

PSCI 5030: Proseminar in American Institutions

Dr. Ashley English
Ashley.English@unt.edu

Spring 2024
Tuesdays
2:00-4:50 PM
Wooten 111

COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

Whose voices do American politicians and policymakers listen to and consider when they design policies? How do our rules, laws, formal institutions, and other political organizations have an impact on whose interests are represented and how public policies are designed? This course will answer these questions by proceeding in three parts. The first part of the course focuses on foundational research findings related to our formal political institutions: Congress, the presidency, the bureaucracy, and the courts. The second part of the course examines research about interest groups, political parties, and the media – three intermediary institutions that link people to our formal political institutions. In the third part of the course, we will consider how formal and intermediary organizations work together to make public policy and set the agenda for policy debates. We will close out the semester by focusing on normative questions about power and powerlessness in American democracy, contemporary forms of institutional dysfunction, and the future prospects for the American democratic system of governance. Overall, the course is designed to provide a broad introduction to the field, rather than going into depth on any of the topics on the syllabus. Therefore, students are also encouraged to complete additional recommended readings for more in-depth understandings of the topics covered in this course and to prepare for comps.

In addition to introducing myriad current and foundational texts on American political institutions, this course will also help you develop the skills you will need to produce your own research and eventually publish papers in political science journals. We will focus specifically on writing good research questions, writing effective critical literature reviews, and designing research studies that will answer the research questions that students pose. Altogether those skills will help students learn how to write research papers that make unique, original contributions to the political science literature.

At the end of this course, you will be able to:

- Synthesize the foundational literature on American political institutions
- Evaluate and analyze research on the formal institutions that comprise the federal government (Congress, the presidency, the bureaucracy, and courts)
- Evaluate and analyze research on intermediary organizations and institutions in American politics (Interest groups, political parties, and the media)
- Evaluate and analyze research on the American public policymaking process
- Evaluate arguments about the causes and consequences of contemporary forms of political dysfunction in American political institutions
- Identify and pose unique and original research questions that will move the literature on American political institutions forward
- Write critical analyses of the literature on American institutions

COURSE FORMAT

Each class session will consist of a graduate student-led presentation that provides a critical analysis of the readings followed by class discussion of the readings.

IMPORTANT DUE DATES

- Tuesday, April 30: Final Exam
- Tuesdays in Class: Discussion Leader Presentations
- Mondays at 5:00 PM: Discussion Leader Objectives and Questions and Assigned Short Critical Essays

COURSE MATERIALS AND READINGS

Required Books and Readings

- 1) Aldrich, John. 1995. *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ISBN: 9780226012728.
- 2) Arnold, R. Douglas. 1990. *The Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. ISBN: 9780300056594.
- 3) Kingdon, John. 2003. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Longman. ISBN: 9780205000869.
- 4) Rosenberg, Gerald. 1991. *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ISBN: 9780226726717.
- 5) Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy*, New York, NY: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston. ISBN: 9780030133664.
- 6) Theirault, Sean. 2005. *Party Polarization in Congress*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 9780521717687.
- 7) Mann, Thomas and Norman Ornstein. 2016. *It's Even Worse than It ~~Looks~~ Was: How the American Constitutional System Collided with the New Politics of Extremism*. New York: Basic Books. ISBN: 9780465096206.

All of the readings in the syllabus are required. Because our class discussions depend on them, it is extremely important that **you** complete **all** readings.

Communications and Email

Throughout the semester, I will primarily communicate with the class using our Canvas site and email. I will keep the class updated on upcoming activities and provide other timely notifications using the “Announcements” feature on Canvas.

If you have substantive questions about the course or the material, American politics more broadly, or any concerns about the class or other situations that are bothering you, I strongly encourage you to come see me during office my office hours (listed above) or make an appointment if you have a conflict with my office hours. I am happy to help!

Email is also an excellent way to reach me, but please note that it is often more effective to discuss substantive questions and concerns in-person during office hours. **If you contact me by email**

between Monday and Friday, I will do my best to respond within 24 hours. When you send emails, please include the course number (PSCI 5030) in the subject line of your email along with a brief description of the class-related subject you would like to discuss. **I receive a large number of emails from students, so including this information will help me respond to you!**

CLEAR has also developed a website (<https://clear.unt.edu/online-communication-tips>) with online communication tips that you may find helpful.

If you need to get in touch with me about a grade, please be aware that **I will not discuss grades over email, so you will need to meet with me to discuss any issues with your grade.** If you wish to dispute a grade, please be aware that a significant amount of time and effort are dedicated to grading student assignments. That being said, if you would like to dispute a grade, you must set up a meeting with me and provide, in writing, a clear explanation as to why a different grade is in order and what grade you believe is appropriate prior to our meeting. All grade dispute requests **must be submitted within one week** of the date that grades are made available to the class and grade disputes will not be considered past the one-week dispute period. Please be advised that I will not change grades simply because students believe they “want” or “need” a higher grade. Also, when I review work for grade disputes, I reserve the right to leave the grade unchanged, raise the grade, or lower the grade.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Grades and Assignments

Final course grades will be based on your discussion leadership during 1 class session, a final research paper (broken into four smaller assignments), and your class participation. Each of these components will factor into your final grade as follows:

Activity	Grading Method	% of Final Course Grade
Discussion Leadership and Presentation	A-F	20%
Short Critical Essays	A-F	40%
Final Exam (Take Home Mini-Comp)	A-F	30%
Class Participation	A-F	10%

Discussion Leadership and Presentations (20% of Grade)

Each student will lead the class discussion for our weekly class meetings. As the discussion leader, you will be asked to: (1) provide the class with a **20-minute** presentation that provides a critical analysis of the readings, and then (2) lead the class discussion for the rest of our class meeting. As the instructor, I will assist and add to the discussion as necessary, but it is the discussion leader's responsibility to:

- **Provide a list of 3-5 learning objectives (PhD students) or 3-5 practical applications (MA students) for the week's readings**
- **Provide 5-7 discussion questions on the week's readings**
- **Identify and highlight major themes, questions, and topics for the week**

- Identify and highlight the major contribution(s) that each reading makes to the literature on interest groups
- Offer original criticisms and analysis of the readings
- Engage other students in a lively and productive conversation during our class session.

All discussion leader presentations MUST discuss all of the assigned readings for the week.

The discussion leader's presentation **should NOT simply summarize the readings**. The presentation may begin with a **brief** summary of the readings, but the bulk of the presentation should assume that your classmates have read the required materials and instead provide an original analysis of the readings for the week. **To avoid summarizing the readings, I strongly recommend that you organize your presentation around themes in the readings, rather than going through each reading one-by-one.**

Successful presentations will provide an analysis of the arguments made in the readings, the evidence used to support those arguments, and the methods the authors used to answer their research questions. They will also help spur the class's thinking about future research related to the readings by identifying the limitations of each study and providing suggestions for how future research projects could address those limitations and/or build on the study's findings.

Good discussion questions should ask the class to wrestle with the author's arguments, research methods, and analytical choices. I strongly encourage students to write open-ended questions about the readings. Avoid simple yes/no or agree/disagree questions. While normative questions about the implications of the readings can be interesting to discuss, I'd also encourage students to focus more on questions that help the class understand the readings and how they relate to each other than broad normative questions that go beyond the readings. As you write questions, remember that one of the goals of our class is to make sure students can deeply understand and apply the lessons learned from the readings. Thus, your goal should be to ask questions that will help your classmates use the readings to prepare for comps and for their future research.

Short Critical Essays

You will be assigned to a group that will write a 4-5-page critical overview of the readings for assigned weeks throughout the semester. **These papers should provide a thoughtful, original analysis of the readings, not a simple article-by-article summary of the readings.** In other words, my expectation is that you will use your paper to make an intellectual argument about the readings, not that you will provide an annotated bibliography of them. There are many ways that your paper can make an original argument, but these four forms should help you get started if you are looking for some ideas:

- Option 1: Your paper could identify the limitations or shortcomings of some of the studies you read for the week and make in-depth practical suggestion(s) for how those studies could be improved.
- Option 2: Your paper could identify an important, researchable issue or question that is not addressed in that week's readings, discuss the issue's importance, and explain how it might be studied. Note: If you take this option, you need to discuss this new issue in relationship

to the studies you read for the week by explaining how studying the new issue you propose will build on the previous studies that you read for class.

- Option 3: Your paper could develop a counterargument to a theoretical claim made by one or more authors in that week's readings.
- Option 4: Your paper could critically examine an important concept used by one or more authors in that week's readings.

Your critical essay should refer to **at least half of the readings** in your assigned week.

Critical Essays must meet the following formatting requirements:

- 12-point Times New Roman Font
- 1 Inch margins
- Double-spaced
- Title pages and references lists are not necessary

Critical Essays will be **due at 5:00 PM on the day before your class session meets**. (For example, if you group is assigned to write papers for class on Tuesday, January 23, that means your paper is due on Monday, January 22 at 5:00 PM).

Grading Criteria for Discussion Leadership and Critical Essays

The following general grading scale will be used to assess each student's discussion leader presentations and critical essays:

Grade	Contribution
A	<p>The student made a very strong contribution to the course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Their presentations, discussion questions, papers, and comments were closely connected to the readings and identified the main themes of the readings in full. ▪ Presentations, comments, or discussion questions asked students to critically engage with the readings by identifying and analyzing key concepts, key findings, strengths and weaknesses of studies, key methodological decisions, and/or putting the different authors for the week in conversation with each other. ▪ Presentations, comments, papers, or discussion questions started to provide a launching point for how we could each week's materials as a foundation for future research. They identify gaps in the literature and provide suggestions for how to fill those gaps and why it is important to fill them. ▪ Comments, questions, and arguments provided strong evidence of a student's original, critical analyses of the readings. The student attempted to make an original contribution to how we should think about the readings for the course. ▪ Comments, discussions, and/or presentations encouraged other classmates to join the discussion and/or consider the readings more deeply. ▪ The student was always prepared for discussion with notes and copies of the readings that they could refer to during the discussion.
B	<p>The student contributed meaningfully to the course.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The presentation and questions were closely connected to the readings and identified the main themes of the readings in full, but the comments, presentation, and questions primarily focused on summarizing the readings rather than providing a critical analysis of them. ▪ Presentations, comments, papers, or discussion questions started to provide a launching point for how we could each week's materials as a foundation for future research. They identify gaps in the literature, but they do not provide suggestions for how to fill those gaps and why it is important to fill them. ▪ Most comments were on topic, but some comments and/or the presentation may have been related to tangential issues or topics that were not central to the main themes and/or findings of the readings. ▪ The student was always prepared for discussion with notes and copies of the readings that they could refer to during the discussion.
C or Below	<p>The student did not contribute meaningfully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presentations, papers, and comments were limited to repeating the assigned material rather than making connections or extensions. ▪ Presentations, papers, and comments focused on tangential issues in the readings, rather than key points in the studies. ▪ Their work included multiple mistakes and inaccuracies. ▪ Their paper discussed fewer than half of the readings. The student did not provide at least 5 discussion questions. ▪ The student was not prepared for discussions. They did not have copies of the readings or notes with them, so they could not engage with the readings in a meaningful way during class. ▪ The student did not speak at all in class discussions.
F	The student did not complete the required presentation, paper, or questions.

Class Participation (10% of Course Grade)

Lastly, class discussions are a very important component of graduate school. Thus, you will be graded on class participation. Barring any extenuating circumstances as defined in the university's excused absences policy, you should not miss classes. In other words, my expectation is that students will attend and participate in all of our classes unless they have an excused absence or an extraordinary, documented, extenuating circumstance (see the attendance and COVID policies below for more info). During class, I also expect that each student will make comments that engage with the material critically and allow students to learn from each other. I recognize speaking in discussions can be intimidating, but effective public speaking is a skill that will be necessary for your future academic or professional career. Participation will be graded using the criteria described in the class discussion section above.

Final Exam (30% of course grade)

The final exam will consist of a mini-comprehensive exam. We will take the exam during our final regular class meeting, and the exam is designed to provide practice and experience with the types of questions that you may encounter when you take comps. Students will be given a list of 3 questions

and they will have to answer one. The exam will be open notes and book. More information about the exam will be provided in class as the exam date approaches.

Assignment Submissions, AI, and Academic Integrity

Students will submit all of their work on Canvas this semester. Turnitin or other plagiarism detecting software will be used for assignment submissions. **This course assumes that all work submitted for a grade by students will be generated by the students themselves, working individually.**

Therefore, class policy indicates the following constitute violations of academic honesty: a student has another person/entity do the work of any substantive portion of a graded assignment for them, which includes purchasing work from a company, hiring a person or company to complete an assignment or exam, and/or using generative AI tools (such as ChatGPT).

Students should note that according to the UNT policy, “cheating” includes, but is not limited to: “1) the use of any unauthorized assistance to take exams, tests, quizzes, or other assessments; 2) dependence upon the aid of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments; 3) the acquisition, without permission of tests, notes, or other academic materials belonging to a faculty or staff member of the University; 4) dual submission of a paper or project, or re-submission of a paper or project to a different class without express permission from the instructor; 5) any other act designed to give a student an unfair advantage on an academic assignment.”

UNT policy also defines plagiarism as the “use of another’s thoughts or words without proper attribution in any academic exercise *regardless of the student’s intent*” (emphasis mine). It includes, but is not limited to: “1) the knowing or negligent use by paraphrase or direct quotation of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgement or citation; 2) the knowing or negligent unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or by an agency engaged in selling term papers or other academic materials.”

COURSE POLICIES

Attendance Policy and UNT Excused Absences

Attendance for this class is expected and you will be graded on participation in unannounced in-class activities. One of the best ways to take responsibility for your success in this class is to attend class regularly.

In accordance with UNT’s attendance policy, absences will be excused for religious holy days, active military service, participation in official university functions, illness or other extenuating circumstances, pregnancy and parenting under Title IX, and when the University is officially closed by the President. As the policy states, students are required to request and document their excused absences with me. If you have an excused absence, please provide me with notice and documentation for that absence as soon as possible. More information on UNT’s attendance policy is available at:

http://policy.unt.edu/sites/default/files/untpolicy/15.2.5_StudentAttendance_May2016.pdf.

COVID-19 Impact on Attendance

While attendance is expected as outlined above, it is important for all of us to be mindful of the health and safety of everyone in our community, especially given concerns about COVID-19. Please contact me if you are unable to attend class because you are ill, or unable to attend class due to COVID-19 including symptoms, potential exposure, pending or positive test results, or if you have been given specific instructions to isolate or quarantine from a health care provider or a local authority.

Grading Scale

Grades will follow the standard scale listed below and will be posted on Canvas. As you can see from the chart below, grades will be rounded to the nearest tenth.

A	100-90.0%
B	89.9-80.0%
C	79.9-70.0%
D	69.9-60.0%
F	Below 60%

Incomplete and Late Work Policy

Please make note of **all of the due dates** and **plan accordingly**. No late work will be accepted unless the student has documented, extenuating circumstances and provides documentation within 48 hours of the missed deadline.

Extra Credit

I do not provide individual opportunities for extra credit because I have never found a way to provide them that is fair to other members of the class. To be successful in this class, students should focus on completing the required assignments to the best of their ability.

If you do not do well on your assignments, I encourage you to see me for assistance as soon as possible. We will be happy to work with you to improve your grades, but it is your responsibility to seek out help if you need it.

UNT POLICIES

Americans with Disabilities Act Statement

UNT makes reasonable academic accommodation for students with disabilities. Students seeking accommodation must first register with the Office of Disability Accommodation (ODA) to verify their eligibility. If a disability is verified, the ODA will provide a student with an accommodation letter to be delivered to faculty to begin a private discussion regarding one's specific course needs. Students may request accommodations at any time; however, ODA notices of accommodation should be provided as early as possible in the semester to avoid any delay in implementation. Note

that students must obtain a new letter of accommodation for every semester and must meet with each faculty member prior to implementation in each class. For additional information see the ODA website at disability.unt.edu.

Emergency Notification and Procedures

UNT uses a system called Eagle Alert to quickly notify students with critical information in the event of an emergency (i.e., severe weather, campus closing, and health and public safety emergencies like chemical spills, fires, or violence). In the event of a university closure, please refer to Canvas for contingency plans for covering course materials.

Prohibition of Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation

The University of North Texas (UNT) prohibits discrimination and harassment because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, disability, genetic information, veteran status, or any other characteristic protected under applicable federal or state law in its application and admission processes; educational programs and activities; employment policies, procedures, and processes; and university facilities. The University takes active measures to prevent such conduct and investigates and takes remedial action when appropriate.

Sexual Discrimination, Harassment, and Assault

UNT is committed to providing a safe learning environment free of all forms of sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Federal laws (Title IX and the Violence Against Women Act) and UNT policies prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, and therefore prohibit sexual misconduct. If you or someone you know is experiencing sexual harassment, relationship violence, stalking, and/or sexual assault, there are campus resources available to provide support and assistance. UNT's Survivor Advocates can assist a student who has been impacted by violence by filing protective orders, completing crime victim's compensation applications, contacting professors for absences related to an assault, working with housing to facilitate a room change where appropriate, and connecting students to other resources available both on and off campus. The Survivor Advocates can be reached at SurvivorAdvocate@unt.edu or by calling the Dean of Students Office at 940-565-2648. Additionally, alleged sexual misconduct can be non-confidentially reported to the Title IX Coordinator at oeo@unt.edu or at (940) 565-2759.

Mandatory Reporter

As a UNT faculty member, I am required to share information regarding sexual assault and retaliation and sexual harassment with the university. Therefore, I want to be transparent that while I will seek to keep information that you share with me about your life in classroom discussions, your written work, one-on-one meetings, and/or emails private, I am required to disclose information about sexual misconduct to UNT's Office of Equal Opportunity. For more information on reporting sexual misconduct at UNT, please see: <https://deanofstudents.unt.edu/sexual-misconduct/reporting-sexual-misconduct>.

Retention of Student Records

Student records pertaining to this course are maintained in a secure location by the instructor of record. All records such as exams, answer sheets (with keys), and written papers submitted during the duration of the course are kept for at least one calendar year after course completion. Course work completed via the Canvas online system, including grading information and comments, is also stored in a safe electronic environment for one year. Students have the right to view their individual record; however, information about student's records will not be divulged to other individuals without proper written consent. Students are encouraged to review the Public Information Policy and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) laws and the University's policy. See UNT Policy 10.10, Records Management and Retention for additional information.

Access to Information - Eagle Connect

Students' access point for business and academic services at UNT is located at: my.unt.edu. All official communication from the University will be delivered to a student's Eagle Connect account. For more information, please visit the website that explains Eagle Connect and how to forward e-mail [Eagle Connect](https://it.unt.edu/eagleconnect) (<https://it.unt.edu/eagleconnect>).

Student Evaluation Administration Dates

Student feedback is important and an essential part of participation in this course. The student evaluation of instruction is a requirement for all organized classes at UNT. The survey will be made available during weeks 13, 14 and 15 of the long semesters to provide students with an opportunity to evaluate how this course is taught. Students will receive an email from "UNT SPOT Course Evaluations via IASystem Notification" (no-reply@iasystem.org) with the survey link. Students should look for the email in their UNT email inbox. Simply click on the link and complete the survey. Once students complete the survey they will receive a confirmation email that the survey has been submitted. For additional information, please visit the [SPOT website](http://spot.unt.edu/) (<http://spot.unt.edu/>) or email spot@unt.edu.

Important Notice for F-1 Students taking Distance Education Courses

To read detailed Immigration and Customs Enforcement regulations for F-1 students taking online courses, please go to the [Electronic Code of Federal Regulations website](http://www.ecfr.gov/) (<http://www.ecfr.gov/>). The specific portion concerning distance education courses is located at Title 8 CFR 214.2 Paragraph (f)(6)(i)(G).

The paragraph reads:

(G) For F-1 students enrolled in classes for credit or classroom hours, no more than the equivalent of one class or three credits per session, term, semester, trimester, or quarter may be counted toward the full course of study requirement if the class is taken on-line or through distance education and does not require the student's physical attendance for classes, examination or other purposes integral to completion of the class. An on-line or distance education course is a course that is offered principally through the use of television, audio, or computer transmission including open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, or satellite, audio conferencing, or computer conferencing. If the F-1 student's course of study is in a language study program, no on-line or distance education classes may be considered to count toward a student's full course of study requirement.

University of North Texas Compliance

To comply with immigration regulations, an F-1 visa holder within the United States may need to engage in an on-campus experiential component for this course. This component (which must be approved in advance by the instructor) can include activities such as taking an on-campus exam, participating in an on-campus lecture or lab activity, or other on-campus experience integral to the completion of this course.

If such an on-campus activity is required, it is the student's responsibility to do the following:

- (1) Submit a written request to the instructor for an on-campus experiential component within one week of the start of the course.
- (2) Ensure that the activity on campus takes place and the instructor documents it in writing with a notice sent to the International Student and Scholar Services Office. ISSS has a form available that you may use for this purpose.

Because the decision may have serious immigration consequences, if an F-1 student is unsure about his or her need to participate in an on-campus experiential component for this course, s/he should contact the UNT International Student and Scholar Services Office (telephone 940-565-2195 or email internationaladvising@unt.edu) to get clarification before the one-week deadline.

Student Verification

UNT takes measures to protect the integrity of educational credentials awarded to students enrolled in distance education courses by verifying student identity, protecting student privacy, and notifying students of any special meeting times/locations or additional charges associated with student identity verification in distance education courses.

See [UNT Policy 07-002 Student Identity Verification, Privacy, and Notification and Distance Education Courses](https://policy.unt.edu/policy/07-002) (<https://policy.unt.edu/policy/07-002>).

ETHICS AND CONDUCT

Academic Misconduct: Cheating and Plagiarism

According to UNT Policy 06.003, Student Academic Integrity, academic dishonesty occurs when students engage in behaviors including, but not limited to cheating, fabrication, facilitating academic dishonesty, forgery, plagiarism, and sabotage. A finding of academic dishonesty may result in a range of academic penalties or sanctions ranging from admonition to expulsion from the University. <http://facultysuccess.unt.edu/academic-integrity>.

The Political Science Department adheres to and enforces UNT's policy on academic integrity (cheating, plagiarism, forgery, fabrication, facilitating academic dishonesty and sabotage). Students in this class should review the policy, which is located at: http://policy.unt.edu/sites/default/files/untpolicy/pdf/7-Student_Affairs-Academic_Integrity.pdf.

Violations of academic integrity in this course will be addressed in compliance with the penalties and procedures laid out in this policy. Students may appeal any decision under this policy by following the procedures laid down in the UNT Policy Manual Section 18.1.16 "Student Standards of Academic Integrity."

Students should note that according to the UNT policy, “cheating” includes, but is not limited to: “1) the use of any unauthorized assistance to take exams, tests, quizzes, or other assessments; 2) dependence upon the aid of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments; 3) the acquisition, without permission of tests, notes, or other academic materials belonging to a faculty or staff member of the University; 4) dual submission of a paper or project, or re-submission of a paper or project to a different class without express permission from the instructor; 5) any other act designed to give a student an unfair advantage on an academic assignment.” According to UNT policy, plagiarism is defined as the “use of another’s thoughts or words without proper attribution in any academic exercise *regardless of the student’s intent*” (emphasis mine). It includes, but is not limited to: “1) the knowing or negligent use by paraphrase or direct quotation of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgement or citation; 2) the knowing or negligent unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or by an agency engaged in selling term papers or other academic materials.”

Rules of Engagement and Classroom Conduct

Rules of engagement refer to the way students are expected to interact with each other and with their instructors. Here are some general guidelines:

- While the freedom to express yourself is a fundamental human right, any communication that utilizes cruel and derogatory language on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, age, disability, genetic information, veteran status, or any other characteristic protected under applicable federal or state law will not be tolerated.
- Treat your instructor and classmates with respect in any communication online or face-to-face, even when their opinion differs from your own.
- Ask for and use the correct name and pronouns for your instructor and classmates.
- Speak from personal experiences. Use “I” statements to share thoughts and feelings. Try not to speak on behalf of groups or other individual’s experiences.
- Use your critical thinking skills to challenge other people’s ideas, instead of attacking individuals.
- Avoid using all caps while communicating digitally. This may be interpreted as “YELLING!”
- Be cautious when using humor or sarcasm in emails or discussion posts as tone can be difficult to interpret digitally.
- Avoid using “text-talk” unless explicitly permitted by your instructor.
- Proofread and fact-check your sources.
- Keep in mind that online posts can be permanent, so think first before you type.

See these [Engagement Guidelines](https://clear.unt.edu/online-communication-tips) (https://clear.unt.edu/online-communication-tips) for more information.

Acceptable Student Behavior

Student behavior that interferes with an instructor's ability to conduct a class or other students' opportunity to learn is unacceptable and disruptive and will not be tolerated in any instructional form at UNT. Students engaging in unacceptable and disruptive behavior will be directed to leave the classroom and the instructor may refer to the student to the Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities to consider whether the student's conduct violated the Code of Student Conduct. The university's expectations for student conduct apply to all instructional forums including university and electronic classrooms, labs, and discussion groups, field trips, etc. The Code of Student Conduct can be found at <https://deanofstudents.unt.edu/conduct>.

As an instructor, I believe that students learn best when they are able to engage with each other (and the professor!) in a respectful and open-minded manner. So, please practice the Golden Rule and treat others as you would like to be treated. Specifically, I ask that you avoid disruptive behaviors by:

- Silencing all disruptive electronic devices;
- Refraining from texting, tweeting, checking email, surfing the internet, or reading irrelevant materials during class;
- Having side conversations with others during class;
- Falling asleep.

Since the topics in this course will encourage lively and energetic discussions and debates, it is also important for you to show respect for others' opinions and points of view, even when you disagree.

ACADEMIC SUPPORT & STUDENT SERVICES

Student Support Services and Mental Health

UNT provides mental health resources to students to help ensure there are numerous outlets to turn to that wholeheartedly care for and are there for students in need, regardless of the nature of an issue or its severity. Listed below are several resources on campus that can support your academic success and mental well-being:

- [Student Health and Wellness Center](https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/student-health-and-wellness-center) (<https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/student-health-and-wellness-center>)
- [Counseling and Testing Services](https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/counseling-and-testing-services) (<https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/counseling-and-testing-services>)
- [UNT Care Team](https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/care) (<https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/care>)
- [UNT Psychiatric Services](https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/student-health-and-wellness-center/services/psychiatry) (<https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/student-health-and-wellness-center/services/psychiatry>)
- [Individual Counseling](https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/counseling-and-testing-services/services/individual-counseling) (<https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/counseling-and-testing-services/services/individual-counseling>)

Chosen Names

A chosen name is a name that a person goes by that may or may not match their legal name. If you have a chosen name that is different from your legal name and would like that to be used in class, please let the instructor know. Below is a list of resources for updating your chosen name at UNT.

- [UNT Records](#)
- [UNT ID Card](#)
- [UNT Email Address](#)
- [Legal Name](#)

**UNT euIDs cannot be changed at this time. The collaborating offices are working on a process to make this option accessible to UNT community members.*

Pronouns

Pronouns (she/her, they/them, he/him, etc.) are a public way for people to address you, much like your name, and can be shared with a name when making an introduction, both virtually and in-person. Just as we ask and don't assume someone's name, we should also ask and not assume someone's pronouns.

You can [add your pronouns to your Canvas account](#) so that they follow your name when posting to discussion boards, submitting assignments, etc.

Below is a list of additional resources regarding pronouns and their usage:

- [What are pronouns and why are they important?](#)
- [How do I use pronouns?](#)
- [How do I share my pronouns?](#)
- [How do I ask for another person's pronouns?](#)
- [How do I correct myself or others when the wrong pronoun is used?](#)

Additional Student Support Services

- [Registrar](https://registrar.unt.edu/registration) (<https://registrar.unt.edu/registration>)
- [Financial Aid](https://financialaid.unt.edu/) (<https://financialaid.unt.edu/>)
- [Student Legal Services](https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/student-legal-services) (<https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/student-legal-services>)
- [Career Center](https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/career-center) (<https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/career-center>)
- [Multicultural Center](https://edo.unt.edu/multicultural-center) (<https://edo.unt.edu/multicultural-center>)
- [Counseling and Testing Services](https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/counseling-and-testing-services) (<https://studentaffairs.unt.edu/counseling-and-testing-services>)
- [Pride Alliance](https://edo.unt.edu/pridealliance) (<https://edo.unt.edu/pridealliance>)
- [UNT Food Pantry](https://deanofstudents.unt.edu/resources/food-pantry) (<https://deanofstudents.unt.edu/resources/food-pantry>)

Academic Support Services

- [Academic Resource Center](https://clear.unt.edu/canvas/student-resources) (<https://clear.unt.edu/canvas/student-resources>)
- [Academic Success Center](https://success.unt.edu/asc) (<https://success.unt.edu/asc>)
- [UNT Libraries](https://library.unt.edu/) (<https://library.unt.edu/>)
- [Writing Lab](http://writingcenter.unt.edu/) (<http://writingcenter.unt.edu/>)

COURSE SCHEDULE

Readings Marked *** are available on Canvas!

Tuesday, January 16: Course Introduction, Expectations, and Class Norms

- ***Baglione, Lisa. 2016. *Writing a Research Paper in Political Science: A Practical Guide to Inquiry, Structure, and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, Chapters 4 and 5.
- ***Svinicki, Marilla and Wilbert McKeachie. 2011. "Facilitating Discussion." *McKeachie's Teaching Tips*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, pgs 36-45.
- ***Bloom's Taxonomy Cognitive Domains Handout
- ***Course Design by Objectives Handout

PART I: FORMAL INSTITUTIONS

Tuesday, January 23: Congressional Elections

- Skim [The Federalist Papers, Numbers 10, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 62, 63, 64, 65.](#)
- [The Constitution, Article 1.](#)
- ***Mayhew, David. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven: Yale University Press, pgs 1-77.
- ***Fenno, Richard. 1977. "U.S. House Members and their Constituencies." *American Political Science Review* 71.
- ***Fenno, Richard. 1978. *Home Style: Members in their Districts*. New York, NY: Longman. Chapters 3-4.
- ***Miller, Warren E. and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57.
- Theirault, Sean. 2005. *Party Polarization in Congress*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1, 4, and 5.

Tuesday, January 30: Congressional Organization (Parties and Committees)

- Theirault, Sean. 2005. *Party Polarization in Congress*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 2-3, 7-10.
- ***Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the US House of Representatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1-2.
- ***Rhode, David. 1991. *Parties and Leaders in the Post-Reform House*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press., Chapters 2-3.
- ***Shepsle, Kenneth and Barry Weingast. 1987. "The Institutional Foundations of Committee Power." *American Political Science Review* 81.
- ***Adler, Scott E. and John Lapinski. 1997. "Demand-Side Theory and Congressional Committee Composition: A Constituency Characteristics Approach." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(3): 895-918.

Tuesday, February 6: Congressional Policymaking

- Arnold, R. Douglas. 1990. *The Logic of Congressional Action*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, Chapters 1-6.
- ***Kingdon, John. 1977. "Models of Legislative Voting." *Journal of Politics* 39.
- ***Binder, Sarah. 1999. "The Dynamics of Legislative Gridlock, 1947-1996." *American Political Science Review*. 519-533.

- ***Evans, Diana. 2004. *Greasing the Wheels; Using Pork Barrel Politics to Build Majority Coalitions in Congress*, Chapters 3 and 4.
- ***Koger, Gregory. 2010. *Filibustering: A Political History of Obstruction in the House and the Senate*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapters 7 and 8.

Tuesday, February 13: Descriptive and Substantive Representation

- ***Pitkin, Hannah. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, Chapters 4-6.
- ***Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent Yes" *Journal of Politics* 61:628-657.
- ***Dovi, Suzanne. 2002. "Preferable Representatives: Will Just Any Woman, Black or Latino Do?" *American Political Science Review* 96: 729-744.
- ***Swers, Michele. 2002. *The Difference Women Make*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapter 3.
- ***Tate, Katherine. 2003. *Black Faces in the Mirror: African Americans and Their Representatives in Congress*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapter 4.
- ***Reingold, Beth, Kerry Haynie, and Kirsten Widner. 2021. *Race, Gender, and Political Representation: Toward a More Intersectional Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press, Chapter 4.
- ***English, Ashley, Dara Strolovitch, and Kathryn Pearson. 2019. "Who Represents Me? Race, Gender, Partisan Congruence and Representational Alternatives in a Polarized America." *Political Research Quarterly* 72(4): 785-804.

Tuesday, February 20: The Presidency

- Skim [The Federalist Papers, 70-77](#)
- [The Constitution, Article 2](#)
- Neustadt, Richard. 1990. *Presidential Power and Modern Presidents*. New York: The Free Press, Chapters 1-5.
- ***Kernell, Samuel 2007. *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*. Washington, DC: CQ Press, Chapters 1, 2, and 5.
- ***Edwards, George C. III. 2009. *The Strategic President*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapters 1 and 3.
- ***Skowronek, Stephen. 1993. *The Politics Presidents Make*. Cambridge: Bellknap, Ch. 1-3.

Tuesday, February 27: The Bureaucracy

- ***Wilson, James. 1989. *Bureaucracy*. Basic Books, Chapters 3-6.
- ***McCubbins, Mathew and Thomas Schwartz. 1984. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols and Fire Alarms." *American Journal of Political Science* 84: 165-179.
- ***Watkins-Hayes, Celeste. 2009. *The New Welfare Bureaucrats: Entanglements of Race, Class, and Policy Reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapters 1 and 4.
- ***Keiser, Lael, Vicky Wilkins, Kenneth Meier, and Catherine Holland. 2002. "Lipstick and Logarithms: Gender, Institutional Context, and Representative Bureaucracy." *American Political Science Review* 96(3):553-564.
- ***Kerwin, Cornelius and Scott Furlong. 2011. *Rulemaking: How Government Agencies Write Law and Make Policy*. Washington, DC: CQ Press, Chapters 2 and 5.
- ***Yackee, Jason Webb and Susan Yackee. 2006. "A Bias Towards Business: Assessing Interest Group Influence on the U.S. Bureaucracy." *Journal of Politics* 68(1): 128-139

Tuesday, March 5: The Courts

- [Federalist 78](#)
- [The Constitution Article 3](#)
- ***Segal, Jeffrey and Harold Spaeth. 1996. "The Influence of Stare Decisis on the Votes of Supreme Court Justices." *American Journal of Political Science* 40:971-1003.
- ***Bailey, Michael and Forrest Maltzman. 2008. "Does Legal Doctrine Matter? Unpacking Law and Policy Preferences on the US Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review* 102(3): 369-384.
- ***Black, Ryan and Ryan Owens. 2009. "Agenda Setting in the Supreme Court: The Collison of Policy and Jurisprudence." *Journal of Politics* 71(3): 1062-1075.
- ***Collins, Paul M., Jr. 2007. "Lobbyists before the U.S. Supreme Court: Investigating the Influence of Amicus Curiae Briefs." *Political Research Quarterly* 60(1): 55-70.
- Rosenberg, Gerald. 1991. *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Either Part 1 or Part 2 (Class Choice).

Tuesday, March 12: Spring Break/No Class

PART 2: INTERMEDIARY INSTITUTIONS

Tuesday, March 19: Interest Groups

- [Federalist 10 and Federalist 51](#)
- ***Tocqueville, Alexis de. Selections from "Political Association in the United States."
- ***Olson, Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*, Chapters 1 and 2.
- ***Walker, Jack. 1983. "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America." *American Political Science Review* 77(2): 390-406.
- ***Hall, Richard and Alan Deardorff. 2006. "Lobbying as a Legislative Subsidy." *American Political Science Review* 100(1): 69-84.
- ***Schlozman, Kay Lehman, Sidney Verba, and Henry Brady. 2013. *The Unevenly Chorus: Unequal Political Voice and the Broken Promise of American Democracy*, Chapters 11 and 12.
- ***Strolovitch, Dara. 2006. "Do Interest Groups Represent the Disadvantaged: Advocacy at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender." *Journal of Politics* 68(4): 894-910.

Tuesday, March 26: Political Parties as Organizations Outside of Congress

- Aldrich, John. 1995. *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapters 1-2, 6-9.
- Theirault, Sean. 2005. *Party Polarization in Congress*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 6.

Tuesday, April 2: The Media

- ***Boydston, Amber. 2013. *Making the News*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 2, 3, and 5.
- ***Schudson, Michael. 2002. "The News Media as Political Institutions." *American Review of Political Science* 5:249-269.
- ***Dunaway, Johanna. 2008. "Markets, Ownership, and the Quality of Campaign News Coverage." *Journal of Politics* 1193-1202.
- ***Mutz, Diana and Byron Reeves. 2005. "The New Videomalaise: Effects of Televised Incivility on Political Trust." *American Political Science Review* 99: 1-15.

- ***Prior, Marcus 2005. "News vs. Entertainment: How Increasing Media Choice Widens Gaps in Political Knowledge and Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science*: 577-592.
- ***Fowler, Erika Franklin, Michael Franz, and Travis N. Ridout. 2016. *Political Advertising in the United States*. Routledge, Chapter 3.
- ***Geer, John. 2006. *In Defense of Negativity*. Chicago: University of Chicago, Ch. 1 and 3.

PART 3: PUBLIC POLICY, POWER, AND PROBLEMS IN AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Tuesday, April 9: Public Policy and Agenda Setting

- Kingdon, John. 2003. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Longman, Chapters 1, 5-8.
- ***Baumgartner, Frank and Bryan Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapters 1-3.
- ***Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1993. "Social Constructions of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." *American Political Science Review* 87(2): 351-365.
- ***Metzler, Suzanne and Joe Soss. 2004. "The Consequences of Public Policy for Democratic Citizenship: Bridging Policy Studies and Mass Politics." *Perspectives on Politics* 1:55-73.

Tuesday, April 16: Pluralism, Power, and Powerlessness

- ***Dahl, Robert. 1956. *A Preface to a Democratic Theory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 3.
- ***Truman, David. 1951. Excerpts from *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*. New York, NY: Alfred Knopf.
- Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy*, New York, NY: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston. Chapters 1-3, 8.
- ***Bachrach, Peter and Morton Baratz. 1962. "The Two Faces of Power." *American Political Science Review* 56: 946-952.
- ***Gaventa, John. 1980. *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley*, Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, Chapters 1 and 6.

Tuesday, April 23: How Bad Is It? Contemporary Problems in American Democracy

- Levitsky, Steven and Daniel Ziblatt. 2023. *Tyranny of the Minority*. New York, NY; Crown, Chapters 5 and 6.
- Mann, Thomas and Norman Ornstein. 2016. *It's Even Worse than It ~~Looks~~ Was: How the American Constitutional System Collided with the New Politics of Extremism*. New York: Basic Books, Part II: What to Do About It.

Tuesday, April 30: Final Exam

- 24 Hour Take Home Exam open from 12:00 AM to 11:59 PM

RECOMMENDED READINGS

Professionalization

- Kelsky, Karen. 2015. *The Professor Is In: The Essential Guide to Turning Your Ph.D. into a Job*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Congressional Elections

- Abramowitz, Alan, Brad Alexander, and Matthew Gunning. 2006. "Incumbency, Redistricting, and the Decline of Competition in U.S. House Elections." *Journal of Politics* 60: 34-62.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, David Brady, and Morris Fiorina. 1992. "The Vanishing Marginals and Electoral Responsiveness." *British Journal of Political Science* 22.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, James M. Snyder, and Charles Stewart. 2000. "Old Voters, New Voters, and the Personal Vote: Using Redistricting to Measure the Incumbency Advantage." *American Journal of Political Science* 44.
- Box-Steffensmeir, Janet. 1996. "A Dynamic Analysis of the Role of War Chests in Campaign Strategy." *American Journal of Political Science* 40.
- Cain, Bruce, John Ferejohn, and Morris Fiorina. 1984. "The Constituency Service Basis of the Personal Vote." *American Political Science Review* 78.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice, David Brady, and John Cogan. 2002. "Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting." *American Political Science Review*
- Caron, Jamie, Gregory Koger, Matthew Lebo, and Everett Young. 2010. "The Electoral Costs of Party Loyalty in Congress." *American Journal of Political Science* 54: 598-616.
- Cox, Gary and Jonathan Katz. 1996. "Why Did the Incumbency Advantage in U.S. House Elections Grow?" *American Journal of Political Science* 40:48-497.
- Fiorina, Morris. 1989. *Congress: Keystone of the Washington Establishment*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Hibbing, John and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 1995. *Congress as Public Enemy: Public Attitudes Toward American Political Institutions*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, Lawrence and Robert Shapiro. 2000. *Politicians Don't Pander: Political Manipulation and the Loss of Democratic Responsiveness*.
- Jacobson, Gary. *The Politics of Congressional Elections*.
- Jacobson, Gary and Samuel Kernell. 1981. *Strategy and Choice in Congressional Elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jones, David. 2010. "Partisan Polarization and Congressional Accountability in House Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 54: 323-337.
- Kuklinski, James. 1978. "Representativeness and Elections: A Policy Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 72: 165-177.
- Lee, Frances. 1998. "Representation and Public Policy: The Consequences of Senate Apportionment for the Geographic Distribution of Federal Funds." *Journal of Politics* 60:34-62.
- Maestas, C.D., S. Fulton, S. Maisel, and W.J. Stone. 2006. "When to Risk it? Institutions, Ambitions, and the Decision to Run for the U.S. House." *American Political Science Review* 100: 195-208.
- Rohde, David. 1991. *Parties and Leaders in the Post-Reform House*. 1991. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Stimson, James A., Michael B. Mackuen, and Robert S. Erikson. 1995. "Dynamic Representation." *American Political Science Review* 89(3).

Congressional Organization: Parties and Committees

- Adler, Scott, 2002. *Why Congressional Reforms Fail: Re-Election and the House Committee System*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aldrich, John, and David Rohde. 2000. "The Republican Revolution and the House Appropriations Committee." *Journal of Politics* 62.
- Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fenno, Richard. 1973. *Congressmen in Committees*.
- Jones, David. 2010. "Partisan Polarization and Congressional Accountability in House Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 54: 323-337.
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1999. "Paradoxes of Parties in Congress." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 23:31-64.

- Krehbiel, Keith. 1990. "Are Congressional Committees Composed of Preference Outliers?" *American Political Science Review*
- Lee, Frances. 2008. "Agreeing to Disagree: Agenda Content and Senate Partisanship, 1981-2004." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 33:19-222.
- Lee, Frances. 2009. *Beyond Ideology: Politics, Principles, and Partisanship in the US Senate*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, Frances and Bruce Oppenheimer. 1999. *Sizing Up the Senate: The Unequal Consequences of Equal Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Maltzman, Forrest. 1997. *Competing Principles: Committees, Parties, and the Organization of Congress*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- McCarty, Nolan, Keith Poole, and Howard Rosenthal. 2006. *Polarized America: The Dance of Ideology and Unequal Riches*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Pearson, Kathryn. 2015. *Party Discipline in the U.S. House of Representatives*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Polsby, Nelson. 1968. "The Institutionalization of the US House of Representatives." *American Political Science Review* 62: 144-168.
- Schickler, Eric and Kathryn Pearson. 2009. "Agenda Control, Majority Party Power, and the House Committee on Rules, 1937-65." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*
- Schickler, Eric. 2001. *Disjointed Pluralism: Institutional Innovation and the Development of the US Congress*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schickler, Eric and Andrew Rich. 1997. "Controlling the Floor: Politics as Procedural Coalitions in the House." *American Journal of Political Science* 41: 1340-1375.
- Sinclair, Barbara. 1995. *Legislators, Leaders, and Lawmaking: The US House of Representatives in the Post-Reform Era*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, Steven. 1988. "An Essay on Sequence, Position, Goals, and Committee Power." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*
- Smith, Steven. 2000. "Positive Theories of Congressional Parties." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*

Congressional Policymaking

- Ansolabehere, Stephen, James Snyder, and Charles Stewart. 2001. "The Effects of Party and Preferences on Roll Call Voting." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*.
- Binder, Sarah. 2003. *Stalemate: Causes and Consequences of Legislative Gridlock*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Cox, Gary and Keith Poole. 2002. "On Measuring Partisanship in Roll-Call Voting." *American Journal of Political Science*
- Fiorina, Morris. 1974. *Representatives, Roll Calls, and Constituencies*.
- Hall, Richard. 1996. *Participation in Congress*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1999. *Pivotal Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levitt, Steven. 1996. "How Do Senators Vote?" *American Economic Review*
- Martins, Andrew D. 2001. "Congressional Decisionmaking and the Separation of Powers." *American Political Science Review* 95.
- Poole, Keith and Howard Rosenthal. 1991. "Patterns of Congressional Voting." *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Poole, Keith and Howard Rosenthal. 1997. *Congress: A Political Economic History of Roll Call Voting*, Oxford University Press.
- Sulkin, Tracy. 2005. *Issue Politics in Congress*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wawro, Gregory, and Eric Schickler. 2006. *Filibuster: Obstruction and Lawmaking in the U.S. Senate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Descriptive and Substantive Representation (and Representation More Broadly)

- Bratton, Kathleen and Kerry Haynie. 1999. "Agenda Setting and Legislative Success in State Legislatures: The Effects of Gender and Race." *Journal of Politics* 61: 658-79.
- Canon, David. 1999. *Race, Redistricting, and Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dittmar, Kelly, Kira Sanbonmatsu, and Sue Carroll. 2018. *A Seat at the Table: Congresswomen's Perspectives on Why Their Presence Matters*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dodson, Debra. 2006. *The Impact of Women in Congress*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Eulau, Heniz, John Wahlke, William Buchanan, and LeReoy Ferguson. 1959. "The Role of the Representative: Some Empirical Observations on the Theory of Edmund Birke." *American Political Science Review* 53: 742-56.
- Fenno, Richard. 1978. *Going Home: Black Representatives and their Constituents*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gay, Claudine. 2001. "The Effect of Black Congressional Representation on Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 95: 589-602.
- Gay, Claudine. 2007. "Legislating without Constraints: The Effect of Minority Districting on Legislators' Responsiveness to Constituency Preferences." *Journal of Politics* 69: 442-456.
- Gay, Claudine. 2002. "Spirals of Trust? The Effect of Descriptive Representation on the Relationship between Citizens and their Government?" *American Journal of Political Science* 46.
- Gerrity, Jessica, Tracy Osborn, and Jeanette Morehouse Mendez. 2007. "Women and Representation: A Different View of the District?" *Politics and Gender* 3: 179-200.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2003. "Congressional Enactments of Race-Gender: Toward a Theory of Raced-Gendered Institutions." *American Political Science Review* 97.
- Hero, Rodney, and Caroline Tolbert. 1995. "Latinos and Substantive Representation in the US House of Representatives: Direct, Indirect, or Non-Existent?" *American Journal of Political Science* 39.
- Hill, Kim Quail and Patricia Hurley. 1999. "Dyadic Representation Reappraised." *American Political Science Review* 72: 165-177.
- Kathlene, Lyn. 1994. "Power and Influence in State Legislative Policymaking: The Interaction of Gender and Position in Committee Hearing Debates." *American Political Science Review*.
- Krehbiel, Keith. 1991. *Information and Legislative Organization*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lublin, David. 1999. "Racial Redistricting and African-American Representation." *American Political Science Review* 93: 183-187.
- Mansbridge, Jane. 2003. "Rethinking Representation" *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 515-28.
- Pantoja, A. and G.M. Segura. 2003. "Does Ethnicity Matter? Descriptive Representation in Legislatures and Political Alienation Among Latinos." *Social Science Quarterly* 84: 441-460.
- Pearson, Kathryn and Eric Schickler. 2009. "Discharge Petitions, Agenda Control, and the Congressional Committee System, 1929-1976." *Journal of Politics* 71(40): 1238-1256.
- Preuhs, Robert. 2006. "The Conditional Effects of Minority Descriptive Representation: Black Legislators and Policy Influence on the American States." *Journal of Politics* 68: 585-599.
- Rosenthal, Cindy Simon, ed. 2002. *Women Transforming Congress*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2003. "Gender-Related Political Knowledge and the Descriptive Representation of Women." *Political Behavior* 25: 367 – 388.
- Swain, Carol. 1993. *Black Faces, Black Interests: The Representation of African Americans in Congress*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Thomas, Sue. 1994. *How Women Legislate*. New York: Oxford University Press.

The Presidency

- Barrett, Andrew. 2004. "Going Public: The Impact of Going Public on Presidential Legislative Success." *American Politics Research* 32: 338-370.
- Barrett, Andrew and Matthew Eshbaugh-Soha. 2007. "Presidential Success on the Substance of Legislation." *Political Research Quarterly* 60: 100-112.
- Baum, Matthew and Samuel Kernell. 1999. "Has Cable Ended the Golden Age of Presidential Television?" *American Political Science Review* 93:99-114.
- Beckman, Matthew. 2010. *Pushing the Agenda*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blackstone, Bethany and Greg Goelzhauser. 2014. "Presidential Rhetoric Toward the Supreme Court." *Judicature*.
- Bond, Jon and Richard Fleisher. 1990. *The President in the Legislative Arena*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bond, Jon R., Richard Fleisher, and B. Dan Wood. 2003. "The Marginal and Time-Varying Effect of Public Approval on Presidential Success in Congress." *Journal of Politics* 65:92-110.
- Bond, Jon R, Richard Fleisher, and Glen Krutz. 2009. "Malign Neglect." *Congress and the Presidency* 36:226-243.
- Cameron, Charles. 2000. *Vote Bargaining: Presidents and the Politics of Negative Power*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, Charles, Albert Cover, and Jeffrey Segal. 1990. "Senate Voting on Supreme Court Nominees: A Neoinstitutional Model." *American Political Science Review* 84: 525-538.

- Canes-Wrone, Brandice. 2001. "The President's Legislative Influence from Public Appeals." *American Journal of Political Science* 45: 313-329.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice. 2006. *Who Leads Whom?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice, William Howell, and David Lewis. 2008. "Toward a Broader Understanding of Presidential Power: A Reevaluation of the Two Presidencies Thesis." *Journal of Politics* 70:1-16.
- Cohen, Jeffery. 2019. *The President on Capitol Hill: A Theory of Institutional Influence*. Columbia University Press.
- Cohen, Jeffrey. 1995. "Presidential Rhetoric and the Public Agenda." *American Journal of Political Science* 39: 87-107.
- Cohen, Jeffery and Matthew Eshbaugh-Soha. 2012. "Durability and Change in the President's Legislative Agenda, 1799-2002." In *Living Legislation*, eds. Jeffrey Jenkins and Eric Patashnik. University of Chicago Press.
- Collins, Paul and Matthew Eshbaugh-Soha. 2020. *The President and the Supreme Court: Going Public on Judicial Decisions from Washington to Trump*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, George C. III. 1989. *At the Margins: Presidential Leadership of Congress*. Yale University Press.
- Edwards, George C. III. 2003. *On Deaf Ears*. Yale University Press.
- Edwards, George C. III, Andrew Barrett, and Jeffrey Peake. 1997. "The Legislative Impact of Divided Government." *American Journal of Political Science* 41: 545-563.
- Eshbaugh-Soha, Matthew. 2006. *The President's Speeches: Beyond "Going Public."* Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Moranski, Byron and Charles Shipan. 1999. "The Politics of Supreme Court Nominations: A Theory of Institutional Constraints and Choices." *American Journal of Political Science* 43: 1069-1095.
- Peterson, Mark. 1990. *Legislating Together: The White House and Capital Hill from Eisenhower to Reagan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rottinghaus, Brandon. 2010. *The Provisional Pulpit*. Texas A&M University Press.
- Thrower, Sharece. 2017. "The President, the Court, and Policy Implementation." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 47: 122-145.
- Welch, Reed. 2003. "Was Reagan Really a Great Communicator?" *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 853-76.
- West, Darrell. 1988. "Activists and Economic Policymaking in Congress." *American Journal of Political Science* 32: 662-680.
- Yates, Jeff and Andrew Whitford. 1998. "Presidential Power and the US Supreme Court." *Political Research Quarterly* 51: 539-550.

The Bureaucracy

- Aberbach, Joel. 1990. *Keeping a Watchful Eye: The Politics of Congressional Oversight*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Arnold, R. Douglas. 1978. *Congress and the Bureaucracy: A Theory of Influence*. Yale University Press.
- Barnard, Chester. 1938. *Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Clinton, Joshua, Anthony Bertelli, Christian Grose, David Lewis, and David Nixon. 2012. "Separated Powers in the United States: The Ideology of Agencies, Presidents, and Congress." *American Journal of Political Science* 56:341-354.
- Dolan, Julie and David Rosebloom. 2003. *Representative Bureaucracy: Classic Readings and Continuing Controversies*. ME Sharp.
- Dwidar, Maraam. 2021. "Diverse Lobbying Coalition and Influence in Notice-and-Comment Rulemaking." *Policy Studies Journal* 50(1): 199-240.
- Furlong, Scott and Cornelius Kerwin. 2005. "Interest Group Participation in Rulemaking: A Decade of Change." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15: 353-370.
- Ferejohn, John and Charles Shipan. 1990. "Congressional Influence on the Bureaucracy." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 6.
- Golden, Marissa Martino. 1998. "Interest Groups in the Rulemaking Process: Who Participates? Whose Voices Get Heard?" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8(2): 245-270.
- English, Ashley. 2021. "Implementing Intersectionality: Women's Organizations' Representation of Women During Two Rulemakings" *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 9(4): 739-758
- English, Ashley. 2021. "Lobbying Beyond Legislature: Challenges and Biases in Women's Organizations' Participation in Rulemaking." *Politics & Gender*
- English, Ashley. 2019. "She Who Shall Not be Named: The Women that Women's Organizations Do (and Do Not) Represent in the Rulemaking Process." *Politics & Gender* 15(3): 573-598.

- English, Ashley. 2016. "Rewriting Title IX: The Department of Education's Response to Feminists' Comments in the Rulemaking Process." *Politics & Gender* 12(3): 491-517.
- Huber, John and Charles Shipan. 2002. *Deliberate Discretion: The Institutional Foundations of Bureaucratic Autonomy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaufman, Herbert. 1960. *The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior*. RFF Press.
- Lipsky, Michael. 2010. *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Skowronek, Stephen. 1982. *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920*. Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, Herbert. 1957. *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. New York: MacMillan.
- Wood, B. Dan and Richard Waterman. 1994. *Bureaucratic Dynamics*. Westview Press.
- Yackee, Jason Webb and Susan Yackee. 2006. "A Bias Towards Business: Assessing Interest Group Influence on the U.S. Bureaucracy." *Journal of Politics* 68(1): 128-139.

The Courts

- Baum, Lawrence. 1994. "What Judges Want: Judges' Goals and Judicial Behavior." *Political Research Quarterly* 4: 749-768.
- Braman, Eileen, and Thomas E. Nelson. 2007. "Mechanism of Motivated Reasoning? Analogical Perception in Discrimination Disputes." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4): 940-956.
- Clark, Tom and Benjamin Lauderdale. 2010. "Locating Supreme Court Opinions in Doctrine Space." *American Journal of Political Science* 54(4): 871-890.
- Collins, Paul M., Jr. 2008. *Friends of the Supreme Court: Interest Groups and Judicial Decision Making*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Corley, Pamela C., Paul M. Collins, Jr., and Bryan Calvin. 2011. "Lower Court Influence on U.S. Supreme Court Opinion Content." *Journal of Politics* 73: 31-44.
- Dahl, Robert. 1957. "Decisionmaking in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as National Policymaker." *Journal of Public Law* 6:279-95.
- Epstein, Lee, and Jack Knight. 1998. *The Choices Justices Make*. Washington: CQ Press.
- Epstein, Lee, Rene Lindstadt, Jeffery Segal, and Chad Westerland. 2006. "The Changing Dynamics of Senate Voting on Supreme Court Nominees." *Journal of Politics* 68(2): 296-307.
- George, Tracy and Lee Epstein. 1992. "On the Nature of Supreme Court Decision Making." *American Political Science Review* 86(2): 323-337.
- Giles, Micheal W., Bethany Blackstone, and Richard L. Vining, Jr. 2008. "The Supreme Court in American Democracy: Unraveling the Linkages between Public Opinion and Judicial Decision Making." *Journal of Politics* 70: 293-306.
- Graber, Mark A. 1993. "The Non-majoritarian Difficulty: Legislative Deference to the Judiciary." *Studies in American Political Development* 7: 35-73.
- Hall, Melinda Gann. 2001. "State Supreme Courts in American Democracy: Probing the Myths of Judicial Reform." *American Political Science Review* 95: 315-330.
- Johnson, Timothy, Paul Wahlbeck and James Springs. 2006. "The Influence of Oral Arguments on the US Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review* 100:99-114.
- Kritzer, Herbert M., and Mark J. Richards. 2010. "Taking and Testing Jurisprudential Regimes Seriously: A Response to Lax and Rader" *Journal of Politics* 72(2): 285-288.
- Lax, Jeffrey R. and Kelly Rader. 2010. "Legal Constraints on Supreme Court Decisionmaking: Do Jurisprudential Regimes Exist?" *Journal of Politics* 72(2): 273-284.
- Lax, Jeffrey R., and Kelly T. Rader. 2010. "The Three Prongs of a J Regimes Test: A Response to Kritzer and Richards." *Journal of Politics* 72(2): 289-291.
- Maltzman, Forrest, James F. Spriggs, II, and Paul J. Wahlbeck. 2000. *Crafting Law on the Supreme Court: The Collegial Game*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martinek, Wendy L., Mark Kemper, and Steven R. Van Winkle. 2002. "To Advise and Consent: The Senate and Lower Federal Court Nominations, 1977-1998." *Journal of Politics* 64: 337-361.
- McCann, Michael. 2006. "Reform Litigation on Trial: Review of The Hollow Hope." In *Courts, Judges, and Politics*, ed. Walter F. Murphy, C. Herman Pritchett, Lee Epstein, and Jack Knight. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Murphy, Walter F. 1964. *Elements of Judicial Strategy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Perry, H.W., Jr. 1991. *Deciding to Decide: Agenda Setting in the United States Supreme Court*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Richards, Mark and Herbert Kritzer. 2002. "Jurisprudential Regimes in Supreme Court Decision Making." *American Political Science Review* 96: 305-320.
- Segal, Jeffrey A. and Harold Spaeth. 2002. *Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Songer, Donald R., Jeffrey A. Segal, and Charles M. Cameron. 1994. "The Hierarchy of Justice: Testing a Principal-Agent Model of Supreme Court-Circuit Court Interaction." *American Journal of Political Science* 38: 673-696.

Interest Groups

- Baumgartner, Frank and Beth Leech. 1998. *Basic Interests: The Importance of Groups in Politics and Political Science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Baumgartner, Frank, Jeffrey Berry, Marie Hojnacki, David Kimball, and Beth Leech. 2014. "Money, Priorities, and Stalemate: How Lobbying Affects Public Policy." *Election Law Journal* 13(1): 194-209.
- Caldeira, Gregory A., and John R. Wright. 1988. "Organized Interests and Agenda Setting in the U.S. Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review* 82(4): 1109-1127.
- Chong, Dennis. 1991. *Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Caldeira, Gregory A., and John R. Wright. 1990. "Amici Curiae Before the Supreme Court: Who Participates, When, and How Much?" *Journal of Politics* 52(3): 782-806.
- Caldeira, Gregory A., Marie Hojnacki, and John R. Wright. 2000. "The Lobbying Activities of Organized Interests in Federal Judicial Nominations." *Journal of Politics* 62(1): 51-69.
- Caldeira, Gregory A., and John R. Wright. 1998. "Lobbying for Justice: Organized Interests, Supreme Court Nominations, and the United States Senate." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(2): 499-523.
- Costain, Anne. 1981. "Representing Women: The Transition from Social Movement to Interest Group." *Western Political Quarterly* 34(1): 100-113.
- Grossman, Matt, ed. 2014. *New Directions in Interest Group Politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hall, Richard, and Frank Wayman. 1990. "Buying Time Moneyed Interests and the Mobilization of Bias in Congressional Committees." *American Political Science Review*.
- Gilens, Martin and Benjamin Page. 2014. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics* 12(3): 564-581.
- Hojnacki, Marie, and David Kimball. 1998. "Organized Interests and the Decision of Who to Lobby in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 92(4): 775-790.
- Holyoke, Thomas T. 2021. *Interest Groups and Lobbying: Pursuing Political Interests in America*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Kollman, Ken. 1988. *Outside Lobbying: Public Opinion and Interest Group Strategies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kollman, Ken. 1997. "Inviting Friends to Lobby: Interest Groups, Ideological Bias, and Congressional Committees." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(2): 519-544.
- Lowery, David and Virginia Gray. 1995. "The Population Ecology of Gucci Gulch or the Natural Regulation of Interest Group Numbers in the American States." *American Journal of Political Science* 39(1): 1-29.
- Skocpol, Theda. 2003. *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Skocpol, Theda. 2004. "Voice and Inequality: The Transformation of American Civic Democracy." *Perspectives on Politics* 2(1): 3-20.
- Salisbury, Robert. 1969. "An Exchange Theory of Interest Groups." *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 13(1): 1-32.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1988. "The Consequences of Professionalization and Formalization in the Pro-Choice Movement." *American Sociological Review* 53: 585-605.
- Tilly, Charles and Sidney Tarrow. 2015. *Contentious Politics*. Second Edition. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, John R. June 1990. "Contributions, Lobbying, and Committee Voting in the U.S. House of Representatives." *American Political Science Review* p. 417-38.
- Wright, John. 1989. PAC Contributions, Lobbying, and Representation." *Journal of Politics* 51(3): 713-729.

Political Parties

- American Political Science Association. 1950. "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System: A Report of the Committee on Political Parties." *American Political Science Review* 44(3): Part 2 Supplement.

- Campbell, Angus, Phillip Converse, Warren Miller, and Donald Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*.
- Cohen, Marty, David Karol, Hans Noel, and John Zaller. 2008. *The Party Decides: Presidential Nominations Before and After Reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper and Row.
- Frymer, Paul. 1999. *Uneasy Alliances: Race and Party Competition in America*. Princeton University Press.
- Green, Donald, Bradley Palmquist, and Eric Schickler. 2002. *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and Social Identities of Voters*.
- Hetherington, Marc. 2001. "Resurgent Mass Partisanship: The Role of Elite Polarization." *American Political Science Review* 95: 619-632.
- Polsby, Nelson. 1983. *Consequences of Party Reform*. Oxford University Press.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2002. *Democrats, Republicans, and the Politics of Women's Place*. University of Michigan Press.

The Media

- Arnold, R. Douglas. 2004. Congress, the Press and Political Accountability. Russell Sage.
- Baum, Matthew A. 2006. *Soft News Goes to War: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy in the New Media Age*.
- Baum, Matthew. 2005. "Talking the Vote: Why Presidential Candidates Talk the Campaign Circuit." *American Journal of Political Science* 49:213-234.
- Bartels, Larry and Wendy Rahn. 2005. *Political Attitudes in the Post-Network Era*.
- Baumgartner and Morris. 2006. "The Daily Show Effect." *American Politics Research* 34: 341-67.
- Bennett, W. Lance, Regina G. Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. 2007. *When the Press Fails: Political Power and the News Media from Iraq to Katrina*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapter 2.
- Cohen, Jeffrey E. 2008. *The Presidency in an Era of 24-Hour News*. Princeton University Press.
- Druckman, James N., and Michael Parkin. 2005. "The Impact of Media Bias: How Editorial Slant Affects Voters." *Journal of Politics* 67: 1030-1049.
- Druckman, James and Kjersten Nelson. 2003. "Framing and Deliberation: How Citizens' Conversations Limit Elite Influence." *American Journal of Political Science* 47:729-745.
- Eshbaugh-Soha, Matthew. 2008. "Local Newspaper Coverage of the Presidency." *International Journal of Press/Politics* 13: 103-119.
- Freedman, Paul, Michael Franz, and Kenneth Goldstein. 2004. "Campaign Advertising and Democratic Citizenship." *American Journal of Political Science* 48: 7223-741.
- Fowler, Erika Franklin, Michael Franz, and Travis Ridout. 2020b. "Online Political Advertising in the United States." In *Social Media and Democracy*. eds. Nathaniel Persily and Joshua Tucker. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 111-138.
- Gentzkow, Matthew. 2006. "Television and Voter Turnout." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* August: 931-972.
- Graber, Doris A. 2006. *Mass Media and American Politics*, 7th edition. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Groeling, Tim, and Samuel Kernell. 1998. "Is Network Coverage of the President Biased?" *Journal of Politics* 60: 1063-1087.
- Groseclose, Tim and Jeff Milyo. 2005. "A Measure of Media Bias." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 70(4): 1191-1237.
- Grossman, Michael Baruch, and Martha Joynt Kumar. 1981. *Portraying the President: the White House and the News Media*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hamilton, James T. 2004. *All the News That's Fit to Sell: How the Market Transforms Information into News*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hill and Holbrook. 2005. "Agenda-Setting and Priming in Prime-Time Television." *Political Communication* 22: 277-95.
- Iyengar, Shanto and Donald Kinder. 1987. *News That Matters: Television and American Opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Iyengar, Shanto. 1993. *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jon A. Krosnick and Donald R. Kinder. 1990. "Altering the Foundations of Support for the President through Priming." *American Political Science Review* 84: 497-512. [more behavior]
- Miller, Joanne and John Krosnick. 2000. "News Media Impact on the Ingredients of Presidential Evaluations." *American Journal of Political Science* 44: 301-315.
- Mondak, Jeffrey J. 1995. *Nothing to Read*. The University of Michigan Press.
- Mutz, Diana. 1998. *Impersonal Influence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Prior, Markus. 2007. *Post-Broadcast Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.

- Vavreck, Lynn. 2009. *The Message Matters: The Economy and Presidential Campaigns*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zaller, John R. and Dennis Chiu. 1996. "Government's Little Helper: U.S. Press Coverage of Foreign Policy Crises, 1945-1991." *Political Communication*, 13: 385- 405.

Public Policy, Social Policy, and Policy Feedback

- Canaday, Margot. *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship Twentieth Century America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Campbell, Andrea. 2003. *How Policies Make Citizens: Senior Political Activism and the American Welfare State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hacker, Jacob. 2002. *The Divided Welfare State: The Battle Over Public and Private Social Benefits in the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirschman, Albert. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Howard, Christopher. *The Welfare State Nobody Knows: Debunking Myths and US Social Policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kenney, Sally. 2002. "Where is Gender in Agenda Setting?" *Women & Politics* 25(1/2): 179-207.
- Mettler, Suzanne. 1998. *Dividing Citizens: Gender and Federalism in New Deal Public Policy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mink, Gwendolyn. *The Wages of Motherhood: Inequality In the Welfare State*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Patashnik, Eric M. 2008. *Reforms at Risk: What Happens After Major Policy Changes are Enacted*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pierson, Paul. 2004. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pierson, Paul. 1993. "When Effect Becomes Cause: Policy Feedback and Political Change." *World Politics* 45(4): 595-628.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1992. *Protecting Soliders and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*. Belknap Press.
- Stone, Deborah. 2011. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decisionmaking*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Pluralism and Political Power in American Democracy

- Dahl, Robert. 1974. *Who Governs: Democracy and Power in an American City*.
- Lukes, Steven. 1974. *Power: A Radical View*.
- Lowi, Theodore. 1969. *The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy, and the Crisis of Public Authority*.
- Riker, William H. 1964. "Some Ambiguities in the Notion of Power." *American Political Science Review* 58: 341-349.
- Skocpol, Theda. 2003. *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. 1840. *Democracy in America*.
- Rosenstone, Steven and John Mark Hansen. 2003. *Participation, Mobilization, and Democracy in America*.

Problems in American Democracy

- Achen, Christopher and Larry Bartels. 2016. *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dahl, Robert. 2002. *How Democratic Is the American Constitution?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Levitsky, Steven and Daniel Ziblatt. 2018. *How Democracies Die*. New York: Penguin/Random House.