

AMERICAN POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: STATE POLITICS AND POLICYMAKING

PL SC 541
W 9:00AM – 12:00PM
Burrowes 025

Michael Nelson
mjn15@psu.edu
Office: Pond Lab 232
Office Hours: M 10:30-11:30

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The fifty state governments are often referred to as “laboratories of democracy.” In this class, we investigate this phrase in two ways. First, this label refers to the role that states play in the policymaking process by experimenting with policies across time and space. In this course, we will examine how policies are developed and implemented, how they diffuse across state lines, and how the federal government encourages (and discourages) this process of policy experimentation. Second, states are also laboratories for scholars. As we review the literature on state political institutions and behavior, we will pay particular attention to how the states can be used by scholars to test general questions about political institutions, mass behavior, policymaking, and representation. Students in this course are expected to complete the assigned readings, to contribute meaningfully to class discussions, and to complete a variety of formal and informal writing assignments.

OBJECTIVES

By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- (1) Explain the major findings in the study of American state political behavior, institutions, and policymaking.
- (2) Employ data analytic and methodological tools used by scholars of state politics.
- (3) Propose promising research topics in the study of American state politics and policymaking.
- (4) Evaluate studies of American state politics orally and in writing.
- (5) Communicate results of original research orally and in writing.

COURSE MATERIALS

We will read a variety of books and articles. Two are particularly worthy of purchase. The articles are available online. If you have trouble finding copies of any assigned reading, please let me know.

- Key, V.O. 1949. *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Erikson, Robert, Gerald Wright, and John McIver. 1993. *Statehouse Democracy: Public Opinion and Policy in the American States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The requirements for this course involve both (1) the completion of reading assignments and written work on your own outside of our class meetings and (2) your active and informed contributions to our course discussions when we meet. This course is a seminar. You are expected to come prepared to talk.

ARTICLE REVIEW (15%): As a midterm “exam,” I will e-mail you a blinded unpublished manuscript on a topic relating to state politics and policy. You may not discuss the manuscript with your peers but may use external (e.g. internet) resources for additional information as needed as you craft a 2-3 page (single-spaced) review of the book appropriate for *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*.

COMPREHENSIVE-STYLE EXAM (15%). Students will take a final exam that mirrors in its design the comprehensive exam in American Politics. You will be asked to synthesize the literature and our class discussions to answer a broad question about American state politics. You will have four hours to answer one question.

Comprehensive exam answers can be deceptively hard. Here are some tips to tackle these in the future:

- Your goal, first and foremost, on any comprehensive exam answer is to make a convincing case that you know the literature in American politics and can synthesize it into something coherent. You do this in three ways: by citing the appropriate literature, by summarizing it correctly, and by telling us a story about how that literature fits together (e.g. how it has developed over time). By nature, a comprehensive exam asks you to synthesize the literature.
- Your second goal on most comprehensive exam questions is to craft and defend a clear argument. Weak comprehensive exam answers read like undergraduate literature reviews: each paragraph discusses a new source and there is little conversation among the sources until a final paragraph. Great comprehensive exam answers employ the literature to support and defend an argument, using it as evidence to bolster their thesis.
- The best way that you meet these two goals is to spend the first portion of your time with any answer making an outline. If you don't know what evidence you have, you can't figure out what claim to make, and if you don't start writing with a clear claim/thesis, you are going to have problems with the organization of the essay (see: undergraduate literature review). Clear organization is extremely important; if your reader cannot follow the argument you are making, you're in trouble. Subheadings can be helpful.

RESEARCH PROJECT (50% Total). This course culminates with the production of an original research project. You may choose any topic in law and courts that interests you, though my hope is that this project will help you start to think about the sort of research projects that will interest you as you progress through graduate school. To help you finish the project on schedule, you will complete it in stages. You may choose to complete: (a) a research design, (b) a research paper, or (c) a reanalysis.

- A. Research Paper. A research paper moves beyond a design by providing a test of a theoretical argument. A strong manuscript would have all the core components of a paper that could form the basis of a MA thesis, conference paper, or dissertation chapter. I highly encourage 2nd and 3rd year Ph.D. students to take this option.
- B. Research Design. A research design is a well-thought-out plan that “sells” your research question as an essential one, explains why that original question is motivated by the extant research, clearly explains the testable, falsifiable hypotheses you hope to examine, and explains the data with which you plan to test those hypotheses, including both the data collection and analysis stages of the process. Basically, you should think about this as a highly detailed overview of a research project that likely lacks the empirical analysis that would enable one to actually test the proposed theory (though some preliminary data analysis, if available, may be useful as proof of concept). This option is only available to first year students, undergraduate students, and MPP students.
- C. Reanalysis Paper. A reanalysis paper *replicates* and *reanalyzes* an existing published finding. Your research paper should *not* simply reproduce the table of results and figures included in the article you select. You will conduct a thorough *reanalysis* of the paper by embracing the authors' theory and hypotheses but writing your own code to analyze the data and fit the model(s) presented in the article. Be careful! Anyone can find “reasonable” ways of changing someone else's models so that coefficient estimates change. That is not the objective of this assignment. The goal of this research paper is for

you to grasp the complete research process by focusing on characteristics of the data, the most appropriate quantitative method for establishing a clear connection between theory and empirics, hypothesis testing, and the substantive interpretation and visualization of the results.

Regardless of your assignment choice, you will complete the following assignments. I will include my assessment of your checkpoints (including their quality and timeliness) in my evaluation of your final manuscript.

- Checkpoint #1: Research Proposal Meeting. You must meet with me at least three times over the course of your semester (September, October, and November) to discuss your project. Before the September meeting, please send me a 2-page document that outlines 2-3 proposed topics. During this meeting, we will discuss proposed topics and which assignment is the best fit for your stage in the program, substantive interests, and career goals. For those students interested in a Renanalysis Paper, indicate whether you have obtained the author's original data.
- Checkpoint #2: Literature Review. The purpose of the literature review is to bring your reader up to speed about the current state of knowledge on a topic and, in the process, explain why there has not been a good answer to your research question. A good literature review is *not* a summary of a bunch of articles. Instead, it weaves the articles together to describe the state of knowledge on that topic. *A literature review is an argument about what "we" know and do not know about your topic. It is an argument that your paper deserves to be written.* In a paper of about 6 pages (double-spaced) in length, you should do three things: (1) Summarize the literature/existing explanations in terms of method and major findings. (2) Critique the strengths and weaknesses of each literature/explanation. (3) Identify why there is a need in the literature for your proposed research.

To help you prepare to write this paper, take careful notes. Pay attention to how articles "speak" to each other: which articles agree? Which articles disagree? Once you've found the points of consensus and dissensus in the literature, you can begin writing. *The topic sentences in your literature review should be **your** summary of the literature, and the supporting sentences in each paragraph should use the articles as sources.* You should plan to read at least 10 articles (the more the better!) on your topic before you start writing. You may not cite all of those sources in the eventual literature review, but you need to read enough before you write so that you know the state of the literature on the topic.

- Checkpoint #3: Data Report. Each student will write a report on data that they would (or will) use to test their theory. The report should be 3-5 pages long and discuss the availability of data, how key concepts in the theory would be measured, and the reliability and validity of those measurements (or how reliability and validity would be assessed). For those students writing a research paper or a reanalysis paper, your Data Report should contain some data analysis.
- Checkpoint #4: Peer Review. You will circulate a draft of your paper to two of your colleagues (selected by me). You will read and comment on the drafts of the two colleagues and provide them with constructive critiques of their argument, research design, and (if applicable) data analysis. You may comment on mechanical (grammatical) errors, but those should not be the focus of your commentary. You will summarize your comments in a memorandum (about 2 double-spaced pages) that you will submit to (a) the colleagues whose papers you reviewed and (b) to Prof. Nelson.

- Final Paper and Response Memo: By the Tuesday of finals week, submit your final, revised manuscript—along with a memo responding to your classmates’ critiques—on Canvas. Most completed manuscripts will be about 25 double-spaced pages (though concision is always appropriate).
- In-Class Presentations: We will spend the last hour of most class sessions workshopping your papers. Each week, I will assign the students who will present the following week. Students should expect to present about three times over the course of the semester.

PARTICIPATION (20%). This is a graduate seminar. It is your collective job to carry most of our class discussion. The final portion of your grade is based on your ability and willingness to contribute to our class. Everyone’s experience in this course is enhanced by regular attendance and active participation; conversely, everyone’s experience suffers if individuals do not participate. Remember that a sincere question often adds as much (if not more) to our understanding of the course material as an explanation of the week’s readings. So, don’t be afraid to speak up!

Please remember that attending class and sitting silently is not, by definition, “participation.” Also, please note that I do not penalize you directly for missing class (though multiple absences will adversely affect your grade through a lower participation score).

You will also grade your own participation. After every 5-week period (so three times throughout the semester), I will ask you to reflect on your participation in the course. Based on your reflection and your contribution to the course, I will grade your participation. In this way, I hope to make you assess critically your contribution to the seminar and also to provide you with regular feedback on your performance.

EXPECTATIONS/PROCEDURES

RESPECT. In this course, we are all engaged in the endeavor of building a stronger understanding of American politics. Everyone comes to this course with a different background in the subject (particularly with respect to the technical aspects of the readings). It is important that we all treat each other with the utmost respect.

CRITICISM. This is a seminar and, as such, it is our job to be critics. As you read for class, you should examine the goals of an article, the persuasiveness of the evidence it presents in support of its theory, and the place it makes for itself in the literature. Remember that a harsh critique isn’t the same thing as an intellectually rigorous one, and focus less on what you perceive to be flaws and more on what you could learn from the article. Oftentimes, it is more difficult to point out what is “good” than what is “bad”. In other words, treat our authors the way you would like to be treated by students in your shoes in 20 years.

OFFICE HOURS. I have office hours, listed at the beginning of the syllabus. My door is usually open, and you shouldn’t hesitate to stop by outside of my scheduled office hour times.

LATE ASSIGNMENTS. Assignments not submitted by the assigned due date and time are late and will be penalized by a 5% per day deduction. This is a graduate class, so I expect you to communicate with me about things that affect your ability to get an assignment in on time. All assignments must be completed to complete this course.

EXTENSIONS. Extensions will be granted in only the most severe circumstances. If you foresee the need for an extension, one needs to be requested and granted at least 24 hours before the due date. No one is entitled to an extension; they will be offered only at my discretion.

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. I take violations of the University’s academic dishonesty policy—reprinted below—very seriously. Please review the policy and let me know if you have any questions.

GRADING SCALE. The course will follow a standard grading scale:

93-100	A	80-82	B-
90-92	A-	77-79	C+
87-89	B+	70-76	C
83-86	B	60-69	D

A NOTE ON GRADES. I do not *give* grades. You *earn* grades. It is essential that you are proactive regarding your performance in this course; *do not wait* until grades are posted and then ask how your grade could be improved. At that point, barring a mathematical error on my part, it cannot be. If, at any point, you are unsure of your current standing in the course, please come to my office hours.

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY. The Department of Political Science, along with the College of the Liberal Arts and the University, takes violations of academic dishonesty seriously. Academic integrity is the pursuit of scholarly activity in an open, honest and responsible manner. Academic integrity is a basic guiding principle for all academic activity at The Pennsylvania State University, and all members of the University community are expected to act in accordance with this principle. Consistent with this expectation, the University’s Code of Conduct states that all students should act with personal integrity, respect other students’ dignity, rights and property, and help create and maintain an environment in which all can succeed through the fruits of their efforts.

Academic integrity includes a commitment by all members of the University community not to engage in or tolerate acts of falsification, misrepresentation or deception. Such acts of dishonesty violate the fundamental ethical principles of the University community and compromise the worth of work completed by others.

Penn State defines academic integrity as “the pursuit of scholarly activity in an open, honest and responsible manner” ([Senate Policy 49-20](#)). Dishonesty of any kind will not be tolerated in this course. Dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, cheating, plagiarizing, fabricating information or citations, facilitating acts of academic dishonesty by others, having unauthorized possession of examinations, submitting work of another person or work previously used without permission from the instructor, or tampering with the academic work of other students. All course work by students is to be done on an individual basis unless an instructor clearly states that an alternative is acceptable. Any reference materials used in the preparation of any assignment must be explicitly cited. Students uncertain about proper citation are responsible for checking with their instructor. In an examination setting, unless the instructor gives explicit prior instructions to the contrary, whether the examination is in-class or take-home, violations of academic integrity shall consist but are not limited to any attempt to receive assistance from written or printed aids, or from any person or papers or electronic devices, or of any attempt to give assistance, whether the one so doing has completed his or her own work or not.

Lying to the instructor or purposely misleading any Penn State administrator shall also constitute a violation of academic integrity. In cases of any violation of academic integrity it is the policy of the

Department of Political Science to follow procedures established by the College of the Liberal Arts. Students facing allegations of academic misconduct should not drop the course; those who do will be added to the course again and will be expected to complete course work and meet course deadlines. If the allegations are dismissed, then the drop will be permitted. Students found responsible for academic misconduct often receive academic sanctions, which can be severe, and put themselves at risk for disciplinary sanctions assigned by the University's Office of Student Conduct (see [Senate Policy G-2](#)). Students with questions about academic integrity should visit <https://la.psu.edu/current-students/undergraduate-students/education/academic-integrity>.

NOTE TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES. Penn State welcomes students with disabilities into the University's educational programs. Every Penn State campus has an office for students with disabilities. The Student Disability Resources Web site provides [contact information for every Penn State campus](#). For further information, please visit the [Student Disability Resources Web site](#).

In order to receive consideration for reasonable accommodations, you must contact the appropriate disability services office at the campus where you are officially enrolled, [participate in an intake interview, and provide documentation](#). If the documentation supports your request for reasonable accommodations, your [campus's disability services office](#) will provide you with an accommodation letter. Please share this letter with your instructors and discuss the accommodations with them as early in your courses as possible. You must follow this process for every semester that you request accommodations.

COUNSELING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES. Many students at Penn State face personal challenges or have psychological needs that may interfere with their academic progress, social development, or emotional wellbeing. The university offers a variety of confidential services to help you through difficult times, including individual and group counseling, crisis intervention, consultations, online chats, and mental health screenings. These services are provided by staff who welcome all students and embrace a philosophy respectful of clients' cultural and religious backgrounds, and sensitive to differences in race, ability, gender identity and sexual orientation.

[Counseling and Psychological Services at University Park \(CAPS\)](#): 814-863-0395
Penn State Crisis Line (24 hours/7 days/week): 877-229-6400
Crisis Text Line (24 hours/7 days/week): Text LIONS to 741741

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND REPORTING BIAS INCIDENTS. State takes great pride to foster a diverse and inclusive environment for students, faculty, and staff. Acts of intolerance, discrimination, or harassment due to age, ancestry, color, disability, gender, gender identity, national origin, race, religious belief, sexual orientation, or veteran status are not tolerated and can be reported through Educational Equity via the [Report Bias webpage](#).

EXTENDED ABSENCES. During your enrollment at Penn State, unforeseen challenges may arise. If you ever need to miss an extended amount of class in such a circumstance, please notify your professor so you can determine the best course of action to make up missed work. If your situation rises to a level of difficulty you cannot manage on your own with faculty support, reach out to the Student Care & Advocacy office by phone at [\(814-863-2020\)](tel:814-863-2020) or email them at StudentCare@psu.edu.

COVID-19 POLICY. Like all Penn State classes, we will be following [Penn State COVID-19 guidance for faculty and instructors](#). Please do not come to class if you are feeling ill!

SCHEDULE

Below, you'll find a list of all class meetings, the topic we'll discuss, and the reading assignment. You should complete the reading assignment before you come to class and bring any questions that you have with you to our class meetings. If deviations from this schedule are necessary, they will be announced in class.

Part I: People and Groups in the States

Week 1: Introduction (8/24)

- Key, V.O. 1949. *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. Chapters 1, 14, 18-20, 24, plus one of the state chapters:
 - Georgia: Morrigan H. and Nicholas R.
 - Arkansas: Arif M. and Michael L.
 - North Carolina: Nitheesha N. and Nick H.
 - Mississippi: Yang S., Teresa O., and Alex B.
 - Alabama: Mia P. and Nathaniel F.

Week 2: Partisanship and Parties in the States (8/31)

- Holbrook, Thomas M., and Emily Van Dunk. 1993. "Electoral Competition in the American States." *American Political Science Review*. 87:955-962.
- Wright, Gerald C. and Elizabeth Rigby. 2020. "Income Inequality and State Parties: Who Gets Represented?" *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 20(4): 395-415.
- Masket, Seth. 2007. "It Takes an Outsider: Extralegisative Organization and Partisanship in the California Assembly, 1849-2006." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(3): 482-497.
- Grumbach, Jacob M. 2022. "Laboratories of Democratic Backsliding." *American Political Science Review* Forthcoming.
- Handan-Nader, Cassandra, Andrew C.W. Myers, and Andrew B. Hall. 2022. "Polarization and State Legislative Elections." Working Paper.

Week 3: Electoral Institutions (9/7)

- Chubb, John. 1988. "Institutions, the Economy, and Dynamics of State Elections." *American Political Science Review* 82: 133-54.
- Anzia, Sarah F. 2011. "Election Timing and the Electoral Influence of Interest Groups." *Journal of Politics* 73 (2): 412-427.
- Schaffner, Brian F., Matthew Streb, and Gerald Wright. 2001. "Teams Without Uniforms: The Nonpartisan Ballot in State and Local Elections." *Political Research Quarterly* 54 (1):7-30.
- Fraga, Bernard L. and Michael G. Miller. 2021. "Who Does Voter ID Keep From Voting?" *Journal of Politics*. In Press.
- Ladam, Christina, Jeffrey J. Harden, and Jason H. Windett. 2018. "Prominent Role Models: High-Profile Female Politicians and the Emergence of Women as Candidates for Public Office." *American Journal of Political Science* 62(2): 369-381.

Week 4: Electoral Accountability (9/14)

Checkpoint #1 Due

- Carey, John M., Richard G. Niemi, and Lynda W. Powell. 2000. "Incumbency and the Probability of Reelection in State Legislative Elections." *Journal of Politics* 62 (3): 671–700.
- Hogan, Robert E. 2004. "Challenger Emergence, Incumbent Success, and Electoral Accountability in State Legislative Elections." *Journal of Politics* 66: 1283–303.
- Michael W. Sances. 2017. "Attribution Errors in Federalist Systems: When Voters Punish the President for Local Tax Increases." *Journal of Politics* 79(4): 1286-1301.
- Rogers, Steven. 2017. "Electoral Accountability for State Legislative Roll-Calls and Ideological Representation." *American Political Science Review* 111(3): 555-571.
- de Benedictis-Kessner, Justin and Christopher Warshaw. 2020. "Accountability for the Local Economy at All Levels of Government in United States Elections." *American Political Science Review* 114: 660-676.

Week 5: Measuring Subnational Public Opinion (9/21)

- Erikson, Robert, Gerald Wright, and John McIver. 1993. *Statehouse Democracy: Public Opinion and Policy in the American States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-3, 9 (to pg. 232).
- Berry, William D., Evan J. Ringquist, Richard C. Fording, and Russell L. Hanson. 1998. "Measuring Citizen and Government Ideology in the American States." *American Journal of Political Science*. 42:337-348.
- Lax, Jeffrey R., and Justin H. Phillips. 2009. "How Should We Estimate Public Opinion in the States?" *American Journal of Political Science* 53(1): 107-21.
- Enns, Peter and Julianna Koch. 2013. "Public Opinion in the U.S. States: 1656 to 2010." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 13(3): 349-372.
- Smith, Candis Watts, Rebecca J. Kreitzer, and Feiya Suo. 2019. "The Dynamics of Racial Resentment in the US States, 1988-2016." *Perspectives on Politics*.

Skim:

- Lopez-Martin, Juan, Justin H. Phillips, and Andrew Gelman. 2022. *Multilevel Regression and Poststratification Case Studies* Chapter 1. Available at <https://bookdown.org/jl5522/MRP-case-studies/>. (see also <https://github.com/JuanLopezMartin/MRPCaseStudy>).
- Kstellec, Jonathan P., Jeffrey R. Lax and Justin Phillips. 2019. "Estimating State Public Opinion with Multi-Level Regression and Poststratification using R." [Replication information available at: https://scholar.princeton.edu/jkstellec/publications/mrp_primer]
- Hanretty, Chris. 2019. "An Introduction to Multilevel Regression and Post-Stratification for Estimating Constituency Opinion." *Political Studies Review* 18(4): 630-645.
- <http://joshuamccrain.com/index.php/mrp-in-r/>

Week 6: Policy Responsiveness to Public Opinion (9/28)

- Erikson, Robert, Gerald Wright, and John McIver. 1993. *Statehouse Democracy: Public Opinion and Policy in the American States*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 4-8, 9 (from 232), 10
- Lax, Jeffrey R. and Justin H. Phillips 2012. "The Democratic Deficit in the States." *American Journal of Political Science* 56(1): 148-166.
- Broockman, Daniel and Daniel M. Butler. 2017. "The Causal Effects of Elite Position-Taking on Voter Attitudes: Field Experiments with Elite Communication." *American Journal of Political Science* 61(1): 208-221.
- Broockman, Daniel and Christopher Skovron. 2018. "Bias in Perceptions of Public Opinion among Political Elites." *American Political Science Review* 112(3): 542-563.
- Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936-2014." *American Political Science Review*. 112(2): 249-266.

Part II: Institutions in the States

Week 7: Parties in Legislatures (10/5)

[Checkpoint #2 Due]

- Wright and Schaffner. 2002. "The Influence of Party: Evidence from the State Legislatures" *American Political Science Review* 96:367-79
- Jackman, Molly. 2014. "Parties, Median Legislators, and Agenda Setting: How Legislative Institutions Matter." *Journal of Politics* 76: 259-72.
- Cox, Gary W., Kousser, Thad, and McCubbins, Mathew D. 2010. "Party Power or Preferences? Quasi-Experimental Evidence from American State Legislatures." *Journal of Politics* 72: 799-811.
- Shor, Boris and Nolan McCarty. 2011. "The Ideological Mapping of American Legislatures." *American Political Science Review* 105: 530-551.
- Holman, Mirya R. and Anna Mahoney. 2018. "Stop, Collaborate, and Listen: Women's Collaboration in U.S. State Legislatures." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 43: 179-206.

Week 8: Legislative Professionalism and Term Limits (10/12)

[Midterm Exam Handed Out]

- Squire, Peverill. 1992. "The Theory of Legislative Institutionalization and the California Assembly," *Journal of Politics* 54: 1026-1054.
 - Squire, Peverill. 2007. "Measuring State Legislative Professionalism: The Squire Index Revisited." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 7(2): 211-27.
- Maestas, Cherie. 2003. "The Incentive to Listen: Progressive Ambition, Resources, and Opinion Monitoring among State Legislators," *Journal of Politics* 65: 439-456.
- Michael P. Olson and Jon C. Rogowski. 2020. "Legislative Term Limits and Polarization." *Journal of Politics* 82(2): 572-586.
- Hall, Andrew B. and Alexander Fournaies. 2021. "How Do Electoral Incentives Affect Legislator Behavior? Evidence from U.S. State Legislatures." *American Political Science Review*
- Cook, Scott J. and David Fortunato. 2022. "The Politics of Police Data: State Legislative Capacity and the Transparency of State and Substate Agencies" *American Political Science Review* Forthcoming.

Week 9: Governors (10/19)

[Midterm Exam Due]

- Barrilleaux, Charles and Michael Berkman. 2003. "Do Governors Matter? Budgeting Rules and the Politics of State Policy Making," *Political Research Quarterly* 56: 409-17.
- Brown, Adam. 2010. "Are Governors Responsible for the State Economy? Partisanship, Blame, and Divided Federalism." *Journal of Politics* 72(3): 605-15.
- Cummins, Jeff and Thomas T. Holyoke. 2018. "Fiscal Accountability in Gubernatorial Elections." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 18(4): 395-416.
- Klarner, Carl E., and Andrew Karch. 2008. "Why Do Governors Issue Vetoes? The Impact of Individual and Institutional Influences." *Political Research Quarterly* 61: 574-84
- Robert J. McGrath, Jon C. Rogowski, and Josh M. Ryan. 2018. "Veto Override Requirements and Executive Success." *Political Science Research and Methods* 6:153–79.

Week 10: Interbranch Relations (10/26)

- Dynes, Adam M. and John B. Holbein. 2020. "Noisy Retrospection: The Effect of Party Control on Policy Outcomes." *American Political Science Review* 114(1): 237-257.
- Kousser, Thad and Justin H. Phillips. 2009. "Who Blinks First? Legislative Patience and Bargaining with Governors." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 34(1): 55-86.
- Alt, James and Robert Lowry. 2000. "A Dynamic Model of State Budget Outcomes under Divided Partisan Government." *Journal of Politics* 62:1035-1070.
 - James Alt and Robert Lowry. 1994. "Divided Government, Fiscal Institutions, and Budget Deficits: Evidence from the States," *American Political Science Review* 88:811-828.
- Klarner, Carl, Justin Phillips, and Matt Muckler. 2012. "Overcoming Fiscal Gridlock: Institutions and Budget Bargaining." *Journal of Politics*. 74.
- Vakilifathi, Mona. 2020. "Strategic Delegation? How Legislative Political Elites Respond to Electoral Uncertainty" *Legislative Studies Quarterly*

Week 11: Courts and Judicial Elections (11/2)

[Checkpoint #3 Due]

- Shugerman, Jed H. 2010. "Economic Crisis and the Rise of Judicial Elections and Judicial Review," *Harvard Law Review* 123:1061-1150. Read the Introduction and pg. 1097-1123.
- Hall, Melinda Gann and Chris W. Bonneau. 2006. "Does Quality Matter? Challengers in State Supreme Court Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 50: 20-33.
- Gibson, James L. 2008. "Challenges to the Impartiality of State Supreme Courts: Legitimacy Theory and 'New-Style' Judicial Campaigns." *American Political Science Review* 102: 59-75.
- Canes-Wrone, Brandice, Tom S. Clark, and Jason P. Kelly. 2014. "Judicial Selection and Death Penalty Decisions." *American Political Science Review* 108:23-39.
- Kastellec, Jonathan P. 2018. "How Courts Structure State-Level Representation." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 18(1): 27-60.

Part III: Making Policies in the States

Week 12: Policy Innovation, Competition, and Diffusion (11/9)

- Walker, Jack L. 1969. "The Diffusion of Innovations among the American States." *American Political Science Review* 63: 880-899
- Berry, Frances Stokes, and William D. Berry. 1990. "State Lottery Adoptions as Policy Innovations: An Event History Analysis." *American Political Science Review*. 84:395-416
- Shipan, Charles R. and Craig Volden. 2008. "The Mechanisms of Policy Diffusion," *American Journal of Political Science* 52(4).
- Desmarais, Bruce; Jeffrey J. Harden and Frederick J. Boehmke. 2015. "Persistent Policy Pathways: Inferring Policy Diffusion Networks in the American States." *American Political Science Review* 109 (2): 392-406.
- Butler, Daniel M., Craig Volden, Adam Dynes, and Boris Shor. 2017. "Ideology, Learning and Policy Diffusion: Experimental Evidence." *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (1): 37-49.
- Kroeger, Mary, Timothy Callaghan and Andrew Karch. "Model Bills, State Imitation, and the Political Safeguards of Federalism." Working Paper.

Week 13: Policy Implementation (11/16)

[Circulate Draft for Checkpoint 4]

- Haider-Markel, Donald P. 2002. "Regulating Hate: State and Local Influences on Hate Crime Law Enforcement." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 2 (2):126
- Norrander, Barbara. 2000. "The Multi-Layered Impact of Public Opinion on Capital Punishment Implementation in the American States," *Political Research Quarterly*.
- Enns, Peter K. 2016. *Incarceration Nation: How the United States Became the Most Punitive Democracy in the World*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 6.
- Kreitzer, Rebecca J., Candis Watts Smith, Kellen A. Kane, Tracee Saunders. 2021. "Affordable but Inaccessible?: Contraception Deserts in the U.S. States." *Journal of Health, Politics, Policy and Law*.
- Michener, Jamila. 2019. "Policy Feedback in a Racialized Polity." *Policy Studies Journal* 47(2): 423-450.

Week 14: Federalism (11/30)

[Checkpoint 4 Due]

- Volden, Craig. 2005. "Intergovernmental Political Competition in American Federalism." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2): 327-342.
- Weissert, Carol. S. and D. Scheller. 2008. "Learning from the States? Federalism and National Health Policy." *Public Administration Review* 68: S162-S174
- Kelly, Nathan J. and Christopher Witko. 2012. "Federalism and American Inequality." *Journal of Politics* 74(2): 414-426.
- Payson, Julia. 2020. "The Partisan Logic of City Mobilization: Evidence from State Lobbying Disclosures." *American Political Science Review* 114(3): 677-690.
- Barber, Michael and Adam M. Dynes. 2022. "City-State Ideological Congruence and Municipal Preemption." *American Journal of Political Science* Forthcoming.

Week 15: Nationalization (12/7)

- Hopkins, Dan. 2018. *The Increasingly United States: How and Why American Political Behavior Nationalized*. University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1, 2, and 6.
- Moskowitz, Daniel J. 2021. "Local News, Information, and the Nationalization of U.S. Elections." *American Political Science Review* 115: 114-129.
- Das, Sanmay, Betsy Sinclair, Steven W. Webster and Hao Yan. 2022. "All (Mayoral) Politics is Local?" *Journal of Politics* 84: 1021-1034.
- Hopkins, Daniel J., Eric Schickler, and David Azizi. 2021. "From Many Divides, One? The Polarization and Nationalization of American State Party Platforms, 1918-2017." *Studies in American Political Development* 36: 1-20.

Finals Week

Your paper is due at 5pm on 12/13.

You must complete your final exam by 5pm on 12/14.

You should also know about:

Direct Democracy

- Gerber, Elisabeth R. 1996. "Legislative Response to the Threat of Popular Initiatives." *American Journal of Political Science*. 40:99-128.
- Boehmke, Frederick J., Tracy L. Osborn and Emily U. Schilling. 2015. "Pivotal Politics and Initiative Use in the American States." *Political Research Quarterly* 68 (4): 665-677.
- Sances, Michael W. 2018. "Something for Something: How and Why Direct Democracy Impacts Service Quality." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 13(1): pp. 29-57.
- LaCombe, Scott J. and Frederick J. Boehmke. 2021. "The Initiative Process and Policy Innovation in the American States." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*
- Ladam, Christina. 2020. "Does Process Matter? Direct Democracy and Citizens' Perceptions of Laws." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 7(3): 232-237.