

Spring 2017
SOVI 30900
Social Science Inquiry III

Professor Nalepa
mnalepa@uchicago.edu
The University of Chicago
T, Th: 9:00-10:20 a.m.
Wieboldt Hall 130
Office hours: Tuesday 3 - 5 p.m.

TA: Ji Xue
jixue@uchicago.edu
TA Office Hours:

Course description

This course is the third quarter of the year-long sequence devoted to positive methods of inquiry in social sciences with a specific focus on formal theory. In this class we focus on formal models of domestic politics. We will read a total of ten classical political science texts, all of which contain formal models that teach us something about the functioning of political institutions that we did not know earlier. The class is organized around seven classes of models: electoral competition under certainty and uncertainty, special interest politics, veto players, delegation, coalitions, and political agency. There are important political science topics that have been left out, most notably models of democratic transitions and regime change and all models of international relations. These classes of models are covered in other courses in the political science department and I encourage you to explore these offerings. It is the hope of the instructors that equipped with tools you learned during the first two quarters of the Social Science Inquiry Sequence, exposure to the formal models lying at the very foundation of contemporary political science will not only help you understand how strategies of conflict and cooperation structure political and social interactions, but also facilitate the development of your final projects.

Required and Recommended Material

The readings for this class are ten political science articles that have been uploaded to the chalk website. All students are expected to do the readings before the day they will be

discussed. Groups of 2-3 students will be asked to do the readings very carefully and to present them to the rest of the class. To prepare the presentation, you may use Beamer, Keynote, Powerpoint or any software of your choice. On the first day of class, you will be asked to list your top three presentation choices and the instructors will do their best to match you with fellow students who also want to prepare a presentation on that topic.

Group Presentations

Every other class, a group of 2 students will be tasked with the challenge of presenting to their classmates one of the classical articles on a topic discussed in the preceding lecture. The presentation should take roughly 30 -45 minutes, although because of interruptions (as students struggle to grasp the model and ask presenters clarifying questions) the presentation may slightly go over the time allotted. In preparing your presentation, you must present the model's motivation (what problem or literature was the author responding to), the formal model itself, and its solution. The discussion following the presentation will focus on the model's implications.

Final Poster

Throughout the quarter, you are encouraged to continue working on the project you initiated during the winter. My expectation is that you revise your papers, responding to Professor Penn's comments. You are encouraged to consult with us as you conduct those revisions during office hours. It is important that you realize that we expect you to improve on your Winter work. You will present the final project, your formal model, its solution and implications in the format of a poster. All posters will be presented at a special session in a different location. Please invite your friends to the Science Fair. We will provide snacks to share!

Mathematical prerequisites

The mathematical prerequisites for this course are rather modest. I expect you to know basic algebraic operation and elements of calculus. There will be a special session of the class devoted to reviewing the basics of calculus on April 19th. If you are familiar with calculus, you may skip this session.

Exams

There will one in class exam held on May 25th. You will be tested on material learned in the second quarter (Winter) of SSI as well as material covered in this class. The goal of the exam is to motivate you to study the material.

Grading

Grades will be assigned according to the following rubric:

A	81-100%
B	61-80%
C	41-60%
D	26-40%
F	0-25%

The requirement for this class will contribute to your final grade as follows:

Problem Sets	45%
Presentation	15%
Final Exam	15%
Final Poster	15%
Participation	10%

Problem Sets

There will be three problem sets (due **April 13, April 25, and May 16**) as well as a final exam (**May 25**). You will have 7 days to complete the exam.

Calendar

March 28: Introduction to SSI III

March 30: Hotelling-Downs Models

April 4: Presentation of Wittman model

Wittman, Donald A. Parties as Utility Maximizers. *American Political Science Review* 67, no. 02 (1973): 490-98.

April 6: Vote Buying

April 11: Presentation of Nichter Model

Nichter, Simeon. Vote Buying or Turnout Buying? *Machine Politics and the Secret Ballot*. *American Political Science Review* 102, no. 01 (2008): 19-31.

April 13: discussion preceding Jennifer Gandhi's talk:

Gandhi, J, John Ora-Reuter and "Expanding the Pie: Compensating Losers in Authoritarian Regimes"

April 18: Special Interest Politics

April 20: Presentation of Ashworth model

Ashworth, Scott. Campaign Finance and Voter Welfare with Entrenched Incumbents. *American Political Science Review* 100, no. 01 (2006): 55-68.

April 25: Veto Players

April 27: Presentation of Romer and Rosenthal model Romer, T. and H. Rosenthal (1978). "Political Resource Allocation, Controlled Agendas, and the Status Quo." *Public Choice* 33: 27-44.

May 2: Legislative Bargaining

May 4: Presentation of Baron-Ferejohn Model

Baron, David P., and John A. Ferejohn. Bargaining in Legislatures. *American Political Science Review* 83, no. 04 (1989): 1181-1206.

May 9: Delegation

May 11: Presentation of Johnson-Urpelainen

Johnson, Tana, and Johannes Urpelainen. "International bureaucrats and the formation of intergovernmental organizations: Institutional design discretion sweetens the pot." *International Organization* 68, no. 01 (2014): 177-209.

May 16: Political Agency

May 18: Presentation of the Barro-Ferejohn Model

Barro, Robert J. The Control of Politicians: An Economic Model. *Public Choice* 14, no. 1 (1973): 1942.

Ferejohn, John. Incumbent Performance and Electoral Control. *Public Choice* 50, no. 1 (1986): 525.

May 23: Review before final

May 25: Final Exam

June 1: Science Fair and poster presentations of your projects.

Other recommended readings

Bureaucracy, delegation, expertise, oversight

1. Huber, John and Nolan McCarthy 2004. "Bureaucratic Capacity, Delegation and Political Reform," *APSR* 98(3), 481-494
2. Gailmard, Sean and John W. Patty. 2007. "Slackers and Zealots: Civil Service, Policy Discretion and Bureaucratic expertise", *AJPS* 51(4) 873-889
3. Bednar, Jenna and Scott E. Page. 2007. "Can Game Theory Explain Culture? The Emergence of Cultural Behavior within Multiple Games" *Rationality and Society* 19(1):65-97.
4. Ting, M. M. (2003). "A Strategic Theory of Bureaucratic Redundancy." *American Journal of Political Science* 47(2): 274-292.
5. Bawn, K. (1997). "Choosing Strategies to Control the Bureaucracy: Statutory Constraints, Oversight, and the Committee System." *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 13(1): 101-126.
6. Gailmard, Sean. 2009. "Multiple Principals and Oversight of Bureaucratic Policy-making." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 21(2): 161-186
7. Gailmard, Sean. 2009. "Discretion Rather than Rules: Choice of Instruments to Control Bureaucratic Policy Making." *Political Analysis* 17(1): 25-44
8. Gailmard, S. (2002). "Expertise, Subversion, and Bureaucratic Discretion." *J Law Econ Organ* 18(2): 536-555.
9. McCarty, N. (2004). "The Appointments Dilemma." *American Journal of Political Science* 48(3): 413-428.

10. Figueiredo, R. J. P. d., Jr. (2002). "Electoral Competition, Political Uncertainty, and Policy Insulation." *The American Political Science Review* 96(2): 321-333.
11. Huber, John D. and Nolan McCarty. 2006. "Bureaucratic Capacity and Legislative Performance" in *Macropolitics of Congress*, E. Scott Adler and John Lapinski, eds. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
12. Ferejohn, J. and C. Shipan (1990). "Congressional Influence on Bureaucracy." *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 6: 1-20.
13. Hopenhayn, H. and S. Lohmann (1996). "Fire-Alarm Signals and the Political Oversight of Regulatory Agencies." *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization* 12(1): 196-213.

Principal-agent models

1. Sappington, D. E. M. (1991). "Incentives in Principal-Agent Relationships." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5(2): 45-66.
2. Maskin, E. and J. Tirole (1992). "The Principal-Agent Relationship with an Informed Principal, II: Common Values." *Econometrica* 60(1): 1-42.

Fair Division

1. Brams, S. J. and D. M. Kilgour (2001). "Competitive Fair Division." *The Journal of Political Economy* 109(2): 418-443.
2. Aumann, R. and M. Maschler (1985). "Game Theoretic Analysis of a Bankruptcy Problem from the Talmud." *Journal of Economic Theory* 36: 195-213.
3. Elster, J. (1992). *Local Justice. How Institutions Allocate Scarce Goods and Necessary Burdens*. New York, Russel Sage Foundation.
4. Kaminski, M., M. (2000). "Hydraulic Rationing." *Mathematical Social Sciences*.
5. O'Neil, B. (1982). "A Problem of Rights Arbitration from the Talmud." *Mathematical Social Sciences* 2: 345-371.
6. Young, P. (1987). "On Dividing an Amount according to Individual claims and Liabilities." *Mathematics of Operations Research* 12(No. 3 August 1987): 398 -414.
7. Young, P. (1994). "Equity in Theory and Practice." Princeton, Princeton University Press: 190 - 199 (Claims and Liabilities).
8. Young, P. (1994). "Equity in Theory and Practice." Princeton, Princeton University Press: 65-80 (Equity, Equality and Proportionality).

Legislative-Executive relations

1. Epstein, D. and S. O'Halloran (1996). "Divided Government and the Design of Administrative Procedures: A Formal Model and Empirical Test." *The Journal of Politics* 58(2): 373-397.
2. Huber, J. D. (1996). "The Vote of Confidence in Parliamentary Democracies." *The American Political Science Review* 90(2): 269-282.
3. Bernhardt, Dan, John Duggan and Francesco Squintani (2009). *American Political Science Review* 103 (4): 570-587
4. Ting, Michael M., (2009) "Legislatures, Bureaucracies and Distributive Spending" . APSA 2009 Toronto Meeting Paper. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1449846>

Signalling games

1. Farrell, J. and R. Gibbons (1989). "Cheap Talk can Matter in Bargaining." *Journal of Economic Theory* 48: 221-237.
2. Farrell, J. and R. Gibbons (1989). "Cheap Talk with Two Audiences." *The American Economic Review* 79(5): 1214-1223.