

# Elections and Representation: Pol Sci 399<sup>1234 56 7</sup>

4:00 PM – 5:30 PM Monday and Wednesday Seigle Hall Room 104

Justin Fox

Phone: 314-935-9867

Office: Seigle 237

E-mail: jfox26@wustl.edu

Office Hours: Tues, 11 AM – 12 PM & 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM

<http://pages.wustl.edu/justinfox>

**Course abstract:** Political representation deals with the correspondence between citizen preferences and public policies. This seminar examines the critical role elections play in linking the two. After providing an overview of alternative notions of representation, we examine whether voters are capable of holding elected officials accountable, the strategies elected officials employ to get reelected, how the rules by which elections are contested structure the incentives of both politicians and voters, and the effects of separation of powers on political accountability. A reoccurring theme throughout this course will be the role elections play in both disciplining incumbent behavior and enabling voters to select politicians that share their policy commitments. Particular attention will be given to understanding how institutional variation affects the incentives of politicians to cater to certain constituencies while neglecting others.

**Course goals:** This course has several goals. The first goal is to expand your knowledge of the topics we shall cover. The second goal is to give you practice critically analyzing research, a skill that is important in all walks of life. As such, most of the readings are academic articles, some of which have been published and others which are soon to be. While it is not critical to master the details of these articles, the aim is to grasp their main points, and have a sense of both their strengths and limitations. Third, to introduce you to a diverse range of scholarship. We will read papers written by philosophers, political scientists, economists, and law professors. Some of the papers will be normative (how the world should be) and some will be positive (how the world actually works). Some will be completely verbal, others will conduct sophisticated data analyses, and some will use game-theoretic reasoning. Fourth, to introduce you to the elements of sound research design, and to understand the conditions under which a correlation need not imply causation.

**Office hours:** If you have questions concerning a particular reading, desire feedback on your writing, etc.,

---

<sup>1</sup>Last edited on September 26, 2013. Reduced reading for class on October 2nd.

<sup>2</sup>Edited on September 12th, 2013. Changes made to reading for Sep 25 and 28. Effect is to reduce total reading load and increase coherence among readings.

<sup>3</sup>Edited on October 10th, 2013. Changes made to Week 8 in order to increase cohesiveness of readings.

<sup>4</sup>Edited on October 17, 2013. Reduced reading load for October 23rd meeting.

<sup>5</sup>Edited on October 31, 2013. Reduced reading load for November 4th meeting, dropping the selection by Grose.

<sup>6</sup>Edited November 7, 2013. Reduce reading load for meeting of November 13 by swapping a longer reading for two shorter ones.

<sup>7</sup>If needed, I reserve the right to update any aspect of this syllabus. Any changes will be announced in class, and the updated syllabus will be posted to the Blackboard site for this course. It is your responsibility to learn about these changes in the event that you missed the class in which the changes were announced.

I *strongly* encourage you to come to my office hours or make an appointment.

**Grading:** Your grade will be determined by the quality of your writing (70%) and class participation (30%). There is also an optional final. For those who take the final, and whose performance on the final would have the effect of bringing up their course grade, your writing score will constitute 49% of your grade, class participation will constitute 21%, and the final will constitute 30%.

- **Writing:** There are two types of writing assignments in this course: “reading responses,” and the “critical essay.” In terms of calculating your course grade, reading responses will constitute 65% of your grade and your critical essay will constitute 5% of your grade.

- *Reading responses:* A reading response is a two-page, double-spaced, essay dealing with a given class’s set of readings. (The word limit for a given response is 550.) At least 48 hours before each class meeting, I will post a question that draws upon or relates to our upcoming class. While I encourage you to discuss readings with your colleagues, you should not discuss your reading responses with your colleagues until everyone has turned their response in. You are to write a total of twelve reading responses over the course of the semester. You are free to write more than twelve. I’ll count your best twelve toward your final grade.

- *Critical essay:* You are to respond to an editorial or an op-ed published in either the *New York Times* or the *Wall Street Journal* that makes some form of argument about the electoral process, the nature of political representation, or how the political process should be reformed. Your job is to give reasons why the editorial is wrong. To do so, I want you to draw upon at least four academic articles that are not on the syllabus. This essay should be no more than four pages long (1100 words maximum). Each student is expected to distribute their essay to their classmates and summarize their essay for everyone in a short five-minute class presentation toward the end of the semester. The essay is due on Sunday, December 1st, and should be turned in no later than 11:59 PM. Also, each student is required to meet with me during my office hours before December 1st to run a rough draft of their essay by me.

- **Class participation:** Attendance is mandatory, although every student is allowed to miss up to four classes without it affecting their grade (in addition to those classes missed due to university sponsored events or religious holidays).<sup>8</sup> We will focus on what is known as “active learning” during class. Sometimes I will have the class break into smaller groups and work on a short project. Other times we will be discussing class readings as a group. This will vary from class to class depending on the nature

---

<sup>8</sup>Those students missing class due to university sponsored events or religious holidays should e-mail me.

of the material covered.

You are expected to read the assigned readings before class. An excellent way to prepare for class is the following: While you are reading, take notes on matters that you wish to discuss further. Many of the authors we will read have various weaknesses in their arguments; at times their writing can get sloppy and their logic a bit fuzzy. As such, do not hesitate to raise your concerns and questions in class. The point of class discussion is to work through these things together as a team.

- **Exams:** There will be a final, although it is optional. I will distribute a set of potential exam questions before the final. The final will be based on a subset of these questions. The final is scheduled for Friday, December 13th, from 6 PM - 8 PM. The exam will be “closed book.” Make sure that you do not have an exam conflict. If you do, you must notify me in writing by October 1st, 2013 in order to have the exam rescheduled.
- **Calculating course grade:** I will compare your total course score to grade cutoffs that will be determined after final exams have been graded. That said, a student with a total score of 94 points or more is ensured to receive at least an A. Further, any student receiving 90 points or more is ensured to receive at least an A-. Any student receiving 80 points or more is ensured to receive at least a B-. Any student receiving 70 points or more is ensured at least a C-. Any student receiving 60 points or more is ensured at least a D-. Student taking the course credit/no-credit must receive a letter grade equivalent of C- or above.

**Course website and class readings:** We will use Blackboard this semester. To access this course on Blackboard, log in to <https://bb.wustl.edu>. The most recent version of the course syllabus will be there. In addition, I will post all reading response questions there. I will also post most, if not all, of the course readings there as well. Reading not available there will be put on reserve at the library. Student help for Blackboard is available at <http://sts.wustl.edu/blackboard>. There is also a free mobile app for blackboard.

I will sometimes post newspaper articles or other documents (e.g., judicial opinions) that I’ll want you to look at briefly before class. I will notify you of any such documents the class before they will be discussed.

**Academic integrity:** Academic honesty is a matter taken seriously at Wash U, and a matter I also take seriously as well. Please see the university’s policies concerning academic integrity at

[http://provost.wustl.edu/undergraduate\\_student\\_academic\\_integrity](http://provost.wustl.edu/undergraduate_student_academic_integrity).

**E-mail policy:** Under normal circumstance, I’ll reply to your e-mail within 24 hours. Also, for any class

related matters, you must e-mail me from your wustl account.

---

**Week 1: Course overview**

---

Wed, Aug 28:

- Edwards, Mickey. 2012. "The Unraveling of Government." *New York Times* 27 September.

---

**Week 2: On the forms of representation**

---

Wed, Sep 4:

- Manin, Bernard. 1997. *The Principles of Representative Government*. Cambridge University Press.
  - Introduction, Chapters 3 & 5
- Stokes, Susan. 2001. *Mandates and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
  - Chapter 6

---

**Week 3: Electoral connection and research design**

---

Mon, Sep 9

- Mayhew, David. 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. Yale University Press.
  - Chapter 1
- Stewart, Charles. 2001. *Analyzing Congress*. W. W. Norton.
  - Chapter 1

Wed, Sep 11

- Sykes, Alan. 1993. "An Introduction to Regression Analysis." Typescript.
- Ho, Daniel and Donald Rubin. 2011. "Credible Causal Inference for Empirical Legal Studies." *Annual Review of Law and Social Sciences* 7: 17–40.

---

**Week 4: Elec. connection and voter sophistication**

---

Mon, Sep 16:

- Fenno, Richard. 1977. "U.S. House Members in Their Constituencies: An Exploration." *American Political Science Review* 71(3): 883-917.

- Grimmer, Justin. 2013. “Appropriators not Position Takers: The Distorting Effects of Electoral Incentives in Congress.” *American Journal of Political Science* 57(3): 624–642.

Wed, Sep 18

- Gerson, Jacob and Matthew Stephenson. 2013. “Accountability Pathologies in Public Law: Diagnosis and Treatment.” Typescript.<sup>9</sup>
- Gibbons, Robert. 1997. “An Introduction to Applicable Game Theory.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11(1): 27–149.<sup>10</sup>

---

**Week 5: Voter sophistication**

---

Mon, Sep 23

- Achen, Christopher and Larry Bartels. 2012. “Blind Retrospection: Why Shark Attacks are Bad for Democracy.” Typescript.
- Healy, Andrew, and Gabriel Lenz. 2012. “Substituting the End for the Whole: Why Voters Respond Primarily to the Election-Year Economy.” Forthcoming, *American Journal of Political Science*

Wed, Sep 25

- Lenz, Gabriel and Chappel Lawson. 2011. “Looking the Part: Television Leads Less Informed Citizens to Vote Based on Candidates’ Appearance.” *American Journal of Political Science* 55(3): 574–589.
- Grimmer, Justin, Sean Westood and Solomon Messing. 2013. *The Impression of Influence: How Legislator Communication and Government Spending Cultivate a Personal Vote*. Typescript.

– Chapter 6

---

**Week 6: Empirical studies of representation**

---

Mon, Sep 30

- Bulter, Daniel and David Nickerson. 2011. “Can Learning Constituency Opinion Affect How Legislators Vote? Results from a Field Experiment.” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 6(1): 55–83.

---

<sup>9</sup>Focus carefully on pages 1–35, although be sure to skim the rest.

<sup>10</sup>Reading is optional. While not necessary to understand course material, reading it would potentially deepen your understanding of some readings and give you an introduction to a method of reasoning prevalent in economics and political science, and is also a form of reasoning you will sometimes see invoked in new analyses.

- Fowler, Anthony and Andrew Hall. 2013. “Do Legislators Cater to the Priorities of their Constituents?” Typescript.

Wed, Oct 2

- Cascio, Elizabeth and Ebonya Washington. 2012. “Valuing the Vote: The Redistribution of Voting Rights and State Funds following the Voting Rights Act of 1965.” Forthcoming, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.
- Washington, Ebonya. 2008. “Female Socialization: How Daughters Affect Their Legislator Fathers’ Voting on Women’s Issues.” *American Economic Review* 98(1): 311–332.

---

**Week 7: Interest groups and lobbying**

---

Mon, Oct 7

- Ansolabehere, Stephen, John de Figueiredo and James Snyder. 2003. “Why is There So Little Money in U.S. Politics?” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17(1): 105–30.
- Ackerman, Bruce, and Ian Ayres. 2002. *Voting With Dollars*. Yale University Press.
  - Chapters 1, 2, 3, & 4

Wed, Oct 9

- Hall, Richard and Alan Deardorff. 2006. “Lobbying as Legislative Subsidy.” *American Political Science Review*. 100(1): 68–84.
- Grimmer, Justin and Eleanor Powell. 2013. “Money in Exile: Campaign Contributions and Committee Access.” Typescript.

---

**Week 8: Parties and primaries**

---

Mon, Oct 14

- Fiorina, Morris. 1980. “The Decline of Collective Responsibility in American Politics.” *Daedalus* 109:25–46.
- Gilmour, John. 1995. *Strategic Disagreement: Stalemate in American Politics*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
  - Introduction & Chapter 1

Wed, Oct 16

- Hirano, Shigeo, James Snyder, Stephen Ansolabehere, and John Hansen. “Primary Elections and Partisan Polarization in the U.S. Congress.” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 5:169–191.
- Boatright, Robert. 2010. “The Consequences of Primary Challenges to Incumbents, 1970–2008.” Typescript.

---

**Week 9: Media and its influence on voters and the public**

---

Mon, Oct 21

- Gerber, Alan, Dean Karlan, and Daniel Bergan. 2009. “Does the Media Matter? A Field Experiment Measuring the Effect of Newspapers on Voting Behavior and Political Opinions.” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 1(2): 35–52.
- Hopkins, Daniel and Jonathan Ladd. 2012. “The Consequences of Broader Media Choice: Evidence from the Expansion of Fox News.” Typescript.

Wed, Oct 23

- Bullock, John. 2006. “Partisanship and the Enduring Effects of False Information.” Typescript.
- Mutz, Diana. 2007. “Effects of In-Your-Face Television Discourse on Perceptions of Legitimate Opposition.” *American Political Science Review* 101(4):621–635.

---

**Week 10: Pledges, wedges, negative campaigns, and incumbency**

---

Mon, Oct 28

- Tomz, Michael and Robert Van Houweling. 2012. “Political Pledges as Credible Commitments.” Typescript.
- Hirsch, Eitan and Brian Schnaffner. 2013. “Targeted Campaign Appeals and the Value of Ambiguity.” *Journal of Politics* 75(2): 520–534.

Wed, Oct 30

- Zaller, John 1998. “Politicians as Prize Fighters: Electoral Selection and Incumbency Advantage,” In *Politicians and Party Politics*, ed. John Geer. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.



- Jeong, Gyung-Ho, Gary Miller, Camilla Schfoield, and Itai Sened. “Cracks in the Opposition: Immigration as a Wedge Issue for the Reagnn Coalition.” *American Journal of Political Science* 55(3): 511–525.

---

**Week 11: Racial redistricting**

---

*Mon, Nov 4*

- Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. “Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent Yes.” *Jounral of Politics* 61(3): 628-57.
- Brookman, David. 2012. “Black Politicians are more Intrinsically Motivated to Advance Blacks’ Interests: A Field Experiment Manipulating Political Incentives.” *American Journal of Political Science* 57(3): 521–536.

*Wed, Nov 6*

- Shotts, Kenneth. 2003. “Does Racial Redistricting Cause Conservative Policy Outcomes? Policy Preferences of Southern Representatives in the 1980s and 1990s.” *Journal of Politics* 65(1): 216-26.
- Rehfeld, Andrew. 2005. *The Concept of Constituency*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
  - Chapter 9

---

**Week 12: Transparency and representation**

---

*Mon, Nov 11*

- Carey, John. 2004. “Visible Votes: Recorded Voting and Legislative Accountability in the Americas.” Working Paper. Dartmouth College.
- Stasavage, David. 2004. “Open-Door or Closed-Door? Transparency in Domestic and International Bargaining.” *International Organization* 58(4):667–703.

*Wed, Nov 13*

- Sagar, Rahul. 2007. “On Combating the Abuse of State Secrecy.” *Journal of Political Philosophy* 15(4): 404–427.
- Stadelmann, David, Marco Portmann, and Reiner Eichenberger. 2013. “Full Transparency of Politicians’ Actions does not Increase the Quality of Political Representation.” Working paper.
- Stone, Geoffrey. 2013. “Edward Snowden: Hero or Traitor?” Huffington Post. June 10.

---

**Week 13: SoP I: General overview and role of delegation**

---

*Mon, Nov 18*

- Manin, Bernard. 1994. "Checks, Balances, and Boundaries: The Separation of Powers in the Constitutional Debate of 1787," in B. Fontana (ed.), *The Invention of the Modern Republic*, 27-62.
- Eskridge, William N. and John Ferejohn. 1991. "Article I, Section 7 Game." *Georgetown Law Journal* 80:523-564.

*Wed, Nov 20*

- Schoenbrod, David. 1993. *Power Without Responsibility*. Yale University Press.
  - Chapters 1, 2, 3, & 4
- Orszag, Peter. 2011. "Too Much of a Good Thing: Why We Need Less Democracy." *The New Republic*.
- Cohen, Diane and Michael F. Cannon. 2012. "The Independent Advisory Board: PPACA'S Anti-Constitutional and Authoritarian Super-Legislature."

---

**Week 14: SoP II: executive unilateralism and representation**

---

*Mon, Nov 25*

- Calabresi, Steven and Saikrishna Prakash. 1994. "The President's Power to Execute the Laws." *Yale Law Journal* 104(3):541-665.
- Nzelibe, Jide. 2011. "Partisan Conflicts over Presidential Authority." *William and Mary Law Review* 389-430.

---

**Week 15: SoP III: judicial review and representation**

---

*Mon, Dec 2*

- Waldron, Jeremy. 2006. "The Core of the Case Against Judicial Review." *Yale Law Journal* 115:1346-1406.
- Fox, Justin and Matthew Stephenson. 2011. "Judicial Review as a Response to Political Posturing" *American Political Science Review* 105(2): 397-414.

*Wed, Dec 4*

- Class presentations