

American Political Institutions and Processes
GOV 381J; Unique #: 38465
Professor Eric L. McDaniel
emcdaniel@austin.utexas.edu

Spring 2018
Monday 12:30-3:30
Classroom BAT 5.102

Office: 4.122 Batts Hall
Office Hours: Monday and Wednesday 10-11:30
Phone: 232-7268

Course Description

This seminar introduces graduate students to the study of American political institutions. The course reviews both classic and recent scholarship on issues in related to political institutions. The readings address a range of topics regarding the definition and study of institutions along with an in depth analysis of specific institutions in American politics.

Classes will be devoted to intensive reading and critical discussion of the literature (and related scholarship) of that week's topic. Discussion will be of the works read for that day as well as other approaches and scholarship on related issues.

Course Expectations and Requirements

As with every graduate seminar, this course should help you to prepare for your preliminary exams, to consider research and dissertation topics, and to teach in the sub-field of American politics. More specifically, this seminar will be somewhat of a "mini-laboratory" in which we will not only discuss and debate old and new ideas/paradigms, but the course assignments will correspond to the types of activities in which you will be engaged as a practicing political/social scientist. I will determine the course grade based upon: short papers, class participation and a take-home final.

Short Papers (30% of grade): Each student will write two short papers (5 pages, typed and double-spaced with citations) each dedicated to a week's readings. The papers are to summarize the central debate of the readings, their arguments, and their strengths and weaknesses. The short papers are to be posted in the designated section of Canvas by 5 PM the Sunday before class meets. Each paper will be worth 15 percent of your grade.

Participation (30% of grade): In conjunction with the short papers, students will lead class discussion. Students discussing readings should be in contact with one another to coordinate their presentations. An example of what the presentations should look like is posted on Canvas. The class participation grade will be further determined by how students contribute to the overall discussions in class. I of course expect you to attend class, to have read and thought about all of the week's assigned readings, and not to be bashful or overzealous in sharing your thoughts. A 30 percent participation grade will be based on the quality of these presentations and overall participation.

In order to facilitate better discussion in class you should attempt to answer the following questions as you prepare your short papers, presentations and comments for class.

1. What is the author's central question?
2. What are the core concepts under investigation?
 - a. How does the author define these concepts?
 - b. How does this definition of the concepts differ from others?
3. What is the author's argument?
 - a. Are there any specific hypotheses?
 - b. Is the author refuting someone else's findings?
 - c. Are their alternative hypotheses that are being ignored?
 - d. Is this a valid argument?
4. What evidence does the author use to support her argument?
 - a. Is the author's evidence valid?
 - b. How does the author operationalize the core concepts?
 - c. Is the author's argument and data similar or different from other readings?
5. Is the author able to support her argument?
 - a. Does the author confirm her hypotheses?
 - b. How convincing are the results?
6. What questions are left unanswered?

Take-Home Final (40% of grade): The Take-home final will be a mock comprehensive exam, with two exam questions. Students will be provided several essay questions and will be given 48 hours to complete two of them. The take-home final is worth 40% of your grade.

Required Texts

1. Schattschneider, E. E. 1975. *The Semisovereign People: A Realists View of Democracy in America*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers. ISBN-10: 0030133661
2. Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*. New York: W.W. Norton. ISBN-10: 0393935078
3. Cox, Gary W., and Mathew D. McCubbins. 2007. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*. Cambridge. New York: Cambridge University Press. ISBN-10: 0521694094
4. Beckmann, Matthew N. 2010. *Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004*. New York: Cambridge University Press. ISBN-10: 0521162912
5. Minta, Michael D. 2011. *Oversight: representing the interests of Blacks and Latinos in Congress*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press. ISBN-10: 0691149259
6. Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics: A Theory of U.S. Lawmaking*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ISBN-10: 0226452727
7. Aldrich, John Herbert. 2011. *Why Parties? : A Second Look*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ISBN-10: 0226012743
8. Philpot, Tasha S. 2007. *Race, Republicans, and the Return to the Party of Lincoln*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. ISBN-10: 0472069675
9. Gillion, Daniel Q. 2013. *The political power of protest: minority activism and shifts in public policy*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press. ISBN-10: 1107657415

10. Boydston, Amber E. 2013. *Making the News: Politics, the Media, and Agenda Setting*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press. ISBN-10: 022606557X

Required readings that are not listed among the above texts are the responsibility of the student (available through UT Library databases). I will post book chapters and unpublished manuscripts on the Canvas site for this class.

Preparation

Doing well in this class necessitates that students are informed and prepared. Therefore, you will be expected to complete the readings prior to when class meets. This course covers a large amount of material in a short amount of time. If you do not keep up with the readings, your grade will reflect your preparation.

Professionalism

Remember that this is an academic environment. Therefore, I ask that you minimize unnecessary disruptions. This includes (but it is not limited to) side conversations, cell phone calls and pagers. I also ask that you be proactive if any conflict occurs. This means notifying me ahead of time if you are unable to meet the requirements of the course.

Academic Dishonesty

The University defines scholastic dishonesty in the following way:

“According to the *Institutional Rules*, scholastic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, collusion, and falsifying academic records.” For a detailed explanation of the University’s honor code and definition of plagiarism please refer to the following website <http://registrar.utexas.edu/catalogs/gi09-10/ch01/index.html>.

In the event that a student violates the University policy on scholastic dishonesty, he or she will be subject to disciplinary penalties, including the possibility of failure in the course and/or dismissal from the University. Since such dishonesty harms the individual, all students, and the integrity of the University, policies on scholastic dishonesty will be strictly enforced.

Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities may request appropriate academic accommodations from the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement, Services for Students with Disabilities, 471-6259, <http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/ddce/ssd/>

Religious Holy Day Observance

By UT Austin policy, you must notify your instructor of your pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day. If you must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

Emergency Evacuation Policy

In the event of a fire or other emergency, it may be necessary to evacuate a building rapidly. Upon the activation of a fire alarm or the announcement of an emergency in a university building, all occupants of

the building are required to evacuate and assemble outside. Once evacuated, no one may re-enter the building without instruction to do so from the Austin Fire Department, University of Texas at Austin Police Department, or Fire Prevention Services office.

Students should familiarize themselves with all the exit doors of each room and building they occupy at the university, and should remember that the nearest exit routes may not be the same as the way they typically enter buildings.

Students requiring assistance in evacuation shall inform their instructors in writing during the first week of class. Faculty members must then provide this information to the Fire Prevention Services office by fax (512-232-2759), with "Attn. Mr. Roosevelt Easley" written in the subject line.

Information regarding emergency evacuation routes and emergency procedures can be found at <http://www.utexas.edu/emergency>

Cancelled Classes

Periodically class may be canceled. The class will be informed of these dates and will be held accountable for the readings of that day.

Changes to the Course

The professor reserves the right to make changes to the syllabus in order to better facilitate the needs of the course.

Course Schedule

22-January

Why Institutions are Important and how to Study Them

1. Schattschneider, E. E. 1975. *The Semisovereign People: A Realists View of Democracy in America*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
2. Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapters 1-2 and Chapter 11
3. North, Douglass C. 1991. Institutions. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5 (1): 97-112.
4. Rhodes, R. A. W., Sarah A. Binder, and Bert A. Rockman. 2006. *The Oxford handbook of political institutions*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapters 1-6

29-January **Federalism**

1. Gibson, Edward L. 2012. *Boundary Control: Subnational Authoritarianism in Federal Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 6
2. Shipan, Charles R., and Craig Volden. 2006. Bottom-Up Federalism: The Diffusion of Antismoking Policies from U.S. Cities to States. *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (4): 825-843.
3. Volden, Craig. 2005. Intergovernmental Political Competition in American Federalism. *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (2): 327-342.
4. Kelly, Nathan J., and Christopher Witko. 2012. "Federalism and American Inequality." *The Journal of Politics* 74: 414-26.
5. Bednar, Jenna. 2011. "The Political Science of Federalism." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 7: 269-88.

5-February **Congress**

1. Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics: A Theory of U.S. Lawmaking*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1-3 and 7-8
2. Cox, Gary W., and Mathew D. McCubbins. 2007. *Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House*. Cambridge. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-5
3. Schickler, Eric, and Andrew Rich. 1997. Controlling the Floor: Parties as Procedural Coalitions in the House. *American Journal of Political Science* 41 (4): 1340-1375.
4. Cox, Gary W., and Mathew D. McCubbins. 1997. Toward a Theory of Legislative Rules Changes: Assessing Schickler and Rich's Evidence. *American Journal of Political Science* 41 (4): 1376-1386.
5. Schickler, Eric, and Andrew Rich. 1997. Party Government in the House Reconsidered: A Response to Cox and McCubbins. *American Journal of Political Science* 41 (4): 1387-1394.

12-February **Congress**

1. Theriault, Sean M., and David W. Rohde. 2011. The Gingrich Senators and Party Polarization in the U.S. Senate. *The Journal of Politics* 73 (4): 1011-1024.
2. Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapters 3-7 & 12
3. Minta, Michael D. 2011. *Oversight: Representing the Interests of Blacks and Latinos in Congress*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.
4. Grose, Christian R. 2011. *Congress in black and white: Race and representation in Washington and at home*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-4 and 7

19-February **Presidency**

1. Neustadt, Richard E. 1990. *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents: The Politics of Leadership from Roosevelt to Reagan*. New York: Free Press Chapters 1-3
2. Skowronek, Stephen. 2002. Presidency and American Political Development: A Third Look. *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 32 (4): 743-752.
3. Bowles, N. (1999). "Studying the Presidency." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2 (1): 1-23.
4. Rogowski, Jon C. 2016. "Presidential Influence in an Era of Congressional Dominance." *American Political Science Review* 110: 325-41.

26-February **No Meeting**

5-March **Presidency**

1. Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapters 14 and 16
2. Beckmann, Matthew N. 2010. *Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-3 and 6
3. Kernell, Samuel. 2007. *Going Public: New Strategies of Presidential Leadership*. 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press. Chapters 1-3
4. Kriner, Douglas L., and Andrew Reeves. 2015. "Presidential Particularism and Divide-the-Dollar Politics." *American Political Science Review* 109: 155-71.
5. Nyhan, B. (2015). Scandal Potential: How Political Context and News Congestion Affect the President's Vulnerability to Media Scandal. *British Journal of Political Science*, 45(2), 435-466.

12-March **Spring Break**

19-March**Bureaucracy/Courts**

1. Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapter 13
2. Walton, Hanes Jr. 1988. *When the Marching Stopped: The Politics of Civil Rights Regulatory Agencies*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. Chapters 1, 2 and 6
3. Gailmard, Sean, and John Patty. 2013. Stovepiping. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*.
4. Meier, Kenneth J., Robert D. Wrinkle, and J. L. Polinard. 1999. Representative Bureaucracy and Distributional Equity: Addressing the Hard Question. *The Journal of Politics* 61 (4): 1025-1039.
5. Nielsen, Laura B., and Patrick J. Wolf. 2001. Representative Bureaucracy and Harder Questions: A Response to Meier, Wrinkle, and Polinard. *The Journal of Politics* 63 (2): 598-615.
6. Meier, Kenneth J., and Amanda Rutherford. 2014. Partisanship, Structure, and Representation: The Puzzle of African American Education Politics. *American Political Science Review* 108 (02): 265-280.
7. Hollibaugh, Gary E., Gabriel Horton, and David E. Lewis. 2014. "Presidents and Patronage." *American Journal of Political Science* 58: 1024-42.
8. Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapter 15
9. Robert A. Dahl Decision-Making in a Democracy. *Journal of Public Law* 6 (1957): 279-95
10. Segal, Jeffrey A., Chad Westerland, and Stefanie A. Lindquist. 2011. Congress, the Supreme Court, and Judicial Review: Testing a Constitutional Separation of Powers Model. *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (1): 89-104.
11. Caldeira, Gregory A., and John R. Wright. 1988. Organized Interests and Agenda Setting in the U.S. Supreme Court. *The American Political Science Review* 82 (4): 1109-1127.
12. Frymer, Paul 2005. Racism revised: Courts, Labor Law, and the Institutional Construction of Racial Animus. *American Political Science Review* 99 (3): 373-387.
13. Hall, Matthew E.K. 2014. "The Semiconstrained Court: Public Opinion, the Separation of Powers, and the U.S. Supreme Court's Fear of Nonimplementation." *American Journal of Political Science* 58(2):352-366.
14. Hall, Matthew E.K. and Joseph Daniel Ura. 2015. "Judicial Majoritarianism." *Journal of Politics* 77(3):818-832.

26-March**Parties**

1. Aldrich, John Herbert. 2011. *Why Parties? : A Second Look*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1-3, 6-9
2. Reiter, Howard L. 2006. The Study of Political Parties, 1906-2005: The View from the Journals. *The American Political Science Review* 100 (4): 613-618.
3. Snyder, James M., Jr., and Michael M. Ting. 2002. An Informational Rationale for Political Parties. *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (1): 90-110.
4. Erikson, Robert S., Gerald C. Wright, Jr., and John P. McIver. 1989. Political Parties, Public Opinion, and State Policy in the United States. *The American Political Science Review* 83 (3): 729-750.

2-April**Parties**

1. Philpot, Tasha S. 2007. *Race, Republicans, and the Return to the Party of Lincoln*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chapters 1-5, 7 & 9
2. Frymer, Paul. 1999. *Uneasy Alliances: Race and Party Competition in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Chapters 1 and 2
3. Layman, Geoffrey. 2001. *The Great Divide: Religious and Cultural Conflict in American Party Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press. Chapters Introduction, 1 and 2
4. Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2002. Political Parties and the Recruitment of Women to State Legislatures. *The Journal of Politics* 64 (3): 791-809.

9-April**Interest Groups**

1. Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chapters 8-10
2. Walker, Jack L. 1983. The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America. *The American Political Science Review* 77 (2): 390-406.
3. McDaniel, Eric L. 2008. *Politics in the Pews: The Political Mobilization of Black Churches*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chapters 1 and 2
4. Boehmke, Frederick J., and Daniel C. Bowen. 2010. Direct Democracy and Individual Interest Group Membership. *The Journal of Politics* 72 (3): 659-671.
5. Heaney, Michael T., and James M. Strickland. 2017. "A Network Approach to Interest Group Politics." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Networks*, eds. Jennifer Nicoll Victor, Alexander H. Montgomery and Mark Lubell. New York: Oxford University Press.

16-April**Interest Groups**

1. Gais, Thomas L., Mark A. Peterson, and Jack L. Walker. 1984. Interest Groups, Iron Triangles and Representative Institutions in American National Government. *British Journal of Political Science* 14 (2): 161-185.
2. Richard L. Hall and Alan Deardorff. 2006. Lobbying as Legislative Subsidy. *American Political Science Review*. 100 (1): 69-84.
3. Hall, Richard, and Frank Wayman. 1990. Buying Time: Moneyed Interests and the Mobilization of Bias in Congressional Committee. *The American Political Science Review* 84: 797-820.
4. Reynolds, Molly E., and Richard L. Hall. Issue Advertising and Legislative Voting on the Affordable Care Act. *Political Research Quarterly* 0 (0):.
5. Gilens, M., & Page, B. (2014). Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens. *Perspectives on Politics*, 12(3), 564-581
6. Dusso, Aaron. 2010. Legislation, Political Context, and Interest Group Behavior. *Political Research Quarterly* 63 (1): 55-67.
7. Bell, Derrick A. Jr. 1995. "Serving Two Masters: Integration Ideals and Client Interest in School Desegregation Litigation." In *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*, eds. Kimberle Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller and Kendall Thomas. New York: New Press.
8. Heaney, Michael T. 2014. Multiplex networks and interest group influence reputation: An exponential random graph model. *Social Networks* 36: 66-81.

23-April**Social Movements**

1. Gillion, Daniel Q. 2013. *The Political Power of Protest: Minority Activism and Shifts in Public Policy*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
2. Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A. Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage Books. Chapter 1
3. Morris, Aldon D. 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: Free Press. Chapters 1, 2 and 11
4. Smith, Robert C. 1996. *We Have No Leaders: African Americans in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. Chapter 1
5. McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1-3

30-April**Media**

1. Boydston, Amber E. 2013. *Making the News: Politics, the Media, and Agenda Setting*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.
2. Sparrow, Bartholomew H. 2006. A Research Agenda for an Institutional Media. *Political Communication* 23 (2): 145-157.
3. Armstrong, Elizabeth M., Daniel P. Carpenter, and Marie Hojnacki. 2006. Whose Deaths Matter? Mortality, Advocacy, and Attention to Disease in the Mass Media. *Journal of Health Politics Policy and Law* 31 (4): 729-772.