

**POS 5427 Legislative Politics
Fall 2005**

Dr. Cherie Maestas
Cherie.maestas@fsu.edu
Bellamy 558
644-7324

Office Hours: Tues 2:30 – 4:30
or by appointment

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this course is to help you learn how to ask and answer original research questions related to the study of U.S. legislatures and their members. Accordingly, this course has two goals: to introduce you to a broad range of legislative research and to explore how to critically assess and extend that research.

The course will begin with an overview of the structure and purpose of the U.S. Congress and U.S. state legislatures. The broad topical areas we will cover include legislative elections, individual behavior of legislators, institutional design, and institutional function. We will give special attention to the themes of representation and institutional development throughout the course.

The focus of this course is depth rather than breadth so we will read only a small sampling of the voluminous literature on Congress and U.S. state legislatures. I have chosen to limit the reading load to encourage you to spend more time considering each of the readings in depth. You will need to do additional research and reading outside of this material to complete your final research paper. This course is a seminar, so you will be expected to come to class prepared to participate fully in discussing the readings.

GRADE COMPONENTS

Homework and Participation (40% of final grade)

Reaction Papers	20%
Participation	20%
Proposal Critique	10%

Original Research Requirement (50% of final grade)

Research Proposal	10%
Response to Critique	10%
Research Paper & Presentation	30%

HOMEWORK

Reaction Papers

Reaction papers are a **one page single-spaced** "reaction" to the readings that offer your critiques and suggestions for future study. In your reactions, you might identify and expand on common themes among the readings, question empirical evidence, identify questions that are not addressed by the authors, suggest alternative perspectives, identify weakness in the logic of the arguments, or explain how the perspectives from other fields/areas of study might enhance the understanding of research questions in this area. You need not discuss every single reading for that week in the reaction paper, but you must cover multiple readings and/or demonstrate that your reactions to one reading are informed by other readings from that week.

Reaction papers must be submitted over e-mail to the entire class by 5:00 p.m. on the Monday before class is scheduled to meet. You should plan to print and read your colleagues reactions to the readings prior to attending class. Since the primary purpose of these papers is to prepare you for classroom discussion, I will not accept late papers. Late papers will score a 0.

Each reaction paper will be graded on a 3 point scale, where a grade of 3 = exceptional, 2 is acceptable and 1 is below graduate level standards. A total of 42 reaction paper points are possible, but for final grading, I will divide your total points by 32. This allows you score less than "3" on a number of reaction papers and still receive an "A" or "B" on this portion of your grade. Please be aware, 2 is the typical grade on reaction papers. Only papers that demonstrate the highest-quality analytic arguments will receive a 3.

Proposal Critique

You will be assigned the research paper proposal of one of your classmates to critique. You must provide your colleague with a thorough set of comments and suggestions for improving the research design and analysis. This should be 2-4 single spaced pages in length.

PARTICIPATION

Since this is a graduate level course, it goes without saying that your attendance each week is expected and required. The course is a seminar, which means your job is to carry the discussion and my job is to help guide you through your exploration of these readings. It is essential that you read the assigned material thoroughly prior to each class and come prepared to discuss your thoughts and questions.

The readings will be challenging, and some may have mathematical or statistical information that is beyond your skill level. However, all readings will have sufficient information in the text to understand the author's theoretical perspectives, hypotheses, and results from hypothesis tests. I will spend some time discussing techniques for reading academic articles during the first day of class.

20% of your grade is based on the quality of your participation each week. I will award 5 points per class based on your ability to summarize and discuss the readings assigned that week. Each

week, I will randomly call on people to summarize one of the articles or book chapters assigned for that week. If you cannot summarize the material when called upon, you will lose 3 of the 5 possible participation points for that day. In addition to responding when called upon, I expect you to offer comments on the readings, respond to the comments or questions of your colleagues, and raise questions about the material. Your participation should demonstrate that you have critically read and assessed the assigned readings. Of course, if you miss class you will receive a participation score of 0 for that day. You can receive a total of 70 participation points.

ORIGINAL RESEARCH REQUIREMENT

Research Paper Overview

The purpose of the research paper is to give you the opportunity to begin a research project on a topic about Congress that interests you. Under special circumstances, I will consider projects designed to study legislatures cross-nationally. Each paper should identify an original research question, develop a theory to generate testable hypotheses and include empirical analysis to test the hypotheses. The format of the paper should follow the format of the articles we will read throughout the semester.

Please be aware, you will not be graded on how "sophisticated" your analysis is. I recognize that some of you are just beginning your training in data analysis and do not have the range of skills that other students may have. My only goal is for you to conduct an analysis that is appropriate to the question you are asking, at whatever level of skill you have. I will provide a separate handout with more detailed explanations of what you will be expected to do in this paper.

Research Proposal

Your research proposal must be a 7 - 10 page (double spaced) paper that identifies a research project on some aspect of legislatures or legislators. This proposal will form the basis of your final research paper in this course. The proposal should include a full literature review to motivate your research question, a theoretical argument and a set of hypotheses you would like to test. You must outline how you plan to test your hypothesis and identify the data you will gather to conduct test. Please follow the outline in Kay Chapter 20. I will provide more details on this during the semester.

Final Research Paper - Due at Final Exam Period

This paper should be 15-25 pages in length and should build from your research proposal. In addition to the material in the proposal, this paper must include your hypothesis tests and the conclusions drawn from these tests.

In lieu of a final exam in this class, I will ask each of you to prepare a presentation of your final research paper to be given during the final exam class period. This presentation may be attended by other faculty and students in the department.

CLASSROOM POLICIES

Communication

You must have an email account that you check regularly and you need to confirm that the University has your email address on file. I will provide updates to the reading list or to the class schedule through email. Each week, you will email your reaction paper to the entire class, and you will be responsible for printing and reading the reaction papers of your colleagues. In addition, I will post information about the class and the readings online on the blackboard website for this course.

If you need to reach me, the best way is through email. I check my email regularly and respond as quickly as I can. I hold office hours on Tuesdays from 2:30 – 4:30, but can meet with you by appointment at other times during the week. If we cannot schedule a time to meet during the day, we can arrange a phone conference. Although my office phone number is listed on the syllabus, it is unlikely you will reach me there. I do not have voice mail, and I am in and out of the office. If you need to leave a message for me and cannot send an email, contact the main office at 644-5727.

Academic Honesty

The penalties for cheating in my class – particularly plagiarism - are severe and simply not worth the risk. Academic dishonesty will result in you failing this course and I will refer you for University disciplinary action. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, the use of unauthorized information during a quiz or exam, plagiarism, submitting the same paper for multiple courses, or depriving another student of the ability to perform his or her work. If you have questions about University policy on academic dishonesty, please see the Academic Honor System at <http://www.fsu.edu/Books/Student-Handbook/2003codes/honor.html>.

Perhaps the primary danger of academic dishonesty in a graduate level course is plagiarism. Whether intentional or unintentional, plagiarism is a serious offense. It is the job of each student in the class to carefully check his or her papers to ensure that the ideas of others are properly cited. The following excerpt of discussion of plagiarism appears on the website:
<http://online.fsu.edu/learningresources/plagiarism/student.html>

“Your paper would be considered as "plagiarized" in part or entirely if you do any of the following:

- *Submit a paper that was written by someone other than you.*
- *Submit a paper in which you use the ideas, metaphors or reasoning style of another, but do not cite that source and/or place that source in your list of references.*
- *Submit a paper in which you "cut and paste" or use the exact words of a source and you do not put the words within quotation marks, use footnotes or in-text citations, and place the source in your list of references.”*

Additional resources to help you understand the problem of plagiarism and how it can be avoided can be found on Dr. Paul Hensel's website at:

<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~phensel/citation.html>

A note on citation style for this class:

Your research proposal and research paper should follow the American Political Science Association style guide for citations. We will talk about this in class and I will provide a handout.

For reaction papers, you may use parenthetical citations in the body of the text that provide the author, date and page from where you drew your material. You need not include a reference list for assigned readings. However, if you draw on sources outside of readings assigned on the syllabus, you need to provide a standard APSA-style reference list at the end of the paper in addition to the parenthetical citations.

Students with Disabilities

Any student who, because of a disabling condition, may require some special arrangements in order to meet the course requirements should contact the instructor **as soon as possible** to make the necessary accommodations. Students should (1) register with the Student Disability Resource Center and (2) bring a letter to the instructor from the SDRC indicating the required accommodations. This should be done during the first week of class. This syllabus and other course materials are available in alternate form upon request.

Tentative (Partial) Reading List and Schedule
Please check Blackboard website for updates

Required Books

Cox, and McCubbins 1993. *Legislative Leviathan* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics*. University of Chicago Press.

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

Squire, Peverill and Keith Hamm. 2003. *101 Chambers: Congress, State Legislatures and the Future of Legislative Studies*. Ohio State Press

Weisberg, Heberlig and Campoli 1999. *Classics in Congressional Politics*. New York: Addison Wesley.

Schedule of Readings

1. Overview/Introduction

Weisberg, et. al. 1999. "The Study of Congress: Methodologies and the Pursuit of Theory" Chapter 1 in eds, Weisberg, Heberlig and Campoli 1999. *Classics in Congressional Politics*. New York: Addison Wesley.

Kay, Susan. 1991. "Starting Out: What Political Scientist Do When They Do Research" Chapters 1 in *Introduction to the Analysis of Political Data*.

Herrick, Rebekah, Michael Moore, John R. Hibbing "Unfastening the Electoral Connection: The Behavior of U.S. Representatives When Reelection Is No Longer a Factor" *Journal of Politics* 56 (Feb): 214-217

Souva, Mark. 2005. "A Primer on Building Theories" *unpublished manuscript*.

Thematic Questions

2. Legislative Institutions / Development – an overview

CLASSICS: Chapter 2 "How Do Legislatures Change"

Squire, Peverill and Keith Hamm. 2003. *101 Chambers: Congress, State Legislatures and the Future of Legislative Studies*. Ohio State Press

Mayhew, David. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

3. Legislatures and Representation

CLASSICS- Chapter 5: What is Representation?
Chapter 7: Fenno "U.S. House Members in their Constituency"

Miller, Warren and Donald Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress."
American Political Science Review. JSTOR Also in CLASSICS, Chapter 6.

Bartels, Larry M. 1991. "Constituency Opinion and Congressional Policymaking."
American Political Science Review. 85:457-74. / JSTOR

John Jackson and David King, "Public Goods, Private Interests, and Representation,"
American Political Science Review 83:4 (December, 1989): 1143-64. JSTOR

Cameron, Charles, David Epstein, and Sharon O'Halloran. 1996. "Do Majority-Minority
Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress?" *American
Political Science Review* 90(December): 533-44. /JSTOR

Canes-Wrone, Brandace, David W. Brady, and John F. Cogan. 2002. "Out of Step, Out of
Office; Electoral Accountability and House Members' Voting. *American
Political Science Review*. 96: 127-140. (on my door)

Stimson, James, Michael B. MacKuen, Robert Erickson. 1995. "Dynamic
Representation" *American Political Science Review*. 89 (Sept): 543-565.

4. Congressional Elections - Incumbency Advantages

CLASSICS - Chapter 8: How do Candidacies Affect Elections?
Chapter 9. Mayhew "Congressional Elections: The Case of the Vanishing
Marginals"

Fiorina, Morris P. 1977 "The Case of the Vanishing Marginals: The Bureaucracy did it."
American Political Science Review 71 (March): 177-81. JSTOR

Jacobson, Gary. 1987. "The Marginals Never Vanished: Incumbency and Competition in
the U.S. House of Representatives 1952-1982" *American Journal of Political
Science*, Vol. 31, No. 1. (Feb., 1987), pp. 126-141. JSTOR

Cain, Bruce E. John A. Ferejohn, Morris P. Fiorina 1984. "The Constituency Service
Basis of the Personal Vote for U.S. Representatives and British Members of
Parliament." *The American Political Science Review*. 78(1): 110-25. JSTOR

Johannas, John R. and John C. McAdams. 1981. "The Congressional Incumbency Effect. Is it Case Work, Policy Compatibility or Something Else?" *AJPS* 25:512-42. JSTOR

Desposota, Scott and John Petrocik. 2003. "The Variable Incumbency Advantage: New Voters, Redistricting and the Personal Vote" *AJPS* 47(Jan): 18-32. JSTOR

Herrera, Richard and Michael Yawn. 1999. "The Emergence of the Personal Vote" *Journal of Politics* 61 (Feb) 136-150.

5. Congressional Elections II – Candidates and Money

Jacobson, Gary 1989. "Strategic Politicians and the Dynamics of U.S. House Election, 1946-86" *APSR* 83:3 pp. 773-793. JSTOR

Abramowitz, Alan I. 1991. Incumbency, Campaign Spending, and the Decline of Competition in U.S. House Elections." *The Journal of Politics* 52: 34-56. JSTOR

Krasno and Green 1988. "Preempting Quality Challenger in House Elections" *JOP* 50:920-36. (JSTOR)

Goodliffe, Jay. 2001. "The Effect of War Chests on Challenger Entry in U.S. House Election. *The American Journal of Political Science*. 45 (October):830-844. JSTOR

Carson, Jamie L. 2005. Strategy, Selection, and Candidate Competition in U.S. House and Senate Elections. *Journal of Politics* 67 (1) 1-28

Lublin, David Ian. 1994. Quality, Not Quantity: Strategic Politicians in U.S. Senate Elections, 1952-1990. *Journal of Politics* 56 (1):228-41. JSTOR

6. Legislative Activities of Members

Hall, Richard L 1996. *Participation in Congress*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

7. Legislative Decision-making

CLASSICS: Chapter 24: "How Do Legislators Decide How to Vote?"
Chapter 25: Kingdon "Models of Legislative Voting"

Hibbing, 1984 "The Liberal Hour: Electoral pressures and Transfer Payment Voting in the United States Congress" *Journal of Politics* 46:3 p 846-865.

Wright, John R. 1990. "Contributions, Lobbying and Committee Voting in the U.S. House of Representatives" *American Political Science Review* 84:418-38.

- Sullivan, John L, et. al. 1993. "The Dimensions of Cue-Taking in the House of Representatives: Variation by Issue Area" *Journal of Politics* 55:975-97.
- Gordon, Stacy B. 2001. "All Votes are Not Create Equal: Campaign Contributions and Critical Votes" *The Journal of Politics* 63(February): 249-269.

7. Legislative Decision-making – Roll Call Vote Patterns

- Peter VanDoren. 1990. "Can We Learn the Causes of Congressional Decisions from Roll Call Data?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 15(3): 311-40.
- Jackson, John E. and John W. Kingdon. 1992. "Ideology, Interest Groups, and Legislative Votes." *American Political Science Review*. 36: 805-23. [how to – and not to – analyze roll call votes]
- Timothy Groseclose, Steven Levitt, and James M. Snyder, Jr. 1999. "Comparing interest group scores across time and chambers: Adjusted ADA scores for the US Congress" *American Political Science Review*, vol. 93, pp. 33–50.
- Keith T. Poole and R. Steven Daniels . 1985. "Ideology, party, and voting in the United States Congress, 1959-1980" *American Political Science Review*, vol. 79, pp. 373–399.
- Keith T. Poole and Howard Rosenthal. 1991. "Patterns of Congressional Voting." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 35, No. 1. (Feb.), pp. 228-278.

8. Legislative Organization and Institutions

- Kenneth A. Shepsle; Barry R. Weingast. 1994. "Positive Theories of Congressional Institutions." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 2. (May, 1994), pp. 149-179.
- A Sequential Choice Theory Perspective on Legislative Organization. 1994. David P. Baron. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 19(2): 267-96.
- McKelvey, Richard and Peter Ordeshook. 1984. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Procedural Rules on Committee Behavior" *Journal of Politics* 46 (Feb.):182-205
- Kenneth A. Shepsle; Barry R. Weingast 1994. "When do Rules Matter?" *Journal of Politics* 46 (Feb.): 206-221.
- Evans, C. Lawrence 1999. "Legislative Structure: Rules, Precedents, and Jurisdictions," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 24:(November): 605-42.

9. Committees and Committee Power

CLASSICS: Chapter 16: "What Affects Committee Power and Success?"

Shepsle, Kenneth and Barry R. Weingast. 1987. "The Institutional Foundation of Committee Power." *The American Political Science Review*. 81(March): 85-104. /JSTOR

David C. King "The Nature of Congressional Committee Jurisdictions" *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 88, No. 1. (Mar., 1994), pp. 48-62.

Krehbiel, Keith. 1990. "Are Congressional Committees Composed of Preference Outliers?" *American Political Science Review*. 84:149-63.

Adler, E. Scott and John Lapinski. 1997. "Demand-side Theory and Congressional Committee Composition: A Constituency Characteristics approach," *American Journal of Political Science*. 41:895-918.

Richard L. Hall; Bernard Grofman 1990. "The Committee Assignment Process and the Conditional Nature of Committee Bias" *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 84, No. 4. (Dec., 1990), pp. 1149-1166.

10. Party and Party Power

CLASSICS: Chapter 20: "Is Party Leadership Personal or Contextual?"

Cox, and McCubbins 1993. *Legislative Leviathan* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

11. Party Power, Controversies

Forrest Maltzman "Meeting Competing Demands: Committee Performance in the Postreform House" *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 39, No. 3. (Aug., 1995), pp. 653-682.

Hurwitz, Mark S., Roger J. Moiles, David W. Rohde. 2001. "Distributive and Partisan Issues in Agriculture Policy in the 104th Congress" *American Political Science Review* 95(December): 911 - .

Sara Binder. , 1996. "The Partisan Basis of Procedural Choice: Allocating Parliamentary Rights in the House, 1789-1991." *American Political Science Review*. 90:8-20.

Shickler et al. 1997. "Controlling the Floor: Parties as Procedural Coalitions in the House. 1997" *American Journal of Political Science*. 41(4) 1340-75.

Cox and McCubbins "Toward a Theory of Legislative Rules Changes: Assessing Shickler and Rich's Evidence." *American Journal of Political Science*. 41(4): 1376-86.

Keith Krehbiel. 2000 "Party Discipline and Measures of Partisanship." *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 44, No. 2. (Apr.), pp. 212-227.

12. Inter-branch Relationships: Legislative-Executive Relationships and Veto Power

Krehbiel, Keith. 1998. *Pivotal Politics*. University of Chicago Press.

13. Inter-branch Relationships: Controlling the Bureaucracy

McCubbins, Mathew and T. Schwartz. 1984. "Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols Versus Fire Alarms." *AJPS*. 2:165-79.

Balla, Steven J. "Administrative Procedures and Political Control of the Bureaucracy." *American Political Science Review*_ 92:3 (September, 1998): 663-73.

Huber, John D. and Charles L. Shipan. 2000. "The Costs of Control: Legislators, Agencies, and Transaction Costs." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 25: 25-52

McCubbins, Mathew D., Roger G. Noll, and Barry R. Weingast. 1987. "Administrative Procedures as Instruments of Political Control," *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization* 3: 243-277.

Epstein, David and Sharyn O'Halloran. 1994. "Administrative Procedures, Information, and Agency Discretion." *The American Journal of Political Science* 38(August): 697-722.