

POLS 675  
SUMMER 2005  
Dr. P. Hurley

Office Hours: By Appt.

## SEMINAR IN REPRESENTATION

At the heart of theories of democratic government is the notion that government acts in accord with public preferences. This course will consider the actual extent of opinion-policy correspondence in the United States, and examine the processes and institutions that promote or inhibit linkages between public preferences and public policy. Topics to be considered include conceptual and theoretical considerations on democratic linkage, methodological problems and prospects for the empirical assessment of representation, the impact of elections and political parties on the representative process in legislatures, dynamic representation, the representation of population subgroups, the conflict between district-based and national representation, and the effects of structural differences between legislative chambers (i.e. constitutionally specified and informal differences between the House and the Senate) on the opinion-policy linkage process. We will examine research on both state legislatures and the U.S. Congress.

This course is a research seminar. We will have a number of course meetings in which we review and discuss classic and contemporary literature on representation. Short written assignments (the character of which will vary) will be required. When a topic covers two class periods all students will write the short paper for that topic. On weeks when we cover two topics, one-half the class will write the assigned paper on one topic and the other half will write the assigned paper on the second topic. We will work out who does what explicitly in class prior to the week that the papers are due. The logic for this is to minimize the need for students to write two papers in any single week. Nonetheless, all students are expected to be prepared to discuss the assigned reading for each class period. These written assignments are due at the class meeting to which they apply. Papers will not be accepted after the class meeting to which they apply without a University-excused reason.

There are two options for the major paper for the class. Students may write an original research paper that takes the form of a research note on some aspect of representation. A second option is to write the equivalent of an NSF grant proposal (without a budget) for a projected project on representation.

Course grades will be assessed on the basis of class discussion (20%), short paper assignments (40%), and the paper (40%). There will be no exams.

### **ADA Statement**

The American with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal antidiscrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please contact the Department of Student Life, Services for Students with Disabilities in Room B-118 in the Cain Building, or call 845-1637.

**Aggie Honor Code: "An Aggie does not lie, cheat or steal or tolerate those who do."**

For more information about the Aggie Honor Code (stated above) see the Honor Council Rules and Procedures on the web: <http://www.tamu.edu/aggiehonor>.

## **SCHEDULE OF TOPICS**

### **June 1 Organizing Meeting**

### **June 6& 8 CONCEPTUALIZING REPRESENTATION**

James Madison. *The Federalist Papers* No. 10.

J. Roland Pennock. 1952. "Responsiveness, Responsibility, and Majority Rule," *American Political Science Review* 46: 790-807

H. Eulau, J. Wahlke, W. Buchanan, and L. Ferguson. 1959. "The Role of the Representative: Some Empirical Observations on the Theory of Edmund Burke," *American Political Science Review* 53: 742-756

H. Pitkin. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. (Berkeley: U. of CA Press). Ch. 10 "Political Representation." (Entire book is recommended)

J. Wahlke. 1971. "Policy Demands and System Support: The Role of the Represented," *British Journal of Political Science* 1: 271-290

H. Eulau and P. Karps. 1977. "The Puzzle of Representation: Specifying Components of Responsiveness," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 2: 233-254

R. Weissberg. 1978. "Collective v. Dyadic Representation in Congress," *American Political Science Review* 72: 535-547

Kuklinski, James H., and Gary M. Segura. 1995. "Endogeneity, Exogeneity, Time, and Space in Political Representation." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 20:3-22.

J. Mansbridge. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes.'" *Journal of Politics* 61: 628-657.

S. Dovi. 2002. "Preferable Descriptive Representatives: Will Just Any Woman, Black, or Latino Do?" *American Political Science Review* 96: 729-743.

J. Mansbridge. 2003. "Rethinking Representation." *American Political Science Review* 97: 515-528

J. T. Grant and T. J. Rudolph. 2004. "The Job of Representation in Congress: Public Expectations and Representative Approval." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 29: 431-445.

### **OF RELATED INTEREST:**

*Classics*

Edmund Burke. 1774. *Works* (various publishers)

John Stuart Mill. 1861. *Considerations on Representative Government* (various publishers)

Jean-Jacques Rousseau. 1762. *The Social Contract* (various publishers and translations)

*More Contemporary Work*

H. Eulau. 1967. "Changing Views of Representation," in I. de Sola Pool, ed. *Contemporary Political Science: Toward Empirical Theory* New York: McGraw Hill.

K.A. Shepsle. 1988. "Representation and Governance: The Great Legislative Trade-Off," *Political Science Quarterly* 103: 461-483.

B. Grofman and S. Feld. 1988. "Rousseau's General Will: A Condorcetian Perspective," *American Political Science Review* 82: 567-576.

D. Estlund, J. Waldron, B. Grofman and S. Feld. 1989. "Controversy: Democratic Theory and the Public Interest: Condorcet and Rousseau Revisited," *American Political Science Review* 83: 1317-1340.

Schwartz, T. 1995. "The Paradox of Representation," *Journal of Politics* 57: 309-23.

Jacobs, L.R. and R.Y. Shapiro. 1994. "Studying Substantive Democracy," *PS* 27: 9-17.

**ASSIGNMENT:** Write a brief (3 pages) paper addressing the following questions:

What is representation? What is a constituency? How do the assigned articles agree and disagree on these matters? Can there be any common agreement or do we need multiple definitions of these concepts? What do these conceptualizations imply for operational definitions of variables of interest to the empirical study of representation? For models of representation?

**June 13          OPINION-POLICY CONGRUENCE**

Weissberg, Robert. 1976. *Public Opinion and Popular Government*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Ch. 6 "Opinion and Policy Congruence: Domestic Issues" pp. 94-137.

Monroe, Alan D. 1998. "Public Opinion and Public Policy, 1980-1993," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 62: 6-28. [NOTE: This article is an update of a widely cited earlier work : Monroe, Alan D. 1979. "Consistency Between Public Preferences and National Policy Decisions," *American Politics Quarterly* 7: 3-19.]

Monroe, Alan D. 1983. "American Party Platforms and Public Opinion," *American Journal of Political Science* 27: 27-42.

Page, Benjamin and Robert Shapiro. 1983. "Effect of Public Opinion on Policy," *American Political Science Review*: 77: 175-90.

Brooks, Joel. 1985. "Democratic Frustration in the Anglo American Polities: A Quantification of Inconsistency between Mass Public Opinion and Public Policy," *Western Political Quarterly* 38: 250 -61.

Wright, G.C. Jr, R.S. Erikson, and J.P. McIver. 1987. "Public Opinion and Policy Liberalism in the American States," *American Journal of Political Science* 31: 980-1001.

P. Burstein. 2003. The Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy: A Review and an Agenda." *Political Research Quarterly* 56: 29-40.

**ASSIGNMENT:** Write a brief paper (approx 3 pages) on the following:

What is the extent of opinion-policy congruence? What do these authors identify as the sources of congruence? Do these articles tell us enough about how congruence is achieved?

## **June 15 CLASSIC EMPIRICAL WORK**

H. McClosky, P. Hoffman, and R. O'Hara. 1960. "Issue Conflict and Consensus Among Party Leaders and Followers," *American Political Science Review* 54: 406-27. [widely reprinted]

W. Miller and D. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress," *American Political Science Review* 57: 45-56. [widely reprinted]

R. Erikson, N. Luttbeg, and W. Holloway. 1975. "Knowing One's District: How Legislator's Predict Referendum Voting," *American Journal of Political Science* 19: 231-246.

J. Kuklinski and R. Elling. 1977. "Representational Role, Constituency Opinion, and Legislative Roll Call Behavior," *American Journal of Political Science* 21: 135-147.

D. J. McCrone and J. H. Kuklinski. 1979. "The Delegate Theory of Representation," *American Journal of Political Science* 23: 278-300.

R. Erikson. 1978. "Constituency Opinion and Congressional Behavior: A Reexamination of the Miller-Stokes Data," *American Journal of Political Science* 22: 511-35.

## *A NON-EXHAUSTIVE LIST OF OTHER CLASSICS*

W. Crane. 1960. "Do Representatives Represent?" *Journal of Politics* 22: 295-299.

- L. Dexter. 1957. "The Representative and His District," *Human Organization*: 16: 2-13.
- C. Cnudde and D. J. McCrone. 1966. "The Linkage between Constituency Attitudes and Congressional Voting: A Causal Model," *American Political Science Review* 60: 66-72.
- W. Shannon. 1968. *Party, Constituency, and Congressional Voting*. Baton Rouge: LSU Press.
- J. Turner and E. Schneir, Jr. 1970. *Party and Constituency: Pressures on Congress*. Revised Edition. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- R. Hedlund, and P. Friesema. 1972. "Representative's Perceptions of Constituency Opinion," *Journal of Politics* 34: 730-752.
- M. Fiorina. 1974. *Representatives, Roll Calls, and Constituencies*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co.
- A. Clausen. 1973. *How Congressmen Decide: A Policy Focus*. New York: St. Martin's.
- J. Kingdon. 1981. *Congressmen's Voting Decisions*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Harper and Row.
- R. Fenno, Jr. 1978. *Home Style*. Boston, Little Brown.
- P. Converse and R. Pierce. 1986. *Political Representation in France*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

For other classics, see also the bibliographies of the articles assigned.

**ASSIGNMENT:** Write a short paper addressing the following questions:

What are the major empirical research questions addressed in the assigned articles? Does this empirical work address any of the concerns of the authors we reviewed on the concept of representation? What interesting conceptual questions have not been addressed in this body of empirical work?

**June 20      METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES**

- Achen, C. 1977. "Measuring Representation: Pitfalls of the Correlation Coefficient," *American Journal of Political Science* 21: 805-815.
- Achen, C. 1978. "Measuring Representation," *American Journal of Political Science* 22: 475-510.
- Weissberg, R. 1979. "Assessing Legislator-Constituency Policy Agreement," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 4: 605-622.
- Stone, W. 1979. "Measuring Constituency-Representative Linkages: Problems and Prospects," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 4: 623-639.

McCrone, D. and W. Stone. 1986. "The Structure of Constituency Representation: On Theory and Method," *Journal of Politics* 48: 956-975.

Jackson, J. and J. Kingdon. 1992. "Ideology, Interest Group Scores, and Legislative Votes." *American Journal of Political Science* 36: 805-823.

Zaller, J. and S. Feldman. 1992. "A Simple Theory of the Survey Response: Answering Questions vs. Revealing Preferences," *American Journal of Political Science*, 36: 579-616.

Hill, K.Q., S. Hanna, and S. Shafqat. 1997. "The Liberal-Conservative Ideology of U.S. Senators: A new Measure," *American Journal of Political Science*, 41: 1395-1413.

### **OF RELATED INTEREST:**

Erikson, R. 1981. "Measuring Constituency Opinion: The 1978 U.S. Congressional Election Survey," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 6: 235-246.

Hurley, P. 1982. "Collective Representation Reappraised," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 7: 119-136.

Fowler, L. 1982. "How Interest Groups Select Issues for Rating Voting Records of Members of Congress," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 7: 401-413.

Hill, K., and P. Hurley. 1984. "Estimating Congressional District Attributes with National Election Study Data: A Reliability Assessment," *Political Methodology* 10: 447-463.

Powell, L. 1989. "Analyzing Misinformation: Perceptions of Congressional Candidates' Ideologies," *American Journal of Political Science* 33: 272-293.

Volden, Craig. 1998. "Sophisticated Voting in Supermajoritarian Settings," *Journal of Politics*, 60: 149-173.

K.Q. Hill. 2001. "Multiple-Method Measurement of Legislators Ideologies." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 26: 263-274.

**ASSIGNMENT:** Write a brief (3 page) paper identifying the major methodological problems associated with the study of representation as identified in the assigned reading. Can you think of any other methodological problems that these articles fail to identify?

### **June 23      ELECTORAL COMPETITION I: MARGINALITY & HETEROGENEITY**

M. Fiorina. 1973. "Electoral Margins, Constituency Influence, and Policy Moderation: A Critical Assessment," *American Politics Quarterly* 1: 479-498.

- B. Deckard. 1976. "Electoral Marginality and Party Loyalty in House Roll Call Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 20: 469-482.
- J. H. Kuklinski. 1977. "District Competitiveness and Legislative Roll Call Behavior: A Reassessment of the Marginality Hypothesis," *American Journal of Political Science*, 21:627-638.
- J. Sullivan and E. Uslander. 1978. "Congressional Behavior and Electoral Marginality," *American Journal of Political Science* 22: 536-553.
- Bailey, M. and D.W. Brady. 1998. "Heterogeneity and Representation: The Senate and Free Trade," *American Journal of Political Science*, 42: 524-544.
- B. Canes-Wrone, D.W. Brady, and J.F. Cogan. 2002. "Out of Step, Out of Office: Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting." *American Political Science Review* 96: 127-140.

**ASSIGNMENT:** Write a brief paper integrating the articles and addressing these questions: What effects do these authors expect marginality to have on legislative behavior and constituency representation? To what extent are these expectations supported by their analyses? How are expectations about marginality affected by the responsible parties vs. median voter models of representation?

**June 27            ELECTORAL COMPETITION II: INCUMBENCY ADVANTAGES AND REPRESENTATION**

- D. R. Mayhew. 1974. "Congressional Elections: The Case of the Vanishing Marginals," *Polity* 6: 295-317.
- M. Fiorina. 1977. "The Case of the Vanishing Marginals: The Bureaucracy Did It." *American Political Science Review* 71: 177-181.
- P. A. Hurley. 1989. "Party Dealignment and Policy Representation in the House of Representatives: Comparing Opinion-Policy Congruence in the 1950s and 1970s," *Congress and the Presidency* 16: 37-55.
- S. Ansolabehere, D. Brady, and M. Fiorina. 1992. "The Vanishing Marginals and Electoral Responsiveness." *British Journal of Political Science*, 22: 21-38.
- C. Maestas. 2000. "Professional Legislatures and Ambitious Politicians: Policy Responsiveness of State Institutions." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 25: 663-690.
- J. Box-Steffensmeier, D. Kimball, S. Meinke, and K. Tate. 2003. "The Effects of Political Representation on the Electoral Advantages of House Incumbents." *Political Research Quarterly* 56: 259-270.

**Assignment:** Write a brief paper integrating the readings and addressing these questions: these authors posit (and sometimes test for) an effect of the decline of competition on representation. How is representation affected by the decline of competition? Are the authors sufficiently precise about what types of representation are affected by the decline in competition? Is there sufficient clarity about the direction of the relationship between changes in representation and the decline of competition in congressional elections?

**For More Information on Electoral Competition I and II (a non-exhaustive list):**

D. MacRae. 1952. "The Relation between Roll Call Votes and Constituencies in the Massachusetts House of Representatives," *American Political Science Review* 46: 1046-1055.

D. R. Mayhew. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

M. Fiorina. 1974. *Representatives, Roll Calls, and Constituencies*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co.

M. Fiorina. 1977. *Congress: Keystone of the Washington Establishment*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 2nd. ed. 1989.

J. Ferejohn. 1977. "On the Decline of Competition in Congressional Elections," *American Political Science Review*, 71: 166-176.

Bartlett, Robert. 1979. "The Marginality Hypothesis: Electoral Insecurity, Self Interest, and Voting Behavior," *American Politics Quarterly*, 7: 498-508.

Stone, Walter J. 1980. "The Dynamics of Constituency: Electoral Control in the House," *American Politics Quarterly* 8: 399-424.

J. C. McAdams and J.R. Johannes. 1988. "Congressmen, Perquisites, and Elections," *Journal of Politics* 50: 412-439.

**June 29 REPRESENTATION IN THE SENATE**

Kuklinski, James H. 1978. "Representativeness and Elections: A Policy Analysis," *American Political Science Review* 72: 165-177.

Bullock, Charles S., III and David W. Brady. 1983. "Party, Constituency, and Roll Call Voting

- in the U.S. Senate," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 8: 29-43.
- Elling, Richard C. 1982. "Ideological Change in the United State Senate: Time and Electoral Responsiveness," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 7: 75-92.
- Thomas, Martin. 1985. "Election Proximity and Senatorial Roll Call Voting," *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 96-111.
- Wright, Gerald C. 1989. "Policy Positions in the Senate: Who is Represented?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 14: 465-486.
- C. Shapiro, D. Brady, R. Brody, and J. Ferejohn. 1990. "Linking Constituency Opinion and Senate Voting Scores: A Hybrid Explanation," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 15: 599-622.
- W. Schiller. 1995. "Senators as Political Entrepreneurs: Using Bill Sponsorship to Shape Legislative Agendas." *American Journal of Political Science* 39: 186-203..
- B. I. Oppenheimer. 1996. "The Representational Experience: The Effect of State Population on Senator-Constituency Linkages." *American Journal of Political Science* 40: 1280-1299.
- Wood, B.D. and A. Hinton Andersson. 1998. "The Dynamics of Senatorial Representation, 1952-1991," *Journal of Politics*, 60: 705-36.
- K.Q. Hill and P.A. Hurley. 2002. "Symbolic Speeches in the U.S. Senate and Their Representational Implications." *Journal of Politics* 64: 219-231.

#### **FOR MORE INFO:**

- Markus, Gregory B. 1974. "Electoral Coalitions and Senate Roll Call Behavior," *American Journal of Political Science* 18: 595-607.
- Dean, Gillian, John Siegfried, and Leslie Ward. 1981. "Constituency Preference and Potential Economic Gain: Cues for Senate Voting on the Family Assistance Plan," *American Politics Quarterly* 9: 341-355.
- Wright, Gerald C. and Michael B. Berkman. 1986. "Candidates and Policy in United States Senate Elections," *American Political Science Review* 80: 567-588.
- Bernstein, Robert A., Gerald C. Wright, Jr., and Michael B Berkman. 1988. "Controversy: Do Senators Moderate Strategically?" *American Political Science Review* 82: 237-45.
- Jackson, John E. 1974. *Constituencies and Leaders in Congress*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.
- R. Erikson. 1990. "Roll Calls, Reputation, and Representation in the U.S. Senate," *Legislative*

*Studies Quarterly* 15: 623-642.

R. Fenno. 1992. *The United States Senate: A Bicameral Perspective*. Washington DC: American Enterprise Institution Press.

Ahuja S. 1994. "Electoral Status and Representation in the Senate: Does Temporal Proximity to Election Matter?" *American Politics Quarterly*, 22: 104-118.

Oppenheimer, B. I. And F. Lee. 1999. *Sizing Up the Senate: The Unequal Consequences of Equal Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

W. Schiller. 2000. *Partners and Rivals: Representation in U.S. Senate Delegations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

**ASSIGNMENT:** Write a short paper summarizing the major research questions and conclusions regarding representation in the Senate. How do interesting questions about representation in the Senate differ from questions raised about representation in the House?

**July 4            EAT HOTDOGS, WATCH FIREWORKS – NO CLASS**

**July 6            INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATION**

Backstrom, Charles H. 1977. "Congress and the Public: How Representative is One of the Other?" *American Politics Quarterly* 5: 411-434.

Schwarz, J.E., B. Fenmore, and T. Volgy. 1980. "Liberal and Conservative Voting in the House of Representatives: A National Model of Representation." *British Journal of Political Science* 10: 317-339.

Hurley, P.A., 1982. "Collective Representation Reappraised," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 7: 119-136.

Erikson, R.S., G.C. Wright, Jr., and J. P. McIver. 1989. "Political Parties, Public Opinion, and State Policy in the United States," *American Political Science Review* 83:729-750.

Jackson, J. E. and D.C. King. 1989. "Public Goods, Private Interests, and Representation" *American Political Science Review* 83: 1143-1164.

NOTE: Weissberg (1978) from the first set of readings is also relevant.

[More articles may be assigned later.]

**ASSIGNMENT:** Write a short paper addressing the following questions:

What problems facing those who study dyadic representation are eased when thinking of representation as a collective phenomenon? What new questions does focusing on representation as a collective process allow us to address? What problems face the analyst interested in collective or institutional representation?

**July 11      ELECTORAL CHANGE, CRITICAL ELECTIONS, AND REPRESENTATION**

D. Brady and N. Lynn. 1973. "Switched-seat Congressional Districts: Their Effect on Party Voting and Public Policy," *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 17: 528-543.

D. W. Brady. 1978. "Critical Elections, Congressional Parties and Clusters of Policy Changes," *British Journal of Political Science* 8: 79-99.

W. J. Stone. 1982. "Electoral Change and Policy Representation in Congress: Domestic Welfare Issues from 1956-1972," *British Journal of Political Science* 12: 95-115.

P.A. Hurley. 1984. "Electoral Change and Policy Consequences: Representation in the 97<sup>th</sup> Congress," *American Politics Quarterly* 12: 177-194.

P. A. Hurley. 1989. "Partisan Representation and the Failure of Realignment in the 1980s," *American Journal of Political Science* 33: 240-261.

L.M. Bartels. 1991. "Constituency Opinion and Congressional Policy Making: The Reagan Defense Buildup," *American Political Science Review*, 85: 457-474.

J. H. Aldrich. 1999. "Political Parties in a Critical Era." *American Politics Quarterly* 27: 9-32.

D. Peterson, L. Grossback, J. Stimson, and A. Gangl. 2003. Congressional Response to Mandate Elections." *American Journal of Political Science* 47: 411-426.

**ASSIGNMENT:** Write a short paper that integrates the readings and address the following questions: What are the effects of electoral change on Congressional behavior? How does this relate to the issue of representation?

**For More Information:**

Weinbaum M. and D. Judd. 1970. "In Search of a Mandated Congress," *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 14: 276-302.

Sullivan, J. and R. O'Connor. 1972. "Electoral Change and Popular Control of Public Policy: The Case of the 1966 House Elections," *American Political Science Review* 66:1256-1268.

B.D. Sinclair. 1982 *Congressional Realignment*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

D.W. Brady. 1988. *Critical Elections and Congressional Policymaking*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

E. Carmines and J.A. Stimson. 1989. *Issue Evolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

P.A. Hurley. 1991. "Partisan Representation, Realignment and the Senate in the 1980s," *Journal of Politics* 53: 3-33.

A. Abramowitz. 1995. "The End of the Democratic Era? 1994 and the Future of Congressional Election Research." *Political Research Quarterly*. 48: 873-889.

Brunell, T. and B. Groffman. 1998. "Explaining Divided U.S. Senate Delegations, 1788-1996: A

Realignment Approach,” *American Political Science Review* 92: 391-399

M. Hood, Q. Kidd, and I. Morris. 2001. “The Key Issue: Constituency Effects and Southern Senators’ Roll Call Voting on Civil Rights.” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 26: 599-622.

### **July 13            STUDENT PAPER TOPIC PRESENTATIONS**

Each student will make a brief (15 minute) presentation to the class explaining the theory, design, and data for the course research paper (or grant proposal). The class as a group will critique and brainstorm on problems facing the researchers.

### **July 18            MINORITY REPRESENTATION I: Aspects of African-American Representation**

Overby, M.L. B.M. Henschen, J. Strauss, and M.H. Walsh. 1992. "Courting Constituents? An Analysis of the Senate Confirmation Vote on Justice Clarence Thomas." *American Political Science Review* 86: 997-1006.

Overby, M.L. and K.M. Cosgrove. 1996. "Unintended Consequences?: Racial Redistricting and the Representation of Minority Interests." *Journal of Politics* 58: 540-50.

Hutchings, V. 1998. “Issue Salience and Support for Civil Rights Legislation Among Southern Democrats,” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 23: 521-544.

C. Sharpe and J. Garand “Race, Roll-Calls, and Redistricting: The Impact of Race-Based Partisanship on Congressional Roll-Call,” *Political Research Quarterly* 54: 31-52.

K. Tate. 2001. The Representation of Blacks in Congress: Does Race Matter?” *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 26: 623-638.

C. Gay. 2002. “Spirals of Trust? The Effect of Descriptive Representation on the Relationship Between Citizens and Their Government.” *American Journal of Political Science* 46: 717-732.

V. Hutchings, H. McClerking, and G. Charles. 2004. “Congressional Representation of Black Interests: Recognizing the Importance of Stability.” *Journal of Politics* 66: 450-468.

**ASSIGNMENT:** Write a short (3-5 pages) paper addressing the following questions:

Some have argued that descriptive representation of minorities is necessary if they are to receive substantive representation. Based on the empirical evidence offered in these articles, is descriptive representation a necessary condition for substantive representation? Is descriptive representation a sufficient condition? How does this relate to issues of dyadic and collective representation?

**July 20      MINORITY REPRESENTATION II: Latinos and Women**

B. Feingold. 1992. "Concepts of Representation Among Male and Female State Legislators." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 4: 509-537.

Vega, A. and J.M. Firestone. 1995. "The Effects of Gender on Congressional Behavior and the Substantive Representation of Women." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 20: 213-22.

Hero R.E. and C.J. Tolbert. 1995. "Latinos and Substantive Representation in the U.S. House of Representatives: Direct, Indirect, or Nonexistent?" *American Journal of Political Science*. 39: 640-52.

Kerr, B. and W. Miller. 1997. "Latino Representation, It's Direct and Indirect: A Critique of Hero and Tolbert." *American Journal of Political Science* 41: 1066-1071.

Swers, M. 1998. "Are Women More Likely to Vote for Women's Issue Bills Than Their Male Colleagues," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 23: 435-448.

L. Schwindt-Buyer and W. Mishler. 2004. "An Integrated Model of Women's Representation." *Journal of Politics*. 67: 407-428.

**NOTE:** Additional reading on Latino representation may be assigned.

**ASSIGNMENT:** Do the findings of work on representations of women and Latinos confirm or contradict the findings of the work on representation of African-Americans? Should substantive representation of minority groups (these or others) be studied in isolation from one another? Is it possible to develop a general theory of representation of minority groups? Do any of these works (explicitly or implicitly) suggest a theory of minority representation?

**FOR MORE INFO ON ALL ASPECTS OF MINORITY REPRESENTATION:**

There is a very large literature on this question (some of it imbedded in work about other aspects of minority politics), too large to list here. But for more info, see:

Cameron, C., D. Epstein, and S. O'Halloran. 1996. "Do Majority-Minority Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress?" *American Political Science Review* 90: 794-812.

Overby, M.L. 1994. "The Senate and Justice Thomas: A Note on Ideology, Race, and Constituent Pressures." *Congress and the Presidency*. 21: 131-36.

Bullock, C.S. III. 1995. "The Impact of Changing the Racial Composition of Congressional Districts on Legislators' Roll Call Behavior." *American Politics Quarterly*. 23: 141-58.

Swain, Carol. 1993. *Black Faces, Black Interests: The Representation of African Americans in Congress*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press.

Thomas, S. 1992. "The Effects of Race and Gender on Constituency Service." *Western Political Quarterly*. 45: 169-80.

Gerber, E., R. Morton and T. Rietz. 1998. "Minority Representation in Multi-Member Districts," *American Political Science Review* 92: 127-144.

- Williams, Melissa. 1998. *Voice, Trust, and Memory: Marginalized Groups and the Failings of Liberal Representation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [This is normative political theory. The bibliography also cites some empirical work on this topic.]
- D. Canon. 1999. *Race, Redistricting, and Representation: The Unintended Consequences of Black Majority Districts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- D. Haider-Markel, M. Joslyn, and C. Kniss. 2000. "Minority Group Interests and Political Representation: Gay Elected Officials in the Policy Process." *Journal of Politics* 62: 568-577.
- C. Gay. 2001. "The Effect of Black Congressional Representation on Political Participation." *American Political Science Review*. 95: 589-602.
- M. Swers. 2001. "Understanding the Policy Impact of Electing Women: Evidence from Research on Congress and State Legislatures." *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 34: 217-220.
- M. Swers. 2002. *The Difference Women Make: The Policy Impact of Women in Congress*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- C. Levoux-Sharpe. 2001. "Congressional Responsiveness to Redistricting Induced Constituency Change: An Extension to the 1990s." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 26: 275-286.
- S. Weldon. 2002. "Beyond Bodies: Institutional Sources of Representation for Women in Democratic Policymaking." *Journal of Politics* 64: 1153-1174.
- R. Fenno. 2003. *Going Home: Black Representatives and Their Constituents*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- K. Tate. 2003. *Black Faces in the Mirror: African-Americans and Their Representatives in Congress*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

**July 25            COMPLEX LINKAGE MODELS**

Hartley, Thomas, and Bruce Russett. 1992. "Public Opinion and the Common Defense: Who Governs Military Spending in the United States?" *American Political Science Review* 86:905-15.

Gerber, Elisabeth R. and John E. Jackson. 1993. "Endogeneous Preferences and the Study of Institutions," *American Political Science Review*. 87: 639-656.

Hill, Kim Quaile, and Angela Hinton-Andersson. 1995. "Pathways of Representation: A Causal Analysis of Public Opinion-Public Policy Linkages." *American Journal of Political Science* 39:924-35.

Stimson, James A., Michael B. MacKuen, and Robert S. Erickson. 1995. "Dynamic Representation." *American Political Science Review* 89:543-65.

Wlezien, Christopher. 1995. "The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending." *American Journal of Political Science* 39:981-1000.

P. A. Hurley and K. Q. Hill. 2003. "Beyond the Demand-Input Model: A Theory of Representational Linkages." *Journal of Politics* 65: 304-326.

C. Wlezien. 2004. "Patterns of Representation: Dynamics of Public Preferences and Policy." *Journal of Politics* 66: 1-24.

**For more info:**

Costain, Anne N., and Steven Majstorovic. 1994. "Congress, Social Movements and Public Opinion: Multiple Origins of Women's Rights Legislation." *Political Research Quarterly* 47:111-36.

McGraw, Kathleen M., Samuel Best, and Richard Timpone. 1995. "What They Say or What They Do?" The Impact of Elite Explanation and Policy Outcomes on Public Opinion." *American Journal of Political Science* 39:53-74.

Page, Benjamin. 1994. "Democratic Responsiveness? Untangling the Links Between Public Opinion and Policy," *PS* 27: 25-29.

Wlezien, Christopher. 1996. "Dynamics of Representation: The Case of US Spending on Defence," *British Journal of Political Science* 26: 81-104."

Hill, Kim Quaile, and Patricia A. Hurley. 1999. "Dyadic Representation Reappraised," *American Journal of Political Science* 43: 109-37.

(Assignment is on next page)

**ASSIGNMENT:**

Write a short essay (approximately 5 pages) addressing the following questions based on the assigned readings.

Most of the work we have considered this semester assumes public opinion to be temporally and causally prior to congressional voting and public policy. Yet there have been hints that policy or other elite behaviors might influence public opinion, calling its status as a prime independent variable in the study of representation into question. Based on the empirical evidence presented in these articles, how likely is it that public opinion is endogenous to the representational process? If public opinion is endogenous, what does this imply about the adequacy of the traditional cross-sectional, dyadic designs for studying representation? If public opinion is endogenous, how must we modify the standard conceptualization of representation based on normative democratic theory?

(HINT: you might look at the model in the Kuklinski and Segura article we read early in the semester and decide what you think of it now.)

**July 27, August 1, August 3, August 8**

We will use these days as needed in one of two ways:

1. "Catch up" days in case any topic takes longer than the number of days it has been allocated on the syllabus
2. Days to work on papers independently and meet with instructor as needed.

**PAPERS DUE: Thursday August 11**

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Below are two topics that I have cut from this semester's course, but you should be aware of them if you are taking prelims in American Politics. I have not systematically updated the reading here, and there is a lot of work "out there" on these topics. See especially *Legislative Studies Quarterly*.

## HOMESTYLE, CASEWORK, AND PORK

R. Fenno, Jr. 1977. "U.S. House Members in their Constituencies," *American Political Science Review* 71:883-917.

Richard Fenno, *Home Style: House Members in their Districts*. Addison-Wesley: 1978.

NOTE: Fenno has numerous other books – often case studies of individual members of Congress, that are relevant to the topic of homestyle and representation.

J.R. Johannes. 1983. "Explaining Casework Styles," *American Journal of Political Science* 27: 530-47.

J. C. McAdams and J.R. Johannes. 1985. "Constituency Attentiveness in the House, 1977 - 1982," *Journal of Politics* 47: 1108-1139.

J.R. Bond. 1985. "Dimensions of District Attention Over Time," *American Journal of Political Science* 29:330-347.

R. K. Wilson. 1986. "What Was It Worth to be on a Committee in the U.S. House. 1889-1913?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 11:47-64.

J. Ferejohn. 1974. *Pork Barrel Politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Oppenheimer, B. I. 1996. "The Representational Experience: The Effect of State Population on Senator-Constituency Linkages." *American Journal of Political Science*, 40: 1280-99.

**Questions to consider:** To date, we have considered only the policy component of representation. But Eulau and Karps identify three others: allocation (pork), service (casework), and symbolic responsiveness. This week's readings address the issues of homestyle, casework, and pork. In a short paper, summarize and critique the assigned articles and conclude by addressing the questions: do these activities constitute meaningful representation? Is there any possibility that they undermine policy representation?

## LOBBYISTS, PACS, AND REPRESENTATION

Welch, W., 1982, "Campaign Contributions and Legislative Voting," *Western Political Quarterly* 35: 478-98.

Freindreis, J., and R.W. Waterman, 1985. "PAC Contributions and Legislative Behavior: Senate Voting on Trucking Deregulation," *Social Science Quarterly* 66: 401-12.

Wright, J. R., 1985. "PACS, Contributions and Roll Calls: An Organizational Perspective," *American Political Science Review* 79: 400-414.

Jones, W. and R. Keiser, 1987. "Issue Visibility and the Effects of PAC Money," *Social Science Quarterly*: 170-176.

Grenzke, J. 1989. "PACS and the Congressional Supermarket: The Currency is Complex," *American Journal of Political Science* 33: 1-24.

Wright, J. 1989. PAC Contributions, Lobbying, and Representation," *Journal of Politics* 51: 713-729.

See the excellent bibliographies in Grenzke, 1989 and Wright, 1989.

J. M. Bacheller. 1977. "Lobbyists and the Legislative Process: The Impact of Environmental Constraints," *American Political Science Review* 71:252-263.

Herrnson, P. 1988. *Party Campaigning in the 1980s* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press), has a discussion of the roll of national party organizations in putting candidates and PACS in touch with each other.

Fowler, L. and R. G. Shaiko, 1987. "The Grass Roots Connection: Environmental Activists and Senate Roll Calls," *American Journal of Political Science* 31: 484-510.

S. Shaffer. 1980. "The Policy Biases of Political Activists," *American Politics Quarterly* 8:15-33.

E. Carmines and J. Stimson. 1989. *Issue Evolution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Ch. 4.

Ainsworth, Scott, and Itai Sened. 1993. "The Role of Lobbyists: Entrepreneurs with Two Audiences." *American Journal of Political Science* 37:834-66.

Davis, Frank L. 1993. "Balancing the Perspective on PAC Contributions: In Search of an Impact on Roll Calls." *American Politics Quarterly* 21:205-22.

Evans, Diana. 1996. "Before the Roll Call: Interest Group Lobbying and Public Policy Outcomes in House Committees." *Political Research Quarterly* 49:287-304.

Fleisher, Richard. 1993. "PAC Contributions and Congressional Voting on National Defense." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 18:391-410.

Smith, Richard A. 1995. "Interest Group Influence in the U.S. Congress." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 20:89-160. (a review article)

**Questions to consider:** Write a short paper addressing the following questions:

Is there any consensus in the literature on the impact of PACs on voting behavior in the House and Senate? What might be the cause of diverse findings of the various authors? Can anything definitive be said about PAC influence in the Congress?