

**SYLLABUS**  
**PLSC 404 – Selected Problems in Political Science**  
**Loyola University Chicago**  
**Spring 2018**

Wednesday 7:00 – 9:30 pm  
Mundelein 617 (officially)  
Coffey 326 (unofficially)

**Instructor**

Eric Hansen

Email: ehansen4@luc.edu

Office Location: Coffey Hall 326B

Office Hours: Monday and Wednesday 11:00 am – 12:30 pm; or by appointment

**Course Description and Objectives**

This seminar covers political institutions in the context of the United States. American institutions include not only the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the federal government, but also include state and local governments, electoral rules, extragovernmental organizations, and civic norms. Institutions create incentives for citizens and elites to take some political actions and avoid taking others. However, institutions are far from immutable—they persist as long as they allow the political actors working within them to achieve their underlying objectives.

This course takes a bottom-up approach to political institutions. We start small—studying the institutions that citizens encounter in their day-to-day lives—and work our way up through national governing institutions. We finish by studying the products of our institutions: public policy.

The primary objective of the class is for students to gain skills and confidence in interpreting and critiquing contemporary literature on American political institutions. By successfully completing the class, students should be able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of research across a variety of subjects. They should also be able to apply lessons from this substantive body of work to their own research interests.

The secondary objective of the class is for students to become more familiar with foundational literature in American institutions so that they are better prepared to teach undergraduate classes in American politics. At least one article each week will be foundational. The remainder of the foundational readings will appear under the “recommended” readings each week as a resource for students to reference outside of our class discussions.

**Required Texts**

We will read the following books in their entirety.

- Theda Skocpol. 2003. *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Amber Boydston. 2013. *Making the News: Politics, the Media, and Agenda Setting*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Frances Lee. 2016. *Insecure Majorities: Congress and the Perpetual Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Optional Texts**

We will read excerpts from the following books. Scanned copies of reading selections will be posted on Sakai, but students may wish to obtain their own copies.

- Mancur Olson. 1971. *The Logic of Collective Action*.
- Frank Baumgartner and Bryan Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*.
- Frank Baumgartner et al. 2009. *Lobbying and Policy Change*.
- John Aldrich. 2011. *Why Parties? A Second Look*.

**Grades**

Final grades for the course will be based on the following scale. I reserve the right to make adjustments to individual grades based on overall performance in the course and/or extenuating circumstances. There will be **NO** extra credit provided.

Letter Grade	Percentage Score
A	93-100
A-	90-92.99
B+	87-89.99
B	83-86.99
B-	80-82.99
C+	77-79.99
C	73-76.99
C-	70-72.99
D+	67-69.99
D	63-66.99
D-	60-62.99
F	59.99 or below

The proportion of each assignment as part of your overall grade is as follows:

Participation: 30%

    Active Discussion: 15%

    Discussion Questions: 15%

Writing Assignments: 45%

Final Exam: 25%

## Participation

Participation grades will be comprised of two components: active discussion and discussion questions.

### *Active Discussion*

This seminar requires active participation from students every class period. There may be some days when I prepare a short lecture, but we will spend a vast majority of our time discussing the assigned reading. To spare us from awkwardly sitting in silence, students should prepare by (a) actively reading the assigned material (i.e. reading in a low-distraction environment, taking notes while reading) and (b) coming to class prepared to ask questions—even if those questions are to clarify the reading. Active participation in the discussions will account for 15% of the grade.

### *Discussion Questions*

To help students prepare for discussion and to add some structure to the reading, **all students must submit three (3) discussion questions about the day's reading to Sakai by 9 pm the night before the class meeting** (i.e. Tuesday nights). Students should submit them under the appropriate day's thread in the "Forum" tab on the class Sakai site. I will incorporate the discussion questions that students submit into that week's lesson plans. I will grade discussion questions on the quality of the question and the timeliness of submission. Discussion questions are worth 15% of the class grade.

Discussion questions should be open-ended and allow for disagreement and extended dialogue among seminar participants.

Examples of good discussion questions:

- Theoretical questions
  - Why does the author think that democratic nations are less likely to go to war? What are other potential explanations?
- Methodological questions
  - Why do you think the author chose this method to provide evidence? What other research design(s) could the author have used?
- Critiques
  - What problems do you see in the author's use of an online survey sample?

Examples of bad discussion questions:

- Factual questions
  - Where did the author conduct the field experiment?
- Yes or no questions
  - Did the author use multinomial regression to test the hypothesis?

## Writing Assignments

Students will complete and submit three “mini” research designs on topics covered over the course of the semester. For each research design, students must choose a topic relevant to the material covered within that third of the semester. The following topics will be in bounds for each of the three assignments:

- Due 2/28: Norms/Attitudes, Civil Society, Interest Groups, Federalism & Subnational Politics, Media
- Due 4/4: Party Formation/Alignment, Campaigns/Elections, Congressional Representation, Congressional Parties
- Due 5/2: Congressional Organization/Procedure, Presidency, Courts, Bureaucracy, Public Policy

Many students taking this course will not have substantive research interests falling in American politics (though the American case is an interesting one in the comparative context!). Students may write research designs on topics *related to the course content* but set in contexts more immediate to their research interests. For example, a research design for the period covering the week on Congressional representation/the electoral connection would be welcome to write a research design testing theories of constituency representation in Brazil. When in doubt, feel free to ask me to vet your topic ahead of time.

Research designs should consist of four single-spaced (or eight double-spaced) pages. Research designs should consist of the following elements:

- Statement of a theoretical puzzle or problem
  - A research question that is interesting and important, and that has not been answered (or at least satisfactorily answered) in previous research
  - A “Why” question is necessary—a good research design will seek to *explain* rather than *describe* a political phenomenon.
- Theory (and Literature Review)
  - A good research design should have a theory—an explanation of a political process—at its core.
  - Avoid spending too much time reviewing relevant literature. Citations should be added in support of your original thinking in developing the theory. The theory section should not be a summary or laundry list of previous works.
  - Students should not be afraid to assert their original thoughts in articulating a theory. Replicating and extending prior work can contribute valuable knowledge to the field, but relying too much on prior work to generate ideas can prevent students from overturning conventional wisdom (when appropriate) and developing new knowledge. Previous research should help inform the theory—but it’s not always the most important part.
- Hypothesis Formation
  - Students should explicitly present one or more hypotheses derived from the theory.

- Hypotheses are testable implications of an abstract theory. Ask yourself, “If the theory were true, what sorts of events or outcomes could we expect to observe in the real world?”
- Methodology
  - Students are not required to gather data and test the hypotheses for this assignment. However, students should make extensive plans for how they would plan to test their hypotheses using current, accepted research methodologies.
  - *Be specific* in describing the research methodology. The following scenario might be helpful to giving you an idea of an ideal research design. Imagine that you and a fellow student are given your research design, put into separate labs without the ability to communicate, and asked to execute your design. Your fellow student should be able to replicate exactly the tests that you intend to conduct based solely on the text of the research design.
  - Make sure you describe the data you would use (or you would need to collect) as well as the statistical test or method of analysis you would use to analyze the data. If you plan to collect original data, describe how exactly you would collect the data.
  - Make sure you also address the appropriateness of your proposed test for answering the question in the theory section. For example, if there are potential issues of generalizability or selection bias, address them.

### **Final Exam**

The final exam is intended to be practice for your comprehensive exams. The exam will consist of essay questions designed to test your comprehension of the assigned material. Even more importantly, the final exam will test your ability to synthesize the material and apply lessons from it to conduct your own research and answer to more fundamental questions the discipline faces.

The final exam will be a take home exam. Students can think of it as a “mini-comp”—questions will be designed similar to the way that students will see them in the comprehensive exams. I will email students the exam at the beginning of finals week. Students must return their exam to me by email no later than the end of the scheduled final exam period.

The final exam will be designed to take no longer than four hours to complete. Students are **strongly discouraged** from spending more than four hours on the exam. Quite frankly, you have better things to do with your time than spending an entire day or several days on one exam. (Good test grades won’t get you a job—good publications will.) Moreover, since this exam mimics the comprehensive exam, this is a golden opportunity for students to simulate the comp and practice performing under time pressure.

### **Communication, Office Hours, Question about Grades**

Please direct all communication with me outside class or office hours through my campus email account, which can be found in the header of this syllabus. I check my campus email account several times daily and will try to reply to student emails as quickly as possible. That being said, students should not necessarily expect me to reply immediately to emails sent to me at the last

minute. I may not be able to reply to questions about course material the morning of an exam or provide resources for writing assignments the night before it is to be turned in.

My office hours exist solely for you to visit me with questions about this class. If you can't make those times, email me to schedule a more convenient appointment time. Email is only for brief communications. If you have long and complicated questions, come to my office hours. After I have graded and returned your assignments, there is a twenty-four hour moratorium before I will answer questions about that assignment.

### **Technology Use**

I will allow the use of laptops, tablets, or other devices in class. However, if I suspect that devices are being used for purposes other than a resource to further discussion or take notes, I reserve the right to curtail or prohibit their use in class. The use of cell phones or other mobile communication devices is strictly prohibited during class, except in the event of an emergency. Cell phones minimally should be put on silent but preferably should be turned off. Students discovered using their phones during class time will be asked to turn off their phones and place them out of reach.

### **Students with Disabilities**

Loyola University Chicago provides reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities. Any student requesting accommodations related to a disability or other condition is required to register with Services for Students with Disabilities (SSWD), located in Sullivan Center, Suite 117. Students should provide me with an accommodation notification from SSWD, preferably within the first two weeks of class. Students are encouraged to meet with me individually in order to discuss their accommodations. All information will remain confidential. For more information or further assistance, please call (773) 508-3700 or visit <http://www.luc.edu/sswd>.

### **Academic Integrity**

Students are responsible for adhering to university policy on academic honesty and avoiding acts of plagiarism or cheating. Students can find more information about what constitutes plagiarism at the Writing Center's website: (<http://www.luc.edu/writing/studentresources/onlineresources>). Consult the College of Arts and Sciences' statement to learn more about college policy: (<http://www.luc.edu/cas/advising/academicintegritystatement>). I reserve the right to case-by-case discretion in assigning penalties for acts of academic dishonesty. Generally speaking, however, students should expect to receive a score of "0" on any assignment or exam where they are observed plagiarizing, cheating, or passing off someone else's ideas as their own. If a student commits more than one act of academic dishonesty during the semester, I will fail that student in the course. I report all instances of academic dishonesty to the Office of the Dean of the College of Arts and Science.

### **Readings**

Students are expected to complete weekly reading assignments in preparation for class. Read carefully and be ready to discuss the material, as discussions based around these readings will form the basis of the participation component of your grade. I reserve the right to make changes to the reading list and will inform students well in advance of any changes.

All reading assignments are to be completed by the beginning of class on the day the assignment is listed. Students are responsible for obtaining their own copies of the books by Skocpol (1/24), Boydston (2/14), and Lee (3/21). All other chapters and articles will be posted on Sakai. Students may not share course materials with others outside of the class without my written permission.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Readings</b>
1/17	Introduction; Civic Norms and Democratic Attitudes	<p><u>Required: Introduction</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This syllabus</li> <li>• Jim Stimson. “Professional Writing in Political Science: A Highly Opinionated Essay.”</li> </ul> <p><u>Required: Norms and Attitudes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Herbert McClosky. 1964. “Consensus and Ideology in American Politics.” <i>APSR</i> 58:361-82.</li> <li>• John Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2001. “Process Preferences and American Politics: What the People Want Government to Be.” <i>APSR</i> 95:145-53.</li> <li>• Luke Keele. 2007. “Social Capital and the Dynamics of Trust in Government.” <i>AJPS</i> 241-54.</li> <li>• Roberto Stefan Foa and Yascha Mounk. 2016. “The Democratic Disconnect.” <i>Journal of Democracy</i> 27:5-17.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jack Citrin. 1974. “Comment: The Political Relevance of Trust in Government.” <i>APSR</i> 68:973-88.</li> <li>• Danielle Allen. 2004. <i>Talking to Strangers: Anxieties of Citizenship Since Brown v. Board of Education</i>.</li> <li>• Marc Hetherington. 2005. <i>Why Trust Matters: Declining Political Trust and the Demise of American Liberalism</i>.</li> </ul>
1/24	Civil Society	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theda Skocpol. 2003. <i>Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life</i>. Entire book.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alexis de Tocqueville. 1840. <i>Democracy in America</i>.</li> <li>• Robert Dahl. 1963. <i>Who Governs?</i></li> <li>• Jack Walker. 1966. “A Critique of the Elitist Theory of Democracy.” <i>APSR</i> 60: 285-95.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sidney Verba, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry Brady. 1995. <i>Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics</i>.</li> <li>• Robert Putnam. 2001. <i>Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community</i>.</li> <li>• Lee Cronk and Beth Leech. 2012. <i>Meeting at Grand Central: Understanding the Social and Evolutionary Roots of Cooperation</i>.</li> </ul>
1/31	Interest Groups	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mancur Olson. 1971. <i>The Logic of Collective Action</i>. Chapters 1-2.</li> <li>• Richard Hall and Alan Deardorff. 2006. “Lobbying as Legislative Subsidy.” <i>APSR</i> 100: 69-84.</li> <li>• Frank Baumgartner et al. 2009. <i>Lobbying and Policy Change</i>. Chs. 1 &amp; 11.</li> <li>• Sarah Anzia and Terry Moe. 2015. “Public Sector Unions and the Costs of Government.” <i>JOP</i> 77:114-27.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Truman. 1951. <i>The Governmental Process</i>.</li> <li>• E.E. Schattschneider. 1960. <i>The Semisovereign People</i>.</li> <li>• Robert Salisbury. 1969. “An Exchange Theory of Interest Groups.” <i>Midwest Journal of Political Science</i> 79:1-32.</li> <li>• John Mark Hansen. 1985. “The Political Economy of Group Membership.” <i>APSR</i> 79:79-96.</li> <li>• John Heinz et al. 1993. <i>The Hollow Core</i>.</li> <li>• David Austen-Smith. 1993. “Information and Influence: Lobbying for Agendas and Votes.” <i>AJPS</i> 37:799-833.</li> <li>• David Lowery and Virginia Gray. 1995. “The Population Ecology of Gucci Gulch or the Natural Regulation of Interest Group Numbers in the American States.” <i>AJPS</i> 39: 1-29.</li> <li>• Mark Smith. 2000. <i>American Business and Political Power: Public Opinion, Elections, and Democracy</i>.</li> <li>• Frank Baumgartner and Beth Leech. 2001. “Interest Niches and Policy Bandwagons: Patterns of Interest Group Involvement in National Politics.” <i>JOP</i> 63:1191-1213.</li> <li>• Kay Lehman Schlozman et al. 2012. <i>The Unheavenly Chorus</i>.</li> </ul>



2/7	Federalism & Subnational Politics	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lisa Miller. 2007. “The Representational Biases of Federalism: Scope and Bias in the Political Process, Revisited.” <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 5:305-21.</li> <li>• Arthur Lupia et al. 2010. “Why State Constitutions Differ in Their Treatment of Same-Sex Marriage.” <i>JOP</i> 70:1217-31.</li> <li>• Jeff Lax and Justin Phillips. 2012. “The Democratic Deficit in the States.” <i>AJPS</i> 56:148-66.</li> <li>• Nathan Kelly and Chris Witko. 2012. “Federalism and American Inequality.” <i>JOP</i> 74:414-26.</li> <li>• Gerald Gamm and Thad Kousser. 2013. “No Strength in Numbers: The Failure of Big-City Bills in American State Legislatures, 1880-2000.” <i>APSR</i> 107:663-78.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peverill Squire. 1992. “Legislative Professionalization and Membership Diversity in State Legislatures.” <i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i> 17:69-79.</li> <li>• Robert Erikson, Gerald Wright, and John McIver. 1993. <i>Statehouse Democracy: Public Opinion and Policy in the American States</i>.</li> <li>• Andrew Karch. 2007. “Emerging Issues and Future Directions in State Policy Diffusion Research.” <i>State Politics &amp; Policy Quarterly</i> 7:54-80.</li> <li>• Lisa Miller. 2008. <i>The Perils of Federalism</i>.</li> <li>• Thad Kousser and Justin Phillips. 2010. <i>The Power of American Governors</i>.</li> <li>• Chris Tausanovitch and Christopher Warshaw. 2014. “Representation in Municipal Government.” <i>APSR</i> 108:605-41.</li> <li>• Steven Rogers. 2017. “Electoral Accountability for State Legislative Roll Calls and Ideological Representation.” <i>APSR</i> 111:555-71.</li> </ul>
2/14	Media	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amber Boydston. 2013. <i>Making the News: Politics, the Media, and Agenda Setting</i>. Entire book.</li> <li>• Joshua Clinton and Ted Enamorado. 2014. “The National News Media’s Effect on Congress: How <i>Fox News</i> Affected Elites in Congress.” <i>JOP</i> 76:928-43.</li> </ul>

		<p><u>Recommended:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charles Franklin 1991. “Eschewing Obfuscation? Campaigns and the Perception of U.S. Senate Incumbents.” <i>APSR</i> 85:1193-1214.</li> <li>• Timothy Cook. 1998. <i>Governing with the News: The News Media as a Political Institution</i>.</li> <li>• Martin Gilens and Craig Hertzman. 2000. “Corporate Ownership and News Bias: Newspaper Coverage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act.” <i>JOP</i> 62:369-86.</li> <li>• Johanna Dunaway. 2008. “Markets, Ownership, and the Quality of Campaign News Coverage.” <i>JOP</i> 70:1193-1202.</li> <li>• James T. Hamilton. 2006. <i>All the News That’s Fit to Sell: How the Market Transforms Information into News</i>.</li> <li>• Jeffrey Berry and Sarah Sobieraj. 2014. <i>The Outrage Industry: Political Opinion Media and the New Incivility</i>.</li> </ul>
2/21	Political Parties: Formation and Alignment	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Aldrich. 2011. <i>Why Parties? A Second Look</i>. Chs. 1-2.</li> <li>• Gary Miller and Norman Schofield. 2003. “Activists and Partisan Realignment in the United States.” <i>APSR</i> 97:245-60.</li> <li>• Kathleen Bawn et al. 2012. “A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands and Nominations in American Politics.” <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 10:571-97.</li> <li>• Matt Grossmann and David Hopkins. 2015. “Ideological Republicans and Group Interest Democrats: The Asymmetry of American Party Politics.” <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 13:119-39.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• V.O. Key, Jr. 1949. <i>Southern Politics in State Nation</i>.</li> <li>• Edward Carmines and James Stimson. 1989. <i>Issue Evolution: Race and the Transformation of American Politics</i>.</li> <li>• Paul Frymer. 1999. <i>Uneasy Alliances: Race and Party Competition in America</i>.</li> <li>• Geoffrey Layman et al. 2010. “Activists and Conflict Extension in American Party Politics.” <i>APSR</i> 104:324-46.</li> <li>• David Karol. 2009. <i>Party Position Change in American Politics: Coalition Management</i>.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matt Grossmann and David Hopkins. 2016. <i>Asymmetric Politics: Ideological Republicans and Group Interest Democrats</i>.</li> </ul>
2/28	Parties, Campaigns, and Elections	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gerald Wright and Brian Schaffner. 2002. "The Influence of Party: Evidence from the State Legislatures." <i>APSR</i> 96:367-79.</li> <li>• Bruce Desmarais, Raymond La Raja, and Michael Kowal. 2015. "The Fates of Challengers in U.S. House Elections: The Role of Extended Party Networks in Supporting Candidates and Shaping Electoral Outcomes." <i>AJPS</i> 59:194-211.</li> <li>• Eric McGhee et al. 2015. "A Primary Cause of Partisanship? Nomination Systems and Legislator Ideology." <i>AJPS</i> 58:337-51.</li> <li>• Ryan Enos and Eitan Hersh. 2015. "Party Activists as Campaign Advertisers: The Ground Campaign as a Principal-Agent Problem." <i>APSR</i> 109:252-78.</li> <li>• Hans Hassell. 2016. "Party Control of Party Primaries: Party Influence in Nominations for the U.S. Senate." <i>JOP</i> 78:75-87.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thomas Carsey. 2001. <i>Campaign Dynamics</i>.</li> <li>• Tali Mendelberg. 2001. <i>The Race Card: Campaign Strategy, Implicit Messages, and the Norm of Equality</i>.</li> <li>• Martin Cohen et al. 2008. <i>The Party Decides: Presidential Nominations Before and After Reform</i>.</li> <li>• Seth Masket. 2009. <i>No Middle Ground: How Informal Party Organization Control Nominations and Polarize Legislatures</i>.</li> <li>• James Druckman, Martin Kifer, and Michael Parkin. 2009. "Campaign Communications in U.S. Congressional Elections." <i>APSR</i> 103:343-66.</li> <li>• Tracy Sulkin. 2011. <i>The Legislative Legacy of Congressional Campaigns</i>.</li> <li>• Brendan Nyhan and Jacob Montgomery. 2015. "Connecting the Candidates: Consultant Networks and the Diffusion of Campaign Strategy in American Congressional Elections." <i>AJPS</i> 292-308.</li> <li>• Christopher Achen and Larry Bartels. 2016. <i>Democracy for Realists</i>.</li> </ul>

3/7	<i>Spring Break – No class meeting</i>	
3/14	Congress: Electoral Connection and Representation	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Richard Fenno. 1977. “U.S. House Members in Their Constituencies.” <i>APSR</i> 71: 883-916.</li> <li>• Brandice Canes-Wrone, David Brady, and John Cogan. 2002. “Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members’ Voting.” <i>APSR</i> 96:127-40.</li> <li>• Kristina Miler. 2007. “The View from the Hill: Legislative Perceptions of the District.” <i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i> 32:597-628.</li> <li>• Jeff Harden. 2013. “Multidimensional Responsiveness: The Determinants of Legislators’ Representational Priorities.” <i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i> 38:155-84.</li> <li>• Eric Hansen and Sarah Treul. 2015. “The Symbolic and Substantive Representation of LGB Americans in the U.S. House.” <i>JOP</i> 77:955-67.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Warren Miller and Donald Stokes. 1963. “Constituency Influence in Congress.” <i>APSR</i> 57:45-57.</li> <li>• David Mayhew. 1973. <i>Congress: The Electoral Connection</i>.</li> <li>• Richard Fenno. 1978. <i>Home Style: House Members in Their Districts</i>.</li> <li>• Bruce Cain, John Ferejohn, and Morris Fiorina. 1987. <i>The Personal Vote: Constituency Service and Electoral Independence</i>.</li> <li>• Gary Jacobson. 1989. “Strategic Politicians and the Dynamics of U.S. House Elections, 1946-86.” <i>APSR</i> 83:773-93.</li> <li>• David Canon. 1999. <i>Race, Redistricting, and Representation: The Unintended Consequences of Black Majority Districts</i>.</li> <li>• Joshua Clinton. 2006. “Representation in Congress: Constituents and Roll Calls in the 106<sup>th</sup> House.” <i>JOP</i> 68:397-409.</li> <li>• Barry Burden. 2007. <i>The Personal Roots of Representation</i>.</li> <li>• Matthew Hayes, Matthew Hibbing, and Tracy Sulkin. 2010. “Redistricting, Responsiveness, and Issue Attention.” <i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i> 35:91-115.</li> <li>• Christian Grose. 2011. <i>Congress in Black and White</i>.</li> <li>• Nicholas Carnes. 2013. <i>White-Collar Government</i>.</li> </ul>

3/21	Congress: Parties	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gary Cox. 2001. “Agenda Setting in the U.S. House: A Majority-Party Monopoly?” <i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i> 26:185-210.</li> <li>• Frances Lee. 2016. <i>Insecure Majorities: Congress and the Perpetual Campaign</i>. Entire book.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Rohde. 1991. <i>Parties and Leaders in the Post-Reform House</i>.</li> <li>• Keith Krehbiel. 1993. “Where’s the Party?” <i>BJPS</i> 23: 235-66.</li> <li>• Jason Roberts and Steven Smith. 2003. “Procedural Contexts, Party Strategy, and Conditional Party Voting in the U.S. House of Representatives, 1971-2000.” <i>AJPS</i> 47:305-17.</li> <li>• Gary W. Cox and Mathew D. McCubbins. 2005. <i>Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives</i>.</li> <li>• Sean Theriault. 2008. <i>Party Polarization in Congress</i>.</li> <li>• Frances Lee. 2009. <i>Beyond Ideology: Politics, Principles, and Partisanship in the U.S. Senate</i>.</li> <li>• David Rohde. 2013. “Reflections on the Practice of Theorizing: Conditional Party Government in the Twenty-First Century.” <i>JOP</i> 75:849-64.</li> <li>• Laurel Harbridge. 2015. <i>Is Bipartisanship Dead?</i></li> </ul>
3/28	Congress: Internal Organization and Procedure	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nelson Polsby. 1968. “The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives.” <i>APSR</i> 62:148-68.</li> <li>• Justin Grimmer and Eleanor Neff Powell. 2013. “Congressmen in Exile: The Politics and Consequences of Involuntary Committee Removal.” <i>JOP</i> 75:907-20.</li> <li>• Nicholas Howard and Jason Roberts. 2015. “The Politics of Obstruction: Republican Holds in the U.S. Senate.” <i>Legislative Studies Quarterly</i> 40:273-94.</li> <li>• Hans Hassell and Samuel Kernell. 2016. “Veto Rhetoric and Legislative Riders.” <i>AJPS</i> 60:845-59.</li> <li>• Christopher Berry and Anthony Fowler. 2016. “Cardinals or Clerics? Congressional Committees and the Distribution of Pork.” <i>AJPS</i> 60:692-708.</li> </ul>

		<p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Richard Fenno. 1973. <i>Congressmen in Committees</i>.</li> <li>• John Kingdon. 1973. <i>Congressmen's Voting Decisions</i>.</li> <li>• Joseph Cooper and David Brady. 1981. "Institutional Context and Leadership Style: The House from Cannon to Rayburn." <i>APSR</i> 75:411-25.</li> <li>• Douglas Arnold. 1990. <i>The Logic of Congressional Action</i>.</li> <li>• Keith Krehbiel. 1991. <i>Information and Legislative Organization</i>.</li> <li>• Keith Krehbiel. 1998. <i>Pivotal Politics: A Theory of U.S. Lawmaking</i>.</li> <li>• Diana Evans. 2004. <i>Greasing the Wheels: Using Pork Barrel Projects to Build Majority Coalitions in Congress</i>.</li> <li>• James Curry. 2015. <i>Legislating in the Dark: Information and Power in the House of Representatives</i>.</li> <li>• Sarah Treul. 2017. <i>Agenda Crossover: The Influence of State Delegations in Congress</i>.</li> </ul>
4/4	Presidency	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lyn Ragsdale and John Theiss. 1997. "The Institutionalization of the American Presidency." <i>AJPS</i> 93:99-114.</li> <li>• Gary Hollibaugh, Gabriel Horton, and David Lewis. 2014. "Presidents and Patronage." <i>AJPS</i> 58:1024-42.</li> <li>• Douglas Kriner and Andrew Reeves. 2015. "Presidential Particularism and Divide-the-Dollar Politics." <i>APSR</i> 109:155-71.</li> <li>• George Krause and Anne Joseph O'Connell. 2016. "Experiential Learning and Presidential Management of the U.S. Federal Bureaucracy: Logic and Evidence from Agency Leadership Appointments." <i>AJPS</i> 60:914-31.</li> <li>• Sharece Thrower. 2017. "To Revoke or Not Revoke? The Political Determinants of Executive Order Longevity." <i>AJPS</i> 61:642-56.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• James David Barber. 1972. <i>Presidential Character</i>.</li> <li>• Richard E. Neustadt. 1990. <i>Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents: The Politics of Leadership from Roosevelt to Reagan</i>.</li> <li>• Samuel Kernell. 1997. <i>Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership</i>.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charles Cameron. 2000. <i>Veto Bargaining: Presidents and the Politics of Negative Power</i>.</li> <li>• Andrew Rudalevige. 2002. <i>Managing the President's Program: Presidential Leadership and Legislative Policy Formulation</i>.</li> <li>• Brandice Canes-Wrone. 2006. <i>Who Leads Whoms? Presidents, Policy, and the Public</i>.</li> <li>• James Druckman and Lawrence Jacobs. 2015. <i>Who Governs? Presidents, Public Opinion, and Manipulation</i>.</li> </ul>
4/11	Bureaucracy	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jason Webb Yackee and Susan Webb Yackee. 2006. "A Bias Toward Business? Assessing Interest Group Influence on the Bureaucracy." <i>JOP</i> 68:128-39.</li> <li>• Joshua Clinton, David Lewis, and Jennifer Selin. 2015. "Influencing the Bureaucracy: The Irony of Congressional Oversight." <i>AJPS</i> 58:387-401.</li> <li>• David Konisky and Manuel Teodoro. 2016. "When Governments Regulate Governments." <i>AJPS</i> 60:559-74.</li> <li>• Christine Palus and Susan Webb Yackee. 2016. "Clerks or Kings? Partisan Alignment and Delegation to the U.S. Bureaucracy." <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 26:693-708.</li> <li>• Matthew Hall. 2017. "Macro Implementation: Testing the Causal Paths from U.S. Macro Policy to Federal Incarceration." <i>AJPS</i> 61:438-55.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charles Lindblom. 1959. "The Science of Muddling Through." <i>Public Administration Review</i> 19:79-88.</li> <li>• Michael Cohen, James March, and Johan Olsen. 1972. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> 17:1-25.</li> <li>• Gary Miller. 1992. <i>Managerial Dilemmas: The Political Economy of Hierarchy</i>.</li> <li>• Daniel Carpenter. 2001. <i>The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies</i>.</li> <li>• John Huber and Charles Shipan. 2002. <i>Deliberate Discretion: The Institutional Foundation of Bureaucratic Autonomy</i>.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sean Gailmard and John Patty. 2007. "Slackers and Zealots: Civil Service, Policy Discretion, and Bureaucratic Expertise." <i>AJPS</i> 51:873-89.</li> </ul>
4/18	Courts	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robert Dahl. 1957. "Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as National Policy Maker." <i>Journal of Public Law</i> 6:279-95.</li> <li>Brandon Bartels and Andrew O'Geen. 2015. "The Nature of Legal Change on the U.S. Supreme Court: Jurisprudential Regimes Theory and Its Alternatives." <i>AJPS</i> 59:880-95.</li> <li>Rachel Hinkle. 2015. "Legal Constraint in the U.S. Courts of Appeals." <i>JOP</i> 77:721-35.</li> <li>Ryan Black and Ryan Owens. 2016. "Courting the President: How Circuit Court Judges Alter Their Behavior for Promotion to the Supreme Court." <i>AJPS</i> 60:30-43.</li> <li>Brandice Canes-Wrone, Tom Clark, and Jason Kelly. 2014. "Judicial Selection and Death Penalty Decisions." <i>APSR</i> 108:23-39.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jonathan Casper. 1976. "The Supreme Court and National Policy Making." <i>APSR</i> 70:50-63.</li> <li>Gerald N. Rosenberg. 1991. <i>The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change?</i></li> <li>Melinda Gann Hall. 2001. "State Supreme Courts in American Democracy: Probing the Myths of Judicial Reform." <i>APSR</i> 95:315-30.</li> <li>Forrest Maltzman, James F. Spriggs II, and Paul J. Wahlbeck. 2002. <i>Crafting Law on the Supreme Court: The Collegial Game.</i></li> <li>Jeffrey A. Segal and Harold J. Spaeth. 2002. <i>The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited.</i></li> <li>Hansford, Thomas G., and James F. Spriggs, III. 2006. <i>The Politics of Precedent on the Supreme Court.</i></li> <li>Timothy R. Johnson, Paul J. Wahlbeck, and James F. Springs, II. 2006. "The Influence of Oral Arguments on the U.S. Supreme Court." <i>American Political Science Review</i> 100: 99-114.</li> </ul>
4/25	Policy Making	<p><u>Required</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deborah Stone. 1989. "Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas." <i>Political Science Quarterly</i> 104(2):281-</li> </ul>



		<p>300.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frank Baumgartner and Bryan Jones. 1993. <i>Agendas and Instability in American Politics</i>. Chs. 1-2.</li> <li>• Bryan Jones, Heather Larsen-Price, and John Wilkerson. 2009. "Representation and American Governing Institutions." <i>JOP</i> 71:277-90</li> <li>• Suzanne Mettler. 2010. "Reconstituting the Submerged State: The Challenges of Social Policy Reform in the Obama Era." <i>Perspective on Politics</i> 8:803-24.</li> <li>• Devin Caughey and Christopher Warshaw. 2017. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936-2014." <i>APSR</i>. Forthcoming.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommended</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Kingdon. 1984. <i>Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policy</i>.</li> <li>• Bryan Jones. 2003. "Bounded Rationality and Political Science: Lessons from Public Administration and Public Policy." <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i> 13:395-412.</li> <li>• Bryan Jones and Frank Baumgartner. 2005. <i>The Politics of Attention: How Government Prioritizes Problems</i>.</li> <li>• Suzanne Mettler. 2011. <i>The Submerged State: How Invisible Government Policies Undermine American Democracy</i>.</li> <li>• Paul Burstein. 2014. <i>American Public Opinion, Advocacy, and Policy in Congress: What the Public Wants and What It Gets</i>.</li> <li>• Bryan Jones and Frank Baumgartner. 2015. <i>The Politics of Information: Problem Definition and the Course of Public Policy in America</i>.</li> </ul>
5/2	<i>Final Exam</i>	

**Disclaimer**

I reserve the right to make any changes to this syllabus as circumstances change throughout the semester. Any changes will be announced over email and, when possible, verbally in class well in advance of the changes taking effect.