

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

PL SC 540
M 9:05 AM – 12:05 PM
236 Pond Laboratory

Michael Nelson
mjn15@psu.edu
Office: Pond Lab 232
Office Hours: M 2-3 PM

COURSE DESCRIPTION

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

OBJECTIVES

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

COURSE MATERIALS

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

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

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

MIDTERM EXAM (20%). I will e-mail you a blinded unpublished manuscript on a topic relating to American politics. You may not discuss the manuscript with your peers but may use external (e.g. internet) resources for additional information as needed as you craft a 2-3 page (single-spaced) review of the book appropriate for a general political science journal.

FINAL EXAM (20%). Students will take a final exam that mirrors in its design a portion of the comprehensive exam in American Politics. You will be asked to synthesize the literature and our class discussions to answer a broad question about American politics.

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

- Your goal, first and foremost, on any comprehensive exam answer is to make a convincing case that you know the literature in American politics and can synthesize it into something coherent. You do this in three ways: by citing the appropriate literature, by summarizing it correctly, and by telling us a story about how that literature fits together (e.g. how it has developed over time). By nature, a comprehensive exam asks you to synthesize the literature.

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

RESEARCH DESIGN (40% Total; 20% Checkpoints and 20% Paper). This course culminates with the production of an original research design. You may choose any topic in political science that interests you, though my hope is that this project will serve as a proposal for a dissertation or M.A. thesis.

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

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

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

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

CHECKPOINT #3: PROPOSING A THEORY. In a short presentation and an accompanying 4-6-page paper, identify and fully explain the answer to the “why” question you have proposed, defining all of

your major concepts. Deduce a hypothesis from your theory. Contrast your answer to competing or complementary answers to the “why” question, again defining all necessary concepts.

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

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

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

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

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

EXPECTATIONS/PROCEDURES

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

CRITICISM. This is a seminar and, as such, it is our job to be critics. As you read for class, you should examine the goals of an article, the persuasiveness of the evidence it presents in support of its theory, and the place it makes for itself in the literature. Remember that a harsh critique isn’t the same thing as an intellectually rigorous one, and focus less on what you perceive to be flaws and more on what you could learn from the article. Oftentimes, it is more difficult to point out what is “good” than what is “bad”. In other words, treat our authors the way you would like to be treated by students in your shoes in 20 years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Students with questions about academic integrity should visit <http://www.la.psu.edu/> and then click on "Academic Integrity."

Penn State defines academic integrity as "the pursuit of scholarly activity in an open, honest and responsible manner" ([Senate Policy 49-20](#)). Dishonesty of any kind will not be tolerated in this course. Dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, cheating, plagiarizing, fabricating information or citations, facilitating acts of academic dishonesty by others, having unauthorized possession of examinations, submitting work of another person or work previously used without permission from the instructor, or tampering with the academic work of other students.

Students facing allegations of academic misconduct should not drop the course; those who do will be added to the course again and will be expected to complete course work and meet course deadlines. If the allegations are dismissed, then the drop will be permitted. Students found responsible for academic misconduct often receive academic sanctions, which can be severe, and put themselves at risk for disciplinary sanctions assigned by the University's Office of Student Conduct (see [Senate Policy G-9](#)).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SCHEDULE

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

Week 1: Studying American Politics (January 7)

Theoretical Trends in American Political Science

- Dahl, Robert A. 1961. "The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest." *American Political Science Review* 55(4): 763-772
- Peter A. Hall and Rosemary C. R. Taylor. 1996. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms." *Political Studies* 44 (5): 936-957
- Bond, Jon R. 2007. "The Scientification of the Study of Politics: Some Observations on the Behavioral Evolution in Political Science." *Journal of Politics* 69 (4): 897-907.
- Sean M. Diament, Adam J. Howat & Matthew J. Lacombe 2017. "What is the Canon in American Politics? Analyses of Core Graduate Syllabi." *Journal of Political Science Education* 13(3): 256-278.

Methodological Trends in American Political Science

- Daniel Diermeier and Keith Krehbiel. 2003. "Institutionalism as a Methodology." *Journal of Theoretical Politics*. 15:123-144.
- Samii, Cyrus. 2016. "Causal Empiricism in Quantitative Research." *Journal of Politics* 78(3): 941-955.
- Monroe, Burt L, Jennifer Pan, Margaret E Roberts, Maya Sen, and Betsy Sinclair. 2015. "No! Formal Theory, Causal Inference, and Big Data are Not Contradictory Trends in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 48 (1): 71-74.

Week 2: Public Opinion (January 14)

- Converse, Philip. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in the Mass Public." in *Ideology and Discontent* ed. David Apher 206-261.
- Zaller, John and Stanley Feldman. 1992. "A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions versus Revealing Preferences." *American Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 579-616.
- Druckman, James N. 2004. "Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects." *American Political Science Review* 98: 671-686.
- Druckman, James, Erik Peterson, and Rune Slothuus. 2013. "How Elite Partisan Polarization Affects Public Opinion Formation." *American Political Science Review* 107: 57-79.
- Cramer Walsh, Katherine. 2012. "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 106(3): 517-532.
- Acharya, Avidit, Matthew Blackwell, and Maya Sen. 2016. "The Political Legacy of American Slavery." *Journal of Politics* 78 (3): 621-641.

Week 3: No Class. MLK Day (January 21)

Meet with me this week to discuss your final paper topic.

Week 4: Partisanship (January 28) [Presentations: Research Question]

- Campbell et al. 1960. *The American Voter*. [ch. 2-4, 6-7]
- Jerit, Jennifer and Jason Barabas. 2012. "Partisan Perceptual Bias and the Information Environment." *Journal of Politics* 74: 672-684.
- Iyengar, Shanto and Sean J. Westwood. 2014. "Fear and Loathing across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization." *American Journal of Political Science* 59: 690-707.
- Mason, Lilliana. 2015. "I Disrespectfully Agree: The Differential Effects of Partisan Sorting on Social and Issue Polarization." *American Journal of Political Science* 59(1): 128-145.
- Barber, Michael and Jeremy C. Pope. 2018. "Does Party Trump Ideology? Disentangling Party and Ideology in America." *American Political Science Review* Forthcoming
- Mummolo, Jonathan, Erik Peterson, and Sean Westwood. 2018. "Conditional Party Loyalty." Working Paper.

Week 5: Voter Decisionmaking (February 4) [Presentations: Research Question]

- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. [ch 1, 3 and 8]
- Lenz, Gabriel. 2009. "Learning and Opinion Change, Not Priming: Reconsidering the Priming Hypothesis." *American Journal of Political Science* 53(4): 821-827.
- Ashworth, Scott and Ethan Bueno de Mesquita. 2014. "Is Voter Competence Good for Voters? Information, Rationality, and Democratic Performance?" *American Political Science Review* 108(3): 565-587.
- Achen, Christopher and Larry Bartels. 2016. *Democracy for Realists*, pg. 118-28.
- Fowler, Anthony and Andrew B. Hall. 2017. "Do Shark Attacks Influence Presidential Elections? Reassessing a Prominent Finding on Voter Competence." *Journal of Politics*.
- Achen and Bartels. 2018. "Statistics as if Politics Mattered: A Reply to Fowler and Hall." *Journal of Politics*. [Recommended]
- Fowler and Hall. 2018. "Politics as if Evidence Mattered: A Reply to Achen and Bartels." [Recommended]
- Martin, Gregory J. and Ali Yurukoglu. 2017. "Bias in Cable News: Persuasion and Polarization." *American Economic Review* 107(9): 2565-99.
- Spencer Piston, Yanna Krupnikov, Kerri Milita, and John Barry Ryan. 2018. "Clear as Black and White: The Effects of Ambiguous Rhetoric Depend on Candidate Race." *Journal of Politics* 80(2): 662-674.

Week 6: The Mechanics of Elections (February 11) [Presentations: Existing Explanations]

Why do Voters Participate?

- Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89(2): 279-94.
- Washington, Ebonya. 2006. "How Black Candidates Affect Voter Turnout." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121:973-998.
- Rogowski, Jon. 2013. "Electoral Choice, Ideological Conflict, and Political Participation." *American Journal of Political Science*.

Candidates and Campaigns

- Joshua L. Kalla and David E. Broockman. 2017. "The Minimal Effects of Campaign Contact in General Elections: Evidence from 49 Field Experiments." *American Political Science Review*.
- Kalla, Joshua and Frances Rosenbluth and Dawn Teele. Forthcoming. "The Ties that Double Bind: Social Roles and Women's Underrepresentation in Politics." *American Political Science Review* Forthcoming.

Week 7: Parties as Organizations (February 18) [Presentations: Existing Explanations]

- American Political Science Association. 1950. "Towards a More Responsible Two-Party System: A Report of the Committee on Political Parties." *American Political Science Review* 44: 15-36. [Skim]
- Aldrich, John. 1995. *Why Parties?* [Ch. 1-2]
- Key, V.O. *Southern Politics in State and Nation* [Ch. 1, 14, 18, 24]
- Bawn, Kathleen et al. 2012. "A Theory of Political Parties." *Perspectives on Politics* 10 (3): 571-597.
- Ilyana Kuziemko and Ebonya Washington. 2018. "Why Did the Democrats Lose the South? Bringing New Data to an Old Debate." *American Economic Review*, 108 (10): 2830-67.

Week 8: Congressional Behavior (February 25) [Presentations: Theory]

- Mayhew, David. 1974. *The Electoral Connection*. [Excerpt]
- Fiorina, Morris. 1978. *Keystone*. [Excerpt]
- Fenno, Jr., Richard F. 1977. "U.S. House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration." *American Political Science Review* 71(3):883-917.
- Anzia, Sarah F., and Christopher R. Berry. 2011. "The Jackie (and Jill) Robinson Effect: Why Do Congresswomen Outperform Congressmen?" *American Journal of Political Science* 55:478-493.
- Grimmer, Justin. 2013. "Appropriators Not Position Takers: The Distorting Effects of Electoral Incentives on Congressional Representation." *American Journal of Political Science* 57: 624-642.

Midterm Exam due Monday of Spring Break

Week 9: Representation (March 11) [Presentations: Theory]

- Miller, Warren E., and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57(1):45-56.
- Jeffrey R. Lax and Justin H. Phillips. 2012. "The Democratic Deficit in the States." *American Journal of Political Science* 56 (1): 148-166.
- Gilens, Martin 2012. *Affluence and Influence: Economic Inequality and Political Power in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapters 3 and 4.
- David E. Broockman and Christopher Skovron. 2017. "Conservative Bias in Perceptions of Public Opinion Among Political Elites." *American Political Science Review*.
- Hertel-Fernandez, Alexander, Matto Mildemberger, and Leah C. Stokes. 2018. "Legislative Staff and Representation in Congress." *American Political Science Review* Forthcoming.

Week 10: Parties in Government (March 18) [Presentations: Data/Design]

Legislative Parties

- Cox, Gary W., and Mathew D. McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Ch. 2, 5, and 10]
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1993. "Where's the Party?" *British Journal of Political Science* 23:235-66.
- Lee, Frances E. 2016. *Insecure Majorities: Congress and the Perpetual Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 3 and 7.

Divided Government

- Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics* [Ch. 1-2]
- Binder, Sarah A. 1999. "The Dynamics of Legislative Gridlock, 1947-96." *American Political Science Review* 93 (3):519-534.
- Cameron, Charles. 2000. *Veto Bargaining* [Ch. 1-2]

Week 11: Presidency (March 25) [Presentations: Data/Design]

- Neustadt, Richard. *Presidential Power*. [Excerpt]
- Kernell, Samuel. *Going Public* [Excerpt]
- Howell, William G. 2005. *Power Without Persuasion* [p. 8-23, Ch. 4]
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice, William G. Howell, and David E. Lewis. 2008. "Toward a Broader Understanding of Presidential Power: A Re-Evaluation of the Two Presidencies Thesis." *Journal of Politics* 70(1):1-16.
- Bolton, Alexander and Sharece Thrower. 2016. "Legislative Capacity and Executive Unilateralism." *American Journal of Political Science* 60(3): 649-663.

Week 12: The Bureaucracy (April 1)

- Lindblom, Charles. 1959. "The Science of Muddling Through." *Public Administration Review* 19:79-88.
- Miller, Gary J. 2005. "The Political Evolution of Principal-Agent Models." *Annual Review of Political Science* 8:203-225.
- McCubbins, Mathew, and Thomas Schwarz. 1984. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols versus Fire Alarms." *American Journal of Political Science* 28:165-79.
- McCubbins, Mathew, Roger Noll, and Barry Weingast. 1987. "Administrative Procedures as Instruments of Political Control." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 3:243-77.
- Clinton, Joshua, David E. Lewis, and Jennifer Selin. 2014. "Influencing the Bureaucracy: The Irony of Congressional Oversight." *American Journal of Political Science*
- Lowande, Kenneth. 2018. "Who Polices the Administrative State?" *American Political Science Review*

Week 13: Congressional Committees (April 8) [Paper Draft Due. Review Peer's Drafts.]

- Krehbiel, Keith. 1991. *Information and Legislative Organization* [Ch. 4]
- Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins. 2003. *Legislative Leviathan* [Ch. 8]
- Maltzman, Forrest. 1995. *Competing Principals* [Ch. 2 and 5]
- Grimmer, Justin and Eleanor Powell. 2016. "Money in Exile: Campaign Contributions and Committee Access." *Journal of Politics*. 78(4): 974- 988.

Week 14: Interest Groups and Money in Politics (April 15) [Peer Reviews Due]

- Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. *The Semisovereign People* [Excerpt]
- Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. [Ch 1-2]
- Truman, David. 1971. *The Governmental Process* [Excerpt]
- Li, Zhao. 2018. "How Internal Constraints Shape Interest Group Activities: Evidence from Access-Seeking PACs." *American Political Science Review* 112(4): 792-808.
- Fowler, Anthony, Haritz Garro, and Jorg L. Spenkuch. 2018. "Quid Pro Quo? Corporate Returns to Campaign Contributions." Working Paper.
- Schnakenberg, Keith E. and Ian R. Turner. 2018. "Helping Friends or Influencing Foes: Electoral and Policy Effects of Campaign Finance Contributions." Working Paper.

Week 15: Policymaking in a Federal System (April 22)

- Lipsky, Michael. 1983. "The Critical Role of Street-Level Bureaucrats" and "Street-Level Bureaucrats as Policy Makers," in *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Schneider, Anne and Ingram, Helen. 1993. "Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." *American Political Science Review* 87 (2): 334-47
- Timothy Besley and Anne Case. 2003. "Political Institutions and Policy Choices: Evidence from the United States." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 41:7-73.

- Kogan, Vladimir, Stephane Lavertu, and Zachary Peskowitz. 2016. "Performance Federalism and Local Democracy: Theory and Evidence from School Tax Referenda." *American Journal of Political Science* 60: 418-435.
- Sances, Michael W. 2017. "Attribution Errors in Federalist Systems: When Voters Punish the President for Local Tax Increases." *Journal of Politics* 79: 1286-1301.
- Michener, Jamila. 2018. *Fragmented Democracy: Medicaid, Federalism, and Unequal Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. [Chapters 1, 2, and 4.]

Finals Week: Paper due Tuesday. Exam due Wednesday.

Other Important Readings

NOTE: Because you took PLSC 541 (Seminar on Law and Courts) in Fall 2018, I have omitted many readings on judicial politics and the courts from this reading list. Were we to spend a week on the judicial branch, this is what I would have assigned:

Judiciary

Judicial Decisionmaking

- Segal and Spaeth, *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited* [Ch. 3 and 8]
- Rachael K. Hinkle. 2015. "Legal Constraint in the U.S. Courts of Appeals." *Journal of Politics* 77: 721-735.
- Boyd, Christina L., Lee Epstein, and Andrew D. Martin. 2010 "Untangling the Causal Effects of Sex on Judging." *American Journal of Political Science*. 54(2): 389-411

Courts in the Political System

- Dahl, Robert. 1957. "Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as National Policy-Maker." *Journal of Public Law* 6(2): 279-95
- Clark, Tom S. 2009. "The Separation of Powers, Court-curbing and Judicial Legitimacy." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (4): 971-989.
- 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*. 99(4): 583-59.
- Rosenberg, Gerald. *The Hollow Hope*. [Ch. 1 and Civil Rights section]

The History of the Subfield and the Discipline

- Sigelman, Lee. 2006. "The Coevolution of American Political Science and the *American Political Science Review*." *American Political Science Review*
- Almond, Gabriel. 1996. "Political Science: The History of the Discipline." In *A New Handbook of Political Science*. Eds. Robert E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Katznelson, Ira and Helen V. Milner. "American Political Science: The Discipline's State and the State of the Discipline."
- Wahlke, John C. "Pre-Behavioralism in Political Science." *American Political Science Review*
- March, James G. and Johan P. Olsen. "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life."
- Riker, William. H. 1990. "Political Science and Rational Choice." In *Perspectives on Positive Political Economy*. ed. James E. Alt and Kenneth A. Shepsle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.