

POLS 6611-01: American Politics Institutions: The Courts Spring 2016

Department of Political Science
Idaho State University

1 Instructor Information

Shane A. Gleason, PhD
Email: gleashan@isu.edu
Office: Gravely Hall 310
Phone: 208.282.2530

Office Hours: Tuesdays: 1:00pm to 3:00pm,
Wednesdays 11:00am to 12:00pm
and by appointment
Class Location: Graveley Hall 300
Course Time: 1:00 to 3:50 W

2 Course Description and Purpose

The aim of this seminar is to provide an introduction to the literature on the courts, particularly from a judicial behavior viewpoint. Particular emphasis will be placed on the Supreme Court, however we will also cover research that has been conducted on lower federal courts and state supreme courts. We will discuss some of the classics in the field of judicial politics as well as some of the more recent work that is being done by scholars of the courts. My goals are to: (1) introduce graduate students to the literature in judicial process and behavior and, in so doing, discuss some of the most important debates (both past and present) in the sub-field; and (2) underscore the importance of sound theoretical arguments, careful research designs, and compelling empirical results. This course is taught from the perspective that the study of courts should be (and currently is) closely connected to the theoretical and empirical traditions in American Politics. As such, we will focus on the scientific study of judicial process and politics, analyzing the substantive, theoretical, and methodological developments in the field.

This is a graduate level seminar, as such we will not use any textbooks. Rather, we will read the original journal articles from which textbooks are typically written. Additionally, an important skill for political scientists is to locate literature; as such I will not put journal articles on Moodle unless ISU does not have access to that journal (it is on you to let me know which articles ISU does not have access to).

3 Course Format

This course will be conducted in seminar fashion. That is to say, each week I will present a brief overview of the topic (15-20 minutes) and then we will have a discussion of the assigned works which will be led by a member of the class. Importantly, we won't take the literature at face value. We will discuss the findings in light of the research design employed therein, and ways in which future scholars can (and should) make it better. You will each lead the discussion several times over the course of the semester.

4 Requirements

Text

The majority of our readings can be obtained from the library's databases. Only when the library does not have access to a given article will I post it on Moodle (and again, it is on you to let me know which articles need to be put on Moodle). In addition, we will read a number of books. If you are planning to take your comps in public law I encourage you to buy these books. Otherwise, interlibrary loan or rental is fine. Given the small size of this class, none of the books are available at the campus bookstore. I encourage you to purchase your books online, which is in almost all instances *substantially* cheaper than the book store. I provide the ISBN for the book below to make locating them easier.

1. Segal, Jeffrey, and Harold Spaeth. 2002. *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **EXCERPTS POSTED ON MOODLE**
ISBN: 9780521789714
2. Maltzman, Forrest, James F. Spriggs II, and Paul J. Wahlbeck. 2000. *Crafting Law on the Supreme Court: The Collegial Game*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
ISBN: 9780521783941
3. Hansford, Thomas G., and James F. Spriggs, III. 2006. *The Politics of Precedent on the Supreme Court*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
ISBN: 9780691136332
4. Epstein, Lee and Jeffery A. Segal. 2005. *Advice and Consent: The Politics of Judicial Appointments*. New York: Oxford University Press.
ISBN: 9780195315837

Assessment

This course is worth 100 points which are broken up over several different items

- Practice Comprehensive Exam: 20 points
 - Paper Assignment: 70 points
 - Discussion Leader Assignment: 10 points
1. **Practice Comprehensive Exam (20 points)**—One of the most trying parts of a doctoral program is the comprehensive exam. In order to prepare you for your future exams, you will complete a “practice” comprehensive exam during finals week. The exam will consist of two essays. There will be two sets of two questions. From each set, you will select one question to answer. The exam will be conducted, during finals week without notes. As the semester draws to a close, let me know a four hour block in finals week that works for you (you don't all have to go at the same time).
 2. **Paper Project (70 points)**— You have your choice of two paper assignments, a research paper or three synthesis papers. You must let me know which one you would like to do by February 1. You should talk with me about which one you opt for, as the degree to which your research agenda is developed will dictate which is the best choice for you:

- **Research Paper**— You will write a research paper addressing some aspect of judicial behavior which includes original data analysis. The writing assignment will be broken up over several smaller assignments. For more information on the writing assignment please see the writing assignment handout which will be passed out on the first day of class and will also be available on Moodle.
 - **Additional Readings Synthesis**— You will prepare three five to seven page syntheses of one of the topics we discuss in class summarizing the key theoretical contribution of each piece and suggesting future avenues for research (seriously, whatever you think might be of theoretical interest!). Importantly, you should focus in on one aspect of the topic **and** you should search for recent scholarship not listed on the syllabus to make your argument. This is perhaps best done by using the “cited by” function in Google Scholar. Importantly, these papers should not be a list of summaries, rather you should weave them into a cohesive whole. For more information see the Synthesis Supplement.
3. **Discussion Leader Assignment (10 points)**— This class is not a lecture, rather it is a seminar based on discussion. To that end, each of you will lead discussion a few times over the course of the semester and provide a list of *at least* five questions to me by Monday at 4pm to review— I will get back to you with any feedback I might have and you should e-mail the questions to your peers by 4pm on Tuesday. I will go over how to do this on the first class meeting.

Assessment Scale

A: 93-100	A-: 90-92	B+: 87-89	B: 83-86	B-: 80-82	C+: 77-79
C: 73-76	C-: 70-72	D+: 67-69	D: 63-66	D-: 60-62	F: <60

An Important Note About Grades

I do not post grades to Moodle; instead, I maintain an offline gradebook. Since the course is worth 100 points, you can keep track of your performance in the class by noting your scores on exams and assignments. Because of federal student privacy laws, I cannot discuss grades via e-mail. If you need a grade check for whatever reason, please let me know via e-mail the day before you want that check.

5 Course Policies

Contacting the Instructor

I am happy to help you via e-mail, telephone, and in person. I have several office hours posted, if my office hours do not fit your schedule let me know and we can schedule a meeting at a time that is more convenient. If you come to office hours you should come prepared; bring your book and notes and read the material in advance. You can call me on my office phone if you like, but e-mail may be faster if I am away from my desk. If you contact me via e-mail, I will respond within 48 hours, though in most cases it will be less than six hours. However, in any e-mail you must identify yourself and use proper format which consists of an opening (As simple as the recipient’s name), a closing (as simple as your name), and a descriptive message subject. If you do not follow that convention or if you use Internet shorthand (ie: “u” instead of “you,”) I will not reply to the

message.

Make-up Exams and Assignments

To qualify for a make-up test a student must notify me of the absence in advance via e-mail and provide documentation. Make-up exams will be a written research paper.

Papers are due in hard copy at the beginning of the class on the date indicated in the schedule. I will not accept e-mail copies or papers placed under my door. Please do not be afraid to print multiple rough drafts and revise them before turning them in. I am happy to look at drafts and help you with crafting your final paper. I do not accept excuses about dogs, computers, or traffic. Be responsible.

Technology in the Classroom

I understand that laptops and tablets have become the primary means of note taking for many of you. To this end, you are welcome to bring those devices to class. *However*, I ask that you only use them for class purposes. So, you can take notes and view the readings, but please do not browse the Internet or update Facebook in class. The screens are distracting to those around you and takes away from learning. No cell phones are permitted to be out in class without first notifying me of a valid reason (i.e.: You're waiting on a phone call/ your kids are home alone).

Particularly with new technology, some students opt to record lectures to compliment their notes. If you wish to do so, please let me know before you record me. You are more than welcome to record, I just want to know when/if I am being recorded.

Extra Credit

As a graduate level class, there is no extra credit.

Academic Honor Code

Academic integrity is the expected norm for all academic activity at ISU, and all members of the ISU community are expected to act in accordance with this principle. Academic integrity is the pursuit of scholarly activity in an open, honest, and responsible manner. Consistent with this expectation is an ISU code of conduct 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 not to engage in or tolerate acts of deception, falsification, or misrepresentation. Such acts of dishonesty violate the fundamental ethical principles of the University community and compromise the worth of the work completed by others.

Plagiarism is an act of academic dishonesty and shall be dealt with according to ISU policy. Plagiarism is any misrepresentation of anothers work as your own. For example, copying portions of articles, papers, web pages, etc, or using portions of another persons work (either word for word or paraphrasing) without proper citations. If you have questions about plagiarism, please come talk to me, or refer to Plagiarism Statement written by the ISU Department of English and Philosophy:

(<http://www.isu.edu/english/DeptDocs/PlagiarismStatement.pdf>).

I adhere to the University policy regarding academic misconduct and expect academic integrity. Academic misconduct will result in an “F” for the assignment, a possible “F” for the course, and the filing of charges with the University against the student involved. Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to, taking credit for work done by others, cheating, and helping others to cheat. I encourage students to study together and exchange ideas and information, but you must do your own work when taking exams and completing writing assignments. If you are unclear on this topic, please let me know. I am happy to discuss it further.

Students with Disabilities

ISU is committed to providing equal opportunity in education for all students. If you have a diagnosed disability or if you believe you have a disability physical, learning, hearing, vision, psychiatric etc.) that might require reasonable accommodation in this course, please contact the Disability Services Center, Rendezvous Building, Room 125 (282-3599) or on the web at <http://www.isu.edu/ada4isu>. It is the responsibility of students to contact instructors during the first week of each semester to discuss appropriate accommodations. Of course any communication with me about disabilities remains strictly confidential.

Classroom Courtesy

Classroom courtesy is an essential component of creating an effective learning environment. All students have the right to learn without unnecessary distractions. These distractions include: cell phones, talking during lectures (unless recognized by the instructor), reading newspapers, falling asleep, etc. If you need a cell phone for emergency purposes, leave it on vibrate. Entering and leaving are also significant sources of distraction. It is your responsibility to be on time and to stay for the entire period. In circumstances where you need to leave early, tell the instructor beforehand. Repeated disruptions of class will lead to a reduction in your final grade.

Most importantly, class discussions of law will include several sensitive topics which can lead to strong feelings and heated debate. Because this is a college classroom, all discussion must be respectful and scholarly. This is to say you must be respectful, in both content and tone, of diverse opinions and not make personal or partisan attacks.

Acceptable Comments

- are respectful of diverse opinions and open to follow up questions and/or disagreement
- are related to class and/or the course material
- focus on advancing the discussion about issues related to the course and/or course material rather than personal beliefs, and
- are delivered in normal tones and a non-aggressive manner.

Unacceptable Comments

- are personal in nature. This includes attacks on a person’s appearance, demeanor, or political beliefs.
- include interrupting the instructor or other students. Raise your hand and wait to be recognized.
- often use the discussion to argue for political positions and/or beliefs. If political discussions arise, they must be discussed in a scholarly way (see above).
- may include using raised tones, yelling, engaging in arguments with other students and being threatening in any manner.
- include ignoring the instructor’s authority to maintain the integrity of the classroom environment.

Syllabus Change Policy

This syllabus is a guide for the course and is subject to change with advanced notice. These changes may come via e-mail. Make sure to check your university supplied email regularly. You are accountable for all such communications.

6 *Tentative* Course Schedule

A few notes about reading the course schedule:

- All articles can be found in the ISU library. If you come across an article that is not in the library, you should 1:) Check Moodle to see if it is posted there. 2:) If the article is not posted to Moodle, e-mail me and I’ll post it. “I could not find the article” is not an acceptable excuse for not doing a reading.
- You should read all assignments in order of publication unless otherwise specified via e-mail or in-class.
- Please be sure to reference the “How to read a journal article” handout as you read through the articles.

The Basics of Judicial Decision-Making

Wednesday, January 13– Judicial Preferences

- Segal and Spaeth. 2002. *The Supreme Court and the Attitudinal Model Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (**EXCERPTS ON MOODLE**)
- Glynn, Adam N. and Maya Sen. 2015. “Identifying Judicial Empathy: Does Having Daughters Cause Judges to Rule for Womens’ Issues?” *American Journal of Political Science*. 59:37-54.
- Braman, Eileen. 2006. “Reasoning on the Threshold: Testing the Separability of Preferences in Legal Decision Making.” *Journal of Politics*. 68: 308-321.
- Epstein, Lee, Valerie Hoekstra, Jeffrey A. Segal, and Harold J. Spaeth. 1998. “Do Political Preferences Change? A Longitudinal Study of U.S. Supreme Court Justices.” *Journal of Politics*. 60: 801-818.

Wednesday, January 20– Measuring Judicial Preferences

- Segal, Jeffrey A., and Albert Cover. 1989. “Ideological Values and the Votes of U.S. Supreme Court Justices.” *American Political Science Review*. 83: 557-565.
- Bailey, Michael A. 2013. “Is Today’s Court the Most Conservative in Sixty Years? Challenge and Opportunities in Measuring Judicial Preferences.” *Journal of Politics*, 75:821-834.
- Ringsmuth, Eve M., Amanda C. Bryan, and Timothy C. Johnson 2013. “Voting Fluidity and Oral Arguments on the U.S. Supreme Court.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 66:429-440.
- Bonica Adam and Michael J. Woodruff. 2015. “A Common-Space Measure of State Supreme Court Ideology.” *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*. 31:472-498.

Wednesday, January 27– The Role of the Law

- Hansford, Thomas G., and James F. Spriggs, III. 2006. *The Politics of Precedent on the Supreme Court*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Segal, Jeffrey A. 1984. “Predicting Supreme Court Decisions Probabilistically: The Search and Seizure Cases.” *American Political Science Review*. 78:891-900.
- Gates, John B., and Glenn A. Phelps. 1996. “Intentionalism in Constitutional Opinions.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 48:245-261.
- Richards, Mark, and Herbert Kritzer. 2002. “Jurisprudential Regimes in Supreme Court Decision Making.” *American Political Science Review*. 96:305-320.
- George, Tracey E. and Lee Epstein. 1992. “On the Nature of Supreme Court Decision Making.” *American Political Science Review*. 86:323-337.
- Fowler, James H. and Sangrick Jeon. 2008. “The Authority of Supreme Court Precedent.” *Social Networks*. 30:16-30.

Dynamics Within the Court

Wednesday February 3– Nominations & Confirmations

- Epstein, Lee, and Jeffrey A. Segal. 2005. *Advice and Consent: The Politics of Judicial Appointments*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moraski, Byron and Charles Shipan. 1997. “The Politics of Supreme Court Nominations: A Theory of Institutional Constraints and Choices.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 43:1069-1095.
- Johnson, Timothy, and Jason Roberts. 2004. “Presidential Capital and the Supreme Court Confirmation Process.” *Journal of Politics*. 66: 663-683.
- Epstein, Lee, Rene Lindstadt, Jeffrey Segal, and Chad Westerland. 2006. “The Changing Dynamics of Senate Voting on Supreme Court Nominees.” *Journal of Politics*. 68: 296-307.
- Massie, Tajuana, Kirk A. Randazzo, and Donald R. Songer. 2014. “The Politics of Judicial Retirement in Canada and the United Kingdom.” *Journal of Law and Courts*, 2:273-299.

Wednesday February 10– Agenda Setting

- Goelzhauser, Greg and Nicole Vouvalis. 2015. "Amicus Coalition Heterogeneity and Signaling Credibility in Supreme Court Agenda Setting." *Publius*. 45:99-116.
- Caldeira, Gregory and John R. Wright. 1988. "Organized Interests and Agenda Setting in the U.S. Supreme Court." *American Political Science Review*. 82: 1109-1127.
- Caldeira, Gregory A., John R. Wright, and Christopher J.W. Zorn. 1999. "Sophisticated Voting and Gate-keeping in the Supreme Court." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*. 15:549-572.
- Cameron, Charles, M., Jeffrey A. Segal, and Donald Songer. 2000. "Strategic Auditing in a Political Hierarchy: An Informational Model of the Supreme Court's Certiorari Decisions." *American Political Science Review*. 94: 101-116.
- Baird, Vanessa. 2004. The Effect of Politically Salient Decisions on the U.S. Supreme Courts Agenda. *Journal of Politics*. 66: 775-772.

Wednesday February 17– Leadership

- Maltzman, Forrest, and Paul J. Wahlbeck. 2004. "A Conditional Model of Opinion Assignment on the Supreme Court." *Political Research Quarterly*. 57:551-563.
- Crowe, Justin. 2007. "The Forging of Judicial Autonomy: Political Entrepreneurship and the Reforms of William Howard Taft." *Journal of Politics*. 69:73-87.
- Johnson, Timothy R., James F. Spriggs, II, and Paul J. Wahlbeck. 2005. "Passing and Strategic Voting on the U.S. Supreme Court." *Law & Society Review*. 39: 349-377.
- Schmidt, Patrick D., and David A. Yalof. 2004. "The 'Swing Voter' Revisited: Justice Anthony Kennedy and the First Amendment Right of Free Speech." *Political Research Quarterly*. 57:209-217.

Wednesday February 24– Opinion Writing & Bargaining

- Maltzman, Forest, James Spriggs, and Paul Wahlbeck. 2000. *Crafting Law on the Supreme Court: the Collegial Game*. Cambridge University: New York.
- Corley, Pamela C. 2008. "The Supreme Court and Opinion Content." *Political Research Quarterly*. 61:468-478.
- Szmer, John, Robert K. Christensen, and Erin B. Kaheny. 2015. "Gender, Race, and Dissensus on State Supreme Courts." *Social Science Quarterly*. 96:553-575.
- Spriggs, James. F. and Paul J. Wahlbeck. 1997. "Amicus Curiae and the Role of Information at the Supreme Court." *Political Research Quarterly*. 50:365-386.
- Hettinger, Virginia, Stefanie Lindquist, and Wendy Martinek. 2004. "Comparing Attitudinal and Strategic Accounts of Dissenting Behavior on the U.S. Courts of Appeals." *American Journal of Political Science*. 48:123-137.
- Lax, Jeffrey R. 2007. "Constructing Legal Rules on Appellate Courts." *American Political Science Review*. 101:591-604.

Other Actors at the Court

Wednesday February 24– The Court and Congress

- Nelson, Kjersten R. and Eve M. Ringsmuth. 2013. "Inter-Institutional Dynamics: Assessments of the Supreme Court in a Separation of Powers Context." *Political Behavior*. 35:357-382.
- Toma, Eugenia Froedge. 1991. "Congressional Influence and the Supreme Court: The

- Budget as a Signaling Device.” *Journal of Legal Studies*. 20:131-146.
- Randazzo, Kirk A., Richard W. Waterman, and Jeffrey A. Fine. 2006. “Checking the Federal Courts: The Impact of Congressional Statutes on Judicial Behavior.” *Journal of Politics*. 68:1006-1017.
 - Sala, Brian, and James Spriggs. 2004. “Designing Tests of the Supreme Court and the Separation of Powers.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 57:197-208.

Wednesday March 2– The Court and the President

- Johnson, Timothy R. 2003. “The Supreme Court, the Solicitor General, and the Separation of Powers.” *American Politics Research*. 31:426-451.
- Wohlfarth, Patrick C. 2009. “The Tenth Justice? Consequences of Politicization in the Solicitor General’s Office.” *Journal of Politics*. 71:224-237.
- Nicholson, Chris and Paul Collins. 2008. “The Solicitor General’s Amicus Curiae Strategies in the Supreme Court.” *American Politics Research*. 36:382-415.
- Black, Ryan C. and Ryan J. Owens. 2012. “A Built-In Advantage: The Office of the Solicitor General and the U.S. Supreme Court.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 66:454-466.
- Bailey, Michael A., Brian Kamoie, and Forrest Maltzman. 2005. “Signals from the Tenth Justice: The Political Role of the Solicitor General in Supreme Court Decision Making.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 49:72-85.

Wednesday March 16– Attorneys

- McGuire, Kevin T. 1995. “Repeat Players in the Supreme Court: The Role of Experienced Lawyers in Litigation Success.” *Journal of Politics*. 57:187-196. (M)
- Ringsmuth, Eve, Amanda C. Bryan, and Timothy R. Johnson. 2013. “Voting Fluidity and Oral Arguments on the U.S. Supreme Court.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 66:429-440.
- Provost, Colin. 2010. “When is AG Short for Aspiring Governor? Ambition and Policy Making Dynamics in the Office of State Attorney General.” *Publius*. 41:597-616.
- Paik, Anthony., John P. Heinz, and Ann Southworth. 2011. “Political Lawyers: The Structure of a National Network.” *Law and Social Inquiry*. 36:892-918.
- Wedeking, Justin. 2010. “Supreme Court Litigants and Strategic Framing.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 54:617-631.

Wednesday March 23– **SPRING BREAK: NO CLASS**

Wednesday March 30– Interest Groups

- Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M. and Dino P. Christenson. 2014. “The Evolution and Formation of Amicus Curiae Networks.” *Social Networks*. 36:82-96.
- Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M. Dino P. Christenson, and Matthew P. Hitt. 2013. “Quality Over Quantity: Amici Influence and Judicial Decision Making.” *American Political Science Review*.
- Collins, Paul M. 2007. “Lobbyists before the U.S. Supreme Court.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 60:55-70.

- Hansford, Thomas. 2011. “The Dynamics of Interest Representation at the U.S. Supreme Court.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 64:749-764.
- Caldeira, Gregory and John R. Wright. 1988. “Organized Interests and Agenda Setting in the U.S. Supreme Court.” *American Political Science Review*. 82:1109-1127.

Lower Courts

Wednesday April 6 State Courts & Actors

- Squire, Peverill. 2008. “Measuring the Professionalism of State Courts of Last Resort.” *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*. 8:223-238.
- Hall, Matthew E., and Jason H. Windett. 2013. “New Data on State Supreme Court Cases.” *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*. 13:427-445.
- Owens, Ryan J. and Patrick Wohlfarth. 2014. “State Solicitors General, Appellate Expertise, and State Success Before the U.S. Supreme Court.” *Law & Society Review*. 48:657-685.
- Gregory A. Caldeira. 1985. “The Transmission of Legal Precedent: A Study of State Supreme Courts.” *American Political Science Review*. 79:178-194.
- Hall, Melinda Gann. 2014. “Representation in State Supreme Courts: Evidence from the Terminal Term.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 67:335-346.

Wednesday April 13– Lower Federal Courts

- Szmer, John, Erin B. Kaheny, Tammy A. Sarver, and Mason DeCamillis. 2013. “The Impact of Attorney Gender on Decision Making in the United States Courts of Appeal.” *Journal of Women, Politics, & Policy*. 34:72-100.
- Boyd, Christina L. 2015. “Opinion Writing in the Federal District Courts.” *Justice System Journal*. XX:1-20.
- Budziak, Jeffery. 2014. “The Strategic Design of Visiting Judges in the U.S. Courts of Appeals.” *Justice System Journal*. XX:1-21.
- Giles, Michael W., Joshua Strayhorn, and Todd Peppers. 2015. “Policymaking under Constraint: Decision Modes in the U.S. Courts of Appeals.” *Justice System Journal*. XX:1-24.
- Boyd, Christina L., Lee Epstein, and Andrew D. Martin. 2010. “Untangling the Causal Effects of Sex on Judging.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 54:389-411.

The Court and the Public

Wednesday April 20– Public Opinion

- McGuire, Kevin T., and James A. Stimson. 2004. “The Least Dangerous Branch Revisited: New Evidence on Supreme Court Responsiveness to Public Preferences.” *Journal of Politics*. 66: 1018-1035.
- Flemming, Roy B. and B. Dan Wood. 1997. “The Public and the Supreme Court: Individual Justice Responsiveness to American Policy Moods.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 41:468-498.
- Bodderly, Scott S. and Jeff Yates. 2014. “Do Policy Messengers Matter? Majority

Opinion Writers as Policy Cues in Public Agreement with Supreme Court Decisions.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 67:851-863.

- Gibson, James L., Gregory A. Caldeira, and Vanessa A. Baird. 1998. “On the Legitimacy of National High Courts.” *American Political Science Review*. 92:343-358.

Wednesday April 27– The Court in a Democratic Society

- Funston, Richard. 1975. “The Supreme Court and Critical Elections.” *American Political Science Review*. 69: 795-811.

- Dahl, Robert A. 1957. “Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as a National Policy-Maker.” *Journal of Public Law*. 6:279-295.

- Casper, Jonathan. 1976. “The Supreme Court and National Policy Making.” *American Political Science Review*. 70:50-63.

- Flemming, Roy B., John Bohte, and B. Dan Wood. 1997. “One Voice Among Many: The Supreme Court’s Influence on Attentiveness to Issues in the United States, 1947-1992.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 41: 1224-1250.

- Howard, Robert and Jeffrey Segal. 2004. “A Preference for Deference?: The Supreme Court and Judicial Review.” *Political Research Quarterly*. 57:131-143.

Final Exam: A four-hour block in Finals Week (May 2-6, 2016).