

Pro-Seminar in American Government and Politics
Political Science 510

Instructor: Michael S. Rocca, Associate Professor
Office: Social Science Building, Room 2043
Office Hours: Thursday 1:00pm-4:00pm
Email: msrocca@unm.edu
Office Phone: 505-277-2165

Fall 2013
T 2:00-4:30pm
SSCI 2069

SCOPE OF THE COURSE

This course is designed to introduce you to the field of American politics by intensively examining selected readings, almost exclusively articles drawn from leading research journals, in the various areas that comprise the field. No single course can hope to represent, or even sample in representative fashion, this rich and expansive field of study. The approach taken in this course is to identify some key research questions that are subjects of empirical study and (often) debate and to expose you to key readings that deal with each question. None of the readings is beyond the reach of first-quarter graduate students, although you may not be familiar with all the statistical or modeling techniques employed and the theory and conceptualization may be complex. Many of the selections are models of political science research, and you should come to a good understanding of why. My hope is that thinking about these readings will hone your analytic and conceptual skills and whet your appetite for more study of each area. The readings also reflect the wide variety of theoretical approaches, research designs, and research methodologies that characterizes empirical research in American politics, so that you can see for yourself how diverse are the ways of answering what I hope you will find are interesting questions in the field.

REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING POLICIES

Beyond introducing the field of American politics, the course invites you to engage in intensive writing and seminar discussion around these topics and a final topic of your choosing. Its basic requirements are three:

1. Three essays of no more than 5 pages each that review all of the readings for a particular question in a class session (20% of the course grade). Each essay should include a clear and succinct summary of the important points (e.g., research question[s], theory and conceptualization, study design, analysis, and results) in each reading and a discussion of how -- and how well -- the readings address the research question posed in the syllabus (or another research question if you find it more relevant). These essays will be graded, but if you are dissatisfied with the grade you can do a fourth essay on the class session of your choice and substitute its grade for the grade on the lowest essay. The essays are due at the beginning of the class session when these readings are to be discussed; their grade will be reduced by 1/3 of a letter grade for each 24 hours they are late, beginning with the end of that class session.
2. Active and informed participation in seminar discussions (40% of the course grade). Each student should have sufficient familiarity with the readings for any session to be able to engage in discussion that day, whether or not an essay has been

prepared on the topic. This requires careful study of each selection and considerable thought about how the readings for that day interrelate. It is the quality of participation, more than its quantity, which is important. Regular class attendance is a minimal expectation for a graduate seminar. Furthermore, 1 to 2 students will be designated as “discussion leaders” during each class session. It will be the responsibility of these leaders to facilitate the session’s discussion. How this is done is up to the leader’s discretion, though two effective methods are (1) arriving prepared with provocative questions and/or (2) by answering the “question of the day” (see below) in a provocative way. Each student’s participation grade will be partly determined by their performance during these leadership opportunities.

3. A 10-15 page critical literature analysis that traces the impact of one of the field’s classic articles or topics (worth 40% of the grade). A list of the classics from which to choose is provided at the end of the syllabus; with my permission, you may choose another classic article as your focus. Your task is to trace the principal work derived from this classic, addressing what its theoretical, methodological, and/or empirical legacy has been and why it has attained standing of a classic. To identify the “offspring” of the classic article you have selected, you can trace them “backwards” from the footnotes of a recent article using it or use the Social Science Citation Index online through the library. You should not try to include each and every derivative work in your analysis. Instead, you should focus on only the ones that make substantial use of the classic and only the most important of them, probably no more than a dozen in all.

ACADEMIC HONESTY

All of the work you do in this course is expected to be your own, done exclusively for this course. Cheating or plagiarism (using someone else’s words or ideas without proper citation) will not be tolerated. All cases of academic misconduct in the form of cheating or plagiarism will be reported to the University Committee on Academic Misconduct and handled according to University policy.

DISABILITIES

Students with disabilities are responsible for making their needs known to me, and seeking available assistance, at the first meeting of the course. Course materials may be made available in alternative formats upon request. If you need such materials, please inform me immediately.

SYLLABUS

The following pages contain the course syllabus. All readings contained in it are required. Most can be found on JSTOR or through the library. Others – e.g. book chapters – will be made available by the professor.

WEEK 1

Introduction: Review of Course and the American Field

WEEK 2

What is the nature of representation?

Burke, Edmund. 1774. "Speech to the Electors of Bristol." In *Works*, New York: Harpers 446-48.

- Available at <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch13s7.html>

Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Chapter 4.

Miller, Warren E. And Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *The American Political Science Review* 57: 45-56.

Weissberg, Robert. 1978. "Collective vs. Dyadic Representation in Congress." *The American Political Science Review* 72: 535-547.

Mansbridge, Jane. 2003. "Rethinking Representation" *The American Political Science Review* 97: 515-528.

Rehfeld, Andrew. 2009. "Representation Rethought: On Trustees, Delegates, and Gyroscopes in the Study of Political Representation and Democracy." *The American Political Science Review* 103: 214-230.

*****Optional***

Nadia Urbinati and Mark E. Warren. 2008. "The Concept of Representation in Contemporary Democratic Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 387-412.

WEEK 3

Why Is Voter Turnout in American Elections So Low?

Despite an easing of the requirements for registration and voting, contemporary American turnout is well below the levels routinely achieved in other democracies and in nineteenth century America. Scholars have provided different explanations for turnout levels, which can be drawn upon to answer this perplexing question.

G. Bingham Powell, Jr. 1986. "American Voter Turnout in Comparative Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 80: 17-43.

Aldrich, John H. 1993. "Rational Choice and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science* 37: 246-278.

Alan S. Gerber and Donald P. Green. 2000. "The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls,

and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment.” *The American Political Science Review* 94: 653-663.

****Optional**

André Blais. 2006. “What Affects Voter Turnout?” *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 111-125.

What Motivates Political Activity?

Even though political participation in the United States is more widespread than in most other democracies, only a minority of Americans engage in more demanding forms of political activity than voting. Contrasting explanations for why American citizens participate reflect the different theoretical approaches scholars have taken to accounting for political behavior in general, and specifically political activity.

Henry E. Brady, Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. “Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation.” *American Political Science Review* 89: 271-94.

Eric Plutzer. 2002. “Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth in Young Adulthood.” *The American Political Science Review* 96: 41-56.

Diana C. Mutz. 2002. “The Consequences of Cross-Cutting Networks for Political Participation.” *American Journal of Political Science* 46: 838-855.

****Optional**

Michael X. Delli Carpini, Fay Lomax Cook, and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2004. “Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 315-344.

WEEK 4

Is Social Capital Eroding in America and, If So, What Can Be Done About It?

Political analysts, as well as leaders, have become concerned about the declining quality of civic life in America. Political conflict and intolerance seem to be on the increase; political trust and political efficacy have declined. Ordinary Americans seem more divided from one another and less engaged in the political decisions that affect their lives. Scholars have studied what seems to be happening to these elements of “social capital” and have pondered what can be done about the changes they have seen.

Robert Putnam. 1995. “Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28: 664-83.

Pippa Norris. 1996. “Does Television Erode Social Capital? A Reply to Putnam.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29(3): 474-480

John Brehm and Wendy Rahn. 1997. “Individual-Level Evidence for the Causes and Consequences of Social Capital.” *American Journal of Political Science* 41: 999-1023.

Mark Schneider, Paul Teske, Melissa Marschall, Michael Mintrom, and Christine Roch. 1997. "Institutional Arrangements and the Creation of Social Capital: The Effects of Public School Choice." *American Political Science Review* 91: 82-93.

Stephen Knack. 2002. "Social Capital and the Quality of Government: Evidence from the States." *American Journal of Political Science* (46)4: 772-785.

Luke Keele. 2007. "Social Capital and the Dynamics of Trust in Government." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(2): 241-254.

****Optional**

Robert W. Jackman and Ross A. Miller. 1998. "Social Capital and Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 1: 47-73.

WEEK 5

How Ideological Are Americans? How Informed are Americans?

Voting and public opinion often are analyzed in ideological terms -- e.g., left, right, liberal, conservative -- as if these terms reflect the thinking of ordinary citizens as readily as they do the thinking and rhetoric of political leaders. Converse's classic 1964 work casts doubt on the ability of most Americans to engage in the level of constrained or consistent political thought that is required for them to be at all ideological. Subsequent recent studies, though, question Converse's conceptualization and conclusions.

Philip E. Converse. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. David Apter. New York: Free Press, pp. 206-61.

Sullivan, John L., James E. Piereson, and George E. Marcus. 1978. "Ideological Constraint in the Mass Public: A Methodological Critique and Some New Findings." *American Journal of Political Science* 22: 233-49.

Stanley Feldman and John Zaller. 1992. "The Political Culture of Ambivalence: Ideological Responses to the Welfare State." *American Journal of Political Science* 36: 268-307.

Bartels, Larry M. 1996. "Uninformed Votes: Information Effects in Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 194-230.

Lupia, Arthur. 1994. "Shortcuts versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections." *American Political Science Review* 88(March): 63-76.

****Optional**

William A. Galston. 2001. "Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 217-234.

WEEK 6

To what extent is America polarized?

Fiorina, Morris P., Samuel J. Abrams, and Pope, J.C. 2006. *Culture War? The Myth of a Polarized America: Second Edition*. New York: Pearson Longman.

Alan I. Abramowitz, Kyle L. Saunders. 2008. "Is Polarization a Myth?" *The Journal of Politics* 70: 542-555.

Morris P. Fiorina, Samuel A. Abrams and Jeremy C. Pope. 2008. "Polarization in the American Public: Misconceptions and Misreadings." *The Journal of Politics* 70: 556-560.

****Optional**

Morris P. Fiorina and Samuel J. Abrams. 2008. "Political Polarization in the American Public." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 563-588.

WEEK 7

How Central is Race in American Politics?

The question of race remains at the center of American politics, as it has throughout the history of the nation. Among its contemporary manifestations, affirmative action, welfare policy, and redistricting to enhance the prospects of electing African-American officials have received the most attention.

Carmines EG, Stimson JA. 1989. *Issue Evolution: Race and the Transformation of American Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press Chapters ???

Lawrence Bobo and James R. Kluegel. 1993. "Opposition to Race-Targeting: Self-Interest, Stratification Ideology, or Racial Attitudes?" *American Sociological Review* 58: 443-464.

Charles Cameron, David Epstein, and Sharyn O'Halloran. 1996. "Do Majority-Minority Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress?" *American Political Science Review* 90: 794-812.

****Optional**

Vincent L. Hutchings and Nicholas A. Valentino. 2004. "The Centrality of Race in American Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 383-408

Does Gender Make a Difference?

Women have become more involved in politics in recent years, challenging the traditional male dominance of the political world. As their involvement increases, in some areas attaining the levels of male involvement, attention has been drawn to how much it matters for such political behavior as voting in elections and service in legislatures and on the courts.

Carole Kennedy Chaney, R. Michael Alvarez, and Jonathan Nagler. 1998. "Explaining the Gender Gap in U.S. Presidential Elections, 1980-1992." *Political Research Quarterly* 51: 311-39.

Donald R. Songer, Sue Davis, and Susan Haire. 1994. "A Reappraisal of Diversification in the Federal Courts: Gender Effects in the Court of Appeals." *Journal of Politics* 56: 425-39.

Sue Thomas. 1991. "The Impact of Women on State Legislative Policies." *Journal of Politics* 53: 958-76.

****Optional**

Joni Lovenduski. 1998. "Gendering Research in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 1: 333-356.

WEEK 8

How Do Media Influence American Politics?

Although the media are widely credited as powerful influences on Americans' political views, the absence of clear evidence of that influence for many years produced a "minimal effects" theory of the media. Recent research provides evidence of more substantial effects, but the nature of these effects varies considerably as does whether they represent influence of the media themselves or of the media simply as the conduit for messages from other sources.

Shanto Iyengar, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1982. "Experimental Demonstrations of the 'Not-So-Minimal' Consequences of Television News Programs." *American Political Science Review* 76: 848-58.

Thomas E. Nelson, Rosalee Clawson, and Zoe Oxley. 1997. "Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance." *American Political Science Review* 91: 567-84.

Stephen Ansolabehere, Shanto Iyengar, Adam Simon, and Nicholas Valentino. 1994. "Does Attack Advertising Demobilize the Electorate?" *American Political Science Review* 88: 829-38.

Mutz, Diana C. and Byron Reeves. 2005. "The New Videomalaise: Effects of Televised Incivility on Political Trust." *American Political Science Review*. 99(1): 1-16.

Benjamin I. Page, Robert Y. Shapiro and Glenn R. Dempsey. 1987. "What Moves Public Opinion?" *The American Political Science Review* 81: 23-44.

Prior, Markus. 2013. "Media and Political Polarization." *Annual Review of Political Science* 16: 101-127.

****Optional**

Kenneth Goldstein and Travis N. Ridout. 2004. "Measuring the Effects of Televised Political Advertising in the United States." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 205-226.

Michael Schudson. 2002. "The News Media as Political Institutions." *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 249-269

Doris Graber. 2003. "The Media and Democracy: Beyond Myths and Stereotypes." *Annual Review of Political Science* 6: 139-160

WEEK 9

Are Political Parties Dying or "Born Again"?

Political parties, long presumed to be important and perhaps even essential actors for American democratic politics, have changed considerably in role and vitality in recent decades. After a long period of decline in their classic form, the political machine, local party organizations appear to have rebounded in strength. The differences between these "new" local parties and the traditional machines, though, raise the question of what party organizations are and how what they are affects the role they play.

"Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System: Summary of Conclusions and Proposals." *American Political Science Review* 44: 1-14.

- For the full report and subsequent commentaries see http://www.apsanet.org/~pop/APSA_Report.htm#REPORT

Pomper, Gerald M. 1971. "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System? What, Again?" *Journal of Politics* 33:916-940.

Joseph Schlesinger. 1985. "The New American Political Parties." *American Political Science Review* 79: 1152-69.

Lowi, Theodore. 2003. "Toward a More Responsible Three-Party System: Deregulating American Democracy." In *The State of the Parties*, eds. John C Green and Rich Farmer. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Herrnson, Paul S. 1986. "Do Parties Make a Difference? The Role of Party Organizations in Congressional Elections." *Journal of Politics* 48:589-615.

Fiorina, Morris P. 2002. "Parties and Partisanship: A 40-Year Retrospective." *Political Behavior* 24(June): 93-115.

*****Optional***

Harold Clarke Marianne Stewart. 1998. "The Decline of Political Parties in the Minds of Citizens." *Annual Review of Political Science* 1: 357-378.

WEEK 10

Why Do People Organize for Political Pressure?

In his classic *The Logic of Collective Action* (1965), Mancur Olson observes that individual incentives to join with one another in pursuit of collective goods that can not be restricted are generally weak because of the "free rider" problem. Yet interest groups have proliferated in modern times, much as Madison feared they might in *Federalist 10*. This situation has led scholars back to the question of why people seem to join groups in spite of "rational" reasons not to do so.

- Jack Walker. 1983. "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America," *American Political Science Review* 77: 90-406.
- John Mark Hansen. 1985. "The Political Economy of Group Membership," *American Political Science Review* 79: 79-96.
- Lawrence S. Rothenberg. 1988. "Organizational Maintenance and the Retention Decision in Groups." *American Political Science Review* 82: 1129-52.

PACs and Interest Groups: Who Do They Influence and How?

That organized interests will attempt to turn public policy to their advantage hardly surprising, as this is very much a part of democratic politics. Just how they do this, however, is more difficult to discern. Scholars have answered this question in different ways, narrowing the search for answers while leaving considerable mysteries yet to be solved.

- Stephen Ansolabehere, John M. de Figueiredo, James M. Snyder Jr. 2003. "Why Is There so Little Money in U.S. Politics?" *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17: 105-130.

- Wright, John R. 1990. "Contributions, lobbying, and committee voting in the US House of Representatives." *The American Political Science Review* 85: 417: 438.

- Marie Hojnacki, David C. Kimball. 1998. "Organized Interests and the Decision of Whom to Lobby in Congress." *The American Political Science Review* 92: 775-790

****Optional***

- Marie Hojnacki, David C. Kimball, Frank R. Baumgartner, Jeffrey M. Berry, and Beth L. Leech. 2012. "Studying Organizational Advocacy and Influence: Reexamining Interest Group Research" *Annual Review of Political Science* 15: 379-399

WEEK 11

What Motivates Members of Congress?

- Mayhew, David. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press. Part 1.

- Katz JN, Sala BR. 1996. "Careerism, Committee Assignments, and the Electoral Connection." *American Political Science Review* 90: 21-33.

*****Optional***

- Jamie L. Carson and Jeffery A. Jenkins. 2011. "Examining the Electoral Connection Across Time." *Annual Review of Political Science* 14: 25-46.

How Important Is Party in the House of Representatives?

The majority party organizes the House of Representatives, dominating its committees, controlling the agenda on the floor, and generally regulating the flow of legislation. Yet some question whether this is really party control, because the power of individual members, the committees and their leaders, and even cross-party coalitions is substantial. In the end, the role party plays is an empirical question, subject to systematic investigation.

Keith Krehbiel. 1993. "Where's the Party?" *British Journal of Political Science* 23: 235-266.

Sarah A. Binder; Eric D. Lawrence; Forrest Maltzman. 1999. "Uncovering the Hidden Effect of Party." *The Journal of Politics* 61: 815-831.

James M. Snyder, Jr.; Tim Groseclose. 2000. "Estimating Party Influence in Congressional Roll-Call Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 44: 193-211.

****Optional**

Nelson W. Polsby and Eric Schickler. 2002. Landmarks in the Study of Congress Since 1945." *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 333-367.

WEEK 12

How uncompetitive are congressional elections?

David R. Mayhew. 1974. "Congressional Elections: The Case of the Vanishing Marginals." *Polity* 6: 295-317.

Gary C. Jacobson. 1987. "The Marginals Never Vanished: Incumbency and Competition in Elections to the U.S. House of Representatives, 1952-82." *American Journal of Political Science* 31: 126-141.

Andrew Gelman and Gary King. 1990. "Estimating Incumbency Advantage without Bias." *American Journal of Political Science* 34: 1142-1164.

Why are congressional elections so uncompetitive?

Gary W. Cox; Jonathan N. Katz. 1996. "Why Did the Incumbency Advantage in U.S. House Elections Grow?" *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 478-497.

Alan I. Abramowitz, Brad Alexander, Matthew Gunning. 2006. "Incumbency, Redistricting, and the Decline of Competition in U.S. House Elections." *The Journal of Politics* 68: 75-88.

Alan I. Abramowitz. 1991. "Incumbency, Campaign Spending, and the Decline of Competition in U.S. House Elections." *The Journal of Politics* 53: 34-56.

WEEK 13

What is the meaning of presidential power?

Taft, William Howard. 1916. *Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 138-145.

Roosevelt, Theodore. 1913. *The Autobiography of Theodore Roosevelt*. Centennial, ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 197-200.

- Available online at <http://www.bartleby.com/55/10.html> Read paragraphs 10-22.

Lincoln, Abraham. 1894. "Letter to A.G. Hodges." In *The Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln*, Vol. 10, eds. John Nicolay and John Hay. New York: Francis D. Tandy Co.

- Available online at: http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Letter_to_A._G._Hodges

Fatovic, Clement. 2004. "Constitutionalism and Presidential Prerogative: Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian Perspectives." *American Journal of Political Science* 48(3): 429-444.

Whittington, Keith E. and Daniel P. Carpenter. 2003. "Executive Power in American Institutional Development." *Perspectives on Politics* 1(September): 495-513.

Neustadt, Richard. 1990. *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents*. New York, NY: The Free Press. Chapters 3-5.

*****Optional***

William G. Howell. 2011. "Presidential Power in War." *Annual Review of Political Science* 14: 89-105

WEEK 14

Law or Politics: What Is the Basis for Supreme Court Decisions?

The Framers of the Constitution created a Supreme Court with lifetime appointments, perhaps hoping that it would be sufficiently insulated from ordinary political pressures to make decisions based on legal canons and legal precedents, not political considerations. Some legal scholars conclude that these hopes, by and large, have been realized, whereas others see the Court is an eminently political institution, subject to the same political forces experienced by the other institutions, albeit in probably more muted form.

Gregory A. Caldeira and John R. Wright. 1988. "Organized Interests and Agenda Setting in the U.S. Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review* 82: 1109-27.

Jeffrey A. Segal and Harold J. Spaeth. 1996. "The Influence of *Stare Decisis* on the Votes of United States Supreme Court Justices." *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 971-1003.

Jack Knight and Lee Epstein. 1996. "The Norm of *Stare Decisis*." *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 1018-35.

****Optional**

Lee Epstein and Tonja Jacobi. 2010. The Strategic Analysis of Judicial Decisions *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 6: 341-358.

Lee Epstein and Jack Knight. 2013. "Reconsidering Judicial Preferences." *Annual Review of Political Science* 16: 11-31.

Howard Gillman. 2004. "Martin Shapiro and the Movement from "Old" to "New" Institutional Studies in Public Law Scholarship." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 363-382.

Keith J. Bybee. 2012. "Paying Attention to What Judges Say: New Directions in the Study of Judicial Decision Making." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 8: 69-84.

Jeb Barnes. 2007. "Bringing the Courts Back In: Interbranch Perspectives on the Role of Courts in American Politics and Policy Making." *Annual Review of Political Science* 10: 25-43.

Does the Supreme Court Respond to Public Opinion?

At least since Robert Dahl's classic "Decision-making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as National Policy-maker" (1957), scholars have looked for a relationship between public opinion, especially as expressed through election results, and the decisions of the Supreme Court. Establishing this relationship is difficult, and therefore has been a source of enduring controversy. But the fact remains that the Court is not so aloof from popular pressures as its institutional insulation might presume.

William Mishler and Reginald S. Sheehan. 1993. "The Supreme Court as a Countermajoritarian Institution: The Impact of Public Opinion on Supreme Court Decisions." *American Political Science Review* 87: 87-101.

Helmut Norpoth and Jeffrey A. Segal. 1994. "Comment." *American Political Science Review* 88: 711-16.

William Mishler and Reginald S. Sheehan. "Response." *American Political Science Review* 88: 716-24.

****Optional**

Lawrence Baum. 2003. "The Supreme Court in American Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 6: 161-180.

WEEK 15: TBA (STUDENT CHOICE)

WEEK 16: CONCLUSION, PAPERS DUE

SOME CLASSICS IN AMERICAN POLITICS

Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: Wiley, Chapters 6 and 7.

Philip E. Converse. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. David Apter. New York: Free Press, pp. 206-61.

Anthony Downs. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row, Chapters 3 or 4.

David R. Mayhew. 1974. "Congressional Elections: The Case of the Vanishing Marginals." *Polity* 295-317.

David R. Mayhew. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57: 45-56.

John E. Mueller. 1970. "Presidential Popularity from Truman to Johnson." *American Political Science Review* 64:18-34.

Mancur Olson. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Chapter 1.

Nelson W. Polsby. 1968. "The Institutionalization of the House of Representatives." *American Political Science Review* 64: 144-68.

Spaeth, Harold J. "An Approach to the Study of Attitudinal Differences as an Aspect of Judicial Behavior." *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 5: 165-180.

Peter B. Clark and James Q. Wilson. 1961. "Incentive Systems: A Theory of Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 6: 129-166.

March, James and Johan P. Olsen. 1984. "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life." *The American Political Science Review* 78: 734-749.

Shanto Iyengar, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1982. "Experimental Demonstrations of the 'Not-So-Minimal' Consequences of Television News Programs." *American Political Science Review* 76: 848-58.

"Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System" *American Political Science Review* 44: 1-99.