PP 305: Congressional-Executive Institutions & Policymaking in the United States

Claremont Graduate University

Spring 2023
Seminar: Tuesday, 9:00-11:50AM (PST)
Course Location: Burkle 22 &
Zoom Room [https://cgu.zoom.us/j/86020205546]

Instructor: Carlos Algara, Ph.D.
Office: 227 McManus Hall
Office Hours: Please email me to schedule.
✉ carlos.algara@cgu.edu
🌐 https://calgara.github.io

Course Objective: What theoretical models underpin conflict and policymaking between, and within, the American Presidency and the United States Congress?

This course is a graduate seminar surveying the theoretical foundations, and empirical evaluations, assessing the interactions between the American chief executive (presidency) and the United State Congress. To assess intrabranch dynamics between the Presidency and U.S. Congress, we begin with evaluating the logic of the principal-agent model that structures representation within the American democratic system and for each institution. This course will also spend considerable amount of time assessing how each policymaking institution is structured, particularly with respect to the U.S. Congress which serves as the center of American democracy, and how these structures inform intrabranch conflict in the policymaking arena. This requires assessing the following questions throughout the course:

* ★ (1) What is the theoretical principal-agent model underpinning the behavioral incentives of the American president and the U.S. Congress and why is conflict between the executive and legislative branches "built into" American democracy?

* ★ (2) What transaction costs are associated with "policy representation" for both the executive and the U.S. Congress, particularly with respect to the President that is constrained in their *formal* powers to provide representation?

* ★ (3) How does bicameralism and conflict *within* Congress influence its ability to engage with the policymaking process? Specifically, how do institutional-specific legislative processes within the U.S. House and U.S. Senate shape the ability of Congress to engage in the policymaking process?

* ★ (4) What are the role of political parties in shaping conflict and policymaking between the U.S. Congress and the Presidency? How has the influence of political parties in the policymaking, particularly in the U.S. Congress, changed over time?

1

★ (5) What should we expect with respect to executive-legislative relations as American politics becomes increasingly polarized, especially for "divided government" that may arise as a result of the 2022 congressional midterm elections? Are there areas for reform that could reshape executive-legislative relations in light of pronounced partisan polarization?

Taken together, this course will guide us through assessing the theoretical underpinning, and empirical nature, of executive-legislative conflict apparent in American national government. This approach will also inform evaluation of conflict *within* the United States Congress and how the bicameral nature of the institution, with separate formal and informal rules governing both the U.S. House and U.S. Senate, influences the intrabranch dynamics between the executive and legislative branches.

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 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 7, March 12th, 12:00pm)

★ 25% Final Exam (Due: Finals Week, May 14th, 12:00pm)

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/.

Successful Strategies for the Systematic Study of Politics

This section of the syllabus provides successful strategies on *how* to succeed in this course.

Note on Reading Scholarly Articles: Many of the readings of this course will be academic in nature. I understand that, as an introductory seminar, these works may contain empirical analysis that may seem daunting and confusing to read (i.e., lots of equations & statistics). The *only* expectation from you is to read the article carefully before seminar, attempt to understand the article's main argument (this includes what political phenomena does the article's argument seek to explain), how the article's findings fit with the theory presented, and what the implications of the author's empirical findings are for a given week's thematic orientation. **You can find a reading guide at the conclusion of this syllabus, which provides a checklist**

document that outlines how to read these works for content, using this content in seminar discussion, and synthesizing the work towards application in other research related endeavors (i.e., annotated bibliographies for research papers or comprehensive exams).

Expectations: Students can expect me to come prepared to seminar. This entails that students can expect me to give a strong effort to convey the given seminar's course concepts and the implications these concepts have for the main questions highlighted in the course description. This seminar will be taught in a *dynamic* fashion which will require full participation from *everyone* in the seminar. As such, most lectures will incorporate activities designed to stimulate student involvement and gauge comprehension of the material. It is critical that everyone (including me) is **prepared** to discuss the seminar's assigned reading for the week and come ready to discuss the concepts in a scholarly fashion.

Keeping an Open-Mind & Importance of Questions: It is critical to challenge partisan predispositions and other biases we may hold, even if that means confronting powerful myths that can bias our perceptions and assessments. Assessing whether representation functions well requires **questioning everything**, both of the theories themselves and our interpretation of them. Intellectual curiosity and asking questions is both a strong and desirable virtue. Asking questions and engaging in a conversation by sharing your ideas and thoughts help strengthen our assessments.

Constructive Critiques: One of the mainstays of conducting, and consuming, scientific work is consistent critique by the scholarly community. This is part of the scientific process and, ultimately, critiques should be constructive towards the goal of strengthening our collective knowledge and improving scholarly work. As such, critiques in this course must be good-faith exercises designed to be *constructive* towards improving our ability to consume and produce research. I expect all critiques of the work we read, and produce, to follow this model of constructive and professional feedback in this course.

Course Road-Map

★ Note CGU campus closed in observance of Martin Luther King Jr. holiday on Monday, January 17th ★
★ CGU Spring 2022 semester & classes begin on Tuesday, January 17th ★

1. Week 1 (1/17/2023): Course Introduction, Organization, & Overview

Theoretical Foundations of Executive-Legislative Relations

2. Week 2 (1/24/2023): Setting the stage: what is the principal-agent framework shaping the incentives of individual members of Congress and the president?

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

   - ★ "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*.

   - ★ Miller, Gary J. 2005. "The Political Evolution of Principal-Agent Models." *Annual Review of Political Science* 8(1): 203-225.

3. Week 3 (1/31/2023): Building on the principal-agent model of incentives: Specifying inherent conflict between the U.S. Congress and the President (and *within* Congress). How does the theoretical framework of American institutions *guarantee* high transaction costs and conflict between the president and Congress?

   - ★ 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 1: Self-Interest as the Problem and the Solution.

   - ★ 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.

   - ★ Shugart, Matthew S. 2006. "Comparative Executive–Legislative Relations." In Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes & Bert A. Rockman eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions* New York, NY: Oxford University Press 2008.

4. Week 4 (2/7/2023): The Electoral Connection & Textbook "Congressional Incentives": What motivates representation by members of Congress and what does electoral accountability look like as envisioned by Madison's *Federalist 10*?

- ⋆ 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.

- ⋆ Mayhew, David. 1974. "The Electoral Incentive." In Steven S. Smith, Jason M. Roberts & Ryan J. Vander Wielen eds., *The American Congress Reader.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2012.

- ⋆ Fenno Jr., Richard F. 1977. "U.S. House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration." In Steven S. Smith, Jason M. Roberts & Ryan J. Vander Wielen eds., *The American Congress Reader.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2012.

- ⋆ Kaslovsky, Jaclyn. 2021." Senators at Home: Local Attentiveness and Policy Representation in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 1-17.

- ⋆ 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.

5. Week 5 (2/14/2023): The Presidential Incentive: What explains the *source* and *rise* of the unilateral presidency? In what ways does executive presidential representation differ from congressional representation? In what ways are these different representational dynamics similar?

- ⋆ Morris, Irwin L. 2020. *The American Presidency: An Analytical Approach.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 4: Theories of Presidential Power.

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

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

- ⋆ Kriner, Douglas L. & Andrew Reeves. 2015. *The Particularistic President: Executive Branch Politics & Political Inequality.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 & 2: Introduction & The Origins of Presidential Particularism.

Transaction Costs Associated with Legislative & Executive Action

6. Week 6 (2/21/2023): Conceptualizing Madison's Transaction Costs: How does bicameralism and within-chamber rules inhibit the ability of the collective U.S. Congress to act? Why does Congress have a strong status quo bias and how does the U.S. Senate, in particular, constrain the ability of Congress to act?

★ Algara, Carlos, & Savannah Johnston. 2022. "The Rising Electoral Role of Polarization & Implications for Policymaking in the United States Senate: Assessing the Consequences of Polarization in the Senate from 1914-2020. " *The Forum: A Journal of Applied Research in Contemporary Politics.*

★ Lee, Frances E. 2011. "Bicameral Representation." In George C. Edwards III, Frances E. Lee, & Eric Shickler (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the American Congress.* Oxford University Press.

★ Binder, Sarah A. 1999. "The Dynamics of Legislative Gridlock, 1947-96." *The American Political Science Review* 93(3): 519–533.

★ Binder, Sarah A. 1996. "The Partisan Basis of Procedural Choice: Allocating Parliamentary Rights in the House, 1789-1990." *American Political Science Review*, 90(1): 8–20.

★ Cox, Gary W. 2000. "On the Effects of Legislative Rules." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 25(2): 169–192.

★ Roberts, Jason M. & Steven S. Smith. 2007. "The Evolution of Agenda-Setting Institutions in Congress: Path Dependency in House and Senate Institutional Development." In Steven S. Smith, Jason M. Roberts & Ryan J. Vander Wielen eds., *The American Congress Reader.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2012.

7. Week 7 (2/28/2023): Polarization & Congressional Policymaking: How does partisan polarization exasperate the transaction costs of Congress to pass policy? How has partisan polarization within Congress led to "institutional changes" in the policymaking process?

★ Smith, Steven S. 2015. " Partisan Polarization and the Senate Syndrome." In Nathaniel Persily eds., *Solutions to Political Polarization in America.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2015.

★ Theriault, Sean M. 2008. "Party Polarization in Congress." Cambridge University Press. **Part III: Institutional Change: Chapters 7- 10**

8. Week 8 (3/7/2023): Reconsidering the Presidency: In what ways can the president provide representation in the policymaking process in the face of Congressional inaction? How has

★ Berry, Christoher R., Barry C. Burden, & William G. Howell. 2010. "The President and the Distribution of Federal Spending." *American Political Science Review* 104(4): 783-799.

★ Reeves, Andrew & Jon C. Rogowski. 2015. "Unilateral Powers, Public Opinion, and the Presidency." *Journal of Politics* 78(1): 137-151.

★ Waterman, Richard W. 2009. " Assessing the Unilateral Presidency." In George C. Edwards III & William G. Howell eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the American Presidency.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 2009.

* Kaufman, Aaron R. & Jon C. Rogowski. 2018. "The Unilateral Presidency, 1933-2017". *Working Paper*.

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

⋆ Midterm Exam Due Saturday, March 12ᵗʰ, Noon ⋆
⋆ CGU Spring Break March 14ᵗʰ-March 19ᵗʰ

Introducing Formal Models of Executive-Legislative Policymaking

9. Weeks 9 & 10 (3/21/2023 & 3/28/2023): How do spatial models of the policymaking models articulate the role of the U.S. Congress and President in the policymaking process? How does the *Pivotal Politics Model* conceptualize Madison's *Theory of the Republic* articulated in Federalist 10 & 51? Again, how does the U.S. Senate, play a critical role in the process?

   * Smith, Steven S., Jason M. Roberts, & Ryan J. Vander Wielen. 2007. " Introduction to the Spatial Theory of Legislating." In Steven S. Smith, Jason M. Roberts & Ryan J. Vander Wielen eds., *The American Congress Reader.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2012.

   * Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. "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. 2012.

   * 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.

   * Chiou, Fang-Yi & Lawrence Rothenburg. 2003. "When Pivotal Politics Meets Partisan Politics." *The American Journal of Political Science* 47(3): 503-522.

10. Weeks 11 & 12 (4/4/2023 & 4/11/2023): In contract to the "party-less" spatial model of policymaking articulated in the *Pivotal Politics Model*, how does the *Procedural Cartel Party Theory Model* explain the policymaking process? In what form does "policy representation" for Congress and the Presidency take shape under this model? Key hint: *Party Theory* posits that parties not only reduce the cost of collective action in the policymaking arena, but also in the electoral arena.

    * 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.

    * Cox, Gary W. & Matthew D. McCubbins. 2005."Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives." Cambridge University Press. ***Chapter 5: Final-Passage Votes***

⋆ Smith, Steven S. 2007. "Party Influence in Congress." In Steven S. Smith, Jason M. Roberts & Ryan J. Vander Wielen eds., *The American Congress Reader.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2012.

⋆ Gailmard, Sean & Jeffery A. Jenkins. 2007. "Negative Agenda Control in the Senate and House: Fingerprints of Majority Party Power." *The Journal of Politics* 69(3): 689-700.

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

⋆ 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.

⋆ Algara, Carlos, Isaac Hale, & Cory Struthers. 2022. "Do Voters Balance Partisan Control of the Federal Government During the Partisan Era? Assessing the Case of the 2021 Georgia U.S. Senate Runoffs." *American Politics Research.*

Presidential-Congressional Relations, and Conflict, During the Polarized Era: Consequences & Areas of Reform

11. Week 13 (4/18/2023): Assessing conflict between the Congress and President: How do presidents use the veto, or the the threat of one, to negotiate with Congress and how the president may "legislate" despite not being a member of Congress?

⋆ Fisher, Louie S. 1998. "The Politics of Shared Power." In Steven S. Smith, Jason M. Roberts & Ryan J. Vander Wielen eds., *The American Congress Reader.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2012.

⋆ 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.

⋆ Cameron, Charles. 2000. "Veto Bargaining: Presidents and the Politics of Negative Power." In Steven S. Smith, Jason M. Roberts & Ryan J. Vander Wielen eds., *The American Congress Reader.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2012.

⋆ Copeland, Gary W. 1983. "When Congress and the President Collide: Why Presidents Veto Legislation." *Journal of Politics* 45(3): 696-710.

12. Week 14 (4/25/2023): Polarization and Executive-Congressional Relations: Why has partisan ideological polarization led to more "presidential" parties in American politics and what are the implications of this for executive-congressional relations?

   ★ Rohde, David & Meredith Barthelemy. 2009. "The President and Congressional Parties in an Era of Polarization." In George C. Edwards & William Howell eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the American Presidency.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 2010.

   ★ Barber, Michael J. & Nolan McCarty. 2015. "Causes and Consequences of Polarized Parties." In Nathaniel Persily eds., *Solutions to Political Polarization in America.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2015.

   ★ Hacker, Jacob S. & Paul Pierson. 2015. "Confronting Asymmetric Polarization." In Nathaniel Persily eds., *Solutions to Political Polarization in America.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2015.

   ★ Samuels, David J. & Matthew S. Shugart. 2012. "Presidents, Parties, and Prime Ministers: How the Separation of Powers Affects Party Organization and Behavior." Cambridge University Press. ***Chapter 3: Insiders and Outsiders: Madison's Dilemma and Leadership Selection***

   ★ Milkis, Sidney M. & Nicholas Jacobs. 2017. " 'I Alone Can Fix It'Donald Trump, the Administrative Presidency, and Hazards of Executive-Centered Partisanship." *The Forum* 15(3): 583-613.

13. Week 15 (5/2/2023): Polarization, Reform, and Executive-Congressional Relations: Why has partisan ideological polarization led to more "presidential" parties in American politics and what are the implications of this for executive-congressional relations? Are there potential areas of reform that could reshape executive-legislative relations in light of pronounced partisan polarization?

   ★ McCarty, Nolan. 2015. "Reducing Polarization by Making Parties Stronger." In Nathaniel Persily eds., *Solutions to Political Polarization in America.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2015.

   ★ Taylor, Steven L., Matthew S. Shugart, Arend Lijphart, & Bernard Groffman. 2014. "A Different Democracy: American Government in a 31-Country Perspective." Yale University Press. ***Chapter 6: Political Parties, Election Campaigns, and Interest Groups & Chapter 8: Executive Power***

   ★ Taylor, Steven L. 2020. "Reforms: the Possible, the Improbable, and the Unpossible." *Outside the Beltway Blog Post.*

   ★ Rodden, Jonathan. 2015. "Geography and Gridlock in the United States." In Nathaniel Persily eds., *Solutions to Political Polarization in America.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2015.

★ CGU Final Exam Week, May 8th - May 12th ★
★ Final Exam Due Saturday, May 13th, Noon ★

This syllabus was last updated on: January 17, 2023

How to Read Social Science Research Articles
Spring 2023
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 research 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 evaluating 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?