

AMERICAN POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: STATE POLITICS

PL SC 541
T 3:20 PM – 6:20 PM
236 Pond Laboratory
Office Hours: TR 9:30-10:30 (And by Appointment)

Michael Nelson
mjn15@psu.edu
Office: Pond Lab 232

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The fifty state governments are often referred to as “laboratories of democracy.” On the one hand, this label refers to the role that states play in the policymaking process by experimenting with policies across time and space. In this course, we will examine how policies are developed and implemented, how they diffuse across state lines, and how the federal government encourages (and discourages) this process of policy experimentation. On the other hand, states are also laboratories for scholars. As we review the literature on state political institutions and behavior, we will pay particular attention to how the states can be used by scholars to test general questions about political institutions, mass behavior, and representation.

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

By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- (1) Explain the major findings in the study of American state political behavior, institutions, and policymaking.
- (2) Employ data analytic and methodological tools used by scholars of state politics.
- (3) Propose promising research topics in the study of American state politics and policymaking.
- (4) Evaluate studies of American state politics orally and in writing.
- (5) Communicate results of original research orally and in writing.

COURSE MATERIALS

We will read a variety of books and articles. Three are particularly worthy of purchase. The articles are available online. If you have trouble finding copies of any assigned reading, please let me know.

- Key, V.O. 1949. *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Erikson, Robert, Gerald Wright, and John McIver. 1993. *Statehouse Democracy: Public Opinion and Policy in the American States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Enns, Peter K. 2016. *Incarceration Nation: How the United States Became the Most Punitive Democracy in the World*. New York. Cambridge University Press.

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.

SHORT WRITING ASSIGNMENTS [BOOK REPORT/MEMOS/DATA ASSIGNMENT] (20%). You will complete three writing assignments for this class during the semester: a book report, a data assignment, and a blind article review.

1. For each week in the semester, I will ask one student to select a book-length study of state politics to read and write a short, 6-page (double-spaced) review of the book, modeled after the sort of book

reviews published in the *Journal of Politics*. Your review of the book should: (a) briefly (in no more than one page) explain the book's major argument and evidence for that argument, (b) place the book in the broader context of research on the topic, explaining what the innovation of the study is and its importance for our understanding of state politics, and (c) offer a critique of the argument and evidence, as appropriate. You will present the book to the class in a 10-15 minute presentation on the day we discuss that book's topic, and you will also be responsible with helping me lead discussion on the day you present. Your book review is due via e-mail by 5pm on the Friday after your presentation, giving you time to revise your review and incorporate our class discussion into your paper.

2. As a midterm "exam," I will e-mail you a blinded unpublished manuscript on a topic relating to state politics and policy. You may not discuss the manuscript with your peers but may use external (e.g. internet) resources for additional information as needed as you craft a 2-3 page (single-spaced) review of the book appropriate for *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*.
3. You will also complete a short data description assignment aimed at helping you implement some basic data manipulation tasks (e.g. merging data, converting data from wide to long formats, etc.) that are common in the quantitative analysis of state politics. More information will be provided in class, and the write-up will be short (about 2 pages) in length.

EXAM (20%). Students will take a final exam that mirrors in its design a portion of the comprehensive exam in American Politics. I will distribute two questions to you; you will have four hours to answer one of the two questions. Each question will ask you 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 really helpful.

RESEARCH PROJECT (40% Total). This course culminates with the production of an original research project of sufficient quality to be presented as a poster at the 2018 State Politics and Policy conference hosted by Penn State's Department of Political Science, Center for American Political Responsiveness, and the McCourtney Institute of Democracy. You may choose any topic in state politics that interests you, though my hope is that this project will help you start to think about the sort of research projects that will interest you as you progress through graduate school. To help you finish the project on schedule, you will complete it in stages.

You should plan to meet with me sometime during the month of September to discuss your proposed topic.

CHECKPOINT #1: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY. The bibliography should cover 5 individual works that are not part of the assigned reading list for the course. You will provide an introduction (approximately 1000 words) defining the topic, why it is important, summarizing the general state of the literature, and briefly proposing a theory/hypothesis suggested by the literature around which you intend to focus your poster. Then, summarize each of the individual works in paragraphs of about 250 words each. Your summaries should identify the research question, the author's theoretical argument, the evidence that supports (or rebuts) the argument, and the conclusion drawn by the author.

CHECKPOINT #2: PRELIMINARY DATA ANALYSIS. Write a 5-page preliminary analysis of your data. Depending on your topic and how you measure your variables, the best way to summarize your data will vary, however, you should, at a minimum, provide the following information: (1) summary statistics (e.g. measures of central tendency (e.g. mean, median and/or mode) and dispersion) for your variables, (2) a visualization of your dependent variable and/or independent variable (with a caption!), and (3) a preliminary test of your major hypothesis. Importantly, this analysis should be discussed in paragraph form. Use "Research Design", "Data", and "Results" sections of some of the articles that we read in class as examples. Make sure you begin your write-up with a paragraph that restates your theory/hypothesis!

CHECKPOINT #3: PEER REVIEW. You will circulate a draft of your analysis (your revised Checkpoint #2 as well as appropriate tests of your theory and a short write-up of your results) to two of your colleagues (selected by me). You will read and comment on the drafts of the two colleagues and provide them with constructive critiques of their argument and 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 POSTER. You will present the results of your research in poster form. The poster should contain:

- An introduction that motivates your topic and tells the reader why your topic merits investigation.
- A literature review/theory section (see Checkpoint #1) that describes the previous literature and uses that literature to motivate a testable, falsifiable theory.
- A methods/data section (see Checkpoints #2) that explains what concepts are needed to test your theory and how you have measured them.
- Basic information about your dataset: the unit of analysis, the time frame, the rule(s) used to select cases, etc.
- Descriptive statistics that summarize your data, the source(s) of your variables, the statistical method you have selected to test your theory.
- A results section that presents and interprets a multiple regression analysis (see Checkpoint #3): a regression table, model fit, interpretation and substantive significance of the coefficients in your model (e.g. predicted values or predicted probabilities)
- A conclusion that (a) summarizes your results, (b) discusses the strengths and weaknesses of your chosen method and design, and (c) suggests topics for future research.
- You will also submit your dataset and a replication file, commented in a way that allows me to see what R commands produced the results discussed in your paper. I may replicate the results on your

poster to check (a) the appropriateness of the tests you have conducted and (b) the validity of the results you have reported.

PARTICIPATION (20%). This is a graduate seminar. It is your collective job to carry the majority of our class discussion. The final portion of your grade is based on your ability and willingness to contribute to our class. 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 all 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, and 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. The Department of Political Science, along with the College of the Liberal Arts and the University, takes violations of academic dishonesty seriously. Observing basic honesty in one's work, words, ideas, and actions is a principle to which all members of the community are required to subscribe.

All course work by students is to be done on an individual basis unless an instructor clearly states that an alternative is acceptable. Any reference materials used in the preparation of any assignment must be explicitly cited. Students uncertain about proper citation are responsible for checking with their instructor.

In an examination setting, unless the instructor gives explicit prior instructions to the contrary, whether the examination is in-class or take-home, violations of academic integrity shall consist but are not limited to any attempt to receive assistance from written or printed aids, or from any person or papers or electronic devices, or of any attempt to give assistance, whether the one so doing has completed his or her own work or not.

Lying to the instructor or purposely misleading any Penn State administrator shall also constitute a violation of academic integrity.

In cases of any violation of academic integrity it is the policy of the Department of Political Science to follow procedures established by the College of the Liberal Arts. More information on academic integrity and procedures followed for violation can be found at: <http://www.la.psu.edu/current-students/student-services/academic-integrity/academic-integrity>

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. The Student Disability Resources Web site provides [contact information for every Penn State campus](#). For further information, please visit the [Student Disability Resources Web site](#).

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](#). If the documentation supports your request for reasonable accommodations, your [campus's 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 in your courses as possible. You must follow this process for every semester that you request accommodations.

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 \(CAPS\)](#): 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 AND REPORTING BIAS INCIDENTS. State takes great pride to foster a diverse and inclusive environment for students, faculty, and staff. Acts of intolerance, discrimination, or harassment due to age, ancestry, color, disability, gender, gender identity, national origin, race, religious belief, sexual orientation, or veteran status are not tolerated and can be reported through Educational Equity via the [Report Bias webpage](#). You may also contact one of the following offices:

University Police Services, University Park: 814-863-1111

Multicultural Resource Center, Diversity Advocate for Students: 814-865-1773

Office of the Vice Provost for Educational Equity: 814-865-5906

Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs: 814-865-0909

Affirmative Action Office: 814-863-0471

Call 911 in cases where physical injury has occurred or is imminent.

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. In the event that deviations from this schedule are necessary, they will be announced in class.

Part I: People and Groups in the States

Introduction (8/22)

- Brace, Paul and Malcolm Jewett. 1995. "Field Essay: The State of State Politics Research," *Political Research Quarterly*, 48: 643-682
- Morehouse, Sarah M. and Malcolm E. Jewell. 2004. "States as Laboratories: A Reprise." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 177-203.

Political Parties in State Politics (8/29)

- Key, V.O. 1949. *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. Chapters 1, 14, 18-21, 25-29
- Schaffner, Brian F., Matthew Streb, and Gerald Wright. 2001. "Teams Without Uniforms: The Nonpartisan Ballot in State and Local Elections." *Political Research Quarterly* 54 (1):7-30.
- Holbrook, Thomas M., and Emily Van Dunk. 1993. "Electoral Competition in the American States." *American Political Science Review*. 87:955-962.
- Rigby, E. and G. C. Wright (2013). "Political Parties and Representation of the Poor in the American States." *American Journal of Political Science* 57(3): 552-565.

Book Report (Joe Phillips)

- Masket, Seth. 2016. *The Inevitable Party: Why Attempts to Kill the Party System Fail and How They Weaken Democracy*, Oxford University Press.
- Masket, Seth. 2009. *No Middle Ground: How Informal Party Organizations Control Nominations and Polarize Legislatures*, The University of Michigan Press.

Interest Groups and Elections (9/5)

- Chubb, John. 1988. "Institutions, the Economy, and Dynamics of State Elections." *American Political Science Review* 82: 133-54.
- Patrick Flavin. 2015. "Campaign Finance Laws, Policy Outcomes, and Political Equality in the American States." *Political Research Quarterly* 68(March):77-88.
- Anzia, Sarah F., and Terry M. Moe. 2015. "Public Sector Unions and the Costs of Government." *Journal of Politics* 77 (1): 114-127.
- Fourinaies, Alexander. 2017. "When Are Agenda Setters Valuable?" *American Journal of Political Science*

Book Report (Steve):

- Anzia, Sarah F. 2014. *Timing and Turnout: How Off-Cycle Elections Favor Organized Groups*. The University of Chicago Press.
- La Raja, Raymond and Brian Schaffner. *Campaign Finance and Political Polarization: When Purists Prevail*. University of Michigan Press.

Measuring Subnational Public Opinion (9/12)

[Data Assignment Handed Out] + [Checkpoint 1 Due]

- Erikson, Robert, Gerald Wright, and John McIver. 1993. *Statehouse Democracy: Public Opinion and Policy in the American States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-3, 9.
- Berry, William D., Evan J. Ringquist, Richard C. Fording, and Russell L. Hanson. 1998. "Measuring Citizen and Government Ideology in the American States." *American Journal of Political Science*. 42:337-348.
- Lax, Jeffrey R., and Justin H. Phillips. 2009. "How Should We Estimate Public Opinion in the States?" *American Journal of Political Science* 53(1): 107-21.
- Kastellec, Jonathan P., Jeffrey R. Lax and Justin Phillips. 2016. "Estimating State Public Opinion with Multi-Level Regression and Poststratification using R." [Replication information available at: http://www.princeton.edu/~jkastell/mrp_primer.html]
- Leerman, Lucas and Fabio Wasserfallen. 2017. "Extending the Use and Precision of Subnational Public Opinion Estimation." *American Journal of Political Science* Forthcoming. [Skim].

"Book" Report (Markus):

- Enns, Peter and Julianna Koch. 2013. "Public Opinion in the U.S. States: 1956 to 2010." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 13(3): 349-372 and subsequent debate with Berry et al. in that issue of *SPPQ*

Part II: Institutions in the States

Legislatures: Elite Decisionmaking (9/19)

[Data Assignment Due]

- Wright and Schaffner. 2002. "The Influence of Party: Evidence from the State Legislatures" *American Political Science Review* 96(June):367-79
- Shor, Boris and Nolan McCarty. 2011. "The Ideological Mapping of American Legislatures." *American Political Science Review* 105(03): 530-551.
- Barrilleaux, Charles, Thomas Holbrook, and Laura Langer. 2002. "Electoral Competition, Legislative Balance, and American State Welfare Policy." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (2):415-427.
- Caughey, Devin, Christopher Warshaw and Yiqing Xu. 2017. "Incremental Democracy: The Policy Effects of Partisan Control of State Government." *Journal of Politics* Forthcoming.
- Jackman, Molly. 2014. "Parties, Median Legislators, and Agenda Setting: How Legislative Institutions Matter." *Journal of Politics* 76(1): 259-72.
- ~~Rogers, Steven. 2017. "Electoral Accountability for State Legislative Roll-Calls and Ideological Representation." *American Political Science Review* Forthcoming.~~

Book Report (_____):

- Powell, Lynda. 2012. *The Influence of Campaign Contributions in State Legislators: The Effects of Institutions and Politics*. University of Michigan Press.

Legislatures: Professionalism and Term Limits (9/26)

- Squire, Peverill. 1992. "The Theory of Legislative Institutionalization and the California Assembly," *Journal of Politics* 54: 1026-1054.
 - Squire, Peverill. 2007. "Measuring State Legislative Professionalism: The Squire Index Revisited." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 7(2): 211-27.
- Berry, Berkman, and Schneiderman. 2000. "Legislative Professionalism and Incumbent Reelection: The Development of Institutional Boundaries," *American Political Science Review*, 94 (Dec. 2000): 859-874
- Maestas, Cherie. 2003. "The Incentive to Listen: Progressive Ambition, Resources, and Opinion Monitoring among State Legislators," *Journal of Politics*, 65 (May, 2003): 439-456.
- Kousser, Thad, Jeffrey B. Lewis, and Seth E. Masket. 2007. "Ideological Adaptation? The Survival Instinct of Threatened Legislators." *Journal of Politics* 69(3): 828-843.
- Meinke, Scott R. and Edward B. Hasecke. 2003. Term Limits, Professionalization, and Partisan Control in U.S. State Legislatures. *Journal of Politics* 65 (3):898.

Book Report (Kim):

- Kousser, Thad. *Term Limits and the Dismantling of State Legislative Professionalism*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Governors and Interbranch Relations (10/3)

[Peer-Review Assignment Handed Out]

- Bowling, C. J. and M. R. Ferguson (2001). "Divided Government, Interest Representation, and Policy Differences: Competing Explanations of Gridlock in the Fifty States." *Journal of Politics* 63(1): 182-206.
- Barrilleaux, Charles and Michael Berkman. 2003. "Do Governors Matter? Budgeting Rules and the Politics of State Policy Making," *Political Research Quarterly* 56: 409-17.
- Dometrius, Nelson C. 1987. "Changing Gubernatorial Power: The Measure vs. Reality." *Western Political Quarterly* 40: 319-333.
- Krupnikov, Y. and C. Shipan. 2012. "Measuring Gubernatorial Budgetary Power A New Approach." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 12(4): 438-455.

Book Report (_____):

- Kousser, Thad and Justin Phillips. 2012. *The Power of American Governors: Winning on Budgets and Losing on Policy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Courts and Judicial Elections (10/10)

[Peer-Review Assignment Due]

- Shugerman, Jed H. 2010. "Economic Crisis and the Rise of Judicial Elections and Judicial Review," 123 *Harvard Law Review* 1061.
- Hall, Melinda Gann and Chris W. Bonneau. 2006. "Does Quality Matter? Challengers in State Supreme Court Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (January): 20-33.
- Gibson, James L. 2008. "Challenges to the Impartiality of State Supreme Courts: Legitimacy Theory and 'New-Style' Judicial Campaigns." *American Political Science Review* 102 (#1, February): 59-75.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice, Tom S. Clark, and Jason P. Kelly. 2014. "Judicial Selection and Death Penalty Decisions." *American Political Science Review* 108 (#1):23-39.
- Nelson, Michael J. 2017. "The Effects of Electoral Competition on Judicial Decisionmaking." Working Paper.

Book Report (Brendan):

- Hall, Melinda Gann. 2014. *Attacking Judges: How Campaign Advertising Influences State Supreme Court Elections*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kritzer, Bert. 2015. *Justices on the Ballot*. Cambridge University Press
- Bonneau, Chris W. and Damon Cann. *Voters' Verdicts: Citizens, Campaigns, and Institutions in State Supreme Court Elections*. University of Virginia Press

Part III: Making Policies in the States

Policy Responsiveness to Public Opinion (10/17)

- Erikson, Robert, Gerald Wright, and John McIver. 1993. *Statehouse Democracy: Public Opinion and Policy in the American States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 4-8
- Lax, J. R. and J. H. Phillips 2012. "The Democratic Deficit in the States." *American Journal of Political Science* 56(1): 148-166.
- Pacheco, J. (2013). "The Thermostatic Model of Responsiveness in the American States." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 13(3): 306-332.
- Broockman, Daniel and Daniel M. Butler. 2017. "The Causal Effects of Elite Position-Taking on Voter Attitudes: Field Experiments with Elite Communication." *American Journal of Political Science* 61(1): 208-221.
- Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936-2014." Conditionally Accepted at *American Political Science Review*

Book Report (Michael):

- Hardin, Jeffrey J. 2016. *Multidimensional Democracy: A Supply and Demand Theory of Representation in American Legislatures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Identities and State Politics (10/24)

[Checkpoint 2 Due]

- Preuhs, R. R. 2006. "The Conditional Effects of Minority Descriptive Representation: Black Legislators and Policy Influence in the American States." *The Journal of Politics* 68(3): 585-599.
- Ladam, Christina, Jeffrey J. Harden, and Jason H. Windett. 2018. "Follow the Leader: Prominent Female Politicians and the Emergence of Women Candidates for Public Office." Working Paper.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2002. "Political Parties and the Recruitment of Women to State Legislatures," *Journal of Politics* 64(3): 791-809.
- Butler, Daniel and David Broockman. 2011. "Do Politicians Racially Discriminate Against Constituents? A Field Experiment on State Legislators," *American Journal of Political Science* 55(3): 463-77.
- Avidit Acharya, Matthew Blackwell, and Maya Sen, "The Political Legacy of American Slavery," *The Journal of Politics* 78, no. 3 (July 2016): 621-641.

Book Report (Megan):

- Osborn, Tracy. 2012. *How Women Represent Women: Political Parties, Gender, and Representation in the State Legislatures*. Oxford University Press
- Soss, J., R. C. Fording, et al. 2011. *Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Thomas, S. 1994. *How Women Legislate*, Oxford University Press New York.
- Rouse, S. 2013. *Latinos in the Legislative Process: Interests and Influence*, Cambridge University Press

Policy Innovation, Competition, and Diffusion (10/31)

- Walker, Jack L. 1969. "The Diffusion of Innovations among the American States." *American Political Science Review* 63: 880-899
- Berry, Frances Stokes, and William D. Berry. 1990. "State Lottery Adoptions as Policy Innovations: An Event History Analysis." *American Political Science Review*. 84:395-416
- Shipan, Charles R. and Craig Volden. 2006. "Bottom-Up Federalism: The Diffusion of Antismoking Policies from U.S. Cities to States." *American Journal of Political Science* 50(4): 825-843
- Volden, Craig. 2002. "The Politics of Competitive Federalism: A Race to the Bottom in Welfare Benefits," *American Journal of Political Science* 46.
- Desmarais, Bruce; Jeffrey J. Harden and Frederick J. Boehmke. 2015. "Persistent Policy Pathways: Inferring Policy Diffusion Networks in the American States." *American Political Science Review* 109 (2): 392-406.

Book Report (Aaron):

- Karch, A. 2007. *Democratic Laboratories: Policy Diffusion Among the American States*, University of Michigan Press.

Direct Democracy (11/7)

[Circulate Draft for Checkpoint 3]

- Gerber, Elisabeth R. 1996. "Legislative Response to the Threat of Popular Initiatives." *American Journal of Political Science*. 40:99-128.
- Lewis, Daniel. 2011. "Bypassing the Representational Filter? Minority Rights Policies under Direct Democracy Institutions." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*. 11 (2): 198-222.
- Donovan, Todd, Caroline J. Tolbert and Daniel A. Smith. 2008. "Priming Presidential Votes by Direct Democracy," *The Journal of Politics* 70: 1217-1231.
- Boehmke, Frederick J., Tracy L. Osborn and Emily U. Schilling. 2015. "Pivotal Politics and Initiative Use in the American States." *Political Research Quarterly* 68 (4): 665-677.

Policy Implementation and Federalism (11/14)

[Checkpoint 3 Due]

- Enns, Peter K. 2016. *Incarceration Nation: How the United States Became the Most Punitive Democracy in the World*. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Weissert, Carol. S. and D. Scheller (2008). "Learning from the States? Federalism and National Health Policy." *Public Administration Review* 68: S162-S174
- Volden, Craig. 2005. "Intergovernmental Political Competition in American Federalism." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2): 327-342.
- James E. Monogan III, David M. Konisky, and Neal D. Woods. 2017. "Gone with the Wind: Federalism and the Strategic Location of Air Polluters." *American Journal of Political Science* 61(2): 257-270.

Book Workshop (11/28)

- Rogers, Steven. *Accountability in American Legislatures*. Book Manuscript.

Poster Session (12/5)

Upload your poster to Canvas by 11:59PM on Dec. 3.

Finals Week

[Final Exam]