PP 300: American Politics & Institutions Graduate Core Seminar
CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY
Fall 2022
Seminar: Mondays, 9:00AM-11:50AM (PST)
Course Location: Burkle 24 &
Zoom Room [https://cgu.zoom.us/j/88389550186]

Instructor: Carlos Algara, Ph.D.
Office: 227 McManus Hall
In-Person Office Hours: Mondays, 8:00AM-9:00AM (PST) & 12:00PM-1:00PM (PST)
Virtual Office Hours: By appointment
✉ carlos.algara@cgu.edu

Course Objective: What are the dominant fields of scientific inquiry in the political science subfield of American politics & what theoretical, and methodological, frameworks underpin this inquiry by political scientists?

This course is a graduate seminar in American Politics and, for most of you, this will mark the beginning of your formal research training in the field of American politics. The main purpose of this course is to give you the theoretical and methodological foundations necessary to begin a transition from *consumers* of knowledge about American politics to *producers* of original research in the subfield. As such, this course is designed to give students the foundation necessary to be producers of knowledge by developing interesting and testable research questions, examining theoretical frameworks and research designs, and making constructive critiques of some of the best work produced by scholars of American politics. American politics is an ideal field for developing the intuition and skills needed for producing new knowledge as scholarship, given that this area continues to be at the forefront of both theory and methodological developments.

This course is designed for both Master's-level and Ph.D.-level students, with varying course outcome expectations for each. Master's students will get acquainted with the main findings across various lines of inquiry in the subfield towards the goal of demonstrating their ability to read, critique, and articulate the state of the research in the field. For doctoral students in this course, the expectation is that many of you are planning to teach courses and conduct original research on American politics. Towards that end, the specific objectives of this course include:

⋆ (1) Helping students prepare for the American politics component of qualifying exams

⋆ (2) Developing the understanding of the theoretical frameworks and empirical methods, with a stark focus on measurement and research design, covered in this course

⋆ (3) Providing a broad overview of the American politics subfield that will serve to guide students to other works in large and rapidly growing strands of literature

★ (4) Developing the ability to conduct scholarly research and evaluate the research of others, particularly with respect to identifying *future* research extending standing studies

★ (5) Lastly, applying the approaches and methods covered in this course to a research question of your choosing

---

Course Limitations Disclaimer

We will cover a variety of topics in the political science subfield of American politics. This course is designed to be a *survey course*, such that our introduction to each topic will be somewhat brief. Advanced courses are offered (or could be) on every topic we touch, so you can think of this class as being just the tip of the iceberg. For many of you, this type of introduction provides an excellent way to sample the types of questions, methodologies, and research being conducted in the subfields of American politics, and this may help you to choose your own course of research and area of specialty.

Given our severe time limitations, we can cover only a few of the many research questions, theoretical frameworks and empirical methods that are relevant to the scientific study of American politics. For example, we will be unable to devote substantial time to the voluminous literatures on race and ethnicity, gender and sexuality, state and local politics, American political development and such topics as immigration, polarization and redistricting. Students should consider this course an introduction to some of the classic, contemporary and cutting edge research approaches in American politics and a starting point to conducting their own research in this area. Ideally, this course will also serve as a prelude to other courses in the American politics subfield.

Broadly, we will cover both institutions and behavior–the two major subfields in American politics. This means we will touch upon topics such as Congress, Interest Groups, Presidency, and Courts. But we will also cover Public Opinion, Democratic Participation & Politics, Elections, Campaigns, Political Parties, Political Organizations, and perhaps some other specialized topics that the class chooses to cover as a group. As such, the first half of the course will cover American behavioral modules while the second half will cover American institutional modules.

Course Logistics & Requirements

This section of the syllabus serves as a guide for course expectations (both for me and for you) and logistical information such as grade breakdown and course texts.

Course Texts, Materials, & Announcements: I will provide all readings for this course. The Course Canvas Page contains all relevant readings for this seminar.

Grade Breakdown & Schedule:

⋆ 25% Class Discussion Participation

⋆ 25% Weekly Synthesis Papers (Due: Weekly, 12:01am Monday prior to the class meeting)

⋆ 25% Midterm Exam (Due: Week 8, October 23rd)

⋆ 25% Final Exam (Due: Finals Week, December 14th)

Class Discussion Participation (25%): As a graduate-level substantive seminar, this course requires students to attend class and be active in our collective course discussion. Ideally, I would be speaking very little during most of our seminars. As such, students are expected to shoulder the burden of driving discussions in this course. This means that students need to read the assigned materials every week and be ready to talk about the substantive topics/work discussed in that week's readings. This largely entails:

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the theoretical model presented in each individual reading for this week? Do these theories "make sense" given what we know from our ongoing discussion about the nature of representation in the United States?

2. What empirical methods and research designs are used to evaluate the theory-driven hypotheses presented in this work? What data sources do these authors rely on to test their hypotheses?

3. What do these readings tell us about the nature of representation and politics in general? What are the limitations of these studies that the authors may have missed and what could be a worthwhile avenue for future work in this area?

Weekly Synthesis Papers (25%): Beginning in the second week of the course, students are responsible for turning in a short 2-3 page double spaced synthesis paper ***summarizing*** a given article used in the week's readings via the Canvas assignment portal. These synthesis essays are due at 12:01am Monday, about a half day prior to our class meeting, over the Canvas Portal. These synthesis papers ***must*** incorporate the main numbered points on the *How to Read Social Science Research Articles* at the end of this syllabus, with these points being:

1. **Assessing Theory**: What is the research's (i.e., article or book section) main argument?

2. **Assessing The Point:** How does this research fit in the overall literature?

3. **Assessing Research Methodology:** What research design is used in this research?

4. **Assessing Research Significance & Quality**: If you had advice for the author(s), what would you suggest?

Students are welcome to complete this exercise for every week during lecture, but note that I will take ***the top seven graded synthesis papers*** in calculating this grade component. In other words, students need to formally complete seven of these assignments for full credit and need not turn in this assignment every week, but rather every other week. No late work will be accepted on this component given the inherent flexibility in when student's may turn in a synthesis paper.

Midterm & Final Exams (50%): This course is designed to give students the foundation to foster their *independent* research agendas. As such, the exams will be based on academic rigor and are designed to strengthen the skills required to development academic arguments. Specifically, these exams assess how well students construct analytical arguments that are supported by both logic and cited literature. Students should not simply summarize literature (i.e., previous work) but rather should fit literature into a coherent argument that both demonstrates an understanding of the literature and the ability to develop, and defend, an original academic argument. Students are required to incorporate literature from both within and out of the course reading list.

The exams will consist of take-home essay questions that will be distributed one week prior to the due date. I will use the following grading rubric, found on the following page and developed by the *Association of American Universities*, to evaluate exams. The numbers at the top of the grid reflect the point value for each element of the exam. No late exams will be accepted unless special arrangements are made via a request, in writing and over email, at least 2 weeks prior to the exam. Like all assignments, the exams will be submitted via the Canvas assignment portal.

Claremont Graduate University Course Grading Scheme

Letter Grade Grade	Grade Point	Grade Description	Learning Outcome
A	4.0	*Complete mastery of course material and additional insight beyond course material*	*Insightful*
B	3.0	*Complete mastery of course material*	*Proficient*
C	2.0	*Gaps in mastery of course material; not at level expected by the program*	*Developing*
U	0	*Unsatisfactory*	*Ineffective*

Note that grades may contain pluses or minus designations as appropriate.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
Explanation of issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence *Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion*	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

Course Attendance, Ethics, & Accommodations

Course Attendance: Students are expected to attend all classes. Students who are unable to attend class must seek permission for an excused absence from the course director or teaching assistant. Unapproved absences or late attendance for three or more classes may result in a lower grade or an "incomplete" for the course. If a student has to miss a class, he or she should arrange to get notes from a fellow student and is strongly encouraged to meet with the teaching assistant to obtain the missed material. Missed assignments will not be available for re-taking unless *prior arrangements are made with the course instructor*.

Academic Dishonesty & Ethics: This course is about developing critical thought and developing personalized skill-sets necessary to examine politics in a systematic and rigorous way. Thus, it is important to develop your own arguments and work to hone in analytical skills. Academic dishonesty is not only a serious breach of ethics in the university community, but it is also detrimental to your scholarly growth. Ethics breaches, such as cheating and plagiarism, will be referred to appropriate avenues. Students may refer to the University's Academic Integrity Archived Bulletin for further clarification or may contact the instructor for any specific questions.

Course Accommodations: Claremont Graduate University is committed to offering auxiliary aids and services to students with verifiable disabilities, in compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. To ensure that their individual needs are addressed, students with special needs are encouraged to contact the Dean of Students Office as early as possible. Additional resources can be found on the linked page: CGU Disability Services.

CGU Mental Health Resources: The Claremont Colleges Monsour Counseling & Psychological Services offers 24/7 assistance and referral to address students' personal, social, career, and study skills problems. Services for students include: crisis and emergency mental health consultations confidential assessment, counseling services (individual and small group), and referrals. For additional information, please see: https://services.claremont.edu/mcaps/.

Course & Reading Expectations

This course is designed for both Master's-level and Ph.D.-level students, with varying course outcome expectations for each. Master's students will get acquainted with the main findings across various lines of inquiry towards the goal of demonstrating their ability to read, critique, and articulate the state of the research in the field. For doctoral students in this course, the expectation is that many of you are planning to teach courses and conduct original research on American politics. In either case, students are expected to arrive in class prepared to discuss the readings and may be asked to summarize what they read at the beginning of each seminar. I do not expect students to fully understand every detail of the material, particularly those that contain complicated statistical methods or formal models, but I expect students to be prepared to work through these facets of empirical work by coming prepared to understand these questions—which

requires initial engagement with the material. This seminar will be taught in a *dynamic* fashion which will require full participation from *everyone* in the seminar.

Lastly, students are expected to **treat each other with respect**, listen attentively when others are speaking, and avoid personal attacks. At the same time, all students should feel comfortable expressing their opinions, political or otherwise, as long as they do so in an appropriate manner.

Course Road-Map

American Political Behavior Modules

1. Week 1 (8/29/2022): Course Introduction: What is "Political Science" discipline and the "Political Science" research process?

   ★ Mansbridge, Jane. 2014. "What is Political Science For?" *Perspectives on Politics* 12(1):1-17.

   ★ Bond, Jon R. 2007. "The Scientification of the Study of Politics: Some Observations on the Behavioral Evolution in Political Science." *Journal of Politics* 69(3):897-907.

   ★ Noel, Hans. 2010. "Ten Things Political Scientists Know That You Don't." *The Forum* 8(3): 1-19.

   ★ Stimson, James A. 2018. "Professional Writing in Political Science: A Highly opinionated Essay."

   ★ Lebo, Matthew J. 2016. "Managing Your Research Pipeline." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 49(2): 259-264.

   ★ **No seminar or office hours due to Labor Day on September 5th (Monday)** ★

2. Week 3 (9/12/2022): Why Government? Madisonian Democracy & The Role of Policy

   ★ Madison, James. 1787. "Federalist 10." In United States Congress Resources

   ★ Madison, James (or Alexander Hamilton). 1788. "Federalist 51." In United States Congress Resources

   ★ McGann, James & Walter J. Stone. 2021. *Republic at Risk*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 2: Big Answers, Better Questions: Madison's Theory of the Republic.

   ★ Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. 1st edition. New York: Harper and Row. (Chapters. 1-3 & 8)

   ★ "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System: A Report of the Committee on Political Parties." 1950. *The American Political Science Review* 44(3), 1-96.

   ★ Wickham-Jones, Mark. 2018. "This 1950 political science report keeps popping up in the news. Here's the story behind it." In *The Washington Post: Monkey Cage*.

   ★ **Note: APSA Annual Conference will be held from September 15th - September 18th** ★

3. Week 4 (9/19/2022): What is "ideological" thinking and can the American mass public think "ideologically" when it comes to policy preferences?

   ⋆ Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." *Critical Review* 18(1-3):1-74.

   ⋆ Freeder, Sean, Gabriel S. Lenz, & Shad Turney. (2018). "The Importance of Knowing "What Goes with What": Reinterpreting the Evidence on Policy Attitude Stability." *The Journal of Politics* 81(1): 274–290.

   ⋆ Broockman, David E. 2014. "Approaches to Studying Representation." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 41(1): 181-215.

   ⋆ Coppock, Alexander & Donald P. Green. 2021. "Do Belief Systems Exhibit Dynamic Constraint?" *The Journal of Politics*: 1-31.

   ⋆ Hare, Christopher D., Tzu-Ping Liu & Robert N. Lupton. 2018. "What Ordered Optimal Classification reveals about ideological structure, cleavages, and polarization in the American mass public." *Public Choice* 1(1): 1-22.

4. Week 5 (9/26/2022): Contrasting partisan identity (*partisanship*) and ideology: is American political behavior better explained by partisanship or ideology?

   ⋆ Barber, Michael, & Pope, Jeremy C. 2019." Does Party Trump Ideology? Disentangling Party and Ideology in America." *American Political Science Review* 113(1): 38–54.

   ⋆ Campbell, Angus, Phillip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, & Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. John Wiley & Sons.(Chapters 1-4)

   ⋆ Bartels, Larry M. 2010. "The Study of Electoral Behavior." In *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

   ⋆ Goren, Paul. 2002. "Character Weakness, Partisan Bias, and Presidential Evaluation." *The Journal of Politics* 46(3): 627-641.

   ⋆ Montagnes, B. Pablo, Peskowitz, Zachary, & McCrain, Josh. 2019. "Bounding Partisan Approval Rates under Endogenous Partisanship: Why High Presidential Partisan Approval May Not Be What It Seems." *The Journal of Politics* 81(1): 321–326.

5. Week 6 (10/3/2022): Is the American mass public polarized on cultural & ideological grounds? What does *polarization* mean in terms of measurement?

   ⋆ Fiorina, Morris P., & Samuel J Abrams. 2008. Political Polarization in the American Public. *Annual Review of Political Science* 11(1): 563–588.

   ⋆ Abramowitz, Alan & Kyle Saunders. 2008. "Is Polarization a Myth?" *Journal of Politics*. 70(2): 542-555

* Fiorina, Morris P., Samuel J. Abrams, & Jeremy C. Pope. 2008. "Polarization in the American Public: Misconceptions and Misreadings." *Journal of Politics.* 70(2): 556-560.

* Jacoby, William G. 2014. Is There a Culture War? Conflicting Value Structures in American Public Opinion. *American Political Science Review* 108(4): 1–18.

* Iyengar, Shanto, Gaurav Sood, and Yphtach Lelkes. 2012. "Affect, Not Ideology A Social Identity Perspective on Polarization." *Public Opinion Quarterly.* 76(3): 405–431.

6. Week 7 (10/10/2022): Mobilization & Political Participation: What are the predictors of participation in American democracy and do institutional barriers to voting affect participation?

   * Gerber, Alan S. & Donald P. Green. 2000. "The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 94(3): 653–663.

   * Hajnal, Zoltan, Nazita Lajevardi, & Lindsay Nielson. 2017. "Voter Identification Laws and the Suppression of Minority Votes." *The Journal of Politics* 79(2): 363–379.

   * Grimmer, Justin, Eitan Hersh, Marc Meredith, Jonathan Mummolo, & Clayton Nall. 2018. "Obstacles to Estimating Voter ID Laws' Effect on Turnout." *Journal of Politics* 80(3): 1045-1051.

   * Burden, Barry C. 2018. "Disagreement over ID requirements and minority voter turnout." *The Journal of Politics* 80(3), 1060-1063.

   * Barreto, Matt A., Stephen Nuño, Gabriel R. Sanchez & Hannah L. Walker. 2019. "The Racial Implications of Voter Identification Laws in America." *American Politics Research* 47(2), 238-249.

   * Fraga, Bernard L &. Michael G. Miller. 2021. "Who Does Voter ID Keep from Voting?" *The Journal of Politics.* Forthcoming.

7. Week 8 (10/17/2022): Does the American mass public espouse liberal democratic values? Is there variation in satisfaction with democracy and liberal democratic values in the American mass public?

   * Graham, Matthew H. & Milan W. Svolik. 2020. "Democracy in America? Partisanship, Polarization, and the Robustness of Support for Democracy in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 114(2): 392-409.

   * Clayton, Katherine, Nicholas T. Davis, Brendan Nyhan, Ethan Porter, Timothy J. Ryan, & Thomas J. Wood. 2021. "Elite rhetoric can undermine democratic norms." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(23): 1-26.

   * Carey, John M., Gretchen Helmke, Brendan Nyhan, Mitchell Sanders, and Susan Stokes. 2019. "Searching for bright lines in the Trump presidency." *Perspectives on Politics* 17(3): 699-718.

* Malka, Ariel, Yphtach Lelkes, Bert N. Bakker, & Eliyahu Spivack. 2020. "Who Is Open to Authoritarian Governance within Western Democracies?" *Perspectives on Politics*, 1-20.

* Bartels, Larry M. 2020. "Ethnic antagonism erodes Republicans' commitment to democracy." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117(37): 22752–22759.

★ **Midterm Exam Due Sunday, October 23ʳᵈ** ★

American Institutional Modules

8. Week 9 (10/24/2022): Why Parties? Reducing costs to collective action in the electoral arena

    * Hassell, Hans J. G. 2018. "Party control of party primaries: Party influence in nominations for the U.S. Senate." *The Journal of Politics* 78(1): 75-87.

    * Hetherington, Marc J. 2001. "Resurgent Mass Partisanship: The Role of Elite Polarization." *The American Political Science Review* 95(3): 619–631.

    * Maestas, Cherie & L. Sandy Maisel, & Walter J Stone. 2005. "National Party Efforts to Recruit State Legislators to Run for the U.S. House." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 30(2): 277–300.

    * Stone, Walter J., Atkeson, Lonna R., & Rapoport, Ronald B. 1992. "Turning On or Turning Off? Mobilization and Demobilization Effects of Participation Nomination Campaigns." *American Journal of Political Science* 36(3): 665–691.

    * Bawn, Kathleen, Martin Cohen, David Karol, Seth Masket, Hans Noel, & John Zaller. 2012. "A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands and Nominations in American Politics." *Perspectives on Politics* 10(3): 571–97.

9. Week 10 (10/31/2022): The Electoral Connection: What motivates representation by members of Congress and what does electoral accountability look like?

    * Mayhew, David. 1974. "The Electoral Connection and the Congress." In Terry Sullivan & Matthew Sullivan eds., *Congress: Structure and Policy.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 1987.

    * Canes-Wrone, Brandice, David W. Brady, & John. F. Cogan. 2002." Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting. *American Political Science Review* 96(1): 127–140.

    * Jacobson, Gary C. 2015. "It's Nothing Personal: The Decline of the Incumbency Advantage in U.S. House Elections." *The Journal of Politics* 77(1): 235–248.

    * Grimmer, Justin. 2013. "Appropriators Not Position takers: The Distorting Effects of Electoral Incentives on Congressional Representation." *American Journal of Political Science* 57(3): 624–642.

10. Week 11 (11/7/2022): Why Parties, Part II? How parties reduce costs to collective action in Congress and what helps explain policy gridlock (or the lack thereof) on Capitol Hill?

   ⋆ Cox, Gary W. & Matthew D. McCubbins. 2005. "Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives." In Steven S. Smith et al. eds. *The American Congress Reader*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2009.

   ⋆ Krehbiel, Keith. 1993. "Pivotal Politics: A Theory in U.S. Lawmaking." In Steven S. Smith et al. eds. *The American Congress Reader*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2009.

   ⋆ McGann, James & Walter J. Stone. 2021. *Republic at Risk*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 7: A Pivotal Politics Model of the Policy Process: The Separation of Powers Reimagined.

   ⋆ Napolio, Nicholas G. & Christian R. Grose. 2021. "Crossing Over: Majority Party Control Affects Legislator Behavior and the Agenda." *The American Political Science Review*. Forthcoming.

11. Week 12 (11/14/2022): The Presidency: What explains the source, and rise, of unilateral presidential action and what are some of the "informal" powers at the disposal of the president?

   ⋆ Moe, Terry M. & William G. Howell. 1999. "Unilateral Action and Presidential Power: A Theory." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 29(4): 850-873.

   ⋆ Canes-Wrone, Brandice. 2001. "The President's Legislative Influence from Public Appeals." *American Journal of Political Science* 45(2): 313-329

   ⋆ Kinane, Christina. 2021. "Control without Confirmation: The Politics of Vacancies in Presidential Appointments." *The American Political Science Review* 115(2): 599-614.

   ⋆ Ostrander, Ian & Joel Sievert. 2013. "What's So Sinister about Presidential Signing Statements?" *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 43(1): 58-80.

   ⋆ Ostrander, Ian & Joel Sievert. 2014. "Presidential Signing Statements and the Durability of the Law." *Congress & the Presidency* 41(1): 362-383.

12. Week 13 (11/21/2022): The Judiciary: What are the competing models of judicial decision making and how do judicial incentives contrast with electoral incentives? Moreover, how do citizens evaluate the job performance and representation provided by the Supreme Court?

   ⋆ Hamilton, Alexander. 1788. "Federalist 78." In United States Congress Resources

   ⋆ Segal, Jeffrey A. & Harold 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.

* Bartels, Bradon L. 2009. "The Constraining Capacity of Legal Doctrine on the U.S. Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review* 40(4): 971-1003.

* Malhotra, Neil, and Stephen A. Jessee. 2014. "Ideological proximity and support for the Supreme Court." *Political Behavior.* 36(4): 817-846.

* Baily, Michael & Forrest Maltzman. 2008. "Does Legal Doctrine Matter Unpacking Law and Policy Preference on the U.S. Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review* 102(3): 369-384.

* Nicholson, Stephen P. & Thomas G. Hansford. 2014. "Partisans in Robes: Party Cues and Public Acceptance of Supreme Court Decisions." *American Journal of Political Science* 58(3): 620-636.

13. Week 14 (11/28/2022): Lobbying & Interest Groups: What is the pluralistic model of representation and do interest groups exasperate representational inequalities in the American political system?

    * Olson Jr., Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **Read Chapter IV: *The "By-Product" & "Special Interest" Theories* (p. 132-167)**

    * Schattschneider, E. E. 1960. "The Scope & Bias of the Pressure System". In *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

    * Esterling, Kevin M. 2017. "Buying Expertise: Campaign Contributions and Attention to Policy Analysis in Congressional Committees." *The American Political Science Review* 101(1): 93–109.

    * Bonica, Adam, Nolan McCarty, Keith T. Poole, & Howard Rosenthal. 2013. "Why Hasn't Democracy Slowed Rising Inequality?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(3): 103–124.

    * Gilens, Martin & Benjamin I. Page. 2014. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics* 12(3): 564–581.

14. Week 15 (12/5/2022): The growing diversity in the U.S. Congress–what are the implications for increased elite diversity on representation and elections?

    * Schaefer, Katherine. 2021. "The changing face of Congress in 7 charts." In *Pew Research Center*.

    * Broockman, David E. 2014. "Distorted Communication, Unequal Representation: Constituents Communicate Less to Representatives Not of Their Race." *American Journal of Political Science* 58(2): 307–21.

★ Juenke, Eric Gonzalez & Robert R. Preuhs. 2012. "Irreplaceable legislators? Rethinking minority representatives in the new century." *American Journal of Political Science* 56(3): 705-715.

★ Bratton, Kathleen A., & Kerry L. Haynie. "Agenda setting and legislative success in state legislatures: The effects of gender and race." *The Journal of Politics* 61(3): 658-679.

★ Curry, James M., & Matthew R. Haydon 2018. "Lawmaker Age, Issue Salience, and Senior Representation in Congress." *American Politics Research* 46(4): 567–595.

★ Bratton, Kathleen A., & Stella M. Rouse. 2011. "Networks in the Legislative Arena: How Group Dynamics Affect Cosponsorship." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 36(3): 423–460.

★ **Final Exam Due Wednesday, December 14th** ★

This syllabus was last updated on: August 11, 2022

How to Read Social Science Research Articles
Fall 2021

Carlos Algara

Many students may not have prior experience to reading substantive social science research. To mitigate these concerns, I prepared the following questions that students may rely on to assess and critique the political science reedarch that we will encounter in this course. This guide can also be used to identify key components of articles that can then be used to develop the thesis statement required for your response paper and final essay exam. I ***strongly*** recommend using this template to assess the literature that we are assessing in this course and more generally across the social sciences.

1. ***Assessing Theory:*** What is the research's (i.e., article or book) main argument?

    ⋆ What political phenomena does the article or book ***ask*** try to explain/address? (i.e., what is the research question?)

    ⋆ What is the theoretical model advocated by the book in terms of the main ***independent variable(s)*** and ***dependent variable(s)***.

    ⋆ What is the main causal mechanism(s) argued in the piece with respect to how the ***independent variable(s)*** exerts an effect on the ***dependent variable(s)***.

2. ***Assessing The Point:*** How does the research fit in the overall literature?

    ⋆ What standing literature in political science does the piece try to speak to?

    ⋆ How well does this research add to our collective understanding of this literature?

    ⋆ Are there any implications of this research that speak to a ***broader literature*** within political science?

3. ***Assessing Research Methodology:*** What research design is used in this research?

    ⋆ What is the ***dependent variable(s)*** in the study?

    ⋆ How well is the ***dependent variable(s)*** measured?

    ⋆ How do the authors ***operationalize*** the ***dependent variable(s)*** in the survey? For example, on what scale is the dependent variable derived from a survey question measured?

    ⋆ What are the ***independent variable(s)*** in the study and how well are they measured?

    ⋆ What are the <u>main</u> ***independent variable(s)*** in the study as opposed to simple "control" ***independent variable(s)***?

    ⋆ Does the research design try to make a ***causal*** argument or a ***correlational*** argument in terms of inference?

* ⋆ What specific **method** (i.e., specific statistical model? causal identification? qualitative methods?) is used in the research design?

* ⋆ What data is used to assess the research design outlined in the work?

* ⋆ Is the method appropriate given the research question asked, any strengths or weaknesses?

4. **Assessing Research Significance & Quality:** If you had advice for the author(s), what would you suggest?

    * ⋆ Are there any shortcomings to the study in terms of the **theoretical argument** or **research design**?

    * ⋆ Are there alternative explanations to the research findings of this work and are these alternative explanations accounted for in this searcher?

    * ⋆ What are the implications of this research?

    * ⋆ Are there any future avenues of research that this study points us to?

    * ⋆ Should this study be replicated, either in terms of **theoretical argument** or **research design**, in other contexts?