

Professor Richard Forgette
116A Deupree, 915-5423
e-mail: rforgett@olemiss.edu
OHs: W., F. 1:00-3:00 p.m., by appt.

POL 603 Seminar on Legislative Politics
Spring 2004 Thursday, 2:30-5:00 205 Deupree

This graduate-level seminar will introduce students to seminal studies and recent research on legislative politics. The focus will be the U.S. Congress, perhaps our best window for watching representative democracy at work. In this course, we will discuss various theoretical frameworks for studying Congress (and legislatures generally) as well as several topics of empirical research (congressional recruitment, elections, committee and party organization, etc...). We will conclude by reading about and discussing some emerging topics and interconnections with the legislative studies literature.

A good theme for this seminar in 2004 might be the benefits, drawbacks, and limits of party government in Congress. Consider the roller-coaster events of the past decade. In the wake of 1994 Republican electoral turnover, Speaker Gingrich was viewed as an exalted, Moses-like figure leading his Republican followers out of the desert after 40 years as the minority party. The Speaker orchestrated the whirlwind 100 day schedule to vote on the *Contract With America*. At the time, the benefits of an empowered leader and disciplined rank-and-file never appeared so evident. Not a full year later, though, Gingrich was being blamed for shutting the government down during the now infamous 1995 budget impasse. During the 105th Congress, the Speaker narrowly survived a coup d'état from among his own copartisans. During the 1998 midterm elections, the Clinton impeachment proceedings polarized both chambers and culminated in the chaotic shakeup of the House Republican leadership. At the time, critics claimed that the excesses of party government were now resulting in a decline of institutional civility and the continuation of policy gridlock. In 2000, the Bush campaign asserted the need for a new bipartisan brand of congressional politics. Bipartisanship was achieved with the Administration's Education Reform. However, other major items of the Bush Administration's legislative agenda – tax cuts and the Medicare reform – were accomplished through narrow partisan coalitions. When and to what degree is bipartisan coalition formation feasible or even desirable in today's Congress? Perhaps we may explore in this seminar the changing ties and liberties of party rank-and-file and leaders in a legislature whose institutional design does not compel strictly cohesive party coalitions.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

This seminar has several goals. First, for students intending to teach and conduct research, this course should provide a well-structured introduction to both the substance and manner of academic research of Congress. We will discuss both classic and current theoretical frameworks and empirical analyses. The final paper will be an opportunity for you to structure and conduct your own independent analysis.

Another goal of this course is to provide a means for exploring the advantages and limits of the legislative process as a governing and representational system. Throughout this course, we implicitly contrast two abstract principles structuring a democratic, legislative institution: representation and governance. Representation is the degree to which elected officials reflect and respond to the preferences and characteristics of their constituents. Governance is the practice of making analytically sound, timely, and well-justified public policy choices, as well as managing and overseeing the development of existing policies in a continuing, reasoned manner.

Sometimes, as we will see, the legislative principles of representation and governance are congruent. That is, legislators' motives, institutional structure, and external forces improve both legislative representation and governance. In other ways, the two principles seem to work against each other. This course will provide an opportunity for you to personally assess how well Congress as a democratic institution works to both represent and govern.

COURSE FORMAT:

This course will follow a seminar format. This means that you are expected to regularly participate in discussions. *Everyone is to read critically each assigned reading before class.* You should be prepared to ask informed and thoughtful comments regarding each author's research question(s), the question's theoretical or empirical relevance, the research design and methods employed, and the work's external and internal validity. The usefulness of our class discussions will largely depend on your level of preparation and participation.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

I will base your grade equally on four assigned works: (1) weekly reviews, (2) participation and presentations, (3) a midterm, and (4) a final exam or research paper. To facilitate your class preparation, I first ask that you hand in (to my mailbox in 116A Deupree) a **brief review** of the week's assigned reading *no later than 9:30 a.m. the day of the class.* This morning due date will allow me to read your reviews before class. Your weekly review should be between 250 and 300 words – about the length of a typed and single spaced page. Late reviews will be assessed a grading penalty (1/2 letter grade per day). Given busy schedules, you may choose *one* week to not complete a review.

Generally, your reviews should be about any or all of the following: a) an informed response to the question posed for that week's reading on the course syllabus; b) a brief summary *and critique* of the assigned reading; and/or c) your ideas of connections between various readings or extensions to the current research. I don't want to limit you too much with regard to the content of your weekly reviews. However, my strongest advice is for you not to infer from the word and page length a casualness in the assignment. I expect that you'll often find it hard to write a clearly written and insightful essay in this limited space. Your review should demonstrate that you critically read the complete assignment. Beyond that, focus on only one or two core criticisms/comments recognizing the page length constraint.

Class participation and presentations will determine the second part of your grade. You must be prepared to participate regularly during each seminar. Thus, all assigned readings must be completed before the scheduled class. This seminar will not work unless everyone participates in the discussions. While frequency of participation is not all important, you should be prepared to participate in the discussion *no less than three times per session.* I will record participation grades as the semester progresses. Please speak with me if you have any questions about your participation.

Additionally, each week there will be readings ("special reports" on the class schedule) that we, as a class, will not be able to complete. Everyone should select *at least two* reading during the semester to present before the class. You may improve your participation grade by choosing to present more than two. Special report entries on the course schedule reading list below are designated as either a "*" or "***." Longer special reports or ones requiring some statistical methods background are given a double asterisk. Non first-year, graduate students are encouraged to choose these double-star, special reports. Your presentation should be about 10 minutes long and should include *all* of the following: a) a brief (1-2 pages) *written handout* of the reading to distribute to the other class members; b) an oral summary of the reading; c) a concluding critique perhaps linking the reading to others or offering questions initiating a discussion for the class.

A third component of your grade will be a **midterm exam or paper.** The exam will be held during the first hour and half of week 7. It will have an essay format and will test your retention and synthesis of the readings from the first half of the class. You have an option to either take the in-class midterm or to complete a written assignment. The writing assignment will be to draft an annotated undergraduate syllabus and a lecture(s) on one course topic from your syllabus. I will discuss this assignment in the coming weeks.

The final quarter of your grade will be determined by a research paper on a topic relevant to the course. I prefer that you write a paper that: 1) poses a single, clear question, 2) includes a discussion of the theoretical or substantive relevance of that question (linking it with works from the legislative studies literature) and 3) incorporates some data in order to respond to that question. Students without methods training may choose to propose a research agenda/design rather than analysis. Begin thinking about this paper early in the semester. For Feb. 19, after the midterm, you will be asked to briefly discuss and present a single page summary of your preliminary paper topic. By March 4, I ask that you submit a 3-5 page, single-spaced, progress report of the research question, introduction, literature review, and methodology. The progress report will count as a quarter of the overall paper grade. The final paper should be a typed, double-

spaced, 10-20 page paper with a reference page and appropriate citation and text style. The paper will be due at the University-scheduled final exam time.

ASSIGNED BOOKS:

David Mayhew. 1974. Congress: The Electoral Connection (Yale University Press).
Press).

Gary Cox and Mathew McCubbins. 1993. Legislative Leviathan: Party Government in the House
(University of California Press).

Gary Jacobson, 2004. The Politics of Congressional Elections. Longman.

Forgette, Richard. 2004. Congress, Parties, and Puzzles. Peter Lang. (**recommended**)

You may want to check the following texts (not required) as useful references on the congressional process:

Roger Davidson and W. Oleszek. 2000. Congress and Its Members, 8th edition.

W. Oleszek. 1996. Congressional Procedure and the Policy Process, 6th ed. (CQ Press).

There will be assigned readings of photocopied articles as well (designated as "**(photo)**" on the readings schedule). A copy of each article will be on reserve at the Reserved Reading Room of Williams Library. Additionally, a copy of each article will be available in the reserved reading file cabinet in Room 205 Deupree under PSC 603. I also have JSTOR links to some of the articles on the web-page version of this syllabus.

NOTE: The "recommended" readings following the special report entries are listed to serve as initial readings for graduate students preparing for masters and Ph.D. exams. A "#" indicates that the book or article may be read in preparation for M.A. tutorials. A "+" next the reading indicates that it should be read in preparation for a Ph.D. comprehensive exam. These Ph.D. recommended readings are not exhaustive of all important research on legislative studies. They are only a base of readings organized by topic that all legislative studies scholars should be familiar with. Students preparing for a Ph.D. comprehensive exam should examine other readings they find useful or important beyond those listed below. I've also included readings designated as "!!?" that are readings that you may find interesting to read if you focus on that particular topic..

COURSE ORGANIZATION:

1. (Jan. 8) Introduction to Course. Complete the assigned readings and review for next Thursday.

I. Representation vs. Governance: Contending Perspectives Regarding the Normative Ideals of a Legislator and Legislature

2. (Jan. 15) Legislative Representation and Governance: What do these terms mean? To what extent does each goal reinforce or limit the other with regard to Congress? What were the founders' expectations about how and to what extent these principles would be attained? How do legislators work toward these principles in practice?

Assignment:

Richard Fenno. Homestyle. ch. 1, 2, 7 (photo)

Richard Forgette. Congress, Parties, and Puzzles, ch.s 1-3 (photo)

Manin, Bernard. The Principles of Representative Government, pp.s 102-131. (photo)

Special Reports:

* Fenno, Richard. 1996. Senators on the Campaign Trail. chap.s 1-3.

* Shepsle, Kenneth. 1989. "The Changing Textbook Congress," in Can The Government Govern? Brookings.

* Federalist Papers. (interests) 47, 51. (House) 52-53, 55-57 (Senate) 62-63

Recommended:

+ Miller, Warren and Donald Stokes. 1963. "Constituency Influence in Congress." APSR (March) JSTOR.

+ Achen, Christopher. 1978. "Measuring Representation." AJPS (August) JSTOR.

+ William Riker. 1982. Liberalism Against Populism. San Francisco: Freeman.

II. Different Theoretical Frameworks and Levels of Analysis To the Study of Legislatures.

A. Systemic Perspectives.

3. (Jan. 22) The Historical and Comparative Approaches to Studying Congress: How has Congress evolved over time? How do different electoral systems and constitutional design affect the internal distribution of power within legislatures?

Assignment:

“History of the House” and “History of the Senate,” in CQ Guide to Congress. (photo)

Norris, Pippa. "Legislative Recruitment," in Comparing Democracies: Elections and Voting in Global Perspectives. (photo)

Special Reports:

* Ehrenhalt, Alan. The United States of Ambition. selected chapters.

* The Political Methodologist. Fall, 1997. (A series of articles about historical study of institutions.)

** Katz, Jonathan and Brian Sala. 1996. "Careerism, Committee Assignments, and the Electoral Connection." APSR 90-1: 21-33. JSTOR

** Fiorina, M. 1994. "Divided Government in the American States: A Byproduct of Legislative Professionalism?" American Political Science Review (June), p.304. See the Stonecash response.

Recommended:

Nelson Polsby. 1968. "The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives." American Political Science Review, 62: 148-68. (photo) JSTOR

Binder, Sarah. 1997. Minority Rights, Majority Rule.

Gerald Gamm and K. Shepsle. 1989. "Emergence of Legislative Institutions: Standing Committees in the House and Senate, 1810-1825." Legislative Studies Quarterly, 24: 39-66.(photo)

+ Cooper, Joseph and David Brady. 1981. "Institutional Context and Leadership Style: The House from Cannon to Rayburn." APSR 75: 411-25.

+ Sundquist, James. The Decline and Resurgence of Congress.

+ Brady, David, Richard Brody, and David Epstein. 1989. "Heterogeneous Parties and Political Organization: The U.S. Senate, 1880-1920." Legislative Studies Quarterly 14: 205-24.

+ Polsby, Nelson, Miriam Gallaher, and Barry Rundquist. 1969. "The Growth of the Seniority System in the House of Representatives." APSR 63: 787-807.

(on comparative legislative systems)

+ Olson, David. Democratic Legislative Institutions: A Comparative View, selected chapters.

+ Shugart, Matthew and John Carey. Presidents and assemblies : Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics

+ Cain, Bruce, John Ferejohn, and Morris Fiorina. The Personal Vote.

+ Rosenthal, Alan. 1998. The Decline of Representative Democracy: Process, Participation, and Power in State Legislatures. CQ Press, selected chapters.

!/? Joseph Cooper. (1988) Congress and Its Committees: A Historical Approach to the Role of Committees in the Legislative Process. New York: Garland Publishing. (Alternatively, see Cooper's 1970 monograph entitled The Origins of the Standing Committees and the Development of the Modern House. Rice University Studies.)

B. Rational-Choice, Economic Approaches (New Institutionalism).

4. (Jan. 29) A Distributive (or vote-maximizing) Model of legislative behavior and organization: What motivates legislators' behavior? How do these motives limit or enhance legislators from fulfilling the constitutional and normative expectations of Congress? How does it affect the structure of the institution?

Assignment:

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

Special Reports:

- ** Adler, Scott. "Demand-Side Theory and Congressional Committee Composition: A Constituency Characteristics Approach, AJPS 41-3: 895-918.
- * Swift, Elaine. "Electoral Connection Meets the Past: Lessons From Congressional History." Political Science Quarterly 102: 4.
- ** Bianco, William, David Spence, and John Wilkerson. 1996. "The Electoral Connection in the Early Congress." AJPS 40-1: 145-71.

Recommended:

- # Fiorina, M. 1989. Congress: Keystone to the Washington Establishment, 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale.
 - # Hall, Richard and Grofman, Bernard. "The Committee Assignment Process and the Conditional Nature of Committee Bias." APSR 84-4: 1149-65.
 - + Rohde, David and K. Shepsle. 1973. "Democratic Committee Assignments in the House of Representatives," American Political Science Review 67-3: 889-905.
 - + Weingast, Barry and W. Marshall. 1988. "The Industrial Organization of Congress," Journal of Political Economy: 132-63.
 - + Weingast, Barry. 1979. "A Rational Choice Perspective on Congressional Norms." American Journal of Political Science 23: 245-62.
 - + Arnold, R. Douglas. 1979. Congress and the Bureaucracy: A Theory of Influence.
 - + Shepsle, Kenneth. 1979. "Institutional Arrangements and Equilibrium in Multidimensional Voting Models." AJPS 57: 27-59. (For a less formal review, see Shepsle's 1986 chapter: "Institutional Equilibrium and Equilibrium Institutions" In Herbert Weisberg's Political Science: The Science of Politics.)
 - + Shepsle and Weingast. 1981. "Political Preferences for the Pork Barrel: A Generalization." APSR 25: 96-111.
 - + Olson, David. Democratic Legislative Institutions: A Comparative View, selected chapters.
 - + Rosenthal, Alan. 1998. The Decline of Representative Democracy: Process, Participation, and Power in State Legislatures. CQ Press, selected chapters.
 - + Cain, Bruce, John Ferejohn, and Morris Fiorina. The Personal Vote.
 - !/? Fiorina, M. 1981. "Universalism, Reciprocity, and Distributive Policy-Making in Majority Rule Institutions. In Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management, ed. John Crecine. Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.
- (The distributive theory literature is huge. For a good review, see Shepsle and Weingast's edited volume, Positive Theories of Congressional Institutions, chap. 1)

5. (Feb. 5) Informational/Organizational Model of Legislative Organization and Behavior: What motivates legislators' behavior? How do these motives limit or enhance legislators from fulfilling the constitutional and normative expectations of Congress? How does it affect the structure of the institution?

Assignment:

- (on the principal-agent relationship) Kiewiet, D. Roderick and Mathew McCubbins. 1991. The Logic of Delegation, chapter 2. (photo)
- Keith Krehbeil. Information and Legislative Organization, chapters 1-3. (photo)

Special Report:

- ** Keith Krehbeil. 1990. "Are Congressional Committees Composed of Preference Outliers?" American Political Science Review. 84:149-63. (photo)
- ** Maltzman, Forrest. 1995. "Meeting Competing Principals," American Journal of Political Science. 39: 653-82.

Adler chapters?

- Snyder, et. Al. 1999. "Comparing Interest Group Scores Across Time and Chamber." APSR. 93: 33-50.

Recommended:

- + Maass, Arthur. 1983. Congress and the Common Good. New York: Basic Books. (the early chapters)

- + Fenno, Richard. 1973. Congressmen in Committees. Boston: Little, Brown. (Specifically, Fenno's concept of "good public policy" may/may not relate to the informational model.)
- + Hall, Richard and B. Grofman. 1990. "The Committee Assignment Process and the Conditional Nature of Committee Bias." American Political Science Review. 84: 1149-1165.
- + Krehbeil, Keith. Pivotal Politics, chap.s 1, 2.
(Although coming at the topic from a completely different theoretical framework, systems or organization theory approaches to the study of legislative organization share some of the underlying premises of the informational theory. Below are some seminal readings in the systems-level approach.)
- !/? Fenno, Richard. 1962. "The House Appropriations Committee as a Political System: The Problem of Integration." American Political Science Review, p.310-24.
- !/? Matthews, David. 1960. U.S. Senators and Their World, chap. 5.
- !/? Cooper, Joseph. 1975. "Strengthening the Congress: An Organizational Analysis." Harvard Journal of Legislation. 2: 301-368.

6. (Feb. 12) Partisan Model of Legislative Organization and Behavior: What motivates legislators' behavior? How do these motives limit or enhance legislators from fulfilling the constitutional and normative expectations of Congress? How does it affect the structure of the institution?

Assignment:

Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins. 1993. Legislative Leviathan.

Special Reports:

- ** Krehbeil, Keith. 1993. "Where's The Party?" British Journal of Political Science 23: 235-266.
- ** Jenkins, Jeffery A. "Examining the Bonding Effects of Party: A Comparative Analysis of Roll-Call Voting in the U.S. and Confederate Houses," American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 43, No. 4. (October, 1999), pp. 1144-1165.

Recommended:

- + Kiewiet, D.Roderick and M. McCubbins. 1991. The Logic of Delegation. The University of Chicago Press.
- + Forgette, R. 1997. "Reed's Rules and The Partisan Theory of Legislative Organization." Polity
- + Cox, Gary and Mathew McCubbins. "Bonding, Structure, and the Stability of Political Parties: Party Government in the House." Legislative Studies Quarterly, May 1994, p.215.
- + Aldrich, John. Why Parties?
- + Brady, David, Joseph Cooper, and Patricia Hurley. 1979. "The Decline of Party in the U.S. House of Representatives, 1887-1968." LSQ 4: 381-407. (This is an alternative view of the role of congressional party organization.)

7. (Feb. 19) Doing Legislative Research: design, data sources, reporting results.

MIDTERM (during the first 90 minutes of the class) and 1 PAGE PAPER PROPOSAL.

III. Empirical Studies of the Contemporary Congress

A. Legislative Electoral Process

8. (Feb. 26) Legislative Electoral Districting and Recruitment: Who runs? How do potential candidates make their decision to run or not? How has that changed over time? Does it matter than women, blacks and Hispanics receive less descriptive representation in Congress?

Assignment:

Cox, Gary and J. Katz. 2002. Eldridge Gerry's Salamander. Selected Chapters.
Forgette, R. and Glenn Platt "Partisan Stratification and Gerrymandering" Typescript.

Canon, D., Schousen, and Patrick Sellers. 1996. "The Supply Side of Congressional Redistricting: Race and Strategic Politicians" Journal of Politics 58: 846-862.

Special Reports:

- ** Huddy and Terkildsen. 1993. "Gender Stereotypes" American Journal of Political Science, 119-47.
- * Butler, David and Bruce Cain. 1992. Congressional Redistricting, selected chapters.

Recommended:

- + Canon, David. Actors, Athletes, and Astronauts.
- + Ehrenhalt, Alan. The United States of Ambition. ch.s 1,2,11.
- + Fowler, Linda and Robert McClure. 1989. Political Ambition: Who Decides to Run for Congress. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- + Fowler, Linda. 1993. Candidates, Congress, and American Democracy.
- + Barbara Burrell. 1992. "Women Candidates in Open-Seat Primaries for the U.S. House: 1968-1990," Legislative Studies Quarterly (November), p.493-508.
- !/? Maisel, Louis Sandy. 1982. From Obscurity to Oblivion: Running in the Congressional Primary. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

9. (March 4) Congressional Campaigns and Elections: What determines who wins congressional elections? What is the relative effect of national factors, local factors, personality, and party?

Assignment:

Gary Jacobson, 2004. The Politics of Congressional Elections. Longman.
PROGRESS REPORT DUE

Special Reports:

- * Readings on the changes and consequences of the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act (tba)
- ** Sarah Binder, Forrest Matzman, and Lee Segilman. 1998. Senators' Home-State Reputations: Why Do Constituents Love a Bill Cohen So Much More Than an Al D'Amato?" LSQ XXIII:545-60

Recommended:

- #Paul Herrnson. 1998. Congressional Elections: Campaigning At Home and In Washington , 2nd edition Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- + Abramowitz, Alan and Jeffrey Segal. 1992. Senate Elections. chap.s 3.4,5
- + Jacobson, Gary. 1990. The Electoral Origins of Divided Government. Boulder: Westview Press.
- + Brady, David. 1988. Critical Elections and Congressional Policy Making. Stanford, CA: Stanford.
- !/? Tufte, Edward. Political Control of the Economy.

B. Congressional Organization

10. (March 18) Congressional Procedures and Decisionmaking:

How is the floor behavior procedurally controlled? How do members' decide how to vote?

Assignment:

Sinclair, B. 1997. Unorthodox Lawmaking: New Legislative Processes in the U.S. Congress. C.Q. Press, 1-3, 5, 6

Oleszek, Walter. 1996. Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process, 4th edition. Wash.: CQ Press. , 5, 6 (on the House) OR 7, 8 (on the Senate)

Special Reports:

- * Kingdon, John. 1989. Congressmen's Voting Decisions, 3rd edition. University of Michigan Press, intro., chap.s 9, 10.

Recommended:

- + Steven Smith. 1989. Call to Order: Floor Politics in the House and Senate. Washington: Brookings.

+ S. Smith and S. Bach. 1988. Managing Uncertainty.

11. (March 25) The Institutional Role of Committees:

Does the committee system enhance legislative governance? Does it principally serve a distributive policy function?

Assignment:

Steven Smith and C. Deering. 1997. Committees in Congress, 3rd ed. Selected chapters

Special Report:

** King, D. 1994. "The Nature of Congressional Committee Jurisdictions," American Political Science Review 88: 48-62.

Recommended:

+ Fenno, Richard. 1974. Congressmen and Committees. Boston: Little, Brown.

+ Hall, Richard and Gary McKissick. "Institutional Change and Behavioral Choice in House Committees." In Congress Reconsidered, 6th edition

+ Evans, Larry. 1991. Leadership in Committees. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

+ Richard Hall. 1993. "Participation, Abdication, and Representation in Congressional Committees," in Lawrence Dodd and B. Oppenheimer (ed.), ch.7 of Congress Reconsidered, 5th ed.

!/? Wilson, Woodrow. 1885. Congressional Government. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

12. (April 1) Legislative Party Leadership: How are the legislative party leadership organized and why does it matter?

Assignment:

Forgette, Richard. 2004. Congress, Parties, and Puzzles. Pp. 53-179

Smith, Steven. 1993. "Forces of Change in Senate Party Leadership and Organization," in Congress Reconsidered, 5th edition.

Special Reports:

** Deitz, Nathan. 2002. "Presidential Influence on Congress" in Rivals for Power.

* Jones, Charles. 1968. "Joseph G. Cannon and Howard W. Smith: An Essay on the Limits of Leadership in the House of Representatives," Journal of Politics, 30-3, pp. 617-46.

* Panetta, Leon. "Politics of the Budget Process," in Rivals for Power.

Recommended:

Rohde, David. 1991. Parties and Leaders in the Postreform House, selected chapters.

+ Peters, Ronald. 1990. The American Speakership. Johns Hopkins University Press.

+ Sinclair, Barbara. 1983. Majority Leadership in the U.S. House. Johns Hopkins Press.

+ Cooper, Joseph and David Brady. 1981. "Institutional Context and Leadership Style: The House from Cannon to Rayburn." American Political Science Review, 75.

+ Brady, David, et. al. 1979. "The Decline of Party in the House of Representatives, 1887-1968," Legislative Studies Quarterly, 4-3, pp. 381-408.

IV. Current Issues/Topics in Legislative Studies: (We have three class sections, April 8, April 15 and April 22, to discuss any three of the eight topics below. Which topics are of greatest interest to you? We will choose as a class.)

13. Congress and Southern Politics: How and why have the southern electorate and elected officials changed? What effect have these changes had on congressional representation and governance?

Assignment:

Black, Merle and Earle Black. 2003 *The Rise of Southern Republicans*. (selections)

Fenno, Richard. 2000. *Congress At the Grassroots*. (selections)

14. The Congress and Foreign Policy: How and to what effect is Congress an important policy actor in foreign policymaking?

Assignment:

James Lindsay. "End of An Era: Congress and Foreign Policy after the Cold War" (photo)

Deering, Chris. "Principle or Party", The Contentious Senate (photo)

Stephen Cohen. "Trade Policy Decisionmaking: Competing Explanations" (photo)

Special Reports:

TBA

15. The U.S. Senate and the Meaning of bicameralism: What makes the Senate unique to the House? What advantages and costs are associated with a bicameral legislature?

Assignment:

Swift, Elaine. 1993. "The Making of an American House of Lords." (photo)

Binder, Sarah and S. Smith. 1997. Politics or Principle? Filibustering in the U.S. Senate. Washington: Brookings. (selected chapters)

Lee, Frances and Bruce Oppenheimer. 2000. Sizing Up the Senate. University of Chicago Press. (selected chapters)

Suggested Reading:

* Schiller, Wendy. 1995. "Senators as Political Entrepreneurs: Using Bill Sponsorship to Shape Legislative Agendas," American Journal of Political Science, 39-1, pp. 186-203.

Recommended:

+ Sinclair, Barbara. 1989. The Transformations of the U.S. Senate. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, selected chapters.

+ Fenno, Richard. 1982. The United States Senate: A Bicameral Perspective. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.

+ Matthews, Donald. 1960. U.S. Senators and Their World. New York: Vintage Books.

!/? Rothman, David. Politics and Power.

16. Congress, Public Attitudes, and the Media: Why do people not like Congress? How does the media report on the institution? How misperceptions are created from these reporting styles?

Assignment:

Hibbing, John and E. Theis-Morse. 1995. Congress as Public Enemy, selected chapters.

Forgette and Morris. "The Effects of New Media Coverage on Perceptions of Congress." (photo)

Special Reports:

* Mann, T. and Norman Ornstein, (ed.s) 1994. Congress, the Press, and the Public, selected chap.s

17. Divided Government: What causes divided government? Is it a deliberate choice of voters? Alternatively, is it an artifact of our electoral process and voters' decisionmaking process? How and to what extent does it matter that we have divided government?

Assignment:

Fiorina, Morris. 1992. Divided Government, 2nd edition, ch.s 4-8. (photo)

Binder, Sarah. 1998. "The Dynamics of Legislative Gridlock, 1947-1996." (photo)

Special Reports:

** Jacobson, Gary. 1991. The Electoral Origins of Divided Government, 1946-88. ch.6.

* Mayhew, David. 1991. Divided We Govern. selected chapters.

Recommended:

- + Fiorina, Morris. 1980. The Decline of Collective Responsibility in American Politics. Daedalus 109: 25-45.
- + Sundquist, James. 1988. " Needed: A Political Theory for the New Era of Coalition Government in the United States." Political Science Quarterly 103: 613-35.
- + Brady, David. 1993. " The Causes and Consequences of Divided Government: Toward A New Theory of American Politics?" American Political Science Review 87: 189-194.

18. Lobbying, Money, and Ethics: The Politics of Congressional Reform (lobbying reform, term limits, campaign finance, committee reform, ethics reform, pay and perks, party organization rules, congressional budget rules, limits on filibustering, etc.): Do reforms need to be adopted and would they have the intended effect? Would they have unintended effects?

Assignment:

Lobbying Reform (TBA)

Budget and institutional reform (TBA)

Campaign Finance Reform (TBA)

Special Reports:

- * Dennis Thompson. Ethics In Congress: From Individual to Institutional Corruption, selected chapters.
- * Barbara Sinclair. "The Struggle Over Representation and Lawmaking in Congress: Leadership Reforms in the 1990s," ch. 6, Remaking Congress. (photo)

Recommended:

- + Hall, Rick and Frank Wayman. 1990. "Buying Time: Moneyed Interests and the Mobilization of Bias in Congressional Committees." American Political Science Review. 84:3, p.797-820. (photo)
- + Hibbing, J. Congressional Careers. ch.s 4 and 5.

19. Group and Minority Representation in Congress: How does it matter than women, blacks and hispanics receive less descriptive representation in Congress?

Assignment:

Canon, David. Race and Representation in Congress, selected chapters.

Swain, Carol. 1994. Black Faces, Black Interests. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, selected chapters.

Schwindt-Bayer, Leslie. 2004. " The Incumbency Disadvantage and Women's Election to Legislative Office." (photo)

Special Reports:

- * Fenno, Richard. 2003. Going Home. University of Chicago Press, selection
- * Schwindt-Bayer, Leslie, et.al. " Gender Turnover and Roll Call Voting in the U.S. House of Representatives."

RESEARCH PAPER DUE AT UNIVERSITY-SCHEDULED FINAL EXAM TIME.