

REPRESENTATION

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO, SPRING 2014

Professor David Doherty | ddoherty@luc.edu | Coffey Hall, 318 (3rd Floor) | Phone: 773-508-3063

Office Hours: Tuesdays from 2:30-4:00pm and Thursdays from 9:30-11:00am

This course will address a range of topics related to political representation with a heavy focus on representation in the United States. During the first several weeks of the course we will discuss various ways of thinking about what representation is and whether policy makers should respond to public preferences. In the second section of the course we will examine empirical evidence regarding when and how policy makers respond to public demands. In the final section of the course we will consider additional questions about representation including whether it is important for representatives to be demographically similar to the people they represent, how Americans want the representation relationship to work, and what types of constituencies are most likely to foster effective political representation.

When you complete this course successfully, you will...

- ...be familiar with different ways political theorists and others have thought about the concept of representation.
- ...understand the evidence empirical researchers have marshalled to assess whether public demands are effectively represented by policy makers, as well as the limitations of that evidence.
- ...understand what this evidence says about the conditional nature of democratic responsiveness in the United States.
- ...be better prepared to think carefully about the health of contemporary American democracy.

1 Course Requirements and Expectations

1.1 Assignments

READING. Reading is a major component of what you are expected to do for this class. The class will run as a (discussion-focused) seminar so it is essential that you complete the readings prior to our class meetings.

Books you need to buy

- Dahl, Robert A. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hutchings, Vincent L. 2005. *Public Opinion and Democratic Accountability: How Citizens Learn about Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hibbing, John R. and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2002. *Stealth Democracy: Americans' Beliefs About How Government Should Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Other readings for the course are posted to Sakai and are sorted by week. I encourage you to read the assigned readings each week in the order they appear in on the syllabus—this will matter more some weeks than others. **Please bring the readings for the week to class meetings.**

PARTICIPATION: 10%. Although I will lecture during most class meetings, this will be limited and will be designed to provide substantive background information, introductions to particular empirical methods, and a framework for our discussion. My efforts this semester will focus on facilitating and moderating discussion

and establishing incentives to ensure that students are prepared to participate. All students are expected to participate during class meetings and 10% of your grade will be based on your participation. Note that this grade will be based on both quality and quantity of participation.

IN CLASS PRESENTATIONS: 15%. Each student will present in class 2-3 times during the course of the semester. The days you are assigned to present will be determined at random. The presentation responsibilities of undergraduate and graduate seminar participants will differ.

Graduate Students: Each week some of the readings will be assigned to graduate students only. However, in order to ensure that all seminar participants can engage with all of the material on the syllabus one graduate student will be assigned to present each “graduate student only” reading to the class. These presentations should describe: the question(s) the author sets out to answer, the theoretical expectations they lay out, the data they use, and their findings. Presenters should prepare PowerPoint presentations that include particularly important tables and figures from the reading (as appropriate) and describe what findings are presented in these tables and figures. I encourage you to make an effort to help your fellow seminar participants understand how the reading you are presenting on relates to the other readings for the week. These presentations should each take about 10-15 minutes and you should be prepared to answer questions about the reading—particularly from undergraduate seminar participants. My expectation is that each graduate student will present twice during the course of the semester and that each presentation will be worth 7.5% of your grade. However, I reserve the right to modify this based on final course enrollment numbers.

Undergraduate Students: In order to keep track of what we have discussed and maintain continuity from week to week, we will begin each class with one student providing an “executive summary” of the previous meeting—including “graduate student only” material which will have been presented by a graduate student during our class meeting. These summaries should review the basic arguments and evidence presented in each of the readings from the previous week. They should also highlight key points/debates/critiques from class discussion the previous week and provide a brief review—as appropriate—of any lecture material from the previous week. These presentations should be approximately 10 minutes long and you are welcome to use PowerPoint if you wish. The first “executive summary” will be presented during our fourth class meeting (reviewing material from Week 3).

As you prepare your presentation you should draft a document that will serve as a study guide for the material from the week you are presenting on. After the class meeting in which you present, you will revise that study guide as necessary and send it to me prior to our next class meeting. I will post the document to Sakai for other students to access.

For meetings 4, 11, and 14 one student will prepare a “regular” executive summary and study guide as described above (for the readings from the previous week). Additional students will be assigned to provide broader overviews of what was covered in the previous *section*, or in the case of our final meeting *sections*, of the course. These reviews need not cover every reading from every meeting. Instead presenters should take a broader view, highlighting the key themes, arguments, and evidence covered in each assigned week. These presenters are particularly encouraged to highlight connections between readings across weeks of the course. My expectation is that each undergraduate participant will present twice and each presentation (including study guide preparation where applicable) will be worth 7.5% of your grade. However, I reserve the right to modify this based on final course enrollment numbers.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS: 1% EACH (x 10). For class meetings 3 through 14 each student should email me a list of 3-5 suggested discussion questions for our class meeting *by midnight on the Monday before we meet*

(I will drop your 2 lowest scores out of the 12 sets of discussion questions you write). Discussion questions should be designed to stimulate class discussion by raising clear normative or empirical questions about the readings.

Strong discussion questions often cite a specific portion (or portions) of a reading (or readings) as a starting point. For example, a discussion question might take a form like: “On page X, Author A says that her evidence supports the conclusion that Y. Does the evidence presented really support Y or might it be interpreted as supporting Z?” or “On page X Author A says Y, but on page X Author B says Z. Can these competing claims/conclusions be reconciled? If so, how? If not, why do they authors reach different conclusions?” Note that these frameworks are merely suggestions. You may also ask broad questions about the readings (e.g., What do the findings presented by Author A suggest about the health of democracy in the U.S.), specific questions about empirical evidence (e.g., How could Author A’s measures of the public’s policy preferences be improved?), or substantive or technical questions that you want the class (or I) to answer about the readings (e.g., “What does the author mean when she says X?”; “How do you interpret the numbers in Table A? What do they mean?”).

I will aggregate and organize these discussion questions prior to our class meeting. My hope is that through the course of the semester you will develop a sense of what types of questions stimulate discussion and which do not. Thus, as the semester progresses I expect that you will write increasingly effective discussion questions. *Graduate students should each write at least one question about a “graduate student only” reading.* Note that in order for these discussion questions to be useful I must receive them in time to prepare them for use in our class meeting—they will not be accepted late.

ANALYSIS PAPERS: 5% EACH (x 6). You will write 6 brief (2 pages, double-spaced, 12 pt Times New Roman font) analysis papers. These papers should *NOT* be summaries of the readings. Instead they should critique a specific aspect of a reading (or readings) or compare/contrast readings from the week (with one another or with readings from previous weeks of the course). Some of the approaches you may consider taking when writing these response papers include (but are not limited to): 1) critiquing or comparing the approaches authors use to test their theories; 2) synthesizing and/or contrasting findings from different readings from the week and earlier in the course; 3) critiquing or comparing how authors conceive of and measure a concept; 4) carefully considering the implications of the findings from the readings—what do they say about the health of American democracy?; 5) identifying unanswered questions and, ideally, how researchers might attempt to answer them.

The best papers will be tightly focused (e.g., addressing *one* of the above questions), clearly written, and demonstrate that you have completed the readings and reflected on them.¹ You cannot write a response paper for the first class meeting or the last meeting, so you must write papers for 6 of the remaining 12 meetings. I strongly encourage you to plan ahead and not put yourself in a situation where you have to write response papers every week for six weeks straight.

ESSAY: 15%. You will write a 5-7 page essay. This paper should make an evidence-based argument—drawing on course materials—about the quality of democratic representation in the United States. In order to do this it is important to begin by making an argument about what high quality representation *should* look like. You do not need to do additional outside research, but you can if you wish (e.g., you may notice work cited in a course reading that you would like to learn more about or think may contribute to the argument you wish to make). *The paper is due at our April 15th meeting.* This paper will be graded based on the clarity of

¹Examples: if you make an argument in your paper that one author’s approach could be improved in a particular way and fail to discuss the fact that another reading from that week does exactly what you are suggesting, this would suggest that you have not completed the readings for the week.

your argument and how effectively and accurately you use course materials. I will deduct points for stylistic (e.g., spelling/grammar) weaknesses.

FINAL EXAM: 20%. The final exam will cover material from the entire course.

1.2 Course Grade

Each assignment will be given a letter grade. These grades will be converted to percentage scores as follows: A = 95%; A- = 91%; B+ = 88%; B = 85%; B- = 81%; C+ = 78%; C = 75%; C- = 71%; D+ = 68%; D = 65%; F = 0%. Your grade for the course will weight these percentage scores as described above (and summarized below). This weighted percentage will then be converted to a letter grade based on the ranges described below.

GRADING RUBRIC AND SCALE:

Participation: 10%	A = 93.00% or higher	C+ = 77.00 - 79.99%
Discussion Questions x 10: 1% each	A- = 90.00 - 92.99%	C = 73.00 - 76.99%
In-Class Presentation: 15%	B+ = 87.00 - 89.99%	C- = 70.00 - 72.99%
Analysis papers x 6: 5% each	B = 83.00 - 86.99%	D+ = 67.00 - 69.99%
Essay: 15%	B- = 80.00 - 82.99%	D = 60.00 - 66.99%
Final Exam: 20%		

The scoring rubric above and the thresholds for various letter grades are non-negotiable. I will not change your numeric grade to “bump you up” to the next letter grade. For example, if your final score in the class is 86.9, your letter grade for the class will be a B, not a B+ just because you are *so close*.

MISSED CLASSES/LATE ASSIGNMENTS: The only excusable reasons for missing a class or exam or handing in an assignment late are serious illnesses and family emergencies. In either case you must both 1) notify me of your situation in a timely manner and 2) provide appropriate documentation. Assignments handed in late without documentation will be penalized by 10 points (out of 100) for each day they are late.

Important: The Sakai gradebook calculates your “Course Grade” on-the-fly using the weights described above. You will also see “points” listed in Sakai—*ignore these points* as they do not give proper weight to each assignment.

1.3 Additional Policies and Notes

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES: If you have a documented disability and wish to discuss academic accommodations, please contact me as soon as possible.

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY will not be tolerated. I reserve the right to submit all papers and exams to Turnitin.com. This service compares your paper with materials available through the internet, published work, and papers submitted by other students (from Loyola and elsewhere). You *must* properly cite any outside sources. If you are not sure about when and how to cite your sources, please refer to this useful guide: <http://www.luc.edu/english/writing.shtml#source>.

Incidents of plagiarism or cheating on written work (by copying from online sources or other published work) will result in a grade of F *in the course* and will be reported to the department chair and to the Dean.

DISCLAIMER: The schedule, policies, and assignments described in this document are subject to change in the event of extenuating circumstances.

2 Class Schedule and Reading Assignments

2.1 Foundations

MEETING 1: JANUARY 14. Introduction

- Dahl, Robert A. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (Chapter 3; 15 pgs.)
- Excerpts from Federalist 10, 51, 55, 57, and the Anti-Federalist Papers
- Burke, Edmund (1774). Speech to the Electors of Bristol (at the Conclusion of the Poll).

MEETING 2: JANUARY 21. Models of Representation

- Dahl, Robert A. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (Chapters 4-5; 31 pgs.)
- Mansbridge, Jane. 2003. "Rethinking Representation." *American Political Science Review* 97: 515-528. (13 pgs.)
- Rehfeld, Andrew. 2009. "Representation Rethought: On Trustees, Delegates, and Gyroscopes in the Study of Political Representation and Democracy." *American Political Science Review* 103: 214-230 (16 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Mansbridge, Jane. 2011. "Clarifying the Concept of Representation." *American Political Science Review* 105: 621-630 (9 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Rehfeld, Andrew. 2011. "The Concepts of Representation." *American Political Science Review* 105: 631-641 (10 pgs.)

MEETING 3: JANUARY 28. Public Opinion and Public Competence

- Dahl, Robert A. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (Chapters 6-9; 52 pgs.)
- Hutchings, Vincent and Spencer Piston. 2011. "Knowledge, Sophistication, and Issue Publics." In *Oxford Handbook of American Public Opinion and the Media* eds. Robert Y. Shapiro and Lawrence R. Jacobs. New York: Oxford University Press, 571-585. (14 pgs.)
- Couzin, Iain D., Christos C. Loannou, Gven Demirel, Thilo Gross, Colin J. Torney, Andrew Hartnett, Larissa Conradt, Simon A. Levin, Naomi E. Leonard. 2011. "Uninformed Individuals Promote Democratic Consensus in Animal Groups." *Science* 334: 1578-1580. (3 pgs.)
- Gilens, Martin. 2001. "Political Ignorance and Collective Policy Preferences." *American Political Science Review* 95: 379-396 (17 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Wlezien, Christopher. 1995. "The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending." *American Journal of Political Science* 39: 981-1000. (19 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Griffin, Dana. 2013. "Citizens, Representatives, and the Myth of the Decision-Making Divide." *Political Behavior* 35: 261-287 (26 pgs.)

2.2 Measuring Representation

MEETING 4: FEBRUARY 4. Do Representatives Respond?

- Miller, Warren E. and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 57: 45-56 (11 pgs.)
- McCrone, Donald J. and James H. Kuklinski. 1979. "The Delegate Theory of Representation." *American Journal of Political Science* 23: 278-300. (22 pgs.)
- Clinton, Joshua D. 2006. "Representation in Congress: Constituents and Roll Calls in the 106th House." *Journal of Politics* 68: 397-409. (12 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Levitt, Steven D. 1996. "How Do Senators Vote? Disentangling the Role of Voter Preferences, Party Affiliation, and Senator Ideology." *American Economic Review* 86: 425-441. (16 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Bafumi, Joseph and Michael C. Herron. 2010. "Leapfrog Representation and Extremism: A Study of American Voters and Their Members in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 104: 519-542. (23 pgs.)

MEETING 5: FEBRUARY 11. Elections and Representative Responsiveness

- Fearon, James D. 1999. "Electoral Accountability and the Control of Politicians: Selecting Good Types versus Sanctioning Poor Performance." In *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation* eds. Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes, Bernard Manin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 55-84 (do not need to read Appendix). (29 pgs.)
- Macdonald, Stuart E., George Rabinowitz, and Holly Brasher. "Policy Issues and Electoral Democracy." In *Electoral Democracy* eds. Michael B. MacKuen and George Rabinowitz. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 172-199. (27 pgs.)
- Thomas, Martin. 1985. "Election Proximity and Senatorial Roll Call Voting." *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 96-111. (15 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Griffin, John D. and Brian Newman. 2005. "Are Voters Better Represented?" *Journal of Politics* 67: 1206-1227. (21 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Canes-Wrone, Brandice and Kenneth W. Shotts. 2004. "The Conditional Nature of Presidential Responsiveness to Public Opinion." *American Journal of Political Science* 48: 690-706. (16 pgs.)

MEETING 6: FEBRUARY 18. The Media and Democratic Accountability

- Hutchings, Vincent L. 2005. *Public Opinion and Democratic Accountability: How Citizens Learn about Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Undergraduates: Chapters 1-3, 5, and 8 = 85 pgs.; Graduate Students: All = 142 pgs.)

MEETING 7: FEBRUARY 25. Does Policy Respond?

- Weissberg, Robert. 1978. "Collective vs. Dyadic Representation in Congress." *American Political Science Review* 72: 535-547 (12 pgs.)
- Page, Benjamin I. and Robert Y. Shapiro. 1983. "Effects of Public Opinion on Policy." *American Political Science Review* 77: 175-190. (15 pgs.)
- Monroe, Alan D. 1998. "Public Opinion and Public Policy, 1980-1993." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 62: 6-28. (22 pgs.)
- **GRADUATE STUDENTS** Wlezien, Christopher. 2004. "Patterns of Representation: Dynamics of Public Preferences and Policy." *Journal of Politics* 66: 1-24. (24 pgs.)
- **GRADUATE STUDENTS** Stimson, James A., Michael B. Mackuen and Robert S. Erikson. 1995. "Dynamic Representation." *American Political Science Review* 89: 543-565 (22 pgs.)

SPRING BREAK - NO CLASS: MARCH 4.

MEETING 8: MARCH 11. Economic Inequality and Representation

- Gilens, Martin. 2005. "Inequality and Democratic Responsiveness." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69: 778-796. (18 pgs.)
- Bartels, Larry M. 2005. "Homer Gets a Tax Cut: Inequality and Public Policy in the American Mind." *Perspectives on Politics* 3: 15-29. (14 pgs.)
- Hacker, Jacob S. and Paul Pierson. 2005. "Abandoning the Middle: The Bush Tax Cuts and the Limits of Democratic Control." *Perspectives on Politics* 3: 33-53. (20 pgs.)
- Soroka, Stuart N. and Christopher Wlezien. 2008. "On the Limits to Inequality in Representation." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 41: 319-327. (8 pgs.)
- **GRADUATE STUDENTS** Page, Benjamin I., Larry M. Bartels, and Jason Seawright. 2013. "Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans." *Perspectives on Politics* 11: 51-73. (18 pgs.)

MEETING 9: MARCH 18. Causality Questions and Other Limitations

- Bartels, Brandon L., and Diana C. Mutz. 2009. "Explaining Processes of Institutional Opinion Leadership." *Journal of Politics* 71: 249-261. (12 pgs.)
- Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Robert Y. Shapiro. 2002. "Politics and Policymaking in the Real World: Crafted Talk and the Loss of Democratic Responsiveness." In *Navigating Public Opinion: Polls, Policy, and the Future of American Democracy*, Eds. Jeff Manz, Fay Lomax Cook, and Benjamin I. Page. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 54-75. (21 pgs.)
- **GRADUATE STUDENTS** Druckman, James N. and Kjersten R. Nelson. 2003. "Framing and Deliberation: How Citizens' Conversations Limit Elite Influence." *American Journal of Political Science* 47: 729-745. (16 pgs.)
- **GRADUATE STUDENTS** Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Benjamin I. Page. 2005. "Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?" *American Political Science Review* 99: 107-123. (16 pgs.)
- Burstein, Paul. 2006. "Why Estimates of the Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy Are Too High: Empirical and Theoretical Implications." *Social Forces* 84: 2273-2289. (16 pgs.)

MEETING 10: MARCH 25. Representation from a Comparative Perspective

- Powell, G. Bingham Jr. 2004. "Political Representation in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 273-296. (23 pgs.)
- Hobolt, Sara B. and Robert Klemmensen. 2005. "Responsive Government? Public Opinion and Government Policy Preferences in Britain and Denmark." *Political Studies* 53: 379-402. (23 pgs.)
- Golder, Matt and Jacek Stramski. 2010. "Ideological Congruence and Electoral Institutions." *American Journal of Political Science* 54: 90-106. (16 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Blais, André and Marc André Bodet. 2006. "Does Proportional Representation Foster Closer Congruence Between Citizens and Policymakers?" *Comparative Political Studies* 39: 1243-1262. (19 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Wlezien, Christopher, and Stuart N. Soroka. 2012. "Political Institutions and the Opinion-Policy Link." *West European Politics* 35: 1407-1432. (25 pgs.)

2.3 Beyond the Public Opinion-Policy Link

MEETING 11: APRIL 1. Descriptive Representation

- Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent 'Yes'." *Journal of Politics* 61: 628-657. (29 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Grose, Christian R. 2005. "Disentangling Constituency and Legislator Effects in Legislative Representation: Black Legislators or Black Districts?" *Social Science Quarterly* 86: 427-443. (16 pgs.)
- Broockman, David E. 2013. "Black Politicians Are More Intrinsically Motivated to Advance Blacks' Interests: A Field Experiment Manipulating Political Incentives." *American Journal of Political Science* 57: 521-536. (15 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Barreto, Matt A. 2007. "¡Sí Se Puede! Latino Candidates and the Mobilization of Latino Voters." *American Political Science Review* 101: 425-441. (16 pgs.)
- Carnes, Nicholas. 2012. "Does the Numerical Underrepresentation of the Working Class in Congress Matter?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 37: 5-34. (29 pgs.)

MEETING 12: APRIL 8. What Kind of Representation Does the Public Want?

- Hibbing, John R. and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse. 2002. *Stealth Democracy: Americans' Beliefs About How Government Should Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Undergraduates: Chapters 1-2, 5-6 = 100 pgs.; Graduate Students: Introduction and Chapters 1-6 = 161 pgs.)
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Neblo, Michael A., Kevin M. Esterling, Ryan P. Kennedy, David M.J. Lazer, and Anand E. Sokhey. 2010. "Who Wants To Deliberate—And Why?" *American Political Science Review* 104: 566-583. (17 pgs.)

MEETING 13: APRIL 15. The Concept of Constituency (*Paper Due*)

- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Doherty, David. 2013. "To Whom Do People Think Representatives Should Respond: Their District or the Country?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 77: 237-255. (18 pgs.)
- Brunell, Thomas L. 2006. "Rethinking Redistricting: How Drawing Uncompetitive Districts Eliminates Gerrymanders, Enhances Representation, and Improves Attitudes toward Congress." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 39: 77-85 (8 pgs.)
- Rehfeld, Andrew. 2005. *The Concept of Constituency: Political Representation, Democratic Legitimacy, and Institutional Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 7 and 9. (61 pgs.)

MEETING 14: APRIL 22. Course Wrap-Up

- Dahl, Robert A. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Chapters TBD.
- ****GRADUATE STUDENTS**** Fishkin, James S. and Robert C. Luskin. 2005. "Experimenting with a Democratic Ideal: Deliberative Polling and Public Opinion." *Acta Politica* 40: 284-298. (14 pgs.)

FINAL EXAM: APRIL 29.