

Course Syllabus

Course Information

Course Number/Section	PSCI 7350
Course Title	Institutions and Citizen Behavior
Term	Fall 2007
Days & Times	Mondays, 4:00–6:45

Professor Contact Information

Professor	Carole J. Wilson
Office Phone	972.883.4957
Email Address	cjwilson@utdallas.edu
Office Location	GR 3.230
Office Hours	Mondays 2:00-4:00, or by appointment

Course Pre-requisites, Co-requisites, and/or Other Restrictions

This is a graduate course. Students should be enrolled in a graduate program or have appropriate permissions.

Course Description

Examines the major theories, concepts and models associated with relationships between public institutions and citizen behavior, particularly how such institutions as elections, interest groups, political parties and social movements mobilize behavior and how behavior, in turn, influences institutional processes and outcomes.

Student Learning Objectives/Outcomes

Upon completing this course, students will:

1. Understand the current theoretical debates surrounding political behavior.
 2. Be able to apply important theoretical and scholarly approaches to explain citizen behavior, and the interaction between citizens and institutions of government.
 3. Be able to develop independent research in the field of political behavior.
-

Required Books

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (ISBN-13: 978-0226092546)
 - Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper & Row. (ISBN-13: 978-0060417505)
 - Sniderman, Paul M., Richard A. Brody, and Philip Tetlock. 1991. *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*. Cambridge University Press. (ISBN-13: 978-0521407700)
 - Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge University Press. (ISBN-13: 978-0521407861)
-

Assignments & Academic Calendar

August 20—Introduction

We will discuss the purpose and format of the course, introduce ourselves, and review the requirements and policies.

Required:

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (Chapters 1 & 2)

Agenda:

- Introductions
- Course Overview (Theory & Practice)
- Assignments
- Expectations & Grading Policy
- Other Policies
 - Missing Class
 - Late Work
 - Incompletes
- Discuss Campbell *et al*

August 27—Social Groups

Social groups form the cornerstone of the Columbia school and are an important aspect of the Michigan school. This week's readings look at the influence of different social groups. The Michigan school is still strongly evident in most of these works, particularly in the notions of group identification and group salience. Some of the more recent research has been influenced by social psychology work like that by Turner et al (1994).

Required:

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (Chapters 12–13 & 17)
- Conover, Pamela J. 1984. “The Influence of Group Identifications on Political Perception and Evaluation.” *Journal of Politics* 46 (3): 760–785.
- Gurin, Patricia, Arthur H. Miller, and Gerald Gurin. 1980. “Stratum Identification and Consciousness.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 43 (1): 30–47.
- Calhoun-Brown, Allison. 1996. “African American Churches and Political Mobilization: The Psychological Impact of Organizational Resources.” *Journal of Politics* 58 (4): 935–953.
- Turner, John C., Penelope J. Oakes, S. Alexander Haslam, and Craig McGarty. 1994. “Self and Collective: Cognition and Social Context.” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 20 (5): 454–xxx.
- Paolino, Philip. 1995. “Group-Salient Issues and Group Representation: Support for Women Candidates in the 1992 Senate Elections.” *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (2): 294–313.
- Huddy, Leonie. 2001. “From Social to Political Identity: A Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory.” *Political Psychology* 22 (1): 127–156.
- Valentino, Nicholas A., Vincent L. Hutchings, and Ismail K. White. 2004. “Cues that Matter: How Political Ads Prime Racial Attitudes During Campaigns.” *American Political Science Review* 96 (01): 75–90.

Recommended:

- ◇ Conover, Pamela J. 1988. “The Role of Social Groups in Political Thinking.” *British Journal of Political Science* 18 (1): 51–76.
- ◇ Wilson, J. Matthew, and Michael Lusztig. 2005. “The Spouse in the House: What Explains the Marriage Gap in Canada?” *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 37 (4): 979–995.

Questions:

- What are the necessary components for an identity to affect political behavior? Which identities are likely to influence one's behavior?
- Attempt to classify the works presented here in terms of their theoretical underpinnings. What distinguishes them?
- What institutional feature may make social identities more or less salient?

September 3—Labor Day, No Classes

I know that we don't have class this week, but get a head-start and read Downs (1957)(especially Chapters 1-3 & 5-8) for later.

September 10—Social Groups and Social Context

This week's readings continue the focus on social groups, but also looks at the social environment. We often point to differences in regional voting or talk about a state's political culture, but seldom delve into casual mechanism behind the effect of context. Huckfeldt is most closely associated with the context literature, but his work is foreshadowed in Soares & Hamblin (1967). In the recommended readings, Hiskey's (2005) article is an interesting application of Huckfeldt to explain the transmission of democratic values across communities in Mexico.

Required:

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (Chapter 16)
- Soares, Glaucio, and Robert L. Hamblin. 1967. "Socio-Economic Variables and Voting for the Radical Left: Chile, 1952." *American Political Science Review* 61 (4): 1053–1065.
- Przeworski, Adam, and Glaucio Soares. 1971. "Theories in Search of a Curve: A Contextual Interpretation of Left Vote." *American Political Science Review* 65 (1): 51–68.
- Huckfeldt, Robert. 1984. "Political Loyalties and Social Class Ties: The Mechanisms of Contextual Influence." *American Journal of Political Science* 28 (2): 399–417.
- Huckfeldt, Robert, and John Sprague. 1987. "Networks in Context: The Social Flow of Political Information." *American Political Science Review* 81 (Dec): 1197–1216.
- Canache, Damaris. 1996. "Looking Out My Back Door: The Neighborhood Context and Perceptions of Relative Deprivation." *Political Research Quarterly* 49 (3): 547.
- Canache, Damaris, Jeffrey J. Mondak, and Annabelle Conroy. 1994. "Politics in Multiparty Context: Multiplicative Specifications, Social Influence, and Electoral Choice." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 58 (4): 509–538.
- Glaser, James M. 1994. "Back to the Black Belt: Racial Environment and White Racial Attitudes in the South." *Journal of Politics* 56 (1): 21–41.

Recommended:

- ◇ Huckfeldt, Robert. 1986. *Politics in Context: Assimilation and Conflict in Urban Neighborhoods*. New York: Agathon Press.
- ◇ Hiskey, Jonathan T., and Shaun Bowler. 2005. "Local Context and Democratization in Mexico." *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (Jan): 57-71.

Questions:

- Compare and contrast Soares & Hamblin with Huckfeldt.
- Explain how context effects behavior. Which components of social context are more or less "transmittable".

September 17—Partisanship

Partisanship is the heart of the Michigan model. As you read Campbell et al, think carefully about the assumptions, the implications, and measurement. The other readings are alternative conceptualizations of partisanship drawing, to varying extents, on Downs (1957).

Required:

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (Chapter Chapters 6 & 7)
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper & Row. (Chapters 1–3 & 5–8)
- Fiorina, Morris P. 1977. “An Outline for a Model of Party Choice.” *American Journal of Political Science* 21 (3): 601–625.
- Franklin, Charles H. 1984. “Issue Preferences, Socialization, and the Evolution of Party Identification.” *American Journal of Political Science* 28 (3): 459–478.
- Clarke, Harold D., David Sanders, Marianne C. Stewart, and Paul Whiteley. 2004. *Political Choice in Britain*. Oxford University Press. (Chapters 2 & 6) (e-reserves)

Recommended:

- ◇ Clarke, Harold D., and Marianne C. Stewart. 1998. “The Decline Of Parties In The Minds Of Citizens.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 1 (1): 357–378.
- ◇ Clarke, Harold D., David Sanders, Marianne C. Stewart, and Paul Whiteley. 2004. *Political Choice in Britain*. Oxford University Press.
- ◇ Fiorina, Morris P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American Presidential Elections*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- ◇ Franklin, Charles H., and John E. Jackson. 1983. “The Dynamics of Party Identification.” *American Journal of Political Science* 77 (4): 957–973.

Questions:

- *How are these approaches different?*
- *Develop a research design that would allow one to empirically distinguish between these competing conceptualizations of partisanship.*

September 24—Partisanship

This week we continue with the subject of partisanship. These pieces are generally responses in different forms to the controversies of measurement of partisanship and its stability. The last two readings MacKuen, Erikson, & Stimson and Green, Palmquist, & Schickler continue the micro-level debate at the aggregate level.

Required:

- Bartels, Larry M. 2000. "Partisanship and Voting Behavior, 1952-1996." *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (1): 35–50.
- Green, Donald Philip, and Bradley Palmquist. 1990. "Of Artifacts and Partisan Instability." *American Journal of Political Science* 34 (3): 872–902.
- Schickler, Eric, and Donald Philip Green. 1997. "The Stability of Party Identification in Western Democracies: Results from Eight Panel Surveys." *Comparative Political Studies* 30 (4): 450.
- Burden, Barry C., and Casey A. Klofstad. 2005. "Affect and Cognition in Party Identification." *Political Psychology* 26 (6): 869–886.
- Sears, David O., and Nicholas A. Valentino. 1997. "Politics Matters: Political Events as Catalysts for Preadult Socialization." *American Political Science Review* 91 (1): 45–65.
- Cowden, Jonathan A., and Rose M. McDermott. 2000. "Short-Term Forces and Partisanship." *Political Behavior* 22 (3): 197–222.
- MacKuen, Michael B., Robert S. Erikson, and James A. Stimson. 1989. "Macropartisanship." *American Political Science Review* 83 (4): 1125–1142.
- Green, Donald Philip, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 1998. "Macropartisanship: A Replication and Critique." *American Political Science Review* 92 (4): 883–899.

Recommended:

- ◇ Achen, Christopher H. 2002. "Parental Socialization and Rational Party Identification." *Political Behavior* 24 (2): 151–170.
- ◇ Green, Donald Philip, and Bradley Palmquist. 1994. "How stable is party identification?" *Political Behavior* 16 (4): 437–466.
- ◇ Greene, Steven. 2002. "The Social-Psychological Measurement of Partisanship." *Political Behavior* 24 (3): 171–197.

Questions:

- Looking at the same data, scholars come to different conclusions about the stability of partisanship. Why?
- Identify the core aspects of each conceptualization of partisanship discussed last week. Chart the debate for each of these aspects in a table.
- What is "Macropartisanship" and why is it important?

October 1—Mass Belief Systems

Converse's 1964 work has been vastly influential in discrediting the knowledge and abilities of American voters. When you read this, pay close attention to the assumptions and measurements used. There have been a number of criticisms of Converse (see especially Achen (1975) and Erikson (1979)), but by and large, we've generally accepted the fact that voters aren't too smart. However, there has been a considerable effort beginning in the 1980s to revise our view of voters, or at least our theories and normative expectations.

Required:

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (Chapters 9 & 10)
- Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. David E. Apter. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. (e-reserves)
- Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1993. "Measuring Political Knowledge: Putting First Things First." *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (4): 1179–1206.
- Conover, Pamela J., and Stanley Feldman. 1981. "The Origins and Meaning of Liberal/Conservative Self-Identifications." *American Journal of Political Science* 25 (4): 617–645.
- Conover, Pamela J., and Stanley Feldman. 1984. "How People Organize the Political World: A Schematic Model." *American Journal of Political Science* 28 (1): 95–126.
- Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge University Press. (Chapters 1–5)

Recommended:

- ◇ Achen, Christopher H. 1975. "Mass Political Attitudes and the Survey Response." *American Political Science Review* 69 (4): 1218–1231.
- ◇ Erikson, Robert S. 1979. "The SRC Panel Data and Mass Political Attitudes." *British Journal of Political Science* 9 (1): 89–114.
- ◇ Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1991. "Stability and Change in the US Public's Knowledge of Politics." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 55 (4): 583–612.
- ◇ Lodge, Milton, Kathleen M. McGraw, Pamela J. Conover, Stanley S. Feldman, and Arthur H. Miller. 1991. "Where is the Schema? Critiques." *American Political Science Review* 85 (4): 1357–1380.
- ◇ Hinich, Melvin J., and Michael C. Munger. 1992. "A Spatial Theory of Ideology." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 4 (1): 5–xxx.

Questions:

- Identify the following terms: attitudes, mass belief system, schema, stability, consistency, ambivalence, ideology.
- What is the difference between attitude instability and variability in survey response?
- What roles do institutions (and which ones) play in inducing consistency and stability?

October 8—Mass Belief Systems

This week we continue our review of mass belief systems by completing Zaller. The Alvarez & Brehm (1995) article is an interesting application of Zaller. Pay particular attention to the way that they operationalize ambivalence. Petty *et al*'s work is an important discussion of the same issues from the view of psychology.

Required:

- Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge University Press. (Chapters 6–11)
- Alvarez, R. Michael, and John Brehm. 1995. “American Ambivalence Towards Abortion Policy: Development of a Heteroskedastic Probit Model of Competing Values.” *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (4): 1055–1082.
- Petty, Richard E., Duane T. Wegener, and Leandre R. Fabrigar. 1997. “Attitudes And Attitude Change.” *Annual Review of Psychology* 48 (1): 609–647.

Questions:

- How does Zaller's conception of attitude change differ from Petty *et al*?
- What role does affect and mood play Petty *et al*'s work? What are affect and mood?

October 15—Information

In continuation of our revised view of the sophistication and knowledge levels of voters we read Sniderman, Brody, & Tetlock with a soupçon of Downs. The subject matter in Sniderman, Brody, & Tetlock really spans the everything we've covered thus far. As you read, you should go back and think about each of the subjects we've gone through and how each chapter fits into the theories and debates we've discussed.

Required:

- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper & Row. (Chapters 11–13)
- Sniderman, Paul M., Richard A. Brody, and Philip Tetlock. 1991. *Reasoning and Choice: Explorations in Political Psychology*. Cambridge University Press.

Questions:

- What is an heuristic? What “determines” when a particular heuristic is used and by whom?
- You can fill in the blanks for each chapter: How does the authors' conceptualization of X in chapter Y fit with the work we've discussed in week Z?

October 22—Economic Voting

Economics forms an important part of almost any voting model. However, how it enters into the decision process is a source of considerable debate. We've already discussed some of this in the context of partisanship and social groups, but we will focus directly on it now by looking at what aspects of the economy affect behavior and how it affects citizens differentially across the electorate.

Required:

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (Chapters 14 & 15)
- Kiewiet, D. Roderick, and Douglas Rivers. 1984. "A Retrospective On Retrospective Voting." *Political Behavior* 6 (4): 369–393.
- Chappell, Jr., Henry W., and William R. Keech. 1985. "A New View of Political Accountability for Economic Performance." *American Political Science Review* 79 (1): 10–27.
- MacKuen, Michael B., Robert S. Erikson, and James A. Stimson. 1992. "Peasants or Bankers? The American Electorate and the US Economy." *American Political Science Review* 86 (3): 597–611.
- Clarke, Harold D., and Marianne C. Stewart. 1994. "Prospections, Retrospections, and Rationality: The 'Bankers' Model of Presidential Approval Reconsidered." *American Journal of Political Science* 38 (4): 1104–1123.
- Krause, George A. 1997. "Voters, Information Heterogeneity, and the Dynamics of Aggregate Economic Expectations." *American Journal of Political Science* 41 (4): 1170–1200.
- Gomez, Brad T., and J. Matthew Wilson. 2001. "Political Sophistication and Economic Voting in the American Electorate: A Theory of Heterogeneous Attribution." *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (4): 899–914.

Recommended:

- ◇ Gomez, Brad T., and J. Matthew Wilson. 2006. "Cognitive Heterogeneity and Economic Voting: A Comparative Analysis of Four Democratic Electorates." *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (1): 127–145.
- ◇ Kinder, Donald R., and D. Roderick Kiewiet. 1979. "Economic Discontent and Political Behavior: The Role of Personal Grievances and Collective Economic Judgments in Congressional Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 23 (3): 495–527.
- ◇ Kramer, Gerald H. 1983. "The Ecological Fallacy Revisited: Aggregate-versus Individual-level Findings on Economics and Elections, and Sociotropic Voting." *American Political Science Review* 77 (1): 92–111.

Questions:

- Define the following terms as they apply to the readings above: pocketbook or egotropic voting, sociotropic voting, retrospective voting, prospective voting, ecological fallacy, heterogeneity.
- How might institutions affect variations in economic voting?

October 29—Economic Voting

We continue with the subject of economic voting with a hodge-podge of readings. In each of these the economy plays a role, but the authors come to different conclusion about its effect on voters.

Required:

- Inglehart, Ronald. 1971. “The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies.” *American Political Science Review* 65 (4): 991–1017.
- Stokes, Susan C. 1996. “Public Opinion and Market Reforms: The Limits of Economic Voting.” *Comparative Political Studies* 29 (5): 499–519.
- Sears, David O., Richard R. Lau, Tom R. Tyler, and Harris M. Allen Jr. 1980. “Self-Interest vs. Symbolic Politics in Policy Attitudes and Presidential Voting.” *American Political Science Review* 74 (3): 670–684.
- McLaren, Lauren M. 2002. “Public Support for the European Union: Cost/Benefit Analysis or Perceived Cultural Threat?” *Journal of Politics* 64 (2): 551–566.
- Jacobson, Gary C., and Samuel Kernell. 1983. *Strategy and Choice in Congressional Elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press. (<http://weber.ucsd.edu/~skernell/strategy.html>) (Chapters 2 & 6)
- Powell, Jr., G. Bingham, and Guy D. Whitten. 1993. “A Cross-National Analysis of Economic Voting: Taking Account of the Political Context.” *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (2): 391–414.

Recommended:

- ◇ Lewis-Beck, Michael S., and Mary Stegmaier. 2007. *Economic Models of Voting*. Oxford University Press chapter 27, p. xxx.
- ◇ Kinder, Donald R., and D. Roderick Kiewiet. 1981. “Sociotropic Politics: The American Case.” *British Journal of Political Science* 11 (2): 129–161.
- ◇ Sears, David O., Carl P. Hensler, and Leslie K. Speer. 1979. “Whites’ Opposition to ‘Busing’: Self-Interest or Symbolic Politics?” *American Political Science Review* 73 (2): 369–384.
- ◇ Sears, David O., and Richard R. Lau. 1983. “Inducing Apparently Self-Interested Political Preferences.” *American Journal of Political Science* 27 (2): 223–252.

Questions:

- Compare and contrast Inglehart and Campbell *et al.*
- What are the requirements of citizens for economic voting (according to the authors this week and last)? How likely is it that voters meet these requirements?
- What role do elites play in economic voting?
- What are “symbolic attitudes”?

November 5—Parties, Candidates & Issues

This week we look at how individuals perceive and use parties, candidates, and issues. We also investigate how these factors, in the context of campaigns, affect behavior. Each of these is an “exogenous” factor in the Michigan view. As you read these articles, try to sketch out the causal sequence suggested by each.

Required:

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (Chapters 3 & 4)
- Petrocik, John R. 1996. “Issue Ownership in Presidential Elections, with a 1980 Case Study.” *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (3): 825–850.
- Lodge, Milton, Marco R. Steenbergen, and Shawn Brau. 1995. “The Responsive Voter: Campaign Information and the Dynamics of Candidate Evaluation.” *American Political Science Review* 89: 309–326.
- Conover, Pamela J., and Stanley Feldman. 1989. “Candidate Perception in an Ambiguous World: Campaigns, Cues, and Inference Processes.” *American Journal of Political Science* 33 (4): 912–940.
- Lodge, Milton, and Ruth Hamill. 1986. “A Partisan Schema for Political Information Processing.” *American Journal of Political Science* 80 (2): 505–520.
- Huddy, Leonie, and Nadya Terkildsen. 1993. “Gender Stereotypes and the Perception of Male and Female Candidates.” *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (1): 119–147.
- Rahn, Wendy M., John H. Aldrich, and Eugene Borgida. 1994. “Individual and Contextual Variations in Political Candidate Appraisal.” *American Political Science Review* 88 (1): 193–199.
- Krosnick, Jon A., and Donald R. Kinder. 1990. “Altering the Foundations of Support for the President Through Priming.” *American Political Science Review* 84 (2): 497–512.
- Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 12)

Questions:

- Does the causal sequence suggested by each of these articles jibe with the “funnel of causality”?
- What affects voters’ perceptions of candidates?
- How can the media affect perceptions? Is its effect benign?

November 12—Turnout

Ultimately, the political consequences of all that we've studied depends upon citizens actually casting a vote. This is not trivial either in terms of its importance or in our ability to explain it. Most of our understanding of political participation is in terms of costs and benefits. That this dominates our explanation of voting is interesting given that social and psychological models have a greater(?) presence in the literature on attitude and opinion formation.

Required:

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (Chapter 5)
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper & Row. (Chapter 14)
- Aldrich, John H. 1993. "Rational Choice and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (1): 246–278.
- Powell, Jr., G. Bingham. 1986. "American Voter Turnout in Comparative Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 80 (1): 17–43.
- Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay L. Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89 (2): 271–294.
- Adams, James, Jay Dow, and Samuel Merrill III. 2006. "The Political Consequences Of Alienation-Based And Indifference-Based Voter Abstention: Applications To Presidential Elections." *Political Behavior* 28 (1): 65–86.
- Jackman, Robert W., and Ross A. Miller. 1995. "Voter Turnout in the Industrial Democracies during the 1980s." *Comparative Political Studies* 27 (4): 467.
- Michelson, Melissa R. 2003. "Getting Out the Latino Vote: How Door-to-Door Canvassing Influences Voter Turnout in Rural Central California." *Political Behavior* 25 (3): 247–263.

Recommended:

- ◇ Fornos, Carolina A., Timothy J. Power, and James C. Garand. 2004. "Explaining Voter Turnout in Latin America, 1980 to 2000." *Comparative Political Studies* 37 (8): 909–940.
- ◇ Verba, Sidney, Kay L. Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice And Equality: Civic Voluntarism In American Politics*. Harvard University Press.
- ◇ Timpone, Richard J. 1998. "Structure, Behavior, and Voter Turnout in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 92 (1): 145–158.

Questions:

- *Is it rational to vote?*
- *What evidence is there that suggests that participation is not a simple cost/benefit analysis?*
- *Were you asked to develop a policy to boost electoral turnout, what would you suggest? Were you asked to develop a strategy to increase turnout for a particular candidate or party for an election, what would you suggest?*

November 19—Vote choice & Conclusion of Campbell *et al*

Finally! We finish up Campbell *et al* this week with the actual vote choice, a discussion of strategic voting, and then a couple of alternative theories of voting.

Required:

- Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (Chapters 11 & 12)
- Blais, Andre, and Richard Nadeau. 1996. “Measuring Strategic Voting: A Two-Step Procedure.” *Electoral Studies* 15 (1): 39–52.
- Cain, Bruce E. 1978. “Strategic Voting in Britain.” *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (3): 639–655.
- Rabinowitz, George, and Stuart Elaine Macdonald. 1989. “A Directional Theory of Issue Voting.” *American Political Science Review* 83 (1): 93–121.
- Lewis, Jeffrey, and Gary King. N.D. “No Evidence on Directional vs. Proximity Voting.” (skim) (<http://gking.harvard.edu/files/spatial.pdf>)
- Swait, Joffre, Wiktor Adamowicz, Michael Hanemann, Adele Diederich, Jon Krosnick, David Layton, William Provencher, David Schkade, and Roger Tourangeau. 2002. “Context Dependence and Aggregation in Disaggregate Choice Analysis.” *Marketing Letters* 13 (3): 195–205.
- Wilson, Carole J. N.D. “Consideration Sets and Political Choices: A Heterogeneous Model of Vote Choice and Sub-national Party Strength.” (e-reserves)

Questions:

- Can we empirically distinguish between the “directional voting model” and the proximity model (ie Downs)? If yes, how? If no, why not?
- What is strategic voting? What assumptions are made about citizens in this framework? How frequent is strategic voting?
- What factors may affect the size of voters’ consideration sets?

November 26—Lagniappe

Lagniappe means a little something extra. This week we’ll cover some things that I think are important, but didn’t quite fit into the structure of the syllabus. We will add more or change these as your interests dictate.

Suggestions:

- Dalton, Russell J. 1984. “Cognitive Mobilization and Partisan Dealignment in Advanced Industrial Democracies.” *Journal of Politics* 46 (1): 264–284.
- Morgenstern, Scott, and Elizabeth J. Zechmeister. 2001. “Better the Devil You Know than the Saint You Don’t? Risk Propensity and Vote Choice in Mexico.” *Journal of Politics* 63 (1): 93–119.
- Miller, Joanne M., and Jon A. Krosnick. 2000. “News Media Impact on the Ingredients of Presidential Evaluations: Politically Knowledgeable Citizens Are Guided by a Trusted Source.” *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (2): 301–315.

Review Assignment—Due Weekly

On 4 occasions, you will review 2 of the week's readings following the format and instructions below.

Purpose:

This assignment is designed to help students succinctly summarize material, identify the important parts of the reading, and prepare for exams.

Grading:

Students will be graded on their ability to demonstrate their understanding of the article and on their ability to identify the important components of the articles. —Value: 10% of course grade.

Article Review Week 1	Your Name Here August 18, 2007
<hr/>	
Alvarez, R. Michael, and Jonathan Nagler. 1995. "Economics, Issues and the Perot Candidacy: Voter Choice in the 1992 Presidential Election." <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> 39 (3): 714–744.	
<hr/>	
Keywords: economic voting, third party candidate, multinomial probit	
Summary	
Summarize the article two or three paragraphs (not lists).	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Describe the goal of the paper and its contribution to political behavior.• You will want to note the general area of political behavior under which this falls (ie. this article focuses on social context).• You should link the article or chapter to some line of research (ie. this is an extension of Downs (1957), or this builds on Conover's work on schema theory).• You should note the important concepts developed in the work.• You should indicate the main hypotheses and the methods of analysis.	
Comments	
This section is for your comments about the paper. You should note any novelties, inconsistencies, problems, or other opinions.	

Assignment 1—Due date August 27th

The following journal article has been cited once in a scholarly journal. What article cites:
—Conover, Pamela J., and Donald D. Searing. 2005. “Part III: Deliberation among citizens - Studying
'Everyday political talk' in the deliberative system.” *Acta Politica* 40 (September): 269–283.

Purpose:

To teach students to use necessary library databases.

Grading:

This assignment will not be graded.

Assignment 2—Due date October 1

You must choose an article that includes an analysis of data from the American National Election Survey and replicate that analysis using the data files that available at <http://www.icpsr.org>. You will turn in to me:

- Your batch file (not your log file).
- A photocopy of the results table(s) from the article.
- Results of your replication in the same table format as the article.
- A brief (2–3 page) discussion addressing the following:
 - Why replication is important
 - What difficulties you encountered in your attempt at replication
 - Suggestions for ways to improve replicability in research
 - If you were unable to replicate the article results, why your results may be different.
- If you are an overachiever, in a separate analysis substitute one or more variables that are conceptually similar (eg. household income instead of personal income, knowledge measures instead of education) or remove a variable that you think should not be there and see if the substantive results of the analysis change.

Purpose:

- To familiarize students with the most commonly used dataset in political behavior.
- To familiarize students with common methods used in political behavior research.
- To impress upon students the importance of documentation and the necessary type of documentation in research to enable replication.

Grading:

Students will be graded on their ability to document their progress through the assignment in their batch files (I encourage you to provide extensive comments) and on their discussion of replication. Note that students *must* format correctly their results. —Value: 20% of course grade.

Assignment 3—Due date Tuesday, November 27th

You will develop an idea into an original research contribution culminating in a 15–25 page research paper. This paper will apply a theory of political behavior, generate hypotheses and analyze data to test these hypotheses.

Purpose:

The purpose of this assignment is for students to apply the theories learned in this course, and to produce original research.

Format:

- Choose a major political science journal (*AJPS*, *APSR*, *JOP*) and follow that format for organization and citation style.
- Your finished paper should be of the quality that you would consider submitting to a professional journal. The format should be appropriate, it should be written succinctly, there should be no spelling errors, and no grammatical mistakes.
- Tables and Figures are to be formatted for publication (cutting and pasting from a stats program is not acceptable).
- Read Jim Stimson's thoughts on writing research papers:
<http://www.unc.edu/~jstimson/Writing.pdf>
- You will include the following elements in your paper:
 - introduction;
 - appropriate literature review;
 - theory;
 - hypotheses;
 - research design with explanation of data, appropriateness of case, etc.;
 - analysis;
 - results;
 - conclusion.

Research:

- Spend time in the library. While no literature review will be exhaustive, you should spend time learning the appropriate works for your topic. Don't depend on electronic journals only. There are books available in the library and bound journals. Your references should reflect this. Your literature search must extend beyond the materials in this course. While I think the syllabus is good, it is designed to substitute for your research.
- “*The best laid schemes o' mice an' men\Gang aft agley*” The most important thing is to begin early. The creative process takes time and there are many problems that may pop up that can be dealt with if you have the benefit of time.

Submission:

You will submit your papers electronically to <http://www.turnitin.com> **and** a paper copy (stapled) to me by noon. Prior to submitting the paper, you will register at [turnitin.com](http://www.turnitin.com) for this course. The class ID is **1949409** and the enrollment password is **paper**.

Grading:

Students will be graded on their knowledge of the theory, their research ability, their ability to deduce hypotheses from the theories, their ability to develop a research design, and their ability to analyze data and test hypotheses. —Value: 40% of course grade.

Final Exam—Monday, December 3rd (4:00–8:00pm)

In this comprehensive exam, you will have 4 hours to answer one question over the course material. The exam is styled after the PhD exams.

Purpose:

The purpose of this exam is to test students' comprehension of the course materials and to prepare students for the format of the program's PhD exams.

Procedure:

Students will receive at least two questions by email (at 4pm) from which they will answer one. The completed exam is due at 8:00pm.

Grading:

Students will be graded on their ability to demonstrate their knowledge of and ability to apply the course literature in answering the proposed question. —Value: 30% of course grade.

Grading Policy

Assignment will be graded according to the criteria described above and will use the following scale:

87-89=B+	77-79=C+		
93-100=A	83-86=B	73-76=C	Below 70=F
90-92=A-	80-82=B-	70-72=C-	

Course Policies

Class Attendance: You must not miss class except under the most dire circumstances. If you must miss class, you will prepare a review assignment for each article and/or chapter assigned for the missed class. This work is due the Wednesday after the class is missed. I will not hunt you down to remind you of this assignment. If this assignment is not turned in by the due date, I will deduct 6 percentage points from your final grade.

Late Work: I will deduct 10 percentage points from the assignment for each day the assignment is late.

Make-up exams: None

Extra Credit: None

Special Assignments: None

Classroom Citizenship: Students are expected to be respectful of each other.

Technical Support

If you experience any problems with your UTD account you may send an email to: assist@utdallas.edu or call the UTD Computer Helpdesk at 972-883-2911.

Field Trip Policies / Off-Campus Instruction and Course Activities

Off-campus, out-of-state, and foreign instruction and activities are subject to state law and University policies and procedures regarding travel and risk-related activities. Information regarding these rules and regulations may be found at the website address http://www.utdallas.edu/BusinessAffairs/Travel_Risk_Activities.htm.

Additional information is available from the office of the school dean. Below is a description of any travel and/or risk-related activity associated with this course.

Student Conduct & Discipline

The University of Texas System and The University of Texas at Dallas have rules and regulations for the orderly and efficient conduct of their business. It is the responsibility of each student and each student organization to be knowledgeable about the rules and regulations which govern student conduct and activities. General information on student conduct and discipline is contained in the UTD printed publication, A to Z Guide, which is provided to all registered students each academic year.

The University of Texas at Dallas administers student discipline within the procedures of recognized and established due process. Procedures are defined and described in the Rules and Regulations, Series 50000, Board of Regents, The University of Texas System, and in Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities of the university's Handbook of Operating Procedures. Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations (SU 1.602, 972/883-6391) and online at <http://www.utdallas.edu/judicialaffairs/UTDJudicialAffairs-HOPV.html>

A student at the university neither loses the rights

nor escapes the responsibilities of citizenship. He or she is expected to obey federal, state, and local laws as well as the Regents' Rules, university regulations, and administrative rules. Students are subject to discipline for violating the standards of conduct whether such conduct takes place on or off campus, or whether civil or criminal penalties are also imposed for such conduct.

Academic Integrity

The faculty expects from its students a high level of responsibility and academic honesty. Because the value of an academic degree depends upon the absolute integrity of the work done by the student for that degree, it is imperative that a student demonstrate a high standard of individual honor in his or her scholastic work.

Scholastic Dishonesty, any student who commits an act of scholastic dishonesty is subject to discipline. Scholastic dishonesty includes but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, collusion, the submission for credit of any work or materials that are attributable in whole or in part to another person, taking an examination for another person, any act designed to give unfair advantage to a student or the attempt to commit such acts.

Plagiarism, especially from the web, from portions of papers for other classes, and from any other source is unacceptable and will be dealt with under the university's policy on plagiarism (see general catalog for details). This course will use the resources of turnitin.com, which searches the web for possible plagiarism and is over 90% effective.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials, including music and software. Copying, displaying, reproducing, or distributing copyrighted works may infringe the copyright owner's rights and such infringement is subject to appropriate disciplinary action as well as criminal penalties provided by federal law. Usage of such material is only appropriate when that usage constitutes "fair use" under the Copyright Act. As a UT Dallas student, you are required to follow

the institution's copyright policy (Policy Memorandum 84-I.3-46). For more information about the fair use exemption, see <http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/copypol2.htm>

Email Use

The University of Texas at Dallas recognizes the value and efficiency of communication between faculty/staff and students through electronic mail. At the same time, email raises some issues concerning security and the identity of each individual in an email exchange. The university encourages all official student email correspondence be sent only to a student's U.T. Dallas email address and that faculty and staff consider email from students official only if it originates from a UTD student account. This allows the university to maintain a high degree of confidence in the identity of all individual corresponding and the security of the transmitted information. UTD furnishes each student with a free email account that is to be used in all communication with university personnel. The Department of Information Resources at U.T. Dallas provides a method for students to have their U.T. Dallas mail forwarded to other accounts.

Withdrawal from Class

The administration of this institution has set deadlines for withdrawal of any college-level courses. These dates and times are published in that semester's course catalog. Administration procedures must be followed. It is the student's responsibility to handle withdrawal requirements from any class. In other words, I cannot drop or withdraw any student. You must do the proper paperwork to ensure that you will not receive a final grade of "F" in a course if you choose not to attend the class once you are enrolled.

Student Grievance Procedures

Procedures for student grievances are found in Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities, of the university's Handbook of Operating Procedures.

In attempting to resolve any student grievance regarding grades, evaluations, or other fulfillments of academic responsibility, it is the obligation of the student first to make a serious effort to resolve the matter with the instructor, supervisor, administra-

tor, or committee with whom the grievance originates (hereafter called "the respondent"). Individual faculty members retain primary responsibility for assigning grades and evaluations. If the matter cannot be resolved at that level, the grievance must be submitted in writing to the respondent with a copy of the respondent's School Dean. If the matter is not resolved by the written response provided by the respondent, the student may submit a written appeal to the School Dean. If the grievance is not resolved by the School Dean's decision, the student may make a written appeal to the Dean of Graduate or Undergraduate Education, and the dean will appoint and convene an Academic Appeals Panel. The decision of the Academic Appeals Panel is final. The results of the academic appeals process will be distributed to all involved parties.

Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations.

Incomplete Grade Policy

As per university policy, incomplete grades will be granted only for work unavoidably missed at the semester's end and only if 70% of the course work has been completed. An incomplete grade must be resolved within eight (8) weeks from the first day of the subsequent long semester. If the required work to complete the course and to remove the incomplete grade is not submitted by the specified deadline, the incomplete grade is changed automatically to a grade of F.

Disability Services

The goal of Disability Services is to provide students with disabilities educational opportunities equal to those of their non-disabled peers. Disability Services is located in room 1.610 in the Student Union. Office hours are Monday and Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.; Tuesday and Wednesday, 8:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.; and Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

The contact information for the Office of Disability Services is:

The University of Texas at Dallas, SU 22
PO Box 830688

Richardson, Texas 75083-0688
(972) 883-2098 (voice or TTY)
disabilityservice@utdallas.edu

If you anticipate issues related to the format or requirements of this course, please meet with the Coordinator of Disability Services. The Coordinator is available to discuss ways to ensure your full participation in the course. If you determine that formal, disability-related accommodations are necessary, it is very important that you be registered with Disability Services to notify them of your eligibility for reasonable accommodations. Disability Services can then plan how best to coordinate your accommodations.

It is the student's responsibility to notify his or her professors of the need for such an accommodation. Disability Services provides students with letters to present to faculty members to verify that the student has a disability and needs accommodations. Individuals requiring special accommodation should contact the professor after class or during office hours.

Religious Holy Days

The University of Texas at Dallas will excuse a student from class or other required activities for the travel to and observance of a religious holy day for a religion whose places of worship are exempt from

property tax under Section 11.20, Tax Code, Texas Code Annotated. The student is encouraged to notify the instructor or activity sponsor as soon as possible regarding the absence, preferably in advance of the assignment. The student, so excused, will be allowed to take the exam or complete the assignment within a reasonable time after the absence: a period equal to the length of the absence, up to a maximum of one week. A student who notifies the instructor and completes any missed exam or assignment may not be penalized for the absence. A student who fails to complete the exam or assignment within the prescribed period may receive a failing grade for that exam or assignment. If a student or an instructor disagrees about the nature of the absence [i.e., for the purpose of observing a religious holy day] or if there is similar disagreement about whether the student has been given a reasonable time to complete any missed assignments or examinations, either the student or the instructor may request a ruling from the chief executive officer of the institution, or his or her designee. The chief executive officer or designee must take into account the legislative intent of TEC 51.911(b), and the student and instructor will abide by the decision of the chief executive officer or designee. These descriptions and timelines are subject to change at the discretion of the Professor.

These descriptions and timelines are subject to change at the discretion of the Professor.