

PSC 505: SEMINAR IN AMERICAN POLITICS

Jake Neiheisel
University at Buffalo, SUNY
Office: 422 Park Hall
Class Day/Time: W 9:00-11:50 AM

E: jacobnei@buffalo.edu
P: 716.645.8439
Office Hours: MWF 12:30-2:00PM or by appointment
Classes held in 502 Park Hall

Course Overview

This course is an introductory, graduate-level overview of the vast literature in political science on American politics. Throughout the semester we will focus on what I see as some of the more interesting questions that have occupied the attentions of scholars in the field for generations. Some “pro-seminars” of this nature march through the classic works in American politics, moving systematically through a greatest hits collection of books and articles on topics ranging from democratic theory and American political institutions to political behavior and organizations. Such classes are, in essence, introductory courses on American politics that have taken a few vitamins and packed on the muscle. Other seminars of this nature cover a few topics or current debates in the field in great depth, often to the exclusion of many others of arguably equal import. There is absolutely nothing wrong with either approach. For this course, however, I have chosen to present a sort of “middle path.” Each week of readings addresses a different question, highlighting how the evolution of theory tracks with development of research design and testing.

By necessity, this approach couples classic readings with more current work—some of which is still forthcoming. In an effort to bring breadth of coverage together with some depth, both are at times given short shrift. For this reason each week features a list of recommended works (usually books) in addition to the required readings. You will want to have taken a look at these (and many, many others) prior to taking your comprehensive exam in American politics. I urge you to take a look at these works on your own time. You should also be reading current work in the top general journals and in select subfield journals. Unlike in the field of international relations, where a running joke suggests that there are a dozen “top-three” journals, the three most recognizable general journals in the discipline (the *American Political Science Review*, the *American Journal of Political Science*, and the *Journal of Politics*) are widely (but not universally) acknowledged as the best outlets for work on American politics to appear. If you have an affinity for political behavior, you should also be taking a look at the journal of the same name. Interested in Congress? Well, *Legislative Studies Quarterly* is for you. I also urge you to take a look at other “pro-seminar” syllabi that are out there.

Finally, you will note that there are writings from some “local celebrities” on your list of required readings. This is not an accident, as I have designed much of this syllabus in a way that showcases some the strengths of the American politics faculty here at Buffalo.

Course Requirements

Class Participation	20%
Discussion Leadership	10%
Literature Reviews	15% Total
Article Reviews (3)	15% Total
Research Design	25%
“Comp”	15%

EXPLANATION OF REQUIREMENTS

Class Participation

This class demands your active participation. In order to participate, you need to be in class. It therefore should go without saying that attendance will also be taken into account when calculating your overall participation grade. You will be evaluated on the quality of your in-class comments as well as, to a much lesser extent, the quantity of your public remarks. Whether you plan to join the ranks of the academe as a professor or use your training in another arena (common non-academic outlets include business, market research, non-profits, government, and political consulting), you will need to be able to communicate ideas effectively and demonstrate a facility with difficult, often abstract discussion material. As such, your contributions to in-class discussions will be reflected in your course grade. You are expected to come to class having read the required readings and ready to talk.

Discussion Leadership

You will be responsible for leading discussion on one occasion. Which class you take on I leave entirely up to you. These assignments will be handed out on a first-come, first-serve basis. You may want to type up a little discussion guide for this class. At a minimum, though, you will want to come to class with a copious amount of notes and discussion questions, and be ready to jump in with something new whenever the conversation stalls.

Literature Reviews

The ability to write a good literature review is a very important skill to have in your toolkit. Throughout your graduate career you will need to be able to synthesize a large amount of information in a concise, informative manner. To this end, I want you to write a number of literature reviews over the course of the semester. These are to be roughly one (single-spaced) page in length. In these reviews you are to take a week's worth of readings and pull out the main lessons. Where possible, make the readings speak to each other and highlight where you might improve upon the works that you read in that particular week. These are not to be simply summaries of the readings. Rather, you are to turn a critical eye to the readings and point out gaps in our understanding of the week's topic (insofar as the scholarly literature is represented by the assigned pieces). In an effort to encourage you to focus on the ideas, rather than the authors themselves (rarely is it appropriate to construct a literature review in a "so-and-so said X, while so-and-so said Y"), I only want to see the authors' names in the parenthetical citation. You do not have to write one the first two weeks of class. After that, if you aren't a discussion leader or writing an article review, you should be writing one of these. These are due at 9PM the day before class meets.

Article Reviews

At some point you will be asked to review a manuscript for a journal. This is a critical service, as the peer-review process does not work without individuals in the discipline who are willing to donate their time to read and evaluate papers that have been submitted to a journal for publication. While some individuals in the discipline no doubt use this opportunity to "gate keep," the vast majority take their role as referees very seriously. Increasingly, journal editors are turning to graduate students to provide reviews, as they are often closest to the methods that, for better or worse, are central to evaluating the worth of a manuscript. On three separate occasions you will write a review of a particular article. While you might assume that, as a published work, the pieces that we read in this

class are beyond reproach, sometimes this is just not the case. There is certainly a stochastic component to the review process. As a result, some pieces are published that are flawed in any number of ways. And while no paper is without shortcomings (this is just the nature of the beast—you can't do everything), some pieces that we will read in this class are clearly more polished than are others. For this assignment, you will take three different articles and critique them as if you had been asked to evaluate them for potential publication in a scholarly journal. These are to be about a page to a page and a half in length (single-spaced). Be critical, but also constructive. The third week of class you will read an article that I have recently had accepted for publication. It went through three rounds of review, so you will get to take a look at a wide variety of reviews. I can also make available to you some of the reviews that I have written recently. These are due by 9PM the day before the class period during which we will be discussing your article.

Research Design

Ideally, this ten to twelve page paper will build upon one of the lit reviews that you wrote throughout the semester. Take your critique of a particular literature and turn it into a plan that will improve upon the shortcomings that you noted or expand the literature in a different direction. Identify a clear research question and be up front about the particular tack that you desire to take in answering it. Assume that you will have all the money in the world to execute your research design. Think carefully about how you can gain leverage over your question of interest. This is due the last week of classes.

“Comp”

As this pro-seminar is designed to help you prepare for a comprehensive exam in American politics, your final will consist of an oral examination. Closer to the end of the semester I will draw up a list of potential questions. While you do not have to answer them in writing, as you will have to do during a “real” comprehensive exam, you should prepare as if you would be completing a written component as well. That is to say that you should take notes and make outlines without actually writing out an answer to each question. You may have these notes with you during the oral exam, but try not to use them as a crutch. Your “comp” will be held during exam week.

CLASS SCHEDULE

August 27th – Introduction and Introductions

- Overview of the syllabus
- Opening remarks

September 3rd – Political Science as a Discipline and Profession

- (skim) Wilson, Woodrow. 1885. “Introductory” from *Congressional Government* <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/35861/35861-h/35861-h.htm>.
- Cohen, Patricia. Oct. 19, 2009. “Field Study: Just How Relevant is Political Science?” *New York Times* <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/20/books/20poli.html>.
- Kristof, Nicholas. Feb. 15, 2014. “Professors, We Need You!” *New York Times* http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/16/opinion/sunday/kristof-professors-we-need-you.html?_r=0.

- Klein, Ezra. Oct. 30, 2012. "The Nate Silver Backlash." *The Washington Post*
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2012/10/30/the-nate-silver-backlash/>.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 1992. "The State in Political Science: How We Became What We study." *American Political Science Review* 86(1): 1-7.
- Calvert, Randall L. 1993. "Lowi's Critique of Political Science: A Response." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 26(2): 196-198.

Recommended:

Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. 2011. *Winner-Take-All Politics: How Washington Made the Rich Richer—and Turned Its Back on the Middle Class*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Dahl, Robert A. 1961. *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

DISCUSSION LEADER: Mumo Nzau

September 10th - Do Presidential Campaigns Matter?

- Campbell, James E. 2001. "When Have Presidential Campaigns Decided Election Outcomes?" *American Politics Research* 29(5): 437-460.
- Finkel, Steven E. 1993. "Reexamining the 'Minimal Effects' Model in Recent Presidential Campaigns" *Journal of Politics* 55(1): 1-21.
- Beck, Paul Allen, Russell J. Dalton, Steven Greene, and Robert Huckfeldt. 2002. "The Social Calculus of Voting: Interpersonal, Media, and Organizational Influences on Presidential Choices." *American Political Science Review* 96(1): 57-73.
- Bergan, Daniel E., Alan S. Gerber, Donald P. Green, and Costas Panagopoulos. 2005. "Grassroots Mobilization and Voter Turnout in 2004." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69(5): 760-777.
- Gelman, Andrew, and Gary King. 1993. "Why Are American Presidential Election Campaign Polls So Variable When Votes Are So Predictable?" *British Journal of Political Science* 23(4): 409-451.
- Holbrook, Thomas M., and Scott D. McClurg. 2005. "The Mobilization of Core Supporters: Campaigns, Turnout, and Electoral Composition in United States Presidential Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(4): 689-703.
- Skim the manuscripts and reviewer memos associated with: Neiheisel, Jacob R., and Sarah Niebler. Forthcoming. "On the Limits of Persuasion: Campaign Ads and the Structure of Voters' Interpersonal Discussion Networks." *Political Communication*.
- Gelman, Andrew. Aug. 20, 2014. "The Mythical Swing Voter." *Monkey Cage*
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2014/08/20/the-mythical-swing-voter/>.

Recommended:

Alvarez, R. Michael. 1998. *Information and Elections*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Berelson, Bernard R., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee. 1954. *Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Holbrook, Thomas M. 1996. *Do Campaigns Matter?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shaw, Daron R. 2006. *The Race to 270: The Electoral College and the Campaign Strategies of 2000 and 2004*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnston, Richard, Michael G. Hagen, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 2004. *The 2000 Presidential Election and the Foundations of Party Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Key, Jr., V.O. 1966. *The Responsible Electorate: Rationality in Presidential Voting, 1936-1960*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

DISCUSSION LEADER: Devon Beck

September 17th - Does Public Opinion Mean Anything?

- Converse, Philip E. 2006 (1964). "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics" Reprinted in *Critical Review* 18(1-3): 1-74.
- Achen, Christopher H. 1975. "Mass Political Attitudes and the Survey Response." *American Political Science Review* 69(4): 1218-1231.
- 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.
- Zaller, John. 1998. "Monica Lewinsky's Contribution to Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 31(2): 182-189.
- Lodge, Milton, Marco R. Steenbergen, and Shawn Brau. 1995. "The Responsive Voter: Campaign Information and the Dynamics of Candidate Evaluation." *American Political Science Review* 89(2): 309-326.
- Alvarez, R. Michael, and John Brehm. 1995. "American Ambivalence Towards Abortion Policy: Development of a Heteroskedastic Probit Model of Competing Values." *American Journal of Political Science* 39(4): 1055-1082.
- Druckman, James N., Jordan Fein, and Thomas J. Leeper. 2012. "A Source of Bias in Public Opinion Stability." *American Political Science Review* 106(2): 430-454.

Recommended:

Zaller, John. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press. **YOU SHOULD OWN THIS**

Alvarez, R. Michael, and John Brehm. 2002. *Hard Choices, Easy Answers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lupia, Arthur, and Mathew McCubbins. 1998. *The Democratic Dilemma: Can Citizens Learn What They Need to Know?* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Berinsky, Adam J. 2004. *Silent Voices: Opinion Polls and Political Representation in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Page, Benjamin I., and Robert Y. Shapiro. 1992. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DISCUSSION LEADER: Kevin Gallaher

September 24th - How Stable is Party Identification?

- Franklin, Charles H., and John E. Jackson. 1983. "The Dynamics of Party Identification." *American Political Science Review* 77(4): 957-973.
- MacKuen, Michael B., Robert S. Erikson, and James A. Stimson. 1989. "Macropartisanship." *American Political Science Review* 96(1): 1125-1142.
- Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 1998. "Macropartisanship: A Replication and Critique." *American Political Science Review* 92(4): 883-899.
- Hetherington, Marc J. 2001. "Resurgent Mass Partisanship: The Role of Elite Polarization." *American Political Science Review* 95(3): 619-631.
- Gerber, Alan S., Gregory A. Huber, and Ebonya Washington. 2010. "Party Affiliation, Partisanship, and Political Beliefs: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 104(4): 720-744.
- Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M., and Renee M. Smith. 1996. "The Dynamics of Aggregate Partisanship." *American Political Science Review* 90(3): 567-580.
- Clarke, Harold D., and Allan L. McCutcheon. 2009. "The Dynamics of Party Identification Reconsidered." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73(4): 704-728.

Recommended:

Campbell, Angus, Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley

Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Erikson, Robert S., Michael B. MacKuen, and James A. Stimson. 2002. *The Macro Polity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

October 1st - What Explains Changes in Aggregate Voter Turnout?

- Burnham, Walter Dean. 1974. "Theory and Voting Research: Some Reflections on Converse's 'Change in the American Electorate'." *American Political Science Review* 68(3): 1002-1023.
- Converse, Philip E. 1974. "Comment on Burnham's 'Theory and Voting Research'." *American Political Science Review* 68(3): 1024-1027.
- Rusk, Jerrold G. 1974. "Comment: The American Electoral Universe: Speculation and Evidence" *American Political Science Review* 68(3): 1028-1049.
- McDonald, Michael P., and Samuel L. Popkin. 2001. "The Myth of the Vanishing Voter." *American Political Science Review* 95(4): 963-974.

- Geys, Benny. 2006. Explaining Voter Turnout: A Review of Aggregate-Level Research.” *Electoral Studies* 25(4): 637-663.
- Burden, Barry C., and Jacob R. Neihsel. 2013. “Election Administration and the Pure Effect of Voter Registration on Turnout.” *Political Research Quarterly* 66(1): 77-90.
- Hill, Kim Quaile, and Jan E. Leighley. 1993. “Party Ideology, Organization, and Competitiveness as Mobilizing Forces in Gubernatorial Elections.” *American Journal of Political Science* 37(4): 1158-1178.
- Darmofal, David. 2006. “The Political Geography of Macro-Level Turnout in American Political Development.” *Political Geography* 25(2): 123-150.
- Gomez, Brad T., Thomas G. Hansford, and George A. Krause. 2007. “The Republicans Should Pray for Rain: Weather, Turnout, and Voting in U.S. Presidential Elections.” *Journal of Politics* 69(3): 649-663.

Recommended:

Burnham, Walter Dean. 1970. *Critical Elections and the Mainsprings of American Politics*. New York: Norton.

Rosenstone, Steven J. and John Mark Hansen. 1993. *Mobilization, Participation and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan.

Wolfinger, Raymond E., and Steven J. Rosenstone. 1980. *Who Votes?* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A. Cloward. 1988. *Why Americans Don't Vote*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper Collins.

DISCUSSION LEADER: Nicholas Hillman

October 8th - Economic Voting: Do Members of the Electorate Vote with Their Pocketbooks?

- Duch, Raymond M., Harvey D. Palmer, and Christopher J. Anderson. 2000. “Heterogeneity in Perceptions of National Economic Conditions. *American Journal of Political Science* 44(4): 635-652.
- Mutz, Diana C. 1992. “Mass Media and the Depoliticization of Personal Experience.” *American Journal of Political Science* 36(2): 483-508.
- Gomez, Brad T., and J. Matthew Wilson. 2001. “Political Sophistication and Economic Voting in the American Electorate: A Theory of Heterogeneous Attribution.” *American Journal of Political Science* 45(4): 899-914.
- Nadeau, Richard, and Michael S. Lewis-Beck. 2001. “National Economic Voting in U.S. Presidential Elections.” *Journal of Politics* 63(1): 159-181.
- Gerber, Alan S., and Gregory A. Huber. 2010. “Partisanship, Political Control, and Economic Assessments.” *American Journal of Political Science* 54(1): 153-173.
- Tilley, James, and Sara B. Hobolt. 2011. “Is the Government to Blame? An Experimental Test of How Partisanship Shapes Perceptions of Performance and Responsibility.” *Journal of Politics* 73(2): 316-330.

- Kriner, Douglas L., and Andrew Reeves. 2012. "The Influence of Federal Spending on Presidential Elections." *American Political Science Review* 106(2): 348-366.

Recommended:

Fiorina, Morris P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lewis-Beck, Michael S. 1988. *Economics and Elections: The Major Western Democracies*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

DISCUSSION LEADER: Soma Hawramee

October 15th - What are the Determinants of Congressional Elections?

- Coleman, John J. 1997. "The Importance of Being Republican: Forecasting Party Fortunes in House Midterm Elections." *Journal of Politics* 59(2): 497-519.
- Campbell, James E. 1991. "The Presidential Surge and its Midterm Decline in Congressional Elections, 1868-1988." *Journal of Politics* 53(2): 477-487.
- Campbell, James E. 1985. "Explaining Presidential Losses in Midterm Congressional Elections." *Journal of Politics* 47(4): 1140-1157.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice, David W. Brady, and John F. Cogan. 2002. "Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting." *American Political Science Review* 96(1): 127-140.
- McGhee, Eric. 2008. "National Tides and Local Results in US House Elections." *British Journal of Political Science* (38): 719-738.
- Stein, Robert M., and Kenneth N. Bickers. 1994. "Congressional Elections and the Pork Barrel." *Journal of Politics* 56(2): 377-399.
- Burden, Barry C. 2004. "Candidate Positioning in US Congressional Elections." *British Journal of Political Science* 34(2): 211-227.

Recommended:

Jacobson, Gary C. 2012. *The Politics of Congressional Elections*. 8th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson. [Older editions are fine]

Mayhew, David R. 2004. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Jacobson, Gary C., and Samuel Kernell. 1983. *Strategy and Choice in Congressional Elections*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

DISCUSSION LEADER: Si Chen (Catherine)

October 22nd - Political Communication: Does Elite Rhetoric Shape Attitudes and Change Minds?

- Clifford, Scott, Jennifer Jerit, Carlisle Rainey, and Matt Motyl. Forthcoming. "Moral Concerns and Policy Attitudes: Investigating the Influence of Elite Rhetoric." *Political Communication*.

- Clifford, Scott, and Jennifer Jerit. 2013. "How Words do the Work of Politics: Moral Foundations Theory and the Debate over Stem Cell Research." *Journal of Politics* 75 (3): 659-671.
- Arceneaux, Kevin. 2012. "Cognitive Biases and the Strength of Political Arguments." *American Journal of Political Science* 56(2): 271-285.
- Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. "Framing Public Opinion in Competitive Democracies." *American Political Science Review* 101(4): 637-655.
- Tomz, Michael, and Robert P. Van Houweling. 2009. "The Electoral Implications of Candidate Ambiguity." *American Political Science Review* 103(1): 83-98.
- Sides, John. 2007. "The Consequences of Campaign Agendas." *American Politics Research* 35(4): 465-488.
- Pietryka, Matthew T., and Amber E. Boydstun. 2012. "Going Maverick: How Candidates Can Use Agenda-Setting to Influence Citizen Motivations and Offset Unpopular Issue Positions." *Political Behavior* 34(4): 737-763.
- Cobb, Michael D., James H. Kuklinski. 1997. "Changing Minds: Political Arguments and Political Persuasion." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(1): 88-121.
- Djupe, Paul A., and Brian R. Calfano. 2013. "Divine Intervention? The Influence of Religious Value Communication on U.S. Intervention Policy." *Political Behavior* 35(4): 643-663.

Recommended:

Vavreck, Lynn. 2009. *The Message Matters: The Economy and Presidential Campaigns*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Barker, David C. 2002. *Rushed to Judgment: Talk Radio, Persuasion, and American Political Behavior*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Riker, William H. 1996. *The Strategy of Rhetoric: Campaigning for the American Constitution*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

October 29th – Interest Groups: Where Do Groups Focus Their Resources?

- Austen-Smith, David, and John R. Wright. 1994. "Counteractive Lobbying." *American Journal of Political Science* 38(1): 25-44.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., and Beth L. Leech. 1996. "The Multiple Ambiguities of 'Counteractive Lobbying'." *American Journal of Political Science* 40(2): 521-542.
- Austen-Smith, David, and John R. Wright. 1996. "Theory and Evidence for Counteractive Lobbying." *American Journal of Political Science* 1996 40(2): 543-564.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., and Beth L. Leech. 1996. "Good Theories Deserve Good Data." *American Journal of Political Science* 40(2): 565-569.
- Hojacki, Marie, and David C. Kimball. 1998. "Organized Interests and the Decision of Whom to Lobby in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 92(4): 775-790.
- Lowery, David, and Virginia Gray. 2004. "A Neopluralist Perspective on Research on Organized Interests." *Political Research Quarterly* 57(1): 164-175.
- Salisbury, Robert H., John P. Heinz, Edward O. Laumann, and Robert L. Nelson. 1987. "Who Works with Whom? Interest Group Alliances and Opposition." *American Political Science Review* 81(4): 1217-1234.

- Holyoke, Thomas T. 2009. "Interest Group Competition and Coalition Formation." *American Journal of Political Science* 53(2): 360-375.
- Schlozman, Kay Lehman, and John T. Tierney. 1983. "More of the Same: Washington Pressure Group Activity in a Decade of Change." *Journal of Politics* 45(2): 351-377.

Recommended:

Baumgartner, Frank R., and Beth L. Leech. 1998. *Basic Interests: The Importance of Groups in Politics and in Political Science*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kollman, Ken. 1998. *Outside Lobbying: Public Opinion and Interest Group Strategies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Baumgartner, Frank R., Jeffrey M. Berry, Marie Hojnacki, David C. Kimball, and Beth L. Leech. 2009. *Lobbying and Policy Change: Who Wins, Who Loses, and Why?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Franz, Michael M. 2008. *Choices and Changes: Interest Groups in the Electoral Process*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hansen, John Mark. 1992. *Gaining Access: Congress and the Farm Lobby, 1919-1981*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gray, Virginia, and David Lowery. 1996. *The Population Ecology of Interest Representation: Lobbying Communities in the American States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

November 5th - Do Parties Matter in the Legislative Arena?

- Aldrich, John H., and James S. Coleman Battista. 2002. "Conditional Party Government in the States." *American Journal of Political Science* 46(1): 164-172.
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1993. "Where's the Party?" *British Journal of Political Science* 23(2): 235-266.
- Lebo, Matthew J., Adam J. McGlynn, and Gregory Koger. 2007. "Strategic Party Government: Party Influence in Congress, 1789-2000." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(3): 464-481.
- Carroll, Royce, and Henry A. Kim. 2010. "Party Government and the Cohesive Power of Public Plunder." *American Journal of Political Science* 54(1): 34-44.
- Wright, Gerald C., and Brian F. Schaffner. 2002. "The Influence of Party: Evidence from the State Legislatures." *American Political Science Review* 96(2):367-379.
- Cox, Gary W. 2001. "Agenda Setting in the U.S. House: A Majority-Party Monopoly." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 26(2): 185-210.
- Balla, Steven J., Eric D. Lawrence, Forrest Maltzman, and Lee Sigelman. 2002. "Partisanship, Blame Avoidance, and the Distribution of Legislative Pork." *American Journal of Political Science* 46(3): 515-525.

Recommended:

Cox, Gary W., and Matthew D. McCubbins. 1993. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cox, Gary W., and Matthew D. McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics: A Theory of U.S. Lawmaking*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kiewiet, D. Roderick, and Matthew D. McCubbins. 1991. *The Logic of Delegation: Congressional Parties and the Appropriations Process*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, Steven S. 2007. *Party Influence in Congress*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lipinski, Daniel. 2004. *Congressional Communication: Content and Consequences*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Rohde, David W. 1991. *Parties and Leaders in the Postreform House*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Aldrich, John H. 2011. *Why Parties? A Second Look*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

November 12th - Can the President Shape Public Opinion?

- Cameron, Charles, and Jee-Kwang Park. 2011. "Going Public when Opinion is Contested: Evidence from Presidents' Campaigns for Supreme Court Nominees, 1930-2009." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 41(3): 442-470.
- Rottinghaus, Brandon. 2009. "Strategic Leaders: Determining Successful Presidential Opinion Leadership." *Political Communication* 26(3): 296-316.
- Tedin, Kent, Brandon Rottinghaus, and Harrell Rodgers. 2011. "When the President Goes Public: The Consequences of Communication Mode for Opinion Change across Issue Types and Groups." *Political Research Quarterly* 64(3): 506-519.
- Cavari, Amnon. 2013. "The Short-Term Effect of Going Public." *Political Research Quarterly* 66(2): 336-351.
- Cohen, Jeffrey E. 1995. "Presidential Rhetoric and the Public Agenda." *American Journal of Political Science* 39(1): 87-107.
- Baum, Matthew A., and Samuel Kernell. 1999. "Has Cable Ended the Golden Age of Presidential Television?" *American Political Science Review* 93(1): 99-114.

Recommended:

Cohen, Jeffrey E. 2010. *Going Local: Presidential Leadership in the Post-Broadcast Age*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, George C. III. 2003. *On Deaf Ears: The Limits of the Bully Pulpit*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kernell, Samuel. 1997. *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

DISCUSSION LEADER: Yohan Park

November 19th - Are the Courts Political Institutions? Do they follow Precedent?

- Dahl, Robert A. 1957. "Decision Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as a National Policy Maker." *Journal of Public Law* 6: 279-295.
- Casper, Jonathan D. 1976. "The Supreme Court and National Policy Making." *American Political Science Review* 70(1): 50-63.
- Epstein, Lee, Jack Knight, and Andrew D. Martin. 2001. "The Supreme Court as a *Strategic* National Policy Maker." *Emory Law Journal* 50: 583-612.
- Hinkle, Rachael K., Andrew D. Martin, Jonatha Shaub, and Emerson H. Tiller. 2012. "A Positive Theory and Empirical Analysis of Strategic Word Choice in District Court Opinions." *Journal of Legal Analysis* 4(2): 407-444.
- Segal, Jeffrey A., and Howard J. Spaeth. 1996. "The Influence of Stare Decisis on the Votes of United States Supreme Court Justices." *American Journal of Political Science* 40(4): 971-1003.
- Spriggs, James F. II and Thomas G. Hansford. 2001. "Explaining the Overruling of U.S. Supreme Court Precedent." *Journal of Politics* 63(4): 1091-1111.
- George, Tracey E. and Lee Epstein. 1992. "On the Nature of Supreme Court Decision Making." *American Political Science Review* 86(2): 323-337.

Recommended:

Segal, Jeffrey A., and Howard J. Spaeth. 2002. *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

DISCUSSION LEADER: Carla Calabro

November 26th - Fall Recess (No Class)

December 3rd - Choose One:

Race and Politics/Gender and Politics: Does Descriptive Representation Lead to Better Policy Outcomes for Minorities?

The Bureaucracy: Who Controls the Bureaucracy?

Political Parties: Are the Parties "Responsible," "Functional," or Both?

Political Psychology: How Do Voters Decide?

State Politics: Is there a "Race to the Bottom" when States Compete?

Discussion Leader: Eric Rosiek