

POLS 600 - American Politics Core Graduate Seminar

Fall 2017

3:30 pm-6:10 pm, Tuesday

DuSable Hall 464

Prof. April K. Clark
402 Zulauf Hall
aclark9@niu.edu

Office Hours

Tuesday: 12:30 pm-1:30 pm

Thursday: 12:30 pm-3:00 pm

Also by appointment

I. Course Description

This course provides an introduction to the classic and contemporary scientific literature on American politics and government. This core seminar serves as a broad introduction to political science research in American politics, laying a foundation for your comprehensive exam, future courses you will teach, and any research you may choose to do in the field. It is my goal to introduce you to a wide range of theoretical and methodological perspectives via an examination of some of the “classics” along with the most recent empirical work in our field. With respect to what we read, we will pay close attention to theoretical arguments, methodological choices, and findings. I expect that most students have already had some exposure to the literature in American politics, but I understand that there may be great variety in the depth of your exposure. In general, this course is designed to help graduate students become introduced to the breadth of this literature, to know the state-of-the-literature on a variety of topics (described below), and to help you transition from being primarily a consumer of the literature to a producer of the literature.

While any seminar of this kind can but scratch the surface of our enormous, diverse, and still-evolving field, we will cover a variety of topics in the Political Science subfield of American politics. Yet, this course is designed to be a survey course, such that our introduction to each topic will be somewhat brief. Advanced courses are offered (or could be) on every topic we touch, so you can think of this class as being just the tip of the iceberg. For many of you, this type of introduction provides an excellent way to sample the types of questions, methodologies, and research being conducted in the subfields of American politics, and this may help you to choose your own course of research and area of specialty. Broadly, we will cover both institutions and behavior—the two major subfields in American politics. This means we will touch upon topics such as Congress, Bureaucracy, Presidency, and Courts. But we will also cover Public Opinion, Elections, Campaigns, Political Parties, Political Organizations, and perhaps some other specialized topics that the class chooses to cover as a group.

II. Course Goals

There are two primary goals for this course. First, students should gain a working familiarity with the literature in American Politics. One could not hope to understand the complete literature in only a semester, but this introduction will provide you with a foundation on which you can begin to build more specialized knowledge. Students planning to research and teach in American politics should gain a fundamental grasp of the substance of research in this vast field.

Students who do not expect to further study American politics will find the theoretical and methodological lessons are foundational to studying other subfields of political and social science. Second, students will practice and improve their critical thinking, writing, and research skills in this class. Students will have a heavy reading load, which is necessary to begin to dissect the voluminous literature

in this field. Students will also actively engage with one another in research, presentations, and writing assignments.

III. Seminar Organization and Requirements. Each seminar will center on a critical analysis of the assigned readings. Most of our class time will typically be spent in group discussion, although I will usually offer some commentary on the week's readings (e.g., placing the readings in context of previous research or research not represented on the syllabus, etc.). Also, at the end of each class I will introduce the next week's readings by briefly describing them, suggesting issues for you to think about, etc.

Seminar grades will be based on several considerations—class participation, a research paper, and weekly reaction papers and literature presentation.

For each week's readings, you should be prepared to discuss the following questions:

- What are the major theoretical perspectives that structure research in a given area? What are the major strengths and weaknesses of each perspective and how do they compare with other perspectives considered in the course?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methodological strategies used to investigate the subject? What methodologies, broadly conceived (e.g., basic issues of design, measurement, etc.) are most appropriate, given the subject of inquiry? To what degree are substantive conclusions dependent on the methods employed?
- What suggestions would you make for improving research in a given area of study? What theories, methods and substantive foci deserve more attention in future research?
- What are the major implications of the findings for public policy, policy-makers, and democratic theory?
- How should this material be presented to undergraduates?

Class Discussions / Presentations. (20%) Each week, one (or two) student(s) will be responsible for presenting the required readings. The student presenter should circulate discussion questions to the rest of the class by **Monday at 5:00 p.m.** the evening before the scheduled class period. The presenter will provide a brief oral summary of the readings and help to start discussion about the day's topics. The presenter should note points of interest, confusion, or controversy in the readings and provide a thoughtful criticism.

Reaction Papers. (30%) Each student is expected to write short (2 pages max.) reaction papers for each week's assigned readings. These reaction papers should provide a focused discussion of some aspect of the readings (e.g. major strengths/problems, the overall themes you think we should consider for the week, etc.) for the day rather than a summary of them, and should be designed to facilitate and help direct the class discussion. The reaction papers should also offer a research question based on the literature you have read with a few thoughts regarding the data you'd need and what your hypotheses might be. Before coming to class, you should read your classmates' memos and think about their comments to facilitate discussion. The papers should be double spaced with 12 point font, and emailed to the entire class (including the instructor) by **Monday no later than 5 p.m.** the evening before the scheduled class period. If you miss the deadline, make up memos are not accepted under any circumstances.

Research Paper. Half (50%) of your grade will be based on a research paper (15-20 double-spaced pages) on a topic of your choice that will be due on the last day of class. At a minimum, this paper must include a critical literature review and an accompanying research design. More ambitiously, you should think of this assignment as an opportunity to craft a piece of original research which states and tests hypotheses. Ultimately, this paper can be a blueprint for a thesis, dissertation prospectus, or should lead to

a conference paper or journal submission. Students will also present a short synopsis of their research on the final day of the seminar. The topic should be discussed with, and approved by, the instructor before you begin work on it. Your paper proposal is due **October 17** and the final paper is due **December 5th**. See **Guidelines for Research Design Paper**.

Professional Development

I also strongly recommend you do two other things this semester to begin to be part of the profession. First, I suggest that you join the American Political Science Association at <http://www.apsanet.org>. Membership will get you three journals (*APSR*, *Perspectives on Politics*, and *PS*), access to the services offered by APSA (such as their job listings), and will keep you up-to-date on goings on in the profession. Second, I recommend you attend several research talks in the department over the semester. These may include job talks, invited talks by prominent researchers, or talks by faculty and other graduate students in our department. These talks will give you a chance to see current research in American politics and other subfields of political science.

Course Policies.

1. Late assignments: Late assignments will not be accepted except under the most extraordinary circumstances, and will be scored zero.

2. Incomplete Requests: Such petitions will be granted only in extraordinary circumstances. The instructor reserves the right to ask for documentation to verify the problem preventing completion of the course by the normal deadlines. If the student does not present documentation from a university office or official, the matter will be left to the instructor's discretion.

3. Accommodations for Students with Disabilities: A student who believes that reasonable accommodations with respect to course work or other academic requirements may be appropriate in consideration of a disability must (1) provide the required verification of the disability to the Disabilities Resource Centre (2) meet with the Disabilities Resource Centre to determine appropriate accommodations, and (3) inform the faculty in charge of the academic activity of the need for accommodation. Students are encouraged to inform the faculty of their requests for accommodations as early as possible in the semester, but must make the requests in a timely enough manner for accommodations to be appropriately considered and reviewed by the university. Students who make requests for reasonable accommodations are expected to follow the policies and procedures of the Disabilities Resource Centre in this process, including but not limited to the Student Handbook. A wide range of services can be obtained by students with disabilities, including housing, transportation, adaptation of printed materials, and advocacy with faculty and staff. Students with disabilities who need such services or want more information should contact the Disabilities Resource Centre at 815-753-1303 or drc@niu.edu. The DRC is located on the 4th floor of the Health Services Building.

Books

These are the required books for this class; you will read all or large portions of each.

Aldrich, John. 1995. *Why Parties?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Arnold, R. Douglas. 1990. *The Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven: Yale.

Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins. 2007. *Legislative Leviathan* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Robert. 1961. *Who Governs?* Yale University Press.

Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, James A. Stimson. 2001. *The Macro Polity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Lewis-Beck, Michael, William G. Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, and Herbert F. Weisberg. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Sulkin, Tracy. 2005. *Issue Politics in Congress*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Henry Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civil Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

**** Reading Schedule (subject to change) ****

Tuesday, August 29

INTRODUCTION TO THE COURSE

Tuesday, September 5

POLITICAL SCIENCE IN PRACTICE

Required Readings:

- Bond, Jon R. “The Scientification of the Study of Politics: Some Observations on the Behavioral Evolution in Political Science.” *Journal of Politics* 69, no. 4 (2007): 897–907. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2508.2007.00597.x.
- Noel, Hans. “Ten Things Political Scientists Know That You Don’t.” *The Forum* 8, no. 3 (January 14, 2010). doi:10.2202/1540-8884.1393.

Methodological and Theoretical Approaches to American Politics

- Fenno, Richard F., Jr. 1986. “Observation, Context, and Sequence in the Study of Politics.” *American Political Science Review* 80:3-15.
- Green, Donald P, and Alan S. Gerber. 2002. “Reclaiming the Experimental Tradition in Political Science.” In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, ed. Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner. New York: W. W. Norton. (ER)
- James N. Druckman, Donald P. Green, James H. Kuklinski, and Arthur Lupia. 2006. “The Growth and Development of Experimental Research in Political Science.” *American Political Science Review* 100:627-635.
- Thompson, Clive. 2009. “Can Game Theory Predict When Iran Will Get the Bomb?” *New York Times Magazine*, August 12, 2009.
- Weingast, Barry R. 2002. “Rational-Choice Institutionalism.” In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, ed. Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner. New York: W. W. Norton. (ER)
- Orren, Karen, and Stephen Skowronek. 2002. “The Study of American Political Development.” In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, ed. Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner. New York: W. W. Norton. (ER)

Tuesday, September 5 (cont'd.)
POLITICAL SCIENCE IN PRACTICE

Recommended Reading:

- Ada Finifter, ed., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, revised edition (1993).
- Lawrence Dodd and Calvin Jillson, eds., *The Dynamics of American Politics: Approaches and Interpretations* (1994).
- Riker, William H. 1986. *The Art of Political Manipulation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Herbert Weisberg, ed. *Political Science: The Science of Politics* (1986).
- Morris Fiorina. 1975. "Formal Models in Political Science." *American Journal of Political Science* 19:133-159.
- Donald P. Green and Ian Shapiro. 1994. *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Herbert Simon. 1985. "Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 79:293-304.
- Ira Katznelson and John S. Lapinski. 2006. "At the Crossroads: Congress and American Political Development." *Perspectives on Politics* 4:243-260.

Tuesday, September 12
WHY GOVERNMENT?

Required Readings:

- Dahl, Robert. 1961. *Who Governs?* Yale University Press.
- Downs, Anthony. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. 1st edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1957. (Chapters. 1-4) (ER)
- De Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. Volume I, Chapters 3, 4, 8
<http://selfeducatedamerican.com/founders-corner-library/democracy-in-america-by-alexis-de-tocqueville/> (ER)

Recommended Reading:

- Robert Dahl, *A Preface to Democratic Theory* (1956).
- Orren, K. and S. Skowronek. *The Search for American Political Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior and Institutions, 2nd Ed.* New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Part I.

Tuesday, September 19

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Required Readings:

- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Henry Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civil Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Chapters 2-3, 7-14, 16
- Fowler, J., L. Baker, and C. Dawes. 2008. "Genetic Variation in Political Participation." *American Political Science Review*. 70(3):579-594.
- Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster. Chapter 1 (ER)
- Rosenstone, Steven and John Mark Hansen. 2002. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Longman. Chapters 1, 2 (ER)

Recommended Readings

- Kam, C. and C. Palmer. 2008. "Reconsidering the Effects of Education on Political Participation." *Journal of Politics*. 70(3):612-631.
- Leighley, J. and J. Nagler. 1992. "Socioeconomic Bias in Turnout, 1964-1988: The Voters Remain the Same." *American Political Science Review*. 86(3):725-36.
- Popkin, S. and M. MacDonald. 2001. "The Myth of the Vanishing Voter." *American Political Science Review*. 95(4):963-74.
- Powell, G., Jr. 1986. "American Voter Turnout in Comparative Perspective." *American Political Science Review*. 80(1):17-43.
- Wolfinger, R. and S. Rosenstone. *Who Votes?*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980.

Tuesday, September 26

ELECTIONS & CAMPAIGNS

Required Readings:

- Sulkin, Tracy. 2005. *Issue Politics in Congress*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-7
- Carmines, Edward and Michael W. Wagner. 2006. "Political Issues and Partisan Alignments: Assessing the Issue Evolution Perspective," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9: 67-91.
- Ansolabehere, S., et al. 2008. "The Strength of Issues: Using Multiple Measures to Gauge Preference Stability, Ideological Constraint, and Issue Voting." *American Political Science Review*. 102(2):215-32.
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row. Chapters 4 and 6 (ER)
- Bartels, Larry. 1987. "Candidate Choice and the Dynamics of the Presidential Nominating Process." *American Journal of Political Science* 31(1): 1-30.
- Carson, Jamie L., Erik J. Engstrom, and Jason M. Roberts. "Candidate Quality, the Personal Vote, and the Incumbency Advantage in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 101, no. 02 (2007): 289–301.
- Friedman, John N., and Richard T. Holden. "The Rising Incumbent Reelection Rate: What's Gerrymandering Got to Do With It?*" *The Journal of Politics* 71, no. 02 (April 2009): 593. doi:10.1017/S0022381609090483.

Tuesday, September 26 (cont'd.)

ELECTIONS & CAMPAIGNS

Recommended Readings

- Ansolabehere, Stephen, James M. Snyder, Jr. and Charles Stewart III. 2001. "Candidate positioning in U.S. House elections," *American Journal of Political Science* 45(1):136-159.
- Cox, Gary W., and Jonathan N. Katz. "Why Did the Incumbency Advantage in U.S. House Elections Grow?" *American Journal of Political Science* 40, no. 2 (May 1996): 478. doi:10.2307/2111633.
- Erikson, Robert and Thomas Palfrey. 2000. "Equilibria in Campaign Spending Games: Theory and Data." *The American Political Science Review* 94(3): 595-609.
- Gerber, Alan. 1998. "Estimating the Effect of Campaign Spending on Senate Election Outcomes Using Instrumental Variables." *The American Political Science Review* 92(2): 401-411.
- Huddy, Leonie and N. Terkildsen. 1993. "Gender Stereotypes and the Perception of Male and Female Candidates." *American Journal of Political Science* 37(1):119-147.
- Jacobson, Gary C. 1987. "The Marginals Never Vanished: Incumbency and Competition in Elections to the U.S. House of Representatives, 1952-1982." *American Journal of Political Science* 31(1):126-141.
- Jacobson, Gary C. 2004 *The Politics of Congressional Elections*. 6th ed. Longman Press.
- Jacobson, Gary C. 1990. "The Effects of Campaign Spending in House Elections: New Evidence for Old Arguments." *American Journal of Political Science* 34(2): 334-362.
- Jacobson, Gary C. 1989. "Strategic Politicians and the Dynamics of U.S. House Elections, 1946-1986." *American Political Science Review* 83(3): 773-793.
- Stein, Robert M. and Kenneth N. Bickers. 1996. "The Electoral Dynamics of the Federal Pork Barrel." *American Journal of Political Science* 40(4): 1300-1326.

Tuesday, October 3

VOTING

Required Readings:

- Lewis-Beck, Michael, William G. Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, and Herbert F. Weisberg. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
- Popkin, Samuel. 1994. *The Reasoning Voter*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1, 2, 3 (ER)
- Lau, Richard and David Redlawsk. 1997. "Voting Correctly." *American Political Science Review* 91(3): 585-598.
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row. Chapters 3, 13 (ER)

Recommended Readings:

- Aldrich, J. 1993. "Rational Choice and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science*. 37(1):246-78.
- Bartels, Larry M. 1988. *Presidential Primaries and the Dynamics of Public Choice*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Tuesday, October 3 (cont'd.)

VOTING

Recommended Readings:

- Burden, Barry C., David T. Canon, Kenneth R. Mayer, and Donald P. Moynihan. "Election Laws, Mobilization, and Turnout: The Unanticipated Consequences of Election Reform." *American Journal of Political Science* 58, no. 1 (2014): 95–109. doi:10.1111/ajps.12063.
- Campbell, A., P. Converse, W. Miller, and D. Stokes. *The American Voter*. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Carmines, E. and J. Stimson. 1980. "The Two Faces of Issue Voting." 74(1):78-91.
- Carmines, E. and J. Stimson. 1989. *Issue Evolution*. Princeton University Press.
- Citrin, Jack, Eric Schickler, and John Sides. "What If Everyone Voted? Simulating the Impact of Increased Turnout in Senate Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 47, no. 1 (January 1, 2003): 75–90. doi:10.2307/3186094.
- Fiorina, Morris P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*. New Haven: Yale.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin and Patrick Kenney. 1999. "Do Negative Campaigns Mobilize or Suppress Turnout? Clarifying the Relationship between Negativity and Participation." *American Political Science Review* 93(4): 877-889.
- Leighley, Jan E., and Nagler, Jonathan. *Who Votes Now?*. Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Lewis-Beck, et. al. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. University of Michigan Press.
- Nickerson, David W. "Is Voting Contagious? Evidence from Two Field Experiments." *American Political Science Review* 102, no. 01 (February 2008). doi:10.1017/S0003055408080039.
- Mebane, Walter R., Jr. 2000. "Coordination, Moderation, and Institutional Balancing in American Presidential and House Elections." *American Political Science Review*, 94(1): 37-57.

Tuesday, October 10

PUBLIC OPINION

Required Readings

- Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics," in *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. David Apter. New York: Free Press. (Seminal piece on mass belief systems, ideology, and sophistication.)
- Zaller, John. "Information, Values, and Opinion." *The American Political Science Review* 85, no. 4 (December 1, 1991): 1215–37. doi:10.2307/1963943.
- Page, Benjamin and Robert Shapiro. 1994. *The Rational Public*. Chs. 1-2. (overview of debate).
- Holbrook, Thomas. 1996. *Do Campaigns Matter?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Chapter 1 (ER).
- Michael Delli Carpini and Scott Keeter, "Stability and Change in the US Public's Knowledge of Politics," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 55 (1991): 583-612.
- Dennis Chong and James N. Druckman. "Framing Theory." *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 2007. 10:103–26.

Tuesday, October 10 (cont'd.)

PUBLIC OPINION

Recommended Readings:

- Alford, John R., Carolyn L. Funk, and John R. Hibbing. 2005. "Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?" *American Political Science Review* 99(2):153-167.
- Althaus, Scott. 2003. *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartels, Brandon L. and Diana C. Mutz. 2009. "Explaining Processes of Institutional Opinion Leadership." *The Journal of Politics* 71(1): 249-261.
- Bonica, Adam. "Mapping the Ideological Marketplace." *American Journal of Political Science* 58, no. 2 (April 1, 2014): 367–86. doi:10.1111/ajps.12062.
- Converse, Philip E. "Information Flow and the Stability of Partisan Attitudes." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (December 1, 1962): 578–99.
- Downs, Anthony. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. 1st edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1957. (Chapters. 5-8)
- Hibbing, John R. and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 1995. *Congress as Public Enemy: Public Attitudes Toward American Political Institutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Holbrook, Thomas. 1996. *Do Campaigns Matter?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Lupia, Arthur and Jesse O. Menning. 2009. "When Can Politicians Scare Citizens into Supporting Bad Policies?" *American Journal of Political Science* 53(1): 90-106.
- Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior and Institutions*, 2nd Ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Part II.
- Sinclair, Betsy. 2012. *The Social Citizen*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zaller, John. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaller, John and Stanley Feldman. 1992. "A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions or Revealing Preferences?" *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(3): 579-616.

Tuesday, October 17

POLITICAL PARTIES

Required Readings

- Aldrich, John. 1995. *Why Parties?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Focus on Chapters 1, 2, 6, 7.
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row. Chapter 8. (ER)
- MacKuen, Michael B., Robert S. Erikson, and James A. Stimson. "Macropartisanship." *The American Political Science Review* 83, no. 4 (December 1989): 1125. doi:10.2307/1961661.
- Miller, Gary, and Norman Schofield. 2003. "Activists and Partisan Realignment in the United States." *American Political Science Review*. 97(2):245-60.
- Woon, Jonathan, and Jeremy C. Pope. "Made in Congress? Testing the Electoral Implications of Party Ideological Brand Names." *The Journal of Politics* 70, no. 3 (July 1, 2008): 823–36.
- Wright, Gerald C. and Brian F. Schaffner 200. "The Influence of Party: Evidence from the State Legislatures", *American Political Science Review* 367-79.

Tuesday, October 17 (cont'd.)

POLITICAL PARTIES

Recommended Readings:

- Binder, Sarah, Eric D. Lawrence, and Forrest Maltzman. 1999. "Uncovering the Hidden Effect of Party." *Journal of Politics* 61(3):815-831.
- McCarty, Nolan, Keith Poole and Howard Rosenthal. 2001. "The Hunt for Party Discipline in Congress." *The American Political Science Review* 95(3):673-687.
- Noel, Hans. *Political Ideologies and Political Parties in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Schattschneider, Elmer E. *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. 1 edition. Hinsdale, Ill: Cengage Learning, 1975.
- Snyder, James and Michael Ting. 2002. "An Informational Rationale for Political Parties." *American Journal of Political Science* 46(1): 90-110.
- Poole, Keith T. and Howard Rosenthal. 1997. *Congress: A Political-Economic History of Roll Call Voting*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Merrill, III, B. Grofman, and T. Brunell. 2008. "Cycles in American National Electoral Politics, 1854-2006: Statistical Evidence and an Explanatory Model." *American Political Science Review*. 102(1):1-18.
- Ranney, Austin. 1951. "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System: A Commentary." *American Political Science Review* 45(2): 488-99.
- Coleman, J. 1999. "Unified Government, Divided Government, and Party Responsiveness." *American Political Science Review*. 93:821-35.
- Green, D., B. Palmquist, and E. Schickler. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Schlesinger, J. *Political Parties and the Winning of Office*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- Wattenberg, M. *The Decline of American Political Parties, 1952-1996*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Tuesday, October 24

POLARIZATION

Required Readings:

- Abramowitz, Alan I., Brad Alexander, and Matthew Gunning. "Incumbency, Redistricting, and the Decline of Competition in U.S. House Elections." *The Journal of Politics* 68, no. 1 (February 1, 2006): 75–88.
- Abramowitz, Alan I., and Kyle L. Saunders. "Ideological Realignment in the U.S. Electorate." *The Journal of Politics* 60, no. 03 (August 1998): 634. doi:10.2307/2647642.
- Abramowitz, A. and K. Saunders. 2008. "Is Polarization a Myth?" *Journal of Politics*. 70(2):542-57.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Snyder. "Purple America." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20, no. 2 (2006): 97–118.
- Fiorina, Morris P., and Samuel J. Abrams. "Political Polarization in the American Public." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11, no. 1 (2008):563–88. doi:10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.053106.153836.

Tuesday, October 24 (cont'd.)

POLARIZATION

Required Readings:

- Jacoby, William G. “Is There a Culture War? Conflicting Value Structures in American Public Opinion.” *American Political Science Review* 108, no. 04 (November 2014): 754–71. doi:10.1017/S0003055414000380.
- Hetherington, Marc. 2001. “Resurgent Mass Partisanship: The Role of Elite Polarization.” *American Political Science Review*. 95(3):619-32.
- Druckman, James N., Erik Peterson, and Rune Slothuus. “How Elite Partisan Polarization Affects Public Opinion Formation.” *American Political Science Review* 107, no. 01 (February 2013): 57–79. doi:10.1017/S0003055412000500.

Recommended Readings:

- Bartels, Larry M. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. New York; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Enns, Peter K., Nathan J. Kelly, Jana Morgan, Thomas Volscho, and Christopher Witko. “Conditional Status Quo Bias and Top Income Shares: How U.S. Political Institutions Have Benefited the Rich.” *The Journal of Politics* 76, no. 02 (2014): 289–303. doi:10.1017/S0022381613001321.
- Jones, David R. 2010. “Partisan Polarization and Congressional Accountability in House Elections.” *American Journal of Political Science* 54(2): 323-337.
- Layman, G. and T. Carsey. 2002. “Party Polarization and ‘Conflict Extension’ in the American Electorate.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 46(4):786-802.
- Lazarus, Jeffrey. 2010. “Giving the People What They Want? The Distribution of Earmarks in the U.S. House of Representatives.” *American Journal of Political Science* 54(2): 338-353.
- Lee, Frances. 2009. *Beyond Ideology: Politics, Principles, and Partisanship in the U. S. Senate*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCarty, Nolan, Keith T. Poole, and Howard Rosenthal. 2006. *Polarized America: The Dance of Ideology and Unequal Riches*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- Patty, John W. 2008. “Equilibrium Party Government.” *American Journal of Political Science* 52(3): 636-655.
- Stoker, Laura and M. Kent Jennings. 2008. “Of Time and the Development of Partisan Polarization.” *American Journal of Political Science* 52(3):619-635.
- Theriault, Sean. 2008. *Party Polarization in Congress*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tuesday, October 31

LOBBYING AND GROUPS

Required Readings:

- Olson, Mancur. (1971) [1965]. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Chapters 1 & 2 (ER)
- Walker, Jack. 1983. "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America." *American Political Science Review* 77(2): 390-406.
- Hall, Richard and Frank Wayman. 1990. "Buying Time: Moneyed Interests and the Mobilization of Bias in Congressional Committees." *American Political Science Review* 84(3): 797-820.
- Carpenter, Daniel P., Kevin M. Esterling, and David M. J. Lazer. 2004. "Friends, Brokers, and Transitivity: Who Informs Whom in Washington Politics?" *The Journal of Politics* 66, no. 1: 224–46. doi:10.1046/j.1468-2508.2004.00149.x.
- Esterling, Kevin M. 2007. "Buying Expertise: Campaign Contributions and Attention to Policy Analysis in Congressional Committees." *American Political Science Review* 101, no. 01: 93–109.
- Wright, John. 1985. "PACs, Contributions, and Roll Calls: An Organizational Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 79(2): 400-414.

Recommended Readings:

- Ainsworth, Scott and Itai Sened. 1993. "The Role of Lobbyists: Entrepreneurs with Two Audiences." *The American Journal of Political Science* 37(3):834-866.
- Ainsworth, Scott H. 1997. "The Role of Legislators in the Determination of Interest Group Influence." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 22(4):517-533.
- Austen-Smith, David. 1993. "Information and Influence: Lobbying for Agendas and Votes." *The American Journal of Political Science* 37(3):799-833.
- Bachrach, Peter and Morton Baratz. 1961. "Two Faces of Power." *The American Political Science Review* 56(4):947-52.
- Baumgartner, Frank R. and Beth L. Leech. 1998. *Basic Interests: The Importance of Groups in Politics and Political Science*. Princeton University Press.
- Box-Steffensmeier, Janet, Peter M. Radcliffe, and Brandon L. Bartels. 2005. "The Incidence and Timing of PAC Contributions to Incumbent U.S. House Members, 1993-94." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 30(4): 549.
- Cigler, A. and B. Loomis. 2008. *Interest Group Politics*, 7th ed. CQ Press.
- Denzau, Arthur T. and Michael C. Munger. 1986. "Legislators and Interest Groups: How Unorganized Interests get Represented." *The American Political Science Review* 80(1):89-106.
- Evans, Diana. 1996. "Before the Roll Call: Interest Group Lobbying and Public Policy Outcomes in House Committees." *Political Research Quarterly* 49(2):287-304.
- Fouirnaies, Alexander and Andrew B. Hall. 2014. "The Financial Incumbency Advantage: Causes and Consequences." *The Journal of Politics*, 76, pp 711-724.
- Hansen, John Mark. 1991. *Gaining Access: Congress and the Farm Lobby, 1919-1981*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hojnacki, Marie and David C. Kimball. 1999. "The Who and How of Organizations' Lobbying Strategies in Committee." *Journal of Politics* 61(4): 999-1024.

Tuesday, October 31 (cont'd.)

LOBBYING AND GROUPS

Recommended Readings:

- Hojnacki, Marie and David C. Kimball. 1998. "Organized Interests and the Decision of Whom to Lobby in Congress." *The American Political Science Review* 92(4):775-790.
- Kollman, Ken. 1998. *Outside Lobbying: Public Opinion and Interest Group Strategies*. Princeton University Press.
- Schattschneider, E.E. 1975. *The Semisovereign People*. Hinsdale: Dryden.
- Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior and Institutions*, 2nd Ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Part III.
- Truman, David B. 1951. *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*. New York: Knopf.
- Wawro, Gregory. 2001. "A Panel Probit Analysis of Campaign Contributions and Roll-Call Votes," *American Journal of Political Science* 45: 563-79.
- Wright, John R. 1990. "Contributions, Lobbying, and Committee Voting in the U.S House of Representatives." *The American Political Science Review* 84(2):417-438. :
- Wright, John. 1996. *Interest Groups & Congress: Lobbying, Contributions, and Influence*. Allyn and Bacon.

Tuesday, November 7

CONGRESS

Required Readings

- Cox, Gary W. and Mathew D. McCubbins. (2007) [1993]. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Focus on Chapters 1, 4, 5 & 6.
- Kingdon, John W. "Models of Legislative Voting." *The Journal of Politics* 39, no. 03 (August 1977): 562. doi:10.2307/2129644.
- Mayhew, David R. *Congress: The Electoral Connection, Second Edition*. 2 edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004. Chapter 1 (ER).
- Arnold, R. Douglas. 1990. *The Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven: Yale. Chapters 1-4 (ER).
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Philip Edward Jones. "Constituents' Responses to Congressional Roll-Call Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 54, no. 3 (2010): 583-97.
- Carey, John M., Richard G. Niemi, and Lynda W. Powell. "The Effects of Term Limits on State Legislatures." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (May 1998): 271. doi:10.2307/440283.

Recommended Readings:

- Arnold, R. Douglas. 1990. *The Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven: Yale U.P.
- Binder, Sarah A. 1996. "The Partisan Basis of Procedural Choice: Allocating Parliamentary Rights in the House, 1789-1990." *The American Political Science Review* 90(1): 8-20
- Binder, Sarah A. and Steven S. Smith. 1997. *Politics or Principle: Filibustering in the United States Senate*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Clausen, Aage. 1973. *How Congressmen Decide*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Tuesday, November 7 (cont'd.)

CONGRESS

Recommended Readings

- Cox, Gary W. and Mathew D. McCubbins. (2007) [1993]. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fiorina, Morris. 1989. *Congress: Keystone to the Washington Establishment*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gamm, G. and J. Huber, "Legislatures as Political Institutions: Beyond the Contemporary Congress." I. Katznelson and H. Milner, eds. *State of the Discipline*.
- Gerber, Elisabeth R., Arthur Lupia, and Mathew D. McCubbins. 2004. "When Does Government Limit the Impact of Voter Initiatives? The Politics of Implementation and Enforcement." *The Journal of Politics*, 66, pp 43-68.
- Hibbing, John R. and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 1995. *Congress as Public Enemy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurwitz, M.S., R.J. Moiles, and D. Rohde. 2001. "Distributive and Partisan Issues in the 104th House." *American Political Science Review*. 95(4):911-22.
- Kingdon, John W. 1989. *Congressmen's Voting Decisions*. 3rd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Koger, Gregory. 2010. *Filibustering: A Political History of Obstruction in the House and Senate*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1991. *Information and Legislative Organization*. University of Michigan Press.
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics: A Theory of U.S. Lawmaking*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lapinski, J. 2008. "Policy Substance and Performance in American Lawmaking, 1877-1994." *American Journal of Political Science*. 52(2):235-51.
- Lawrence Eric D., Forrest Maltzman and Steven S. Smith. 2006. "Who Wins? Party Effects in Legislative Voting." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 31(1): 33-69.
- Lebo, Matthew J., Adam J. McGlynn, and Gregory Koger. "Strategic Party Government: Party Influence in Congress, 1789-2000." *American Journal of Political Science* 51, no. 3 (July 1, 2007): 464-81.
- Mayhew, David R. 1991. *Divided We Govern: Party Control, Lawmaking, and Investigations. 1946-1990*.
- Miller, Gary J. and Joe A. Oppenheimer. 1982. "Universalism in Experimental Committees." *The American Political Science Review* 76(3) : 561-574
- Oleszek, Walter. 1996. *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Patty, John W. 2007. "The House Discharge Procedure and Majoritarian Politics" *Journal of Politics* 69(3): 678.
- Polsby, Nelson. 1968. "The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives." *American Political Science Review* 62:144-168.
- Poole, Keith T. 1999. "NOMINATE: A Short Intellectual History." *The Political Methodologist* 9: 1-6.
- Redman, Eric. 1973. *The Dance of Legislation*. New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Riker, William H. 1980. "Implications from the Disequilibrium of Majority Rule for the Study of Institutions." *American Political Science Review* 74(2): 432-446.

Tuesday, November 7 (cont'd.)

CONGRESS

Recommended Readings

- Rohde, David. 1991. *Parties and Leaders in the Postreform House*. University of Chicago Press.
- Schickler, Eric. 2000. "Institutional Change in the House of Representatives, 1867-1998: A Test of Partisan and Ideological Power Balance Model Models." *The American Political Science Review* 94: 269-288.
- Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior and Institutions*, 2nd Ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Chs 11 & 12
- Sinclair, Barbara. 1997. *Unorthodox Lawmaking: New Legislative Processes in the U.S. Congress*. C.Q. Press.
- Smith, Steven S. 1989. *Call to Order: Floor Politics in the House and Senate*. Washington: Brookings.

Tuesday, November 14

REPRESENTATION

Required Readings:

- Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, James A. Stimson. 2001. *The Macro Polity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fenno, Richard. 1978. *Home Style: House Members in their Districts*. New York: Longman. Focus on Chapters 1, 5, 7
- Hibbing, John R. and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2002. *Stealth Democracy*. Cambridge. Chapters 2 and 6 (ER)
- Miller, Warren and Donald Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57(1): 45-56.
- Eulau, Heinz and Paul Karpis. 1977. "The Puzzle of Representation." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 2(3): 233-54.
- Broockman, David E. 2014. "Distorted Communication, Unequal Representation: Constituents Communicate Less to Representatives Not of Their Race." *American Journal of Political Science* 58, no. 2: 307–21. doi:10.1111/ajps.12068.
- Juenke, Eric Gonzalez, and Robert R. Preuhs. 2012. "Irreplaceable Legislators? Rethinking Minority Representatives in the New Century." *American Journal of Political Science* 56, no. 3: 705–15.

Recommended Readings:

- Anzia, Sarah F., and Christopher R. Berry. "The Jackie (and Jill) Robinson Effect: Why Do Congresswomen Outperform Congressmen?" *American Journal of Political Science* 55, no. 3 (2011): 478–93.
- Bratton, Kathleen A., and Kerry L. Haynie. "Agenda Setting and Legislative Success in State Legislatures: The Effects of Gender and Race." *The Journal of Politics* 61, no. 3 (August 1, 1999): 658–79. doi:10.2307/2647822.
- Cannon, David. 1999. *Race and Representation in Congress*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tuesday, November 14 (cont'd.)

REPRESENTATION

Recommended Readings:

- Carson, Jamie L. Michael H. Crespin, Carrie P. Eaves, and Emily Wanless. 2011. "Constituency Congruency and Candidate Competition in U.S. House Elections." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 36(3): 461-482.
- Cox, Gary and Jonathan Katz. 2002. *Elbridge Gerry's Salamander*. Cambridge.
- Erikson, Robert S. 1978. "Constituency Opinion and Congressional Behavior: A Reexamination of the Miller-Stokes Representation Data." *American Journal of Political Science* 22(3): 511-535).
- Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. Mackuen, and James A. Stimson. 1998. "What Moves Macropartisanship? A Response to Green, Palmquist, and Schickler." *The American Political Science Review* 92:4.
- Fenno, Richard F., Jr. 1977. "U.S. House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration." *The American Political Science Review* 71:3 (pp. 883-917).
- Fenno, Richard. 1978. *Homestyle*. New York: Little Brown.
- Fowler, James. 2005. "Dynamic Responsiveness in the U.S. Senate." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2): 29-312.
- Griffin, John D. and Brian Newman. 2005. "Are Voters Better Represented?" *Journal of Politics* 67(4): 1206-1227.
- Griffin, John D., and Brian Newman. 2007. "The Unequal Representation of Latinos and Whites." *The Journal of Politics* 69, no. 4: 1032-46.
- Hill, Kim Quaile and Patricia A. Hurley. 1999. "Dyadic Representation Reappraised." *American Journal of Political Science* 43(1):109-137
- Hutchings, Vincent L. Harwood K. McClerking and Guy-Uriel Charles. 2004. "Congressional Representation of Black Interests: Recognizing the Importance of Stability." *The Journal of Politics* 66(2): 450-468.
- Kanthak, Kristin and George A. Krause. 2010. "Valuing Diversity in Political Organizations: Gender and Token Minorities in the U.S. House of Representatives." *American Journal of Political Science* 54(4): 839-854.
- Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes.'" *The Journal of Politics* 61, no. 3: 628-57. doi:10.2307/2647821.
- Merolla, Jennifer L., Abbylin H. Sellers, and Derek J. Fowler. 2013. "Descriptive Representation, Political Efficacy, and African Americans in the 2008 Presidential Election." *Political Psychology* 34, no. 6: 863-75. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00934.x.
- Miller, Warren E. and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *The American Political Science Review* 57(1):45-56
- Pitkin, Hanna. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shotts, Kenneth W. 2003. "Racial Redistricting's Alleged Perverse Effects: Theory, Data, and 'Reality.'" (in Research Notes) *The Journal of Politics*, 65(1): 238-243.
- Stimson, James A. Michael B. Mackuen, Robert S. Erikson. 1995. "Dynamic Representation." *The American Political Science Review* 89(3):543-565. 89: 543-565.

Tuesday, November 21

THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH & THE BUREAUCRACY

Required Readings:

- Rudalevige, Andrew. 2006. "The Decline and Resurgence and Decline (and Resurgence?) of Congress: Charting a New Imperial Presidency," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 36: 506-24.
- Neustadt, Richard. 1980. *Presidential Power*. Prentice Hall. Chapter 3 (ER)
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice and Kenneth Shotts. 2004. "The Conditional Nature of Presidential Responsiveness to Public Opinion." *American Journal of Political Science* 48(4): 690-706.
- Cohen, Jeffrey E. 1995. "Presidential Rhetoric and the Public Agenda." *American Journal of Political Science* 39:87-107.
- Kernell, Samuel. 2006. *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership, Fourth Edition*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press. Chapter 1. (ER)
- Ragsdale, Lyn and John Theis. 1997. "The Institutionalization of the American Presidency, 1924-92." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(4): 1280-1318.
- Shipan, Charles. 2004. "Regulatory Regimes, Agency Actions, and the Conditional Nature of Congressional Influence." *American Political Science Review* 98(3): 467-80.
- Bawn, Kathleen. 1995. "Political Control versus Expertise: Congressional Choices about Administrative Procedures." *American Political Science Review* 89: 62-73.
- McCubbins, Mathew D., and Thomas Schwartz. 1984. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols versus Fire Alarms." *American Journal of Political Science* 28(1): 165-179. doi:10.2307/2110792.

Recommended Readings:

- Cameron, Charles and Nolan McCarty. 2004. "Models of Vetoes and Veto Bargaining," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7: 409-35.
- Cameron, Charles M. 2000. *Veto Bargaining and the Politics of Negative Power*. Cambridge University Press.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice. 2001. "The president's legislative influence from public appeals," *American Journal of Political Science* 45: 313-329.
- Carpenter, Daniel P. 1996. "Adaptive Signal Processing, Hierarchy, and Budgetary Control in Federal Regulation." *American Political Science Review* 90(2): 283-302.
- Carpenter, Daniel P. 2001. *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy*, pp.1-64.
- Groseclose, Timothy, and Nolan McCarty. 2001. "The Politics of Blame: Bargaining Before an Audience." *American Journal of Political Science* 45:100-119.
- Howell, William G. 2003. *Power without Persuasion: The Politics of Direct Presidential Action*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Kernell, Samuel. 1986. *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*. Washington: CQ Press.
- Kiewiet, D. Roderick and Mathew McCubbins. 1991. *The Logic of Delegation*. The University of Chicago Press.
- McCarty, Nolan. 2000. "Presidential Pork: Executive Veto Power and Distributive Politics." *American Political Science Review* 94(1): 117-129.
- Miller, Gary. 1992. *Managerial Dilemmas: The Political Economy of Hierarchy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Moe, Terry M. and William G. Howell. 1999. "Unilateral Action and Presidential Power: A Theory." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 29(4): 850-873.

Tuesday, November 21 (cont'd.)

THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH & THE BUREAUCRACY

Recommended Readings:

- Moe, Terry. 1984. "The New Economics of Organization." *American Journal of Political Science* 28: 739-777.
- Neustadt, Richard E. 1990. *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents*. Simon and Schuster.
- Ragsdale, Lyn and John J. Theis, III. 1997. "The Institutionalization of the American Presidency." *American Journal of Political Science* 41:1280-1318.
- Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior and Institutions*, 2nd Ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Chs 13 & 14
- Shipan, Charles. 2004. "Regulatory Regimes, Agency Actions, and the Conditional Nature of Political Influence." *American Political Science Review* 98(3):467-480.
- Stephen Skowronek. 1997. *The Politics Presidents Make: Leadership from John Adams to Bill Clinton*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Wilson, James Q. (2000) [1989]. *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It*. New York: Basic Books.

Tuesday, November 28

THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

Required Readings:

- Bartels, Brandon L. 2009. "The Constraining Capacity of Legal Doctrine on the U.S. Supreme Court." *The American Political Science Review* 103, no. 3: 474-95.
- Braman, Eileen. 2006. Reasoning on the Threshold: Testing the Separability of Preferences in Legal Decision Making. *Journal of Politics* 68(2):308-321.
- Keck, Thomas. 2007. "Party, Policy, or Duty? Why Does the Supreme Court Invalidate Federal Statutes?" *American Political Science Review*. 101(2):321-38.
- Nicholson, Stephen P., and Thomas G. Hansford. 2014 "Partisans in Robes: Party Cues and Public Acceptance of Supreme Court Decisions." *American Journal of Political Science* 58, no. 3: 620-36. doi:10.1111/ajps.12091.
- Moraski, Bryon J., and Charles R. Shipan. 1999. "The Politics of Supreme Court Nominations: A Theory of Institutional Constraints and Choices." *American Journal of Political Science* 43, no. 4: 1069. doi:10.2307/2991818.
- Caldeira, Gregory, and John Wright. 1998. "Lobbying for Justice: Organized Interests, Supreme Court Nominations, and the United State Senate." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(2): 499-523.

Recommended Readings:

- Epstein, Lee and Jack Knight. 1998. *The Choices Justices Make*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Knight, Jack and Lee Epstein. 1996. "The Norm of Stare Decisis." *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 1018-1035.
- Murphy, Walter F. 1964. *Elements of Judicial Strategy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Rosenberg, Gerald. 1993. *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Segal, Jeffrey A., and Harold J. Spaeth. 1996. "The Influence of Stare Decisis on the Votes of United States Supreme Court Justices." *American Journal of Political Science* 40, no. 4: 971. doi:10.2307/2111738.
- Segal, Jeffrey A. and Harold J. Spaeth. *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited*. Cambridge University Press.
- Segal, Jeffrey and Harold Spaeth. 1996. "Norms, Dragons, and Stare Decisis: A Response." *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 1064-1082.
- Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior and Institutions*, 2nd Ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., Ch. 15

Tuesday, December 5

FINAL CLASS

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS OF FINAL PAPERS

Guidelines for Research Design Paper

POLS 600, American Politics Core Graduate Seminar

The purpose of this assignment is twofold: (1) to allow you to explore a given topic of your choice in more depth than is otherwise possible in a seminar, and (2) to help you hone your research skills in making the transition from a consumer of knowledge to a producer of knowledge. Try to think of the paper, not as just another written assignment, but as an opportunity to make the course more relevant to your interests, and to develop a research paper that will eventually result in a conference paper, a publication in a scholarly journal, or a dissertation topic.

Think about the assignment as writing a slightly more detailed version of the first half of a journal article or an NSF proposal requesting for funding for your research. In other words, you have limited space to convince me (or a panel of reviewers at NSF, or a journal editor and three anonymous reviewers) of the importance of your research, your ability to complete it, its contribution to the literature, theoretical motivation, conceptual development, and the rationale behind your design for carrying out your research.

- The paper is due the last day of class, when students will make brief presentations. The paper should be doubled spaced with one-inch margins. Do not use fonts that are smaller than 12 point.
- Your paper proposal is due **October 17**. Write a brief, two-page, typed proposal which describes your thesis and outlines the subject in as much detail (a rough outline of potential research questions, the relevant literature, how the topic fits with the course materials, and so on) as possible so that I can provide you with useful feedback before you start writing.
- For your proposal and final paper, you might want to follow the **suggested outline below**:

1) Introduction

- a) Thesis: What is the central research question that you are investigating? Some statement like, “The primary purpose of this paper is to...” (Or, the purpose of this paper is twofold...). The thesis of the research should be stated early in the paper—the first few paragraphs, the first page or two.
- b) Include in your introduction a brief statement describing the importance of the topic and the thesis. What are the political, theoretical, and normative implications of your research? How does your research improve upon the existing literature? What contribution will the proposed research make to the literature? What new, exciting directions will you take the literature? Like a journalist, you need to convince the reader that the paper is worthy of careful consideration.
- c) Plan of the paper: In a brief paragraph, give an overview of your arguments and how the paper will be organized.

2) **Past Research** (review of the literature). Please be especially vigilant about keeping the review *relevant* to the *central thesis* of the paper, which should be the central organizing theme of your paper. I don’t want a bibliographic essay, but an evaluation of relevant prior research on the topic that will describe how you intend to improve upon existing studies.

- a) Strengths and weaknesses of prior research (see page 1 of the syllabus for ideas here); you might discuss one or more of the following:
 - i) How existing research has overlooked or given inadequate attention to your topic, for whatever reason.
 - ii) You might critique existing studies on a number of grounds, including inadequate measures, inappropriate design, fuzzy concepts, lack of theory, contradictory findings, puzzles in the literature that need to be solved, and so on. You’re obviously going to focus on those problems that you intend to correct in your research.

- b) Describe briefly how you propose to correct the above problems.
- 3) **Expectations:** What do you expect to find? What are your expectations? Your expectations or hypotheses will flow from theory and prior research.
- 4) **Design, Measures, Data:** The actual design of your proposed research. What basic decisions are you making about your research design and how do you justify them?
 - a) What general type of research design is most appropriate for your study? Survey research, field research, panel design, time-series, experimental, or some other way of collecting observations?
 - b) Define important concepts and describe how you plan to operationalize (measure) important variables.
 - c) What type of observations, at what level of analysis, how they should be made, and so forth?
- 5) **Conclusions:** Reflect back on your thesis and the contribution of your proposed research.

The first step in your assignment was the selection of your **research topic**.

The next step is to identify and review the relevant literature on your topic. To conduct your literature review, you should first identify work that has been done on your topic by social scientists. A good way to begin is to use JSTOR, an archive of scholarly journals (<http://www.jstor.org/>), to identify recent articles on your topic.

The **literature review** should flow into your specific research question. You should place the research question in the context of the literature that you reviewed. Some questions that might guide your effort are:

- After your review of the existing literature, what outstanding question do you have that you could answer?
- Why is this question interesting?
- How will the answer to the question further our collective knowledge in the field?
- How will the answer to the question help policymakers or scholars understand the effectiveness of various techniques?

Once you have established your research question, you are ready to describe how you intend to answer that question. Begin by clearly stating your hypothesis (or hypotheses) and describe how your hypothesis is related to theories in the literature you reviewed.

Your task for the rest of the paper is to describe how you will evaluate your hypothesis against data. You are **NOT** required to actually complete the data analysis you describe in your research design, but you should think through the hard questions involved with any data collection project.

First, choose a particular method of analysis (experiments, case study, comparative case study, or large-N) and describe why you have chosen that particular methodology. Think about which method is most appropriate for your research question. You may decide that you need to employ multiple methods.

Next, describe the data collection process, paying special attention to questions of case selection and measurement. Some questions you might consider are:

- How have other scholars defined your variables of interest? How have they measured those variables?
- How should you select your cases for analysis?
- How will you control for threats to internal and external validity?
- What problems might you encounter in your data collection effort? How might you overcome those problems?

Finally, describe how you would analyze your data. Think about the analyses you would need to perform in order to:

- Know whether your explanation is wrong (to disconfirm your hypotheses);
- Make a compelling case that your argument is right, and
- Dismiss the major alternative plausible hypotheses.