

POL 290A: Framing  
Winter 2016  
Wednesdays 9:00-11:50am  
593 Kerr Hall

**Instructor:** Dr. Amber Boydston  
**Email:** aboydstun@ucdavis.edu  
**Office:** 684 Kerr Hall  
**Office Hours:** M 10:00am-12:00pm and by appointment

This is a graduate seminar on framing, or the process of defining an issue from one perspective at the necessary neglect of alternative perspectives. We will consider the phenomenon of framing within and between at least three bodies of existing research:

- Large-N observational studies have sought to trace the framing of policy issues over time, testing whether shifts in media framing have a significant influence on shifts in public opinion and or policy. For example, U.S. media and societal portrayals of homosexuality are radically different today compared to, say, the 1950s, and these shifts have been linked to subsequent shifts in public opinion and the widespread legalization of same-sex marriage.
- Experimental studies have sought to understand the conditions under which different frames, from different sources, are differentially influential on different audiences. For example, more educated people tend to be less susceptible to framing effects.
- Finally, a small number of studies have tackled what is arguably the question most relevant to modern politics: In a competitive framing environment, what is the best framing strategy for each side of an issue or political campaign to employ? Given the wide acknowledgment of the importance of framing, it is perhaps an unusual characteristic of the framing literatures that they are plural, and poorly integrated.

Political communication studies commonly focus on framing. Public opinion scholars do so as well, as do those in public policy, social movements, social psychology, cognitive psychology, and in other fields. The work also covers the gamut in terms of methodological approach, including formal theories, experimental work, time series dynamics, content analysis, case studies of particular issues, elite interviews, mass surveys, and interpretive / qualitative analysis. Many of these literatures are completely distinct from the others, but there is a lot of room for mutual improvement by cross-pollination. Thus, one of the goals of this course will be to see what we can learn by discussing a wide range of studies.

A syllabus is like a contract, so I have tried to specify lots of details in the document to follow, sometimes in relatively harsh language. Don't be turned off. We will read and discuss a wide variety of very interesting ideas and you'll learn a lot in this class. I am excited to teach it and am looking forward to each week of what follows. I certainly hope it will be one of the best courses you ever take.

## Grading

Participation	20%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Participate in class</li><li>• Come prepared to discuss progress on your research paper</li><li>• In the weeks you are not writing a short paper, upload two questions/thoughts by <b>noon Tuesday</b></li></ul>	
Leading Class, 2 x 10% each	20%
Response Papers, 3 x 5% each	15%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Upload by <b>noon Tuesday</b></li></ul>	
Research Project:	
Memo	5%
Outline/Draft	10%
Paper	20%
Presentation	10%
<hr/> <b>Total:</b>	<hr/> <b>100%</b>

## Participation

There is no need to know anything about framing before taking this course. What is necessary is that you read, think, and talk—preferably in that order. Each week you should read all the readings, critically, and come to class prepared to discuss them. It is fine to come to class not having understood something, as long as you pose your questions to me prior to class (see below) and come to class prepared to discuss them. Short of extenuating circumstances—which you should discuss with me on the first day of class if not before—**silence is not acceptable in a graduate seminar.**

Class participation (showing up, having done the readings, having sent me your two questions in advance, and participating in the discussion with well-reasoned questions and/or responses) is worth 20% of your grade for this class, and I will not necessarily assign participation grades only within a narrow B+ to A range. Since there are only 10 class sessions, that's 2% of your final grade per class based just on participation. You can see this fact as a good thing or a bad thing, depending on your habits of preparation and procrastination. If you're used to coming to your graduate classes fully prepared and excited to participate, great. If not, let this course be a wonderful opportunity for you to turn over a new proverbial leaf.

### Falling Behind

Note that it's all too easy to fall behind in a graduate seminar. My best advice to you is this: Don't.

Reading is fundamental. If you ever come to class and for some extraordinary reason you have not done all the readings that were assigned, let me know before class indicating what readings you have not been able to do, and go ahead and participate in the seminar when discussion centers on the readings you did complete or on general topics. In other words, don't skip class, ever. If something happens and you can't do the bulk of the reading for some reason some week, give me your slip of paper and attend class anyway. If it is an isolated incident, I'll understand. If it's a pattern, I'll be uncomprehending. And never, under any circumstances, BS about a reading

you haven't done. If you don't tell me what you did not read and class discussion reveals it, I'll give you a zero for class participation that day.

### Weekly Questions/Thoughts

Each week you are not writing a response paper, you will be responsible for uploading two (2) questions/thoughts you have about the readings to the SmartSite course page (under "Assignments"—inline submissions please) by **Tuesday at noon**.

Think of these questions/thoughts as the next step in your "conversation" with the readings after you have:

- done the readings
- grappled with the material
- written your one-page response paper (if you're writing one that week)
- allowed everything percolate in your brain

Your questions/thoughts need to be compelling and well-reasoned, but they need not be deep or complicated. For example, "What does Figure 1 really tell us?" and "What are the far-reaching implications of this work for our understanding of democracy?" are both great questions—as long as you've spent some time mulling over these questions yourself and you articulate the relevant context of each question. In other words, I would never want to see either of these questions by themselves, but rather every question should be more like a paragraph, in which your prerequisite mulling is evidenced.

The questions/thoughts you and your colleagues submit each week—in combination with the one-page response papers—will help shape the agenda for our class session. When we discuss one of your questions/thoughts in class I certainly don't expect you to have the answers (or else you wouldn't have been wondering about that point in the first place), but I will expect you to contribute to the conversation by helping to articulate and motivate your idea.

### **Leading Class**

Being in charge of a seminar requires a different kind of engagement with the readings than is usually accomplished alone by participation. So in order to coax you to fully engage the readings—and toward the aim of preparing you to teach your own graduate seminars one day—I will ask each of you to lead (or co-lead) two seminars over the course of the quarter. Leading a seminar is a nuanced skill (one I certainly have not mastered), requiring at least three elements:

- An intimate knowledge of the readings and of the questions/thoughts and response papers submitted by your colleagues.
- A general game plan of the key points you want your colleagues to walk away from the seminar with (think comps questions).
- A talent for fostering conversation, allowing the conversation to progress organically without getting derailed, and an awareness of equal participation around the table.

I am, of course, happy to talk with you in advance of the class you will lead to help you prepare.

## **Response Papers**

You will be responsible for writing a total of three (3) response papers over the course of the quarter. During those weeks that you write a response paper, these response papers are due to me via SmartSite (under “Assignments”) by **noon on Tuesday** the day before class. They will be shared with the class leader(s) for that week but should not be distributed to other students.

Each paper should meet the following guidelines:

- name, date, and title listed at the top of the first page
- max 2 pages in length, not including bibliography
- single spaced
- 12pt Times New Roman font
- max 1 inch margins on all sides
- parenthetical citations
- bibliography on pg. 3 if needed

Like the questions/thoughts each of you will submit each week, these response papers will help provide structure for our in-class conversations. Response papers are your opportunity to further engage with the literature we are reading (as well as any additional literature you want to incorporate). You can write your response paper around a single article, or around two or more articles, depending on your interests. In any case, you should cover the descriptive material, summarizing the approach and findings of the article(s), in less than half a page, then use the remainder of the paper to pose questions, discuss implications, and suggest future directions. In composing your response paper, you should ground your discussion in the relevant readings for that week (as well as readings from previous weeks if you want). However, your paper should *not* be a lit review but rather a critical engagement of the literature, complete with your own well-reasoned and well-supported argument in response to the readings. You can agree with the readings, disagree with them, or suggest a different dimension of discussion altogether. What’s important is that you engage the readings and, in doing so, engage the larger questions under investigation.

## **Research Project**

In addition to the material we discuss in class, the core focus of this course will be on your research project.

Given the brevity of the quarter system, your paper need not be a full-length manuscript. Papers should focus on the development of a research project for an article-length treatment or a dissertation / NSF grant proposal. You should not simply write a literature review; the term paper must lead to a proposal for original research.

Since students may be at different stages in their graduate programs (and come from many different fields), your interests may be quite diverse. Your papers therefore may be either very specific, more literature-based, and from a variety of theoretical perspectives. I encourage both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The syllabus below allows for many “taking off points” for term paper projects and I encourage you to think of how a framing approach can be useful for a variety of studies.

Whatever your substantive/methodological approach, you should focus on developing not just an idea but also a game plan for how you will examine it. The development of an idea and game plan will look quite different from one paper to the next. But to give a sense of the scope of what I'm expecting, for a standard quantitative study, I would expect the paper to include: 1) a compelling research puzzle, 2) research question, 3) significance, 4) a brief annotated lit review / theory, 5) hypotheses, and 6) proposed data and research design. For papers (And if you have existing data you can use to test your hypotheses, by all means do so. The more you give me, the more feedback I can give you.)

I will encourage discussion of your term papers in class discussion so that all students can get a feeling for the range of studies being done and the strengths and problems of each approach. That means I may call on you at any time to update the class on your thinking about your project.

Note that it will be impossible to do well in this project by starting at the last minute, so I have built in two deadlines designed to keep you on track throughout the semester: a paper "memo" and an "outline/draft". These assignments also allow me to give you feedback along the way to push your project to a higher level. The grades associated with these interim assignments are not huge, but they do add up, so make sure to hand them in on time and to take them seriously. You will be pleasantly surprised what a good term paper you can do if you work on it regularly rather than all in a rush at the last second. (It may become a habit, who knows!)

Finally, you will be able to showcase your research project at the end of the quarter—we will have a presentation session on the last day of class (just for our class, but feel free to invite friends and colleagues).

## **Late Work**

Response papers, as well as questions/thoughts are due by Tuesday at noon the day before class. Response papers submitted after that, but before class, will be accepted but marked down a full letter grade. Response papers are not accepted after the respective class begins—even if you don't attend class. It's simply not fair to write a paper on a topic that has already been discussed.

The final research paper will not be accepted after the deadline, period. You are responsible for staying in touch with me throughout the quarter about your progress on your project, especially if you experience any difficulties.

## **Classroom Items**

### Disabilities

Please let me know in the first two weeks of class if you need any accommodation for a disability. No problem. But don't delay in letting me know.

### Academic Honesty

Study together but make sure the work you hand in is your own. I will not tolerate plagiarism or deception in any form.

### Effort

Don't come to class unprepared to participate.

### Diversity of Approach

Students in this class may be coming from American politics, comparative politics, political theory, or international relations within our department, from other departments at UC Davis, or from universities overseas. Therefore you may see a diversity of approaches and backgrounds. Take advantage of that fact and take seriously what you can learn from engaging with unfamiliar approaches. After all, if any one approach could answer every question in this literature, we would be in a very different world.

### Computers, Tablets, and Cell Phones

Turn them off, period. Pay attention to the discussion. Bring paper copies of the readings, and a pad and pen to take notes.

### **Required Books**

The following books are available at the UC Davis campus bookstore, although for the sake of your bank account I encourage you to consider buying used copies (in a bookstore or online). I'm also happy to loan an extra copy if I have it.

Iyengar, Shanto and Donald R. Kinder. 2010. *News That Matters: Television and American Opinion*. Second Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baumgartner, Frank R., Suzanna L. De Boef and Amber E. Boydstun. 2008. *The Decline of the Death Penalty and the Discovery of Innocence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

ONE of the following:

- McCall, Leslie. 2013. *The Undeserving Rich: American Beliefs about Inequality, Opportunity, and Redistribution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth M. 2003. *Conceiving Risk, Bearing Responsibility: Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and the Diagnosis of Moral Disorder*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schrad, Mark Lawrence. 2010. *The Political Power of Bad Ideas: Networks, Institutions, and the Global Prohibition Wave*. New York: Oxford University Press.

## Weekly Topics and Assignments

You should do the assigned readings before the seminar. All journal articles are available as links on the SmartSite course page. Everything is required unless noted as optional. Each week, readings are listed in the suggested order in which to read them.

### Week 1

#### **January 6: Introductions and Overview**

- syllabus (read in full)

### Week 2      *Leader: Ross*                      *Papers: Kendra, Shannon, Daniel*

#### **January 13: Cognitive Basics**

- Tversky, Amos and Daniel Kahneman. 1981. "The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice." *Science*, 211 (4481): 453-458.
- Stone, Deborah A. 1989. Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas. *Political Science Quarterly* 104, 2 (Summer): 281–300.
- Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. 1993. Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy. *American Political Science Review* 87 (2): 334–47.
- Druckman, James N. 2004. Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects. *American Political Science Review* 98 (4): 761–86.

Optional, in case you're interested:

- Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1974. Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science* 185 (4157): 1124-31.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1985. Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science. *American Political Science Review* 79: 293–304.
- Slovic, Paul. 1987. Perception of Risk. *Science* 236 (4799): 280-85.
- Quattrone, George A., and Amos Tversky. 1988. Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analyses of Political Choice. *American Political Science Review* 82, 3 (Sept.): 719–736.
- Dijksterhuis, Ap. 2004. Think Different: The Merits of Unconscious Thought in Preference Development and Decision Making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87 (5): 586–98.
- Graham, Jesse, Jonathan Haidt, and Brian A. Nosek. 2009. Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96, 5: 1029–46.
- Kahneman, Daniel. 2013. *Thinking Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Due Tuesday, January 19 by 9am (under my door): One-page memo describing your term paper topic in conceptual terms and a general idea of the empirical / theoretical approach, relevant literature, and your goals in it (article project, MA thesis idea, PhD idea, etc.)**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Week 3      *Leader: Kendra      Papers: Maria, Sam, Daniel***

**January 20: Agenda-Setting, Priming and Framing, Oh My!**

- Druckman, James N., Lawrence R. Jacobs, and Eric Ostermeier. 2004. Candidate Strategies to Prime Issues and Image. *Journal of Politics* 66 (4): 1180-1202.
- Entman, R. M. 1993. Framing: Towards Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication* 43 (4): 51–58.
- Chong, Dennis and James N. Druckman. 2007. “Framing Theory.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 10: 103-126.
- Scheufele, Dietram A. and David Tewksbury. 2007. "Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models." *Journal of communication* 57 (1): 9-20.
- Michael A. Cacciatore, Dietram A. Scheufele and Shanto Iyengar. 2016. “The End of Framing as we Know it ... and the Future of Media Effects.” *Mass Communication and Society*, 19 (1): 7-23.

**Week 4      *Leader: Maria      Papers: Shannon, Kendra, Gento***

**January 27: Motivated Reasoning**

- Kunda, Ziva. 1990. The Case for Motivated Reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin* 108(3): 480-98.
- Redlawsk, David P. 2002. Hot Cognition or Cool Consideration? Testing the Effects of Motivated Reasoning on Political Decision Making. *Journal of Politics* 64, 4: 1021-1044.
- Taber, Charles S. and Milton Lodge. 2006. Motivated Skepticism in the Evaluation of Political Beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (3): 755-69.
- Bizer, George Y., Zakary L. Tormala, Derek D. Rucker, and Richard E. Petty. 2006. Memory-Based Versus On-Line Processing: Implications for Attitude Strength. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 42: 646-653.
- Eric Groenendyk and Yanna Krupnikov “What Motivates Reasoning? A Goal Oriented Theory of Evaluation.” Working Paper.

Also, in case you're interested:

- Lodge, Milton and Charles S. Taber. 2000. "Three steps toward a theory of motivated political reasoning". In Lupia, Arthur, Mathew D. McCubbins and Samuel L. Popkin (eds), *Elements of Reason: Cognition, Choice and Bounds of Rationality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lord, Charles G., Lee Ross, and Mark R. Lepper. 1979. Biased Assimilation and Attitude Polarization: The Effects of Prior Theories on Subsequently Considered Evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37 (11): 2098-2109.
- Tormala, Zakary L., and Richard E. Petty. 2001. On-Line Versus Memory-Based Processing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27, 12: 1599-1612.
- Conover, Pamela Johnston and Stanley Feldman. 1984. How People Organize the Political World: A Schematic Model. *American Journal of Political Science* 28 (1): 95-126.
- Ditto, Peter H. and David F. Lopez. 1992. Motivated Skepticism: Use of Differential Decision Criteria for Preferred and Nonpreferred Conclusions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 63 (4): 568-84.
- Edwards, Kari, and Edward E. Smith. 1996. A Disconfirmation Bias in the Evaluation of Arguments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 71 (1): 5-24.
- Schumann, David W., Richard E. Petty, and D. Scott Clemons. 1990. Predicting the Effectiveness of Different Strategies of Advertising Variation: A Test of the Repetition-Variation Hypotheses. *Journal of Consumer Research* 17: 192-202.

Week 5      Leader: Isaac      Papers: Sam, Daniel, Ross

**February 3: From Internal Cognitive Processes to Framing Effects**

- Kuklinski, James H., Paul J. Quirk, Jennifer Jerit, David Schweider, and Robert F. Rich. 2000. Misinformation and the Currency of Democratic Citizenship. *Journal of Politics* 62 (3): 790-816.
- Gaines, Brian J., James H. Kuklinski, Paul J. Quirk, Buddy Peyton and Jay Verkuilen. 2007. Interpreting Iraq: Partisanship and the Meaning of Facts. *Journal of Politics* 69 (4): 957-74.
- Peffley, Mark and Jon Hurwitz. 2007. Persuasion and Resistance: Race and the Death Penalty in America. *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4): 996-1012.
- Nyhan, Brendan and Jason Reifler. 2010. When Corrections Fail: The Persistence of Political Misperceptions. *Political Behavior* 32: 303–30.
- Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson, and Zoe M. Oxley. 1997. Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance. *American Political Science Review* 91, 3 (Sept.): 567–583.

Week 6      Leader: Sam      Papers: Isaac, Maria, Ross

**February 10: Media Framing Effects**

- McCombs, Maxwell and Donald Shaw. 1972. The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36, 2 (Summer): 176–87.
- Berinsky, Adam J., and Donald R. Kinder. 2006. Making Sense of Issues through Media Frames: Understanding the Kosovo Crisis. *Journal of Politics* 68, 3 (August): 640–56.
- Iyengar, Shanto and Donald R. Kinder. 2010. *News That Matters: Television and American Opinion*. Second Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Due Tuesday, February 15 by 9am: Outline/draft of paper. This should include a full structure, planned cites, methods, etc. The text need not be written but the structure should be complete, in outline form if not in full prose. You'll be surprised how easy it is to complete the paper if you have a complete outline in the proper order.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**February 17: Source Credibility and Competitive (Re)Framing**

- Chaiken, Shelly. 1980. Heuristic Versus Systematic Information Processing and the Use of Source Versus Message Cues in Persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39, 5: 752-66.
- Slothuus, Rune, and Claes H. de Vreese. 2010. Political Parties, Motivated Reasoning, and Issue-Framing Effects. *Journal of Politics* 72, 3: 630–45.
- Klar, Samara, Joshua Robison, and James N. Druckman. 2013. “Political Dynamics of Framing.” In Travis N. Ridout (ed.) *New Directions in Media and Politics*, New York: Routledge.
- Chong, Dennis and James N. Druckman. 2013. “Counterframing Effects.” *Journal of Politics* 75: 1-16.
- Clifford, Scott, and Jennifer Jerit. 2013. How Words Do the Work of Politics: Moral Foundations Theory and the Debate over Stem Cell Research. *Journal of Politics* 75(3): 659-71.
- Ledgerwood, Alison and Amber E. Boydston. 2014. Sticky Prospects: Loss Frames Are Cognitively Stickier Than Gain Frames *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(1):376-85.

Optional, in case you’re interested:

- Chaiken, Shelly. 1979. Communicator Physical Attractiveness and Persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37, 8: 1387-97.
- Riker, William H. 1986. *The Art of Political Manipulation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, ch. 10, Warren Magnuson and Nerve Gas.
- Druckman, James N. 2001. On the Limits of Framing Effects: Who Can Frame? *Journal of Politics* 63, 4 (November): 1041–66.
- Druckman, James N., and Kjersten R. Nelson. 2003. Framing and Deliberation: How Citizens’ Conversations Limit Elite Influence. *American Journal of Political Science* 47, 4 (October): 729–45.
- Chong, Dennis and James N. Druckman. 2007. Framing Public Opinion in Competitive Democracies. *American Political Science Review* 101, 4: 637-55.
- Jerit, Jennifer. 2008. “Issue Framing and Engagement: Rhetorical Strategy in Public Policy Debates.” *Political Behavior*, 30: 1-24.

\*\*\*\*\*

***5 points extra credit if you turn in your research paper by 4pm on Monday, February 22)***

\*\*\*\*\*

## Week 8     **Leader: Shannon**     **Papers: Kendra, Isaac**

### **February 24:** The Policy Effects of Framing

- Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 1991. Agenda Dynamics and Policy Subsystems. *Journal of Politics* 53 (November): 1044–74.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., Suzanna L. De Boef and Amber E. Boydston. 2008. *The Decline of the Death Penalty and the Discovery of Innocence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, Max, and Frank R. Baumgartner. 2013. Framing the Poor: Media Coverage and US Poverty Policy, 1960–2008. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41, 1: 22–53.

Optional, in case you're interested:

- Campbell, John L. 2002. Ideas, Politics, and Public Policy. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 21-38.
- Hall, Peter A. 1993. Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics* 25: 275–96.
- Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 611-39.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Due Monday, February 29 by 4pm: Research paper (5 extra points if turned in by Feb. 22)**

\*\*\*\*\*

## Week 9

### **March 2: Framing: A Hinge Between Good vs. Bad Ideas?**     **Papers: Ross, Maria, Isaac**

**\*\*\* Read ONE (or more!) of the following: \*\*\***

- McCall, Leslie. 2013. *The Undeserving Rich: American Beliefs about Inequality, Opportunity, and Redistribution*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth M. 2003. *Conceiving Risk, Bearing Responsibility: Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and the Diagnosis of Moral Disorder*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Schrad, Mark Lawrence. 2010. *The Political Power of Bad Ideas: Networks, Institutions, and the Global Prohibition Wave*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Optional, in case you're interested:

- Scheve, Kenneth, and David Stasavage. 2012. Democracy, War, and Wealth: Lessons from Two Centuries of Inheritance Taxation. *American Political Science Review* 106, 1 (February): 81-102.
- Jones, Kenneth L., David W. Smith, Christy N. Ulleland, and Ann Pytkowicz Streissguth. 1973. Pattern of Malformation in Offspring of Chronic Alcoholic Mothers. *The Lancet* 1, 7815 (9 June): 1267–71.
- Jones, Bryan and Walter Williams. 2007. *The Politics of Bad Ideas: The Great Tax Cut Delusion and the Decline of Good Government in America*. New York: Routledge.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., Jeffrey M. Berry, Marie Hojnacki, David C. Kimball, and Beth L. Leech. 2009. *Lobbying and Policy Change: Who Wins, Who Loses, and Why*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. **Chapter 9:** Washington: The Real No-Spin Zone, pp. 166-89.

## Week 10

### **March 9: Research Project Presentations**

- 10 minutes for presentation
- 2-3 minutes for Q&A
- 2-3 minutes for general feedback
- 3-5 minutes for lotus or pigeon pose