

Texas A&M University Syllabus

Course Information

Meeting Details

Course Number: POLS 670
Course Title: Proseminar in American Politics
Section: 600
Semester: Fall 2024
Time: T 8:45 AM - 11:35 AM
Location: ALLN 3125
Credit Hours: 3

Instructor Details

Instructor: Soren Jordan
Office: ALLN 3085
Phone:
Email: sorenjordan@tamu.edu
Office Hours: MW 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM; Appointment (email me; Zoom ID: 2287366424)

Course Description

This course is designed to give you an overview to broad areas of study in American politics. This course is somewhat oddly situated: you receive (a lot) of training in behavior, institutions, and modeling in other areas of the curriculum. For those of you specifically interested in American politics, you may receive more training in American-specific institutions, behavior, policy, and representation beyond this course.

That means this course is both a bridge and a foundation. As a bridge, it connects the general ideas you've seen about behavior and institutions to the specific field of American politics. As a foundation, it shows you the essential readings that form the core knowledge of this particular subfield—readings often with 5,000 citations or more. As such, my view on this course is that it should expose you to *essential concepts and classic readings* that make up the backbone of the theory and cited literature in contemporary American politics literature. Some caveats apply:

- This literature is, at times (and by definition), dated. You should (and will) read more contemporary pieces in your subsequent courses. These are, for the most part, classics. And the older the field, the more “classic” the classics.
- You will read a lot. I am trying to eschew books in favor of articles to ease this burden, but we will read a lot of articles a week.
- Even then, we're barely skimming the surface. It is literally impossible to cover the entire field of American politics in a single semester. Some weeks, we will do even sillier things, like pretend that a single week on legislatures covers the whole field. All it is doing is laying a foundation for your future study.

Official catalog description: Credits 3. 3 Lecture Hours. Survey of selected segments of the literature on American politics; includes an introduction to core theories and controversies in the study of both American political institutions and American mass political behavior.

Course Prerequisites

Prerequisites: Graduate classification.

Course Learning Outcomes

1. Students will be familiar with classic literature in American politics.
2. Students will be able to connect contemporary literature to classics.
3. Students will be familiar with three areas of American politics: institutions (legislatures, executives, and courts), para-institutions (interest groups and parties), and behavior (public opinion, voting behavior, participation, and partisanship, including polarization).
4. Students will be able to cite classic literature in building a theory or interpreting results from contemporary tests.

Textbook and Resource Materials

All of the texts are articles available from the university library or other campus subscriptions. I will not post the articles to **Canvas** unless the library doesn't provide access; learning how to acquire the full text of an article is an essential skill in graduate school. I included the DOI of every article (I actually pretty much only included the DOI: lazy me): it will point you to the article's website if you "resolve" it at doi.org. All of the articles are ungated if you access them on A&M's Wifi network. If you're at home, you can still get the full text by logging into the library and searching for the journal. If you cannot find one of the articles, let me know, and I'll make it available on **Canvas**.

You are responsible for obtaining one book: Mayhew. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. ISBN: 9780300105872. You should be able to get a used copy for \$2.

You'll notice that I am light on "recommended readings." In my experience, I recommend them, and no one does them, so there's not much point. Accordingly, if I *do* recommend a reading, it is a very strong signal that the reading (more than likely a book that I do not want you to be beholden to reading or buying) is a touchstone book in the field.

Grading Policy and Assignments

89.5-100:	A
79.5-89.49:	B
69.5-79.49:	C
59.5-69.49:	D
59.49↓:	F

I use the standard Texas A&M University grading scale. To maintain fairness, I do not change grades under any circumstances except when I make a mathematical error in computing your grade. There is no extra credit. All grades will be posted to **Canvas**.

The course is divided into the following components:

Class participation	25%
Personal responses	25%
Final paper	50%
Total	100%

Class participation: Do. The. Reading. It is literally that simple. Do the reading and come to class prepared to discuss that reading. When I ask questions of the class, please answer the questions and contribute to the lecture. When you have questions, please ask them. It's fun to be candid about what you love, what you hate, and what you don't understand. The only thing you cannot do is be silent.

I will assess your participation. Each week, I will assess your participation on 3/2/1 scale. 3 is "meets expectations": if you receive this score, you will not receive additional feedback. If you receive a 2 ("below expectations") or 1 ("unacceptable"), you will receive feedback from me (on **Canvas**) on why you received this score.

Personal responses: to help facilitate class discussion, you will submit a *maximum* of 500 words (as plain text) of reactions to the weekly readings to **Canvas**, due at 11:59 PM the night before class (Monday). You do not need to react to every reading. I'm looking for you to synthesize the content *across* the readings and *react critically* to at least one: suggesting areas for future study or deficiencies you noticed in the design or content. **You should not simply summarize the readings.** As you think about both your participation and personal responses, consider the classic elements of an article as well as your reaction to them (theory/hypotheses, data/empirical design, and findings/implications). As you will hear me say many times, these are also the elements of the article you should be summarizing as you create an article summary for future use.

I will assess your personal responses. I will use the same 3/2/1 scale. You will especially be penalized for surface-level summaries, pervasive use of rhetorical questions, criticism without solution, or other elements that suggest a lack of critical thinking. You will receive feedback on all of your talking points.

In addition: since this course includes many classics, each week you must also find two articles from the last two years (2023 or 2024) that cite one of the classics. Come prepared to discuss the (1) context in which the recent article uses the classic article for citation and (2) how compelling you think the classic's place in the literature is, given the citation. This does not count against your 500 words.

Final paper: students will be required to complete an original research project. This assignment will have a more complete set of instructions posted to **Canvas**. You will also be required to submit

it in chunks through the semester to update on regular progress. Everything you submit will be submitted to Canvas for ease of feedback. The assignment is due on Friday, December 6.

Late Work Policy

Writing assignments and homework assignments must be turned in, electronically, on the day assigned. Makeup assignments/examinations will only be offered to those with a University excused absence, which can be found at tx.ag/tamurule07. It is your responsibility to ensure that your absence is covered by the University, and it is your responsibility to comply with all policies. These policies require that you notify me of your absence prior to the date of absence if such notification is feasible, but within two business days from the missed class. Your makeup examination must be scheduled within 30 days of this notification (though I recommend much, much earlier). If I need additional information on your absence (doctor's notes, for instance), you must provide this additional documentation within two business days of the last date of the absence. Note that this policy also allows for makeup examinations for reasons deemed appropriate by the instructor. If you do not have a University excused absence, and you are going to miss an examination, it is much easier for me to work with you if you notify me promptly, especially if you can provide some sort of documentation.

Late personal responses will not be accepted.

Work submitted by a student as makeup work for an excused absence is not considered late work and is exempted from the late work policy (Student Rule 7: tx.ag/tamurule07).

My Personal Classroom Expectations

Graduate courses are intended to lay the foundation for your future as a researcher. Each one of you have elected to be here and to pursue a graduate degree, so it is to your benefit to attend class, do the outside readings, react to the readings, and, most importantly, *come to class prepared to discuss the material*. Graduate courses are built around an exchange of ideas, so come prepared with your ideas!

I want to set extremely clear and early expectations about one thing in particular: plagiarism. If you plagiarize any portion of any assignment (including plagiarizing a fellow student's answers), it's an automatic zero on the assignment. To be absolutely certain: you can use AI tools to verify your summary of articles, to gain interesting perspectives, or other non-writing tasks. However, ***all writing on all assignments that are submitted to me must be your own***.

A note on decorum: We will be discussing a variety of political topics that, as we will learn, engineer an emotional response. Some of you might have very strong, even partisan, feelings about politics or one side of the political spectrum versus the other. We will not bring those personal emotional assessments into class. Specifically, I will not allow any cross-talk directed at another classmate's political opinions or other commentary that excessively abstracts away from the political science of the topic.

If you need to contact me, I'm in Allen almost every day, but especially during my listed office hours. I check my email very, very regularly. If you want to get in touch with me through email, I ask that you follow three guidelines when attempting to contact me. First: include the course number in the subject of your email. Your email will almost certainly get lost in the abyss if it missing this information. Second: wait at least 48 hours, not including weekends, to send a second email. I promise I will get to it, but it may not be immediate. Third: email me only from your Texas A&M University official email address. In the event that I need to contact you, it will almost certainly be at your @tamu.edu email address. You should check this email often!

My Personal Statement on Academic Honesty and AI

Texas A&M University is a institution committed to integrity and honor. It is your job as a University citizen to uphold those values. I will not tolerate any cheating or plagiarism, broadly defined as using unauthorized aids during examinations or attempting to represent someone else's work as your own. Graduate courses are *especially* concerned with plagiarism, especially in the context of AI. Please also note that I am required to initiate University-level procedures in instances of academic dishonesty. Penalties are severe. For additional information visit tx.ag/tamuhonor.

Acceptable use of AI is not yet a point of consensus in the discipline. We will discuss AI use often during class, and you will probably see multiple approaches over your time in the program. For now, I think I can safely say that the expectation is still that *anything you sign your name to is assumed to be your personal writing product, created by you, not by AI. When in doubt: ask before doing.*

My Personal Statement on Mandatory Reporting

I am a sincere advocate for student mental health. If you are struggling, I encourage you to reach out and talk to someone: including me. However, I want to specifically note that I am a Mandatory Reporter (see the University Policy below), and, in some instances, I cannot guarantee the confidentiality of what you share with me. I am also not a mental health expert. I can help you seek tailored resources, but I encourage you to find the expertise you need.

Course Schedule

Important Dates

Please see the full academic calendar at tx.ag/tamuACF24.

- August 23. Friday. Last day for adding/dropping courses for the fall semester.
- September 4. Wednesday. Fall official census date.
- September 16. Monday. Undergraduate deadline to submit a request for change of curriculum.
- September 20. Friday. Last day to apply for all degrees to be awarded in December without a late fee.
- September 30. Monday. Undergraduate degree plan approval deadline. See Student Rule 1.9.

- October 7. Monday, noon. Mid-semester grades due.
- October 8. Tuesday. Fall break (no class).
- October 30. Wednesday. Last day to apply online for fall 2024 graduation.
- November 13. Wednesday. Last day for all students to drop courses with no penalty (Q-drop). Last day to officially withdraw from the University. Fall 2024 Degree Candidates: Degree Requirement Verification (DRV) deadline per Student Rule 14.2.
- December 6. Friday. Final paper due.

Course Outline

Week 1 (August 20): Background on American Politics and American Politics in Political Science

- Bond. 2007. “The Scientification of the Study of Politics: Some Observations on the Behavioral Evolution in Political Science.” DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2508.2007.00597.x
- March and Olsen. 1983. “The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life.” DOI: 10.2307/1961840
- Ostrom. 1998. “A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Choice Theory of Collective Action: Presidential Address, American Political Science Association, 1997.” DOI: 10.2307/2585925
- Arnold. 1982. “Overtilled and Undertilled Fields in American Politics.” DOI: 10.2307/2149316
- Modern partisanship. tinyurl.com/pew-party

Week 2 (August 27): Parties and Partisanship

- Summary of Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. tinyurl.com/ccms-is-old. (If you plan to study American politics, you *must* read the full book.)
- Theodoridis. 2017. “Me, Myself, and (I), (D), or (R)? Partisanship and Political Cognition through the Lens of Implicit Identity.” DOI: 10.1086/692738
- MacKuen, Erikson, and Stimson. 1989. “Macropartisanship.” DOI: 10.2307/1961661
- Goidel, Kellstedt, and Lebo. 2022. “Macropartisanship with Independents.” DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfab073
- Lelkes and Sniderman. 2016. “The Ideological Asymmetry of the American Party System.” DOI: 10.1017/S0007123414000404
- Aldrich. 1995. Selections from *Why Parties? A Second Look*. Chapters on *Canvas*. (If you plan to study American politics, you *must* read the full book.)

Week 3 (September 3): Public Opinion Formation

- Converse. 1964. “The Nature of Belief Systems in the Mass Publics.” DOI: 10.1080/08913810608443650
- Feldman. 1988. “Structure and Consistency in Public Opinion: the Role of Core Beliefs and Values.” DOI: 10.2307/2111130

- Zaller and Feldman. 1992. “A Simple Theory of the Survey Response.” DOI: 10.2307/2111583
- Achen. 1975. “Mass Political Attitudes and the Survey Response.” DOI: 10.2307/1955282
- Ansolabehere, Rodden, and Snyder. 2008. “The Strength of Issues: Using Multiple Measures to Gauge Preference Stability, Ideological Constraint, and Issue Voting.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055408080210
- Barber and Poper. 2019. “Does Party Trump Ideology? Disentangling Party and Ideology in America.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055418000795
- Erikson, McIver, and Wright. 1987. “State Political Culture and Public Opinion.” DOI: 10.2307/1962677

Recommended (at least read a summary):

- Zaller. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. DOI: 10.1017/CB09780511818691 (Book)
- Delli Carpini and Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. ISBN: 9780300072754 (Book)
- Ellis and Stimson. 2012. *Ideology in America*. DOI: 10.1017/CB09781139094009 (Book)
- Erikson, MacKuen, and Stimson. 2002. *The Macro Polity*. DOI: 10.1017/CB09781139086912 (Book)

Week 4 (September 10): Ideological Polarization (Mass)

- Roucek. 1944. “A History of the Concept of Ideology.” DOI: 10.2307/2707082
- Abramowitz and Saunders. 2008. “Is Polarization a Myth?” DOI: 10.1017/S0022381608080493
- Fiorina, Abrams, Pope. 2008. “Polarization in the American Public: Misconceptions and Misreadings.” DOI: 10.1017/S002238160808050X
- Lupton, Smallpage, and Enders. 2020. “Values and Political Predispositions in the Age of Polarization: Examining the Relationship between Partisanship and Ideology in the United States, 1988–2012.” DOI: 10.1017/S0007123417000370
- Baldassarri and Park. 2020. “Was There a Culture War? Partisan Polarization and Secular Trends in US Public Opinion.” DOI: 10.1086/707306
- Castle and Stepp. 2021. “Partisanship, Religion, and Issue Polarization in the United States: A Reassessment.” DOI: 10.1007/s11109-020-09668-5
- Fowler, et al. 2023. “Moderates.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055422000818

Recommended (at least read a summary):

- Levendusky. 2009. *The Partisan Sort: How Liberals Became Democrats and Conservatives Became Republicans* DOI: 10.7208/chicago/9780226473673.001.0001 (Book)

Week 5 (September 17): Ideological Polarization (Elite)

- Fleisher and Bond. 2003. “The Shrinking Middle in the US Congress.” DOI: 10.1017/S0007123404000122

- Theriault. 2006. “Party Polarization in the US Congress: Member Replacement and Member Adaptation.” DOI: 10.1177/1354068806064730
- Ansolabehere, Snyder, and Stewart. 2001. “Candidate Positioning in U.S. House Elections.” DOI: 10.2307/2669364
- Thomsen. 2014. “Ideological Moderates Wont Run: How Party Fit Matters for Partisan Polarization in Congress.” DOI: 10.1017/s0022381614000243
- Layman and Carsey. 2002. “Party Polarization and ‘Conflict Extension’ in the American Electorate.” DOI: 10.2307/3088434
- Hetherington. 2001. “Resurgent Mass Partisanship: The Role of Elite Polarization.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055401003045
- Druckman, Peterson, and Slothuus. 2013. “How Elite Partisan Polarization Affects Public Opinion Formation.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055412000500

Final paper: topic must be selected and one-page summary of anticipated theory submitted.

Week 6 (September 24): Affective Polarization

- Iyengar, Lelkes, Levendusky, Malhotra, and Westwood. 2019. “The Origins and Consequences of Affective Polarization in the United States.” DOI: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-051117-073034
- Mason. 2018. “Ideologues without Issues: The Polarizing Consequences of Ideological Identities.” DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfy005
- Abramowitz and Webster. 2018. “Negative Partisanship: Why Americans Dislike Parties But Behave Like Rabid Partisans.” DOI: 10.1111/pops.12479
- Ahler and Sood. 2018. “The Parties in Our Heads: Misperceptions about Party Composition and Their Consequences.” DOI: 10.1086/697253
- Enders and Lupton. 2021. “Value Extremity Contributes to Affective Polarization in the US.” DOI: 10.1017/psrm.2020.27
- Ryan. 2017. “No Compromise: Political Consequences of Moralized Attitudes.” DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12248
- Webster, Connors, and Sinclair. 2022. “The Social Consequences of Political Anger.” DOI: 10.1086/718979
- Graham and Svobik. 2020. “Democracy in America? Partisanship, Polarization, and the Robustness of Support for Democracy in the United States.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055420000052

Week 7 (October 1): Voting Behavior

- Riker and Ordeshook. 1968. “A Theory of the Calculus of Voting.” DOI: 10.2307/1953324
- Aldrich. 1993. “Rational Choice and Turnout.” DOI: 10.2307/2111531
- Lau and Redlawsk. 1997. “Voting Correctly.” DOI: 10.2307/2952076
- Hetherington. 1996. “The Media’s Role in Forming Voters’ National Economic Evaluations in 1992.” DOI: 10.2307/2111629

- Brady, Verba, and Schlozman. 1995. “Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation.” DOI: 10.2307/2082425
- Lupia. 1994. “Shortcuts Versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections.” DOI: 10.2307/2944882

Week 8 (October 8): Fall Break. No classes.

Week 9 (October 15): Interest Groups

- Gilens and Page. 2014. “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens.” DOI: 10.1017/S1537592714001595
- Fournaies and Hall. 2018. “How Do Interest Groups Seek Access to Committees?” DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12323
- Chin, Bond, and Geva. 2000. “A Foot in the Door: An Experimental Study of PAC and Constituency Effects on Access.” DOI: 10.1111/0022-3816.00024
- Kalla and Broockman. 2016. “Campaign Contributions Facilitate Access to Congressional Officials: A Randomized Field Experiment.” DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12180
- Anzia. 2019. “Looking for Influence In All the Wrong Places: How Studying Subnational Policy Can Revive Research on Interest Groups.” DOI: 10.1086/700726
- Garlick. 2017. “National Policies, Agendas, and Polarization in American State Legislatures: 2011 to 2014.” DOI: 10.1177/1532673X17719719
- Grumbach. 2020. “Interest Group Activists and the Polarization of State Legislatures.” DOI: 10.1111/lsq.12244

Final paper: rough draft of analysis plan submitted.

Week 10 (October 22): Mass Media

- Edwards and Wood. 1999. “Who Influences Whom? The President, Congress, and the Media.” DOI: 10.2307/2585399
- Prior. 2005. “News vs. Entertainment: How Increasing Media Choice Widens Gaps in Political Knowledge and Turnout.” DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-5907.2005.00143.x
- Prior. 2013. “Media and Political Polarization.” DOI: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-100711-135242
- Stroud. 2008. “Media Use and Political Predispositions: Revisiting the Concept of Selective Exposure.” DOI: 10.1007/s11109-007-9050-9
- Hayes and Lawless. 2015. “As Local News Goes, So Goes Citizen Engagement: Media, Knowledge, and Participation in U.S. House Elections.” DOI: 10.1086/679749”
- Bakshy, Messing, and Adamic. 2015. “Exposure to Ideologically Diverse News and Opinion on Facebook.” DOI: 10.1126/science.aaa1160
- Bail, et al. 2018. “Exposure to Opposing Views on Social Media Can Increase Political Polarization.” DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1804840115
- Martin and McCrain. 2019. “Local News and National Politics.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055418000965
- Guess. 2021. “(Almost) Everything in Moderation: New Evidence on Americans Online Media Diets.” DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12589

Week 11 (October 29): Campaigns and Elections

- Gelman and King. “Why Are American Presidential Election Campaign Polls So Variable When Votes Are So Predictable?” DOI: 10.1017/S0007123400006682
- Gerber, Green, and Larimer. 2008. “Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment.” DOI: 10.1017/S000305540808009X
- Bond, et al. 2012. “A 61-Million-Person Experiment in Social Influence and Political Mobilization.” DOI: 10.1038/nature11421
- Coppock, Hill, and Vavreck. “The Small Effects of Political Advertising Are Small Regardless of Context, Message, Sender, or Receiver: Evidence From 59 Real-time Randomized Experiments.” DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.abc4046
- Karpowitz, Monson, and Preece. 2017. “How to Elect More Women: Gender and Candidate Success in a Field Experiment.” DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12300
- Bauer. 2020. “Shifting Standards: How Voters Evaluate the Qualifications of Female and Male Candidates.” DOI: 10.1086/705817
- Warshaw. 2019. “Local Elections and Representation in the United States.” DOI: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-050317-071108

Week 12 (November 5): Executives

- Ragsdale and Theis. 1997. “The Institutionalization of the American Presidency, 1924-92.” DOI: 10.2307/2960490
- Canes-Wrone, Howell, and Lewis. 2008. “Toward a Broader Understanding of Presidential Power: A Reevaluation of the Two Presidencies Thesis.” DOI: 10.1017/S0022381607080061
- Moe. “The Revolution in Presidency Studies.” DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-5705.2009.03701.x
- Moe and Howell. 1999. “Unilateral Action and Presidential Power: A Theory.” DOI: 10.1111/1741-5705.00070
- Cheistenson and Kriner. 2017. “Mobilizing the Public Against the President: Congress and the Political Costs of Unilateral Action.” DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12298
- Christenson and Kriner. 2017. “Constitutional Qualms or Politics as Usual? The Factors Shaping Public Support for Unilateral Action.” DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12262
- Berry, Burden, and Howell. 2010. “The President and the Distribution of Federal Spending.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055410000377
- Howell and Pevehouse. “Presidents, Congress, and the Use of Force.” DOI: 10.1017/S0020818305050034

Recommended (on the approval of the institution):

- Kriner and Schwartz. 2009. “Partisan Dynamics and the Volatility of Presidential Approval.” DOI: 10.1017/S0007123409000647
- Edwards, Mitchell, and Welch. 1995. “Explaining Presidential Approval: The Significance of Issue Salience.” DOI: 10.2307/2111760

Final paper: analysis submitted for review.Week 13 (November 12): Courts

- Gibson, Caldeira, and Spence. 2003. “Measuring Attitudes toward the United States Supreme Court.” DOI: 10.1111/1540-5907.00025
- Gibson. 2024. “Losing Legitimacy: The Challenges of the *Dobbs* Ruling to Conventional Legitimacy Theory.” DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12834
- Whittington. 2005. “‘Interpose Your Friendly Hand’: Political Supports for the Exercise of Judicial Review by the United States Supreme Court.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055405051890
- McGuire and Stimson. 2004. “The Least Dangerous Branch Revisited: New Evidence on Supreme Court Responsiveness to Public Preferences.” DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2508.2004.00288.x
- Friedman. 2006. “Taking Law Seriously.” DOI: 10.1017/S1537592706060178
- Haglin, Jordan, Merrill, and Ura. 2021. “Ideology and Specific Support for the Supreme Court.” DOI: 10.1177/1065912920950482
- Brace, Langer, and Hall. 2000. “Measuring the Preferences of State Supreme Court Judges.” DOI: 10.1111/0022-3816.00018

Recommended (on the approval of the institution):

- Gibson, Caldeira, and Spence. 2003. “The Supreme Court and the US Presidential Election of 2000: Wounds, Self-Inflicted or Otherwise?” DOI: 10.1017/S0007123403000243
- Ansolabehere and White. 2020. “Policy, Politics, and Public Attitudes Toward the Supreme Court.” DOI: 10.1177/1532673X18765189

Final paper: completed analysis submitted.Week 14 (November 19): Legislatures

- Mayhew. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. ISBN: 9780300105872 (Book)
- Polsby. 1968. “The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives.” DOI: 10.2307/1953331
- Fenno. 1977. “U.S. House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration.” DOI: 10.2307/1960097
- Shepsle and Weingast. 1994. “Positive Theories of Congressional Institutions.” DOI: 10.2307/440423
- Broockman and Skovron. 2018. “Bias in Perceptions of Public Opinion among Political Elites.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055418000011
- Rohde and Aldrich. 2010. “Consequences of Electoral and Institutional Change: The Evolution of Conditional Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives.” (I provide)
- Jones. 2001. “Party Polarization and Legislative Gridlock.” DOI: 10.2307/4492114
- Curry and Lee. 2020. “What Is Regular Order Worth? Partisan Lawmaking and Congressional Processes.” DOI: 10.1086/706893

Recommended (on the approval of the institution):

- Harbridge, Malhotra, and Harrison. 2014. “Public Preferences for Bipartisanship in the Policymaking Process.” DOI: 10.1111/lsq.12048
- Ramirez. 2009. “The Dynamics of Partisan Conflict on Congressional Approval.” DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-5907.2009.00394.x
- Ramirez. 2013. “The Policy Origins of Congressional Approval.” DOI: 10.1017/S0022381612000965
- Durr, Gilmour, and Wolbrecht. 1997. “Explaining Congressional Approval.” DOI: 10.2307/2111713
- Hibbing and Theiss-Morse. 2002. *Stealth Democracy: Americans’ Beliefs About How Government Should Work*. DOI: 10.1017/CB09780511613722 (Book) (But seriously I love this book. It features the American public at its most fundamental and contradictory.)

Week 15 (November 26): Representation (Note: Virtual Meeting)

- Miller and Stokes. 1963. “Constituency Influence in Congress.” DOI: 10.2307/1952717
- Mansbridge. 2003. “Rethinking Representation.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055403000856
- Whalke. 1971. “Policy Demands and System Support: The Role of the Represented.” DOI: 10.1017/S0007123400009121
- Achen. 1978. “Measuring Representation.” DOI: 10.2307/2110458
- Canes-Wrone, Brady, and Cogan. 2002. “Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members’ Voting.” DOI: 10.1017/S0003055402004276
- Hurley and Hill. 2003. “Beyond the Demand-Input Model: A Theory of Representational Linkages.” DOI: 10.1111/1468-2508.t01-2-00002
- Griffin and Newman. 2005. “Are Voters Better Represented?” DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2508.2005.00357.x
- Ansolabehere, Snyder, and Stewart. 2001. “The Effects of Party and Preferences on Congressional Roll-Call Voting.” DOI: 10.2307/440269
- Lowande, Ritchie, and Lauterbach. 2019. “Descriptive and Substantive Representation in Congress: Evidence from 80,000 Congressional Inquiries.” DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12443

December 6 (Friday): Final paper due.

University Policies

All of the following are verbatim university-level policies and procedures in a variety of areas of student life. You will find these policies in your syllabus for every course. My personal policies are denoted above.

Attendance Policy

The university views class attendance and participation as an individual student responsibility. Students are expected to attend class and to complete all assignments.

Please refer to Student Rule 7 (tx.ag/tamurule07) in its entirety for information about excused absences, including definitions, and related documentation and timelines.

Makeup Work Policy

Students will be excused from attending class on the day of a graded activity or when attendance contributes to a student's grade, for the reasons stated in Student Rule 7 (tx.ag/tamurule07), or other reason deemed appropriate by the instructor.

Please refer to Student Rule 7 (tx.ag/tamurule07) in its entirety for information about makeup work, including definitions, and related documentation and timelines.

Absences related to Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 may necessitate a period of more than 30 days for make-up work, and the timeframe for make-up work should be agreed upon by the student and instructor" (Student Rule 7, Section 7.4.1) (tx.ag/tamurule07).

The instructor is under no obligation to provide an opportunity for the student to make up work missed because of an unexcused absence (Student Rule 7, Section 7.4.2) (tx.ag/tamurule07).

Students who request an excused absence are expected to uphold the Aggie Honor Code and Student Conduct Code. (See Student Rule 24: tx.ag/tamurule24.)

Academic Integrity Statement and Policy

"An Aggie does not lie, cheat, or steal, or tolerate those who do."

Texas A&M University students are responsible for authenticating all work submitted to an instructor. If asked, students must be able to produce proof that the item submitted is indeed the work of that student. Students must keep appropriate records at all times. The inability to authenticate one's work, should the instructor request it, may be sufficient grounds to initiate an academic misconduct case" (Student Rule 20, Section 20.1.2.3: tx.ag/tamuhonor).

You can learn more about the Aggie Honor System Office Rules and Procedures, academic integrity, and your rights and responsibilities at aggiehonor.tamu.edu.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Policy

Texas A&M University is committed to providing equitable access to learning opportunities for all students. If you experience barriers to your education due to a disability or think you may have a disability, please contact the Disability Resources office on your campus (resources listed below) Disabilities may include, but are not limited to attentional, learning, mental health, sensory, physical, or chronic health conditions. All students are encouraged to discuss their disability related needs with Disability Resources and their instructors as soon as possible.

Disability Resources is located in the Student Services Building or at (979) 845-1637 or visit disability.tamu.edu.

Title IX and Statement on Limits to Confidentiality

Texas A&M University is committed to fostering a learning environment that is safe and productive for all. University policies and federal and state laws prohibit gender-based discrimination and sexual harassment, including sexual assault, sexual exploitation, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

With the exception of some medical and mental health providers, all university employees (including full and part-time faculty, staff, paid graduate assistants, student workers, etc.) are Mandatory Reporters and must report to the Title IX Office if the employee experiences, observes, or becomes aware of an incident that meets the following conditions (see University Rule 08.01.01.M1: tx.ag/tamuunivrule08):

- The incident is reasonably believed to be discrimination or harassment.
- The incident is alleged to have been committed by or against a person who, at the time of the incident, was (1) a student enrolled at the University or (2) an employee of the University.

Mandatory Reporters must file a report regardless of how the information comes to their attention – including but not limited to face-to-face conversations, a written class assignment or paper, class discussion, email, text, or social media post. Although Mandatory Reporters must file a report, in most instances, a person who is subjected to the alleged conduct will be able to control how the report is handled, including whether or not to pursue a formal investigation. The University's goal is to make sure you are aware of the range of options available to you and to ensure access to the resources you need.

Students wishing to discuss concerns related to mental and/or physical health in a confidential setting are encouraged to make an appointment with University Health Services (<https://uhs.tamu.edu/appointments/index.html>) or download the TELUS Health Student Support app (<https://uhs.tamu.edu/mental-health/student-support.html>) for 24/7 access to professional counseling in multiple languages. Walk-in services for urgent, non-emergency needs are available during normal business hours at University Health Services locations; call 979.458.4584 for details.

Students can learn more about filing a report, accessing supportive resources, and navigating the Title IX investigation and resolution process on the University's Title IX webpage (<https://titleix.tamu.edu/>).

Statement on Mental Health and Wellness

Texas A&M University recognizes that mental health and wellness are critical factors influencing a student's academic success and overall wellbeing. Students are encouraged to engage in healthy self-care practices by utilizing the resources and services available through University Health Services (<https://uhs.tamu.edu/appointments/index.html>). Students needing a listening ear can call the Texas A&M Helpline (979.845.2700) from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. weekdays and 24 hours on weekends for mental health peer support while classes are in session. The TELUS Health Student Support app (<https://uhs.tamu.edu/mental-health/student-support.html>) provides access to professional counseling in multiple languages anytime, anywhere by phone or chat, and the 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline offers 24-hour emergency support at 988 or 988lifeline.org.

In College Station, students needing a listening ear can contact University Health Services (979.458.4584) or call the Texas A&M Helpline (979.845.2700) from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. weekdays and 24 hours on weekends while classes are in session. 24-hour emergency help is also available through the 988 Suicide & Crisis Lifeline (988) or at 988lifeline.org.

Department Policies

Departmental Policy Regarding Academic Misconduct

University Student Rule 20 prohibits academic misconduct of all types. This Department has zero tolerance for academic misconduct, and particularly for plagiarism. This policy applies to all academic activities, including but not limited to exams, homework, class essays, class research papers, conference papers, and dissertations. Academic misconduct by a student is sufficient grounds for his or her permanent removal from the graduate program with no option to pursue a Master's Degree in Political Science, in addition to receiving other sanctions imposed by the university Honor System. Student Rule 20 defines each type of academic misconduct prohibited by the university (<https://aggiehonor.tamu.edu/rules-and-procedures/rules/honor-system-rules>). However, most honor system violations made by graduate students involve plagiarism.

The Aggie Honor System defines plagiarism as “The appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit” (tx.ag/tamuplagiarism). Hence plagiarism is not restricted to text, but also includes ideas and numerical data, for example. Fabrication is another frequent violation due to easy access to generative artificial intelligence (AI), such as Large Language Models. If you use AI in an academic exercise in any way that is not authorized by your instructor, you can be found responsible for the violation of fabrication. In addition, you must avoid the violation of “multiple submissions.” This form of academic misconduct is based on the expectation that each instance of work submitted by you for graduate seminars or other academic exercises will be original work completed for that activity or assignment. For example, if you are considering using the same paper or portions of a paper for multiple seminars, you must secure prior approval from all faculty members to whom the paper will be submitted. It is essential that every graduate student read University Student Rule 20 in its entirety at their first opportunity.

Faculty members must report all suspected cases of academic misconduct to the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS), even if the faculty member is uncertain if any academic misconduct actually occurred. The faculty member may consult with the student to obtain additional information before contacting the DGS. The DGS will serve in an advisory role to the faculty member and together they will determine whether they will hold a joint meeting with the student to further discuss the matter. Alternatively, the DGS and the faculty member may request a written response from the student as part of the supplemental document to the case. It will be the sole decision of the faculty member whether it is more likely than not that the student engaged in academic misconduct. If so, the university requires that all faculty members report likely honor violations to the Aggie Honor System Office (AHSO). The AHSO or any member of the University Honor Council from within the department or the school can assist the faculty member and/or the DGS before, during, and after a report is submitted.

If the current DGS is a member of the advising committee for the student, the initial consulting role of the DGS will be handled by the most recent former DGS who is available and who is not a member of the current advising committee for the student. This individual will then fulfill the role of the DGS for the specific case being handled.

There are up to two processes that may be involved in all suspected instances of academic miscon-

duct. The first process belongs to the university, is administered by the AHSO, and must always be used. The second process belongs to the department and will only apply in cases where the university has found the student responsible for academic misconduct. If the student is found to be not responsible by the university, then the department must accept that determination. Below is the general sequence of actions that may occur.

1. The university process overseen by the AHSO is initiated by the faculty member filing an on-line violation report. If multiple faculty members are involved in related incidents for the same student, they should seek guidance from the AHSO on how to proceed. The link and instructions for reporting are available on the AHSO website at <https://aggiehonor.tamu.edu/>. The university honor system process moves as quickly as possible but can sometimes take several weeks or months to complete. Once a decision about student responsibility is made by the university and any university sanctions are assigned, the AHSO will formally notify the faculty member who filed the report of that outcome.
2. Once notice is received by the faculty member that the university process has completed, they will immediately notify the DGS. If the university found the student to be responsible for one or more charges of academic misconduct, the DGS will notify the members of the department's Academic Misconduct Committee (AMC) of that outcome. At that time, the DGS will also share with the AMC the available information on the case. If the university has found that the student did not commit academic misconduct, the department and the AMC will have no role to play in the matter.
3. The AMC will include five faculty members. It will be chaired by the Director of Graduate Studies and will also include the four most recent individuals who have previously served as DGS in the Department of Political Science at Texas A&M and who are not members of the current advising committee for the student and who are not currently serving as Department Head. In cases where the number of faculty eligible and available to serve on the AMC is less than five, the Department Head may appoint additional tenured faculty to the committee for that specific case.
4. The committee will meet to discuss all the evidence and the university's decision finding the student responsible for academic misconduct, as well as the sanctions the university assigned to the student. The primary job of the committee will be to decide whether a departmental-level response to the violation is necessary and appropriate. The options available to the AMC include, but are not limited to, 1) academic probation for the student; 2) termination of the student's departmental funding; 3) transitioning the student from the PhD to the MA track; or 4) removing the student from the PhD program without the option to pursue an MA in Political Science.
5. The DGS will provide a written memo to the student and relevant faculty member(s) that conveys the outcome of the meeting.
6. The student has the right to appeal this decision. To do so, the student must write a memo to the Department Head that describes their justification for the appeal. The student has 10 business days from the date of their notification of the AMC decision to file an appeal.

Statement on conflict of interest: None of the accused student's advisors nor the faculty member who taught the class in which the alleged transgression occurred are permitted to participate in the AMC decision process. These individuals must recuse themselves from the process. When recusals are necessary, the Department Head may appoint others to serve in particular roles, as needed. If the Department Head must recuse himself as well, this job (as well as handling the appeals process) will fall to the Associate Department Head.

This departmental policy does not apply to the grade a student will receive in the class. Unless the university has dictated a particular course grade for the student as part of the university sanctions, it is the instructor of record, not the AMC, that will have full discretion over the grading process. When reporting a violation to the university, the faculty member will be given the option of either recommending appropriate sanctions themselves, or turning the case over to the AHSO for the Honor Council to choose sanctions in cases where misconduct did occur. The available sanctions that can be recommended by an instructor include giving a low or failing grade on the specific assignment or for the course. However, the instructor's recommendation can be overridden in some cases, moving the case under the purview of the Honor Council. Faculty members should consult the AHSO website and contact AHSO staff members or serving Honor Council members to obtain a clear understanding of the sanctions that instructors may recommend.

All faculty teaching graduate-level courses are required to include this departmental policy on their course syllabi.

All documentation associated with cases where the university found the student responsible for academic misconduct will be placed in the student's file housed in the departmental graduate program office. In addition, when a faculty member submits their course evaluations as part of the departmental review process, a note will be appended by the Department Head or the Head's assistant indicating the semester and course in which their student(s) were found responsible for academic misconduct.