Polarization, Parties, and Power

POSC 315 – Winter 2020
Carleton College
Tu-Th 1:15-pm - 3:00 pm
Library 344

Instructor: Melanie Freeze
Phone: 507-222-4724
Email: mfreeze@carleton.edu
Office: 417 Willis Hall
Office Hours: Mon. 10:00 a.m. - noon & Wed. 1:00 - 3:00 p.m. and by appt.

Course Description

How have political parties shaped the distribution of power and political landscape in the United States? This seminar explores theories of political party development, third-party dynamics in a two-party system, and the rise of ideological and party polarization in the United States. We will engage with scholarly debates that grapple with the extent and implications of polarization in the American case at all levels of government, in the electorate, and in interpersonal interactions.

Course Objectives

This course is about both learning substantive theories and developing specific skills. You will bring all of the academic knowledge and skills you have developed so far to investigate a research topic of your choice that is related to political parties and/or polarization. In this course, you will produce knowledge, not just consume it. This will require curiosity, creativity, and critical thinking. As you question prior research and seek to answer your own questions, you will develop additional skills and knowledge including:

- *Analytical skills*: Thinking critically about existing research is difficult, but it is important for the goal of producing good research. In this course, you should further your ability to identify broad research agendas, compare and contrast existing theories and concepts, recognize the limitations of prior research, and develop interesting questions and hypotheses from prior research and the patterns you see in the world around you.
- *Writing skills*: Communication is also a fundamental component of good research. Through clear and concise delivery, research can be verified, applied, and expanded upon. You should further develop professional writing skills including the ability to construct a persuasive argument using logic, relevant evidence, and good mechanics. You should learn how to present data verbally as well as in writing. Your final paper should be at the level of a manuscript ready for publication.
- *Research skills*: You should develop the ability to independently set up and carry out a sophisticated research project in which you attempt to explain a phenomena related to political

1

parties or polarization using the theories and tools of political science. Your research will clearly identify and operationalize a set of variables, develop a theory explaining how and why you think these variables are related, and support your expectations with systematic evidence. You will test hypotheses and analyze data that is either qualitative or quantitative.

- *Substantive knowledge*: You will come to understand the key theories, concepts, and literatures of political parties and polarization.

Required Texts

- Aldrich, J. H. (2011). *Why Parties? A Second Look.* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

- McCarty, N. (2019). *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know.* Oxford University Press.

- Mason, L. (2018). *Uncivil agreement: How politics became our identity.* University of Chicago Press.

- Other assigned readings will come from a variety of scholarly sources and research institutions and will be available on Moodle.

Recommended Software

- Much of the research on parties and polarization draws on empirical measures and large-N datasets. If you have previous experience with the statistical program and language called R (or a comparable program like Stata), you are encouraged to apply and continue to grow these skills. If you have never worked with data in R, that is fine too. Experience with statistics and R is not required for this class. However, from time to time in class, I will conduct guided data exploration and analyses in R. If you are interested in learning more about how to use empirical data to understand the political phenomena of parties and polarization, I recommend that you download the following programs so that you can follow along and begin to build these skills.
- Most R users run R through a separate user interface in which they manage R. For this class, we will be using RStudio, which I have found to be a relatively user friendly R editor, while preserving the flexibility and power of R programming.
- **Getting R**: https://www.r-project.org/ – Go to download, choose a download site/mirror, select download appropriate for your OS (Mac, Windows, or Linux).
- **Getting R Studio**: https://www.rstudio.com/products/rstudio/download/#download – Download the open-source desktop version that associates with your OS.

Course Requirements and Expectations

This seminar is not a traditional course. Class time will be primarily discussion based and your grade is almost completely determined by the course project and the component assignments. I have structured the research project so you will have many opportunities to interact with me and each other to produce a well-crafted paper. The rest of your grade centers around your preparation

for and involvement in class discussion which will be also tested through a midterm exam. I will provide a short recap lecture at the beginning of each class, but then the bulk of the class will be you discussing the concepts and literature of that week. I will ask questions, facilitate the discussion, and keep things going. Because this course is oriented toward discussion and research, you will have to spend a good deal of time outside of class reading, researching, and writing. **Do not underestimate the time you will need to spend on reading and researching.**

The majority of assigned readings draw on pertinent academic articles and books. While I expect you to read the entire selection, I would recommend you be strategic in your reading. First, do not try to understand every minor point an author makes; instead, find (and note) the most important themes or concepts. Second, pay special attention to summary sections when they are available. Finally, do not try to understand the details of complicated statistics and research designs, just be sure you understand the main results and implications of the author's research. I also encourage, but do not require, you to pay attention to a quality daily newspaper.

Grading

Your grade will be based on the following:

Class Participation and Attendance		5%
Reading Responses (Due 15 min. before every lecture)		5%
Discussion Leader		10%
In-class Midterm (Th. Feb. 6)		20%
Course Research Project		60%
Cite your Sources Worksheet (Due Fri. Jan. 10)	5%	
Topic and References with Abstracts (Due Fri. Jan. 17)	5%	
Narrowed Topic, Theory Outline, Data Plan, Updated References (Due Fri. Jan. 31)	5%	
Rough Draft & Peer Review (Due Mon Mar. 2)	15%	
Final Draft (Due Mar. 16)	30%	
Total		**100%**

Class Participation (Attendance, Discussion and In-Class Activities) - 5%

Seminar classes are discussion oriented. In order for this class to be productive, regular attendance is required, and you should come to class ready to discuss the weaknesses, implications, and any questions you may have regarding the week's assigned readings. You should draw on your reading response paper in these discussions (you must bring a hard copy to class). Because the class size is small and the meeting time relatively long, you will be expected to participate in every class discussion.

You are not expected to read the recommended readings. However, if your research falls in the topic area, if you are leading the discussion that week, or if you are just interested, you should consider skimming the readings or *at least* reading the abstract to get a sense for the general argument. I may also present some of the results of the recommended readings in lecture.

Attendance is mandatory. You are expected to come to class on time and regularly. If you need to miss class because of an emergency or illness, please send me an email before class starts. A pattern of unexcused absences will negatively impact your participation grade.

Number of Unexcused Absences	Penalty
2	Participation grade lowered by 1/3 (e.g., from B+ to B)
3	Participation grade lowered by full grade (e.g., from B+ to C+)
4	Participation grade lowered by two full grade (e.g., from B+ to D+)
5	Participation grade = 0
6	Automatic F for the class

If you do miss a class, you should first contact another student for notes before coming to see me during office hours.

Reading Responses - 5%

DUE: Before each class
SUBMISSION FORMAT: No longer than one page. The three responses should be presented in list format. Submit to Moodle (if you are using .pages, please convert to .pdf before submitting) AND bring a hard-copy to class.

Drawing on the assigned reading and other research related to the topic, provide your reading responses in list format and bring a hard copy to class using the Chicago author-data citation style. The reading response needs to include three bullet points and should be no longer than one page:

1. One question about something in the readings.

2. One idea for a political science related research project that is inspired or suggested by the readings.

3. One analysis that incorporates the readings (try to pick a different mode of critical thinking for each response). For example:

   - Discuss how the reading applies to to current events.
   - Extend the reading by developing an idea which picks up on a point made by the author.
   - Suggest alternative explanations that were not addressed by authors.
   - Connect this reading to concepts discussed in earlier weeks.
   - Suggest the application of a theory or research finding conducted outside of political science that might help us better understand the political phenomena.
   - Are there any underlying assumptions or logic in the theory that may be faulty?
   - Is there anything in the research method or data used that might undermine the validity (internal or external) of the research results? (e.g., biased sampled, possible spurious relationships, omitted variables, model mispecifications, failure to consider important subgroups, etc.)
   - What contributions does the selected research make to its field? What is the paper's "So What" answer? Does the paper address an empirical puzzle seen in the real world? Does the paper apply an abstract theory to real data? Does the paper defy convention wisdom? Does it bring anything new to the table? (Note: While you can add your

own perspective to this question, you can also draw on the author's claims. Authors' justifications of their research question and findings is often most easily found in the introduction, literature review, discussion, or conclusion sections).

- Has there been any response or research that complements, critiques, or contradicts the paper's findings? Are there any conflicting research findings conducted by other scholars? (Note: You can often find this by using the Cited Reference Search in Web of Science or clicking on the "cited by" link in the Google Scholar search results).

Remember to properly attribute and cite all ideas that are not your own in these papers. Provide a complete reference for any citations that are not on the list of required readings for that week.

Grading

1. Content (70%) Does the response provide adequate and insightful analysis of the article that pushes or expands the reading in some manner? Are ideas clearly explained? Is the research question and proposed project creative and thoughtful? Do the three components reflect you have read and thought about the readings?

2. Style (30%) Is the response generally free of spelling, typographical, and grammatical errors? Are sentences well formed and appropriately varied in length and style? Are citations correct and consistent using author-date Chicago citation style?

Discussion Leader 10%

I will lead the discussion for the first 3 weeks of class. Beginning with week 4, students will take joint responsibility with me for leading class discussions. In addition to required readings, the discussion leader should look for supplementary readings using reference databases (e.g, JSTOR, Web of Science, Google Scholar, etc), references in the required readings, and other sources to lead the class through a discussion of that week's topic. You are encouraged to be creative in how you present the readings and encourage discussion. You are expected to be an active participant in the discussion as well as leader of the discussion. Instead of a Reading Response, the discussion leader will produce a memorandum (2-3 pages double-spaced) that I will grade along with the content and quality of the class discussion.

In-Class Midterm - 20%

DATE: Thursday, February 6 from 1:15 - 3:00 p.m. in Library 344

The exam will consist of identifications (one sentence definition and one sentence statement of significance), short answers, and an essay.

Research Project - 60%

Good research is produced through a long process of trial, error, and revision. To mimic this process, several smaller assignments will be completed throughout the semester. These smaller projects should guide you in developing ideas and data analysis for your final paper. Separate assignment sheets will be distributed with more details for each of the individual components of

the research project. The final paper should be between 15-25 pages double-spaced, but must NOT exceed 30 pages (not including end matter). The text should have page numbers, be clearly organized and divided in to sub-sections through the use of titles and subtitles. Paper citations should adopt the author-date Chicago style.

Course Policies

Grading Policies

A	93 or higher
A-	90-92
B+	87-89
B	83-86
B-	80-82
C+	77-79
C	73-76
C-	70-72
D+	67-69
D	63-66
D-	60-62
F	Below 60

Late Work

Reading responses are due fifteen minutes before class (1:00 p.m.). All other assignments are due by 7:00 p.m. on the deadline date indicated in the assignment. All written work should be submitted electronically on Moodle (if you are using .pages or some program other than Word please convert to .pdf before submitting). Note that Moodle time stamps identify the minute of submission, so be sure to give yourself enough time and don't try to cut things too close. Any work submitted late (even by a minute) will face an automatic deduction of 4 percentage points (roughly equivalent to 1/3 letter grade) per 24 hours past the deadline. For example, if a 89% (B+) paper was submitted 1 minute late, it is automatically deducted to 85% (B). If the the paper was submitted 24 hours late, the grade will be reduced by 6 points to 81% (B-), etc. Unless there are campus-wide issues, technological difficulties do not excuse late work. Always backup your work. I highly recommend storing your files on Dropbox. Do not expect any grace period with online submissions.

Extensions

Being able to reliably meet deadlines is a very useful skill. Simply having a lot of work or having a schedule conflict is not grounds for an extension. Take the time at the beginning of the term and build a clear calendar of your respective deadlines and then plan ahead. If you have a conflicting event, find a way to get your assignment done in advance. Prioritize your learning. In the case of an emergency or serious conflict, I ask that you reach out to your student dean and have them contact me, and we work to find an appropriate accommodation.

Because I understand the difficulties of juggling schedules and the fast pace of the Carleton term, I will allow you to have a 24-hour extension for only ONE assignment (does not apply to the final project or exams).

Grade Complaints/Concerns

I will not receive grade complaints if more than one week has passed after the assignment has been returned to you. Before I review your grade you must first:

- Wait 24 hours (Technical problem dealing with errors in score calculations can be sent immediately).
- Schedule a time to meet with me to discuss your grade.
- Submit a formal appeal via email that clearly identifies content in the assignment and the reasons why you think your grade should be changed. Be clear that it is the an appeal in the subject heading. These appeals should refer to specific things in the assignment, and not to vague reasons like "I worked really hard."

The second grade, whether higher or lower, will become your grade on the assignment.

Electronics in Class Policy

If possible, I would like you to bring your own laptop (or mobile device) to class as we will often need to access the Internet for in-class activities. However, I expect you to be responsible in your use of electronic equipment: please avoid visiting social networking sites, or otherwise browsing the internet on sites unrelated to the course. I would also recommend you read through the discussion (including comments), *Computers in the Classroom*, to think about the possible pros and cons of using computers in a classroom setting. Individuals who abuse this privilege will find their participation grade reduced. Please turn off all cell phones during class.

Academic Honesty

You are expected to abide by fundamental standards of academic honesty. A discussion of plagiarism can be found at: https://apps.carleton.edu/campus/doc/integrity/. All work is expected to be your own. Cheating, plagiarism (using someone else's words or ideas without properly citing them), and all forms of academic misconduct will not be tolerated and will be strictly handled according to university policy. If you are uncertain, cite your sources!

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Carleton College is committed to providing equitable access to learning opportunities for all students. The Disability Services office (Henry House, 107 Union Street) is the campus office that collaborates with students who have disabilities to provide and/or arrange reasonable accommodations. If you have, or think you may have, a disability (e.g., mental health, attentional, learning, autism spectrum disorders, chronic health, traumatic brain injury and concussions, vision, hearing, mobility, or speech impairments), please contact disability@carleton.edu or call Jan Foley, Student Accessibility Specialist (x4464) or Chris Dallager, Director of Disability Services (x5250)

to arrange a confidential discussion regarding equitable access and reasonable accommodations.

You can learn more about other academic support available at:

https://apps.carleton.edu/campus/asc/syllabusstatements/speaking/

Resources

- Carleton Quantitative Resource Center: 4th floor Libe East Wing. Drop-in R support Wed 2-3:30 and Thur 7-9:00 from the DataSquad.
- Carleton Writing Center: https://apps.carleton.edu/writing-center/
- Gould Library Political Science Guide: https://gouldguides.carleton.edu/politicalscience
- Chicago Manual of Style Online: https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/book/ed17/frontmatter/toc.html
- Gould Library Citation Managers: https://gouldguides.carleton.edu/citation (Zotero Recommended)
- Congressional Research Service Reports:
  https://crsreports.congress.gov/search/#/?termsToSearch=&orderBy=Date
- Congressional Record: https://www.congress.gov/congressional-record
- GovTrack Bills and Resolutions: https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/
- Cutting edge and research and entertaining analyses at *Mischiefs of Faction*:
  https://www.mischiefsoffaction.com/

Data

- **Harvard Dataverse** https://dataverse.harvard.edu/ $\rightarrow$ Social Sciences: Incredible repository of code and replication data.
- **American Ideology Project** (Tausanovitch & Warshaw) http://www.americanideologyproject.com/: Includes congressional district, state assembly, state-level, county-level ideology estimates for 2000 and 2010.
- **State Legislature Party Control Over Time**
  http://www.ncsl.org/research/about-state-legislatures/partisan-composition.aspx
- **County-level elections and partisan composition** (Warshaw & Benedictis-Kessner) https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/E3FDAV: "an original dataset of 10,708 elections in approximately 298 medium and large counties over the past 25 years"
- **MIT Election Data** https://electionlab.mit.edu/data: Various federal elections at various units of analysis
- **County-level gini** (income inequality) for 2000 (Burkey)
  http://main.burkeyacademy.com/home/gini-coefficients
- **Legislation Tracker** Center for American Politics and Public Policy - University of Washington:
  http://www.legex.org/

- **American Legislatures** (Shor & McCarty) https://americanlegislatures.com/data/: Measures ideology of individual state legislators and state legislatures as a whole, 1993-2016.

- **PIPC Roll Call Dataset** (Rhode and Crespin) http://www.ou.edu/carlalbertcenter/research/pipc-votes: HOUSE: Computer coded 101st Congress to present. 83rd Congress to 100th Congress hand-coded. SENATE: 91st to present. Data gathered nightly. Includes roll call type (e.g., amendment, final passage, moving the previous question) and a range of other variables for each roll call (issue area, vote totals, presidential positions for some years, etc.)

- **Congressional Record 43-114 Congresses: Parsed Speeches and Phrase Counts** (Gentzkow, Shapiro, and Taddy) https://data.stanford.edu/congress_text:

- **NOMINATE/Voteview.com** (Lewis, Poole, Rosenthal, Boche, Rudkin, and Sonnet) https://voteview.com/data: Data on member ideology, congressional votes, member votes, and congressional parties. Ancillary data on attendance, issue codes, party loyalty, presidential support scores.

- **CQ Interest Group Voting Records Data** https://library.cqpress.com/uspoliticalstats/hub.php?id=2: American Civil Liberties Union, American Conservation Union, American Security Council, Americans for Democratic Action, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO, Consumer Federation of America, League of Conservation Voters, National Education Association, National Taxpayers Union.

- **Database on Ideology, Money in Politics, and Elections (DIME)** (Bonica) https://web.stanford.edu/ bonica/data.html: Using a common-space scaling methodology, ideological scores for a wide range of political actors in state and federal politics is calculated –CFscores. Contains other data too–voting records, fundraising statistics, election outcomes, gender, etc although the data quality varies. Also see https://data.stanford.edu/dime and https://data.stanford.edu/dime-plus

- **American National Elections Studies** (ANES) https://electionstudies.org/data-center/: PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY DATA 1948-2016 pre and post election surveys that are nationally representative. ANES also conducts other surveys including periodic panels.

- **The American Panel Survey** (TAPS) https://wc.wustl.edu/taps-data-archive: PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY DATA Public Release Data 2011-2018

- **Cooperative Congressional Election Study** (CCES) https://cces.gov.harvard.edu/: PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY DATA 2006-2018 survey of 50,000 people in the U.S. pre and post election waves in elections years and a single wave in the fall of non-election years. Common Content questions have such a large sample size, state-level or sub-group analysis is more feasible. Common content variables asked across every year include geography, demographics, validation of registration and turnout, partisan identity, retrospect economic evaluations, news interest, elected leader approval, presidential vote, house, senate and governor vote.

- **National Annenberg Election Survey Data Sets** (NAES 2000, 2004, 2008), Institutions of Democracy Data Sets (IOD), National Annenberg Survey of Youth (NASY 2002-2004) https://www.annenbergpublicpolicycenter.org/data-access/: PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY DATA NAES Very detailed tracking of campaign response (For example 2008 phone survey: general perceptions of candidates and political figures, current issues-opinions and perceptions, media-exposure and opinions, campaign discourse-exposure and opinions, political

participation, orientation to politics (PID, ideology, knowledge), voting behavior and attitudes, social group perceptions, demographics), NASY- mostly non-political health issues but a few political knowledge questions, tv consumption, urban rural, religion, race/ethnicity. IOD-Trust in institutions (Supreme Court 2011; Congress 2005) political knowledge

- **How Couples Meet and Stay Together 2017** (HCMST2017) (Rosenfeld, Reuben, & Hausen) https://data.stanford.edu/hcmst2017: Relationship origins and dynamics explored. Party identity is one of the questions asked.

Course Schedule

Readings should be completed prior to class. I reserve the right to make changes to the course schedule. I will alert you to any changes made and I will post the updated syllabus on Moodle.

Part I: Debates, Definitions, and Data

Lecture 1 (Tu. Jan. 7): Introductions, Broad Themes, and Logistics

In-Class Research Skill Topic: Research Questions

Required Readings:

- Begin Lecture 2 readings.

Overview Readings (*IN-CLASS: Just skim the section titles in these review papers to begin your research project brainstorming.*):

- McCarty, N. and Schickler, E. (2018). On the theory of parties. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1):175–193.
- Johnston, R. (2006). Party identification: Unmoved mover or sum of preferences? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9:329–351.
- Jost, J. T., Federico, C. M., and Napier, J. L. (2009). Political ideology: Its structure, functions, and elective affinities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60:307–337.
- Hasen, R. L. (2019). Polarization and the judiciary. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22(1):261–276.
- Layman, G. C., Carsey, T. M., and Horowitz, J. M. (2006). Party polarization in American politics: Characteristics, causes, and consequences. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9:83–110.
- Fiorina, M. P. and Abrams, S. J. (2008). Political polarization in the American public. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11:563–588.
- Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., and Westwood, S. J. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22:129–146.
- Lee, F. E. (2015). How party polarization affects governance. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18(1):261–282.
- Citrin, J. and Stoker, L. (2018). Political trust in a cynical age. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1):49–70.
- Prior, M. (2013). Media and political polarization. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 16(1):101–127.

Lecture 2 (Th. Jan. 9): What are Political Parties?

In-Class Research Skill Topic: Citation style and managers

Required Readings:

- (read efficiently) PAGES 1–26, 163–310: Aldrich, J. H. (2011). *Why Parties? A Second Look*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Brawn, K., Cohen, M., Karol, D., Masket, S., Noel, H., and Zaller, J. (2012). A theory of political parties: Groups, policy demands and nominations in American politics. *Perspective on Politics*, 10:571–597.

Recommended Readings:

- PAGES 19–45: Cohen, M., Karol, D., Noel, H., and Zaller, J. (2008). *The Party Decides: Presidential Nominations Before and After Reform*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Fagan, E. (2019). Issue ownership and the priorities of party elites in the United States, 2004–2016. *Party Politics*, published online March 29:1–12.
- Fagan, E. J. (2018). Marching orders? US party platforms and legislative agenda setting 1948–2014. *Political Research Quarterly*, 71(4):949–959
- Ansolabehere, S. and Iyengar, S. (1994). Riding the wave and claiming ownership over issues: The joint effects of advertising and news coverage in campaigns. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 58(3):335–357.
- What is Voter's Highest Priority? There's a Way to Find Out: *TheUpshot*: shorturl.at/rNRWX
- Center for American Politics and Public Policy- University of Washington, Legislation Tracker: http://www.legex.org/
- GovTrack Bills and Resolutions: https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/#bystatus
- Democrats Discard Washington Platform in Bid for House Control *The New York Times*: https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/15/us/politics/democrats-house-midterm-campaign.html

Lecture 3 (Tu. Jan. 14): What is Party Identification and Ideology?

In-Class Research Skill Topic: Online surveys

Required Readings:

- PAGES 45–47 "What is Partisanship?": Mason, L. (2018). *Uncivil agreement: How politics became our identity*. University of Chicago Press.
- PAGES: 181–205: McCarty, N. (2019). *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know*. Oxford University Press.
- Find and read a book review of: Groenendyk, E. (2013). *Competing motives in the partisan mind: How loyalty and responsiveness shape party identification and democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- PAGES 308–315: Jost, J. T., Federico, C. M., and Napier, J. L. (2009). Political ideology: Its structure, functions, and elective affinities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60:307–337.

Recommended Readings:

- Johnston, R. (2006). Party identification: Unmoved mover or sum of preferences? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9:329–351.
- Tucker, P. D., Montgomery, J. M., and Smith, S. S. (2019). Party identification in the age of Obama: Evidence on the sources of stability and systematic change in party identification from a long-term panel survey. *Political Research Quarterly*, 72(2):309–328.
- Groenendyk, E. (2018). Competing motives in a polarized electorate: political responsiveness, identity defensiveness, and the rise of partisan antipathy. *Political Psychology*, 39:159–171.
- Greene, S. (2000). The psychological sources of partisan-leaning independence. *American Politics Research*, 28:511–537.
- Converse, P. E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In Apter, D. E., editor, *Ideology and Discontent*, pages 206–261. Free Press, New York.
- Freeze, M. and Montgomery, J. M. (2016). Static stability and evolving constraint: Preference stability and ideological structure in the mass public. *American Politics Research*, 44:415–447.
- Greene, S. (2004). Social identity theory and party identification. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85:136–153.

Lecture 4 (Th. Jan. 16): What is Polarization? What is Sorting?

In-Class Research Skill Topic: Data

Required Readings:

- PAGES: 1–21, 169-180: McCarty, N. (2019). *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know.* Oxford University Press.
- PAGES: 1–23: Mason, L. (2018). *Uncivil agreement: How politics became our identity.* University of Chicago Press.

Recommended Readings:

- PAGES 129–134: Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., and Westwood, S. J. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22:129–146.
- PAGES 261–267: Lee, F. E. (2015). How party polarization affects governance. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18(1):261–282.

Lecture 5 (Tu. Jan. 21): Evidence of Polarization and Sorting?

In-Class Research Skill Topic: IRB proposals

Required Readings:

- PAGES: 22–68 McCarty, N. (2019). *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know.* Oxford University Press.
- PAGES: 24–44 Mason, L. (2018). *Uncivil agreement: How politics became our identity.* University of Chicago Press.
- Boris Shor and Nolan McCarty: Asymmetric Polarization in the State Legislatures? Yes and No: https://americanlegislatures.com/2013/07/29/partisan-polarization-in-state-legislatures/
- Current Congress Ideological Positions: VoteView – https://voteview.com/congress/senate
- "Political Polarization in the American Public", *Pew*: https://www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/

Recommended Readings:

- Heaney, M. T., Masket, S. E., Miller, J. M., and Strolovitch, D. Z. (2012). Polarized networks: The organizational affiliations of national party convention delegates. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 56(12):1654–1676.
- Fiorina, M. P. and Abrams, S. J. (2008). Political polarization in the American public. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11:563–588.
- Mason, L. and Wronski, J. (2018). One tribe to bind them all: How our social group attachments strengthen partisanship. *Political Psychology*, 39:257–277.

Part II: Causes of Polarization and Sorting

Lecture 6 (Th. Jan. 23): Causes–Economic, Political, Social Change?

Required Readings:

- PAGES: 69–100 McCarty, N. (2019). *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know.* Oxford University Press.
- Masket, S. (2019). What is, and isn't, causing polarization in modern state legislatures. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 52(3):430–435.
- PAGES: 134–136 Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., and Westwood, S. J. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22:129–146.

Recommended Readings:

- Theriault, S. M. (2006). Party polarization in the US Congress: Member replacement and member adaptation. *Party Politics*, 12(4):483–503.
- PAGES 12–37, 109-119 Levendusky, M. (2009). *The Partisan Sort: How Liberals Became Democrats and Conservatives Became Republicans.* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Layman, G. C. and Carsey, T. M. (2002). Party polarization and 'conflict extension' in the American electorate. *Amierican Journal of Political Science*, 46:786–802.
- Schickler, E. (2016). *Racial realignment: The transformation of American liberalism, 1932–1965.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Lecture 7 (Tu. Jan. 28): Causes–Electoral Law and Campaign Finance?

Required Readings:

- PAGES: 101–133 McCarty, N. (2019). *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know.* Oxford University Press.

Recommended Readings:

- Barber, M. J. (2016). Ideological donors, contribution limits, and the polarization of American legislatures. *The Journal of Politics*, 78(1):296–310.
- La Raja, R. J. and Schaffner, B. F. (2015). *Campaign Finance and Political Polarization: When Purists Prevail.* University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Part III: Consequences of Polarization and Evidence of Party Influence in Government

Lecture 8 (Th. Jan. 30): Centralization of Party Power: Party Leaders and Tools

Required Readings:

- Introduction to the Legislative Process in the U.S. Congress. 2018. Congressional Research Service Report R42843: https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R42843.
- PAGES 267–274 Lee, F. E. (2015). How party polarization affects governance. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18(1):261–282
- Re-visit pages 202-254 of Aldrich, J. H. (2011). *Why Parties? A Second Look.* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Recommended Readings:

- Rohde, D. W. (1991). *Parties and Leaders in the Postreform House.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Hall, A. B. and Shepsle, K. A. (2013). The changing value of seniority in the US house: conditional party government revised. *The Journal of Politics*, 76(1):98–113.

Lecture 9 (Tu. Feb. 4): Polarization, Public Policy, and Governance

Required Readings:

- PAGES: 134–156 McCarty, N. (2019). *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know.* Oxford University Press.
- Curry, J. M. and Lee, F. E. (2019). Non-party government: Bipartisan lawmaking and party power in Congress. *Perspectives on Politics*, 17(1):47–65.

Recommended Readings:

- Cox, G. W. and Terry, W. C. (2008). Legislative productivity in the 93d–105th congresses. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 33(4):603–618.
- Volden, C. and Wiseman, A. E. (2018). Legislative effectiveness in the United States Senate. *The Journal of Politics*, 80(2):731–735.

Lecture 10 (Th. Feb. 6): MIDTERM

IN-CLASS MIDTERM

Part IV: Consequences of Polarization and Evidence of Party Influence in Elections and the Electorate

Lecture 11 (Tu. Feb. 11): Presidential Nominating Processes and Intra-party Divisions

Required Readings:

- Congressional Networks and Campaign Collaboration:
  https://static1.squarespace.com/static/59d41ce72994caedecca4720/t/5d59fba54809950001597d8d/1566178214267/FE
- Koger, G., Masket, S., and Noel, H. (2010). Cooperative party factions in American politics. *American Politics Research*, 38(1):33–53.
- Primaries shed light on intra-party conflict in Congress, *Brookings*:
  https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2017/01/24/primaries-and-intra-party-conflict-congress/

Recommended Readings:

- Hassell, H. J. G. (2017). *The Party's Primary: Control of Congressional Nominations.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lecture 12 (Th. Feb. 13): Motivated Reasoning: Information Consumption and Processing

Required Readings:

- Bullock, J. G., Gerber, A. S., Hill, S. J., and Huber, G. A. (2015). Partisan bias in factual beliefs about politics. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 10(4):519–578.
- Taber, C. S. and Lodge, M. (2006). Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50:755–769.

Recommended Readings:

- Prior, M. (2013). Media and political polarization. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 16(1):101–127.

- Barber, M. and Pope, J. C. (2019). Does party trump ideology? Disentangling party and ideology in America. *American Political Science Review*, 113(1):38–54.
- Hart, P. S. and Nisbet, E. C. (2012). Boomerang effects in science communication: How motivated reasoning and identity cues amplify opinion polarization about climate mitigation policies. *Communication Research*, 39(6):701–723.
- Cassino, D. and Lebo, M. J. (2007). The aggregated consequences of motivated reasoning and dynamics of partisan presidential approval. *Political Psychology*, 28(6):719–746.

Lecture 13 (Tu. Feb 18): Social Structures and Relations

Required Readings:

- PAGES: 24–end Mason, L. (2018). *Uncivil agreement: How politics became our identity.* University of Chicago Press.
- PAGES: 136–143 Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., and Westwood, S. J. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22:129–146.

Recommended Readings:

- Baldassarri, D. and Bearman, P. (2007). Dynamics of political polarization. *American Sociological Review*, 72(5):784–811.
- Cowan, S. K. and Baldassarri, D. (2018). "It could turn ugly": Selective disclosure of attitudes in political discussion networks. *Social Networks*, 52:1–17.
- Huber, G. A. and Malhotra, N. (2017). Political homophily in social relationships: Evidence from online dating behavior. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(1):269–283.
- Johnston, R., Manley, D., and Jones, K. (2016). Spatial polarization of presidential voting in the United States, 1992–2012: The "big sort" revisited. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 106(5):1047–1062.
- Rohla, R., Johnston, R., Jones, K., and Manley, D. (2018). Spatial scale and the geographical polarization of the American electorate. *Political Geography*, 65:117–122.

Lecture 14 (Th. Feb. 20): Polarization and Elections Campaigns/Candidate Rhetoric

Required Readings:

- Sparks, S. (2019). Polarization and the top-two primary: Moderating candidate rhetoric in one-party contests. *Political Communication*, pages 1–21
- Rhodes, J. H. and Albert, Z. (2017). The transformation of partisan rhetoric in American presidential campaigns, 1952–2012. *Party Politics*, 23(5):566–577
- Split-Ticket Voting Hit A New Low In 2018 Senate And Governor Races, *FiveThirtyEight*: https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/split-ticket-voting-hit-a-new-low-in-2018-senate-and-governor-races/

Recommended Readings:

- Dietrich, B. J., Hayes, M., and O'BRIEN, D. Z. (2019). Pitch perfect: Vocal pitch and the emotional intensity of congressional speech. *American Political Science Review*, 113(4):941–962
- Iyengar, S., Jackman, S., and Hahn, K. (2016). Polarization in less than thirty seconds. *Political Communication in Real Time: Theoretical and Applied Research Approaches*, pages 171–196

Part IV: Party Systems and Origins

Lecture 15 (Tu. Feb. 25): Third/Minor Parties

Required Readings:

- Citrin, J. and Stoker, L. (2018). Political trust in a cynical age. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1):49–70.
- PAGES 1–13, 129–145: Tamas, B. (2018). *The Demise and Rebirth of American Third Parties: Poised for Political Revival?* Routledge, New York, NY.

Recommended Readings:

- GROßER, J. and Palfrey, T. R. (2019). Candidate entry and political polarization: An experimental study. *American Political Science Review*, 113(1):209–225.
- Peterson, G. and Wrighton, J. M. (1998). Expressions of distrust: Third-party voting and cynicism in government. *Political Behavior*, 20(1):17–34

Lecture 16 (Th. Feb. 27): Why Parties?

Required Readings:

- PAGES 27–159 Aldrich, J. H. (2011). *Why Parties? A Second Look.* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Recommended Readings:

- Rae, N. C. (2007). Be careful what you wish for: The rise of responsible parties in American national politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10(1):169–191.

Lecture 17 (Tu. Mar. 3): Peer Reviews; Primary Observations, Catch-up

MN PRIMARY ELECTIONS - onsite observations

Research Presentations

Lecture 18 (Th. Mar. 5):

In-class Presentations

Lecture 19 (Tu. Mar. 10):

In-Class Presentations