

POLS 833: Problems in American Democracy

Mondays 2:30-5:30
Mackintosh-Corry B313

Instructor:

Paul Gardner

Email: pg73@queensu.ca

Office: C428 Mackintosh-Corry Hall

Office Hours: Thursdays 1:00-2:30pm and by appointment

Course Summary

This course is a general survey of classic and recent research on major questions in American politics research. Each class will cover an important active research area in the subfield, including public opinion, mass media, voting and participation, campaigns and elections, institutional theories, Congress, the Presidency, the bureaucracy, the judiciary, interest groups, parties, and representation. The development of areas of research will be stressed, along with the theoretical frameworks dominant in substantive areas of inquiry. Students will be exposed both to classic works in the field as well as recent research animated by enduring questions in the study of US politics.

Course Scheduling

Twelve weeks is a short timeframe to survey the state of the academic literature on American politics. The calendar below, in fact, lists 13 weeks of class. We won't meet for one of those weeks (10'), of course, but that "week" is included to give you a sense of what we are unable to cover due to time constraints. Students with a significant interest in American politics or bureaucracy would do well to complete the readings during the supplemental week. Students with particular interest in topics without a dedicated week in class should speak to me about orienting some of their writing for the course toward those topics (e.g. race politics, policymaking, federalism, state and local politics, social movements, constitutionalism, elections and representation, methodological approaches to the study of American politics, etc.), though I have endeavored to cover each of these topics in some way during other weeks of class.

Our course is scheduled for Monday afternoons, which means it's necessary to reschedule our meeting that would otherwise fall on Thanksgiving Day. I will make [a poll](#) available where you can indicate your availability for other meeting times that week. In order to be sure that everyone is able to participate, please indicate your *availability* and not your *preference*. We will also schedule a time for the presentation of research designs in lieu of a final exam during the exam period.

Course Readings

The reading load for this course is substantial and often uneven. You should expect to read an average of 200 pages per week, but some weeks have more or less reading. Our discussions will be aimed at deepening your understanding of those readings and broader concepts that arise. Therefore, you are not expected to have mastered the readings for class, but you should have a strong understanding of the arguments and evidence presented for each of the required readings every week that will facilitate our in-class discussions. In service of that goal, you will be required to prepare nine (9) reaction papers over the course of the semester which should be circulated to myself and your classmates by Sunday noon.

We will be reading large excerpts from the books listed below, so you may want to consider purchasing them. They will all also be placed on reserve in Stauffer Library, so you may access them there as well. Some are also available as e-books through the library, so you may also consider that option before purchasing. If your research engages with American politics, purchasing these books is recommended, as most are canonical texts that you are likely to reference in the future.

- Cameron, Charles M. 2000. *Veto Bargaining: Presidents and the Politics of Negative Power*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Frymer, Paul. 1999. *Uneasy Alliances*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gilens, Martin. 1999. *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Antipoverty Policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics: A Theory of U.S. Lawmaking*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, Taeku. 2002. *Mobilizing Public Opinion*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hartz, Louis. 1995. *The Liberal Tradition in America*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Rosenberg, Gerald. 2008. *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change? (Second edition)*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Segal and Spaeth. 2002. *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Course Requirements and Grading

Your final grade in the course will be based on three different factors:

- **Participation (35%):** Regular, active participation is essential for a successful learning experience in a seminar. To that end, students should come to class having completed all of the assigned readings. In preparing for class, you might consider the following questions:
 - What is the theoretical argument being advanced by the author(s). What assumptions does the author make? Are these reasonable? Is their argument internally consistent, following clearly from the assumptions? What would be the consequence of relaxing any given assumption?
 - What types of data and methods does the author use to evaluate their hypotheses? Are these appropriate for the question being asked? What limitations or biases might different methodological choices have? Are there are other (more effective) ways to study the same questions?
 - How do the conclusions of the study advance our understanding of American politics? What are the scope conditions? What new questions does the research raise?
 - Are there areas of the paper or book where you did not understand what was going on? Bring these questions to class. ***A well-formed question can more useful to our class discussions than the perfect answer.***

To facilitate our discussions, you will be required to **prepare nine (9) reaction papers** over the course of the semester which should be circulated to myself and your classmates by Sunday noon. These reaction papers should be no less than one page and no more than 2 pages (normal-sized font, double-spaced, standard margins).

- **Presentations (15%):** It is difficult to cover the breadth of topics we will be considering in this class in the span of just one semester. Inevitably, important readings and topics will by necessity be omitted. To mitigate this issue, I've included a number of supplemental readings for each week. Twice during the semester, you will be responsible for presenting one of the readings to the class and preparing a short (one page) handout summarizing it. During the presentation, you should give a concise summary of the research question, research design, and conclusions. You should also tie the work into the required readings for the day and broader questions in American politics. The presentations will be short (5-10 minutes), so it is important to be clear and concise. Papers available for this exercise are marked with an asterisk (*) in the recommended readings section.

- **Paper (50%):** Students will write a detailed research design (20-30 pages) that outlines how they would approach a clear, feasible research question they would like to answer. More details are available at the end of this syllabus. I encourage students to discuss their potential research topics with one another and me throughout the semester. Each of you will workshop your papers in the second half of the semester. The final paper is due on **December 19th**.

All components of this course will receive letter grades which, for purposes of calculating your course average, will be translated into numerical equivalents using the Faculty of Arts and Science approved scale (see below). Your course average will then be converted to a final letter grade according to Queen's Official Grade Conversion Scale (see below).

Input Scheme

Assignment mark	Numerical value for calculation of final mark
A+	93
A	87
A-	82
B+	78
B	75
B-	72
C+	68
C	65
C-	62
D+	58
D	55
D-	52
F48 (F+)	48
F24 (F)	24
F0 (0)	0

Official Grade Conversion Scale

Grade	Numerical Course Average (Range)
A+	90-100
A	85-89
A-	80-84
B+	77-79
B	73-76
B-	70-72
C+	67-69
C	63-66
C-	60-62
D+	57-59
D	53-56
D-	50-52
F	49 and below

Accommodations for Disabilities

Queen's University is committed to achieving full accessibility for people with disabilities. Part of this commitment includes arranging academic accommodations for students with disabilities to ensure they have an equitable opportunity to participate in all of their academic activities. The Senate Policy for Accommodations for Students with Disabilities was approved at Senate in November 2016 (see <https://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/sites/webpublish.queensu.ca.uslwww/files/files/policies/senateandtrustees/ACADACCOMMPOLICY2016.pdf>). If you are a student with a disability and think you may need academic accommodations, you are strongly encouraged to contact the Queen's Student Accessibility Services (QSAS) and register as early as possible. For more information, including important deadlines, please visit the QSAS website at: <http://www.queensu.ca/studentwellness/accessibility-services/>

Academic Consideration for Students with Extenuating Circumstances

Queen's University is committed to providing academic consideration to students experiencing extenuating circumstances that are beyond their control and are interfering with their ability to complete academic requirements related to a course for a short period of time. The Senate Policy on Academic Consideration for Students in Extenuating Circumstances is available at

<http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/sites/webpublish.queensu.ca.uslcwww/files/files/policies/senateandtrustees/Academic%20Considerations%20for%20Extenuating%20Circumstances%20Policy%20Final.pdf>

Statement on Academic Integrity

Queen's students, faculty, administrators and staff all have responsibilities for upholding the fundamental values of academic integrity; honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage (see www.academicintegrity.org). These values are central to the building, nurturing and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas" essential to the intellectual life of the University (see the Senate Report on Principles and Priorities <http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/policies/senate/report-principles-and-priorities>).

Students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the regulations concerning academic integrity and for ensuring that their assignments and their behaviour conform to the principles of academic integrity. Information on academic integrity is available in the Arts and Science Calendar (see Academic Regulation 1, <http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academic-calendars/regulations/academic-regulations/regulation-1>), on the Arts and Science website (see <https://www.queensu.ca/artsci/students-at-queens/academic-integrity>), and from the instructor of this course. Departures from academic integrity include plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, facilitation, forgery and falsification, and are antithetical to the development of an academic community at Queen's. Given the seriousness of these matters, actions which contravene the regulation on academic integrity carry sanctions that can range from a warning or the loss of grades on an assignment to the failure of a course to a requirement to withdraw from the university.

Course Calendar

Week 1: Foundations of American Government. The United States has a shorter historical timespan and fewer entrenched institutions than many of its western liberal counterparts. American government included some novel political institutions, but its shorter history does not suggest lack of ideological antecedents. What, then, is the logic of United States government? How was it designed and why? Were its institutions and ideas of the United States implemented consistently with the lofty ideals of its founders?

- *The Constitution* [Give particular attention to Art. I §1-4,7-10, Art. II, Art. III, Art. V. Skim the rest including Amendments.]
- Federalist Papers, Nos. 10, 39, 51
- Hartz, Louis. 1955. *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution*. [Chapter 1]
- Smith, Rogers M. 1993. "Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The Multiple Traditions in America." *American Political Science Review*.
- Skowronek, Stephen. 1982. *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920*. [Chapters 1-3]

Recommended:

- Ackerman, Bruce. *We the People, Volume 2: Transformations*. Harvard University Press, 2000, chapters 1, 2, 4, 10.
- Bailyn, Bernard. 1967. *The Origins of American Politics*
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1935. *Black Reconstruction in America*.
- Foner, Eric. 1970. *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*.
- Gaventa, John. 1982. *Power and Powerlessness*.
- Locke, John. 1689. *Second Treatise of Government: An Essay Concerning the True Original, Extent and End of Civil Government*.
- Orren, Karen. 1992. *Belated Feudalism: Labor, the Law, and Liberal Development in the United States*.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1992. *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers*.
- Toqueville, Alexis de. 1840. *Democracy in America*.
- Wood, Gordon S. 2011. *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787*.

Week 2: Foundations of American Political Behavior I. What is party identification? How do party attachments develop, and how do they subsequently affect political behavior? Can American's party labels change over time?

- Bartels, Larry. 2010. "The Study of Electoral Behavior." In Jan E. Leighley (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior*.
- Berelson, Bernard, et al. 1954. *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. [Introduction and Chapters 1, 4, 6- 7]
- Campbell, Angus, et al. 1960. *The American Voter*. [Chapters 6-7]
- Bartels, Larry. 2002. "Beyond the Running Tally: Partisan Bias in Political Perceptions." *Political Behavior*.

Recommended:

- Fiorina, Morris. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*.
- Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist and Eric Schickler. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds*.
- *Prior, Marcus, Guarav Sood, and Kabir Khanna. 2015. "You Cannot be Serious: The Impact of Accuracy Incentives on Partisan Bias in Reports of Economic Perceptions." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 10: 489-518.
- *Klar, Samara. 2014. "Partisanship in a Social Setting." *American Journal of Political Science* 58(3): 687-704.

Week 3: Foundations of American Political Behavior II. How competent is the average American voter? Can the average voter successfully turn information inputs into political action?

- Kinder, Donald. 2004. "Pale Democracy: Opinion and Action in Postwar America." In Edward D. Mansfield and Richard Sisson (eds.), *The Evolution of Political Knowledge*.
- Converse, Philip. 1964. The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics. In David Apter (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Lupia, Arthur. 1994. "Shortcuts Versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections." *American Political Science Review* 88(1): 63- 76.
- Page and Shapiro. 1992. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. [Chapters 1-2, 8]

Recommended:

- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*.
- *Bartels, Larry M. 1996. "Uninformed Votes: Information Effects in Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 40(1): 194-230.
- *Feldman, Stanley. 1988. "Structure and Consistency in Public Opinion: The Role of Core Beliefs and Values." *American Journal of Political Science* 32(2): 416-440.

Week 4: Opinion Formation and Issue Evolution. How does the public form ideas about politics?
What determines the salient issues in politics?

- Zaller, John R. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. [Chapters 1-3, 7]
- Carmines, Edward G. and James Stimson. 1986. "On the Structure and Sequence of Issue Evolution." *American Political Science Review*.
- Lee, Taeku. 2002. *Mobilizing Public Opinion*. [Chapters 1-2, 4-5, skim Introduction]
- **Presentation:** Milton Lodge, Marco R. Steenbergen and Shawn Brau, 1995. "The Responsive Voter: Campaign Information and the Dynamics of Candidate Evaluation." *The American Political Science Review*.

Recommended:

- *Broockman and Butler. 2017. "The Causal Effects of Elite Position-Taking on Voter Attitudes: Field Experiments with Elite Communication." *American Journal of Political Science* 61(1): 208-221.
- Carmines, Edward G. and James Stimson. 1990. *Issue Evolution*.
- *Huckfeldt and Sprague. 1987. "Networks in Context: The Social Flow of Political Information." *American Political Science Review* 81(4): 1197-1216.
- Melissa Harris-Lacewell. 2004. *Barbershops, Bibles, and BET*.

Week 5: Voting and Participation Who participates in politics and why? What barriers to participation exist?

- Riker, William H. and Peter C. Ordeshook. 1968. "A Theory of the Calculus of Voting." *American Political Science Review*.
- Gerber, Green, and Larimer. 2008. "Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review*.
- Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review*.
- **Presentation:** McAdam, Doug. 1999. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. [Chapter 6]

Recommended:

- Ansolabehere, Stephen, Shanto Iyengar, Adam Simon and Nicholas Valentino. 1994. "Does Attack Advertising Demobilize the Electorate?" *American Political Science Review*.
- *Gay, Claudine. 2001. "The Effect of Black Congressional Representation on Political Participation." *American Political Science Review*.
- Gerber, Alan S., and Donald P. Green. 2000. "The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review*.
- *Krupnikov, Yanna. 2011. "When Does Negativity Demobilize? Tracing the Conditional Effect of Negative Campaigning on Voter Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science*.
- *McDonald, Michael P. and Samuel Popkin. 2001. "The Myth of the Vanishing Voter." *American Political Science Review*.
- Rosenstone, Steven J., and John Mark Hansen. 1993. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*.
- Wolfinger, Raymond E., and Steven J. Rosenstone. 1980. *Who Votes?*

Week 6: Media How do the media affect political behavior? How do voters incorporate information from the news media?

- Iyengar, Shanto and Donald Kinder. 1989. *News that Matters: Television and American Opinion*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. [Chapters 3 and 7]
- Baum, Matthew A. and Angela S. Jamison. 2006. "The Oprah Effect: How Soft News Helps Inattentive Citizens Vote Consistently." *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Prior, Markus. 2005. "News vs. Entertainment: How Increasing Media Choice Widens Gaps in Political Knowledge and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 577-592.
- Gilens, Martin. 1999. *Why Americans Hate Welfare*. [Introduction (especially the plan of the book), Chapters 5-6, skim 102-111]
- **Presentation:** Gilens, Martin. 1999. *Why Americans Hate Welfare*. [Chapters 3-4]

Recommended:

- Crouse, Timothy. 1972. *The Boys on the Bus*.
- *DellaVigna, Stefano and Ethan Kaplan. 2007. "The Fox News Effect: Media Bias and Voting." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*.
- Druckman, James N. 2001. "On the Limits of Framing Effects: Who Can Frame?" *Journal of Politics* 63(4): 1041-1066.
- *Hopkins, Daniel J. and Jonathan M. Ladd. 2014. "The Consequences of Broader Media Choice: Evidence from the Expansion of Fox News." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*.
- *Lenz, Gabriel S. 2009. "Learning and Opinion Change, Not Priming: Reconsidering the Priming Hypothesis." *American Journal of Political Science* 53(4): 821-837.
- Levendusky, Matthew S. 2013. "Why Do Partisan Media Polarize Viewers?" *American Journal of Political Science* 57(3): 611-623.
- Martin and Yurukoglu. 2017. "Bias in Cable News: Persuasion and Polarization." *American Economic Review* 107(9): 2565-2599.
- Snyder and Strömberg. 2010. "Press Coverage and Political Accountability." *Journal of Political Economy* 118(2): 355-408.
- *Zaller, John. 1998. "Monica Lewinsky's Contribution to Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics*.

Week 7: Political Parties and Representation What are parties? Why do they form? What is their role in American politics?

- Anthony Downs, 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. [Chapters 2, 7-8]
- Aldrich, John H. 1995. *Why Parties?* [Chapter 2]
- Frymer, Paul. 1999. *Uneasy Alliances*. [Chapters 1-4]
- **Presentation:** Frymer, Paul. 1999. *Uneasy Alliances*. [Chapters 5-6]

Recommended:

- *Hetherington, Marc. 2001. "Resurgent Mass Partisanship: The Role of Elite Polarization." *American Political Science Review*.
- Key, V.O. 1949. *Southern Politics in State and Nation*.
- *Key, V.O. 1955. "A Theory of Critical Elections." *The Journal of Politics*.
- Cox, Gary W. and Matthew D. McCubbins. 1993. *Legislative Leviathan*.

Week 8: Congress: Campaigns, Elections and Responsiveness: How do elections motivate members of Congress? Are members responsive to constituents?

- Mayhew, David R. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. [Chapter 1]
- Harbridge, Laurel and Neil Malhotra. 2011. "Electoral Incentives and Partisan Conflict in Congress: Evidence from Survey Experiments." *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Canes-Wrone, Brady, and Cogan. 2002. "Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting." *American Political Science Review* 96(1): 127-140.
- **Presentation:** Broockman, David and Joshua Kalla. 2017. "The Minimal Persuasive Effects of Campaign Contact in General Elections: Evidence from 49 Field Experiments." *American Political Science Review* 112(1): 148-166.

Recommended:

- Fenno, Richard. 1978. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*.
- *Miller, Warren and Donald Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress," *American Political Science Review*.
- Green, Donald Philip and Jonathan S. Krasno (and exchange with Jacobson). 1988. "Salvation for the Spendthrift Incumbent: Reestimating the Effects of Campaign Spending in House Elections," *American Journal of Political Science*.
- *Cameron, Charles, David Epstein, and Sharyn O'Halloran. 1996. "Do Majority-Minority Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress?" *American Political Science Review*.
- Gay, Claudine. 2001. "The Effect of Black Congressional Representation on Political Participation." *American Political Science Review*.
- *Lee, Moretti, and Butler. 2004. "Do Voters Affect Or Elect Policies? Evidence from the U. S. House." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.

Week 9: Congress II: Lawmaking and Oversight: How does Congress legislate? How does Congress oversee the bureaucracy?

- Cox, Gary and Matthew McCubbins. 2003. *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the US House of Representatives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. [Chapters 2 & 5]
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics: A Theory of U.S. Lawmaking*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. [Chapters 1-6]
- McCubbins, Matthew and Thomas Schwartz. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrol Versus Fire Alarm," *American Journal of Political Science* (1984), pp. 165-77.

Recommended:

- Arnold, Douglas. 1990. *The Logic of Congressional Action*.
- Baron, David and John Ferejohn. 1989. "Bargaining in Legislatures," *American Political Science Review*.
- Cox, Gary and Matthew McCubbins. 1993. *Legislative Leviathan*.
- Fenno, Richard. 1973. *Congressmen in Committees*.
- *Mayhew, David. 1991. *Divided We Govern*. (See me to discuss chapters to present.)
- *Polsby, Nelson W. 1968. "The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives," *American Political Science Review*.
- Schickler, Eric and Andrew Rich. 1997. "Controlling the Floor: Parties as Procedural Coalitions in the House," *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Schickler, Eric. 2001. *Disjointed Pluralism: Institutional Innovation and the Development of the U.S. Congress*.

Week 10: The Presidency and Executive Branch What is the nature of presidential power? How is it exercised?

- Neustadt, Richard. *Presidential Power* (1960). [Chapters 1-3]
- Cameron, Charles. *Veto Bargaining: The Politics of Negative Power* (2000). [Read chapters 3-4 & 6; skim chapters 1-2 & 5 for context]
- Moe, Terry. "The Politicized Presidency," *The New Direction in American Politics*, edited by J.E. Chubb and P. E. Peterson (1985).

Recommended:

- *Bolton, Alexander and Thrower, Sharece. 2016. "Legislative Capacity And Executive Unilateralism." *American Journal of Political Science*.
- *Canes-Wrone, Brandice. 2001. "The President's Legislative Influence from Public Appeals." *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice. 2006. *Who Leads Whom?*
- *Groseclose, Timothy and Nolan McCarty. 2000. "The Politics of Blame: Bargaining before an Audience." *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Howell, William. 2003. *Power Without Persuasion*.
- Kernell, Samuel. 2006. *Going Public*.
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics*.
- *Skowronek, Stephen. 1997. *The Politics Presidents Make*. (See me for chapters to present)
- Tulis, Jeffrey. 1998. *The Rhetorical Presidency*.

Week 10': The Bureaucracy Why does Congress delegate vast power to executive branch agencies? How do we ensure they are accountable to elected officials and the people?

- McCubbins, Matthew and Thomas Schwartz. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrol Versus Fire Alarm," *AJPS* (1984), pp. 165-77.
- Moe, Terry. "The Politicized Presidency," *The New Direction in American Politics*, edited by J.E. Chubb and P. E. Peterson (1985).
- Carpenter, Daniel. 2001. *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928*.

Recommended:

- Epstein, David and Sharyn O'Halloran. 1999. *Delegating Powers: A Transaction Cost Politics Approach to Policy Making under Separate Powers*.
- Gailmard, Sean and John Patty. "Slackers and Zealots: Civil Service, Policy Discretion, and Bureaucratic Expertise." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4): 873-889, 2007.
- Gordon, Sanford C. and Catherine Hafer. 2005. "Flexing Muscle: Corporate Political Expenditures as Signals to the Bureaucracy." *American Political Science Review*.
- Moe, Terry M. "The Politics of Bureaucratic Structure," *Can the Government Govern?* edited by J.E. Chubb and P. E. Peterson (1989).
- Shapiro, Martin. *Who Guards the Guardians?*
- Skowronek, Stephen. *Building the New American State* (2002).
- Wilson, James. *Bureaucracy, What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It* (2000).

Week 11: Courts How do judges make decisions? Are judicial decisions enforceable? What are the limits of judicial independence?

- Hamilton, Alexander. 1788. *The Federalist* #78.
- Segal, Jeffrey and Harold Spaeth. 2002. *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model, Revisited*. [Chapters 1, 2, 3 (skip the Separation of Powers section), Chapter 7 (pp. 288-311) and Chapter 8 (again skip the Separation of Powers section)]
- Rosenberg, Gerald. 1991. *The Hollow Hope*. [Chapters 1-5, skim 12-14]
- **Presentation:** *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954), *Obergefell v. Hodges* (2015)

Recommended:

- Alexander Bickel. 1962. *The Least Dangerous Branch*
- *Caldeira, Gregory A. and John R. Wright. 1988. "Organized Interests and Agenda Setting in the U.S. Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review*.
- Cameron, Charles M., Jeffrey A. Segal, Donald Songer. "Strategic Auditing in a Political Hierarchy: An Informational Model of the Supreme Court's Certiorari Decisions."
- *Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council*
- Dahl, Robert. 1957. "Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as National Policy-Maker," *Journal of Public Law*.
- *Edelman, Lauren. 1990. "Legal Environments and Organizational Governance: The Expansion of Due Process in the Workplace," *American Journal of Sociology*.
- Epstein, Lee and Jack Knight. 1998. *The Choices Justices Make*.
- Eskridge, William. 1991. "Overriding Supreme Court Statutory Interpretation Decisions," *Yale Law Journal*.
- *Frymer, Paul. 2003. "Acting When Elected Officials Won't: Federal Courts and Civil Rights Enforcement in U.S. Labor Unions, 1935–85" *American Political Science Review*.
- Feeley, Malcolm M. and Edward Rubin. 1998. *Judicial Policy-Making and the Modern State*.
- Frymer, Paul. 2008. *Black and Blue*.
- Galanter, Marc. 1974. "Why the 'Haves' Come Out Ahead: Speculations on the Limits of Legal Change," *Law and Society Review*.
- Graber, Mark. *Dred Scott and the Problem of Constitutional Evil*.
- Harvey, Anna and Barry Friedman. "Pulling Punches: Congressional Constraints on the Supreme Court's Constitutional Rulings, 1987–2000." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*.
- John Hart Ely. 1980. *Democracy and Distrust*
- McCann, Michael. 1994. *Rights at Work: Pay Equity and the Politics of Legal Mobilization*.
- Shapiro, Martin. *Courts*.
- Shapiro, Martin. *Who Guards the Guardians?*
- *Whittington, Keith. 2005. "Interpose Your Friendly Hand: Political Supports for the Exercise of Judicial Review by the United States Supreme Court," *American Political Science Review*.
- Whittington, Keith. 2007. *The Political Foundations of Judicial Supremacy*.
- Whittington, Keith. 2019. *Repugnant Laws: Judicial Review of Acts of Congress from the Founding to the Present*.

Week 12: Interest Groups and Pluralism Who influences policy? How do organized groups attempt to influence policy? Are they successful?

- Lowi, Theodore J. 1979. *The End of Liberalism: The Second Republic of the United States*. [Chapter 7]
- McCann, Michael. 1994. *Rights at Work: Pay Equity and the Politics of Legal Mobilization*. [Chapter 4]
- Strolovitch, Dara. 2006. "Do Interest Groups Represent the Disadvantaged? Advocacy at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender." *The Journal of Politics* 68(4): 894-910.

Recommended:

- *Ansolabehere, de Figueiredo, and Snyder. 2003. "Why Is There So Little Money in US Politics?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*.
- Bertrand, Bombardini, and Trebbi. 2014. "Is It Whom You Know or What You Know? An Empirical Assessment of the Lobbying Process." *American Economic Review*.
- Broockman and Kalla. 2016. "Campaign Contributions Facilitate Access to Congressional Officials: A Randomized Field Experiment." *American Journal of Political Science*.
- *Galanter, Marc. 1974. "Why the Haves Come Out Ahead: Speculations on the Limits of Legal Change." *Law and Society Review*.
- *Gilens, Martin. 2005. "Inequality and Democratic Responsiveness." *Public Opinion Quarterly*.
- Hall and Deardorff. 2006. "Lobbying as Legislative Subsidy." *American Political Science Review*.
- *Hall and Wayman. 1990. "Buying Time: Moneyed Interests and the Mobilization of Bias in Congressional Committees." *American Political Science Review*.
- Olson, Mancur. 1968. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*.
- Schattschneider, E. E. 1960. *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Strolovitch, Dara. 2007. *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics*.

Appendix A: Research Design Assignment

The final paper in this class is meant to help you develop an executable research plan that will result in a published paper related (broadly conceived) to American politics. Most research designs tend to at once do too much and too little. On the one hand, they are often overly ambitious, laying out research plans that are not feasible and are unlikely to be put into practice in the near-term or absent substantial sums of money. On the other hand, there is often little detail about the project and how it might unfold. For this class, you want to write a research plan that is highly specific and could be put into practice in the near-term (think the next 12-18 months). This is an excellent opportunity to develop a clear plan for a master's thesis, a dissertation chapter, or a stand-alone publication.

To begin, choose a question or puzzle in the study of American politics that you find interesting. From there, you need to carefully hone the question, clearly identifying the contribution that you want to make. You should be able to clearly and unambiguously state the aim of your research. Then, begin to look at the literature. What have others said about this issue? How has previous work approached this question? I can help you with this.

In your research design, I will expect you to have developed a clear theory. Your theory should clearly lay out the assumptions and logic of your argument. The empirical hypotheses or comparative statics should be clearly articulated. You should also link your argument to those made in the extant literature. What work are you drawing upon? With what work does your theory comport and with what work does it disagree? What is the marginal contribution of your argument to the literature?

Your design should be equally clear about the data and empirical analyses you plan to carry out (if applicable). In particular, you should identify the exact data sources you will use to collect all variables, whether they are the key independent variables or controls, and (if applicable) how you will collect them. Then, you should clearly identify your identification strategy that you will use to test your empirical hypotheses. Spare no details! For instance, if you are running a regression, write out the exact equations you will estimate and the expected direction for all coefficients. If you propose a survey, you should design the survey instrument. If you will use a qualitative research design, you should identify and/or carry out your case selection method. If you will require the use of archival materials, you should identify the location of your required materials and outline what evidence you hope to acquire.

Depending upon the availability of your data and your approach, it is appropriate and expected that you might have preliminary data analysis in the research design, whether it is summary statistics, simple plots, or a basic regression. You should also specify potential threats to inference, as well as the robustness checks that you will carry out in order to attempt to mitigate these threats. If you plan to do a qualitative paper, the same types of standards will apply. What cases will you examine? What primary or secondary sources are available to you? Where is the data you need located? How will you leverage your cases to make casual statements?

No matter what type of paper you write or methods you use, you should conclude the research design by talking about the generalizability of your argument and your (expected) results. What are the broader implications of your argument and results for how we think about bureaucratic politics? What can't they tell us? Think of this as the starting point of the "discussion" section of your eventual paper.

Finally, a word about the connection between your topic and American politics. I recognize that American politics is likely not your primary research interest, so the empirical work in your paper does not necessarily have to feature (or solely feature) the United States. If this is the case, I would expect that you would be drawing at least in part on theories and concepts that we have discussed in this class. In general, your paper should reflect the fact that you have taken this class and absorbed ideas and arguments from it, whether they be applied to the United States or elsewhere.