option will account for 45% of the course grade. The final exam will require you to draw on a wide range of material covered in the course to address questions I provide. This option is meant to prepare you for taking the M.A. exams. By contrast, the paper will allow you to go more in depth on a particular topic of interest as you review the literature and present a detailed proposal for research. This option is meant to offer you a chance to research a topic that you might eventually develop into a Masters’ thesis. The paper topics, of course, must fall under the subfield of American Politics.

If you choose to write the paper, then please begin early in the semester. Meet with me to discuss the project and hand in a two-page outline by October 4th. Note that this is a strict deadline that you must meet if you plan on doing the paper. Both the take-home exam and the paper should be about twenty pages long. The final exam will be handed out on December 6th and will be due on Wednesday, the 20th at 6:10 p.m. The papers are also due on December 20th at 6:10 p.m. The exams and papers should be handed in on paper. You may turn them in any time before the due date by putting them in my box in HSS 263 or sliding them under my office door. Late exams or papers will be penalized one full letter grade for each calendar day they are late.

Grading and point structure

Grades for this course will be calculated with no curve—one student's grade does not influence another student's chances. Course grades are based on:

Five short essays (7 points each)	35	points
Discussion leader	10	points
Attendance/participation.	10	points
Final paper or exam	45	points
Total	100	points

Grades are assigned in the following way:

94 – 100 = A	80 – 82 = B-	67 – 69 = D+
90 – 93 = A-	77 – 79 = C+	63 – 66 = D
87 – 89 = B+	73 – 76 = C	60 – 62 = D-
83 – 86 = B	70 – 72 = C-	0 – 59 = F

Required Readings

Carroll, Susan, J., and Richard L. Fox, eds. 2006. *Gender and Elections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 0521606705

Dahl, Robert. 2003. *How Democratic is the American Constitution?*, 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press. ISBN: 0300095244

Fiorina, Morris P., Samuel J. Abrams, and Jeremy C. Pope. 2006. *Culture War? The Myth of a Polarized America*, 2nd ed. New York: Pearson/Longman. ISBN: 0321366069

Marcus, George E., W. Russell Neuman, and Michael Mackuen. 2000. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ISBN: 0226504697

Niemi, Richard G., and Herbert F. Weisberg, eds. 2001. *Controversies in Voting Behavior*, 4th ed. Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Press. ISBN: 1568023340

Articles and chapters in the library's electronic reserve system or linked on the course web page.

Other Considerations

Please review the 2005 – 2006 *San Francisco State University Bulletin's* "General Policies and Procedures" section (pp. 83-92) for university policy regarding drops, withdrawals, incompletes, etc. If you have a physical, psychological, medical, or learning disability that may impact on your ability to carry out assigned course work, I urge you to speak with me and to contact the staff in the Disability Resource Center, Student Services Building, Room 110 (415/338-2472 Voice/TDD). They will review your concerns and determine with you what accommodations are necessary and appropriate. Information and documentation of a disability are confidential.

Please read the attached statement on plagiarism. If you have any questions, ask. Also, go to <http://cet.sfsu.edu/academicintegrity/plagiarism.html> for more details on the university policy regarding plagiarism and to <http://bss.sfsu.edu/polisci/Full%20Plagiarism%20Policy.htm> for the department's policy.

Finally, I encourage you to see me during office hours. If you cannot make it during my scheduled hours, we can set an appointment.

Week-by-week Schedule

Week 1 8/30 Introduction

Week 2 9/6 The discipline, the subfield, philosophy of science

O'Brien, Rory. 1998. "Normative versus Empirical Theory and Method." In *Methods for Political Inquiry: The Discipline, Philosophy, and Analysis of Politics*, eds. Stella Z. Theodoulou and Rory O'Brien. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Chapter 5. (PLSI 300 ER, password: inference)

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Preface and Chapter 1 (PLSI 710 ER, password: federal, and PLSI 300 ER).

Yanow, Dvora. 2003. "Interpretive Empirical Political Science: What Makes This Not a Subfield of Qualitative Methods." Qualitative Methods Section (APSA) Newsletter, 2nd Issue. (Linked)

Grant, J. Tobin. 2005. "What Divides Us? The Image and Organization of Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 38(3): 379-386. (Linked)

Week 3 9/13 Political attitudes and attitude formation

Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. David E. Apter. New York: Free Press. (ER)

Achen, Christopher H. 1975. "Mass Political Attitudes and the Survey Response." *American Political Science Review*. 69:1218-1231. (ER)

Sullivan, John L., James E. Piereson, and George E. Marcus. 1978. "Ideological Constraint in the Mass Public: A Methodological Critique and Some New Findings." *American Journal of Political Science* 22:233 - 249. (ER)

Judd, Charles M., and Michael A. Milburn. 1980. "The Structure of Attitude Systems in the General Public: Comparisons of a Structural Equation Model." *American Sociological Review*, 45(4):627-643. (Linked)

Zaller, John, and Stanley Feldman. 1992. "A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science* 36: 579-616. (ER)

Controversies in Voting Behavior Chapters 6 – 9

Lodge, Milton, and Charles S. Taber. 2005. "The Automaticity of Affect for Political Leaders, Groups, and Issues: An Experimental Test of the Hot Cognition Hypothesis." *Political Psychology* 26(3): 455-482. (Linked)

Week 4 9/20 Affective intelligence

Marcus, George E., W. Russell Neuman, and Michael Mackuen. 2000. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Week 5 9/27 Polarized public opinion?
- Franks, Thomas. 2004. "Lie Down for America." *Harpers*, 308(April):33-46. (Linked)
- Bartels, Larry M. 2006. "What's the Matter with *What's the Matter with Kansas?*" *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 1:201-226. (Linked)
- Fiorina, Morris P., Samuel J. Abrams, and Jeremy C. Pope. 2006. *Culture War? The Myth of a Polarized America*, 2nd ed. New York: Pearson/Longman.
- Week 6 10/4 Parties and partisanship
- Controversies in Voting Behavior* Chapters 14 – 23
- Week 7 10/11 Representation
- Miller, Warren E., and Stokes, Donald E. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review*, 57:45-56. (ER)
- Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Introduction, Chapters 7 and 10. (ER)
- Eulau, Heinz, and Paul D. Karps. 1977. "The Puzzle of Representation: Specifying Components of Responsiveness." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 2(3):233-254. (ER)
- Hurley, Patricia A. 1982. "Collective Representation Reappraised." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 7(1):119-136. (ER)
- Stimson, James A., Michael B. Mackuen, and Robert S. Erikson. 1995. "Dynamic Representation." *The American Political Science Review*, 89(3):543-565. (ER)
- Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes'." *The Journal of Politics*, 61(3):628-657. (ER)
- Dovi, Suzanne. 2002. "Preferable Descriptive Representatives: Will Just Any Woman, Black, or Latino Do?" *American Political Science Review*. 96(4):729-743. (ER)
- Young, Iris Marion. 1994. "Gender as Seriality: Thinking about Women as a Social Collective." *Signs*, 19(3): 713-738. (ER)
- Week 8 10/18 Participation and turnout
- Controversies in Voting Behavior* Chapters 1 – 5
- Miller, Arthur H., Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin, and Oksana Malanchuk. 1981. "Group Consciousness and Political Participation." *American Journal of Political Science*, 25(3):494-511. (ER)
- Timpone, Richard J. 1998. "Structure, Behavior, and Voter Turnout in the United States." *The American Political Science Review*, 92(1):145-158. (ER)
- McDonald, Michael P., and Samuel L. Popkin. 2001. "The Myth of the Vanishing Voter." *American Political Science Review*. 95(4):963-974. (ER)

Week 9 10/25 Vote choice

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper. Chapters 1 – 3 (ER)

Riker, William H., and Peter C. Ordeshook. 1968. “A Theory of the Calculus of Voting.” *The American Political Science Review*, 62(1):25-42. (ER)

Ferejohn, John A. and Morris P. Fiorina. 1974. “The Paradox of Not Voting: A Decision Theoretic Analysis.” *The American Political Science Review*, 68:525-536. (ER)

Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1, 2, 6, 7, and 20 (ER)

Controversies in Voting Behavior Chapters 8 and 10 – 13

Week 10 11/1 Media effects

Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1982. “Experimental Demonstrations of the ‘Not-So-Minimal’ Consequences of Television News Programs.” *The American Political Science Review*, 76(4):848-858. (Linked)

Capella, Joseph N., and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 1996. “News Frames, Political Cynicism, and Media Cynicism.” *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 546:71-84. (Linked)

Kahn, Kim Fridkin. 1994. “The Distorted Mirror: Press Coverage of Women Candidates for Statewide Office.” *The Journal of Politics*, 56(1):154-173. (Linked)

Gilliam, Franklin D. Jr., and Shanto Iyengar. 2000. “Prime Suspects: The Influence of Television News on the Viewing Public.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(3):560-573. (Linked)

Brader, Ted. 2005. “Striking a Persuasive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotion.” *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2): 388-405. (Linked)

Kahn, Kim Fridkin, and Patrick J. Kinney. 2002. “The Slant of the News: How Editorial Endorsements Influence Campaign Coverage of Citizens’ Views of Candidates.” *The American Political Science Review*, 96(2):381-394. (Linked)

Week 11 11/8 Questioning the constitution

Dahl, Robert. 2003. *How Democratic is the American Constitution?*, 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Week 12 11/15 The Congress

Poole, Keith T. 2005. “The Decline and Rise of Party Polarization in Congress During the Twentieth Century,” *Extensions*, Fall:1-6. (Linked)

Jacobson, Gary C. 1989. "Strategic Politicians and the Dynamics of U.S. House Elections, 1946-86." *The American Political Science Review*, 83(3):773-793. (Linked)

Shepsle, Kenneth A., and Barry R. Weingast. 1994. "Positive Theories of Congressional Institutions." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 19(2):149-179. (Linked)

Schickler, Eric, and Andrew Rich. 1997. "Controlling the Floor: Parties as Procedural Coalitions in the House." *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(4):1340-1375. (Linked)

Cox, Gary W., and Mathew D. McCubbins. 1997. "Toward a Theory of Legislative Rules Changes: Assessing Schickler and Rich's Evidence." *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(4):1376-1386. (Linked)

Schickler, Eric, and Andrew Rich. 1997. "Party Government in the House Reconsidered: A Response to Cox and McCubbins." *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(4):1387-1394. (Linked)

Roberts, Jason M., and Steven S. Smith. 2003. "Procedural Contexts, Party Strategy, and Conditional Party Voting in the U.S. House of Representatives, 1971-2000." *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(2):305-317.

Week 13 11/22 Thanksgiving break

Week 14 11/29 The Presidency and the psychology of presidents

Moe, Terry M., and Scott A. Wilson. 1994. "Presidents and the Politics of Structure." *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 57(2):1-44.

Barber, James David. 1977. "The Nixon Brush with Tyranny." *Political Science Quarterly*, 92(4):581-605.

Suedfeld, Peter, and Dana C. Leighton. 2002. "Early Communications in the War Against Terrorism: An Integrative Complexity Analysis." *Political Psychology*, 23(3):585-599.

Sigelman, Lee. 2002. "Two Reagans? Genre Imperatives, Ghostwriters, and Presidential Personality Profiling." *Political Psychology*, 23(4):839-851.

Simonton, Dean Keith. 2006. "Presidential IQ, Openness, Intellectual Brilliance, and Leadership: Estimates and Correlations for 42 U.S. Chief Executives." *Political Psychology*, 27(4):511-526. (Linked)

Rottinghaus, Brandon. 2006. "Rethinking Presidential Responsiveness: The Public Presidency and Rhetorical Congruency, 1953-2001." *The Journal of Politics*, 68(3):720-732. (Linked)

Week 15 12/6 The Judiciary and the Supreme Court

Segal, Jeffrey A., and Albert D. Cover. 1989. "Ideological Values and the Votes of U.S. Supreme Court Justices." *The American Political Science Review*, 83(2):557-565. (Linked)

Segal, Jeffrey A., Lee Epstein, Charles M. Cameron, and Harold J. Spaeth. 1995. "Ideological Values and the Votes of U.S. Supreme Court Justices Revisited." *The Journal*

of Politics, 57(3):812-823. (Linked)

Epstein, Lee, Valerie Hoekstra, Jeffrey A. Segal, and Harold J. Spaeth. 1998. "Do Political Preferences Change? A Longitudinal Study of U.S. Supreme Court Justices." *The Journal of Politics*, 60(3):801-818. (Linked)

Gregory A. Caldeira; John R. Wright. 1998. "Lobbying for Justice: Organized Interests Supreme Court Nominations, and United States Senate." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(2):499-523. (ER)

Perry, H. W. Jr. 1991. *Deciding to Decide*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press. Chapter 8 and excerpt from Chapter 9 (ER)

Week 16 12/13 Women in politics

Carroll, Susan, J., and Richard L. Fox, eds. 2006. *Gender and Elections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

A Statement on Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the most common form of academic dishonesty. The following passage, taken from Richard M. Eastman's book entitled *Style*, provides a cogent definition of plagiarism:

(P)lagiarism is the offering of someone else's words, pictures, data, ideas, and even conceptions as if they were one's own. Writers are indeed encouraged to draw upon the information and wisdom of others, but in the spirit of intellectual inquiry they are expected to state such indebtedness so that (a) their own creativity can be justly appreciated and (b) their use of sources, like a scientist's experiment, can be verified by others. Plagiarism differs from this productive use of sources in that the similarity of the original to the borrowing is very close; it is acknowledged imperfectly or not at all; and it shows little or no creative application by the borrower.

Plagiarism is a prime intellectual offense in that the borrower is faking discovery process. No community of writers and readers can thrive if its members counterfeit their achievements, deceive their critics, and take unfair competitive advantage of others. (Pages 270-1 of *Style* by Richard M. Eastman. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

Plagiarism comes in many forms which include (but are not necessarily limited to) the following:

1. Copying verbatim another person's written words without proper acknowledgment. In the case of a direct quote, "proper acknowledgment" entails placing quotation marks around the passage or (in the case of an extended passage) indenting the quotation.
2. Paraphrasing another person's written words without proper acknowledgment. Rephrasing the words does not remove the writer's obligation to indicate clearly that the material belongs to someone else.
3. Quoting or paraphrasing words that were found in a secondary source as if they were found in a primary source. Suppose, for example, that another author uses a quotation from Alfred Marshall that you would like to use in your paper. You may not present the quotation in a manner that will lead readers to believe that you found it by reading Marshall. Instead, you should say, "As so-and-so (19xx) observed, Alfred Marshall made the following statement about this issue:..."

Note: The points made in items 1-3 apply to the use of diagrams, tables, and statistics as well as words.

4. Failing to acknowledge editorial assistance that substantially improves the style and/or quality of your writing. If someone merely points out errors in grammar or punctuation in your writing, or awkward passages, or gives comments about the overall structure of the paper, which you then rewrite, it is not necessary to acknowledge their assistance, although courtesy should lead you to acknowledge substantial helpful editorial comments by colleagues. However, if your writing has been edited or rewritten by someone else in such a way that the style and quality no longer reflect your writing ability, you must acknowledge that editorial assistance was received.
5. Presenting an idea, model, derivation, proof, etc. that other researchers have developed or with which you received substantial assistance without proper acknowledgment. Plagiarism is not limited to the use of other people's words, but it includes the improper use of ideas and methodologies as well. If you choose to present someone else's model in your written work (for example), you must indicate that the model did not originate with you. If an important idea, proof, etc. was given to you by someone else, you must acknowledge the help that you received.

An exception to this point occurs when the model is so widely used and so well-known that it could not possibly be mistaken by the reader as your own (e.g., basic supply and demand models, or the use of ordinary least squares).

6. "Double submission" of papers. Students may not submit the same paper for credit in more than one course without the explicit permission of all instructors who will be evaluating the work.

Note that these rules apply to all written work that you circulate. Also, even starting with the first drafts given to your thesis advisor, you should work at making the appropriate acknowledgments and discuss any uncertain points with your advisor.

(This description of plagiarism is from the Statement on Academic Honesty, found on the SUNY Stony Brook Economics Department's web pages: <http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/economics/instruct/grad/honesty.html>. Another explanation of plagiarism can be found at the following SFSU site: <http://online.sfsu.edu/~rone/StudentHelp/Plagiarism.html>).