

POLS BC 3334  
COLLOQUIUM IN AMERICAN ELECTIONS  
BARNARD COLLEGE  
FALL 2014, TUESDAY, 11-12:50, 227 MILBANK

**INSTRUCTOR:**

Michael G. Miller                      Email: mgmiller@barnard.edu  
Office: 416-B Lehman                Twitter: @Millerpolsci  
Phone: (212) 854-6181

**OFFICE HOURS**

<b>Always:</b> Weds 10:30-1:00	<b>Other Times:</b> By Appointment
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

The last sixty years have seen increases in both mass-media visibility and cost of political campaigns at all levels of American government. Elections today are well-covered events, and even the smallest actions of federal candidates can garner significant attention. Yet, much of the reporting about campaigns—as well as the strategic decisions that occur as they are waged—is based on incorrect or incomplete information. The purpose of this course is to examine how political science can inform the real-world campaign environment, improving our understanding of strategy and outcomes in elections. Some of the readings will be practical in nature. However, most of the readings will be drawn from political science literature.

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

This course will introduce students to the concepts, major themes, and debates in the study of American elections. Students who complete the class will learn how to:

1. Identify the key concepts, actors, and regulatory aspects of both federal and state elections.
2. Draw linkages between theoretical political science and practical politics in describing how to conduct successful political campaigns.
3. Critically engage media coverage of the electoral system and political campaigns.
4. Assess the theoretical and/or empirical quality of academic arguments about elections.
5. Use empirical evidence to present an effective argument, both written and verbal.
6. Produce a high-quality, original research paper that contributes to our understanding of the electoral environment.

**COURSE TEXTS**

---

In nearly all cases, you'll be able to find the books for this course online, either new or used. I also recommend that you purchase recommended texts if they fall in a substantive area close to your project.

**Required Text**

Miller, Michael G. 2013. *Subsidizing Democracy: How Public Funding Changes Elections, and How it Can Work in the Future*. Cornell University Press.<sup>1</sup>

**Other Readings**

The vast majority of the course readings may come from other works. Links to these will be provided most of the time via Courseworks. Students are responsible for obtaining readings via the Columbia Library regardless of whether links are provided.

---

<sup>1</sup>I realize given the number of readings, this makes me look like an egomaniacal twit, but this is the only book of which we read enough that I am legally obligated to make you buy it.

## COURSE RULES, GUIDELINES, AND SUGGESTIONS

---

### GRADING BASIS:

There are 100 points in the class. Course grades will be based on students' case study presentations (10 pts), reaction memos (20), discussion questions (5), in-class participation (15), and major research papers (50).

### ASSIGNMENTS:

#### *Case Study Presentation (10%):*

Writing case studies requires practice, and each student will deliver one case presentation in class during the semester. In most cases, the student will perform this function alone, although it is possible for this presentation to be delivered in tandem with a classmate. The purpose of these presentations will be to link the theoretical or analytical concepts covered in course readings to the activities of actual campaigns. The student will prepare a presentation of roughly 20 minutes in length that will tell the story of the assigned campaign, linking it to the theoretical topic for that week's discussion. Partnered presentations should be longer and more in-depth. The presentation should pay particular attention to highlighting how that campaign exemplifies the week's course topic. Some questions the presentation might address include: What does the campaign tell us about the week's topic? What were the strategic successes and/or failures during the campaign? What lessons should future campaigns learn? Etc. The student's presentation should demonstrate command both of the week's readings and the particulars of the assigned campaign. It should culminate in a set of questions that spur a focused, practical discussion bridging the practical and theoretical, intended to begin discussion for that week.

#### *Reaction Memos (20%):*

Active participation is a required component of the grade in this seminar, and it is impossible to contribute to a discussion if you arrive unprepared. Each student will therefore prepare 4 reaction memos during the semester, on dates of the student's choosing (after the first class). The purpose of these memos is to critically engage ALL of the week's readings in such a way as to provide a basis for discussion in class; good memos are generally between 2 and 4 pages in length. The memo should provide a critical response to each reading, and may connect the readings to other class content/applied politics, and/or incorporate outside research. Reaction memos are due two hours before the start of class (9:00 am on Tuesdays) and should be submitted to CourseWorks. Your reaction paper will be shared with the rest of the class. **Note:** Readings denoted with asterisks (\*) on the course calendar need not be included in the memo, even if required reading for that week.

#### *Weekly Discussion Questions (5%)*

All students must submit three discussion questions two hours before the beginning of each class (9:00 am on Tuesday). I will use the questions to help structure our class discussion. Students who submit all of their questions on time will receive the full 5%. Grade reductions will be the result of missing/late questions and questions that demonstrate no evidence of reading.

#### *Class Participation (15%)*

"Participation" is not the same thing as "attendance." The former is crucially important in a seminar course. While in class, students will be expected to contribute to discussion, and to have demonstrated an attempt both to understand the readings and to place them in a broader thematic context.

### *Research Paper (50%)*

The primary assignment for this course is a major research paper of approximately 25 to 30 pages in length. The research paper will make an original contribution. While your work on the paper is worth 50 points on the whole, you will earn points on the research paper throughout the term, via several smaller assignments with their own deadlines. Regardless of the track you choose (see below), in your research paper you will have four essential tasks:

Objective 1: Explain the problem, question, or focus to a sophisticated audience.

Objective 2: Discuss how existing findings in political science can inform our understanding of the topic.

Objective 3: Describe how you plan to engage the question.

Objective 4: Answer the question and make a conclusion.

To accomplish these four objectives you will need to examine and review the existing research on the topic and conduct your own research, be it in the form of empirical data analysis, case study, or observation. The goal for the literature review is to explain to the reader what the world already knows about the topic. To do this, you will want to examine the research in academic journals as well as that produced by think tanks, companies, governments, and in many cases, the research done by newspapers and reputable websites. We will discuss additional information on how to write successful literature reviews. In total, your paper should be well-grounded in theory, and should contribute to a larger thematic argument about campaigns, elections, and/or voting behavior.

### **Paper Tracks:**

Given the breadth of the subject matter in U.S. elections and political behavior, there are a number of angles that might be pursued. Broadly:

#### **Empirical Assessment: Strategy or Reform**

You might take the approach of engaging an empirical question relating to American elections. For instance, you might evaluate the effectiveness of an election reform, determine whether spending affected an election outcome, or undertake some similar analysis. The possibilities here are quite broad, assuming you can pose an answerable question, can obtain the necessary data to answer it, and possess the tools to conduct the analysis. To that end, students who pursue this track should have an understanding of statistical analysis, demonstrated by previous successful completion of a statistics course. The Empirical Reasoning Lab will no doubt prove to be a valuable resource for students in this track.

Students pursuing the Empirical Assessment track have three tasks at hand:

1. *Pose a testable, theoretically motivated hypothesis.* Your theory should tell a story about what you think is going on in the world. The theory should be guided by existing research findings, and should spawn at least one falsifiable hypothesis. Ideally, your paper will take on a question that has either not been explicitly answered, or one that has not been answered adequately (for reasons that you explain). However, in some cases it will be useful to re-examine old findings with new data. This is doubly true in elections, which are always occurring, and which offer a good chance to examine variation across states and through time.

2. *Define variables and research method, and collect sufficient data.* The concepts in your theory must be validly and reliably represented in data that you can access (from an Internet source, library archive, etc.). Based on the structure of these data, you will pre-define your analytical strategy, which in most cases will exist in the framework of an empirical method such as means testing or (better) multivariate regression.

3. *Test the hypothesis and make a conclusion.* Based on your analysis, is your hypothesis supported? What does that say for your theory, and/or for the existing studies you cited earlier in the paper? Are there policy implications from your research? Etc.

### **Case Study: Completed Campaign**

You may take the approach of doing one or two in-depth campaign case studies (presidential campaigns) or three to five shorter case studies (congressional campaigns). In all cases, the case studies must be original, and cannot include the one on which you present during the term. Whether you choose the congressional or presidential route will likely be the result of your preliminary case study research and/or your examination of existing political science research, but politically inclined students might be particularly interested in races occurring near their home territory, or those in which issues of interest to the student were important.

Each approach has strengths and weaknesses. By doing one or two in-depth case studies of presidential campaigns, you will get to know your cases well. By doing three to five shorter case studies, you may learn less about each case but can compare conditions within them. The goal of the case studies is to help you to better understand the real-life politics of a major political campaign, including strategic choices and effectiveness. Case study research should not be based on other, previously completed case studies, and your research is to be carried out by you alone. We will discuss several campaign case studies during the term. However, note here that there are three primary steps in conducting a case study of a completed campaign:

1. *Case selection.* This is the identification of the case or the cases—e.g. the pairing of two (or in rare conditions, more) major candidates in a legislative or presidential race. The best way to find cases is to find newspaper or other media articles that describe them. For this research, avoid the cases that we will be looking at in class—even if another student presented them—unless you feel you can expand on them on your own and obtain pre-clearance from me first.

2. *Case examination.* This is the actual research: the investigation into what happened, why it happened, and whether the events are consistent with existing political science research. There are a lot of different tactics for carrying out a case study. Perhaps the most basic approach is to piece together newspaper reports and government documents (for instance, campaign finance disclosures) into a story that describes the case. A more advanced approach would involve conducting interviews with people who were actually involved with the case. Candidates, campaign staff, and local party officials are obvious potential sources here, but even voters could work in the right circumstances. The inclusion of interviews and the analysis of primary documents takes the research to a higher level.

3. *Case discussion.* Case discussion is the analytical consideration of the implications of the case study. For this track, the discussion will bring the case back to the second and third paper objectives: underlying political themes and strategy success.

### **Observation: Pending Campaign**

This course occurs during the fall of an election year, which offers ample opportunity both to participate directly in the political process and to parlay observations of ongoing activities into original research. Students who pursue this track will immerse themselves in either a campaign or an election-focused organization (e.g., party or interest group) during September, October, and/or November of 2014. Ideally, students would volunteer for the campaign, and would take field notes about their experience. The observation should focus on the apparent strategic dynamics and tactics observable inside the campaign. In most cases, the observations will be supplemented with interviews (see above). The steps in the Observation track are as follows:

1. *Selection.* There need not be anything outwardly interesting about the campaign in which the student immerses herself. In many cases, the campaign will simply be one that the student supports, or which affords easy access. Nonetheless, students should be cognizant of the strategic circumstances (district demographics/partisan strength, incumbency status, etc.) in which the campaign finds itself, and should describe them in-depth.

2. *Observation.* As with the case study, this is the actual research, but with a twist: the investigation into what *is happening* and *why* it might be happening. The research should also be critical, comparing the campaign's behavior with the path suggested by existing political science research. Simply, campaigns operate within unique strategic circumstances and act accordingly. Students in the Observation track should attempt to discern the strategic goals of the campaign, and should critically evaluate whether the management and/or resources of the campaign are sufficient to achieve the desired ends. The Observation paper might also feature elements of the case study track. For instance, interviews can help the observer to address *why* a campaign behaved in a certain fashion, and journalistic accounts and/or financial reports might confirm or contradict the observer's perception.

3. *Discussion.* Discussion is the analytical consideration of the implications of the paper. For this track, the discussion will bring the case back to the second and third paper objectives: underlying political themes and strategy success. Why was the campaign ultimately successful (or not)? Etc.

### **Research Paper Assignments and Deadlines:**

Before you hand in your final paper, you will have five other deadlines. Each deadline involves the submission of a related assignment or the presentation of your research to the class. Most of the assignments are graded.

*Deadline 1: September 12: Topic Submission.*

A 1-2 paragraph discussion of why you are choosing the track/topic, what you know about it already, and any ideas you have for research (including potential case studies, campaigns to observe, data sources, or interview subjects). This assignment is ungraded but failure to complete it will result in a reduced final grade on your paper.

*Deadline 2: September 26: Research Report 1 (plus preliminary annotated bibliography).*

A 500-word (minimum) report on the status of your research. This report should include a synopsis of your focus and rationale for doing the research, a summary of information/findings have found so far, your remaining research goals, and a discussion of the challenges you are still facing. You must also include an annotated bibliography that contains the citations for at least 20 sources you will use in the paper, as applicable. Each citation should contain a 3-4 sentence summary of the source, including a synopsis of the major findings, data source, and method of analysis. This assignment is graded and worth 4 points

*Deadline 3: October 24: Research Report 2 (with updated bibliography).*

A minimum 1,000-word (minimum) report on the status of your research. This research report should include a summary of your research so far (including advancements you have made since the last report), remaining research goals, and a discussion of both the challenges your are facing and how you will deal with them. The report must also include an updated non-annotated bibliography (that does not count toward your word minimum). Students who already have a working draft may submit it in lieu of the summary but must also include a statement of remaining research goals, and a discussion of the challenges you are facing and how you will deal with them. This assignment is graded and worth 4 points.

*Deadline 4: November 14: Draft 1.*

Provide a relatively complete first draft of the paper. All drafts must contain a complete literature review. This assignment is graded and worth 4 points.

*Deadline 5: November 26 & December 5: Research Presentation*

Our last two classes of the semester are devoted to your research presentations. Presentation details (including length and format) will be provided to you ahead of time. Your presentation is worth 5 points.

*Deadline 6: December 12: Final Paper.*

Worth 33 points.

### **For Seniors:**

All Seniors who have designated this course as the colloquium to fulfill their Senior Capstone requirement must also complete the following:

1. Provide constructive criticism and feedback to your designated peer partner(s). You and your partner should hold meetings, in consultation with the instructor, to discuss your assignments, e.g. research proposals, research methods, rough drafts.
2. If not already required by the syllabus, present your main findings in class at the end of the semester. A portion of the Class participation grade will reflect the quality of your mentoring and final presentation.
3. Attend at least one of the Senior overviews of the library and online resources hosted by the instructor or another member of the Political Science Department.
4. Generate a poster that summarizes your research question, argument, and findings. The poster should accompany your class presentation and will be displayed at the Senior end-of-year Departmental party in May 2014. The poster will not be graded, but is required to receive a "Pass" for your Senior requirement and will factor into Departmental considerations for Senior Project Distinction.

### **DUE DATES AND SUBMISSION**

I will only accept work submitted via CourseWorks, which saves you the trouble of printing and aids organization on my end. Submitted files must include the student's name, both in the document **and** the final name. With the exception of memos and questions (see above), work is due **before** midnight on the date due. **Late work will not be accepted for credit.** That said, if you need an extension, **ask.** I will make reasonable accommodations for what I feel are good reasons. But try to avoid making these requests the day before an assignment is due, and have a well-documented rationale for doing so.

Students wishing to reschedule an assignment due to "academic burden" such as exams for other classes occurring within a certain period of time must show an approved petition from Barnard or Columbia administration—note that these are generally only obtainable for final exams. Finally, a grade of *Incomplete* will be assigned only in well-documented and exceptional circumstances, such as a Texas-sized meteor impacting Earth, the Minnesota Vikings winning the Super Bowl, or a zombie apocalypse.<sup>2</sup>

### **RULES FOR STYLE**

Use a standard Times font in 12-point size, double-spaced with one-inch margins. Please number and staple your pages. Papers should include a title page. Please proofread and spell-check all drafts before bringing them to class. I prefer citation style recommended by the American Political Science Association, but you should use any style with which you are comfortable, so long as you are consistent throughout. That said, no end notes are allowed.

---

<sup>2</sup>I am a lifelong, diehard Viking fan. So I can make fun of them, but it will hurt my feelings if you do.

## **ASSISTANCE AND ACCOMMODATIONS**

I respect and uphold applicable college/university policies pertaining to the observation of religious holidays; assistance available to the physically disabled, visually and/or hearing impaired students, and students with documented learning disabilities; discrimination based on age, race, ethnic origin, gender, sexual orientation, political affiliation, or religion; and all forms of harassment. I am willing to audio-record and share class sessions for students missing class due to religious holidays or for some other acceptable reason, provided sufficient advance notice. In compliance with Barnard/Columbia policy and equal access laws, I am available to discuss appropriate academic accommodations that may be required for students with disabilities. The Office of Disability Services (008 Milbank) is a useful resource for students who need assistance. Students who need accommodations must coordinate through ODS, and I ask that you inform me early in the semester. Finally, I reserve the right—at my discretion—to make accommodations for students who are pregnant women or who are the parents of young children, or who are active-duty members of the United States Armed Forces, as necessary.

## **ACADEMIC HONESTY**

Students have the responsibility of fulfilling their academic obligations in a fair and honest manner. This includes avoiding plagiarism, cheating, collusion or other inappropriate activities. Examples of “plagiarism” include, but are not limited to: copying word-for-word or altering small components of a text, with or without attribution, or borrowing core ideas from others without citing. Ignorance of these rules does not excuse a failure to comply with them, and I will strictly enforce the Barnard Honor Code (BHC) in all appropriate areas. Students engaging in these or any other intellectually dishonest activities will receive no credit for the applicable assignment, and may face additional disciplinary sanctions (such as probation, suspension, etc.) per the BHC, after referral to applicable administrative units. The responsibility for understanding the BHC lies with the student. The plagiarism policy is available at <http://firstyear.barnard.edu/firstyear/plagiarism/introduction>

## **COMMUNICATION AND AVAILABILITY:**

If you want to communicate with me, email is by far the most efficient method—certainly more so than my office phone. Student correspondence is my top email priority, and I will almost always reply within 6 hours. Note however that I will generally not reply to email after 11 PM, because I am an old man with no life and often cannot stay awake past 10:30. When communicating via email, I remind students that email should generally be composed with a professional tone, especially if we do not know each other well. This is good practice as you transition to the workplace.

It is the student’s responsibility to check Barnard/Columbia email, preferably daily, since this is how I will communicate with you outside of class. If you prefer another email address, set up forwarding from your Barnard/Columbia address.

As to availability, I am here to help you and am generally at your service. I am happy to meet with students outside of my normal office hours, either in person or via Skype. If you cannot make office hours but require additional assistance, do not hesitate to let me know and I will make every reasonable effort to accommodate you.

## **RULES FOR SEMINAR DISCUSSION**

Politics can be a tricky topic. Open and free discussion is encouraged in our class, and all viewpoints are welcome in my classroom. Please be respectful of your fellow students and your instructor. With regard to the latter, I ask that you do not pack your things before class is over. If someone is still speaking, we should all still be listening.<sup>3</sup>

Much of what we will discuss in this class is subjective. The strength of class sessions will therefore depend on students' willingness and ability to argue. However, it is important that you argue well. The binding rule for discussion in this class is *The Fairness in Conversation Act* (FICA), which exists by my dictatorial authority.<sup>4</sup> Per FICA, the use of what I call "Jedi logic" (making unfounded assertions with the wave of a hand) is illegal and punishable by public challenge. FICA is intended to foster evidence-based critical argument. I will say more about this in class.

## **LAPTOPS, TABLETS, AND CELL PHONES**

Inappropriate use of electronic devices during class time provides a distraction for instructor and student alike. There is a recent group of studies suggesting that use of laptops for note-taking in university classes reduces students' final grades by roughly one mark. Moreover, the same studies suggest the existence of a "secondhand smoke" effect as students near the laptop user are distracted by its screen. I believe that everyone has the right to make their own poor choices, but consider this clause your "surgeon general's warning" and understand that, guided by social science, I am taking steps to protect those around you. So, if you are not taking notes on your device, please leave it at home. If you use a device for note-taking during class, you must sit in the designated seats for device-users, and know that I will probably call on you first. Finally, please know that one of my personal foibles is that I find student texting in-class to be very distracting. As such, I do not want to see your phones in class, nor are you allowed to text under the table.<sup>5</sup> Phones should be silenced or powered down. If you use any device in a distracting fashion and/or one that is not related to the class (**including texting**), I reserve the right to ask you to leave. So to be clear: If the usage of your phone is more important than engaging with the course, you are welcome to not attend. In the event of an emergency, please step out to use your phone.

## **GRADE APPEALS**

I am not perfect. If at the conclusion of the course you believe that you have earned a grade other than the one you received, you may make an appeal for reconsideration. Such an appeal must be written—no longer than one single-spaced typed page in length—and must lay out a cogent argument for your position. Successful appeals will draw my attention to things I missed in the initial evaluation, or factors that you believe warrant additional consideration. In short, the appeal should be constructed on a factual, argumentative foundation. Note: "I worked really hard" will never form the basis for a successful grade appeal in this course.

My ability to change a grade will be constrained by institutional rules. It is the student's responsibility to learn the applicable deadlines and work within them. Generally however, appeals made more than a month after the end of the course will not be considered.

## **SYLLABUS CHANGES**

Changes in the syllabus may be made from time to time in order to correct errors, adjust the schedule, fine tune course details, or to address unforeseen issues. Changes will be discussed and announced in class. It is the student's responsibility to attend class to be aware of any syllabus changes. The official syllabus will always be available in CourseWorks.

<sup>3</sup>Doubly true if that someone is me. See Footnote 1 re: "Egomaniacal twit."

<sup>4</sup>I have unapologetically re-purposed this idea from Paul Allen, Minneapolis sports talk radio personality.

<sup>5</sup>Seriously, you aren't fooling me. Nobody's lap is that amusing.



## COURSE CALENDAR

---

### September 2: Introduction and Fundamentals

Required Reading:

Druckman, James N., Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2006. "The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100(4): 627-635.

Fenno, Richard F., Jr. 1986. "Observation, Context, and Sequence in the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 80(1): 3-15.

Zigerell, L.J. 2011. "Of Publishable Quality: Ideas for Political Science Seminar Papers." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 44(3): 629-633.

Issenberg, Sasha. 2010. "Nudge the Vote." *New York Times*.

---

### September 9: Systems and Strategy

Case Study: United States House Election: VA-7. 2014.

Required Reading:

Boatright, Robert G. *Getting Primaried: The Changing Politics of Congressional Primary Challenges*. University of Michigan Press. Ch.1.

Masket, Seth. 2014 (July 7). "How Can We Fix the Broken Primary Election System?" *PS Magazine*.

Benoit, Kenneth. 2006. "Duverger's Law and the Study of Electoral Systems." *French Politics* 4(1): 69-83.

---

### September 16: Voting Behavior: Exploding Myths

Case Study: Presidential Election of 1980 (up to 2 students).

Required Reading:

Jacobson, Gary C. 2009. *The Politics of Congressional Elections*. Pearson. Ch 5.

Baumgartner, Jody C., and Peter L. Francia. 2010. *Conventional Wisdom and American Elections*. Rowman and Littlefield. 2nd ed. Ch. 1, 3.

Lewis-Beck, Michael S., *et al.* 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. University of Michigan Press. Ch. 3-4.

Vavreck, Lynn. 2009. *The Message Matters: The Economy and Presidential Campaigns*. Princeton University Press. Ch. 2

---

## September 23: Money: Overview and Fundamentals

Case Study: Presidential Election of 2012. (Dual Presentation).

### Required Reading:

Peruse the Campaign Finance Institute Data Page: <http://www.cfinst.org/data.aspx>

Corrado, Anthony. 2011. "The Regulatory Environment of the 2008 Elections." In *Financing the 2008 Election*. David B. Magleby and Anthony Corrado, Eds. Brookings Institution Press.

Dowling, Conor, and Michael G. Miller: 2014. *Super PAC! Money, Elections, and Voters After Citizens United*. Routledge. Ch. 1-2.

Francia, Peter L., et al. 2003. *The Financiers of Congressional Elections: Investors, Ideologues, and Intimates*. New York: Columbia University Press. Ch. 3-4.

### Recommended Reading:

Levine, Adam Seth. 2010. *Strategic Solicitations: Explaining When Requests for Political Donations Are Persuasive*. Unpublished Dissertation. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Ch. 1-5

Cho, Wendy K. Tam, and James G. Gimpel. 2007. "Prospecting for (Campaign) Gold." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(2): 255–268.

Gimpel, James G., Frances E. Lee, and Joshua Kaminski. 2006. "The Political Geography of Campaign Contributions in American Politics." *The Journal of Politics* 68(3): 626-639.

Gimpel, James G., Frances E. Lee, and Shanna Pearson-Merkowitz. 2008. "The Check Is in the Mail: Interdistrict Funding Flows in Congressional Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 52(2): 373–394.

Steen, Jennifer A. 2006. *Self-Financed Candidates in Congressional Elections*. University of Michigan Press. Ch. 3-4.

Herrnson, Paul S., and Stephanie Perry Curtis. 2011. "Financing the 2008 Congressional Elections." In *Financing the 2008 Election*. David B. Magleby and Anthony Corrado, Eds. Brookings Institution Press.

Wilcox, Clyde. 2001. "Contributing as Political Participation." In *A User's Guide to Campaign Finance Reform*. Gerald Lubenow, ed. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Gordon, Sanford C., Catherine Landa, and Dimitri Hafer. 2007. "Consumption or Investment? On Motivations for Political Giving." *The Journal of Politics* 69(4): 1057-1072.

### **September 30: How and Why Does Money Matter?**

Case study: Washington gubernatorial election, 2012

#### Required Reading:

Dowling, Conor, and Michael G. Miller: 2014. *Super PAC! Money, Elections, and Voters After Citizens United*. Routledge. Ch. 5.

Stratmann, Thomas. 2005. "Some Talk: Money in Politics. A (Partial) Review of the Literature." *Public Choice* 124 (1-2): 135-156.

Gerber, Alan. 2004. "Does Campaign Spending Work? Field Experiments Provide Evidence and Suggest New Theory." *American Behavioral Scientist* 41: 541-574.

Dowling, Conor, and Michael G. Miller. 2014. "Do Funding Sources Affect Voters' Evaluations of Candidates? Evidence From Three Survey Experiments." Typescript.

#### Recommended Reading:

Brown Adam. 2012. "Does Money Buy Votes? The Case of Self-Financed Gubernatorial Candidates, 1998–2008." *Political Behavior* 7(2): 205-226.

Jacobson, Gary C. 1990. "The Effects of Campaign Spending in House Elections: New Evidence for Old Arguments." *American Journal of Political Science*. 34(2): 334-362.

Gerber, Alan. 1998. "Estimating the Effect of Campaign Spending on Senate Election Outcomes Using Instrumental Variables." *The American Political Science Review* 92(2): 401-411.

---

### **October 7: Race and Gender**

Case Study: Presidential Election of 2008. (Dual Presentation).

#### Required Reading:

Berinsky, Adam J., et al. 2011. "Sex and Race: Are Black Candidates More Likely to be Disadvantaged by Sex Scandals?" *Political Behavior* 33(2): 179-202.

Dolan, Kathleen. 2008. "Is There a 'Gender Affinity Effect' in American Politics? Information, Affect, and Candidate Sex in U.S. House Elections." *Political Research Quarterly* 61(1): 79-89.

Hopkins, Daniel J. 2009. "No More Wilder Effect, Never a Whitman Effect: When and Why Polls Mislead about Black and Female Candidates." *Journal of Politics* 71(3): 769-781.

Philpot, Tasha S., and Hanes Walton, Jr. 2007. "One of Our Own: Black Female Candidates and the Voters Who Support Them." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 49–62.

#### Recommended Reading:

Lawless, Jennifer, and Richard C. Fox. 2010. *It Still Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. Cambridge University Press.

Palmer, Barbara, and Dennis Simon. 2012. *Women and Congressional Elections: A Century of Change*. Lynne Rienner.

Lawrence, Regina G., and Melody Rose. 2009. *Hillary Clinton's Race for the White House: Gender Politics and the Media on the Campaign Trail*. Lynne Rienner.

---

## October 14: Media and Message

Case Study: Bush for President, 1988, and Clinton for President, 1992 (Dual Presentation).

### Required Reading:

Prior, Markus. 2007. *Post-Broadcast Democracy*. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 4

Hayes, Danny, and Mathieu Turgeon. 2010. "A Matter of Distinction: Candidate Polarization and Information Processing in Election Campaigns." *American Politics Research* 38(1): 165-192.

Vavreck, Lynn. 2009. *The Message Matters: The Economy and Presidential Campaigns*. Princeton University Press. Ch. 6

Lodge, Milton, and Charles S. Taber. 2013. *The Rationalizing Voter*. Cambridge University Press. Ch. 7

### Recommended Reading:

Lenz, Gabriel. 2009. "Learning and Opinion Change, Not Priming: Reconsidering the Priming Hypothesis." *American Journal of Political Science* 53(4): 821-837.

Druckman, James N. 2004. "Priming the Vote: Campaign Effects in a U.S. Senate Election." *Political Psychology* 25(4): 577-594.

Lewis-Beck, Michael, and Mary Stegmaier. 2000. "Economic Determinants of Electoral Outcomes." *Annual Review of Political Science* 3(3): 183-219.

---

## October 21: Advertising and Opinion Formation

Case Study: Presidential Election of 2004 (up to 2 students)

### Required Reading:

Brader, Ted. 2005. "Striking a Responsive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2): 388-405.

Franz, Michael M., and Travis Ridout. 2007. "Does Political Advertising Persuade?" *Political Behavior* 29(4): 465-491.

Goldstein, Kenneth, and Travis N. Ridout. 2004. "Measuring the Effects of Televised Political Advertising in the United States." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7(2): 205-226.

Gerber, Alan, et al. 2011. "How Large and Long-Lasting Are the Persuasive Effects of Televised Campaign Ads? Results From a Randomized Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 105(1): 135-150.

Huber, Gregory A, and Kevin Arceneaux. 2007. "Identifying the Persuasive Effects of Presidential Advertising." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4): 957-977.

### Recommended Reading:

Baumgartner, Jody, and Jonathan S. Morris. 2006. "The Daily Show Effect: Candidate Evaluations, Efficacy, and American Youth." *American Politics Research* 34(3): 341-367.

Hindman, Matthew. 2009. *The Myth of Digital Democracy*. Princeton University Press.

Taber, Charles S., and Milton Lodge. 2006. "Motivated Skepticism in the Evaluation of Political Beliefs." *American Journal of Political Science* 50

Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1997. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. Yale University Press. Ch. 2, Ch. 6

## October 28: Message Tone

Case Study: U.S. Senate Election: North Carolina. 2008.

### Required Reading:

Geer, John C. 2006. *In Defense of Negativity: Attack Ads in Presidential Campaigns*. U. Chicago Press. Ch. 3-5.

Sides, John, Keena Lipsitz, and Matthew Grossmann. 2010. "Do Voters Perceive Negative Campaigns as Informative Campaigns?" *American Politics Research* 38(3): 502-530.

Arceneaux, Kevin, and David Nickerson. 2010. "Comparing Negative and Positive Campaign Messages." *American Politics Research* 38(1): 54-83.

Krupnikov, Yanna. 2011. "When Does Negativity Demobilize?: Tracing the Conditional Effect of Negative Campaigning on Voter Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science* 55(4) 796-812.

### Recommended Reading:

Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Shanto Iyengar. 1997. *Going Negative: How Political Advertisements Shrink and Polarize the Electorate*. Free Press.

Fridkin, Kim L., and Patrick J. Kenney. 2008. "The Dimensions of Negative Messages." *American Politics Research* 36(5): 694-723.

Mark, David. 2006. *Going Dirty: The Art of Negative Campaigning*.

---

## November 4: Mobilization

Case Study: Maine gubernatorial election: 2014.

### Required Reading:

Rosenstone, Steven J. and John Marc Hansen. 1993. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan. Ch. 6

Gerber, Alan S, and Donald P Green. 2000. "The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment." *The American Political Science Review* 94(3): 653-663.

Nickerson, David W. 2007. "Quality Is Job One: Professional and Volunteer Voter Mobilization Calls." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(2): 269-282.

Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Christopher W. Larimer. 2008. "Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-scale Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 102(1): 33-48.

### Recommended Reading:

Alvarez, R. Michael, Asa Hopkins and Betsy Sinclair. 2010. "Mobilizing Pasadena Democrats: Measuring the Effects of Partisan Campaign Contacts." *The Journal of Politics* 72(1): 31-44.

Panagopoulos, Costas. 2011. "Timing Is Everything? Primacy and Recency Effects in Voter Mobilization Campaigns." *Political Behavior* 33(1): 79-93.

Panagopoulos, Costas. 2009. "Partisan and Nonpartisan Message Content and Voter Mobilization: Field Experimental Evidence." *Political Research Quarterly* 62(1): 70-76.

---

### **November 11: Can We Fix Elections?**

Case Study: Florida gubernatorial election: 2014.

#### Required Reading:

Miller, Michael G. 2013. *Subsidizing Democracy: How Public Funding Changes Elections, and How it Can Work in the Future*. Cornell University Press. Ch. 1-5.

Malbin, Michael J., Peter W. Brusoe, and Brendan Glavin. 2012. "Small Donors, Big Democracy: New York City's Matching Funds as a Model for the Nation and States." *Election Law Journal* 11(1): 3-20.

---

### **November 18: More Reform**

Case Study: Presidential Election of 2000 (Dual Presentation).

Mebane, Walter. 2004. "The Wrong Man is President! Overvotes in the 2000 Presidential Election in Florida" *Perspectives on Politics* 2(3): 525-535

Minnite, Lorraine C. 2013. "Voter Identification Laws: The Controversy Over Voter Fraud." In *Law and Election Politics*, Matthew Streb, ed. Routledge.

Gronke, Paul. 2013. "Early Voting: The Quiet Revolution in American Elections." In *Law and Election Politics*, Matthew Streb, ed. Routledge.

Wang, Tova Andrea. 2012. *The Politics of Voter Suppression*. Cornell University Press. Ch. 9.

---

### **November 25: Research Presentations**

---

### **December 2: Research Presentations**

---