

Gender, Race, and Political Representation in the U.S.

POLS 490_{SWR}/WS 475_{SWR}

Spring 2005

Beth Reingold, Instructor

331 Tarbuton Hall

404-727-6569

beth.reingold@emory.edu

Office Hours: Thursdays 11:30 a.m.-1:30 p.m., or by appointment

Course Description

Why are there so few women (of any race) or people of color (male or female) in public office? How have candidates' race and gender affected their chances of obtaining public office? What difference does the election of more women and people of color really make? Would it mean that women and people of color are better represented? What does it mean to represent women and/or people of color? This course will address these questions from the perspective of legislative politics in the United States, at both the national and state levels. We will begin with a theoretical or philosophical examination of the meaning and value of political representation. Then we will explore the research on the politics of race, gender, and representation as it relates to: candidate recruitment, elections, legislative behavior, the policymaking process, and civic engagement.

This is a writing intensive, advanced seminar for juniors and seniors. Thus, all students are required to conduct a significant amount of independent research, write a good number of papers of varying length and style, and participate in class discussions on a regular basis and in an informed and constructive fashion. Reading the required course materials thoroughly and carefully is key to achieving all these goals.

For more information on what is expected of both students and faculty in a writing intensive course, see the Writing Center's "Guidelines for Post-Freshman Writing Requirement Courses" at: <http://www.writingcenter.emory.edu/requirements.html>.

Course Grades

Each student's grade for the course will be based on the following:

Research Project	
Paper 1	15%
Paper 2	15%
Paper 3	25%
Presentation	5%
Discussion Papers	20%
Presentation of Recommended Reading	5%
Class Participation	15%

Research Projects

The primary question each Research Project should address is:

How well represented are X in the state of Y?

where X = women, or women of color, or African Americans, or Latinos, etc.

and Y = a state of your choice

Although this question is posed in the present tense, directing students to analyze the current state of representation, some historical perspective will no doubt be helpful and informative. Students may focus primarily on one branch of state government – legislative, executive, or judicial. (Keep in mind, however, the course materials focus almost exclusively on legislative politics. Projects on the executive and/or judicial branches may be more “independent” as a result.)

Ideally, each student will study a different state. To ensure broad coverage, students should submit their top three choices to the Instructor by **Friday, February 4** (via e-mail, no later than 5 p.m.). The Instructor will try to accommodate everyone’s first or second choice, if possible, and will notify students of their assignments by Tuesday, February 8. Students are strongly advised against choosing either Arizona or California.

Students will address this research question in three progressive stages, each of which will be manifested in a formal paper (typed, double-spaced, properly written and documented, and proofread).

Part/Paper 1: Background regarding state politics (approx. 5-10 pages; **due March 10**)

What are the 5-10 most important things one should know about Y-state politics?

In addition to the state’s history of racial, ethnic, and /or gender politics, students should consider other significant aspects of the state’s political system and culture. Some potentially interesting topics include: the role of political parties, interest groups, and social movements; the ideological climate; the degree of partisan/electoral competition; sources of political power; professionalization of the legislature (or the entire state government, including the executive and judicial branches).

Part/Paper 2: Descriptive/Numerical Representation (approx. 7-12 pages; **due April 5**)

How well are X descriptively represented in Y politics? How does this compare to other states?

Why is Y (above average, average, below average) in this respect?

In addressing this last “Why” question, students should consider the characteristics of Y-state politics highlighted in Part 1 as possible explanations. In that way, Paper 2 will incorporate and build upon Paper 1.

Part/Paper 3: Substantive Representation (approx. 15-20 pages; **due May 9**)

To what degree are these descriptive representatives making a difference for or on behalf of X in Y? What institutional and contextual factors might be facilitating or inhibiting their ability to do so? What individual characteristics of these descriptive representatives might be facilitating or inhibiting either their desire or ability to act for X in Y?

As you will see in the course readings, there are many different ways in which representatives could “make a difference” for a particular constituency. Students may choose one

of two approaches. A qualitative approach would examine in depth the careers and activities of a small number of representatives (one to four), focusing on many of the different ways in which they do or do not act for X. A quantitative approach would examine the behavior of many, if not all of the representatives (in Y), focusing on only one or two of the activities presumably undertaken on behalf of X.

In addressing the question of what institutional and contextual factors are facilitating or inhibiting the substantive representation of X in Y, students should consider the characteristics and history of Y-state politics (discussed in Part/Paper 1), as well as the overall level of descriptive representation of X in Y. In this way, Paper 3 will incorporate and build upon Papers 1 and 2.

Presentation (max. 10 minutes/student; **May 6, 4:30-7 p.m.**)

In lieu of a final exam, students will have the opportunity to share their research with each other. Each student will be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes to summarize the most interesting aspects of her/his research. Visual aids (e.g., hand-outs, posters, overhead projections, PowerPoint slides) are not mandatory, but they may help clarify your points and reduce the amount of time necessary to do so. If students wish, we can try to schedule additional time to allow for some more informal discussion of the research projects. We could probably also arrange for some refreshments!

Numerous resources will be available, both in and out of class, to help you design and conduct your research.

1. Many of the assigned readings will help students identify both *what* to look for and *where* you might find it. The assigned readings provide the strongest foundation for a successful research project. Students are urged to use them as references and incorporate them into your papers whenever appropriate.

2. Chris Palazzolo, the Political Science Librarian at Woodruff Library, has constructed an extensive web-based research guide for the course:

http://web.library.emory.edu/subjects/socsci/polsci/minority_representation.htm

We will have a brief orientation to this guide in class on February 3rd, but you are encouraged to explore it as soon as possible. Additionally, Dr. Palazzolo is available for one-on-one consultations. To schedule an appointment, simply contact him via e-mail (cpalazz@emory.edu) or phone (404-727-0413).

3. As always, the services of the Writing Center are available free of charge. The Writing Center has a staff of 20 of Emory's most talented undergraduate writers and five experienced graduate student fellows. They also maintain a library of writing and teaching resources, host workshops, and make class visits. A Writing Center tutor will visit our class on February 3rd to introduce students to the Center's philosophy (a peer-based teaching and not an editing or proofreading service), answer student questions, and explain how to make an appointment.

4. Students are required to meet with the Instructor, during office hours, at least twice during the semester to discuss their projects. The first meeting should take place **no later than February 18th**; the second meeting should take place **no later than April 8th**. During the first meeting, students should be prepared to discuss what information you are gathering about the politics of your chosen state, and how. Come prepared with a preliminary list of resources and their location. During the second meeting, students should be prepared to discuss how you plan to conduct Part 3 of your research project. Specifically, you will need to decide (a) which branch of state

government you will study, (b) whether you will be taking a qualitative or quantitative approach (as outlined above), and (c) what sorts of representational activities or accomplishments you will be examining. If adopting a qualitative approach, you will need to think about which public official(s) you will profile, and why. Students should submit a brief (≤ 1 page) outline of their plan in writing no more than a week after their second meeting with the Instructor.

Discussion Papers (max. 2 pages each)

Each student is required to write four Discussion Papers during the course of the semester. Each Paper should address the assigned reading(s) for a particular day by posing a discussion question and offering one or more ways of answering it. These papers are intended to facilitate individual comprehension of and reflection upon the readings, as well as class discussion. Thus, they should be submitted to the course LearnLink conference **no later than 4 p.m.** on the day before class discussion of the materials is scheduled.

Good discussion questions come in many different varieties. They can focus on the strengths and/or weaknesses of the arguments, strengths and/or weaknesses of the research, or implications for “the real world” or for further research. They can speculate on whether the arguments or research are applicable to other groups (delineated by race and/or gender) or in other political or institutional contexts. They can address the “so what?” question: Why should we care, if at all? They can engage in a sort of compare-and-contrast exercise in which two or more scholars “debate” one another. These are just some of the options. Students are welcome to be creative and devise their own approach.

While each Discussion paper should address the readings assigned for the upcoming class day, students may also incorporate arguments and insights from previous assignments. Doing so would be especially useful if one were taking a compare-and-contrast approach.

There are some class meetings for which Discussion Papers are not appropriate or needed. Those dates are marked with an asterisk (*) in the Course Schedule below. Students may choose from the remaining 20 class days. Yet again, to ensure broad coverage, students will be asked to sign up for Discussion Papers well ahead of time. The Instructor will maintain a sign-up sheet on LearnLink, ensuring that each appropriate class meeting has at least two, but no more than four Discussion Papers. In this way, Discussion Paper assignments will be distributed on a first-come first-serve basis.

Presentation of Recommended Reading (approx. 10 minutes)

Each student is required to summarize, in class, the most important and interesting points of one Recommended Reading. Recommended Readings are distributed throughout the semester and are listed in the Course Schedule below. These presentations are meant to be primarily oral, but you may incorporate any visual aids you would like. In your presentation, pay close attention to how the Recommended Reading relates to the required reading(s) for the day.

Again, to ensure broad coverage of the Recommended Readings, students should submit their first, second, and third choices to the Instructor (via e-mail) by class time (10 a.m.) on **Tuesday**,

January 25. (If we can get a volunteer for the January 27 Recommended Reading, then we can put this off a bit.) Please take some time to glance at the Recommended Readings and see what interests you the most. The Instructor will notify students of their assignments as soon as possible.

Class Participation

Students' grades in Class Participation are based on attendance, attentiveness to others, and active, regular, and constructive participation in class discussions.

Students are expected to attend each and every class meeting. If you must miss a day, it is your responsibility to find out what you missed. Talk to your classmates; borrow their notes. Be aware that important announcements regarding course materials, schedule, and assignments can be made in class.

More than three unexcused absences will lower your Class Participation grade. Absences are excused only by a written request from a physician, College Dean, or coach. Observance of religious holidays also will be considered an excused absence. Please notify the Instructor in writing if you must miss class for this reason.

Respect for and attentiveness to your classmates is imperative. That doesn't mean you must always agree with each other. To the contrary, some of the most interesting discussions center on debatable propositions. Yet no one should fear ridicule or personal hostility from classmates. Nor should anyone's contributions be ignored repeatedly.

Constructive participation requires, first and foremost, adequate preparation. Students should always come to class having read the assigned materials, including your classmates' Discussion Papers. Take some time, too, to think critically about what you have read.

Academic Integrity

"For over half a century, academic integrity has been maintained on the Emory Campus through the student initiated and regulated Honor Code. Every student who applies to and is accepted by Emory College, as a condition of acceptance, agrees to abide by the provisions of the Honor Code so long as he or she remains a student at Emory College. By his or her continued attendance at Emory College, a student reaffirms his or her pledge to adhere to the provisions of the Honor Code." (Introduction to the Emory College Honor Code, <http://college.emory.edu/students/honor.html>.)

Plagiarism is an Honor Code violation particularly relevant to this course. The Appendix of the Honor Code offers a very helpful guide on the proper use of sources in writing research papers. Further advice on how to avoid plagiarism and properly document one's sources will be provided by the Instructor.

Students with Disabilities

Emory University complies with the regulations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and offers accommodations to students with disabilities. If you are in need of a classroom accommodation, please make an appointment with the Instructor to discuss this as soon as possible. All information will be held in the strictest confidence.

Keep in mind that no student is required to reveal a disability to an instructor. Likewise, no instructor is expected to make an accommodation unless appropriate documentation from the Office of Disabilities Services is presented.

Required Texts

The following books are required reading for this course and are (should be) available at the Emory Bookstore:

Canon, David T. 1999. *Race, Redistricting, and Representation: The Unintended Consequences of Black Majority Districts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Haynie, Kerry L. 2001. *African American Legislators in the American States*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lublin, David. 1997. *The Paradox of Representation: Racial Gerrymandering and Minority Interests in Congress*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pitkin, Hannah F. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reingold, Beth. 2000. *Representing Women: Sex, Gender, and Legislative Behavior in Arizona and California*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Tate, Katherine. 2003. *Black Faces in the Mirror: African Americans and Their Representatives in the U.S. Congress*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Williams, Melissa S. 1998. *Voice, Trust, and Memory: Marginalized Groups and the Failings of Liberal Representation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

One copy of each book will also be available on Reserve at Woodruff Library. All other required and recommended readings (listed in the Course Schedule below) are (or will be) available through EUCLID, on-line. Book selections can be found on Reserves Direct. Journal articles can be found by searching for the journal title in E-Journals, and then locating the appropriate volume and number.

Please notify the Instructor as soon as possible if you are unable to locate any of the required or recommended readings.

Course Schedule

Part I. Introduction to Core Concepts

Jan 25 **Race and Gender**

Submit top 3 choices for Presentation of Recommended Reading (by 10 a.m.)

Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*, 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.

Introduction “Paradigms of Race, Ethnicity, Class, and Nation” (pp. 9-12);
 “Toward a Racial Formation Perspective” (pp. 48-50); and Chapter 4 “Racial Formation” (pp. 53-76)

Lorber, Judith. 1993. *Paradoxes of Gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
 Chapter 1: “‘Night to His Day’: The Social Construction of Gender”

*Jan 27 **Intersectionality**

Bikel, Ofra. 1992. “Clarence Thomas and Anita Hill: Public Hearings, Private Pain.”
Frontline Documentary aired on PBS. [shown in class]

Recommended for further reading:

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1992. “Whose Story Is It, Anyway? Feminist and Antiracist Appropriations of Anita Hill.” In *Rac-ing Justice, En-gendering Power*, ed. Toni Morrison. New York: Pantheon Books.

Feb 1 **Intersectionality (continued)**

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1998. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics.” In Phillips, Anne (ed.), *Feminism & Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press. [originally published in *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* 139 (1989)]

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 1992. “From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor.” *Signs* 18(1): 1-19, 31-37 ONLY.

Recommended:

Cohen, Cathy J. 1999. *The Boundaries of Blackness: AIDS and the Breakdown of Black Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chapter 2: “Marginalization: Power, Identity, and Membership”

*Feb 3 **Practicum: Getting started on your research projects**

Reingold (2000), Chapter 2: “Gender, Power, and Political Culture in Arizona and California”

Feb 4 Deadline for submitting top 3 choices of states for your Research Project (via e-mail by 5 p.m.)

Feb 8 **Representation**

Pitkin (1967), Chapters 1, 3, 4

Recommended:

Pitkin (1967), Chapter 2

Feb 10 **Representation** (continued)

Pitkin (1967), Chapters 5, 6, 10

Recommended:

Pitkin (1967), Chapter 7

Feb 15 **Representation** (continued)

Williams (1998), Introduction, pp. 23-30, 50-56, and Chapters 2-3

Feb 17 **Representation** (continued)

Williams (1998), Chapters 4-6

Recommended:

Williams (1998), Chapter 7 and Conclusion

Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. “Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent ‘Yes’.” *Journal of Politics* 61(3): 628-657.

Feb 18 Last day to schedule first Research Project consultation with Instructor

Part II. Descriptive Representation

Feb 22 Overview: How many? When and Where?

Tate (2003), Chapter 3

Lublin (1997), pp. 17-22

Dolan, Kathleen A. 2004. *Voting for Women: How the Public Evaluates Women Candidates*. Westview Press. Pp. 29-42 ONLY.

Norrander, Barbara, and Clyde Wilcox. 1998. "The Geography of Gender Power: Women in State Legislatures." In *Women and Elective Office: Past, Present, and Future*, ed. Sue Thomas and Clyde Wilcox. New York: Oxford University Press.

***Feb 24 Practicum: Explaining Multivariate Analysis and Statistics**

Recommended:

Arceneaux, Kevin. 2001. "The 'Gender Gap' in State Legislative Representation: New Data to Tackle an Old Question." *Political Research Quarterly* 54(1): 143-160.

Mar 1 Getting Elected: Why is it taking so long?

Darcy, R., Susan Welch, and Janet Clark. 1994. *Women, Elections, and Representation*, 2nd edition. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Chapter 8: Opening Up Political Life to Women

Dolan (2004), pp. 42-53

Fox, Richard L., and Jennifer L. Lawless. 2004. "Entering the Arena? Gender and the Decision to Run for Office." *American Journal of Political Science* 48(2): 264-280.

Recommended:

Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2002. "Gender Stereotypes and Vote Choice." *American Journal of Political Science* 46(1): 20-34.

Mar 3 Getting Elected: Why is it taking so long? (continued)

Lublin (1997), pp. 23-39 and Chapter 3

Recommended:

Highton, Benjamin. 2004. "White Voters and African American Candidates for Congress." *Political Behavior* 26(1): 1-25.

*Mar 8 **TBA:** Catch-up on course materials or class discussion of papers or extended office hours

*Mar 10 **Papers Due** (no class)

Mar 15 **Spring Break** (no class)
& 17

Part III. Making a Difference: Linking Descriptive and Substantive Representation

Mar 22 **African Americans in Congress**

Canon (1999), Introduction and Chapters 1 and 3

Recommended:

Canon (1999), Chapter 2

Mar 24 **African Americans in Congress** (continued)

Canon (1999), Chapters 4-6

Recommended:

Tate (2003), Chapter 4

Mar 29 **Latinos in Congress**
African Americans in State Legislatures

Hero, Rodney E., and Caroline J. Tolbert. 1995. "Latinos and Substantive Representation in the U.S. House of Representatives: Direct, Indirect, or Nonexistent?" *American Journal of Political Science* 39(3): 640-52.

Haynie (2001), Chapters 1-3

Recommended:

Kerr, Brinck, and Miller, Will. 1997. "Latino Representation, It's Direct and Indirect." *American Journal of Political Science* 41(3): 1066-71

Mar 31 **African Americans in State Legislatures** (continued)

Haynie (2001), Chapters 4-6

Recommended:

Bratton, Kathleen A., and Kerry L. Haynie. 1999. "Agenda Setting and Legislative Success in State Legislatures: The Effects of Gender and Race." *Journal of Politics* 61(3): 658-79.

*Apr 5 **Women of Color in Congress and the States**

Papers Due

Lynch, Shola. 2004. "Chisholm '72: Unbought & Unbossed." Documentary rebroadcast nationally February 7, 2005 on PBS. [shown in class]

Apr 7 **Women of Color in Congress and the States** (continued)

Tate (2003), Chapter 2

Hawkesworth, Mary. 2003. "Congressional Enactments of Race-Gender: Toward a Theory of Raced-Gendered Institutions." *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 529-550.

Fenno, Richard F. 2003. *Going Home: Black Representatives and Their Constituents*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chapter 3: "Barbara Jordan: 1972-1973"

Recommended:

Fenno (2003), Chapter 6: "Stephanie Tubbs Jones: 2000-2002"

Barrett, Edith J. 1995. "The Policy Priorities of African American Women in State Legislatures." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 20(2): 223-47.

Apr 8 *Last day to schedule second Research Project consultation with Instructor*

Apr 12 **Women in State Legislatures**

Reingold (2000), Introduction and Chapters 1 and 4

Recommended:

Reingold (2000), Chapter 3

Apr 14 **Women in State Legislatures** (continued)

Reingold (2000), Chapters 5-7, 9

Recommended:

Reingold (2000), Chapter 8

Cammisa, Anne Marie, and Beth Reingold. 2004. "Women in State Legislatures and State Legislative Research: Beyond Sameness and Difference." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 4(2): 181-210.

Apr 19 **Women in Congress**

Swers, Michele L. 2002. *The Difference Women Make: The Policy Impact of Women in Congress*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chapters 1, 2, and 8

Weldon, S. Laurel. 2002. "Beyond Bodies: Institutional Sources of Representation for Women in Democratic Policymaking." *Journal of Politics* 64(4): 1153-1174.

Part IV. Other Effects of Descriptive Representation

Apr 21 **Does maximizing majority-minority districts reduce substantive representation overall?**

Lublin (1997), Chapters 5-6

Recommended:

Sharpe, Christine Leveaux, and James C. Garand. 2001. "Race, Roll Calls, and Redistricting: The Impact of Race-Based Redistricting on Congressional Roll-Call." *Political Research Quarterly* 54(1): 31-51.

Apr 26 **Does descriptive representation empower citizens?**

Tate (2003), Chapters 6-8

Apr 28 **Does descriptive representation empower citizens?** (continued)

Barreto, Matt A., Gary M. Segura, and Nathan D. Woods. 2004. "The Mobilizing Effect of Majority-Minority Districts on Latino Turnout." *American Political Science Review* 98: 65-75.

Burns, Nancy, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Sidney Verba. 2001. *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality, and Political Participation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Chapter 13: "What If Politics Weren't a Man's Game?"

May 6 *Presentations of Research Projects (4:30-7 p.m.)*

May 9 *Papers Due*