

POLI 891 Special Topics – Contextual Effects in American Mass Politics
Monday 5:00 – 7:50, HM 351

Professor Thomas Carsey

Office: Hamilton Hall 317, Hours: Monday and Wednesday, 1:30-3:00 or by appt.

(919) 962-1207

carsey@unc.edu

<http://www.unc.edu/~carsey/>

Course Description

This course will examine different theoretical and empirical treatments of how contextual factors shape individual-level mass political behavior and opinion formation, focusing primarily on behavior. We will start with the premise that individuals are embedded in larger contextual environments, and those larger environments have an independent impact on the beliefs and behaviors of individuals. Individuals do not exist in a vacuum. They interact both passively and actively with their environments and with other individuals. These interactions provide information that allows an individual to update his/her beliefs, but they may also provide a stimulus other than information that leads an individual to change their outlook and/or behavior. In short, context may matter because it provides information upon which an individual forms beliefs that may alter behavior, but context may also affect the process of forming beliefs directly or may push behavior away from where an individual's beliefs might otherwise take them. Thus, trying to understand whether a person will vote for the Republican candidate should certainly include knowing whether the individual self-identifies as a Republican, but should also incorporate information about the partisan make-up of the context in which this individual lives. Does this person live in a predominantly Republican neighborhood? Are this person's friends and co-workers predominantly Republican? Has the voter been exposed to the Republican candidate's TV advertising? These are the sorts of questions we will consider in this course.

The idea that context matters is far from new or original. However, I would argue that the field of American Political Behavior and, to a similar degree, public opinion on the American setting has paid insufficient attention to the truism that context matters. I think this is particularly true at the micro-theoretical level as well as at the methodological level. From a theoretical perspective, most micro-level (e.g. individual-level) treatments of mass behavior focus on individual-level determinants of those behaviors. Increasingly, scholars will also include some consideration of contextual or environmental factors, but often times these are considered as variables to be added to the model, but not as potentially requiring a revision of the underlying theory. It at least seems plausible to me that theories based on treating individuals as independent and autonomous actors may not be well suited to the inclusion of contextual level factors as merely addition right-hand-side measures. My view is not that most work of this nature is explicitly wrong. Rather, what is more common is simply a failure to consider whether the original micro-level theory adapts easily to include contextual factors. The sin is generally one of omission.

A number of methodological issues also arise as soon as you open the door to thinking about how context might shape attitudes and behaviors. There are several concerns here. First, most traditional methods for conducting statistical analyses of the behaviors and opinions of individuals assume that the observations in the data set are independent and unrelated to each other. In other words, that the measures of variables for one observation are not correlated with measures for those same (or other) variables for other observations in the data set. Unless every individual in your data set experiences a completely unique and independent context, then this assumption will not hold. Moving away from the technical to the conceptual, it will be of limited value at best to employ statistical models that assume independence of observations if you are hoping to test theories that predict non-independence.

Second, most of our analyses rest on what can be thought of as random assignment of the treatment variable. In pure experiments, the treatment (potential causal effect) is studied through random

assignment of that treatment to subjects. In the observational world, we lack that ability, so instead use statistical controls. However, many of the factors we use as individual-level predictors of attitudes and behaviors are at least easily thought of as exogenous – race, gender, education, and income (to lesser degrees), and even partisanship to some extent. But many contextual factors are not. Instead, individuals choose the contexts in which they find themselves (where to live, where to work, who their friends are, what church (if any) to attend, what news to watch, etc.). If there are factors that cause both the selection of these contexts and the ultimate attitude or behavior under study, failure to account for that will lead us to incorrect conclusions about the potential causal importance of contextual factors.

A third consideration that often gets overlooked is what I think of as the effective sample size, or the effective degrees of freedom, you have available when analyzing contextual models. Suppose, for example, that you have a sample of 10,000 voters spread evenly across ten states in the U.S. Suppose further that you believe voting behavior responds to several contextual factors that vary at the state level. You may think that with a sample size of 10,000, the last thing you would need to worry about would be degrees of freedom problems stemming from the inclusion of too many independent variables. However, at the state level, you really only have 10 “observations” with which to work. Each observation within a state will take on the same value for each state-level contextual variable (e.g. all 1,000 respondents from Florida have a Republican control state government).

To summarize, I think extending the study of micro-level attitudes and behavior to include potential contextual influences demands much greater attention to both theoretical and methodological issues than is typically appreciated. It involves so much more than just a few more independent variables in a regression equation.

Finally, I should say a bit more about what I mean by “context.” I’m not one to spend a great deal of time and energy splitting hairs over differences in the terms context, environment, network, etc. For me, the key is to distinguish all of these sorts of phenomenon from individual-level factors. For me, the key point is that a number of factors take on political meaning for individuals outside of that individual’s own personal attributes. Contexts themselves exist outside of the individual. For me, contexts include the racial make-up of the neighborhood, county, or state, the network of friends and co-workers with whom someone actively interacts, the informational environment created by the media, and even institutional structures within which individuals operate. The affect of a context may result from active engagement with it (talking with friends, watching the news, etc.), or through a more passive experiencing of the environment around you (noticing yard signs, voting in single-member or multi-member districts, etc.). As a result, we have a broader range of topics to consider over the course of this semester than would be the case if I employed a more narrow definition of context. However, I think there is more to learn from observing the similarities (and differences) that exist across this broader range of contexts that would be possible with a more narrowly structured course. For example, I could teach an entire course on how formal rules structure mass behavior, or on how political campaigns do the same, but looking at both types of contexts side by side should give us a richer and deeper understanding of each of them than would be possible were we to study them in isolation.

Course Requirements

The course will be conducted as a seminar. That means that while I will provide direction and guidance along the way, the real success or failure of the seminar rests with the students. I expect our evenings together to be filled with lively and thoughtful discussion and debate of our readings and the ideas those readings provoke. That can only happen if every student accepts responsibility for coming to class prepared and ready to participate. I cannot stress this point enough – there are no short-cuts in the process of getting a Ph.D. You simply have to put in the work now. Remember, you are not just trying to get through each Monday night. You are completing a course, you are completing a semester, you are studying for prelims, you are preparing to write and defend a dissertation, you are preparing for the job market. In short, you are preparing for a career as a professional political scientist. The day-to-day work

you do adds up to become the type of political scientist you will be. Gaps in your work now lead to lost time trying to make up for it later and/or weaknesses in your overall development down the road.

The bulk of the required readings will be journal articles and book chapters. Most are available online. Those that are not will be made available to you. There are no books required for this course.

Assignments and Grading

Students will be evaluated on the standard graduate school grading scale employed at UNC: H = High Pass, P=Pass, L=Low Pass, F=Fail. I will not grade this course on any sort of curve. The grade will be based on performance on several assignments.

Seminar Participation (15%): Students are expected to come to class each week and to participate actively and constructively in the discussion. Saying nothing will be unsatisfactory, but just saying anything won't help much either. Demonstrating a careful reading and consideration of the material is what counts. Of course, that does not mean I will be keeping score on how many things you say that are "right" or "wrong." In some cases, there will be clear right and wrong answers, but in many others, the answer will not be obvious. Further, good questions about matters that were confusing are often more helpful than simple statements that, while correct, do not really further the discussion. In other words, I do not want you to feel concerned about voicing uncertainty, raising disagreements, or having others disagree with you. Quite the contrary, I view these as essential elements of meaningful discussion. We won't learn anything if we all agree with each other every week. You should also be aware that I will take on the role of disagreeing with a point for pedagogical reasons at times, so you shouldn't necessarily assume that when I argue with you that I actually disagree with you. Finally, it is important that we all learn how to engage in lively and stimulating debate that is both challenging, yet also respectful. You will need this skill in your professional life, so we should work to develop it now.

Weekly Reaction Papers (10%): Every week, you will be required to write and submit a reaction paper to that week's readings **BEFORE** the class meets. Your reaction papers will be due by Noon on each Monday that we are meeting unless otherwise directed. I **strongly** prefer that you submit your reaction papers to me as an e-mail attachment in a form that I can access and edit with MS Word. The Reaction papers should be critical assessment of the week's readings. They should NOT be simple summaries (I've already read the articles). So, don't tell me what they say, tell me what you think about what they say. Critique the theory, the methods, the conclusions, etc. These papers should only be about 1 to 1½ pages long, single spaced. So, you need to write them very tightly. Some weeks, your papers might come together as a single coherent essay. Other weeks, it might feel more like a few very distinct paragraphs. That's O.K. The point is to cut right to the heart of what you think are the important theoretical, methodological and/or substantive issues raised by the readings and offer a critique. Note also that you cannot successfully complete these papers by focusing on only one or two of the readings each week. I do not intend to keep a strict count of exactly how many of the readings you comment on each week, but keep in mind that I wouldn't put an article on the syllabus if I didn't think there was something to be learned from reading it. Every Reaction paper must conclude with 2 or 3 research questions provoked by that week's readings. Each one should be a short paragraph where you outline an idea for a study. You might suggest a new model, different data that could be used, or a design that merges what are treated as two contesting theories into a broader more general single theory. Again, I want these to be concrete in the sense of presenting the core kernel of an idea that could, in theory, emerge into a paper.

This is a lot to do in 1 to 1½ pages. It will take some time to get good at writing these, but it is a valuable skill. Just keep in mind that it is your ideas that matter here, not flowery prose, so you should spend much more time thinking than writing each week.

Seminar Paper (35%): You will write a full-blown research paper for this course. It should take the basic form of a refereed journal article (like the many you will be reading for this course). That is, you need a research question grounded in theory, hypotheses generated from that theory, an empirical evaluation of those hypotheses, and a conclusion. I won't require that the paper be quantitative, but my tendency is to think in those terms. There is no specific page requirement, but my experience suggests that papers that are 15 pages or less of text tend to be under-developed while papers over 25-30 pages of text would often be better if shorter. Note that one acceptable alternative would be a replication and extension of an existing published paper. However, the extension needs to be "meaningful." Finally, while the paper can be related to previous work you have done or work you are doing for another class, it needs to be a distinctively new paper. For those who have ideas about a thesis or dissertation, this might be a great opportunity to pursue that work.

We will talk regularly about the paper over the course of the semester in class, and I expect that I'll see most of you in my office outside of class as well. I will have several deadlines throughout the semester where I expect you to show me progress. However, the only aspect of the paper that is graded will be the final version you turn in to me. That said, it is VERY important that you get started on this right away. You cannot bang out a quality paper over the week-end, and you need to build in time for the inevitable problems with data, writing, etc. that occur.

Seminar Paper critiques (5%): On April 16th, each of you will turn in a complete draft of your paper. At that point, you will give a draft to me and a draft to two other students in the class. At the same time, you will receive drafts from two other students in the class. **By Noon on Friday, April 20th**, you will provide written feedback for the authors of the two drafts that you received (copies of your comments are sent to me as well). You can e-mail these comments both to your authors and to me. Your responsibility is to provide feedback that will help the authors improve their papers. Point out strengths, note weaknesses, raise challenges, and make suggestions for alternatives. Think of these as the type of comments you wished you received when you submit a paper for publication or present one at a conference. Remember, you are not helping the paper improve if you only provide generic praise. I expect you to write at least one full single-spaced page of comments for each paper, and you should stop if you get to three (just because you need to manage your time). I will also be providing each of you with written comments at the same time. Once I know who is writing what, I'll construct the pairings.

Seminar Paper presentations (10%): Monday, April 23rd, our last class meeting, will be devoted to paper presentations. Each student will present his/her paper to the class. Each presentation will last 10-15 minutes, followed by time for Q&A. I will invite other graduate students and faculty to attend these presentations. Students will have different levels of experience with having done this, and I will take that into account. However, I expect these presentations to be of professional quality. Again, think about the type of presentation you would like to give of your paper at APSA the year you are on the job market (and hoping someone in the audience might be hiring!). To get all of these in might force us to run long that night – I'll buy the pizza!

Final Exam (25%): The course will include a final exam. The exam will take the format of a prelim. As such, students will have eight (8) hours to write their answers for the final exam for this course. You will receive the questions in the morning and return your answers at the end of the working day. The exam itself will have a limited number of broad essay questions. Students will be allowed to use notes, books, and any other similar materials, but will NOT be permitted to discuss the exam with anyone (students, other faculty, etc. are all excluded). Ultimately, you are on your own honor, and I have no reason to expect any problems, but any suspicions on my part will be investigated. We will hammer out the specific format and logistics regarding the final exam in class as the end of the semester approaches.

Communication

I make every effort to communicate to you my expectations, your responsibilities, and the substantive information covered in this course. I will send e-mails to the entire class. I maintain a Blackboard site for the class, and I will make announcements and issue some reminders in class. Note that I will only send e-mail out to your UNC e-mail accounts as listed on the course roster in Blackboard. I will not keep track of any other e-mail addresses that you might use. I am also very easy to reach if you need to communicate with me. Come to my office hours, call my office, or even better, send me an e-mail. It is important for you to stay in touch, particularly if any problems arise. I or any faculty member will be much more understanding if you just communicate with us up front and early if there is a problem.

A Note on Academic Honesty

In order for me to evaluate your work fairly, you have to do your own work. It is much easier to study, work hard, and complete your own assignments than it is to try and figure out some way to “beat the system” without getting caught. Cheating, plagiarism, and all other forms of academic dishonesty are pretty easy to spot and come with severe consequences. All students should familiarize themselves with the Academic Honor Code at UNC (<http://honor.unc.edu/honor/code.html>). Students caught cheating in any form in this course may receive an F for the course and may be turned over for further disciplinary action by the University. By taking this class, you have committed to comply with all aspects of the Honor Code regarding all aspects of this course.

Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities needing academic accommodation should; (1) contact the office of Learning Disabilities at UNC (<http://www.unc.edu/depts/lds/index.html>), (2) bring a letter to the instructor indicating the need for accommodation and what type. This should be done during the first week of class.

Responsibilities

The success of this course depends upon all of us meeting our responsibilities. I am responsible for being prepared each week to present and discuss course material, for challenging you academically and stimulating your curiosity, and for being available for and responsive to your questions and inquiries. You are responsible for being prepared each week as well, for asking questions when you are confused and actively engaging the material, for doing your own work, for meeting the course requirements, and for pushing yourselves to get the most out of this course that you can. Ultimately, this is your education and you should take responsibility for it.

Course Schedule

Below is a semester-long schedule for the course. There may be some need to adjust it here and there as we proceed, but I expect to follow the basic structure of the schedule pretty closely. Remember, you need to read the required reading each week before coming to class. JSTOR refers to articles available on JSTOR. Blackboard lists items I will post on the Blackboard site. E-Journal Finder at UNC means the article is available online by finding the journal itself through UNC’s main library website using the E-Journal Finder search engine.

January 15th: MLK Day – No Class

January 22nd: Introduction to the Problem of Contextual Effects

Required Reading:

Przeworski, Adam and Henry Teune. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*, New York: Wiley & Sons. Chapters 1-3 **(Blackboard)**

Zuckerman, Alan S. 2005. "Returning to the Social Logic of Political Behavior." in *The Social Logic of Politics*, ed. Alan S. Zuckerman. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. Chapter 1. **(Blackboard)**

Sprague, John. 1982. "Is There a Micro Theory Consistent with Contextual Analysis?" in *Strategies of Political Inquiry*, ed. Elinor Ostrom. Beverly Hills: Sage. Chapter 4 **(Blackboard)**

Hogg, Michael A., Deborah J. Terry, and Katherine M. White. 1995. "A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(4): 255-69. **(JSTOR)**

Deaux, Kay and Daniela Martin. 2003. "Interpersonal Networks and Social Categories: Specifying Levels of Context in Identity Processes." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 66(2): 101-17. **(JSTOR)**

January 29th: Theory, Methods, and Models of Contextual Analysis

Required Reading:

Steenbergen, Marco R. and Bradford S. Jones. 2002. "Modeling Multilevel Data Structures." *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(1): 218-37. **(JSTOR)**

Luke, Douglas A. 2004. *Multilevel Modeling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Chapters 1-2) **(Blackboard)**

Jusko, Karen Long and W. Phillips Shively. 2005. "Applying a Two-Step Strategy to the Analysis of Cross-National Public Opinion Data," *Political Analysis*. 13(4):327-44. **(E-Journal Finder at UNC)**

Green, Donald P. and Lynn Vavreck. 2006. "Eight Things You Should Know Before Analyzing Cluster-Randomized Field Experiments." Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting. **(Blackboard)**.

Franzese, Robert J. Jr. 2005. "Empirical Strategies for Various Manifestations of Multilevel Data," *Political Analysis*. 13(4): 430-46. **(E-Journal Finder at UNC)**

Achen, Christopher H. and W. Phillips Shively. 1995. *Cross-Level Inference*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 9. **(Blackboard)**

Arceneaux, Kevin, Alan S. Gerber, and Donald P. Green. 2006. "Comparing Experimental and Matching Methods Using a Large-Scale Voter Mobilization Experiment." *Political Analysis*. 14(1): 37-62. **(E-Journal Finder at UNC)**.

February 5th: The Contextual Effects of Race

Turn in a one-page statement regarding your proposed research paper.

Wright, Gerald C. 1977. "Contextual Models of Electoral Behavior: The Southern Wallace Vote." *American Political Science Review* 71:497-508. **(JSTOR)**

Voss, DS. 1996. "Beyond Racial Threat: Failure of an Old Hypothesis in the New South." *Journal of Politics*, 58(4):1156-1170. **(JSTOR)**

Giles, MW, and M.A. Buckner. 1996. "Beyond Racial Threat: Failure of an Old Hypothesis in the New South: Comment." *Journal of Politics* 58(4): 1171-1180. **(JSTOR)**

Baybeck, Brady. 2006. "Sorting Out the Competing Effects of Racial Context." *Journal of Politics*, 68(2): 386-96. **(E-Journal Finder)**

Campbell, Andrea Louise, Cara Wong, and Jack Citrin. 2006. "'Racial Threat', Partisan Climate, and Direct Democracy: Contextual Effects in Three California Initiatives." *Political Behavior*. 28(2): 129-50. **(E-Journal Finder)**

Huber, Gregory A. and John S. Lapinski. 2006. "The 'Race Card' Revisited: Assessing Racial Priming in Policy Contexts." *American Journal of Political Science*. 50(2): 421-440. **(E-Journal Finder)**

Branton, Regina P. and Bradford S. Jones. 2005. "Reexamining Racial Attitudes: The Conditional Relationship Between Diversity and Socioeconomic Environment." *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(2): 359-72. **(E-Journal Finder)**

February 12th Racial and Ethnic Contexts.

Cho, Wendy K. Tam. 2003. "Contagion Effects and Ethnic Contribution Networks." *AJPS*: 47(2): 368-87.

Gay, Claudine. 2006. "Seeing Difference: The Effect of Economic Disparity on Black Attitudes toward Latinos." *AJPS*. 50(4): 982-97.

Gay, Claudine. 2004. "Putting Race in Context: Identifying the Environmental Determinants of Black Racial Attitudes." *APSR*. 98(4): 547-62.

Branton, Regina P. 2004. "Voting in Initiative Elections: Does the Context of Racial and Ethnic Diversity Matter?" *SPPQ*. 4(3): 294-317.

McClerking, Harwood K. 2001. "Looking for 'Threats' in All the Wrong Places: A Critique of the Current Use of Race as a Contextual Effect in Political Science." *Politics and Policy*. 29:637-49.

Huckfeldt, Robert. 1983 "The Social Contexts of Ethnic Politics: Ethnic Loyalties, Political Loyalties, and Social Support." *APQ*. 99:91-123.

February 19th Religion and Context

Huckfeldt, Robert, Eric Plutzer, and John Sprague. 1993. "Alternative Contexts of Political Behavior: Churches, Neighborhoods, and Individuals." *JOP*. 55(2):365-81.

Jelen, Ted G. 1992. "Political Christianity: A Contextual Analysis." *AJPS*. 36(3): 692-714.

Moore, Laura M. and Reeve Vanneman. 2003. "Context Matters: Effects of the Proportion of Fundamentalists on Gender Attitudes." *Social Forces*. 82(1): 115-39.

McKenzie, Brian D. 2004. "Religious Social Networks, Indirect Mobilization, and African-American Political Participation." *PRQ*. 57:621-32.

Layman, Geoffrey C. and John C. Green. 2005. "Wars and Rumours of Wars: the Contexts of Cultural Conflict in American Political Behavior." *BJPS*. 36: 61-89.

February 26th: Neighborhoods and Social Interaction

Turn in research questions, proposed hypotheses, plan for evaluating hypotheses, and core bibliography.

Finifter, Ada. 1974. "The Friendship Group as a Protective Environment for Political Deviants." *APSR*. 68: 607-25.

Granovetter, Mark. 1983. "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited." *Sociological Theory*, 1: 201-33.

Huckfeldt, Robert and John Sprague. 1987. "Networks in Context: The Social Flow of Political Information." *APSR*. 81:1197-1216.

Grober, Jens and Author Schram. 2006. "Neighborhood Information Exchange and Voter Participation: an Experimental Study." *APSR*. 100(2): 235-48.

Mutz, Diana C. 2002. "Cross-Cutting Social Networks: Testing Democratic Theory in Practice." *APSR*. 96(2): 111-26.

Mutz, Diana C. and Jeffery J. Mondak. 2006. "The Workplace as a Context for Cross-Cutting Political Discourse." *JOP*. 68(1): 140-55.

March 5th Opinion Leadership

Roch, Christine H. 2005. "The Dual Roots of Opinion Leadership" *JOP*. 67(1): 110-31.

McClurg, Scott D. 2006. "The Electoral Relevance of Political Talk: Examining Disagreement and Expertise Effects in Social Networks on Political Participation." *AJPS*. 50(3):737-54.

Putnam, Robert. 1966. "Political Attitudes and the Local Community." *APSR*. 60:640-54.

Weimann, Gabriel. 1991. "The Influentials: Back to the Concept of Opinion Leaders?" *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 55(2): 267-79.

Huckfeldt, Robert. 2001. "The Social Communication of Political Expertise." *AJPS*, 45(2): 425-38.

March 12th Spring Break – No Class

March 19th Deliberation

Michael X. Delli Carpini, Fay Lomax Cook, and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2004. "Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature." *Annual Review of Political Science*. 7:315-44.

Stasavage, David. 2007. "Polarization and Publicity: Rethinking the Benefits of Deliberative Democracy." *JOP* 59-72.

Jackman, Simon and Paul M. Sniderman. 2006. "The Limits of Deliberative Discussion: A Model of Everyday Political Arguments." *JOP*. 68(2): 272-83. (formal and empirical)

Barabas, Jason. 2004. "How Deliberation Affects Policy Opinions." *APSR*. 98(4):687-701.

Druckman, James N. and Kjersten r. Nelson. 2003. "Framing and Deliberation: How Citizens' Conversations Limit Elite Influence." *AJPS*. 47(4): 729-45.

Price, V, J. N. Cappella, and L. Nir. 2002. "Does Disagreement Contribute to More Deliberative Opinion?" *Political Communication*. 19(1): 95-112.

March 26th : Media Effects

Turn in a rough draft of your paper.

Jerit, Jennifer, Jason Barabas and Toby Bolsen. 2006. "Citizens, Knowledge, and the Information Environment." *AJPS*, 50(2): 266-82.

Hibbing, John R. and Elizabeth Theiss-Morese. 1998. "The Media's Role in Public Negativity Toward Congress: Distinguishing Emotional Reactions and Cognitive Evaluations." *AJPS*. 42(2): 475-98.

Mutz, Diana,C. and Paul S. Martin. 2001. "Facilitating Communication Across Lines of Political Difference: The Role of Mass Media." *APSR*: 95(1): 97-114.

Druckman, James N. and Michael Parkin. 2005. "The Impact of Media Bias: How Editorial Slant Affects Voters." *JOP*. 67(4): 1030-49.

Mutz, Diana C. and Byron Reeves. 2005. "The New Videomalaise: Effects of Televised Incivility on Political Trust." *APSR*. 99(1): 1-15.

Bartels, Larry M. 1993. "Messages Received: The Political Impact of Media Exposure." *APSR*. 87:267-85.

April 2nd Campaign Effects

Riker, William H. 1990. "Heresthetic and Rhetoric in the Spatial Model." in *Advances in the Spatial Theory of Voting*, edited by James M. Enelow and Melvin J. Hinich. Cambridge U. Press. pp. 46-65.

Freedman, Paul, Michael Franz, and Kenneth Goldstein. 2004. "Campaign Advertising and Democratic Citizenship." *AJPS*. 48(4): 723-41.

Brader, Ted. 2005. "Striking a Responsive Cord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions." *AJPS*. 49(2): 388-405. (experiments with ads).

Druckman, James N. 2004. "Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects." *APSR*. 98(4):671-86.

Lenz, Gabriel S. nd. "Learning and Opinion Change, Not Priming: Reconsidering the Evidence for the Priming Hypothesis." unpublished paper.

Kam, Cindy D. 2006. "Political Campaigns and Open-Minded Thinking." *JOP*. 68(4): 931-45.

April 9th Institutions

Weldon, Steven A. 2006. "The Institutional Context of Tolerance for Ethnic Minorities: A Comparative, Multilevel Analysis of Western Europe." *AJPS*. 50(2): 331-49.

Wolfinger, Raymond e., Benjamin Highton, and Megan Mullin. 2005. "How Postregistration Laws Affect the Turnout of Citizens Registered to Vote." *SPPQ*. 5(1):1-23.

Rudolph, Thomas J. 2003. "Institutional Context and the Assignment of Political Responsibility." *JOP*. 65(1):190-215.

Keele, Luke. 2005. "The Authorities Really Do Matter: Party Control and Trust in Government." *JOP*. 67(3): 873-86.

Tomz, Michael and Robert P. Van Houweling. 2003. "How Does Voting Equipment Affect the Racial Gap in Voided Ballots?" *AJPS*. 74(1): 46-60.

Barreto, Matt A. Gary M. Segura, and Nathan d. Woods. 2004. "The Mobilizing Effect of Majority-Minority Districts on Latino Turnout." *APSR*. 98(1): 65-75.

April 16th: Wrapping Up.

Turn in a Complete Draft of your paper. (NOTE: Written Comments due back to authors and to Prof. Carsey by Noon on Friday, April 20th)

Beck, Paul Allen, Russell J. Dalton, Steven Greene, and Robert Huckfeldt. 2002. "The Social Calculus of Voting: Interpersonal, Media, and Organizational Influences on Presidential Choices." APSR. 96(1): 57-73.

Sapiro, Virginia. 2004. "Not Your Parents' Political Socialization" Introduction for a New Generation." Annual Review of Political Science. 7:1-23.

Bartels, Brandon L. 2006. "Heterogeneity in Supreme Court Decision Making: How Case-Level Factors Shape Preference-Based Behavior." unpublished paper.

April 23rd Paper Presentations

Final Paper Due on Monday, April 30th at Noon.

Final Exam – Date and Time TBA