

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

PLSC 540
T 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM
318 Sackett

Michael Nelson
mjn15@psu.edu
Office: Pond Lab 232
Office Hours: Thursday 10 AM-12 PM

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course introduces graduate students to the core concepts and controversies in the study of American politics. We will discuss the evolution of research on American political institutions and behavior through discussions of both current and classic readings. We will consider both how these readings contribute to our knowledge of politics in the United States and how researchers designed and executed their studies. Students in this course are expected to complete the assigned readings, to contribute meaningfully to class discussions, and to complete a variety of formal and informal writing assignments.

OBJECTIVES

This course has three central aims: (1) to help students find feasible research questions that they can investigate throughout their graduate careers, (2) to begin to prepare students for the field examination in American politics, and (3) to ready students for more advanced seminars in American political institutions and behavior.

COURSE MATERIALS

We will read a variety of books and articles. The articles are available online; I have not placed any of the books on order at the bookstore. If you have trouble finding a reading, please let me know.

I could remake this syllabus every day and still not be happy with it. We are trying to cover an entire field of inquiry in a semester, and so the assigned readings are necessarily selective. My focus for this syllabus was twofold: (1) give you some exposure to the “classic” readings in American politics and (2) give you a chance to discuss recent research on American politics published in our “top” journals. Since many of you are interested in SoDA as well, I chose many recent readings survey that adopt that approach to the study of American politics.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The requirements for this course involve both (1) the completion of reading assignments and written work on your own outside of our class meetings and (2) your active and informed contributions to our course discussions when we meet. This course is a seminar. You are expected to come prepared to talk.

FINAL EXAM (30%). Students will take a final exam that mirrors in its design the morning portion of the comprehensive exam in American Politics. You will be asked to synthesize the literature and our class discussions to answer a broad question about American politics.

Comprehensive exam answers can be deceptively hard. Here are some tips to tackle these in the future:

- Your goal, first and foremost, on any comprehensive exam answer is to make a convincing case that you know the literature in American politics and can synthesize it into something coherent. You do this in three ways: by citing the appropriate literature, by summarizing it correctly, and

by telling us a story about how that literature fits together (e.g. how it has developed over time). By nature, a comprehensive exam asks you to synthesize the literature.

- Your second goal on most comprehensive exam questions is to craft and defend a clear argument. Weak comprehensive exam answers read like undergraduate literature reviews: each paragraph discusses a new source and there is little conversation among the sources until a final paragraph. Great comprehensive exam answers employ the literature to support and defend an argument, using it as evidence to bolster their thesis.
- The best way that you meet these two goals is to spend the first portion of your time with any answer making an outline. If you don't know what evidence you have, you can't figure out what claim to make, and if you don't start writing with a clear claim/thesis, you are going to have problems with the organization of the essay (see: undergraduate literature review). Clear organization is extremely important; if your reader cannot follow the argument you are making, you're in trouble. Subheadings can be helpful.

RESEARCH DESIGN (50% Total; 20% Checkpoints and 30% Paper). This course culminates with the production of an original research design. You may choose any topic in political science that interests you, though my hope is that this project will serve as a proposal for a dissertation or M.A. thesis.

A research design is a well-thought-out plan that “sells” your research question as an essential one, explains why that original question is motivated by the extant research, clearly explains the testable, falsifiable hypotheses you hope to examine, and explains the data with which you plan to test those hypotheses, including both the data collection and analysis stages of the process. Basically, you should think about a research design as a highly detailed overview of a research project that likely lacks the empirical analysis that would enable one to test the proposed theory (though some preliminary data analysis, if available, may be useful as proof of concept). Importantly, your research design should propose a “doable” project, that is, one that you could complete with the time and resources available to you as a graduate student.

We will complete this project in a series of steps involving short written assignments and in-class presentations. Roughly, we will spend one hour of most class sessions listening to in-class presentations on our research projects.

CHECKPOINT #1: RESEARCH QUESTION. In a short presentation and an accompanying 2-page paper, provide a clear statement of the “why” question motivating your research and justify your research question. Begin by posing a one-sentence question, beginning with the word “Why” and mentioning only a dependent variable (e.g., “Why do some states have more interest groups than others? Why do judges sometimes side with regulatory agencies and sometimes not?”) Then, explain why readers should care about your answering this question. This gives you the theoretical, political, or etc. motivation for answering the question. You want to explain why we should be interested in the answer to your question substantively *and* theoretically.

CHECKPOINT #2: EXISTING EXPLANATIONS. In a short presentation and an accompanying 4-6-page paper, identify the literatures bearing on answering the “why” question you have posted. This requires you to do three things: (1) Summarize each literature/explanation in terms of method and major findings. (2) Critique the strengths and weaknesses of each literature/explanation. (3) Identify why there is a need in the literature for your proposed research.

CHECKPOINT #3: PROPOSING A THEORY. In a short presentation and an accompanying 4-6-page paper, identify and fully explain the answer to the “why” question you have proposed, defining all your major concepts. Deduce a hypothesis from your theory. Contrast your answer to competing or complementary answers to the “why” question, again defining all necessary concepts.

CHECKPOINT #4: DATA AND DESIGN. In a short presentation and an accompanying 6-8-page paper, explain and justify the unit of analysis and research design employed in your project. Operationalize all the theoretical concepts identified in the previous checkpoint, fully discussing the reliability and validity of the measures. Explain the source(s) of your data, providing coding rules, a questionnaire, experimental text, etc. as appropriate. In addition to defending the choices that you make, in terms of measurement and empirical approach, you should also explain the choices that you considered but eventually rejected.

CHECKPOINT #5: PEER REVIEW. You will circulate a draft of your paper to your colleagues (selected by me). You will read and comment on the drafts of your colleagues and provide them with constructive critiques of their argument, research design, and (if applicable) data analysis. You may comment on mechanical (e.g., grammatical) errors, but those should not be the focus of your commentary. You will summarize your comments in a memorandum (about 2 double-spaced pages) that you will submit to (a) the colleagues whose papers you reviewed and (b) to Prof. Nelson.

FINAL PAPER AND RESPONSE MEMO: By the Tuesday of finals week, submit your final, revised manuscript—along with a memo responding to your classmates’ critiques—on Canvas. Most completed manuscripts will be about 20 double-spaced pages (though concision is always appropriate).

PARTICIPATION (20%). The final portion of your grade is based on your ability and willingness to contribute to our class. This is a graduate seminar. It is your collective job to carry most of our class discussion. Everyone’s experience in this course is enhanced by regular attendance and active participation; conversely, everyone’s experience suffers if individuals do not participate. Remember that a sincere question often adds as much (if not more) to our understanding of the course material as an explanation of the week’s readings. So, don’t be afraid to speak up!

Please remember that attending class and sitting silently is not, by definition, “participation.” Also, please note that I do not penalize you directly for missing class (though multiple absences will adversely affect your grade through a lower participation score).

EXPECTATIONS/PROCEDURES

RESPECT. In this course, we are all engaged in the endeavor of building a stronger understanding of American politics. Everyone comes to this course with a different background in the subject (particularly with respect to the technical aspects of the readings). It is important that we treat each other with the utmost respect.

CRITICISM. This is a seminar and, as such, it is our job to be critics. As you read for class, you should examine the goals of an article, the persuasiveness of the evidence it presents in support of its theory, and the place it makes for itself in the literature. Remember that a harsh critique isn’t the same thing as an intellectually rigorous one. Focus less on what you perceive to be flaws and more on what you could learn from the article. Oftentimes, it is more difficult to point out what is

“good” than what is “bad”. In other words, treat our authors the way you would like to be treated by students in your shoes in 20 years.

OFFICE HOURS. I have office hours, listed at the beginning of the syllabus. My door is usually open, and you shouldn't hesitate to stop by outside of my scheduled office hour times.

LATE ASSIGNMENTS. Assignments not submitted by the assigned due date and time are late. This is a graduate class, so I expect you to communicate with me about things that affect your ability to get an assignment in on time. All assignments must be completed to complete this course.

EXTENSIONS. Extensions will be granted in only the most severe circumstances. If you foresee the need for an extension, one needs to be requested and granted at least 24 hours before the due date. No one is entitled to an extension; they will be offered only at my discretion.

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. I take violations of the University's academic dishonesty policy—reprinted below—very seriously. Please review the policy and let me know if you have any questions.

GRADING SCALE. The course will follow a standard grading scale:

93-100	A	80-82	B-
90-92	A-	77-79	C+
87-89	B+	70-76	C
83-86	B	60-69	D

A NOTE ON GRADES. I do not *give* grades. You *earn* grades. It is essential that you are proactive regarding your performance in this course; *do not wait* until grades are posted and then ask how your grade could be improved. At that point, barring a mathematical error on my part, it cannot be. If, at any point, you are unsure of your current standing in the course, please come to my office hours.

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. Academic integrity is the pursuit of scholarly activity in an open, honest and responsible manner. Academic integrity is a basic guiding principle for all academic activity at The Pennsylvania State University, and all members of the University community are expected to act in accordance with this principle. Consistent with this expectation, the University's Code of Conduct states that all students should act with personal integrity, respect other students' dignity, rights and property, and help create and maintain an environment in which all can succeed through the fruits of their efforts.

Academic integrity includes a commitment by all members of the University community not to engage in or tolerate acts of falsification, misrepresentation or deception. Such acts of dishonesty violate the fundamental ethical principles of the University community and compromise the worth of work completed by others.

NOTE TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES. Penn State welcomes students with disabilities into the University's educational programs. Every Penn State campus has an office for students with disabilities. Student Disability Resources (SDR) website provides [contact information for every Penn State campus](http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/disability-coordinator) (<http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/disability-coordinator>). For further information, please visit the [Student Disability Resources website](http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/) (<http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/>).

In order to receive consideration for reasonable accommodations, you must contact the appropriate disability services office at the campus where you are officially enrolled, participate in an intake interview, and provide documentation: [See documentation guidelines](http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/guidelines) at (<http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/guidelines>). If the documentation supports your request for reasonable accommodations, your campus disability services office will provide you with an accommodation letter. Please share this letter with your instructors and discuss the accommodations with them as early as possible. You must follow this process for every semester that you request accommodations.

EXTENDED ABSENCES. During your enrollment at Penn State, unforeseen challenges may arise. If you ever need to miss an extended amount of class in such a circumstance, please notify your professor so you can determine the best course of action to make up missed work. If your situation rises to a level of difficulty you cannot manage on your own with faculty support, reach out to the Student Care & Advocacy office by phone at [\(814-863-2020\)](tel:814-863-2020) or email them at StudentCare@psu.edu. Office hours are Monday-Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

COUNSELING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES. Many students at Penn State face personal challenges or have psychological needs that may interfere with their academic progress, social development, or emotional wellbeing. The university offers a variety of confidential services to help you through difficult times, including individual and group counseling, crisis intervention, consultations, online chats, and mental health screenings. These services are provided by staff who welcome all students and embrace a philosophy respectful of clients' cultural and religious backgrounds, and sensitive to differences in race, ability, gender identity and sexual orientation.

[Counseling and Psychological Services at University Park \(CAPS\)](http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/counseling/)
(<http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/counseling/>): 814-863-0395

Penn State Crisis Line (24 hours/7 days/week): 877-229-6400
Crisis Text Line (24 hours/7 days/week): Text LIONS to 741741

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY. Penn State takes great pride to foster a diverse and inclusive environment for students, faculty, and staff. Consistent with University Policy AD29, students who believe they have experienced or observed a hate crime, an act of intolerance, discrimination, or harassment that occurs at Penn State are urged to report these incidents as outlined on the [University's Report Bias webpage](http://equity.psu.edu/reportbias/) (<http://equity.psu.edu/reportbias/>)

MANDATORY MASKING. Penn State University currently requires everyone to wear a face mask in all university buildings, including classrooms, regardless of vaccination status. **ALL STUDENTS MUST** wear a mask appropriately (i.e., covering both your mouth and nose) while you are indoors on campus. This is to protect your health and safety as well as the health and safety of your classmates, instructor, and the university community. Anyone attending class without a mask will be asked to put one on or leave. I may end class if anyone present refuses to appropriately wear a mask for the duration of class. Students who refuse to wear masks appropriately may face disciplinary action for Code of Conduct violations. If you feel you cannot wear a mask during class, please speak with your advisor about your options for altering your schedule.

SCHEDULE

Below, you'll find a list of all class meetings, the topic we'll discuss, and the reading assignment. You should complete the reading assignment before you come to class and bring any questions that you have with you to our class meetings. If deviations from this schedule are necessary, they will be announced in class.

Week 1: Studying American Politics (August 24)

- Hall, Peter A. and Rosemary C. R. Taylor. 1996. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms." *Political Studies* 44 (5): 936-957
- Bond, Jon R. 2007. "The Scientification of the Study of Politics: Some Observations on the Behavioral Evolution in Political Science." *Journal of Politics* 69 (4): 897-907.
- McClain, Paula D. et al. 2016. "Race, Power, and Knowledge: Tracing the Roots of Exclusion in the Development of Political Science in the United States." *Politics Groups and Identities* 4(3): 467-482.
- Samii, Cyrus. 2016. "Causal Empiricism in Quantitative Research." *Journal of Politics* 78(3): 941-955.
- Tate, C. Neal. 1981. "Personal Attribute Models of the Voting Behavior of U.S. Supreme Court Justices: Liberalism in Civil Liberties and Economics Decisions, 1946-1978."

Before Comprehensive Exams:

- Dahl, Robert A. 1961. "The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest." *American Political Science Review* 55(4): 763-772
- Sigelman, Lee. 2006. "The Coevolution of American Political Science and the *American Political Science Review*." *American Political Science Review*
- Almond, Gabriel. 1996. "Political Science: The History of the Discipline." In *A New Handbook of Political Science*. Eds. Robert E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Katznelson, Ira and Helen V. Milner. 2002. "American Political Science: The Discipline's State and the State of the Discipline." In *Political Science: State of the Discipline*.
- March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen. 1984. "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life." *American Political Science Review* 78(3): 734-49.
- Riker, William. 1982. "The Two-Party System and Duverger's Law: An Essay on the History of Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 76(4): 753-766.
- Daniel Diermeier and Keith Krehbiel. 2003. "Institutionalism as a Methodology." *Journal of Theoretical Politics*. 15:123-144.

Week 2: Public Opinion and the Media (August 31)

- Converse, Philip. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in the Mass Public." in *Ideology and Discontent* ed. David Apher 206-261.
- Zaller, John and Stanley Feldman. 1992. "A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 579-616.
- Cramer Walsh, Katherine. 2012. "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 106(3): 517-532.
- Druckman, James, Erik Peterson, and Rune Slothuus. 2013. "How Elite Partisan Polarization Affects Public Opinion Formation." *American Political Science Review* 107: 57-79.
- Healy, Andrew and Neil Malhotra. 2013. "Childhood Socialization and Political Attitudes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *Journal of Politics* 75(4): 1023-1037.
- Druckman, James N. Matthew S. Levendusky, and Audrey McLain. 2018. "No Need to Watch: How the Effects of Partisan Media Can Spread via Interpersonal Discussions." *American Journal of Political Science* 62: 99-112.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

- Zaller, John. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-5.
- Prior, Markus. 2007. *Post-Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections*. Cambridge University Press. Chs. 1-2.
- Berinsky Adam and Donald Kinder. 2006. "Making Sense of Issues Through Media Frames." *Journal of Politics* 68: 640-656.
- Mutz, Diana C. and Byron Reeves. 2005. "The New Videomalaise: Effects of Televised Incivility on Political Trust." *American Political Science Review* 99: 1-15.
- Druckman, James N. 2004. "Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects." *American Political Science Review* 98: 671-686.
- Munger, Kevin. 2017. "Tweetment Effects on the Tweeted: Experimentally Reducing Racist Harassment." *Political Behavior* 39: 629-649.

Week 3: Partisanship and Polarization (September 7) [Presentations: Research Question]

- Campbell et al. 1960. *The American Voter*. [ch. 2-4, 6-7]
- Shanto Iyengar, Yphtach Lelkes, Matthew Levendusky, Neil Malhotra, Sean J. Westwood. 2019. "The Origins and Consequences of Affective Polarization in the United States." *Annual Review of Political Science* 22(1): 129-146
- Mason, Lilliana. 2018. *Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Became Our Identity*. University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1-3.
- Fowler, Anthony. 2020. "Partisan Intoxication or Policy Voting?" *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 15: 141-179.
- Wamble, Julian J., Chryl N. Laird, Corrine M. McConaughy, and Ismail K. White. 2021. "We Are One: The Social Maintenance of Black Democratic Party Loyalty." *Journal of Politics* Forthcoming.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

- Hetherington, Marc J. 2001. "Resurgent Mass Partisanship: The Role of Elite Polarization." *American Political Science Review* 95:619-31.
- MacKuen, Erikson, and Stimson. 1989. "Macropartisanship," *American Political Science Review*.
- Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M. and Suzanna De Boef. 2001. "Macropartisanship and Macroideology in the Sophisticated Electorate." *Journal of Politics* 63: 232-248.
- Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M., Suzanna De Boef, and Tse-Min Lin. 2004. "The Dynamics of the Partisan Gender Gap." *American Political Science Review* 98: 515-528.
- Hatemi, Peter K. et al. 2008. "Is There a 'Party' in Your Genes?" *Political Research Quarterly* 62: 584-600.
- Jerit, Jennifer and Jason Barabas. 2012. "Partisan Perceptual Bias and the Information Environment." *Journal of Politics* 74: 672-684.
- Druckman, James, Erik Peterson, and Rune Slothuus. 2013. "How Elite Partisan Polarization Affects Public Opinion Formation." *American Political Science Review* 107: 57-79.
- Iyengar, Shanto and Sean J. Westwood. 2014. "Fear and Loathing across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization." *American Journal of Political Science* 59: 690-707.

Week 4: Voting and Elections (September 14) [Presentations: Research Question]

- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. [ch 1, 3 and 8]
- Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89(2): 279-94.
- Lenz, Gabriel. 2009. "Learning and Opinion Change, Not Priming: Reconsidering the Priming Hypothesis." *American Journal of Political Science* 53(4): 821-827.
- Coppock, Alexander, Seth J. Hill, and Lynn Vavreck. 2020. "The Small Effects of Political Advertising are Small Regardless of Context, Message, Sender, or Receiver: Evidence from 59 Real-Time Randomized Experiments." *Science Advances* 6(36): eabc4046.
- Thomsen, Danielle M. and Aaron S. King. 2020. "Women's Representation and the Gendered Pipeline to Power." *American Political Science Review* 114(4): 989-1000.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

- Plutzer, Eric. 2002. "Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth in Young Adulthood." *American Political Science Review* 96: 41-56.
- Collins, Jonathan and Ray Block. 2020. "Fired Up, Ready to Go: The Impact of Age, Campaign Enthusiasm, and Civic Duty on African American Voting." *Political Behavior* 42: 107-142.
- Carmines, Edward, and James Stimson. 1980. "The Two Faces of Issue Voting." *American Political Science Review* 74(1):78-91.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2000. "Partisanship and Voting Behavior, 1952-1996." *American Journal of Political Science* 44:35-50.
- Riker and Ordeshook. 1970. "A Theory of the Calculus of Voting." *American Political Science Review* 62(1): 25-42.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, James M. Snyder, and Charles Stewart, III. 2001. "Candidate Positioning in U.S. House Elections" *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (1): 136-159.
- Lupia, Arthur. 1994. "Shortcuts Versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections." *American Political Science Review* 88 (1): 63-76.
- Gerber, Alan S. and Donald P. Green. 2000. "The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 94(3): 653-663.
- Krupnikov, Yanna. 2012. "When does Negativity Demobilize? Tracing the Conditional Effect of Negative Campaigning on Voter Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (4): 797-813.
- Jacobson, Gary. 2015. "How do Campaigns Matter?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 18: 31-47.

Week 5: Accountability (September 21) [Presentations: Existing Explanations]

- Achen, Christopher and Larry Bartels. 2016. *Democracy for Realists*, pg. 118-28.
- Fowler, Anthony and Andrew B. Hall. 2017. "Do Shark Attacks Influence Presidential Elections? Reassessing a Prominent Finding on Voter Competence." *Journal of Politics*.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice, David W. Brady, and John F. Cogan. 2002. "Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting." *American Political Science Review* 96(1): 127-140.
- Huber, Gregory A., Seth J. Hill, and Gabriel S. Lenz. 2012. "Sources of Bias in Retrospective Decision making: Experimental Evidence on Voters' Limitations in Controlling Incumbents." *American Political Science Review*, 106(4): 720-741.
- de Benedictis-Kessner, Justin and Christopher Warshaw. 2020. "Accountability for the Local Economy at All Levels of Government in United States Elections." *American Political Science Review* 114(3): 660-676.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen and Shiro Kuriwaki. 2021. "Congressional Representation: Accountability from the Constituent's Perspective." *American Journal of Political Science* Forthcoming.

Before Comprehensive Exams

- Fiorina, Morris. 1978. "Economic Retrospective Voting in American National Elections: A Micro-Analysis." *American Journal of Political Science*, 22(2): 426-443.
- Ashworth, Scott and Ethan Bueno de Mesquita. 2014. "Is Voter Competence Good for Voters? Information, Rationality, and Democratic Performance?" *American Political Science Review* 108(3): 565-587.

Week 6: Parties as Organizations (September 28) [Presentations: Existing Explanations]

Aldrich, John. 1995. *Why Parties?* [Ch. 1-2]

Key, V.O. *Southern Politics in State and Nation* [Ch. 1, 14, 18, 24]

Bawn, Kathleen et al. 2012. "A Theory of Political Parties." *Perspectives on Politics* 10 (3): 571-597.

Kuziemko, Ilyana and Ebonya Washington. 2018. "Why Did the Democrats Lose the South? Bringing New Data to an Old Debate." *American Economic Review*, 108 (10): 2830-67.

Gamm, Gerald and Thad Kousser. 2021. "Life, Literacy, and the Pursuit of Prosperity: Party Competition and Policy Outcomes in 50 States." *American Political Science Review*

Before Comprehensive Exams:

American Political Science Association. 1950. "Towards a More Responsible Two-Party System: A Report of the Committee on Political Parties." *American Political Science Review* 44: 15-36.

Desmaris, La Raja, and Kowal. 2014. "The Fates of Challengers in U.S. House Elections: The Role of Extended Party Networks in Supporting Candidates and Shaping Electoral Outcomes." *American Journal of Political Science*.

Key, V.O. 1955. "A Theory of Critical Elections." *Journal of Politics* 17(1): 3-18.

Week 7: Congressional Behavior (October 5) [Presentations: Theory]

Mayhew, David. 1974. *The Electoral Connection*. [Excerpt]

Fiorina, Morris. 1978. *Keystone*. [Excerpt]

Fenno, Jr., Richard F. 1977. "U.S. House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration." *American Political Science Review* 71(3):883-917.

Anzia, Sarah F., and Christopher R. Berry. 2011. "The Jackie (and Jill) Robinson Effect: Why Do Congresswomen Outperform Congressmen?" *American Journal of Political Science* 55:478-493.

Dietrich, Bryce J., Matthew Hayes, and Diana Z. O'Brien. 2019. "Pitch Perfect: Vocal Pitch and the Emotional Intensity of Congressional Speech." *American Political Science Review* 113(4): 941-962.

Minozzi, William and Gregory A. Caldeira. 2021. "Congress and Community: Coresidence and Social Influence in the U.S. House of Representatives, 1801-1861." *American Political Science Review*

Before Comprehensive Exams:

Polsby, Nelson W. 1968. "The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives," APSR.

Shepsle, Kenneth A. 1979. "Institutional Arrangements and Equilibrium in Multidimensional Voting Models." *American Journal of Political Science* 23(1):27-59.

Poole, Keith T. and Howard Rosenthal. 2007. *Ideology & Congress*.

Clinton, Joshua D. 2012. "Using Roll Call Estimates to Test Models of Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science*. 15: 79-99.

Week 8: Representation (October 12) [Presentations: Theory]

- Miller, Warren E., and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57(1):45-56.
- Hertel-Fernandez, Alexander, Matto Mildenerger, and Leah C. Stokes. 2018. "Legislative Staff and Representation in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 113(1): 1-18.
- Kujala, Jordan. 2019. "Donors, Primary Elections, and Polarization in the United States." *American Journal of Political Science* 64(3): 587-602.
- Lax, Jeffrey R., Justin H. Phillips, and Adam Zelizer. 2019. "The Party or the Purse? Unequal Representation in the US Senate." *American Political Science Review* 113(4): 917-940.
- Lowande, Kenneth, Melinda Ritchie, and Erinn Lauterbach. 2019. "Descriptive and Substantive Representation in Congress: Evidence from 80,000 Congressional Inquiries." *American Journal of Political Science* 63(3): 655-659.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

- Achen, Christopher. 1978. "Measuring Representation." *American Journal of Political Science* 22(3):475-510.
- Berkman, Michael B. and Robert E. O'Connor. 1993. "Do Women Legislators Matter?: Female Legislators and State Abortion Policy." *American Politics Research* 21: 102-124.
- Thomas, Sue and Susan Welch. 1991. "The Impact of Gender on Activities and Priorities of State Legislators." *Western Political Quarterly* 44: 445-456.
- Gay, Claudine. 2001. "The Effect of Black Congressional Representation on Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 95(3):589-602.
- Stimson, James A., Michael B. MacKuen, and Robert S. Erikson. 1995. "Dynamic Representation." *American Political Science Review* 89:543-565.
- Mansbridge, Jane. 2003. "Rethinking Representation." *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 515-528.
- Weissberg, Robert 1978. "Collective vs. Dyadic Representation in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 72 (2): 535-47.
- Griffin, John D. 2014. "When and Why Minority Legislators Matter." *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 327-336.
- Gilens, Martin 2012. *Affluence and Influence: Economic Inequality and Political Power in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapters 3 and 4.

Week 9: Parties in Government (October 19) [Presentations: Data/Design]

- Cox, Gary W., and Mathew D. McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Ch. 2, 5, and 10]
- Clarke, Andrew J. 2020. "Party Sub-Brands and American Party Factions." *American Journal of Political Science* 64(3): 452-470.
- Ballard, Andrew O. and James M. Curry. 2021. "Minority Party Capacity in Congress." *American Political Science Review*
- Lee, Frances E. 2016. *Insecure Majorities: Congress and the Perpetual Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 2-3.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

- Krehbiel, Keith. 1993. "Where's the Party?" *British Journal of Political Science* 23:235-66.
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1991. *Information and Legislative Organization* [Ch. 4]
- Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins. 2003. *Legislative Leviathan* [Ch. 8]
- Grimmer, Justin and Eleanor Powell. 2016. "Money in Exile: Campaign Contributions and Committee Access." *Journal of Politics*. 78(4): 974- 988.

Week 10: Presidency (October 26) [Presentations: Data/Design]

Neustadt, Richard. *Presidential Power*. [Excerpt]

Kernell, Samuel. *Going Public* [Excerpt]

Lowande, Kenneth, and Jon C. Rogowski. 2021. "Presidential Unilateral Power." *Annual Review of Political Science*.

Canes-Wrone, Brandice, William G. Howell, and David E. Lewis. 2008. "Toward a Broader Understanding of Presidential Power: A Re-Evaluation of the Two Presidencies Thesis." *Journal of Politics* 70(1):1-16.

Bolton, Alexander and Sharece Thrower. 2016. "Legislative Capacity and Executive Unilateralism." *American Journal of Political Science* 60(3): 649-663.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

Aaron Wildavsky. 1966. "The Two Presidencies." *Trans-Action* 4: 7-14.

Rogowski, Jon C. 2016. "Presidential Influence in an Era of Congressional Dominance." *American Political Science Review*.

Bolton, Alex and Sharece Thrower. 2015. "Legislative Capacity and Executive Unilateralism." *American Journal of Political Science*.

Canes-Wrone, Brandice. 2001. "The President's Legislative Influence from Public Appeals." *American Journal of Political Science* 45:313-29.

Kriner, Douglas L. & Andrew Reeves. 2015. Presidential Particularism and Divide-the-Dollar Politics. *American Political Science Review*, 109(1), p.155-171

Howell, William G. 2005. *Power Without Persuasion* [p. 8-23, Ch. 4]

Week 11: The Bureaucracy (November 2)

- Lindblom, Charles. 1959. "The Science of Muddling Through." *Public Administration Review* 19:79-88.
- McCubbins, Mathew, and Thomas Schwarz. 1984. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols versus Fire Alarms." *American Journal of Political Science* 28:165-79.
- McCubbins, Mathew, Roger Noll, and Barry Weingast. 1987. "Administrative Procedures as Instruments of Political Control." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 3:243-77.
- Lowande, Kenneth and Rachel Augustine Potter. 2021. "Congressional Oversight Revisited: Politics and Procedure in Agency Rulemaking." *Journal of Politics* 83(1): 401-408.
- Kinane, Christina M. 2021. "Control without Confirmation: The Politics of Vacancies in Presidential Appointments." *American Political Science Review* Forthcoming.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

- Epstein, David, and Sharyn O'Halloran. 1996. "Divided Government and the Design of Administrative Procedures: A Formal Model and Empirical Test." *Journal of Politics* 58(May):373-397.
- Howell, William and David E. Lewis. 2002. "Agencies by Presidential Design." *Journal of Politics* 64: 1095-1114.
- Bendor et al. 2001. "Theories of Delegation." *Annual Review of Political Science*
- Lowande, Kenneth. 2018. "Who Polices the Administrative State?" *American Political Science Review*.
- Potter, Rachel Augustine. 2019. *Bending the Rules: Procedural Politicking in the Bureaucracy*. University of Chicago Press.

Week 12: Judiciary (November 9)

- Epstein, Lee, William M. Landes & Richard A. Posner. 2013. *The Behavior of Federal Judges: A Theoretical and Empirical Study of Rational Choice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [Chapters 1-3]
- Boyd, Christina L., Lee Epstein, and Andrew D. Martin. 2010. "Untangling the Causal Effects of Sex on Judging." *American Journal of Political Science*. 54(2): 389-411
- Dahl, Robert. 1957. "Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as National Policy-Maker." *Journal of Public Law* 6(2): 279-95
- TerBeek, Calvin. 2021. "Clocks Must Always Be Turned Back?: *Brown v. Board of Education* and the Racial Origins of Constitutional Originalism." *American Political Science Review*.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

- Bailey, Michael and Forest Maltzman. 2008. "Does Legal Doctrine Matter? Unpacking Law and Policy Preference on the U.S. Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review* 102:369-384.
- Epstein, Lee and Jack Knight. 1998. *The Choices Justices Make*. CQ Press.
- Segal, Jeffrey A. and Harold Spaeth, *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited* [Ch. 3 and 8]
- Rosenberg, Gerald. *The Hollow Hope*. [Ch. 1 and Civil Rights section]
- Zorn, Christopher and Jennifer Bowie. 2010. "Ideological Influences on Decision Making in the Federal Judicial Hierarchy: An Empirical Assessment." *Journal of Politics* 72: 1212-1221.

Week 13: The Separation of Powers (November 16) [Paper Draft Due. Review Peer's Drafts.]

Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics* [Ch. 1-2]

Binder, Sarah A. 1999. "The Dynamics of Legislative Gridlock, 1947-96." *American Political Science Review* 93 (3):519-534.

Cameron, Charles. 2000. *Veto Bargaining* [Ch. 1-2]

Christenson, Dino and Doug Kriner. 2017. "Mobilizing the Public Against the President: Congress and the Political Costs of Unilateral Action." *American Journal of Political Science* 61(4): 769-785.

Braman, Eileen. 2021 "Thinking about Government Authority: Constitutional Rules and Political Context in Citizens' Assessments of Judicial, Legislative, and Executive Action." *American Journal of Political Science* 65(2): 389-404.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

Mayhew, David. 1991. *Divided We Govern*. Chapters 1, 3-5

Binder. 2015. "The Dysfunctional Congress." *Annual Review of Political Science*.

Week 14: Interest Groups and Money in Politics (November 30) [Peer Reviews Due]

Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. *The Semisovereign People* [Excerpt]

Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. [Ch 1-2]

Truman, David. 1971. *The Governmental Process* [Excerpt]

Li, Zhao. 2018. "How Internal Constraints Shape Interest Group Activities: Evidence from Access-Seeking PACs." *American Political Science Review* 112(4): 792-808.

Anzia, Sarah F. 2019. "When Does a Group of Citizens Influence Policy? Evidence from Senior Citizen Participation in City Politics," *Journal of Politics* 81(1): 1-14.

Crosson, Jesse M., Alexander C. Furnas, and Geoffrey M. Lorenz. 2020. "Polarized Pluralism: Organizational Preferences and Biases in the American Pressure System." *American Political Science Review* 114(4): 1117-1137.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

Hall, Richard L. and Alan V. Deardorff. 2006. "Lobbying as Legislative Subsidy." *American Political Science Review* 100 (1): 69-84.

Walker, Jack L. 1983. "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America." *American Political Science Review* 77:390-406.

Austen-Smith, David, and Jack Wright. 1994. "Counteractive Lobbying." *American Journal of Political Science* 38(1):25-44.

Hojnacki, Marie and David C. Kimball. 1998. "Organized Interests and the Decision of Whom to Lobby in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 92(4): 775-790.

Lowery, David and Virginia Gray. 1995. "The Population Ecology of Gucci Gulch, or the Natural Regulation of Interest Group Numbers in the American States." *American Journal of Political Science*. 39: 1-29.

Week 15: Policymaking in a Federal System (December 7)

- Lipsky, Michael. 1983. "The Critical Role of Street-Level Bureaucrats" and "Street-Level Bureaucrats as Policy Makers," in *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Schneider, Anne and Ingram, Helen. 1993. "Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." *American Political Science Review* 87 (2): 334–47
- Michener, Jamila. 2018. *Fragmented Democracy: Medicaid, Federalism, and Unequal Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. [Chapters 1, 2, and 4.]
- [Remaining papers, on COVID-19, TBD]

Finals Week: Revised Paper due Tuesday, December 7. Exam due Wednesday, December 8.

Before Comprehensive Exams:

- Walker, Jack L., Jr. 1966. The Diffusion of Innovations among the American States. *American Political Science Review* 63 (3): 880–99.
- Bachrach, Peter and Morton Baratz. 1962. "The Two Faces of Power." *American Political Science Review*. 56: 947–52.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kingdon, John W. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. 2nd. ed. New York: HarperCollins.
- Desmarais Bruce A., Jeffrey J. Harden, and Frederick J. Boehmke. 2015. "Persistent Policy Pathways: Inferring Diffusion Networks in the American States." *American Political Science Review* 109: 392-406.
- Heidt-Forsythe, Erin. 2017. "Morals or Markets? Regulating Assisted Reproductive Technologies as Morality or Economic Policies in the States." *American Journal of Bioethics: Empirical Bioethics* 8(1): 58–67.
- Kelly, Nathan J. and Christopher Witko. 2012. "Federalism and American Inequality." *Journal of Politics* 74: 414-426.