

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS 298, SPRING 2014 GENDER & ETHNIC POLITICS

Dr. Jason Eichorst  
jeichorst@lclark.edu  
Lewis & Clark College

Department of International Affairs

Class Information: JR Howard 102; Monday, Wednesday & Friday 11:30 am - 12:30 pm

Office Hours: JR Howard 309; Monday & Wednesday 1:30-2:30 pm (or by appointment)

### COURSE OVERVIEW

The incorporation of historically underrepresented groups is both a domestic and global concern for achieving democratic stability. Two specific groups—female and ethnic—have been historically excluded from policymaking power. This cross-national pattern of exclusion has changed over time and we have observed recent incorporation of political elites from historically underrepresented groups. The extent of incorporation and its effects also vary across different countries. This course is a survey of the cross-national literature that explores the political relationship between the state and citizens associated with historically underrepresented groups. The nature of the course emphasizes themes related to democratic political institutions. Our primary concern is to understand the basis for group incorporation, the institutional mechanisms that accelerate incorporation, and the political effects of incorporation (both legislative and non-legislative). The course evaluates these themes in economically industrialized and less developed countries using quantitative and qualitative research methods.

### COURSE EXPECTATIONS

This course is designed to encourage analytical, independent, and critical thinking. You will strengthen your awareness of how democratic political institutions influence incorporation and of the diverse research methods that explore these topics. I expect students to develop a deeper understanding of when incorporation effectively—or ineffectively—influences policy outcomes using a diverse sample of countries. We will collectively evaluate gaps in the literature and discuss attempts to fill those gaps. We will directly engage some of the more advanced (and accessible) literature in political science on this topic. This means that you will develop a fundamental understanding of applied quantitative and qualitative research on a topic that directly impacts the way democracy functions. I do not expect students to be an expert on any of these research methods. I want to help you engage different types of literature in a way that makes it possible to acquire information. At the end of the semester you will be able to efficiently acquire information, synthesize that information, evaluate that information, and present your unique perspective in a concise and coherent way. Students should read the material before attending class and they should actively participate in classroom discussion. *Students (and the professor) will be tolerant of diverse views and intellectual curiosity.*

## ASSIGNMENTS

Class will include lecture and discussion elements. Every assigned reading will be associated with a student who is the expert for that individual reading. All students should read the material and contribute to class with specific questions that help clarify one aspect of the reading. At the end of a theme, the student experts will collectively present an overview of the material, suggest additional readings, and propose ideas for future research. At the end of a section, we will have an in-class exam and a take-home memo assignment. The in-class exam reviews the material from that section and the memo applies that material using an assigned question. The final is a project proposal for your own independent research. All assignments (excluding in-class exams) will be submitted electronically to Moodle (*moodle.lclark.edu*). All documents must be submitted in pdf format. Electronic assignments will also be returned, with comments, using the course page on Moodle. Students can use classroom and external sources for all writing assignments. Ignoring the parameters of the assignment (e.g., pdf conversion, excessive pages, and late assignments) will experience a point reduction. Please, request information if you have questions or concerns.

**Assignment Grade Distribution.**

Class Participation	10 percent
Student Expert (1 assignment)	10 percent
Group Presentation	10 percent
Classroom Exams (2 total)	20 percent
Memo Assignments (2 total)	20 percent
Preliminary Proposal	5 percent
Final Proposal	25 percent

**Student Expert Assignment.** Students will be responsible for one reading assignment during the semester. Each available article is followed with “[STUDENT].” We will make this decision on 24 January (come to class with four ranked-priorities). You will be considered the student expert for that reading. This means you will give an overview of the reading, stimulate discussion, field questions, and distribute a handout for the reading. We will engage each other on the material. You should know the purpose of the reading, the gap in the prior literature (i.e., use the reading to describe the prior literature), the contribution of the reading, the argument of the reading, the method and tools used to test the argument, the conclusions, and the implications. You will present the material to your colleagues in a way that encourages discussion (a formal presentation is unnecessary but acceptable). I will give an example of a handout on 24 January for the first assignment. Bring enough handouts to distribute to everybody. **Submit your assignment electronically to Moodle before the start of class.** Students absent the day of an assignment should notify me in advance via email with your handout attached. Unexcused absences will be given a zero for the assignment. I will post your assignment on Moodle.

*Handout.* Below is a suggestion of items to include in your handout. This is not an exhaustive list nor will all items be applicable to every assignment. Items marked with a star, however, are required. I expect the handouts to be less than two pages.

- Full Citation\*: Use the format from the *American Political Science Review*.
- Overview\*: Give a brief overview of the article, including your assessment.

- Purpose\*: What does the author(s) propose to do?
- Prior Literature\*: How did we get to this point in the literature?
- Gap: What is the gap in the prior literature?
- Contribution\*: Is the contribution theoretical, empirical, or both? Describe it.
- Argument\*: List the assumptions and describe the argument.
- Implications: List the hypotheses.
- Research Methods\*: Does the author(s) use quantitative or qualitative evidence?
  - Describe the methods.
- Results\*: Describe the results from the analysis.
- Conclusions\*: What are the conclusions from the reading? How well does the author contribute to the stated purpose?

*Grade Criteria.* You will be graded on your presentation and your handout. You should do your best to uncover some nuances of the reading assignment and convey that information in a clear way to your colleagues. You need to know how the reading assignment contributes to the literature. I will assist you when it comes to specific detail. The first fifteen minutes of class will be yours exclusively.

**Class Participation.** I suggest that all students compose their own overview of the material (see handout suggestion above) to prepare for the class. You DO NOT need to be an expert on all topics of the assigned material, but you should come to class with questions that clarify at least one aspect of the material. We should be able to rely on our colleagues to develop a collective understanding of the assigned material. For each assignment, you should know the purpose, the contribution, the argument, the analysis, and the conclusions.

*Grade Criteria.* Attending every class will earn you a “B.” Attending every class *and* making a positive contribution to discussion will earn you an “A.” Being disrespectful to me or your colleagues will earn you a “C” or below.

**Group Presentation.** At the end of each theme the student experts will give a brief group presentation of the material that we just covered, suggest additional readings, and propose a few research ideas. I suggest using a formal presentation. The group should present a brief summary of each of the additional readings. You will work in a group to synthesize the material and isolate gaps for further research. This should include at least two formal hypotheses. For each reading, use the works cited to isolate who the authors cite and use google scholar to find who cites the reading. From this, compose and categorize a list of additional readings that would be useful for future research. Use full citations following the format from the *American Political Science Review*. The listed additional readings following each theme should also be helpful. Everybody in the group will receive the same grade conditional on near equal contribution (see below). I will collect the group presentation using a flash drive and I will make it electronically available on Moodle.

*Group Assessment of Individual Contribution.* Each member of the group will give me a grade for every member of the group (including yourself) on a scale from 0 to 100. That grade should be determined by that individual’s contribution to the overall success (or failure) of the presentation. You should submit that grade to Moodle before the end of the day of the group presentation. I will reduce your grade by one-letter if a majority of your teammates give you a grade lower than an “A.” Student assessments are anonymous and will remain

anonymous. Students absent the day of the presentation should notify me in advance via email. Unexcused absences will be given a full letter grade reduction.

**Classroom Exams.** There will be **two** in-class exams, one at the end of each section. This will assess your comprehensive understanding of the material.

**Memos.** Each in-class exam will be coupled with a memo assignment that is distributed electronically via Moodle. A memo is a one-page single-spaced response to a question that I assign. The question will address the theme for that section. Memos should have one-inch margins and 12-point font. This is not a summary of the literature, but a critical assessment. The one-page limit will be enforced. Full citations should be listed on a separate page. The response should have a stated purpose and make an argument. It should also be clear and concise. The introduction paragraph should clearly state your position and present a brief overview of your argument. This will look something like, "In this memo I argue that . . ." Each following paragraph should address one point. It should provide evidence that supports your argument or clarifies a position. The conclusion should synthesize the evidence in support of your argument. I will explain in more detail during lecture what I want from a memo.

*Grade Criteria.* The memos are graded on clarity of presentation, grammatical structure, and how well the argument fits into the classroom material. The grade does not reflect my agreement with the argument, just the ability to convey an argument and support that argument.

**Research Proposal.** The purpose is for you to select a topic relevant to class that interests you and gives you an opportunity to explore the literature independently. This means that you will uncover a gap in the literature, propose a contribution to that gap, and explain how you will fill that gap. You will develop a theoretical argument and propose a way to test that argument. You will need to select a country sample (either cross-national or over time) and explain why that sample is useful for testing your argument. Assume you have reasonable resources for data collection (quantitative or qualitative). The proposal should be realistic.

*Preliminary Proposal Specifications.* The one-page preliminary proposal will include: 1) a clear statement of the purpose of your research; 2) a clear statement of your contribution; 3) a short paragraph that describes the prior research with two fully-cited articles; 4) a short paragraph that describes your argument; and 5) a short paragraph that describes your sample.

*Final Proposal Specifications.* The final assignment is an eight to ten page research proposal. Papers are double-spaced, 12-point font, and one-inch margins. The page requirement excludes the works cited. Papers should use a variety of academic sources (e.g., no blogs or wikipedia entries). Those sources must be cited in the text and compose the works cited. Similar to prior assignments, use *APSR* format for citations. Papers must make an argument and have a clear purpose. We will discuss in class how to prepare the research proposal. The memos, student expert assignment, and group presentation serve as exercises to prepare for the research proposal. Take seriously the requirements. I will not return papers, but I will reduce points for ignoring the parameters of the paper. The paper specifications include, 1) an introduction that clearly presents the argument (e.g. "In this project I argue that . . .")

and an overview of the argument; 2) a review of the relevant literature; 3) a description of the gap in the literature; 4) an argument that fills that gap and a clearly stated hypothesis; 5) an explanation of how you will test that argument; 6) a description of the sample for testing that argument; 7) how you will use the sample to test that argument; and 8) a conclusion that explains the value of the research.

*Grade Criteria.* You are trying to convince me to support your research project. I will determine your grade based on each of the eight paper specifications. Do they exist and are they convincing?

**Grade Conversion.** Your final grade is determined using the above weights and traditional rounding procedures.

A+	97-100
A	94-96
A-	90-93
B+	87-89
B	84-86
B-	80-83
C+	77-79
C	74-76
C-	70-73
D	65-69
F	0-64

**Penalties For Late Assignments and Academic Dishonesty.** Contact me within 48 hours of a University-excused absence. All assignments are due at the start of class, unless otherwise determined. A written-assignment will lose a letter grade for every day late. Academic dishonesty (plagiarism) will not be tolerated and will be handled by the administration. Extensions will not be provided under normal circumstances.

#### CLASSROOM PROCEDURES

**Students with Disabilities.** Contact Student Support Services (768-7156) if you need special assistance because of disabilities. Please pursue this avenue early in the semester so we can immediately make the appropriate accommodations.

**Technology Policy.** The class is structured to promote discussion. Unfortunately, cell phones and computers have a tendency to obstruct classroom discussion when used irresponsibly. Use technology in a responsible way. Casual texting and social media during the period of the class is unacceptable and will not be tolerated. Irresponsible use of technology is just cause for removal from the classroom or a deduction from the participation grade. A technology ban will be imposed if these tools become a distraction to your colleagues.

**Email Policy.** Please follow these instructions for email correspondence. The subject line should read: IA298, [subject]. Replace [subject] with the subject of the email. This means no brackets, but include the comma. This will increase the likelihood that I respond in a timely fashion (48 hours or less) and that I appropriately address your concerns. I reserve the right to ignore emails that are disrespectful and emails that use poor grammatical structure. I expect students to compose emails using professional etiquette, this includes: a greeting, a purpose, a salutation, and your name. You should expect the same from me.

**Office Hours.** Feel free to utilize office hours to discuss research ideas, applied research, and clarify other research themes from class. Office hours are also appropriate for clarifying any other issues related to class (scheduling, etc.). I request that students use the material (e.g., the syllabus and text) to first clarify confusion before relying on office hours. I understand that office hours can be poorly timed. If that is the case, we can arrange via email an appointment at a more appropriate time that fits both our schedules. I may adjust office hours depending on demand.

**Writing Center.** It is critical that you present information in a coherent and concise manner in your assignments. The Writing Center is an additional resource for assistance: [college.lclark.edu/academics/support/writing\\_center](http://college.lclark.edu/academics/support/writing_center)

**Student Services & Possible Extensions.** Student Services is your critical source for determining when circumstances for requesting an extension are categorized as "non-normal." You can also speak to me directly. This includes personal illness, family deaths, and absences for school-sanctioned activities. This list is not exhaustive. Do not wait until the last minute to complete your assignments. Extensions are rare.

**Class Performance.** Speak to me as soon as possible if you are concerned about your grade or performance in the classroom. I will make every reasonable effort to support strong classroom performance. Visiting me during office hours is an appropriate time to address these concerns. We can also discuss minor issues before and after class.

#### MATERIAL

All assignments will be electronically available on Moodle.

#### CLASS SCHEDULE

*Introduction: Institutions and Representation.*

Select assignments in class on **24 January**.

- **22 January:** Introduction & Overview (purpose of the class, expectations, assignments, and instruction for managing the reading material).
- **24 January:** Mansbridge, Jane. 1999. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women: A Contingent Yes." *The Journal of Politics*. 61(3): 628-657.
- **27 January:** Carey, John & Matthew Shugart. 1995. "Incentives to Cultivate a Personal Vote: A Rank Ordering of Electoral Formulas." *Electoral Studies*. 14(4): 417-439.

*additional readings:*

- Pitkin, Hanna. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. University of California Press.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1996. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford University Press.
- Dovi, Suzanne. 2002. "Preferable Descriptive Representatives: Will Just Any Woman, Black, or Latino Do?" *American Political Science Review*. 96(4): 729-743.
- Carey, John. 2000. "Parchment, Equilibria, and Institutions." *Comparative Political Studies*. 33: 735-761.
- Posner, Daniel. 2004. "The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi." *The American Political Science Review*. 98(4): 529-545.

**SECTION 1: Incorporation***Theme: Basis for Incorporation.*

- **29 January:** [STUDENT] Reingold, Beth. 1992. "Concepts of Representation Among Female and Male State Legislators." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 17(4): 509-537.
- **31 January:** [STUDENT] Hale, Henry. 2004. "Explaining Ethnicity." *Comparative Political Studies*. 37(4): 458-485.
- **3 February:** [STUDENT] Posner, Daniel. 2007. "Regime Change and Ethnic Cleavages in Africa." *Comparative Political Studies*. 40(11): 1302-1327.
- **5 February:** Nash, Jennifer. 2008. "Re-Thinking Intersectionality." *Feminist Review*. 89: 1-15. & [STUDENT] Rousseau, Stephanie. 2011. "Indigenous and Feminist Movements at the Constituent Assembly in Bolivia: Locating the Representation of Indigenous Women." *Latin American Research Review*. 46(2): 5-28.
- **7 February:** [STUDENT] Htun, Mala. 2004. "Is Gender like Ethnicity? The Political Representation of Identity Groups." *Perspectives on Politics*. 2(3): 439-458.

*additional readings*

- Various Authors. 2005. "The Concept of Gender: Research Implications for Political Science." *Politics & Gender* 1(1).
- Hatemi, Peter, Sarah Medland & Lindon Eaves. 2009. "Do Genes Contribute to the Gender Gap?" *The Journal of Politics*. 71(1): 262-276.
- Jordan-Zachery, Julia. 2007. "Am I a Black Woman or a Woman Who is Black? A Few Thoughts on the Meaning of Intersectionality." *Politics & Gender*. 3(2).
- Fryer, Roland & Steven Levitt. 2004. "The Causes and Consequences of Distinctively Black Names." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 109(3): 767-805.
- Posner, Daniel. 2003. "The Colonial Origins of Ethnic Cleavages: The Case of Linguistic Divisions in Zambia." *Comparative Politics*. 35(2): 127-146.
- Hooker, Juliet. 2005. "Indigenous Inclusion/Black Exclusion: Race, Ethnicity, and Multicultural Citizenship in Latin America." *Journal of Latin American Studies*. 37(2): 285-310.

Group Presentation at the start of class on **10 February**.

*Theme: Female Incorporation.*

- **10 February:** [STUDENT] Jones, Mark. 2008. "Gender Quotas, Electoral Laws, and the Election of Women: Evidence from the Latin American Vanguard." *Comparative Political Studies*. 42(1): 56-81.
- **12 February:** [STUDENT] Heath, Roseanna, Leslie Schwindt-Bayer, & Michelle Taylor-Robinson. 2005. "Women on the Sidelines: Women's Representation on Committees in Latin American Legislatures." *American Journal of Political Science*. 49(2): 420-436.
- **14 February:** [STUDENT] Escobar-Lemmon, Maria & Michelle Taylor-Robinson. 2005. "Women Ministers in Latin American Government: When, Where, and Why?" *American Journal of Political Science*. 49(4). 829-844.
- **17 February:** [STUDENT] Schwindt-Bayer, Leslie. 2005. "The Incumbency Disadvantage and Women's Election to Legislative Office." *Electoral Studies*. 24: 227-244.
- **19 February:** [STUDENT] Fox, Richard & Jennifer Lawless. 2010. "If Only They'd Ask: Gender, Recruitment, and Political Ambition." *The Journal of Politics*. 72(2): 310-326.

*additional readings*

- Mishler, William and Leslie Schwindt-Bayer. 2005. "An Integrated Model of Women's Representation." *The Journal of Politics*. 67(2): 407-428.
- Rule, Wilma. 1994. "Women's Underrepresentation and Electoral Systems." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 27(4). 689-692.
- Various Authors. 2005. "Gender Quotas I." *Politics & Gender* 1(4).
- Various Authors. 2006. "Gender Quotas II." *Politics & Gender* 2(1).
- Tripp, Aili Mari & Alice Kang. 2008. "The Global Impact of Quotas: On The Fast Track to Increased Female Legislative Representation." *Comparative Political Studies*. 41(3): 338-361.
- Krook, Mona Lena. 2006. "Reforming Representation: The Diffusion of Candidate Gender Quotas Worldwide." *Politics & Gender*. 2: 303-327.
- Baldez, Lisa. 2007. "Primaries vs. Quotas: Gender and Candidate Nominations in Mexico, 2003." *Latin American Politics and Society*. 49(3). 69-96.
- Bhavnani, Rikhil. 2009. "Do Electoral Quotas Work after They're Withdrawn? Evidence from a Natural Experiment in India." *American Political Science Review*. 103(1). 23-35.
- Escobar-Lemmon, Maria & Michelle Taylor-Robinson. 2009. "Getting to the Top: Career Paths of Women in Latin American Cabinets." *Political Research Quarterly* 62(4): 685-699.

Group Presentation at the start of class on **24 February**.



*Theme: Racial & Ethnic Incorporation.*

- **21 February:** Reynolds, Andrew. 2005. "Reserved Seats in National Legislatures: A Research Note." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 30(2): 301-310. & [STUDENT] Casellas, Jason. 2009. "Coalitions in the House? The Election of Minorities to State Legislatures and Congress." *Political Research Quarterly* 62(1): 120-131.
- **24 February:** [STUDENT] Preuhs, Robert & Eric Gonzalez Juenke. 2011. "Latino US State Legislators in the 1990s: Majority-Minority Districts, Minority Incorporation, and Institutional Position." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*. 11(1): 48-75.
- **26 February:** [STUDENT] Shah, Paru. 2013. "It Takes a Black Candidate: A Supply-Side Theory of Minority Representation." *Political Research Quarterly*. 1-14.
- **28 February:** [STUDENT] Holmsten, Stephanie, Robert Moser & Mary Slosar. 2010. "Do Ethnic Parties Exclude Women?" *Comparative Political Studies*. 43(10): 1179-1201.
- **3 March:** [STUDENT] Krook, Mona Lena and Diana O'Brien. 2010. "The Politics of Group Representation: Quotas for Women and Minorities Worldwide." *Comparative Politics*. 42(3): 253-272.

*additional readings*

- Canon, David. 1999. "Electoral Systems and the Representation of Minority Interests in Legislatures." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 24(3): 331-385.
- George, Julie, Robert Moser, & Marko Papić. 2010. "The Impact of Minority-Majority Districts: Evidence from the Ukraine." *Post-Soviet Affairs*. 26(10): 58-76.
- Cameron, Charles, David Epstein, & Sharyn O'Halloran. 1996. "Do Majority-Minority Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress?" *American Political Science Review*. 90(4): 794-812.
- Lublin, David. 1997. *The Paradox of Representation: Racial Gerrymandering and Minority Interests in Congress*. Princeton University Press.
- Lublin, David. 1999. "Racial Redistricting and African-American Representation: A Critique of "Do Majority-Minority Districts Maximize Substantive Black Representation in Congress"" *American Political Science Review*. 93(1): 183-186.

Group Presentation at the start of class on **5 March**.

Lewis & Clark Gender Symposium: 5-7 March.

*Section I Exam.*

- **5 March:** Review Material for Exam, Question and Answers, including Memo expectations.
- **7 March:** Section I Exam, make Memo assignment electronically available

Submit memo to Moodle on **10 March (9:00 pm)**.

## SECTION II: The Effects of Incorporation

*Theme: Gender in the Legislative Arena.*

- **10 March:** Pearson, Kathryn and Logan Dancey. 2011. "Elevating Women's Voices in Congress: Speech Participation in the House of Representatives." *Political Research Quarterly*. 1-14. & Taylor-Robinson, Michelle & Roseanna Heath. 2003. "Do Women Legislators Have Different Policy Priorities than their Male Colleagues?" *Women & Politics*. 24(4): 77-101.
- **12 March:** [STUDENT] Swers, Michelle. 2005. "Connecting Descriptive and Substantive Representation: An Analysis of Sex Differences in Cosponsorship Activity." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 30(3): 407-433.
- **14 March:** [STUDENT] Kittilson, Miki Caul. 2008. "Representing Women: The Adoption of Family Leave in Comparative Politics." *The Journal of Politics*. 70(2). 323-334.
- **17 March:** [STUDENT] Anzia, Sarah & Christopher Berry. 2011. "The Jackie (and Jill) Robinson Effect: Why Do Congresswomen Outperform Congressmen?" *American Journal of Political Science* 55(3): 478-493. & Volden, Craig, Alan Wiseman, & Dana Wittmer. 2013. "When Are Women More Effective Lawmakers Than Men?" *American Journal of Political Science*. 57(2): 327-341.
- **19 March:** [STUDENT] Kerevel, Yann & Lonna Rae Atkeson. 2013. "Explaining the Marginalization of Women in Legislative Institutions." *The Journal of Politics*. 75(4): 980-992.
- **21 March:** [STUDENT] Bratton, Kathleen. 2002. "The Effect of Legislative Diversity on Agenda Setting: Evidence from Six State Legislatures." *American Politics Research*. 30(2): 115-142.

*additional readings*

- Jones, Mark. 1997. "Legislator Gender and Legislator Policy Priorities in the Argentine Chamber of Deputies and the US House of Representatives." *Policy Studies Journal*. 24(4): 613-629.
- Schwindt-Bayer. 2006. "Still Supermadres? Gender and the Policy Priorities of Latin American Legislators." *American Journal of Political Science*. 50(3): 570-585.
- Swers, Michele. 1998. "Are Women More Likely to Vote for Women's Issue Bills than Their Male Colleagues?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 23(3). 435-448.
- Barnello, Michelle & Kathleen Bratton. 2007. "Bridging the Gender Gap in Bill Sponsorship." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 32(3): 449-474.
- Osborn, Tracy & Jeanette Mendez. 2010. "Speaking as Women: Women and Floor Speeches in the Senate." *Journal of Women, Politics, & Policy*. 31(1): 1-21.
- Mendelberg, Tali, Christopher Karpowitz & Nicholas Goedert. 2013. "Does Descriptive Representation Facilitate Women's Distinctive Voice? How Gender Composition and Decision Rules Affect Deliberation." *American Journal of Political Science*. 1-16.
- Bratton, Kathleen. 2005. "Critical Mass Theory Revisited: The Behavior and Success of Token Women in State Legislatures." *Politics & Gender*. 97-125.

Group Presentation at the start of class on **31 March**.

Submit preliminary proposal to Moodle on **7 April (9:00 pm)**.

*Theme: Race & Ethnicity in the Legislative Arena.*

- **31 March:** Broockman, David. 2013. "Black Politicians Are More Intrinsically Motivated to Advance Blacks' Interests: A Field Experiment Manipulating Political Incentives." *American Journal of Political Science*. 1-16.
- **2 April:** [STUDENT] Minta, Michael. 2009. "Legislative Oversight and the Substantive Representation of Black and Latino Interests in Congress." *Legislative Studies Quarterly*. 34(2). 193-218.
- **4 April:** Juenke, Eric Gonzalez. 2012. "Irreplaceable Legislators? Rethinking Minority Representatives in the New Century." *American Journal of Political Science*. 56(3): 705-715. & [STUDENT] Grose, Christian. 2005. "Disentangling Constituency and Legislator Effects in Legislative Representation: Black Legislators or Black Districts?" *Social Science Quarterly* 86(2): 427-443.
- **7 April:** [STUDENT] Preuhs, Robert. 2007. "Descriptive Representation as a Mechanism to Mitigate Policy Backlash: Latino Incorporation and Welfare Policy in the American States." *Political Research Quarterly*. 60(2): 277-292.
- **9 April:** [STUDENT] Gillion, Daniel. 2012. "Protest and Congressional Behavior: Assessing Racial and Ethnic Minority Protests in the District." *The Journal of Politics*. 74(4): 950-962.
- **11 April:** [STUDENT] Htun, Mala & Juan Pablo Ossa. 2013. "Political Inclusion of Marginalized Groups: Indigenous Reservations and Gender Parity in Bolivia." *Politics, Groups, and Identities*. 1(1): 4-25.

*additional readings*

- Butler, Daniel & David Broockman. 2011. "Do Politicians Racially Discriminate Against Constituents? A Field Experiment on State Legislators." *American Journal of Political Science*. 1-15.
- Pande, Rohini. 2003. "Can Mandated Political Representation Increase Policy Influence for Disadvantaged Minorities? Theory and Evidence from India." *The American Economic Review*. 93(4): 1132-1151.
- Ellis, William Curtis & Walter Clark Wilson. 2013. "Minority Chairs and Congressional Attention to Minority Issues: The Effect of Descriptive Representation in Positions of Institutional Power." *Social Science Quarterly*. 1-15.
- Minta, Michael & Valeria Sinclair-Chapman. 2013. "Diversity in Political Institutions and Congressional Responsiveness to Minority Interests." *Political Research Quarterly*. 66(1): 127-140.
- Rocca, Michael & Gabriel Sanchez. 2008. "The Effect of Race and Ethnicity on Bill Sponsorship and Cosponsorship in Congress." *American Politics Research*. 36(1): 130-152.
- Postero, Nancy. 2010. "Morales's MAS Government: Building Indigenous Popular Hegemony in Bolivia." *Latin American Perspectives*. 37(3): 18-34.

- Agrawal, Nina et al. 2012. *Political Representation and Social Inclusion: A Comparative Study of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Guatemala*. Americas Society.

Group Presentation at the start of class on **14 April**.

*Theme: The Non-Legislative Arena (All Groups).*

- **14 April:** Scherer, Nancy & Brett Curry. 2010. "Does Descriptive Race Representation Enhance Institutional Legitimacy? The Case of the US Courts." *The Journal of Politics*. 72(1): 90-104.
- **16 April:** [STUDENT] Barnes, Tiffany & Stephanie Burchard. 2013. "Engendering Politics: The Impact of Descriptive Representation on Women's Political Engagement in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Comparative Political Studies*. 46(7): 767-790.
- **18 April:** [STUDENT] Lawless, Jennifer. 2004. "Politics of Presence?: Congresswomen and Symbolic Representation." *Political Research Quarterly*. 57(1): 81-99.
- **21 April:** [STUDENT] Jeong, Hoi Ok. 2013. "Minority Policies and Political Participation Among Latinos: Exploring Latinos' Response to Substantive Representation." *Social Science Quarterly*. 94(5): 1245-1260.
- **23 April:** [STUDENT] Van Cott, Donna Lee. 2003. "Institutional Change and Ethnic Parties in South America." *Latin American Politics and Society*. 45(2): 1-39.
- **25 April:** [STUDENT] Madrid, Raul. 2005. "Indigenous Parties and Democracy in Latin America." *Latin American Politics and Society*. 161-179. & Madrid, Raul. 2005. "Indigenous Voters and Party System Fragmentation in Latin America." *Electoral Studies*. 24: 689-707.

*additional readings*

- Philpot, Tasha & Hanes Walton. 2007. "One of Our Own. Black Female Candidates and the Voters Who Support Them." *American Journal of Political Science*. 51(1): 49-62.
- Reingold, Beth & Jessica Harrell. 2010. "The Impact of Descriptive Representation on Women's Political Engagement: Does Party Matter?" *Political Research Quarterly*. 63(2): 280-294.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2003. "Gender-Related Political Knowledge and the Descriptive Representation of Women." *Political Behavior*. 25(4): 367-388.
- Desposato, Scott & Barbara Norrander. 2009. "The Gender Gap in Latin America: Contextual and Individual Influences on Gender and Political Participation." *British Journal of Political Science*. 39(1): 141-162.
- Morgan, Jana & Melissa Buice. 2013. "Latin American Attitudes toward Women in Politics: The Influence of Elite Cues, Female Advancement, and Individual Characteristics." *American Political Science Review*. 107(4): 644-662.
- Habyarimana, James, Macartan Hymphreys, Daniel Posner & Jeremy Weinstein. 2007. "Why Does Ethnic Diversity Undermine Public Good Provision?" *The American Political Science Review*. 101(4): 709-725.
- Arzheimer, Kai. 2009. "Contextual Factors and the Extreme Right Vote in Western Europe, 1980-2002." *American Journal of Political Science*. 53(2): 259-275.
- van Spanje, Joost. 2010. "Contagious Parties: Anti-Immigration Parties and Their Impact on Other Parties' Immigration Stances in Contemporary Western Europe." *Party Politics*. 16(5): 563-586.

- Raymond, Christopher & Moises Arce. 2013. "The Politicization of Indigenous Identities in Peru." *Party Politics*. 19(4): 555-576.
- Cleary, Matthew. 2000. "Democracy and Indigenous Rebellion in Latin America." *Comparative Political Studies*. 33(9): 1123-1153.
- Schneider, Gerald & Nina Wiesehomeier. 2008. "Rules that Matter: Political Institutions and the Diversity-Conflict Nexus." *Journal of Peace Research*. 45(2): 183-203.

Group Presentation at the start of class on **28 April**.

*Section II Exam.*

- **28 April:** Review Material for Exam, Question and Answers, clarify research proposal expectations and make Memo assignment electronically available.
- **30 April:** Section II Exam

Submit memo to Moodle on **1 May (9:00 pm)**.

Submit Research Proposal to Moodle on **7 May (9:00 pm)**.