

**Beyond Symbolic Representation: The Influence of Openly Lesbian and Gay  
Officials in State Legislatures**

Donald P. Haider-Markel

Department of Political Science  
1541 Lilac Lane, 504 Blake Hall  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66044  
Email: [prex@ku.edu](mailto:prex@ku.edu)  
Phone: (785) 864-9034  
Fax: (785) 864-5700

Paper prepared for presentation at the annual Conference on State Politics and Policy,  
May 2002.

## **Beyond Symbolic Representation: The Influence of Openly Lesbian and Gay Officials in State Legislatures**

*Abstract:* The representation of minority interests in political institutions has been a central concern for students of democratic politics. However, much of this literature has focused on national or local institutions and has limited itself to examining the representation of ethnic and racial minorities and women. My research builds on this previous work in two ways: 1) by examining the representation of lesbian and gay interests, and 2) doing so by examining lesbian and gay representation in state legislatures. Specifically I examine the influence of openly lesbian and gay elected officials on the number and type of gay-related bills introduced in state legislatures, the legislative outcome of these bills, and the adoption of specific gay-related policies in the states. The analysis proceeds in two parts. First, I explore the influence of openly lesbian and gay elected officials through case studies of three openly gay legislators in three states. Second, I make use of these case studies as well as theories of state policy consideration and adoption in a quantitative model of legislative bill introduction and policy adoption. The findings of the qualitative and quantitative analysis suggest that gay representation in state legislatures is more than symbolic. Even when accounting for the state legislature ideology, interest group strength, and public opinion, among other factors, the presence of gay state legislators does influence the number and type of gay-related bills introduced in state legislatures, the legislative outcome of these bills, and the adoption of specific gay-related policies in the states. However, I also uncover an anti-gay backlash that results from increasing gay representation. This process is explored and I conclude that the net-effect of gay political representation is positive legislative and policy outcomes for the gay community.

Who elected officials represent is a central concern in any democratic system of government. Through democratic elections voters and voting blocs are able to select candidates that represent their political preferences. Minorities and traditionally underrepresented groups, such as women, are especially concerned with electoral representation, each pursuing policy goals through the election of public officials that share group identification (Mladenka 1989; Matland 1993; Thomas 1994). Although shared identification and experience cannot guarantee substantive representation, research suggests the presence of elected black and Hispanic officials increases the likelihood that black and Hispanic interests are represented in policy processes (Eisinger 1982; Mladenka 1989; Saltzstein 1989).

As a generally disliked numerical minority, lesbians and gay men have similar concerns over political representation (Sherrill 1996). Faced with a potentially hostile majority, gays and lesbians may try to achieve political representation through election of openly gay candidates to public office, or by influencing the behavior of elected sympathetic heterosexuals and closeted homosexuals. Although recent research suggests that gay officials serving on local legislatures can effectively represent the interests of the gay community in the policy process (Haider-Markel, Jocelyn and Kniss 2000), substantive representation by openly lesbian and gay state legislators has not been explored.

In this paper, I seek to add to the existing literature on political representation by exploring whether the presence of gay state legislators produces substantive representation in state legislatures. At least 68 gays and lesbians have served as state legislators since 1974. Although this number is small, symbolic gay representation in state legislatures has been dramatically increasing since 1996 as have the number of gay-related issues on state political agendas.

I examine the influence of openly lesbian and gay elected officials on the number and type of gay-related bills introduced in state legislatures, the legislative outcome of these bills, and the adoption of specific gay-related policies in the states. The analysis proceeds in two parts. First, I explore the influence of openly lesbian and gay elected officials through case studies of three openly gay legislators in three states. Second, I make use of these case studies as well as theories of state policy consideration and adoption in a quantitative model of legislative bill introduction and policy adoption. The findings of the qualitative and quantitative analysis suggest that gay representation in state legislatures is more than symbolic. Even when accounting for the state legislature ideology, interest group strength, and public opinion, among other factors, the presence of gay state legislators does influence the number and type of gay-related bills introduced in state legislatures, the legislative outcome of these bills, and the adoption of specific gay-related policies in the states. However, I also uncover an anti-gay backlash that results from increasing gay representation. This process is explored and I conclude that the net-effect of gay political representation is positive legislative and policy outcomes for the gay community.

### **Political Representation and State Legislatures**

In a representative democracy, government officials are elected, in large measure, based on party and group affiliation and issue positions in order to represent a select

number of citizens (Campbell, et al. 1960). In this system voters can be represented more or less based on how well their affiliations and positions match those of the elected representative (Kingdon 1989). If an elected official clearly belongs to or identifies with a particular ethnic, racial, or religious group, it can be argued that the group has achieved symbolic or descriptive representation (Eulau and Karps 1977; Kuklinski 1979; Swain 1993; Fox 1997). If a group achieves symbolic representation, many infer that she or he will pursue the interests of the group he or she identifies with, thus achieving substantive representation (Saltzstein 1989; Fox 1997; Swain 1993). Although substantive representation also may be achieved by electing sympathetic elites (Browning, Marshall, and Tabb 1984), symbolic representation is often viewed as the most reliable way to achieving substantive representation in government (Gerber, Morton, and Rietz 1998).

A considerable body of research has accumulated on substantive representation of group interests in the policy process. For example, research on the election of blacks in urban areas has uncovered fairly consistent links between black representation and increased policy benefits to the black community, including employment and appointment opportunities (Keech 1968; Levine 1974; Cole 1976; Campbell and Feagin 1977; Eisinger 1982; Browning, Marshall, and Tabb 1984; Mladenka 1989; Saltzstein 1989). Research on Hispanic officials has noted similar patterns (Browning, Marshall, and Tabb 1984; Mladenka 1989), and studies of women in state legislatures suggest that increased female representation leads to an increased number of policy proposals relating to women (Thomas 1994).

However, one should not assume that symbolic representation leads to substantive representation simply because elected representatives that identify with a group are introducing and championing proposals that benefit the group. Simply having representatives of a group in a policymaking body may influence other decisionmakers' attitudes about the group and subsequent support for policy proposals related to the group (Wahlke 1971; Browning, Marshall, and Tabb 1984; Rayside 1998). In a role model capacity, elected representatives of a group may likewise influence public perceptions of the group, and preferences related to policies related to the group (Pitkin 1967; Smith and Haider-Markel 2002).

Symbolic representation and its connection to substantive representation may be especially relevant to policies related to lesbians and gays. In this policy area the debate is often peppered with moral perspectives, with political actors lobbying to gain government approval of core secular or religious values, thereby solidifying the importance of symbolism (Haider-Markel and Meier 1996; Wald, Button, and Rienzo 1996; Mooney 1999). Furthermore, as with representatives of other groups, the mere presence of gay officials may serve to undermine arguments based on negative stereotypes of lesbians and gays. Without the articulation of these arguments, officials may be less inclined to make decisions that oppose the preferences of the gay community. This phenomenon may occur even without the direct presence of gay officials. Indeed, Wald, Button, and Rienzo (1996) find that localities where gays had simply run for public office, but failed, were more likely to adopt antidiscrimination policies.

However, substantive representation may occur even in the absence of symbolic representation. For example, at least 80 percent of all local ordinances that ban

discrimination based on sexual orientation were introduced and championed by non-gay officials that sympathized with the gay community (Button, Rienzo, and Wald 1997).

But whether officials are symbolic representatives of a group or sympathizers with a group, they are all constrained in their policymaking roles by the context in which they operate and their individual preferences and characteristics (Kingdon 1989; Fox 1997; Sharp 1997). For example, state legislator behavior and success will also be driven by partisan affiliation and ideology, the composition of the legislature, as well as district and state characteristics and preferences, among other things. Thus, any examination of substantive representation must also account for broader determinants of policymaking outcomes. To clearly illustrate these points, below I briefly explain the scope of lesbian and gay representation in state legislatures and provide three mini-case studies of three gay legislators in three states. The cases will assist in developing the multivariate models explaining policy process outcomes in the following section.

### **Openly Gay Legislators and Case Studies in Political Representation**

Since 1974 only 68 openly gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered persons have served as state legislators. Most of these officials have served in urban districts and in the lower legislative chamber. And although exact figures are not known, by 2001 at least 95 LGBT candidates had run for state offices and lost, with the numbers increasing virtually every election cycle. The number of gay candidates for state legislative seats has increased dramatically since 1996, with at least 56 LGBT candidates running for state legislative seats in the 1998 and 2000 election cycles (23 in 1998 and 34 in 2000) (Smith and Haider-Markel 2002).

Given that the electoral environment varies across the states, it is not surprising that some states have had more gay candidates and legislators than others. In the Republican dominated state of New Hampshire, openly gay Democratic leaders began a campaign in 2000 to recruit more gay candidates, and openly LGBT legislators formed the country's first gay state legislative caucus in 1999. Democratic leaders successfully recruited five openly LGBT legislators to seek reelection and another seven gays to run for state legislative seats (Freiberg 2000). In Vermont, six gay candidates ran for the state legislature in 2000. Interestingly, New Hampshire has had the most LGBT legislators with seven, Oregon and Maine follow with six, and California and Massachusetts have both had five (Smith and Haider-Markel 2002).

Although the total number of LGBT candidates for state legislative office and the number of LGBT state legislative officials is still relatively small, LGBT people are clearly making dramatic inroads in state legislatures. Furthermore, as the following mini-case studies demonstrate, these officials are having an impact on the policy process once elected.

#### **Minnesota: Senator Allan Spear**

Minnesota boasts having had the longest serving openly gay state legislator in the country. Senator Allan Spear served as openly gay in the Minnesota Senate from 1974 until his retirement in 2000. Spear came out in 1974 after having been elected for the first time in 1972 on the Democratic Farmer-Labor ticket. Senator Spear had considerable respect from members of both parties, a fact that contributed to his election as president of the Minnesota Senate in 1993. Throughout his career Senator Spear

championed gay issues, but was best known for his legislative expertise on criminal justice issues, and as a strong opponent of capital punishment and supporter of tougher gun control measures. Indeed, most of the legislation Spear sponsored or co-sponsored was not gay-related. For example, in 1999 and 2000 Senator Spear sponsored or co-sponsored 108 bills in the Minnesota Senate. Of these, three involved domestic partners, three addressed HIV/AIDS issues, two involved hate crimes, and one on discrimination based on sexual orientation. Thus, only seven percent of his bills in this time period were gay-related. Nevertheless, Spear did actively pursue the policy objectives of the gay community as well as serve as a positive role model for the community.

When Senator Spear first came out in 1974, he said he did so because of the highly negative debate over a 1973 gay civil rights bill in the Minnesota Senate. As a result of the debate, and the bill's failure, Spear came to believe that he had to be open about his homosexuality (Grow 2000). Senator Spear subsequently fought for legislation to protect gays and lesbians from hate crime, discrimination, and to ensure equal treatment under the law. In 1983 Spear attempted to include sexual orientation a hate crime bill being debated in the Senate. He succeeded, but only to see the phrase stripped from the bill by amendment during floor debate (Smith and Haider-Markel 2002). In 1987 Spear authored an unsuccessful bill to repeal a law banning homosexual sodomy. Spear was also the author of S 2183, a 1988 bill that added sexual orientation to the state's 1983 hate crime law. Even though it faced opposition from several conservative legislators, the bill passed easily in the Senate (Berrill 1992).

Spear himself views one of his greatest legacies as the passage of a comprehensive gay civil rights law in 1993 (Grow 2000). Spear sponsored the bill in the Senate, with openly lesbian Rep. Karen Clark (DFL) sponsoring the bill in the House. The Senate floor debate over the issue was intense and emotional with some state senators continued to argue that the law was unnecessary because "homosexuality is a choice, not a condition of birth." Spear countered these arguments with a persuasive speech on the senate floor in which he pointed out: "Let me tell you, I'm a 55-year-old gay man and I am not just going through a phase. I can also assure you that my sexual orientation is not something I chose, like choosing to wear a blue shirt and a red tie today" (Grow 2000). Interestingly, Spear's colleagues elected Spear as president of the Senate that same year. Furthermore, as the Minnesota legislature considered multiple bills to ban same-sex marriage in 1996 and 1997, Spear served to delay the inevitable adoption of the law, and helped to ensure that the debate remained collegial.

Spear also appears to have influenced the policymaking process by serving as a positive role model of a gay person to other legislators, and subsequently diffusing opposition on gay-related legislation. A fellow Senator said that Spear "did a great job in the educating process. Homosexuality was something I'd barely heard of in my little town. It wasn't talked about. Here we had Allan Spear. He was a good person, no different from the rest of us. We all needed that education" (Grow 2000).

### **California: Representative Sheila Kuehl**

In 1992 Democrat Sheila Kuehl became the first open lesbian or gay person elected to the California legislature when she won a seat in the Assembly. Rep. Kuehl's leadership ability led to her being chosen as the Assembly's Speaker Pro Tem following her reelection in 1996, making her the highest ranking lesbian in state government in the

country, and the second ranking person in the Assembly (Freiberg 1996). Rep. Kuehl served three terms in the state Assembly before being elected to the state Senate in 2000.

Rep. Kuehl had focused much of her Assembly career on health care and environmental issues, but she was also a strong proponent of gay civil rights. For example, in the 1999-2000 session, Rep. Kuehl authored 27 bills. Of these, only one addressed sexual orientation discrimination directly. However, Rep. Kuehl lobbied for the approximately 81 pro-gay bills introduced during the session.

Although California is considered an exceedingly gay-friendly state, gay activists had accumulated few legislative successes prior to 1996. Activists had repealed the state's sodomy law and passed a law banning sexual orientation discrimination. The state had also been on the forefront of funding for HIV/AIDS patients and research. That pattern began to change in 1996 when Democrats regained control of the Assembly and maintained control of the Senate. Further, in 1998 the state replaced its Republican Governor with a pro-gay Democrat. Rep. Kuehl and other capitalized on these changes by introducing and passing more gay friendly legislation than ever before.

Beginning in 1994, the number of pro-gay legislation introduced in California increased from one or two a year to more than ten per year. Rep. Kuehl played a significant role in this increase, sponsoring or co-sponsoring many gay-related bills, and lobbying for others she did not introduce. However, Rep. Kuehl's first major battle on gay legislation came in 1997 when she introduced AB 101, a bill that would have banned discrimination bias based on sexual orientation in school employment, curriculum and the treatment of students on campus. Conservative legislators had defeated a similar bill by Kuehl in 1996 (AB 1001), and in 1997 they coordinated their efforts with conservative religious groups, such as the Traditional Values coalition (Weintraub 1997). Referring to the bill, Rep. Kuehl argued: "This is not a very radical notion, to say that schools may not discriminate against their own students on these nonacademic, nonrelevant bases" (Weintraub 1997). Opponents charged that the categorization of people was silly. One legislator who opposed the bill, Rep. Baldwin, said, "I could create a category of people who like to pick their nose. Should we have special laws designed for nose-pickers" (Weintraub 1997)? Kuehl was able to steer the bill through the Assembly Education Committee, a committee on which she was a member, but it failed in a vote on the Assembly floor (36-40).<sup>1</sup> On the floor, many Republican lawmakers warned that the bill would require acceptance of "the gay lifestyle." Kuehl argued that the bill was part of "the greatest moral struggle in the last years of the 20th century" and that the bill "is about thousands of students in the public schools of California [who] . . . run a gantlet of harassment and even of violence" (Morain 1997).

In 1997 Kuehl also introduced gay-related legislation to direct school district governing boards to enforce discrimination codes (AB 499), ban housing discrimination (AB 310). Further, Kuehl lobbied for gay-related Assembly legislation addressing gay adoption rights, domestic partner benefits, and housing discrimination, while effectively opposing a ban on same-sex marriage. On the adoption bill, Kuehl argued that it is unfair

---

<sup>1</sup> At one point during the debate, Republican Assemblyman Peter Frusetta, a lifelong rancher, said "I've seen thousands and thousands of cattle . . . I've probably seen three...maybe four that had the hormone imbalance of being odd, unnatural. We called the heifers hermaphrodites. . . . [They would] shy away from bulls and take up with other heifers....We're going down a very dangerous path here" (Skelton 1997).

for society to ban legal marriage for gays and lesbians, but then also tell them they don't have stable enough relationships to adopt (Vanzi 1997).

Kuehl introduced and supported similar legislation in 1998, 1999, and 2000. In a 1998 speech before gay student lobbyists in front of the capital, Kuehl stressed the importance of representing one's beliefs, even in the face of failure, arguing that: "It's not always whether you win the first time, the second time or the third time. At the end of every struggle, what's important is: Did you fight, did you stand up, did you make the pitch" (Davila 1998).

### **Rhode Island: Representative Michael Pisaturo**

Democrat Michael Pisaturo was first elected to represent the 21st State General Assembly district in 1996, and was reelected in 1998 and 2000. Rep. Pisaturo has focused much of his attention on health issues, including HIV/AIDS and sex education issues, but he has also directed his attention to immediate concerns within his district, including transportation issues and criminal justice. From the start, Rep. Pisaturo attempted to be a strong advocate for the gay community in the legislature, sponsoring legislation and helping to mobilize the gay community on pending legislation as committee hearings and votes approached. Indeed, during his first year in office Rep. Pisaturo authored legislation that would have allowed same-sex couples to marry in Rhode Island. But by 2002 Rep. Pisaturo had become less focused on gay-related issues, in part, because of the gay community's victories on a number of issues before the legislature in the late 1990s. In fact, during the 2002 legislative session, Rep. Pisaturo sponsored or co-sponsored 26 bills in the Rhode Island House. Of these, only one was related to HIV/AIDS and none directly mentioned gays, lesbians, or sexual orientation.

With the help of Rep. Pisaturo, 1998 was a banner year for gay-related legislation in the Rhode Island legislature. Indeed, by some accounts Rhode Island had the gay-friendliest legislative record in the country in 1998 (Cassels 1999). Successful legislation in the Assembly included, the repeal of the state's sodomy law, which some argued was the nation's most punitive, passage of a bill that required hospitals to allow patients to designate partners as immediate family, and a bill that enhanced the state's hate crime law covering sexual orientation (Cassels 1999). Rep. Pisaturo did not attribute this success solely to himself or gay lobbying efforts in a single year. Instead he argued that the success "is a direct result, not of any single effort in any single year, but the culmination of legislative and lobbying efforts over the last dozen years or more. The legislature has slowly come to understand our issues because we have made a more visible effort and have become more sophisticated and mature. We've been able to cut way at some of the biases and prejudices. We didn't need to educate from ground zero. Some already had their Gay 101 course and have moved on to 102 and 103" (Cassels 1999).

Although Pisaturo downplayed his own role in the 1998 legislature, the evidence suggests he was a prominent player in the success of gay-related bills. Pisaturo sponsored and co-sponsored bills on making condoms available in schools, asking the state Department of Education to make available sensitivity training about homosexuality, same-sex partner hospital visitation rights, expanding the state's hate crime law, providing more HIV research funding, ending discrimination against AIDS patients by insurance companies, allowing same-sex couples to officially marry, and



provide insurance benefits to the same-sex partners of state employees. Most of this legislation passed through committee, and some bills became law, including the hate crime bill. And although the domestic partner and same-sex marriage bills never received serious consideration, their introduction may provide the start of a “softening-up” of legislators for eventual passage down the road.

Perhaps the biggest gay-related legislative success in 1998 was repeal of the state’s 102 year-old sodomy law. Although he played a key role in its passage, Rep. Pisaturo did not sponsor or co-sponsor the bill for two reasons. First, the sponsor was most appropriately Rep. Ajello, because she had sponsored similar bills each year since 1992 (Haider-Markel 2000). Second, because of the other gay-related Pisaturo was sponsoring, such as same-sex marriage, co-sponsorship seemed politically damaging for the bill. Nevertheless, Pisaturo played a key role in advocating for the legislation and mobilizing the gay community to testify before committees and to lobby legislators. These efforts contributed significantly to final passage of the bill in the House on May 7 by 49-40-11 with no amendments.

Rep. Pisaturo capped his successful first term in the legislature at a June 1998 gay pride rally in front of the state capital. Just prior to the rally his domestic partner hospital visitation rights bill passed the full legislature, and Pisaturo celebrated at the rally by formally announcing he was seeking a second term. He told the crowd, ““It’s been a phenomenal first term for me. I’ve enjoyed every minute of it. We’ve beaten back two attempts to ban same-sex marriages by a bonus margin. We’ve repealed the most archaic and stringent sodomy law in the nation,” adding that he had gained co-sponsors on his bill to allow same-sex marriage and passed the domestic partner visitation law (Cassels 1998).

### **Summary of Case Studies**

As each of these cases demonstrates, openly lesbian and gay state legislators can achieve substantive representation of the gay community in several key ways, 1) by sponsoring or co-sponsoring gay-related legislation, 2) by advocating for the gay community on pro-gay and anti-gay legislation introduced by other legislators, 3) by serving as a liaison between the legislature and the gay community, and 4) by serving as a positive gay or lesbian role model in the legislature--an action that appears to influence other legislators and the public by dispelling negative stereotypes. However, at times representation may not appear so direct. Rather than allows adopting a strategy of directly sponsor or co-sponsoring gay related legislation, lesbian and gay officials may allow other, more senior, members of the legislature take the leadership role at times, regulating themselves to cheerleader positions. This strategy may help build support for legislation, as senior members serve as a lightning rod, and the more junior members can work behind the scenes.

Although these cases are instructive, the empirical question lingers as to whether the presence of lesbian and gay legislators influences the substantive representation in the legislative process. The remainder of this paper is devoted to answering this question using more systematic data. In the next section I introduce the key dependent variables for the analysis, and operationalize the independent variables, with guidance from the preceding cases and theoretical discussion.

## **A Multivariate Analysis of Substantive Political Representation**

### **Dependent Variables**

Because my central question concerns substantive political representation of the gay community, each dependent variable must concern policy related to gays and lesbians. Here I attempt to measure substantive political representation by examining the annual number of pro-gay legislation and anti-gay legislation introduced in each state, as well as the number of pro-gay and anti-gay bills that pass each year from 1992 to 2001.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, I model the difference between the number of pro-gay bills introduced and the number of anti-gay bills introduced, as well as the number of pro-gay bills passed minus the number of anti-gay bills passed. The difference variables allow me to capture the relative impact of the independent variables on pro-gay versus anti-gay legislation. Bill counts, although simplistic, are valid measures of legislative activity on gay issues. However, the measures are limited because they do not weight legislation according to potential impact on the gay community, nor are they limited to those bills sponsored or co-sponsored by gay legislators.

I chose not to design a weighting system for legislation simply because it is unclear that an acceptable weighting system can be devised. Additionally, I chose not to count only gay sponsored gay-related legislation because although such a measure would ensure that I captured the most extreme form of substantive political representation, the measure would miss the possible political nuances of legislative sponsorship. For example, at times it may be more advantageous for building political support if the actual sponsor of the bill is someone perceived as less partisan, more detached from the issue, or simply as someone with more political experience (Schiller 1995). My measures, therefore, should be the best measures of potential substantive political representation by gay and lesbian legislators.

However, I make use of one additional dependent variable--the passage of laws that ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. Lesbian and gay activists have focused more attention on passing these types of laws at the local, state, and national level than on any other gay-related policy. Although many such laws have been passed at the local level, only eleven states have adopted such policies since 1982.<sup>3</sup> Thus, it seems appropriate to examine whether gay legislators increase the likelihood of adopting antidiscrimination laws. To accomplish this task I made use of Event History Analysis, which examines the probability of a non-repeatable event occurring. My data set for this analysis is composed of state years, with each state starting at 1982, the year the first law was passed.<sup>4</sup> Each state has a case for each year through 2001, unless they adopted the policy. In that case the dependent variable is coded as one, and no additional case years are included in the data set for that state. For all other cases the dependent variable is coded as zero.

### **Independent Variables**

---

<sup>2</sup> Data are from the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force and state gay and lesbian interest groups, and searches of state legislative websites and online newspapers by the author.

<sup>3</sup> Maine adopted an antidiscrimination policy in 1997 only to have it repealed at the ballot box. Since the legislature did pass the law and gain the Governor's approval, Maine is counted here as an adopting state.

<sup>4</sup> Data on state antidiscrimination law adoption are from the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.

This section outlines the logic behind my independent variables and their operationalization. Although the key variable is my measure of political representation, the earlier theory discussion and case studies, as well as previous research, suggest that a number of forces will likely influence legislative activity on gay issues, including public opinion, the preferences of elites, the mobilization and resources of interest groups, and the characteristics and rules of the legislature (Haider-Markel and Meier 1996; Haider-Markel 1999; Haider-Markel 2002).

Political Representation: Key to my analysis is the notion that the election of openly lesbian or gay legislators will allow for the substantive representation of lesbian and gay concerns. To capture this influence I first identified all openly lesbian or gay state legislators ever held office in each state and their terms of service.<sup>5</sup> Second, I created a simple count variable of the number of openly lesbian or gay legislators serving in each state for each year from 1992 to 2001. Thus, this variable captures the potential for gay legislators to sponsor gay-related legislation or to simply support or oppose gay-related legislation introduced by another legislator. I expect representation to be positively related to the introduction and passage of pro-gay bills, as well as to the adoption of antidiscrimination laws.

And although one might expect representation to be negatively related to the introduction and passage of anti-gay bills, the relationship may in fact be positive if openly lesbian and gay legislators increase the salience of gay issues in a state. Haider-Markel and Meier (1996) found that increased salience makes the adoption of pro-gay policy less likely. Thus, increased salience in the legislative arena may lead to a legislative “backlash,” in which perceived gay successes lead legislators and interest groups to mobilize and introduce and pass anti-gay legislation. Given that the influence of gay legislators on anti-gay legislation is theoretically unclear, I do not specify the direction of this relationship. However, representation should be positively associated with the dependent variables that capture the difference between pro-gay and anti-gay bills if the relative impact of gay legislators is positive rather than negative.

Interest Group Mobilization: Interest groups typically exist to influence government policy, and they have the best chance for influencing policy if they can effectively mobilize their resources. Here I examine the potential influence of interest groups on both sides of the issue with surrogate measures of potential interest group resources.

Across the states, some gay groups have considerable strength and are likely to have influence in the policymaking process (Haider-Markel 2000). To survive and exert influence, however, gay interest groups must draw on the resources of their potential constituents (Haider-Markel 1997). One measure of potential gay interest group resources is the number of potential members a group can draw upon. The larger the potential membership the larger actual group membership should be. Groups with larger membership levels have greater potential influence in the policymaking process (Thomas and Hrebienar 1996, 147). My measure of potential gay and lesbian interest group

---

<sup>5</sup> Most of this data can be found in Smith and Haider-Markel (2002). The author will provide a complete current list upon request.

members is the number of same-sex unmarried partner households per 1,000 local population.<sup>6</sup>

On the other side of the issue are conservative religious groups that oppose positive legal recognition of homosexuals or homosexuality. Because most religions have explicit moral codes, orthodox followers will often have strong views on issues they perceive as involving morality, which often includes homosexuality. As such, persons with conservative religious beliefs in a state are a potential resource for religious conservative groups. Those religious denominations likely to have the strongest opposition to homosexuality are Protestant Fundamentalists and conservative evangelicals because their religious doctrines oppose homosexuality (Layman and Carmines 1997). Similar to past research (Haider-Markel and Meier 1996; Mooney and Lee 1995; Wald, Button, and Rienzo 1996), I capture the potential resources of conservative religious interest groups by including a measure of the percentage of a state's population that belongs to Protestant Fundamentalist denominations.<sup>7</sup>

Mass and Elite Preferences: As legislators debate policy issues related to gays and lesbians, the preferences of the public and political elites shape the debate as well as legislative outcomes. Research suggests that liberal-leaning legislators are more supportive of gay civil rights issues, and that legislators are more supportive when their constituents support gay civil rights (Haider-Markel 1999). I control for the ideological preferences of legislators with the measure of liberal/conservative ideology in the legislature developed by Berry et al. (1998).<sup>8</sup> Higher scores for this measure indicate greater liberalism, and I expect liberalism to be associated with pro-gay legislation as well as legislative outcomes.<sup>9</sup> Public preferences towards gay civil rights are accounted for with Lewis and Edelson's (2000) average state public support for hiring homosexuals across five job categories. Higher scores for this measure indicate greater support for hiring gays, and I expect higher support to be associated with pro-gay legislation as well as legislative outcomes.

Additionally, competition between political parties may influence the policy process. As parties become more competitive, the demands of appealing to voting and building electoral coalitions may result in more liberal policies (Holbrook and Van Dunk

---

<sup>6</sup> Data are from the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1990). The 1990 census asked respondents if they lived with an unmarried-partner. Respondents could answer yes regardless of their gender or the gender of their partner. Only those respondents indicating that they lived with a same-sex partner are counted here. While it is clear that this measure only counts those gays and lesbians living with a partner and willing to signify it, the measure should be an accurate reflection of *potential* gay and lesbian interest group resources at the local level (see Haider-Markel 1997; Wald, Button, and Rienzo 1996).

<sup>7</sup> Following Haider-Markel and Meier (1996) denominations classified as Protestant Fundamentalist were Churches of God, Later Day Saints, Churches of Christ, Church of the Nazarene, Mennonites, Conservative Baptist Association, Missouri Synod Lutherans, Pentecostal Holiness, the Salvation Army, Seventh-Day Adventists, Southern Baptists, and Wisconsin Synod Lutherans.

<sup>8</sup> Data for 1999 comes from the Berry et al. (1998) data update on the ICPSR website, and data for 2000 and 2001 are extrapolated from earlier years.

<sup>9</sup> Because Democrats tend to be more supportive of gay civil rights than Republicans (Yang 1999), a related measure would be partisan control of the state legislature. However, preliminary analysis found the inclusion of a percent Democrat variable was not statistically significant, nor did it improve the models.

1993). I control for party competition with the Holbrook and Van Dunk (1993) district-level measure of party competition.<sup>10</sup>

Institutional Characteristics: In my preliminary analysis I included several variables to capture institutional characteristics that might influence the legislative process and outcomes, including session length, professionalization, and number of bills introduced and enacted. I expected that each of these variables would increase the total number of gay-related bills considered, and perhaps adopted. However, the only consistently performing variables were the simple counts of the number of bills introduced and enacted. As such, in the models of bills introduced I include a control variable for the total number of bills introduced, and in the models of bills passed I include a control variable for the total number of bills passed.<sup>11</sup> Each of these control variables is of course coded zero for the years in which several states do not hold legislative sessions.

## **Results and Discussion**

For my models examining bills introduced and passed, linear regression was used. However, since the data for the legislation models is pooled cross-sectional data from 1992 to 2001, problems with autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity, tests were conducted for each of these statistical problems. Although autocorrelation was not a problem, heteroskedasticity was. As such, the regression was estimated using heteroskedastic panel corrected standard errors in *STATA* version 7.

Additionally, because my model of the passage of antidiscrimination laws has a dichotomous dependent variable, logistic regression was used to estimate model parameters. The results for the models predicting the introduction and adoption of pro-gay legislation are shown in Table 1 and the results for the models predicting the introduction and adoption of anti-gay legislation are shown in Table 2.

[Insert Table 1 About Here]

The results in Table 1 suggest that the number of pro-gay bills introduced is a function of the total number of bills considered each year, interest group resources, public support for gay civil rights, and the number of openly gay or lesbian legislators. As religious conservative interest group resources increase, pro-gay bills decrease, and pro-gay bills increase as gay interest group resources increase. In fact, the mobilization of potential interest group resources appears to have more influence than does overall legislative ideology, which is not statistically significant. As public support for gay civil rights increases, so to does the number of pro-gay bills. But most importantly, as the number of openly lesbian or gay legislators increases, so to does the number of pro-gay bills introduced, suggesting that gays have achieved substantive representation in state legislatures by electing openly lesbian and gay candidates to the legislature.

The adoption of pro-gay legislation is associated with a similar set of forces, including the number of openly gay or lesbian legislators, interest group resources, and the total number of bills enacted each year. However, public support for gay rights is not

---

<sup>10</sup> Because Louisiana is missing from the Holbrook and Van Dunk (1993) measure, I used other measures of partisanship and competition to estimate Louisiana's score as 17.07.

<sup>11</sup> Data are from the Council of State Governments (various years).

statistically significant in this model. Across both models, the influence of openly gay legislators is highly significant and endures even under alternative model specifications, such as alternative measures of legislative ideology and public opinion. These results provide strong evidence of substantive political representation for the gay community through the election of gay officials.

[Insert Table 2 About Here]

The results in Table 2 are quite similar to those in Table 1. The number of anti-gay bills introduced is a function of interest group resources, the total number of bills considered, and public support for gay rights. The finding on public support suggests that as public support for gay rights increases, legislators may be less likely to even introduce anti-gay bills, perhaps out of concerns for reelection. Additionally, legislature ideology plays a significant role here, with more liberal legislatures introducing fewer anti-gay bills. Interestingly, ideology is significant while religious conservative interest group resources do not show a statistically significant relationship. The fact that legislature ideology is more important than religious conservative interest group resources on anti-gay versus pro-gay bills may occur because the legislature generally represents the views of those interest groups better than, for example, gay interest groups. The model of legislature adoption of anti-gay policies reveals a similar pattern, but interest groups and public opinion appear to matter even less for policy adoption.

However, the most confusing aspect of both models is that the number of gay or lesbian legislators appears to actually increase the number of anti-gay bills introduced and passed. Although I speculated that the increased presence of gays and increased salience of gay issues might result in an anti-gay backlash, the theory of political representation had suggested that the presence of representatives of a group should not only lead to representation in the policy process through the direct actions of those representatives, but also because those representatives might, by providing a positive role model, decrease at least the most extreme elements of debate and policy proposals directed at that group.

So if a backlash hypothesis, that more gay legislators lead to more anti-gay legislation, is correct, we should find that other increases in gay-positive activity increase anti-gay legislation. Conversely, if the broad theory of political representation is correct, that gay officials will decrease opposition simply by acting as positive role models in the legislature, we could perhaps find a interaction between the number of gay officials and legislature ideology would have a negative influence on the number of anti-gay bills introduced and passed. In other words, the combination of liberal legislators and gay legislatures should lead to less anti-gay legislation, but conservative legislators and gay legislators will lead to more anti-gay legislation. I briefly examine both of these hypotheses in Table 2a.

[Insert Table 2a About Here]

The first two columns in Table 2a test the notion that a backlash occurs because some political actors perceive that gays are making policy gains. To test this notion beyond gay legislators I reran the models and included the number of pro-gay bills

introduced (column one) and passed (column two) as independent variables. If backlash occurs because the election of gays to the legislature makes some legislators introduce more anti-gay bills, then so to should any increase in the pro-gay agenda of the legislature.

In columns three and four I reran the same models but included an interaction variable, which is the sum of gay legislators multiplied by legislature ideology. If gay legislators influence the behavior of other legislators through their symbolic representation, then the interaction variable should be negative and significant.

The results appear to support the backlash hypothesis over the political representation hypothesis. The number of pro-gay bills introduced has a positive and strong influence on the number of anti-gay bills introduced, and pro-gay bills adopted influences the number of anti-gay bills adopted. Indeed, these relationships are strong enough to eliminate the previously positive influence gay legislators had on anti-gay bill introduction and adoption. This suggests that backlash does in fact occur when legislators, and perhaps other political actors, observe an increase in the pro-gay agenda of the legislature. Conversely, there is less support for the political representation hypothesis. The interaction variable is not significant in either model. However, it does suggest the hypothesized positive direction and is fairly close to marginal levels of statistical significance. So perhaps this hypothesis cannot be ignored. But the evidence provides the strongest support for the backlash hypothesis.

[Insert Table 3 About Here]

This discussion suggests there are negative outcomes to substantive political representation. If gays and lesbians gain effective substantive political representation through the introduction and passage of pro-gay legislation, they also face an increasing anti-gay agenda in state legislatures. If this is true one might begin to argue that there is a dark side to political representation, or at least that it is not a solely positive political phenomenon for the represented community. So why then elect gay legislators?

My final models provide some hope for normative democratic theorists. To see if the net effect of political representation might in fact be positive rather than negative, I estimated three additional models. The first two are displayed in Table 3 and the final model is displayed in Table 4. For the models in Table 3 I simply subtracted the number of anti-gay bills from the number of pro-gay bills introduced (column one) and adopted (column two). Thus, each dependent variable is still a simple count, with higher positive number indicating a higher pro-gay legislative agenda.

The results are similar to those shown in Table 1 and suggest that the net effect of symbolic political representation for gays and lesbians is positive. As the number of openly gay and lesbian legislatures increases, so to does the net pro-gay agenda. So even though symbolic representation may have negative, anti-gay consequences, the net effect is positive for representation of the gay community.

[Insert Table 4 About Here]

Additionally, symbolic representation of the gay community also leads to significant policy victories. As the results in Table 4 indicate, higher numbers of gay

legislators increase the probability that a state will adopt policies that ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. This combination of results suggests that symbolic political representation can lead to substantive political representation as well as to political backlash. However, the net effect is positive substantive political representation for the gay community.

### **Conclusions**

This study examined the question of whether symbolic political representation can lead to substantive political representation in state legislatures. I focused on the representation of gay and lesbian interests in the policy making process by openly lesbian and gay state legislators. I suggested that lesbians and gays are more likely to place their issues on the political agenda and achieve legislative success if they elect openly gay officials. To test this hypothesis I conducted several case studies of individual legislators, as well as quantitative analysis of pro-gay and anti-gay legislative introduction and policy adoption in state legislatures using 1992 to 2001 data from the fifty American states.

My empirical results suggest that the resources of gay interest groups as well as religious conservative groups, public support for gay civil rights, the ideology of political elites, and institutional characteristics drive the introduction and adoption of gay-related legislation. Most importantly, the symbolic representation of gays and lesbians through openly gay legislators leads to substantive political representation. As more gays are elected to the legislature, the number of pro-gay bills introduced increases, as does the number of pro-gay bills passing, and the likelihood that a state will adopt a policy banning sexual orientation discrimination.

However, my results also suggested there is a dark side to symbolic representation, at least for the gay community. As the number of gay legislators increased, so too did the number of anti-gay bills introduced and passed--a negative outcome for both the gay community and students of normative democratic theory. I hypothesized that this "backlash" might result from the general increased salience of the political demands of the gay community in the legislature through elected gay officials. As a counter-argument, I also hypothesized that the presence of gay officials, acting as positive role models in the legislature, might, in combination with liberal legislator ideology, decrease the introduction and passage of anti-gay legislation. Additional analysis found greatest support for the backlash hypothesis, but there was weak support for the combination of political representation and a liberal legislature.

Although these results are not intuitive, additional analysis of the net effect of gay political representation suggests that symbolic representation for the gay community has a greater positive effect on legislation and policy than negative. Symbolic representation did lead to an anti-gay backlash, but the number of pro-gay bills and the number of those bills adopted was higher relative to anti-gay bills when gay legislators were present than when they were not. Thus, we can be fairly confident that symbolic representation will lead to positive policy outcomes for the represented community.

This study has answered several important empirical questions related to political representation, but the analysis has also raised additional questions that may be even more intriguing. For example, the process by which symbolic representation might lead to a legislative or policy backlash is not well understood, nor has it ever received



systematic empirical attention. Further, it is unclear that groups other than the gay community might have faced, or will face, similar types of backlash in political arenas. Anecdotal evidence suggests the women, blacks, Latinos, and Native Americans have faced periods of policy backlash following the placement of their issues on the political agenda, but such issues have not been subjected to empirical research. Additional research in these areas can better help us understand the process of political representation, as well as potential pitfalls for those making political demands before a, perhaps hostile, ruling majority.

**Table 1: Determinants of State Introduction and Adoption of Pro-Gay Legislation**

<i>Independent Variables</i>	Introduction Model	Adoption Model
Gay Legislators	.677** (.261)	.265** (.064)
Legislature Ideology	-.013 (.009)	-.00007 (.00184)
Religious Interest Group Resources	-.028** (.011)	-.008** (.003)
Gay Interest Group Resources	.008* (.003)	.0011* (.0005)
Public Support for Gay Rights	.081# (.046)	.014 (.009)
Party Competition	.0003 (.0194)	.005 (.004)
Total Bills Considered or Adopted	.0007# (.0004)	.0004** (.0001)
Constant	-1.421 (1.497)	-.507 (.356)
R-squared	.25	.19
Wald Chi-Square	59.93	56.50
Prob. Chi-Square	.000	.000
Number of Cases	500	500

Notes: Dependent variables are raw counts of pro-gay bills introduced or passed. Coefficients are linear regression coefficients. Standard errors are in parenthesis and are heteroskedastic panel corrected standard errors. Significance levels: \*\* < .01; \* < .05; # < .10.

**Table 2: Determinants of State Introduction and Adoption of Anti-Gay Legislation**

<i>Independent Variables</i>	Introduction Model	Adoption Model
Gay Legislators	.302* (.161)	.053# (.030)
Legislature Ideology	-.013** (.006)	-.004** (.001)
Religious Interest Group Resources	.003 (.010)	.005 (.003)
Gay Interest Group Resources	.002# (.001)	-.0002 (.0002)
Public Support for Gay Rights	-.058* (.024)	.002 (.005)
Party Competition	.010 (.016)	-.0005 (.0033)
Total Bills Considered or Adopted	.0005# (.0002)	.0002* (.0001)
Constant	.346 (.972)	.379* (.178)
R-squared	.13	.04
Wald Chi-Square	20.53	22.61
Prob. Chi-Square	.004	.000
Number of Cases	500	500

Notes: Dependent variables are raw counts of anti-gay bills introduced or passed. Coefficients are linear regression coefficients. Standard errors are in parenthesis and are heteroskedastic panel corrected standard errors. Significance levels: \*\* < .01; \* < .05; # < .10.

**Table 2a: Determinants of State Introduction and Adoption of Anti-Gay Legislation, Backlash and Political Representation**

<i>Independent Variables</i>	Backlash Introduction Model	Backlash Adoption Model	Pol. Rep. Introduction Model	Pol. Rep. Adoption Model
Gay Legislators	.003 (.131)	.012 (.030)	1.111* (.547)	.123 (.117)
Legislature Ideology	-.010# (.005)	-.004** (.001)	-.008 (.006)	-.003* (.001)
Religious Interest Group Resources	.016 (.010)	.006# (.004)	-.010 (.011)	.005 (.004)
Gay Interest Group Resources	.0007 (.001)	-.0003 (.0002)	.004** (.001)	-.0002 (.0002)
Public Support for Gay Rights	-.022 (.023)	.004 (.005)	-.073** (.027)	.002 (.005)
Party Competition	.010 (.012)	-.001 (.003)	.017 (.016)	-.0003 (.0033)
Total Bills Considered or Adopted	.0002 (.0001)	.0001 (.0001)	.0016** (.0006)	.0002* (.0001)
Pro-Gay Bills Introduced or Passed	.443** (.046)	.154** (.037)	-----	-----
Interaction: Gay Legislators * Legislature Ideology	-----	-----	-.014 (.009)	-.001 (.001)
Constant	.975 (.804)	.457** (.175)	-.422 (1.071)	.354* (.180)
R-squared	.46	.09	.08	.04
Wald Chi-Square	137.57	42.26	22.20	23.12
Prob. Chi-Square	.000	.000	.005	.003
Number of Cases	500	500	500	500

Notes: Dependent variables are raw counts of anti-gay bills introduced or passed. Coefficients are linear regression coefficients. Standard errors are in parenthesis and are heteroskedastic panel corrected standard errors. Significance levels: \*\* < .01; \* < .05; # < .10.



**Table 3: Determinants of Pro-Gay Legislation to Anti-Gay Legislation Considered and Adopted**

<i>Independent Variables</i>	Pro-Anti Introduction Model	Pro-Anti Adoption Model
Gay Legislators	.375# (.207)	.212** (.062)
Legislature Ideology	.003 (.008)	.003# (.002)
Religious Interest Group Resources	-.031* (.013)	-.013** (.004)
Gay Interest Group Resources	.005# (.003)	.0013* (.0006)
Public Support for Gay Rights	.023 (.041)	.015 (.009)
Party Competition	-.009 (.014)	.005 (.004)
Total Bills Considered or Adopted	.0002# (.0001)	.0002 (.0001)
Constant	-1.767 (1.238)	-.887 (.367)
R-squared	.16	.18
Wald Chi-Square	65.17	65.70
Prob. Chi-Square	.000	.000
Number of Cases	500	500

Notes: Dependent variables are the result of pro-gay bills introduced minus anti-gay bills, and pro-gay minus anti-gay bills passed. Coefficients are linear regression coefficients. Standard errors are in parenthesis and are heteroskedastic panel corrected standard errors. Significance levels: \*\* < .01; \* < .05; # < .10.

**Table 4: Determinants of State Adoption of Antidiscrimination  
Law Covering Sexual Orientation**

<i>Independent Variables</i>	<i>Adoption Model</i>
Gay Legislators	.801** (.264)
Legislature Ideology	.023 (.016)
Religious Interest Group Resources	-.168 (.113)
Gay Interest Group Resources	.010 (.019)
Public Support for Gay Rights	.118* (.054)
Party Competition	-.038 (.041)
Constant	-1.421 (1.497)
% Correctly Predicted	98.66%
Chi-Square	38.74
Prob. Chi-Square	.000
Number of Cases	898

Notes: Dependent variable is coded one if state adopts sexual orientation  
antidiscrimination law and zero otherwise. Coefficients are logistic regression  
coefficients. Standard errors are in parenthesis. Significance levels: \*\* < .01;  
\* < .05; # < .10.



## References

- Berrill, Kevin T. 1992. *Countering Anti-Gay Violence Through Legislation*. Washington, DC: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute.
- Berry, William D., Evan J. Ringquist, Richard C. Fording, and Russell L. Hanson. 1998. "Measuring Citizen and Government Ideology in the American States, 1960-93." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(1):327-348.
- Bradley, Martin B., Norman M. Green, Dale E. Johnson, Mac Lynn, and Lou McNeil. 1992. *Churches and Church Membership in the United States, 1990*. Atlanta: Glenmary Research Center.
- Browning, Rufus P., Dale R. Marshall, and David H. Tabb. 1984. *Protest is not Enough: The Struggle of Blacks and Hispanics for Equality in Urban Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Button, James W., Barbara A. Rienzo, and Kenneth D. Wald. 1997. *Private Lives, Public Conflicts: Battles Over Gay Rights in American Communities*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Campbell, David, and Joe R. Feagin. 1977. "Black Politics in the South: A Descriptive Analysis." *Journal of Politics* 37:129-59.
- Cassels, Peter. "Rhode Island Has Its Pride Fest June 20," *Bay Windows* 25 June 1998, p. 3.
- Cassels, Peter. "R.I. Has Nation's Best Legislative Record," *The Bay Area Reporter* 1 January 1999.
- Cole, Leonard. 1976. *Blacks in Power: A Comparative Study of Black and White Elected Officials*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Council of State Governments. Various Years. *The Book of the States*. Lexington, KY: The Council of State Governments.
- Davila, Robert D. "A Plea For Protection From Harassment: Gay, Lesbian Students Lobby For Safety," *The Sacramento Bee*, 22 January 1998.
- Eisinger, Peter K. 1982. "Black Employment in Municipal Jobs: The Impact of Black Political Power." *The American Political Science Review* 76(2):380-92.
- Eulau, Heinz, and Paul D. Karsps. 1977. "The Puzzle of Representation: Specifying Components of Responsiveness." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 2(1):233-254.
- Fox, Richard Logan. 1997. *Gender Dynamics in Congressional Elections*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Freiberg, Peter. "A Vote of Confidence: Openly Gay Candidates Nearly Double Compared to Number on 1998 Ballots," *The Washington Blade* 27 October 2000.
- Freiberg, Peter. "44 Openly Gay Candidates Win," *The Washington Blade*, 15 November 1996.
- Gerber, Elisabeth R., Rebecca B. Morton, and Thomas A. Rietz. 1998. "Minority Representation in Multimember Districts." *American Political Science Review* 92(1):127-44.
- Grow, Doug. "Allan Spear, Gay Senator Who Educated Minnesota, Retiring," *The Minneapolis Star Tribune*, 17 May 2000.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P. 1997. "Interest Group Survival: Shared Interests Versus Competition for Resources." *Journal of Politics* 59(3):903-12.

- Haider-Markel, Donald P. 1999. "Redistributing Values in Congress: Interest Group Influence Under Sub-Optimal Conditions." *Political Research Quarterly* 52(1):113-44.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P. 2000. "Lesbian and Gay Politics in the States: Interest Groups, Electoral Politics, and Public Policy." In *The Politics of Gay Rights*, eds. Craig A. Rimmerman, and Kenneth D. Wald, Clyde Wilcox. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P. and Kenneth J. Meier. 1996. "The Politics of Gay and Lesbian Rights: Expanding the Scope of the Conflict." *Journal of Politics* 58(2):352-69.
- Haider-Markel, Donald P., Mark R. Joslyn, and Chad J. Kniss. 2000. "Minority Group Interests and Political Representation: Gay Elected Officials in the Policy Process." *The Journal of Politics* 62(2):568-77.
- Holbrook, Thomas M. and Emily Van Dunk. 1993. "Electoral Competition in the American States." *American Political Science Review* 87(4):955-62.
- Keech, William R. 1968. *The Impact of Negro Voting: The Role of the Vote in the Quest for Equality*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Kingdon, John. 1989. *Congressmen's Voting Decisions* 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Row.
- Kuklinski, James H. 1979. "Representative-Constituency Linkages: A Review Article." *Legislative Quarterly Studies* 4: 121-140.
- Layman, Geoffrey C., and Edward G. Carmines. 1997. "Cultural Conflict in American Politics: Religious Traditionalism, Postmaterialism, and U.S. Political Behavior." *Journal of Politics* 59(3):751-77.
- Levine, Charles H. 1974. *Racial Conflict and the American Mayor*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Lewis, Gregory B., and Jonathan L. Edelson. 2000. "DOMA and ENDA: Congress Votes on Gay Rights." In *The Politics of Gay Rights*, eds. Kenneth D. Wald, Craig A. Rimmerman, and Clyde Wilcox. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Matland, Richard E. 1993. "Institutional Variables Affecting Female Representation in National Legislatures: The Case of Norway." *The Journal of Politics* 55(3):737-55.
- Mladenka, Kenneth R. 1989. "Blacks and Hispanics in Urban Politics." *American Political Science Review* 83(1):165-91.
- Mooney, Christopher Z. 1999. "Symposium Editor's Introduction: The Politics of Morality Policy." *Policy Studies Journal* (Forthcoming).
- Mooney, Christopher Z., and Mei-Hsien Lee. 1995. "Legislating Morality in the American States: The Case of Pre-Roe Abortion Regulation Reform." *American Journal of Political Science* 39:599-627.
- Morain, Dan. "Assembly Oks Bill Banning Anti-Gay Bias But Rejects Another," *The Los Angeles Times*, 5 June 1997.
- Pitkin, Hannah F. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rayside, David Morton. 1998. *On the Fringe: Gays and Lesbians in Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Saltzstein, Grace Hall. 1989. "Black Mayors and Police Policies." *The Journal of*

- Politics* 51(3):525-44.
- Schiller, Wendy J. 1995. "Senators as Political Entrepreneurs: Using Bill Sponsorship to Shape Legislative Agendas." *American Journal of Political Science* 39(1):186:203.
- Sharp, Elaine B. 1997. "A Comparative Anatomy of Urban Social Conflict." *Political Research Quarterly* 50(2):261-80.
- Sherrill, Kenneth S. 1996. "The Political Power of Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexuals." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29:469-73.
- Skelton, George. "A Remarkable Floor Debate On Gay Rights," *The Los Angeles Times*, 5 June 1997.
- Smith, Raymond A., and Donald P. Haider-Markel. 2002. *Gay and Lesbian Americans and Political Participation*. Denver: ABC-CLIO Publishers.
- Swain, Carol. 1993. *Black Faces, Black Interests*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Thomas, Clive S., and Ronald J. Hrebenar. 1996. "Interest Groups in the States." In *Politics in the American States*, 6th ed. Eds. Virginia Gray and Herbert Jacob. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Thomas, Sue. 1994. *How Women Legislate*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. Various Years. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Vanzi, Max. "Panel OKs Bill That Would Let Gay Couples Adopt," *The Los Angeles Times*, 3 April 1997.
- Wahlke, John C. 1971. "Policy Demands and System Support: The Role of the Represented." *British Journal of Political Science* 1: 271-290.
- Wald, Kenneth D., James W. Button, and Barbara A. Rienzo. 1996. "The Politics of Gay Rights in American Communities: Explaining Antidiscrimination Ordinances and Policies." *American Journal of Political Science* 40(4):1152-78.
- Weintraub, Daniel M. "California to Battle over Discrimination against Gays in Schools,"
- Yang, Alan S. 1999. *From Wrongs to Rights: Public Opinion on Gay and Lesbian Americans Moves Toward Equality, 1973-1999*. Washington, DC: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.