

Polarization, Parties, and Power

POSC 315 – Fall 2020
Carleton College
Tu-Th 10:20-am - 12:04 pm
Willis 204

Instructor: Melanie Freeze

Phone: 507-222-4724

Email: mfreeze@carleton.edu

Office: 417 Willis Hall

Office Hours: Monday and Wednesday 1:00 – 3:00 pm; and by appointment.

Schedule an appointment via Google Calendar by clicking [here](#).

Course Description

How have political parties shaped the distribution of power and political landscape in the United States? This seminar explores the rise of ideological and party polarization in the United States, theories of political party development and change, and third-party dynamics in a two-party system. 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. Over the term, you will 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 and presentation skills:* Communication is a fundamental component of good research. Through clear and concise delivery, research can be verified, applied, and expanded. You will further develop professional writing skills including the ability to construct a persuasive argument using logic, relevant evidence, and good mechanics. You will also learn how to present data verbally by participating in class discussions, periodically serving as discussion leader, and sharing your research project with the class.
- *Research skills:* You will 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

parties or polarization using the theories and tools of political science. You will learn how to find and navigate empirical data, identify and operationalize a set of variables, and develop a theory explaining how and why you think these variables are related.

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

Required Texts

- 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.
- Hall, A. B. (2019). *Who Wants to Run? How the Devaluing of Political Office Drives Polarization*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 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 course is oriented toward discussion and research. You will have to spend a good deal of time outside of class reading, researching, and writing. You are expected to come to class prepared to discuss the topic and assigned readings. Class discussions may identify limitations, possible extensions, and contributions of the classic and cutting edge studies read in advance of class. The best students will approach the theories, methodologies, and results critically, drawing on specifics

within the readings to build coherent arguments. Excellent students will also make connections with supplementary information and provide clarifying background when necessary in discussions. Discussions should be balanced with all class members participating equally and respectfully. To encourage dynamic and creative discussions, structured lectures and slides should be avoided or only used sparingly (If you want to present a graphic, data, or slides, screen sharing using Zoom is recommended to minimize room movement).

Typically each session will begin with a review period. Under the guidance of the discussion leader, students will work through a series of discussion questions that help identify the broad themes underlying all of the readings. This “big picture” overview will summarize relevant literature and identify fundamental problems/concerns/puzzles that motivate research in this topic area. Introductory questions may also help clarify the specifics research questions, concepts, assumptions, data, and methods employed in a particular reading. Following the review and overview, discussion leaders will guide the class in higher-level questions. Discussion leaders are encouraged to approach the class session topic creatively by incorporating learning activities, case studies, current events, debates, or other tools that help the class engage with the ideas and readings.

The research project forms the heart of the class. The assignments are scaffolded so you will have many opportunities to interact with me and each other to produce a well-crafted paper. You are encouraged to make connections between your project and assigned readings during class discussions.

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. In your first read, 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, if you have not had much exposure to statistics or research methods, 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.

Do not underestimate the time you will need to spend on reading and researching!

Grading

Your grade will be based on the following:

Class Participation and Attendance	5%
Learning Experiences	10%
Reading Responses (Due 60 min. before every lecture)	15%
Discussion Leader	20%
Course Research Project	50%
Research Questions (Due Fri. Sept. 18)	REQUIRED
Topic and References with Abstracts (Due Fri. Sep. 25)	3%
Theory/Literature Draft (Due Fri. Oct. 9)	5%
Rough Draft (Due Mon. Nov. 9)	10%
Peer Review (Due Wed. Nov. 18)	2%
Final Draft (Due Mon. Nov. 23)	30%
Total	100%

Class Participation (Attendance and Discussion) - 5%

Seminar classes are discussion oriented. In order for this class to be productive, regular attendance and advance preparation is required. 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. Because the class size is small and the meeting time relatively long, you will be expected to participate in every class discussion. To enable class-based activities while maintaining distance, many activities may be conducted using Google documents, Moodle forums, or Zoom. Please bring a laptop or Ipad to class if possible.

You are not expected to always 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. You are also encouraged to introduce readings and sources not listed in the syllabus. If you do want to discuss a recommended or other article or reading in class, please provide the class with a brief summary of the reading.

You are expected to come to class on time and regularly, health permitting. If you need to miss class because of an emergency or illness, please send me an email before class starts to get excused. You should not come to class if you are experiencing COVID-19 symptoms (cough, fever, shortness of breath, sore throat, vomiting, diarrhea, or muscle aches, chills/shaking, muscle pain, headache, sore throat, new loss of taste or smell). If your symptoms are mild and you still feel able to participate, you should join class via Zoom (see Moodle for class Zoom link). I reserve the right to pivot the class from face-to-face to a synchronous Zoom format. You will be notified via email if a particular class session will be held on Zoom rather than face-to-face. 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.

Learning Experiences - 10%

We have the exciting opportunity to think about polarization at the height of an electoral season. Five graded learning experiences related to ongoing campaigns and research skills will be incorporated into the class and used to enhance discussions. Each learning experience will have a small project outcome that I will use to gauge participation points. Failure to participate will result in 0 points. You will earn 1 point if your learning experience product is incoherent, incomplete, or riddled with errors. Quality participation will earn 2 points.

- (Due Sept. 22, 10 PM) **Citation Managers:** Learn about Zotero and complete a worksheet.
- (Due Sept. 30, 10 PM) **Sept. 29 Presidential debate watch party:** Watch the debate and contribute reflections/reactions to class forum (on Moodle).
- (Due Sept. 30, 10 PM) **Online Surveys and Experiments:** Learn how to build online survey experiments using Qualtrics. Sign up for a free Qualtrics account and build your own survey using the materials and a pre-recorded tutorial that will be posted on Moodle. Submit the link to your survey.
- (Due Oct. 6 10 PM) **How to vote:** In our discussions of institutional causes and consequences of polarization, you will have the opportunity to create a voting plan and navigate the logistics of voting in your home state (or a state of your choice if you cannot vote).
- (Due Nov. 17, 10 PM) **Election Case Study:** Select two electoral campaigns (local, state, or federal) to track over the course of the election. In the Moodle forum dedicated to your case studies, identify why you have selected the two candidates (e.g., two candidates representing the same geographic area but at different levels of government, two candidates that are in the same geographic area but different media markets, comparable candidates that differ on some critical dimension, two completely different candidates that are similar on one dimension, two ideologically different candidates, etc.). During the term, you should updated your forum with interesting insights, news articles, statistics. You are required to comment on all other students' forums at least once in the term.

Grading

1. If you participate and submit a high quality learning experience product, you will receive 2 points per activity.

2. You will earn 1 point if your learning experience product is incoherent, incomplete, or riddled with errors.
3. Failure to participate will result in 0 points.

Reading Responses - 15%

DUE: One hour before each class.

SUBMISSION FORMAT: Single-spaced one page (put your name in the header). Use citations—you only need to cite the key reading once but all other sources should be properly referenced. No reading responses due in the first week.

Your reading response should think critically about at least one of the assigned readings. You can assume the reader is familiar with the recommended reading and you do not need to summarize it. However, your critical response should demonstrate that you have carefully read and understood the text. While not exhaustive, the following list some possible approaches that you may use to craft your reading response:

- Discuss how the reading applies 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 misspecifications, 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).

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 and logically presented? Does the content 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 20%

Unlike lower level classes, this course is modeled after graduate course seminars in which students are given a lot of control and required to help direct the class. I am a firm believer that you learn much more when you have to teach. I will lead the discussion for the first 2 weeks of class. Beginning with week 3, a student will take joint responsibility with me for leading each class discussions. Discussion leaders are expected to:

- Before class: Submit an extended reading response (4-5 pages double spaced) and discussion questions by 8 AM on the day of class. The extended reading response should incorporate (and properly cite) other relevant and connected research to help build your critical analysis of the required readings.
- Before class: Email Melanie the day before the class with a plan of what you want to do as discussion leader.
- In-class: Briefly review the readings for the class and instruct on key concepts.
- In-class: Guide the class to think more carefully about the readings by providing discussion questions.
- In-class: Stimulate class discussion through an active learning technique or activity (e.g., think-pair-share, scavenger hunt, guided exploration of a current or event that is connected to the reading, investigation of online data (e.g., Apps that allow interactive data visualizations https://dcorrig1.shinyapps.io/shiny_app/), introduction to supplementary research, guest speaker, reflection writing exercises, simulation, games, etc.).

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, but do not dominate the discussion.

Grading

1. Extended Reading Response Content (40%) Does the response provide adequate and insightful analysis of the article that pushes or expands the reading in some manner? Are ideas clearly and logically presented? Does the content reflect you have read and thought about the readings? Does the analysis make connections to other relevant research or materials that were independently found?
2. Extended Reading Response Style (20%) 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?

3. In-class Discussion and Discussion Questions (40%) Was the pre-class coordination with professor was timely and well-organized? Did the leader construct an overview of the readings that was thorough yet concise. Are the open-ended questions varied, on-topic, and effective at stimulating discussion? Did the discussion leader facilitate participation so most of the classmates contributed to the discussion? Was the leader's participation was equal. Were the active learning technique or supplemental materials clearly presented, relevant, and helped foster an educational discussion?

Research Project - 50%

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 one hour before class (9:20 a.m.). All other assignments are due by 10:00 p.m. on the deadline date indicated in the assignment. All written work should be submitted electronically on Moodle (.doc/Word files required). 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 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 discussion leader).

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 <mailto:disability@carleton.edu> or call Sam Thayer ('10), 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://www.carleton.edu/asc/syllabusstatements/>

Coping with COVID-19 Plus

- This is a stressful time for many so practice self care. Eat properly, get enough sleep, and take care of your physical and mental health.
- Let me know if you experience any technical problems or learning challenges and I will do my best to help.
- If for some reason, we need to transition to online learning, the class structure will remain unchanged and class will be synchronous (class will be conducted over Zoom).

Ways to reduce stress and cope with anxiety:

- Learning—connect to others through class; develop analytical skills/tools that might help you navigate complex and difficult situations.
- Talk to someone.
- Write in a journal or meditate.
- Light exercise. Go for a walk, do some yoga, stretching. I personally have found jogging in place while watching an episode of the *Great British Baking Show* almost always helps!
- Take deep breaths.
- Use the “five senses” method if you are panicking (name five things you can see, hear, smell, and/or taste).

Where can I get help when I need it?

- Carleton Student Health: <https://apps.carleton.edu/studenthealth/>
- Office of Health Promotion: <https://www.carleton.edu/health-promotion/>
- Carleton Announcements: <https://www.carleton.edu/disease-updates/coronavirus/>

Resources

Carleton Resources

- Carleton Quantitative Resource Center: <https://www.carleton.edu/quantitative-resource-center/>
- 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)

Data

- **Harvard Dataverse** <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/> → Social Sciences: Incredible repository of code and replication data.
- **Comparative Agendas Project** <https://www.comparativeagendas.net/us/about>: The U.S. Policy Agendas Project collects and organizes data from various archived sources to trace changes in the national policy agenda and public policy outcomes of the United States since the Second World War.
- **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.
- **Current Congress Ideological Positions: VoteView** – <https://voteview.com/congress/senate>
- **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.

- **Internet Archive Wayback Machine:** <https://archive.org/web/> Find archived websites of political parties, candidates, or party organizations.
- **DCinbox:** <https://www.dcinbox.com/about> Online repository of official e-newsletters from every member of Congress.
- **Center for American Politics and Design:** <https://www.politicsanddesign.com/> Collection of every campaign logo from the 2018 election for U.S. Congress.
- **Manifesto Project:** <https://news.mit.edu/2020/economist-antoine-levy-0821> The project provides parties' policy positions derived from a content analysis of parties' electoral manifestos. It covers over 1000 parties from 1945 until today in over 50 countries on five continents.
- **Center for American Politics and Public Policy- University of Washington, Legislation Tracker:**
<http://www.legex.org/>
- **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/>
- **Congressional Data in R:** <http://congressdata.joshuamccrain.com/index.html> 1) An overview of available data and R packages for researchers, instructors, practitioners, and policymakers interested in Congress; and 2) A series of R tutorials centered on using these data, including joining/merging, cleaning, visualization, and modeling.
- **Mischiefs of Faction Blog:** Cutting edge research on parties plus entertaining analyses at
<https://www.mischiefsoffaction.com/>

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

Class Session 1 (Tu. Sep. 15): Introductions, Broad Themes, and Logistics

Required Readings (NO READING RESPONSE DUE):

- PAGES: 1–100: McCarty, N. (2019). *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know*. Oxford University Press.

Supplementary Readings (*literature reviews you can use to find sources for your own papers*):

- 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.

Class Session 2 (Th. Sep. 17): What is Polarization? What is Sorting? What is Party Identification and Ideology?

In-Class Research Skill Topic: Research Questions and Data

Required Readings (NO READING RESPONSE DUE):

- PAGES: 101–205: McCarty, N. (2019). *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know*. Oxford University Press.
- “Political Polarization in the American Public”, *Pew*: <https://www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/>

Recommended Readings:

- 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/>
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Class Session 3 (Tu. Sep. 22): What are Political Parties?

In-Class Research Skill Topic: Citation style and managers

Required Readings:

- PAGES 1–26: 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 1–53: Hershey, M. R. (2017). *Party Politics in America*. Routledge, New York, 17th edition.
- McCarty, N. and Schickler, E. (2018). On the theory of parties. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1):175–193.
- 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: *The Upshot*: shorturl.at/rNRWX

Class Session 4 (Th. Sept. 24): Why Parties?

In-Class Research Skill Topic: Theory (emphasis on Rational Choice Theory)

Required Readings:

- PAGES 27–64: Aldrich, J. H. (2011). *Why Parties? A Second Look*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Chapters 1 and 5 : Bonchek, M. S. and Shepsle, K. A. (1996). *Analyzing politics: Rationality, behavior and institutions*. New York.

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.
- Aldrich, J. H. (2000). Presidential address: Southern parties in state and nation. *Journal of Politics*, 63:643–670.
- Key, V. O. (1949 (1977)). *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. The University of Tennessee Press, a new edition edition.

Class Session 5 (Tu. Sept 29): Individual Meetings for Research Paper

No in-person class. During the class period, there will be individual meetings (via Zoom) with Melanie. Class readings and response paper will be replaced by a two learning activities. You will need to watch the presidential debate, participate in the debate forum on Moodle, watch the pre-recorded tutorial on creating survey experiments in Qualtrics, and submit the link to the survey experiment you created. All of these items need to be submitted on Moodle by September 30th, 10pm.

- **Learning Experience:** Presidential Debate Watch Party and Class Forum Reflection/Response
- **In-Class Research Skill Topic:** Online surveys/survey experiments

Part II: Causes of Polarization and Sorting

Class Session 6 (Th. Oct. 1): Racism, Realignment, and Polarization

Required Readings:

- PAGES 1– 38. Sundquist, J. L. (1973). *Dynamics of the Party System: Alignment and Realignment of the Political Parties in the United States*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Hare, C. and Poole, K. T. (2014). The polarization of contemporary American politics. *Polity*, 46(3):411–429.
- (Note: you can access the entire book online via Gould Library) Chapter 1: Schickler, E. (2016). *Racial realignment: The transformation of American liberalism, 1932–1965*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Balz, Dan. 2020. “The politics of race are shifting, and politicians are struggling to keep pace” *Washington Post* at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2020/politics/race-reckoning/> [can access through Gould Library: Nexis Uni]

Recommended Readings:

- Hutchings, V. L. and Valentino, N. A. (2004). The centrality of race in American politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7:383–408.

- Olson, J. (2008). Whiteness and the polarization of American politics. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(4):704–718.
- Layman, G. C. and Carsey, T. M. (2002). Party polarization and ‘conflict extension’ in the American electorate. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46:786–802.
- Theriault, S. M. (2006). Party polarization in the US Congress: Member replacement and member adaptation. *Party Politics*, 12(4):483–503.

Class Session 7 (Tu. Oct. 6): Institutional Causes of Polarization - Changing Candidates’ Center of Gravity

Required Readings:

- Barber, M. J. (2016). Ideological donors, contribution limits, and the polarization of American legislatures. *The Journal of Politics*, 78(1):296–310.
- Olson, M. P. and Rogowski, J. C. (2020). Legislative term limits and polarization. *The Journal of Politics*, 82(2):572–586.
- Begin reading Hall, A. B. (2019). *Who Wants to Run? How the Devaluing of Political Office Drives Polarization*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Recommended Readings:

- La Raja, R. J. and Schaffner, B. F. (2015). *Campaign Finance and Political Polarization: When Purists Prevail*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Explore shorturl.at/qyBPQ
- Masket, S. (2019). What is, and isn’t, causing polarization in modern state legislatures. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 52(3):430–435.

Class Session 8 (Th. Oct. 8): Institutional Causes of Polarization – Costs of Running and Candidate Selection Bias

Required Readings:

- Hall, A. B. (2019). *Who Wants to Run? How the Devaluing of Political Office Drives Polarization*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Recommended Readings:

- Chapter 7: Thomsen, D. M. (2017). *Opting Out of Congress: Partisan Polarization and the Decline of Moderate Candidates*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Canes-Wrone, B., Brady, D. W., and Cogan, J. F. (2002). Out of step, out of office: Electoral accountability and House members’ voting. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1):127–140.

Part III: Consequences of Polarization

Class Session 9 (Tu. Oct. 13): Social and Psychological Consequences – Social Identity, Affective Politics, and Social Polarization

Required Readings:

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

Recommended Readings:

- Huddy, L. (2001). From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political psychology*, 22(1):127–156.
- Iyengar, S., Sood, G., and Lelkes, Y. (2012). Affect, not ideology: A social identity perspective on polarization. *Public opinion quarterly*, 76(3):405–431.
- 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.
- Greene, S. (2004). Social identity theory and party identification. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85:136–153.
- Levendusky, M. (2009). *The Partisan Sort: How Liberals Became Democrats and Conservatives Became Republicans*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Class Session 10 (Th. Oct. 15): Social and Psychological Consequences – Geographic Political Segregation

Required Readings:

- Abrams, Samuel J. and Morris P. Fiorina. 2012. “Myth of the ‘Big Sort’” at: <https://www.hoover.org/research/myth-big-sort>
- Explore Ryan D. Enos’ Partisan Segregation Maps at: <http://ryandenos.com/partisan-segregation>
- Mummolo, J. and Nall, C. (2017). Why partisans do not sort: The constraints on political segregation. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(1):45–59.
- Brown, J. R. and Enos, R. D. (nd). Partisan segregation. working manuscript.

Recommended Readings:

- Gimpel, J. G. and Hui, I. S. (2015). Seeking politically compatible neighbors? the role of neighborhood partisan composition in residential sorting. *Political Geography*, 48:130–142.
- Tam Cho, W. K., Gimpel, J. G., and Hui, I. S. (2013). Voter migration and the geographic sorting of the American electorate. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 103(4):856–870.
- Nall, C. (2015). The political consequences of spatial policies: How interstate highways facilitated geographic polarization. *The Journal of Politics*, 77(2):394–406.
- 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.

Class Session 11 (Tu. Oct. 20): Social and Psychological Consequences – Political Communication and Social Networks

Required Readings:

- Eady, G., Nagler, J., Guess, A., Zilinsky, J., and Tucker, J. A. (2019). How many people live in political bubbles on social media? Evidence from linked survey and Twitter data. *Sage Open*, 9(1):1–21.
- Freeze, M. and Argyle, L. (nd). Bursting the bubble: Self-affirmation and conditions of political discussion avoidance. working manuscript.

- Settle, J. E. and Carlson, T. N. (2019). Opting out of political discussions. *Political Communication*, pages 1–21.

Recommended Readings:

- Carlson, T. N. and Settle, J. E. (2016). Political chameleons: An exploration of conformity in political discussions. *Political Behavior*, 38(4):817–859.
- 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. Baldassarri, D. and Bearman, P. (2007). Dynamics of political polarization. *American Sociological Review*, 72(5):784–811.

Class Session 12 (Th. Oct. 22): Social and Psychological Consequences – Expressive and Processing Biases

Required Readings:

- Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108:480–498.
- Hameleers, M. and van der Meer, T. G. (2020). Misinformation and polarization in a high-choice media environment: How effective are political fact-checkers? *Communication Research*, 47(2):227–250.
- 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.

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.
- Taber, C. S. and Lodge, M. (2006). Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50:755–769.
- Enders, A. M. and Armaly, M. T. (2019). The differential effects of actual and perceived polarization. *Political Behavior*, 41(3):815–839.

Class Session 13 (Tu. Oct 27): Consequences of Polarization and Evidence of Party Influence in Government: Party Tools and Party Leader Powers

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>.
- 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.

- Ban, P., Moskowitz, D. J., and Snyder, J. M. (nd). Leadership power in Congress, 1890-2014: Evidence from PAC contributions and newspaper coverage. unpublished manuscript.

Recommended Readings:

- PAGES 267–274 Lee, F. E. (2015). How party polarization affects governance. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18(1):261–282.
- Rohde, D. W. (1991). *Parties and Leaders in the Postreform House*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Aldrich, J. H. (2011). *Why Parties? A Second Look*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Class Session 14 (Th. Oct. 29): Consequences of Polarization and Evidence of Party Influence in Government: Policy and Governance

Required Readings:

- 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.
- 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.

Class Session 15 (Tu. Nov 3): Polarization and Elections Campaigns/Candidate Rhetoric

ELECTION DAY Required Readings:

- Lee, F. E. (2011). Making laws and making points: Senate governance in an era of uncertain majorities. *The Forum*, 9(4).
- Sparks, S. (2019). Polarization and the top-two primary: Moderating candidate rhetoric in one-party contests. *Political Communication*, pages 1–21. item Uncivil Behavior May Hurt Politicians—Even With Their Base, *Psychology Today* <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/brainstorm/201809/uncivil-behavior-may-hurt-politicians-even-their-base>

Recommended Readings:

- 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/>
- Rhodes, J. H. and Albert, Z. (2017). The transformation of partisan rhetoric in American presidential campaigns, 1952–2012. *Party Politics*, 23(5):566–577.
- Davis, N. T. and Mason, L. (2016). Sorting and the split-ticket: Evidence from presidential and subpresidential elections. *Political Behavior*, 38(2):337–354.
- Straight Ticket Voting States, NCSL: <http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/straight-ticket-voting.aspx>
- 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.

Class Session 16 (Th. Nov. 5): Intra-party Factions and Networks

Required Readings:

- Clarke, A. J. (2020). Party sub-brands and american party factions. *American Journal of Political Science*, 64(3):452–470.
- Box-Steffensmeier, J. M., Campbell, B. W., Podob, A. W., and Walker, S. J. (2019). I get by with a little help from my friends: Leveraging campaign resources to maximize congressional power. *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Nyhan, B. and Montgomery, J. M. (2015). Connecting the candidates: Consultant networks and the diffusion of campaign strategy in american congressional elections. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(2):292–308.
- 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/>
- Bacon, Perry. 2019. “The Six Wings of the Democratic Party” *FiveThirtyEight*. At: <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/six-wings-of-the-democratic-party/>
- Cai, Weiyi, Nick Corasaniti, Lazaro Gamio, and Ella Koeze. 2020. “See Which Factions Dominated the Republican Convention” *The New York Times*. At: [shorturl.at/foDRW](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/05/us/politics/rep-convention-factions.html)

Recommended Readings:

- Hassell, H. J. G. (2017). *The Party’s Primary: Control of Congressional Nominations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Koger, G., Masket, S., and Noel, H. (2010). Cooperative party factions in American politics. *American Politics Research*, 38(1):33–53.

Class Session 17 (Tu. Nov. 10): 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

Research Presentations

Class Session 18 (Th. Nov. 12): Final Paper Workshop

In-class Presentations/Workshop

Class Session 19 (Tu. Nov. 17): Final Paper Workshop

In-Class Presentations/Workshop