

**GRADUATE SEMINAR  
PSC 536 – AMERICAN POLITICAL PARTIES**

Spring Semester, 2015  
Wednesdays 6-8:50 PM  
502 Park Hall  
e-mail: [jcampbel@buffalo.edu](mailto:jcampbel@buffalo.edu)

Prof. James E. Campbell  
Office: 511 Park Hall  
Office Hours: Tues. & Thurs. 2-4pm  
Phone: 645-8452

**INTRODUCTION**

Perhaps the most famous sentence in the vast literature and long history of studies of American political parties is the opening sentence of Professor Clinton Rossiter's 1960 book on *Parties and Politics in America*. Rossiter wrote: "NO America without democracy, no democracy without politics, no politics without parties, no parties without compromise and moderation." Although the last segment of Rossiter's claim might be questioned in the face of the intense partisan polarization of recent decades and some skeptical reformers might even challenge the first premise of the statement, the centrality of political parties to organizing political conflict in American government as well as in the American public seems beyond dispute. The importance of political parties and partisanship has had its ups and downs, but even at their weakest point during the dealignment or decomposition phase that the major parties went through in the 1970s and early 1980s, American politics could only be understood well by understanding American party politics—the intra-party politics as well as inter-party politics. This course is an attempt to chart out the broad range of research on American party politics, from internal party processes to inter-party competition and at both the mass, activist, and leadership levels.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION**

The course grade for each student in this class will be based on the following four components:

Discussion Leadership	15%
Observation Papers & Class Participation	30%
Term Paper	25%
Final Exam	30%
Or, in lieu of the term paper and final exam, a research paper (55%)	

**Discussion Leaders:** Every student will be assigned to be a discussion leader for a week. You are responsible for taking a leadership role for the all the assigned reading in that week. For the meeting in which you are the discussion leader you should be especially well versed about the week's reading and should help direct the class discussion, either through questions or comments designed to provoke further analysis of the reading, its methodological soundness, its theoretical contribution, its general importance, and implications for other research. Discussion leaders should present a brief (no more than 6 to 8 minutes) summary of the book at the beginning of the class meeting. You should clearly present the following information:

- (1.) what is the research question and hypotheses?
- (2.) why is the research question important?
- (3.) how did the authors attempt to answer the research question (what were the data and how were they analyzed)? and
- (4.) what was the answer to the research question?

You should *not* present a lengthy summary of the book. After this brief presentation and any clarifying questions from other class participants, your responsibility is to raise questions and offer commentary to spur discussion in order to illuminate the quality and importance of the research presented in the book.

**Class Participation.** Active class discussion and preparation is a major component of any good seminar. It should go without saying, but I will say it in any case, that attendance at and preparation for every class meeting is expected. You should also bring your copy of the week's book and articles with your notes on it to each class. Each student, whether leading the discussion or not, should be well-prepared and should participate actively and thoughtfully in the class discussions. Each student will also be assigned three weeks in which he or she is required to prepare in writing a critical (positive, neutral, or negative) comment or question regarding the week's reading. These are the **reading observation papers**. This should be brief, normally a single paragraph. They should be sent via e-mail to other members of the class by at least 11pm of the Tuesday evening before the Wednesday night class. Several of these comments may be read for the class. The comments should concern the reading as political science and absolutely not as literature. That is, comments regarding whether or not you think that a book is well-written are NOT appropriate for these observation papers. You will not receive a grade on these papers per se, unless they are unacceptable. However, your grade for participation may be affected by how insightful these papers are about the readings.

Discussion leader assignments have been randomly assigned and will be distributed at the first class meeting. Late registrants to the course will be assigned to achieve balance in coverage of the material.

**Term Paper.** Since graduate students and junior faculty are often unaware of a good deal of older research and since a major premise of any discipline, particularly a scientific one, is that knowledge is cumulative and builds in one way or another on prior research, the term paper assignment for the course is to write a critical book analysis paper on one of the classic books that have been written on American political parties. The subfield of American political parties has a rich research tradition and I have pared down the list of "classics" in the subfield to 25 books from which you are to choose to write on one. The list is as follows:

### *25 Classic Studies of American Political Parties*

- Aldrich, John H. 1980. *Before the Conventions: Strategies and Choices in Presidential Nomination Campaigns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bartels, Larry M. 1988. *Presidential Primaries and the Dynamics of Public Choice*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bond, Jon R. and Richard Fleisher. 1990. *The President in the Legislative Arena*. Chicago:

University of Chicago Press.

- Burnham, Walter Dean. 1970. *Critical Elections and the Mainsprings of American Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Burns, James McGregor. 1967. *The Deadlock of Democracy: Four-Party Politics in America*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Clubb, Jerome M., William H. Flanigan, and Nancy H. Zingale. 1980. *Partisan Realignment: Voters, Parties, and Government in American History*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Converse, Philip E. 1976. *The Dynamics of Party Support: Cohort-Analyzing Party Identification*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Cotter, Cornelius P., James L. Gibson, John F. Bibby, and Robert J. Huckshorn. 1984. *Party Organizations in American Politics*. New York: Praeger.
- Hofstadter, Richard. 1969. *The Idea of a Party System: The Rise of Legitimate Opposition in the United States, 1780-1840*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Miller, Warren E. And M. Kent Jennings. 1986. *Parties in Transitions: A Longitudinal Study of Party Elites and Party Supporters*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Page, Benjamin I. 1978. *Choices and Echoes in Presidential Elections*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Polsby, Nelson W. 1983. *Consequences of Party Reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ranney, Austin. 1976. *Curing the Mischiefs of Faction: Party Reform in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ranney, Austin. 1954. *The Doctrine of Responsible Party Government*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Rapoport, Ronald B. and Walter J. Stone. 2005. *Three's a Crowd: The Dynamics of Third Parties, Ross Perot, and Republican Resurgence*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Riker, William. 1962. *The Theory of Political Coalitions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rohde, David W. 1991. *Parties and Leaders in the Post-Reform House*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rosenstone, Steven J., Roy L. Behr, and Edward H. Lazarus. 1984. *Third Parties in America, Second Edition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Scammon, Richard M. and Ben J. Wattenberg. 1971. *The Real Majority*. New York: Coward, McCann, and Geoghegan.
- Schattschneider, E.E. 1942. *Party Government*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Schlesinger, Joseph A. 1994. *Political Parties and the Winning of Office*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Sinclair, Barbara. 2006. *Party Wars: Polarization and the Politics of National Policy Making*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Sundquist, James L. 1983. *Dynamics of the Party System: Alignment and Realignment of Political Parties in the United States, Revised Edition*. Washington, DC: Brookings.
- Trilling, Richard J. 1976. *Party Image and Electoral Behavior*. New York: Wiley (and Mark D. Brewer, 2009. *Party Images in the American Electorate*. New York: Routledge.)
- Wilson, James Q. 1962. *The Amateur Democrat*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Next week, you will be asked to pick one of these for your paper assignment. No book can be selected by more than one student. You may not get your first pick, so rank order your top three or four picks. You will have an opportunity to select your book in a random draft.

As to the essay: You should write a 10 to 12 page paper (double-spaced) on one of the classic studies of American parties listed above. The essay should address how the study influenced or did not influence subsequent research in its subfield. What was or might have been its contribution to research on its topic? In retrospect, what was its particular strengths or weaknesses? How did future research extend, revise, or refute the study's conceptual framework, findings, or conclusions? What research questions posed or suggested by the classic study are still open for further investigation? Which of these questions you wish to address is up to you. The paper, however, should in some way place the classic study in the broader context of research on its subject. In what respects was political science successful or unsuccessful in building upon this study and why? Be specific in making and supplying evidence of your claims and thoroughly reference your essay.

**Final Examination:** The final component of your grade is a take-home final examination. It will consist of two essay questions. The questions will be distributed at the last class meeting and will be due eight days later. The essays are limited to eight pages each (double-spaced, 12 point font, 1 inch margins).

**Research Project Option:** An option to writing the term paper and taking the final examination is to conduct research project and prepare a paper on it. The topic for the research paper must be approved by me before the end of the fourth week in the semester.

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

## COURSE READINGS

The following seven books have been ordered through the UB Bookstore:

- (1.) John H. Aldrich. 2011. *Why Parties? A Second Look*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (2.) Mark Brewer and L. Sandy Maisel (eds.). 2013. *The Parties Respond: Changes in American Parties and Campaigns, Fifth Edition*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- (3.) John C. Green, Daniel J. Coffey, and David B. Cohen (eds.). 2014. *The State of the Parties: The Changing Role of Contemporary American Parties, 7<sup>th</sup> edition*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- (4.) Donald Green, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 2004. *Partisan Hearts and Minds*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.
- (5.) Marty Cohen, David Karol, Hans Noel, and John Zaller. 2008. *The Party Decides: Presidential Nominations Before and After Reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (6.) David R. Mayhew. 2004. *Electoral Realignments: A Critique of an American Genre*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- (7.) David R. Mayhew. 2013. *Partisan Balance: Why Political Parties Don't Kill the U.S. Constitutional System*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.



## CLASS TOPICS & READING ASSIGNMENTS

### **WEEK 1. JANUARY 28**

The Syllabus and Course Requirements

Introduction: American Political Parties Subfield

A Mediating Institution: Organizing Political Conflict  
Aggregation and Articulation

Mass and Elite

Intra-Party and Inter-Party

Responsible Party Government

Polarized Parties, Policy Gridlock, and Divided Government

Partisanship in Recent Elections: 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014

The Polarization Book

Chapter 6: Why are Parties More Polarized?

Chapter 7: Is Party Polarization One-Sided or Asymmetric? And if so, why?

Chapter 8: On the Median Voter Puzzle: Why are Parties Polarized at All?

### **WEEK 2. FEBRUARY 4**

#### **Types of Parties and Why Parties?**

##### ***Read:***

William E. Wright. 1971. "Comparative Party Models: Rational-Efficient and Party Democracy,"  
In *A Comparative Study of Party Organization*, ed., William E. Wright. Columbus, OH:  
Charles E. Merrill Publishing, pp.17-54.

##### **Brewer and Maisel (ed.) *The Parties Respond:***

Jeffrey M. Stonecash, "Political Science and the Study of Parties," (chapter 1).

Nicol C. Rae, "The Diminishing Oddness of American Political Parties," (chapter 2).

Aldrich, *Why Parties? A Second Look*. Chapters 1-3 (pp. 3-101).

Discussion Leaders:

Reading Observations:

### **WEEK 3. FEBRUARY 11**

##### ***Read:***

Aldrich, *Why Parties? A Second Look*. Chapters 4-9 (pp. 102-323).

Discussion Leaders:

Reading Observations:

## **WEEK 4. FEBRUARY 18**

### **Party Identification I**

#### **Read:**

Michael S. Lewis-Beck, William G. Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, and Herbert F. Weisberg. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*: “The Impact of Party Identification,” (chapter 6) and “The Development of Party Identification” (chapter 7) [pages 111-160].

Larry M. Bartels. 2000. “Partisanship and Voting Behavior, 1952-1996,” *American Journal of Political Science* 44: 35-50.

#### **Brewer and Maisel (ed.) *The Parties Respond*:**

Mark D. Brewer, “Attempts to Build a Winner,” (chapter 3).

#### **Green, Coffey, and Cohen (eds.), *The State of the Parties*:**

Alan I. Abramowitz, “Partisan Nation: The Rise of Affective Partisanship in the American Electorate,” (chapter 2).

David C. Kimball, Bryce Summary, and Eric C. Vorst, “Political Identity and Party Polarization in the American Electorate,” (chapter 3).

Edward G. Carmines, Michael J. Ensley, and Michael W. Wagner, “Why American Political Parties Can’t Get Beyond the Left-Right Divide,” (chapter 4).

Discussion Leaders:

Reading Observations:

#### Recommended:

Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*: “The Impact of Party Identification,” (chapter 6) and “The Development of Party Identification” (chapter 7) [pages 120-167].

## **WEEK 5. FEBRUARY 25**

### **Party Identification II**

#### **Read:**

Green, Palmquist, and Schickler, *Partisan Hearts and Minds*.

Discussion Leaders:

Reading Observations:

## **WEEK 6. MARCH 4**

### **Macropartisanship**

#### **Read:**

Philip E. Converse. 1966. “The Concept of the ‘Normal Vote’,” In *Elections and the Political Order*, ed. Angus Campbell, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. New York: Wiley.

Michael B. MacKuen, Robert S. Erikson, and James A. Stimson. 1989. “Macropartisanship,” *American Political Science Review*, 83 (4): 1125-42.

Robert S. Erikson, Michael B. MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 1989. “What Moves Macropartisanship? A Response to Green, Palmquist, and Schickler,” *American Political Science Review*, 92 (4): 901-12.

- Paul R. Abramson and Charles W. Ostrom, Jr. 1991. "Macropartisanship: An Empirical Reassessment," *American Political Science Review*, 85 (1): 181-92.
- Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, and Renee M. Smith. 1996. "The Dynamics of Aggregate Partisanship," *American Political Science Review*, 90 (3): 567-80.
- Michael F. Meffert, Helmut Norpoth, and Anirudh V. S. Ruhil. 2001. "Realignment and Macropartisanship," *American Political Science Review*, 95 (4): 953-62.
- James E. Campbell. 2010. "Explaining Politics, Not Polls: Examining Macropartisanship with Recalibrated NES Data," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 74, (4): 616-42.

Discussion Leaders:  
Reading Observations:

## **WEEK 7. MARCH 11**

### **Realignment I**

#### **Read:**

Mayhew, *Electoral Realignments*.

Discussion Leaders:  
Reading Observations from:

#### Recommended:

- Key, V. O. Jr. 1955. "A Theory of Critical Elections." *Journal of Politics* 17: 3-18.
- Key, V. O. Jr. 1959. "Secular Realignment and the Party System." *Journal of Politics* 21: 198-210.
- Theodore Rosenof. 2003. *Realignment: The Theory that Changed the Way We Think about American Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.\* This was ordered for the class, but it is no longer in print.

## **SPRING BREAK – MARCH 18**

## **WEEK 8. MARCH 25**

### **Realignment II**

#### **Read:**

Brewer and Maisel (ed.) *The Parties Respond*:

- Alan Abramowitz, "American Political Parties in an Age of Polarization," (chapter 13)
- Bullock, Charles S., III. 1988. "Regional Realignment from an Officeholding Perspective." *Journal of Politics* 50:553-574.
- Norpoth, Helmut. 1987. "Under Way and Here to Stay: Party Realignment in the 1980s?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51: 376-391.
- Petrocik, John R. 1987. "Realignment: New Party Coalitions and the Nationalization of the South." *Journal of Politics* 49: 347-375.
- Miller, Warren E. 1991. "Party Identification, Realignment, and Party Voting: Back to the Basics," *American Political Science Review* 85:557-568.
- Hetherington, Marc J. 2001. "Resurgent Mass Partisanship: The Role of Elite Polarization," *American Political Science Review* 95: 619-631.
- Campbell, James E. 2006. "Party Systems and Realignments in the United States, 1868-2004," *Social Science History*, v.30, issue 3 (Fall), pp.359-86.

Green, Coffey, and Cohen (eds.), *The State of the Parties:*

Jeffrey M. Stonecash, “A Perfect Storm: Presidential-House Elections, Policy, and Congressional Polarization,” (chapter 5).

Discussion Leaders:

Reading Observations:

## **WEEK 9. APRIL 1**

### **Party Nominations I**

#### ***Read:***

Cohen, Karol, Noel, and Zaller, *The Party Decides*. Chapters 1-7 (pp.1-234)

Discussion Leader:

Reading Observations from:

## **WEEK 10. APRIL 8**

### **Party Nominations II**

#### ***Read:***

Cohen, Karol, Noel, and Zaller, *The Party Decides*. Chapters 8-10 (pp.235-362)

Green, Coffey, and Cohen (eds.), *The State of the Parties:*

Caitlin E. Jewitt, “Republicans and Reform: The 2012 Presidential Nomination Rules,” (chapter 16).

Brewer and Maisel (ed.) *The Parties Respond:*

Barabara Norrander, “Parties and the Presidential Nominating Contests,” (chapter 7).

James E. Campbell. 2005. “Nomination Politics, Party Unity, and Presidential Elections,” In *Understanding the Presidency, Third Edition*, edited by James P. Pfiffner and Roger H. Davidson, (New York: Pearson Longman, 2005), chapter 13, pp.71-84.

Discussion Leader:

Reading Observations from:

## **WEEK 11. APRIL 15**

### **Party Activists**

#### ***Read:***

Green, Coffey, and Cohen (eds.), *The State of the Parties:*

Ronald B. Rapoport, Meridith Dost, and Walter J. Stone, “The Tea Party, Republican Factionalism, and the 2012 Election,” (chapter 10).

Peter L. Francia and Jonathan S. Morris, “The Divided Republicans? Tea Party Supporters, Establishment Republicans, and Social Networks,” (chapter 11).

William J. Miller and Michael John Burton, “Allies and Anatagonists: The Tea Party Impact on the Republican Party,” (chapter 12).



Brewer and Maisel (ed.) *The Parties Respond*:

Marjorie Randon Hershey, Nathaniel Birkhead, and Beth C. Easter, "Party Activists, Ideological Extremism, and Party Polarization," (chapter 4).

Walter J. Stone, L. Sandy Maisel, and Trevor C. Lowman, "Boehner's Dilemma: A Tempest in a Tea Party?" (Chapter 9).

**Party Organizations I**

***Read:***

Green, Coffey, and Cohen (eds.), *The State of the Parties*:

Daniel J. Coffey, "Federal Parties and Polarization," (chapter 9).

Douglas D. Roscoe and Shannon Jenkins, "Changes in Local Party Structure and Activity, 1980-2008," (chapter 17).

Daniel M. Shea, "Separated We Stand? The Impact of Ideological Sorting on Local Party Dynamics," (chapter 18).

Discussion Leader:

Reading Observations from:

**WEEK 12. APRIL 22**

**Party Organizations II**

***Read:***

Brewer and Maisel (ed.) *The Parties Respond*:

Daniel M. Shea, J. Cherie Strachen, and Michael Wolf, "Local Variability, Goals, and Objectives in the Information Age," (chapter 5).

Paul S. Herrnson, "National Parties in the Twenty-First Century," (chapter 6)

**Parties in Campaigns**

***Read:***

Green, Coffey, and Cohen (eds.), *The State of the Parties*:

Diana Dwyre and Robin Kolodny, "Political Party Activity in the 2012 Elections: Sophisticated Orchestration or Diminished Influence?" (chapter 13).

David Magleby, "Classifying Super PACs," (chapter 14).

Paul A. Beck and Erik Heidemann, "The Ground Game from the Voter's Perspective: 2012 and Before," (chapter 15).

William Binning, Melanie J. Blumberg, and John C. Green, "A Report from Mahoning County: Consequences and Causes of Local Party Endorsements," (chapter 19).

Brewer and Maisel (ed.) *The Parties Respond*:

Diana Dwyre, "Political Parties and Campaign Finance: Challenges and Adaptations," (chapter 8).

Diana Owen, "Political Parties and the Media: The Parties Respond to Technological Innovation," (chapter 10).

Discussion Leader:

Reading Observations from:

**WEEK 13. APRIL 29**  
**Parties and Government I**

**Read:**

Mayhew, *Partisan Balance*

Discussion Leader:  
Reading Observations from:

**WEEK 14. MAY 6**  
**Parties and Government II**

**Read:**

Green, Coffey, and Cohen (eds.), *The State of the Parties:*

William F. Connelly, Jr. "Partisan, Polarized, Yet Not Dysfunctional," (chapter 6).

Michael J. Ensley, et. al., "Are These Boots Made for Walking? Polarization and Ideological Change among U.S. House Members," (chapter 7).

Boris Shor, "Party Polarization in America's State Legislatures: An Update," (chapter 8).

Brewer and Maisel (ed.) *The Parties Respond:*

Sean Theriault and Jonathan Lewallen, "Congressional Parties and the Policy Process," (chapter 11)

G. Calvin MacKenzie, "Partisan Presidential Leadership: The President's Appointees," (chapter 12)

**RESEARCH PAPER – May 15**

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆

## The Debate over Responsible Party Government

A long intellectual history:

E.E. Schattschneider. 1942. *Party Government*.

American Political Science Association's Committee on Political Parties. 1950. "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System: A Report of the Committee on Political Parties". *American Political Science Review*, v.44, n.3, Part 2, Supplement.

Austin Ranney. 1962. *The Doctrine of Responsible Party Government: Its Origins and Present State*.

### I. Criticisms of Conventional American Party Politics

#### A. The Parties Themselves

1. Fragmented
2. Unprogrammatic, Deemphasize Issues
3. Not Cohesive, Not Disciplined
4. Indistinct - Too Centrist, Too Muddled

#### B. Consequences for Voter Behavior

1. Unthinking, Knee-jerk Party Votes
2. Unsystematic, Candidate-driven Non-Party Votes

#### C. Consequences for Interest Groups - More Influential as they fill the power void

#### D. The Bottom-line: Irresponsible Parties

1. Parties Lack Power Within Government
2. Parties NOT Clearly Accountable to Public

*In a system of separated powers requiring coordinated action to govern, the only meaningful accountability is collective accountability and the only clear collective accountability is party accountability.*

3. Low Power + Low Accountability = Irresponsible

### II. The Doctrine of Responsible Party Government

#### A. Popular Control Requires Responsible Parties

1. Parties Strong Enough to Run Government
2. Parties Identifiable Enough to be Answerable for the Running of Government

#### B. The Requirements of Responsible Parties

1. Clear and Distinct Party Positions
2. Party Unity/Cohesiveness in Leadership through:
  - a. Selection of Candidates
  - b. Party Discipline
  - c. Constitutional Imperatives - Votes of Confidence
  - d. Natural Ideological Agreement

#### 3. Party Voting

- a. Voters Accurately Perceive Party in Power
- b. Voters Associate Party and Policy
- c. Voters Hold Party Collectively Accountable

4. Interest Groups Shut Out of Direct Power

### III. Defense of Conventional Aggregating “Weak” Party Politics (Loose Coalition Parties, 1940s to 1970s)

#### A. Responsible Parties are Unrealistic

1. Voters are not sufficiently issue-oriented
2. Uncompromising Parties would encourage Third Parties
3. Discipline is not easily available – violates democratic norms
4. Government Structure encourages Party Fragmentation

#### B. Responsible Parties are Undesirable

1. Would Intensify Social Conflicts
2. Party Discipline may cost Intra-Party Democracy
3. "Deadlock" or Compromised Coalition Government may be Desirable
  - a. Stimulates Deliberation
  - b. Permits a Mix of Policies, Flexibility
  - c. Provides Stability to Policy, No lurching from left to right and back
4. Would Lower General Satisfaction with Electoral Choice
  - a. May lead to less competition in some areas of the nation
  - b. May lead to multi-party system & gridlock among these more ideological parties

### IV. Retrospective on Party Development: Evolution into Responsible Parties (The 1980s to 2006)

#### A. Parties are Polarized with Clear and Distinct Positions

#### B. Party Cohesion in Government is High, though Not Perfect

#### C. Partisanship in the Electorate is Strong

1. High Percentage are Partisan
2. High Loyalty Rates in Voting
3. Low level of Split-Ticket Voting

#### D. Realignment Induced Responsible Parties rather than Discipline Induced Responsible Parties

<i>Election Years</i>	<i>Elections resulting in divided government</i>		
	<i>Presidential elections %</i>	<i>Midterm elections %</i>	<i>All elections %</i>
<b>1860-1894</b>	22% (2 of 9)	67% (6 of 9)	44% (8 of 18)
<b>1896-1966</b>	6% (1 of 18)	28% (5 of 18)	17% (6 of 36)
<b>1968-2014</b>	58% (7 of 12)	83% (10 of 12)	71% (17 of 24)
<b>1860-2014</b>	26% (10 of 39)	54% (21 of 39)	40% (31 of 78)

*Note:* The numbers in parentheses are the actual number of elections in the category that resulted in divided government and the total number of presidential or midterm elections held during that period.

*Source:* James E. Campbell, *The Presidential Pulse of Congressional Elections*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. (University Press of Kentucky, 1997) p.251 and updated for 1998-2014. 2000 is counted as a unified government election, though within several months the government was divided because of a party switch by Vermont Senator Jim Jeffords. In the recent era, we have had divided government following the elections of 1968, 1970, 1972, 1974, 1980, 1982, 1984, 1986, 1988, 1990, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2006, 2010, 2012, and 2014 and unified government following the elections of 1976, 1978, 1992, 2000, 2002, 2004, and 2008.

<i>Nature of Political Divisions</i>	<i>Party Polarization and Government Division</i>			
	<i>Less Polarized Heterogenous Parties</i>		<i>Highly Polarized Homogenous Parties</i>	
	<i>Unified Government</i>	<i>Divided Government</i>	<i>Unified Government</i>	<i>Divided Government</i>
<i>Institutional Divisions</i>	Slightly Less Conflict	Slightly More Conflict	Much Less Conflict	Much More Conflict
<i>Ideological Divisions</i>	Less Conflict	Less Conflict	More Conflict	More Conflict

**POLARIZED:  
THE REALITY OF AMERICAN POLITICS**

James E. Campbell  
*University at Buffalo, SUNY*

**Table of Contents**

Introduction

**Part One: Preparing the Foundation**

Chapter 1. Knowns and Unknowns

Chapter 2. History and Theories

**Part Two: The Polarized Electorate**

Chapter 3. Ideologies and Polarization

Chapter 4. Issues and Polarization

Chapter 5. Circumstantial Evidence

**Part Three: The Polarized Parties**

Chapter 6. Why are the Parties More Polarized?

Chapter 7. One-Sided Party Polarization?

Chapter 8. Why are the Parties Polarized at All?

Chapter 9. Polarization and Democracy

References

Participation Assignments				
Week	Discussion Leader	Observation 1	Observation 2	Observation 3
2	Kevin Stout	Michael Deschaies	Sara Norrevick	Rich Horner
3	Elizabeth Tillman	Rebecca Bryan	Samaila Adelaiye	Si Chen
4	Joshua Reichardt	Nicholas Hillman	Michael Schaft	Yohan Park
5	Assaf Almutairi	Kevin Stout	Michael Deschaies	Sara Norrevick
6	Si Chen	Elizabeth Tillman	Samaila Adelaiye	
7	Rebecca Bryan	Joshua Reichardt	Yohan Park	Rich Horner
8	Nicholas Hillman	Assaf Almutairi	Kevin Stout	Rich Horner
9	Sara Norrevick	Michael Schaft	Elizabeth Tillman	Si Chen
10	Samaila Adelaiye	Rebecca Bryan	Joshua Reichardt	
11	Michael Schaft	Nicholas Hillman	Assaf Almutairi	Kevin Stout
12	Michael Deschaies	Sara Norrevick	Si Chen	Elizabeth Tillman
13	Yohan Park	Samaila Adelaiye	Rebecca Bryan	Joshua Reichardt
14	Rich Horner	Michael Schaft	Nicholas Hillman	Assaf Almutairi

and observation note assignments will be linked to your discussion leader week's assignment (3 weeks after, 5 weeks after, and 8 weeks wrapping around back to the course's second week).