This course is the second part of a two quarter sequence in American Politics for Ph.D. students in Political Science. It is a continuation of PS 260A from Fall 2014. As in 260A, each week’s discussion will focus on important works related to a different topic within the field of American Politics. At the end of this class, you should understand the state of knowledge in the discipline about these topics (e.g., what do we know about party leadership in Congress?) You should also improve your understanding of the process through which that knowledge is produced.

PS 260A began with topics related to voting, public opinion and mass behavior, then moved on to questions about representation and the behavior and incentives of elected elites. PS 260B begins with a focus on institutions, the processes through which elites actions shape government policy and the social impact of collective policy decisions. We will end the quarter by returning to questions of representation and the organization of interests.

The study of American political institutions experienced a major renaissance in the 1980’s and 1990’s. This so-called “new institutionalism” was intertwined with an integration of social choice theory, game theory and microeconomic reasoning into the discipline. Our reading list reflects the significant role mathematical modeling has played in the study of institutions. We recognize, however, that many students will have little (if any) experience reading this kind of material. We will help you develop strategies for reading formal models and understanding their main point. We have assigned a textbook (Kenneth Shepsle’s Analyzing Politics) that presents key results from social choice and microeconomic theory in a relatively accessible format, and will devote the second meeting of the quarter (January 14) to an overview of social choice theory as background for the study of institutions.

**Prerequisites**
You should not take this class if you have not taken PS 260A. If you took 260A prior to Fall 2014, you should make sure that you have carefully read and thought about the work assigned last quarter (syllabus at https://moodle2.sscnet.ucla.edu/course/view/14F-POLSCI260A-1.) Prior versions of 260A focused on political behavior topics; this year’s version also covered issues related to representation. In order to effectively participate in 260B, you should be familiar with the literatures covered last quarter: mass behavior, elections and representation. The final exam for 260B will require you to integrate material from both Fall and Winter quarter.
Requirements
We expect you to attend each meeting and fully participate in the discussion. Social scientific arguments are complex: the ability to discuss them accurately and productively only comes with practice. If you don’t talk, we cannot assess whether you are engaging the material in a productive way. More important, you cannot accurately assess your own progress from a consumer of knowledge to a producer unless you actively participate in the discussion as it develops.

Grading
Winter quarter grades are computed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Class Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Weekly Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Final Exam covering material from 260A and 260B. Due 3/16.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cocktail Party
We will continue to open each class with a “cocktail party.” We will go around the room and ask each of you to give us your one sentence, cocktail-party statement about the week’s readings. Cocktail party statements are precise and concise, something that conveys the major takeaway point in ordinary language.

Weekly Page
The Weekly Page is a single page summary of one of the major readings, answering the following questions:

1. What is the question under investigation?
2. What is the argument in this work?
3. How does the evidence support the argument?
4. How could the work be made better?

An ideal answer takes up about ½ of a page of paper; do not submit anything longer than one page. You must turn in a Weekly Page in eight of the ten weeks of 260B. Grading is simple:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>you did not hand in the Weekly Page by class time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>you have not met our expectations, needs serious improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>you have met our expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Proposal
(Details TBD)

Final Exam
You will be given a take-home essay topic that will allow you to demonstrate your cumulative understanding of the works studied in PS 260A-B.
Books
You should buy the following books. Others readings will be available online.

Bartels, Larry. *Unequal Democracy*
Cameron, Charles. *Veto Bargaining*
Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins. *Setting the Agenda*
Kernell, Samuel. *Going Public*
Krehbiel, Keith. *Pivotal Politics*
Krehbiel, Keith. *Information and Legislative Organization*
Shepsle, Kenneth. *Analyzing Politics, 2nd ed*
Reading Schedule (tentative)

January 7: Dynamics of Gridlock (CT/LV)


January 14: Coalitions, Majority Rule and Legislative Decision-Making. (KB/CT)

January 21: Congress: Parties vs. Preferences(CT/KB)
Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins. 2005. *Setting the Agenda*.

January 28: Congress: Committees (KB/CT)


February 4: The Presidency (KB/LV)


February 11: Bureaucracy and Policy Implementation (KB/CT)


Huber, John D., Charles R. Shipan, and Madelaine Pfahler. ”Legislatures and statutory control of bureaucracy.” *AJPS* pp. 330-345.

February 18: Inequality (CT/KB)
Bartels, Larry. 2010. *Unequal Democracy*. Ch. 9

Bonica, Adam, Nolan McCarty, Keith Poole and Howard Rosenthal. “Why Hasn’t Democracy Slowed Rising Inequality?”

Gilens, Martin. 2012. *Affluence and Influence*. Ch. 2,3,4, and 8
February 25: Interest Groups (KB/LV)


March 4: Collective Action, Mobilization and Social Movements (KB/LV)

Chong, Dennis Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement.

March 11: Manipulation or Accountability?


