

# PSC 511: Seminar in American Politics

4 credits

Fall 2020

Online

**Instructor:**  Matthew Geras, Assistant Professor

**Office:**  PAC 358

**Office Hours:**  By appointment

**Phone:** 217-206-7884

**Email:**  mgera2@uis.edu

## **Course Description**

This course is a graduate-level seminar designed to explore what it means to study American politics. American politics is a large and diverse field and as a result, we will not be able to cover all facets of American politics in great detail. However, throughout the course, we will cover 14 different topics, ranging from representation to political institutions to campaigns and elections, in order to gain insight into the current state of the field. Since this is a seminar class, you can expect to do a lot of reading and writing on a weekly basis.

## **Course Objectives**

Upon completion of the course, students will:

* Understand what it means to study American politics in broad terms.
* Be able to critically analyze scientific research in the field of American politics.
* Learn how to synthesize and connect the arguments and findings from multiple research articles in order to build a collective understanding of a given literature.

**Learning Objectives**

* Be able to identify, describe, and communicate the current state of different subfields in American politics.
* Be able to complete a literature review.
* Be able to lead class discussion on multiple subfields in American politics.

## **Course Expectations**

Students will use the internet to access the Canvas course site. The course has a modular structure and for the most part, each module will last one week (Thursday to Wednesday). Each module will consist of a set of assigned readings, discussions board questions, optional synchronistic Zoom meetings, and short video lectures. Due dates of weekly assignments are staggered throughout the week in order to give students time to read and comment on their classmates' work before the next module begins. However, the course schedule is designed so that students are able to complete the majority of their work on either weekdays or weekends depending on their schedule. The course design is based on principles of collaborative learning and active participation.

By registering for this online course, students commit to self-motivated study, participation in online course activities, and the submission of all assignments on time. Furthermore, they commit to accessing the course Web site and checking email at least four times a week and to devoting at least as much time to this online course as to a comparable traditional class on campus. For example, for a four (4) credit hour course offered during a 16-week semester, students would have to commit a minimum of 12 hours per week on readings, class assignments, discussions, etc.

## **UIS Academic Integrity Policy**

I support the UIS policy on Academic Integrity, which states, in part: “Academic integrity is at the heart of the university’s commitment to academic excellence. The UIS community strives to communicate and support clear standards of integrity, so that undergraduate and graduate students can internalize those standards and carry them forward in their personal and professional lives. Living a life with integrity prepares students to assume leadership roles in their communities as well as in their chosen profession. Alumni can be proud of their education and the larger society will benefit from the University’s contribution to the development of ethical leaders. Violations of academic integrity demean the violator, degrade the learning process, deflate the meaning of grades, discredit the accomplishments of past and present students, and tarnish the reputation of the university for all its members.”

Academic sanctions range from a warning to expulsion from the university, depending on the severity of your violation and your history of violations. Whatever the sanction, I will file a report of academic dishonesty to the Office of the Provost.

You are responsible for understanding and complying with the [UIS Academic Integrity Policy](http://www.uis.edu/academicintegrity).

Academic dishonesty in an online learning environment may include the following scenarios:

* Having a tutor or friend complete a portion of your assignments
* Having a reviewer make extensive revisions to an assignment
* Copying work submitted by another student to a public class meeting
* Using information from online information services without proper citation
* Posting any work as your own that has been written by another author(s)

## **Academic Accommodations**

If you are a student with a documented temporary or ongoing disability in need of academic accommodations, please contact the Office of Disability Services at 217-206-6666.

Disabilities may include, but are not limited to: Psychological, Health, Learning, Sensory, Mobility, ADHD, TBI and Autism Spectrum Disorder. In some cases, accommodations are also available for shorter term disabling conditions such as severe medical situations. Accommodations are based upon underlying medical and cognitive conditions and may include but are not limited to extended time for tests and quizzes, distraction free environment for tests and quizzes, a note taker, interpreter and FM devices.

Students who have made a request for an academic accommodation that has been reviewed and approved by the ODS will receive an accommodation letter which should be provided by the student to the instructor as soon as possible, preferably in the first week of class.

For assistance in seeking academic accommodations please contact the UIS Office of Disability Services (ODS) in the Human Resources Building, Room 80, phone number 217-206-6666.

## **Library Resources**

Get help at your library!  You can access library resources, databases, and helpful research guides from [Brookens Library](http://library.uis.edu/).

For in-depth help, please contact one of our librarians directly via email or schedule a one-on-one research consultation conducted in-person, over the phone, or online.

[View full list of librarians by subject](https://libguides.uis.edu/librarians).

**The Learning Hub**

The Learning Hub provides students on campus with many services including online and face-to-face tutoring for writing, science, exercise science, academic skills, business, computer science, and math; supplemental instruction; workshops; and online resources. Any student who is enrolled at UIS is eligible for the free services.

If you feel like you need extra help in the class, please use this service along with instructor help.

Appointments can be made by contacting The Learning Hub at (217) 206-6503, thehub@uis.edu, or in person at Brookens 460. You may also use this link to access a “Make an Appointment” form to ensure you give them all the information needed to schedule an appointment. When making an appointment, please have the following information ready:

Course number

Instructor

Assignment/Paper Length

Available Days and Times

## **Required Texts**

There are no required books for this class. Instead, all course readings will be posted to Canvas.

Readings will include a combination of scientific journal articles, news articles, book excerpts,

and interviews.

## **UIS Resources**

[University of Illinois at Springfield](http://www.uis.edu/)

[[Information Technology Services (ITS)](http://www.uis.edu/)](http://www.uis.edu/its)

[University Webmail](http://webmail.uis.edu)

[Canvas](https://go.uis.edu/canvas)

[The Learning Hub](http://www.uis.edu/thelearninghub/)

[Documentation Style Guides](http://www.uis.edu/thelearninghub/writing/handouts/#Helpful) (from The Learning Hub)

[The Career Development Center](http://www.uis.edu/career/)

## **Course Requirements**

## Complete all assigned readings, discussions, videos, and graded assignments. As a best practice, please keep a backup copy of all assignments that you submit.

## **Access the course materials and complete assignments** within the guidelines as established in the course calendar. You should be visiting the course Canvas page several times a week.

## **Adhere to assignment deadlines as outlined on Canvas and the course schedule. Late submissions may be subject to partial or no credit. However, I recognize we are all living through unprecedented times and many of us are currently facing, or may in the future face, unexpected challenges. If you find yourself in a situation where your ability to meet course deadlines is compromised, please let me know. I will, to the best of my abilities, work with you to come up with a solution that will allow you to complete the required components of this course.**

## **Course Communication**

The best way to contact me is through email or through Canvas’ messenger function, but we can also schedule Zoom meetings and telephone consultations as needed. I typically respond to emails within 24 hours Monday through Friday and within 48 hours on weekends. You will likely receive a response from me faster than this timeline and if you do not receive a response from me within this timeframe, it is okay to assume I did not receive your original message and you can contact me again.

Office Hours:

Since this is an online class, I will hold office hours by appointment via Zoom. To set up a meeting, send me an email with some suggested times. I encourage all students to attend office hours whenever they wish to discuss, or ask questions about, course content and assignments. Please view my office hours as time that I have set aside to answer your questions, clarify class discussions, and help you succeed in class.

### Netiquette

In any social interaction, certain rules of etiquette are expected and contribute to more enjoyable and productive communication. I recommend you review the following [tips for interacting online](https://www.livinginternet.com/i/ia_nq.htm) in e-mail and/or discussion board messages compiled by Chuq Von Rospach and Gene Spafford.

Everyone must plan an active role in helping to facilitate and maintain a safe and comfortable learning environment where everyone should feel free to participate, ask questions, engage the course and support one another. To do this successfully, we must remain mindful and respectful of each other’s freedom of thought and speech and provide mutual respect. Everyone should feel comfortable expressing themselves and their views. There must be a clear respect for diversity of participants including respect for gender, race/ethnicity, religion, disability, age, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, as well as culture, beliefs and personal values.

Here are some tips for discussing serious and potential sensitive topics with your peers:

* Be empathetic and remember that this environment is a safe place for making mistakes.
* Use nonjudgmental language and phrases that do not attack an individual. One way of doing this is to ask the individual to discuss his/her process for making the final decision he/she made.
* Use specific questions, examples, and research as a way of making your point.

## **Methods of Evaluation**

## You will be assessed on class participation, including servicing as a discussion leader for two modules, a cumulative take-home final exam, a literature review on a topic of your choice, and two reading synthesis assignments.

Participation

Since this is a seminar class, I expect students to actively participate in class on a weekly basis. You have two options for participating in class. You can participate in an asynchronistic online discussion board, or you can participate in one of two weekly synchronistic Zoom meetings. Weekly Zoom meetings are entirely optional, but in any week that you participate in a Zoom meeting, you will not be required to participate in the online discussion board unless you are one of the discussion leaders for that week. **The two weekly synchronistic Zoom meetings are currently scheduled for Wednesday evenings from 6:30pm to 8pm and on Thursday mornings from 9:30am to 11am.** Please note the days and times of these Zoom meetings may change depending on the needs and availability of students. You are not required to participate in class via the same method each week, for example, you may select to attend the Wednesday Zoom meeting during Module 1 but use the online discussion board during Module 2. However, if your schedule allows for it, you are strongly encouraged to attend one of the Zoom meetings during the weeks in which you are one of the discussion leaders. Overall, participation is the most important element of your grade in this class, but the course schedule is designed so everyone can determine the best way to participate in class according to their individual schedules.

Discussion Leadership

For each module, there will be 2 to 4 discussion leaders. Discussion leaders are responsible for facilitating class discussion during Zoom meetings and for moderating the discussion board. The most important job of the discussion leaders will be to generate discussion questions for their assigned module. Discussion leaders will post their discussion questions to the discussion board by 11:59pm on Sunday night and will also pose their questions to the class in one of the two synchronistic Zoom meetings. Additionally, discussion leaders will be responsible for facilitating conversation (replying to posts, asking follow-up questions, etc.) on the online discussion board. Each student will serve as discussion leader twice during the semester and the schedule for discussion leadership will be determined during the first week of class.

Final Exam

The final exam for this class will be a take-home essay examination modeled after the department’s comprehensive exam, which you may choose to take to fulfill the requirements for PSC 590. This experience will help you synthesize the different literatures discussed in the course and ideally will prepare you for writing your thesis or taking your comprehensive exams. The exam will consist of several questions that you should be able to answer by the end of the class and you will be required to answer two of these questions. Your answers to each question should be about 5-7 pages in length and will rely on class readings, discussions, and your own thoughts on the topics at hand. A good answer with drawn upon the readings and discussions from multiple weeks of class and you must cite your sources of information as you would in a research paper. The exam will be distributed during the final week of classes and will be **due on December 9th by 11:59pm**.

Literature Review

You will be required to write a literature review that examines a central research question or controversy about American politics. A literature review is a critical part of any research paper because it tells the reader how your research connects to, and builds off of, past research on the topic. This means within your literature review you should analyze how (and how well) the existing literature has addressed the question or controversy you have selected and then discuss ways in which future research could shed new light on the question or controversy.

Your literature review is **due by November 25th at 11:59pm** and you should have your topic approved by me no later than **November 1s**t. When selecting your topic, make sure it is not too broad. For example, Congress or elections are too broad of topics, but you could write your literature on review on “factors that determine committee assignments in Congress” or “the influence of the economy on vote choice in US elections.”

You are welcome to use readings assigned in this class, or another class, within your literature review, but this assignment will require you to do your own research in order to find additional sources related to your topic. Overall, you should be analyzing and synthesizing at least 15 to 20 sources total and your literature review should be no more than 10 pages double spaced.

If you are looking for examples of literature reviews, I recommend starting with many of the assigned readings. Additionally, you can find more information on how to write a good literature review on the [Center for Academic Success’ website](https://www.uis.edu/cas/thelearninghub/writing/handouts/research-methods/literature-review/).

Reading Syntheses

The ability to synthesize and analyze a body of research is a critical skill for graduate students to develop. You will be required to complete two reading synthesis assignments over the course of the semester. For each assignment, you will select a module and either write approximately 3 to 4 pages or record a 10 to 12-minute presentation synthesizing and analyzing the readings from that module. Your assignments should not be a simple summary of the readings; instead, you should identify similarities or differences between the readings, consider the reasons for those similarities or differences, discuss how, or how not, the readings fit together, and/or critique the arguments made in a given reading. Overall, a good reading synthesis can and will take many different forms, but all good assignments will consist of synthesis and analysis, opposed to a simple summary of the arguments or results from each reading. It is okay if your synthesis does not cover every reading that was assigned during the module, but it should certainty engage multiple readings from the module. Reading synthesis assignments are **due by 11:59pm on the Monday night** of the week you have selected and since you have 14 modules from which to select, reading synthesis assignments will not be accepted after Monday night of that week. In order to make sure you are not waiting until the last few weeks of the semester to complete all of your assignments for this course, at least one of your reading synthesis assignments must be turned in by **11:59pm on October 26th**. This means at least one of your reading synthesis assignments will analyze a week of readings between Module 1 and Module 9. Exceptions to this rule will only be approved if requested well prior to this due date.

**Grading Scale**

### Participation 30%

Discussion Leadership (2 x 5%) 10%

Final Exam 20%

Literature Review 20%

Reaching Synthesis Assignments (2 x 10%) 20%

| Percent Range | Letter Grade |
| --- | --- |
| 100-93 | A |
| 92-90 | A- |
| 89-87 | B+ |
| 86-83 | B |
| 82-80 | B- |
| 79-77 | C+ |
| 76-73 | C |
| 72-70 | C- |
| 69-67 | D+ |
| 66-63 | D |
| 62-60 | D- |
| 59 and below | F |

## **Course Calendar**

Below is the course calendar with assigned readings and the due dates of major assignments. Please note this schedule is subject to change.

**Module 1: Representation (8/24 - 9/2)**

Readings:

* Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. “Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent ‘Yes.’” *The Journal of Politics* 61(3): 628–57.
* Lowande, Kenneth, Melinda Ritchie, and Erinn Lauterbach. 2019. “Descriptive and Substantive Representation in Congress: Evidence from 80,000 Congressional Inquiries.” *American Journal of Political Science* 63(3): 644–59.
* Lombardo, Emanuela, and Petra Meier. 2018. “Good Symbolic Representation: The Relevance of Inclusion.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(02): 327–30.
* Hansen, Eric R., and Sarah A. Treul. 2015. “The Symbolic and Substantive Representation of LGB Americans in the US House.” *The Journal of Politics* 77(4): 955–67.
* Bishin, Benjamin G. 2000. “Constituency Influence in Congress: Does Subconstituency Matter?” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 25(3): 389–415.

**Module 2: How Does Race Matter in American Politics? (9/3 - 9/9)**

Readings:

* Griffin, John D. 2014. “When and Why Minority Legislators Matter.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 17(1): 327–36.
* Tate, Katherine. 2001. “The Political Representation of Blacks in Congress: Does Race Matter?” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 26(4): 623–38.
* Butler, Daniel M, and David E Broockman. 2011. “Do Politicians Racially Discriminate Against Constituents? A Field Experiment on State Legislators.” *American Journal of Political Science* 55(3): 463–77.
* Lemi, Danielle Casarez. 2020. “Do Voters Prefer Just Any Descriptive Representative? The Case of Multiracial Candidates.” *Perspectives on Politics*: 1–21.
* Conroy, Meredith, and Perry Bacon Jr. 2020. “There’s A Huge Gap in How Republicans and Democrats See Discrimination.” *FiveThirtyEight*. <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/theres-still-a-huge-partisan-gap-in-how-americans-see-discrimination/> (June 22, 2020).
* Thomson-DeVeaux, Amelia, and Likhitha Butchireddygari. 2020. “For Black Americans, Wearing A Mask Comes With Complicated Anxieties.” *FiveThirtyEight*. <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/for-black-americans-wearing-a-mask-comes-with-complicated-anxieties/> (July 1, 2020).
* Johnson, Theodore R., and Max Feldman. 2020. “The New Voter Suppression.” *Brennan Center for Justice*. <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/new-voter-suppression> (July 17, 2020).

**Module 3: How Does Gender Matter in American Politics? (9/10 - 9/16)**

Readings:

* Lawless, Jennifer L. 2015. “Female Candidates and Legislators.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 18(1): 349–66.
* Carroll, Susan J., and Suzanna Danuta Walters. 2017. “Ask a Feminist: A Conversation with Susan J. Carroll on Gender and Electoral Politics.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 42(3): 771–83.
* Bos, Angela L. et al. 2020. “100 Years of Suffrage and Girls Still Struggle to Find Their ‘Fit’ in Politics.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53(3): 474–78.
* Bracic, Ana, Mackenzie Israel-Trummel, and Allyson F. Shortle. 2019. “Is Sexism for White People? Gender Stereotypes, Race, and the 2016 Presidential Election.” *Political Behavior* 41(2): 281–307.
* Bonneau, Chris W., and Kristin Kanthak. 2020. “Stronger Together: Political Ambition and the Presentation of Women Running for Office.” *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 8(3): 576–94.
* Lawless, Jennifer L., Sean M. Theriault, and Samantha Guthrie. 2018. “Nice Girls? Sex, Collegiality, and Bipartisan Cooperation in the US Congress.” *The Journal of Politics* 80(4): 1268–82.

**Module 4: U.S. Congress (9/17 - 9/23)**

Readings:

* Carson, Jamie L., and Jeffery A. Jenkins. 2011. “Examining the Electoral Connection Across Time.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 14: 25–46.
* Sinclair, Barbara. 2008. “Orchestrators of Unorthodox Lawmaking: Pelosi and McConnell in the 110th Congress.” *The Forum* 6(3).
* Binder, Sarah, and Frances Lee. 2013. “Making Deals in Congress.” In *Negotiating Agreement in Politics*, eds. Jane Mansbridge and Cathie Jo Martin. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association, 54–72.
* Fenno, Richard F. 1977. “US House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration.” *American Political Science Review* 71(3): 883–916.
* Miler, Kristina. 2016. “Legislative Responsiveness to Constituency Change.” *American Politics Research* 44(5): 816–43.

**Module 5: The American Presidency (9/24 - 9/30)**

Readings:

* Kreitner, Richard. 2016. “What Time Is It? Here’s What the 2016 Election Tells Us About Obama, Trump, and What Comes Next.” *The Nation*. <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/what-time-is-it-heres-what-the-2016-election-tells-us-about-obama-trump-and-what-comes-next/> (June 22, 2020).
* Barrett, Andrew W. 2004. “Gone Public: The Impact of Going Public on Presidential Legislative Success.” *American Politics Research* 32(3): 338–70.
* Rutledge, Paul E., and Heather A. Larsen Price. 2014. “The President as Agenda Setter-in-Chief: The Dynamics of Congressional and Presidential Agenda Setting.” *Policy Studies Journal* 42(3): 443–464.
* Warber, Adam L., Yu Ouyang, and Richard W. Waterman. 2018. “Landmark Executive Orders: Presidential Leadership Through Unilateral Action.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 48(1): 110–26.
* Thrower, Sharece. 2017. “To Revoke or Not Revoke? The Political Determinants of Executive Order Longevity.” *American Journal of Political Science* 61(3): 642–56.
* Reeves, Andrew, Jon C. Rogowski, Min Hee Seo, and Andrew R. Stone. 2017. “The Contextual Determinants of Support for Unilateral Action.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 47(3): 448–70.

**Module 6: The Judiciary (10/1 - 10/7)**

Readings:

* Baum, Lawrence. 1994. “What Judges Want: Judges’ Goals and Judicial Behavior.” *Political Research Quarterly* 47(3): 749–68.
* 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): 812–23.
* Sen, Maya. 2014. “How Judicial Qualification Ratings May Disadvantage Minority and Female Candidates.” *Journal of Law and Courts* 2(1): 33–65.
* Berenson, Tessa. 2017. “How Neil Gorsuch’s Confirmation Fight Changed Politics.” *Time*. <https://time.com/4730746/neil-gorsuch-confirmed-supreme-court-year/> (August 5, 2020).
* Hoekstra, Valerie J. 2000. “The Supreme Court and Local Public Opinion.” *The American Political Science Review* 94(1): 89–100.
* Krewson, Christopher N., and Jean R. Schroedel. 2020. “Public Views of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Aftermath of the Kavanaugh Confirmation.” *Social Science Quarterly* 101(4): 1430–41.

**Module 7: Political Parties (10/8 - 10/14)**

Readings:

* Bawn, Kathleen et al. 2012. “A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands and Nominations in American Politics.” *Perspectives on Politics* 10(3): 571–97.
* Hassell, Hans J. G. 2016. “Party Control of Party Primaries: Party Influence in Nominations for the US Senate.” *Journal of Politics* 78(1): 75–87.
* Crowder-Meyer, Melody. 2013. “Gendered Recruitment without Trying: How Local Party Recruiters Affect Women’s Representation.” *Politics & Gender* 9(04): 390–413.
* Dominguez, Casey B.K. 2011. “Does the Party Matter? Endorsements in Congressional Primaries.” *Political Research Quarterly* 64(3): 534–44.
* Feinstein, Brian D., and Eric Schickler. 2008. “Platforms and Partners: The Civil Rights Realignment Reconsidered.” *Studies in American Political Development* 22(1): 1–31.

**Module 8: Political Polarization (10/15 - 10/21)**

Readings:

* Barber, Michael, and Nolan McCarty. 2013. “Causes and Consequences of Polarization.” In *Negotiating Agreement in Politics*, eds. Jane Mansbridge and Cathie Jo Martin. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association, 19–53.
* Thomsen, Danielle M. 2014. “Ideological Moderates Won’t Run: How Party Fit Matters for Partisan Polarization in Congress.” *The Journal of Politics* 76(3): 786–97.
* Abramowitz, Alan I., and Kyle L. Saunders. 2008. “Is Polarization a Myth?” *The Journal of Politics* 70(2): 542–55.
* Mason, Lilliana. 2013. “The Rise of Uncivil Agreement: Issue Versus Behavioral Polarization in the American Electorate.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 57(1): 140–59.
* Banda, Kevin K., and John Cluverius. 2018. “Elite Polarization, Party Extremity, and Affective Polarization.” *Electoral Studies* 56: 90–101.
* Klar, Samara, Yanna Krupnikov, and John Barry Ryan. 2018. “Affective Polarization or Partisan Disdain?” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 82(2): 379–90.

**Module 9: Partisanship, Ideology, & Political Knowledge (10/22 - 10/28)**

Readings:

* Ahler, Douglas J., and Gaurav Sood. 2018. “The Parties in Our Heads: Misperceptions about Party Composition and Their Consequences.” *The Journal of Politics* 80(3): 964–81.
* White, Ismail K., and Chryl N. Laird. 2020. “Why Black Voters Stick With Democrats.” *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/02/trump-doesnt-see-why-black-voters-stick-together/606379/> (July 6, 2020).
* Settle, Jaime E., and Taylor N. Carlson. 2019. “Opting Out of Political Discussions.” *Political Communication* 36(3): 476–96.
* Carsey, Thomas, and Geoffrey Layman. 2006. “Changing Sides or Changing Minds? Party Identification and Policy Preferences in the American Electorate.” *American Journal of Political Science* 50: 464–77.
* Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know about Politics and Why It Matters*. Yale University Press.
* Dolan, Kathleen. 2011. “Do Women and Men Know Different Things? Measuring Gender Differences in Political Knowledge.” *The Journal of Politics* 73(1): 97–107.

Assignments:

* Last Week to Submit 1st Reading Synthesis

**Module 10: The Role of the Media in American Politics (10/29 - 11/4)**

Readings:

* Groeling, Tim. 2013. “Media Bias by the Numbers: Challenges and Opportunities in the Empirical Study of Partisan News.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 16(1): 129–51.
* Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald R. Kinder. 1987. *News That Matters: Television and American Opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
* Farris, Emily, and Heather Silber Mohamed. “The News Media Usually Show Immigrants as Dangerous Criminals. That’s Changed — for Now, at Least.” *Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/06/27/the-news-media-usually-show-immigrants-as-dangerous-criminals-thats-changed-for-now-at-least/> (August 10, 2020).
* Flowers, Julianne F., Audrey A. Haynes, and Michael H. Crespin. 2003. “The Media, the Campaign, and the Message.” *American Journal of Political Science* 47(2): 259–73.
* Wintersieck, Amanda, Kim Fridkin, and Patrick Kenney. 2018. “The Message Matters: The Influence of Fact-Checking on Evaluations of Political Messages.” *Journal of Political Marketing*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15377857.2018.1457591> (July 13, 2020).
* Sobieraj, Sarah, and Jeffrey M. Berry. 2011. “From Incivility to Outrage: Political Discourse in Blogs, Talk Radio, and Cable News.” *Political Communication* 28(1): 19–41.
* Kurtzleben, Danielle. 2018. “Did Fake News on Facebook Help Elect Trump? Here’s What We Know.” *NPR.org*. <https://www.npr.org/2018/04/11/601323233/6-facts-we-know-about-fake-news-in-the-2016-election> (August 5, 2020).

Assignments:

* Literature Review Topic Approval **(Due November 1st by 11:59pm)**

**Module 11: Political Participation (11/5 - 11/11)**

Readings:

* Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. “Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation.” *American Political Science Review* 89(2): 271–94.
* Putnam, Robert D. 1995. “Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital.” *Journal of Democracy* 6(1).
* Bruch, Sarah K., Myra Marx Ferree, and Joe Soss. 2010. “From Policy to Polity: Democracy, Paternalism, and the Incorporation of Disadvantaged Citizens.” *American Sociological Review* 75(2): 205–26.
* Weaver, Vesla M., and Amy E. Lerman. 2010. “Political Consequences of the Carceral State.” *The American Political Science Review* 104(4): 817–33.
* McClendon, Gwyneth H. 2014. “Social Esteem and Participation in Contentious Politics: A Field Experiment at an LGBT Pride Rally.” *American Journal of Political Science* 58(2): 279–90.

**Module 12: Who Vote, How Often, & Why? (11/12 - 11/18)**

Readings:

* Leighly, Jan, and Jonathan Nagler. 2014. *Who Votes Now? Demographics, Issues, Inequality, and Turnout in the United States*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
* Stewart, Emily. 2018. “2018’s Record-Setting Voter Turnout, in One Chart.” *Vox*. <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2018/11/19/18103110/2018-midterm-elections-turnout> (August 5, 2020).
* Green, Donald, and Alan Gerber. 2008. *Get Out the Vote: How to Increase Voter Turnout*. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
* Costa, Mia, Brian F. Schaffner, and Alicia Prevost. 2018. “Walking the Walk? Experiments on the Effect of Pledging to Vote on Youth Turnout” ed. John Holbein. *PLOS ONE* 13(5): e0197066.
* Southwell, Priscilla L. 2009. “Analysis of the Turnout Effects of Vote by Mail Elections, 1980–2007.” *The Social Science Journal* 46(1): 211–16.
* Levitt, Justin. 2007. *The Truth About Voter Fraud*. Brennan Center for Justice. <https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2019-08/Report_Truth-About-Voter-Fraud.pdf>.

**Module 13: Candidates & Campaigns (11/19 - 11/25)**

Readings:

* Parks, Miles, and Chloee Weiner. 2019. “How To Run For Office : Life Kit.” *NPR.org*. <https://www.npr.org/2019/10/15/770332855/how-to-run-for-office> (August 4, 2020).
* Dynes, Adam M., Hans J. G. Hassell, Matthew R. Miles, and Jessica Robinson Preece. 2019. “Personality and Gendered Selection Processes in the Political Pipeline.” *Politics & Gender*: 1–21.
* Green, Emma. 2017. “Millennials Are Unsatisfied With American Politics, but They’re Still Not Willing to Run for Office.” *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/01/millennials-running-for-office-shauna-shames/514493/> (July 13, 2020).
* Shah, Paru, Jamil Scott, and Eric Gonzalez Juenke. 2019. “Women of Color Candidates: Examining Emergence and Success in State Legislative Elections.” *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 7(2): 429–43.
* Hillygus, D. Sunshine, and Todd Shields. 2008. *The Persuadable Voter: Wedge Issues in Presidential Campaigns*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
* Sulkin, Tracy. 2009. “Campaign Appeals and Legislative Action.” *The Journal of Politics* 71(3): 1093–1108.
* Gross, Justin H., and Kaylee T. Johnson. 2016. “Twitter Taunts and Tirades: Negative Campaigning in the Age of Trump.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 49(04): 748–54.

Assignments:

* Literature Review **(Due November 25th by 11:59pm)**

**Module 14: Other Factors that Influence Vote Choice (11/28 - 12/5)**

Readings:

* Jacobson, Gary C. 2015. “It’s Nothing Personal: The Decline of the Incumbency Advantage in US House Elections.” *Journal of Politics* 77(3): 861–73.
* Vavreck, Lynn. 2009. *The Message Matters: The Economy and Presidential Campaigns*. Princeton University Press.
* Sides, John, Michael Tesler, and Lynn Vavreck. 2017. “The 2016 US Election: How Trump Lost and Won.” *Journal of Democracy* 28(2): 34–44.
* Setzler, Mark, and Alixandra B. Yanus. 2018. “Why Did Women Vote for Donald Trump?” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(3): 523–27.
* Lewis-Beck, Michael S., and Mary Stegmaier. 2014. “Introduction.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47(2): 284–88.
* Jackson, Natalie. 2020. “Poll-Based Election Forecasts Will Always Struggle With Uncertainty.” <http://centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/poll-based-election-forecasts-will-always-struggle-with-uncertainty/> (August 6, 2020).

Assignments:

* Final Exam **(Due December 9th by 11:59pm)**
* Last Week to Submit 2nd Reading Synthesis