

**Women in Legislative Studies Conference Program
October 21-22, 2022**

All events unless otherwise specified will be in **Kraft Hall, room 130**.

Friday, October 21

8:15-8:45 Breakfast (informal, so please feel free to arrive anytime in this window)

8:45-9:00 Welcome

9:00-10:20 Workshops 1 and 2

Workshop 1

Chair/Discussant: **Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey**, London School of Economics

Fiona Shen-Bayh, College of William and Mary

Title: Democratic Backsliding on the Legislative Floor: Evidence from Zambia

Workshop 2

Chair/Discussant: **Michele Swers**, Georgetown University

Jatia Wrighten, Virginia Commonwealth University

Title: Heavy Lifting: Authentic Talent Development and Leadership Obtainment for Black Women State Legislators

10:20 – 10:40 Break

10:40 – 12:40 Workshops 3, 4, and 5

Workshop 3

Chair/Discussant: **Michelle Taylor-Robinson**, Texas A&M University

Emilia Simison, MIT/Tulane University

Title: Yes, and yes, sir, parties? Amending Executive bills in Authoritarian Brazil

Workshop 4

Chair/Discussant: **Mirya Holman**, Tulane University

Erinn Lauterbach, Villanova University and Melinda Ritchie, Ohio State University

Title: Policymaking across the Separation of Powers

Workshop 5

Chair/Discussant: **Jackie Kettler**, Boise State University

Susan Miller, Arizona State University

Title: Legislative Term Limits in Municipalities: How Term Limits Shape Lawmaking at the Local Level

12:45 – 1:30 Lunch

1:30- 3:00 Panels 1 and 2

Panel 1: Congress and Bureaucracy/Oversight (Kraft Hall, room 105)

Chair: **Abigail Mancinelli**, University of Notre Dame

Discussants: **Melody Valdini**, Portland State University, and **Rebecca Kreitzer**, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Lauren Perez, Francis Marion University

Title: National Parliamentary Involvement in Transposing European Union Legislation

Brenna Armstrong, Texas A&M University

Title: Oversight, Corruption, and Politician Strategies

Pamela Ban, University of California San Diego, Hye Young You and Ju Yeon (Julia) Park

Title: Bureaucrats in Congress: Information Sharing in Policymaking

Jenn Selin, Carl Levin Center for Oversight and Democracy and **Grace Moore**, Wayne State University

Title: Keeping Tabs on the Executive

Panel 2: Representation/Appeals and Policy (Kraft Hall, room 110)

Chair: **Michelle Torres**, Rice University

Discussants: **Tracy Osborn**, University of Iowa, and **Katelyn Stauffer**, University of South Carolina

Johanna Dunaway, Texas A&M, and **Paru Shah**, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Title: Campaign Strategies of Black and Brown Republicans: Evidence from State Legislative Primaries

Sahar Abi-Hassan, Mills College, **Laura Moses**, Ohio State University, Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Dino Christenson, Adam Perhala, Liam Thacker, and Enan Srivastava

Title: Relational Rhetoric in Congressional Speeches

Mel Atkinson and Ben Radford, University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Title: Measuring the Ideology of Major Laws

Mia Costa, Dartmouth College

Title: How Politicians Polarize: Political Representation in an Age of Negative Partisanship

3:00 – 3:30 Break

3:30 - 5:00 Panels 3 and 4

Panel 3: Coalitions and Factions within parties (Kraft Hall, room 105)

Chair: **Gisela Sin**, University of Illinois

Discussants: **Tiffany Barnes**, University of Kentucky, and **Bethany Albertson**, University of Texas at Austin

Abby Matthews, SUNY Buffalo, **Tracy Osborn**, University of Iowa, **Rebecca Kritzer**, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and **Emily Schilling**
Title: Effectiveness and Collaboration in the Texas State Legislature

Ruth Bloch Rubin, University of Chicago
Title: Divided Parties, Strong Leaders

Danielle Thomsen, University of California, Irvine, and **Michelle Swers**, Georgetown University
Title: What Do Republican Women Want? Understanding the Policy Priorities of Republican Women

Manuela Muñoz, Texas A&M University, **Alicia Cooperman**, George Washington University, **Andrea Junqueira**, Washington University, **Thiago M.Q. Moreira**, Texas A&M University
Title: How do Mega Cities Decentralize Local Representation? Precinct-Level Voting Behavior and Municipal Service Provision: Evidence from Brazil and Colombia

Panel 4: Gender and Legislatures (Kraft Hall, room 110)

Chair: **Malliga Och**, Idaho State University

Discussants: **Lauren Bell**, Randolph-Macon College, and **Paru Shah**, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Ghashia Kiyani, Naval Postgraduate School
Title: Gender Quotas and Respect for Women Rights

Noa Balf, University of Kansas
Title: More Effective and More Marginalized - Women in the Israeli Knesset

Sara Hagedorn, University of Colorado-Colorado Springs
Title: Today's Congressional Staff

Kenicia Wright, Arizona State University

Title: No Money, No Problem? The Effects of Campaign Contributions on the Electoral Fates of Women in State Legislative Elections

5:00-6:00 Social Hour/Mentoring Program

6:00-8:00 Dinner

Saturday, October 22

8:15 – 9:00 Breakfast

9:00 – 10:30 Panels 5, 6, and 7 (simultaneous in different rooms)

Panel 5: Campaigns and Representation (Kraft Hall, room 125)

Chair: **Eleanor Powell**, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Discussants: **Jennifer Lucas**, Saint Anselm College, and **Sara Angevine**, Whittier College

Rochelle Snyder, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Title: Claiming Credit for Constituent Service in the U.S. House of Representatives

Hanna Brant, SUNY Geneseo and **Jordan Butcher**, Arkansas State University

Title: Following the Rainbow: The LGBTQ+ Incumbency (Dis-)Advantage

Anna Mahoney, Tulane University, and **Nadia Brown**, Georgetown University

Title: Sister Space: Collective Descriptive Representation and Black Women in Legislative Caucuses

Kendall Funk, Arizona State University

Title: Responding to Representation: Trust, Corruption, and Exposure to Women in Government

Panel 6: Democratic backsliding/authoritarianism/polarization (Kraft Hall, rm 105)

Chair: **Melissa Meisels**, Vanderbilt University

Discussant: **Taeko Hiroi**, University of Texas at El Paso, and **Rosalyn Cooperman**, University of Mary Washington

Monica Komer, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Title: Symbolic Representation in New Democracies

Silviya Nitsova, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Title: Oligarchic Networks and Legislatures in Developing Democracies: Evidence from Ukraine

Allison Craig and **Bethany Albertson**, University of Texas at Austin

Title: Don't call it a protest: congressional support for democratic norms in the aftermath of January 6th

Maggie Macdonald, New York University, Joshua Tucker, and Jonathan Nagler

Title: The Democratizing and Polarizing Impact of Fundraising on Twitter: Easy Money, Viral Incentives, and the Catalyzing Role of Mainstream Media

Panel 7: Congressional Institutions (Kraft Hall, room 110)

Chair: **Jaclyn Kaslovsky**, Rice University

Discussants: **Molly Reynolds**, The Brookings Institution, and **Annelise Russell**, University of Kentucky

Leah Rosenstiel, Vanderbilt University

Title: The Distributive Politics of Grants-in-Aid

Elizabeth McCallion, Queen's University

Title: Party Discipline, Partisanship, and the Substantive Representation of Women: The Case of the Canadian Senate

Jaclyn Kettler, Boise State University

Title: Obstruction in State Legislatures

Sara Chatfield, University of Denver

Title: The Politics of Bathroom Access in State Legislatures

10:30 – 10:45 Break

10:45 – 12:00 Women in Legislative Studies Discussion (**Kraft Hall, room 110**)

12:00 – 1:00 Lunch

1:00 Departure

Appendix: Workshops and Panels with Abstracts

Workshops

Workshop 1

Chair/Discussant: **Cheryl Schonhardt-Bailey**, London School of Economics

Fiona Shen-Bayh, College of William and Mary

Title: Democratic Backsliding on the Legislative Floor: Evidence from Zambia

Abstract: How does democratic backsliding affect the behavior of incumbent party and opposition legislators in parliament? We investigate this question in the context of Zambia, which experienced a significant spate of oppression against the opposition party during the Presidency of Edgar Lungu. Using computational text analysis on a corpus of 1,292 parliamentary sessions from 2001 - 2021, we systematically analyze how legislative debates between incumbent and opposition players evolved during a period of democratic turmoil compared to periods of relative democratic stability. We specifically examine changes in the composition of legislators who speak up during these debates, the topics raised, as well as the extent of incivility across party lines. Our findings reveal how democratic backsliding manifests in the legislative arena, which has implications for freedom of speech and democratic discourse.

Workshop 2

Chair/Discussant: **Michele Swers**, Georgetown University

Jatia Wrighten, Virginia Commonwealth University

Title: Heavy Lifting: Authentic Talent Development and Leadership Obtainment for Black Women State Legislators

Abstract: Although Black women are one of the most marginalized groups in the United States, they have a unique and specific socio-cultural experience that forces them to confront obstacles overwhelmingly based on their identity at a very early age. This historical socialization has allowed Black women to succeed beyond their traditional roles. The “heavy lifter” theory explains how an intersection of two marginalized groups: women and Black developed the talent and skills necessary to succeed in state legislatures. One way to examine this intersectional theory as it relates to Black women and authentic talent development in a socio-cultural context is an examination of leadership attainment in state legislatures. To test the hypotheses, this study employed panel data that have individual-level data on state legislators from 2007 to 2014 and applied a logistic regression and a predictive probability. Intersectionality, measured as the interaction term between sex and race, increases the probability of leadership for Black women. This research presents a historical context by which to understand and examine the gendered nature of the ascription process of Black women. Specifically, their experience as a marginalized group burdened them with the duty of the heavy lifter. In looking at Black women legislators’ ability to gain leadership, the heavy lifter identity can potentially be a vehicle through which these Black women legislators can find a sense of purpose and psychological and social strength to forge a path that might not have been expected for them.

Workshop 3

Chair/Discussant: **Michelle Taylor-Robinson**, Texas A&M University

Emilia Simison, MIT/Tulane University

Title: Yes, and yes, sir, parties? Amending Executive bills in Authoritarian Brazil

Abstract: What explains the institutional design of authoritarian legislatures? What accounts for their performance? We argue that the level of power-sharing of an authoritarian regime explains the design of its legislature and, thus, the extent of its legislative powers and involvement in lawmaking. In turn, the interaction between such design and the factional politics of the regime, explains the performance of such legislature. Having tested our argument in two extreme cases—Franco’s personalist regime and the Argentinean collective Executive of the Proceso military regime—we propose to test it in a case of intermediate level of power-sharing accompanied by a legislature with correspondingly intermediate level of power: the Brazilian Congress during the last military regime (1964-1985). Combining data scraping and text processing techniques we are building a novel dataset to analyze the frequency of rejection, amendment, and withdrawal of legislative initiatives by the Executive during the dictatorship. We plan to combine the quantitative analysis of this database with a qualitative analysis of some illustrative cases of special relevance for the authoritarian Executive. Given our theoretical argument, we expect rejections and withdrawals to be rare, but for amendments to be relatively common and consequential for policy outcomes.

Workshop 4

Chair/Discussant: **Mirya Holman**, Tulane University

Erinn Lauterbach, Villanova University and Melinda Ritchie, Ohio State University

Title: Policymaking across the Separation of Powers

Abstract: Despite Congress’ Article I powers, challenges within and outside of Congress prevent lawmakers accomplishing policy outcomes. Legislators face obstacles when trying to pass bills, and legislation is often not implemented as intended. What strategies do lawmakers have for influencing policy outcomes? This paper examines the policy tools legislators use to achieve their policy objectives and how their choice of tool varies based on the incentives and constraints of the political context. Using data on the statutory tools drafted into legislation and legislators’ communications with agencies, we examine House members’ efforts to affect policy implementation through formal and informal channels between 2005 and 2012. Lawmakers strategically draft legislation and engage with agencies to affect public policy, and they strategically choice of venue and tool depends on the advantages and constraints of the political context.

Workshop 5

Chair/Discussant: **Jackie Kettler**, Boise State University

Susan Miller, Arizona State University

Title: Legislative Term Limits in Municipalities: How Term Limits Shape Lawmaking at the Local Level

Abstract: There is significant evidence that legislative term limits at the state level shape legislator behavior and have implications for the balance of power in state government. Many municipalities

also have legislative term limits. In an ICMA survey, while 9% of cities reported term limits for council members, 50% of cities with populations over 250k reported having legislative term limits (Moulder 2008). However, we know less about the implications of term limits at the local level. Existing research on the effects of local term limits for policymaking and legislator behaviors and attitudes can be expanded to explore a larger geographic scope and greater variety in the characteristics of local governments. It is important to consider cities across the US with different characteristics (i.e., form of government, salary level, full time vs. part time, etc.), as these characteristics may have meaningful implications for the effects of term limits. This project will explore these characteristics. In doing so, it can aid in crafting a more complete picture of the implications of term limits for policymaking and legislator behavior by extending the consideration of term limits to a wide variety of different types of local governments.

Panels

Panel 1: Congress and Bureaucracy/Oversight

Chair: **Abigail Mancinelli**, University of Notre Dame

Discussants: **Melody Valdini**, Portland State University, and **Rebecca Kreitzer**, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Lauren Perez, Francis Marion University

Title: National Parliamentary Involvement in Transposing European Union Legislation

Abstract: In response to the European Union's (EU) expanded policy-making and concerns that the EU is too distant from its citizens, Europe's national parliaments have been playing an increasing (if still small) role in EU-level politics. However, there is still wide variation in their levels of involvement. One opportunity for involvement is during the final stages of the legislative process. After the EU passes a new directive, the member states must each write that policy into national legislation, a process called transposition. Transposition may be done through the full legislative process with the involvement of the national parliament, or it may be done through ministerial orders and regulations without parliamentary involvement. This paper analyzes what factors make some national parliaments more likely to be involved in transposition than others. Transposition differs from other types of parliamentary involvement in that it is more formalized/institutionalized and less flexible, so I demonstrate that long-term factors are more important than short-term ones. The overall balance of power between the parliament and the executive is the most important factor, since the parliament will often need to have bargained for more involvement in transposition and the institutions governing transposition will largely depend on the broader institutional relationship. Contrary to some existing literature and in line with this institutionalization argument, I demonstrate that long-term legislative party and cabinet fragmentation matter more than short-term fragmentation. Long-term Euroscepticism also matters, but parliamentary involvement in transposition does not serve as a flexible or short-term response to public concerns about Europe.

Brenna Armstrong, Texas A&M University

Title: Oversight, Corruption, and Politician Strategies

Abstract: Do men and women conduct oversight at equal rates? Men and women elected to office are tasked with three priorities: lawmaking, constituency services, and oversight. While often overlooked in research, oversight is an important democratic principle that ensures accountable governance, and given the unique position of women in government, men and women are likely to prioritize oversight and lawmaking differently. I develop a theory of risk aversion and strategic allocation, in which I hypothesize that women are more oversight-driven and are also more likely to conduct oversight in women's issue areas. Differences in oversight behavior may be one mechanism for women's presence in government reducing corruption perceptions. To test these hypotheses, I use oversight committee data from the Colombian Congress (2010-2020). I find that women are more likely to conduct oversight in high visibility committees and when the issue is stereotypically feminine.

Pamela Ban, University of California San Diego, Hye Young You and Ju Yeon (Julia) Park

Title: Bureaucrats in Congress: Information Sharing in Policymaking

Abstract: There exists a canonical power balance in policymaking between Congress and the bureaucracy. The amount and quality of information about the costs and consequences of policy implementation has been theorized to be an important factor in determining who has more of a policymaking advantage on any given piece of legislation: Congress or the bureaucracy. Given the critical role that information plays, how do bureaucrats and Congress control the information flow between them? Bureaucrat testimony in committee hearings is a frequent, important way through which Congress conducts oversight and acquires policy-relevant information. We use committee hearing transcripts to analyze information sharing between Congress and the bureaucracy across all U.S. House and Senate committees from 1997 to 2020. Using our new measurement of analytical testimony that bureaucrats provide to congressional committees, we examine who from the bureaucracy testifies in committee hearings and how much information is provided to Congress, and the quality of information provided. We demonstrate that there are three factors that affect the information flow: the types of hearings, the preference alignment between Congress and the bureaucracy, and the amount of uncertainty regarding the cost or consequences of a legislation's implementation. These factors work to influence both the amount of information that Congress requests from bureaucrats and the quality of information that bureaucrats choose to provide.

Jenn Selin, Carl Levin Center for Oversight and Democracy and **Grace Moore**, Wayne State University

Title: Keeping Tabs on the Executive

Abstract: Congress has long exercised its power to oversee the executive branch. Important research has examined empirical patterns in congressional investigations, finding institutional, individual, policy, and partisan incentives motivate legislative inquiry. Yet, scholars largely have overlooked one fundamental question: what is oversight? In this paper, we seek to fill this gap by analyzing a novel dataset of the documents congressional committees produce during the investigative process. We then utilize new and existing datasets to compare legislative use of different forms of oversight. We find that congressional inquiry occurs much more frequently and covers a wider range of executive actions than previously considered by scholars.

Panel 2: Representation/Appeals and Policy

Chair: **Michelle Torres**, Rice University

Discussants: **Tracy Osborn**, University of Iowa, and **Katelyn Stauffer**, University of South Carolina

Johanna Dunaway, Texas A&M, & **Paru Shah**, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Title: Campaign Strategies of Black and Brown Republicans: Evidence from State Legislative Primaries

Abstract: The rise of GOP candidates of color provides a new opportunity to examine how partisanship intersects with race in campaign strategies. Building upon the deracialization literature, we ask: do black and brown candidates strategically adopt "non-threatening" stances on racial politics, and avoid discussions of their own race and the race of their constituents? Are black and brown Republican candidates more likely to do this than their Democratic counterparts? And perhaps most importantly, is this strategy successful? We examine GOP and Democratic primary candidates' political communication strategies using a unique dataset

containing information on all 2018 and 2020 state legislative primaries in which at least one non-white candidate contended. Our findings add to the broader understanding of how the new wave of black and brown GOP candidates seek to mobilize voters.

Sahar Abi-Hassan, Mills College, **Laura Moses**, Ohio State University, Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Dino Christenson, Adam Perhala, Liam Thacker, and Enan Srivastava

Title: Relational Rhetoric in Congressional Speeches

Abstract: One-minute speeches are often used by Members of Congress to express policy priorities, argue their positions and advocate for issues. Their rhetoric provides us with an understanding of the rhetorical representation Members of Congress employ, and how legislators relate to one another through the statements they make. Using one-minute speeches from 1950 to 2020 we develop relational networks of Members of Congress using their statements. These networks illuminate the lexical similarities between legislators and demonstrate how rhetorical relationships relate to partisanship, and legislative effectiveness. This sheds new light on the impact of communications and rhetoric on legislative processes.

Mel Atkinson and Ben Radford, University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Title: Measuring the Ideology of Major Laws

Abstract: Major laws enacted at the federal level are often amalgamations of smaller bills that become combined into omnibus bills prior to passage. It is not uncommon for bills to be introduced and reintroduced, modified, and combined several times across several sessions of Congress before becoming law. This paper develops and validates a method for scoring the ideological content of these complex and consequential laws. We employ a text-reuse algorithm to trace the provenance of the policy ideas contained in such laws to the legislators who first proposed them. After identifying the Members of Congress responsible for discrete portions of major law, we then attach the ideology scores of the lawmakers to the omnibus laws themselves. This method allows us to capture substantive contributions to major laws by legislators regardless of whether they sponsored, co-sponsored or voted for the law ultimately enacted. The project has the potential to demonstrate instances of bipartisan lawmaking that are obscured by party-line votes at the final passage stage. Moreover, when complete, the project will allow for a large-scale comparison of the content of major laws with public policy preferences.

Mia Costa, Dartmouth College

Title: How Politicians Polarize: Political Representation in an Age of Negative Partisanship

Abstract: In the current era of heightened affective polarization, politicians use identity to draw on outgroups, constituents' negational or negative identities, rather than ingroups. I explore several possibilities regarding why politicians engage in a negative representational style in the context of partisanship. Elites, accurately perceiving mass preferences, do not generally think that negative partisan rhetoric is a viable electoral strategy to win voters' support. I demonstrate that elite-driven negative partisanship is instead part of the vicious cycle of affective polarization. Politicians perceive increased negativity both at the elite and mass levels: they report that campaigns have become more negative over time and are also themselves more affectively polarized than the mass public. At the same time, elites think that negative partisan rhetoric does not necessarily lose elections when both candidates use it. In campaigns that are characterized by negativity, attacking the outparty is viewed as fair game.

Finally, I find that congressional tweets that contain outparty appeals garner significantly more attention than tweets that contain no partisan appeals or inparty appeals. Ultimately, even though Americans do not favor elite expressions of partisan animosity, the broader context of affective polarization makes the use of negative representational styles all too common.

Panel 3: Coalitions and Factions within parties

Chair: **Gisela Sin**, University of Illinois

Discussants: **Tiffany Barnes**, University of Kentucky, and **Bethany Albertson**, University of Texas at Austin

Abby Matthews, SUNY Buffalo, **Tracy Osborn**, University of Iowa, **Rebecca Kritzer**, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and **Emily Schilling**

Title: Effectiveness and Collaboration in the Texas State Legislature

Abstract: In this paper, we use a novel dataset of all bills in the Texas State Legislature from 1989-2019 to test how legislators' identities shape their effectiveness as legislators. Particularly, we examine the degree to which collaboration among racial, ethnic, and gender groups in the form of bill cosponsorship shapes differences in effectiveness among groups.

Ruth Bloch Rubin, University of Chicago

Title: Divided Parties, Strong Leaders

Abstract: The theory chapter from my book manuscript, *Divided Parties, Strong Leaders*, addresses a persistent puzzle in congressional politics. It is often said that the more divided a party, the weaker its leaders will be. But careful scrutiny of congressional history makes clear that party divisions are not inherently limiting. This first chapter develops a theory to explain why this is so and outlines the project's empirical approach. Drawing on nearly a dozen case studies from the postwar Congress, subsequent chapters explore how and why leaders are sometimes able to overcome and even draw strength from their divided ranks.

Danielle Thomsen, University of California, Irvine, and **Michelle Swers**, Georgetown University

Title: What Do Republican Women Want? Understanding the Policy Priorities of Republican Women

Abstract: We take a deep dive into the legislative activity and success of Republicans from the 103rd-113th Congresses (1993-2014) to determine whether the policy priorities of Republican women differ from Republican men. A long line of research shows that female legislators prioritize issues related to women, but Republican women in office dramatically changed over this period, with moderate women leaving and conservative women replacing them. We examine party-owned issues (taxes and national security), social welfare policies, and women's issues. We are the first to study gender differences in tax policy advocacy by analyzing which members pursue tax bills related to social welfare issues. Women are less likely than men to sponsor tax legislation, but when we examine tax policies focused on social welfare, we find that the moderate cohort of Republican women is more likely to use the tax code to pursue social welfare policy than their male colleagues. Only conservative women, however, are more likely to see action on their social welfare-oriented tax policies. When we examine social welfare policies outside the tax code, Republican women are more likely to sponsor these bills than men across this period, but gender differences are larger when there

were more moderate women in office. When bills are more clearly connected to consequences for women, conservative women are again more likely to see action on their bills. The willingness of Republican women to pursue social welfare goals through the tax code and the greater effectiveness of conservative women has important implications for policy outcomes.

Manuela Muñoz, Texas A&M University, **Alicia Cooperman**, George Washington University, **Andrea Junqueira**, Washington University, **Thiago M.Q. Moreira**, Texas A&M University

Title: How do Mega Cities Decentralize Local Representation? Precinct-Level Voting Behavior and Municipal Service Provision: Evidence from Brazil and Colombia

Abstract: Rapid urbanization increases the need to produce public goods, particularly in developing countries, where underprovision and unequal access to services are common. Many public services and development projects are tied to specific neighborhoods, where citizens vote at polling stations whose vote shares are publicly known. We argue that even in "at large electoral systems," the local nature of public services provision creates incentives for voters to demand narrow local representation and for local politicians to respond to specific requests and interests of a given group of constituencies within the city, often at the expense of others. We test our expectations by exploring variation in sub-municipal service provision in three major cities in Latin America: São Paulo, Bogotá, and Fortaleza. Our manuscript focuses on our empirical findings and the complex challenges facing scholars studying sub-municipal outcomes in multiple cases. Our results speak to the difficulties of overcoming underdevelopment and achieving democratic consolidation in the global south.

Panel 4: Gender and Legislatures

Chair: **Malliga Och**, Idaho State University

Discussants: **Lauren Bell**, Randolph-Macon College, and **Paru Shah**, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Ghashia Kiyani, Naval Postgraduate School

Title: Gender Quotas and Respect for Women Rights

Abstract: This paper asks the question of how electoral gender quotas affect women rights. Particularly, it examines the relationship between gender quotas and women rights in authoritarian regimes. The main argument is that electoral autocratic leaders are rational actors who adopt gender quotas to improve their international reputation for democracy. The boost in reputation allows them to secure their position but at the same time allows them to violate their social and economic rights. Leaders engage in violating social and economic rights because it prevents women from becoming powerful entities, and as a result, they are less likely to pose a threat to regime. I test the hypothesis by using cross-sectional and time-series data on gender quotas and women rights from 1980 to 2010.

Noa Balf, University of Kansas

Title: More Effective and More Marginalized - Women in the Israeli Knesset

Abstract: Despite increasingly diverse legislatures the relationship between the presence of individuals from historically marginalized groups and policy outcomes remains unclear. In this paper I present a typology for when gender-related legislation is likely to occur. I argue that substantive representation of women, that is to say gender legislation is going to be associated

with institutional weakness. I look at how political advancement influences policy preferences and legislative agenda setting as well as the gendered implications of that process. I argue that gender legislation is a strategic choice women politician make. I show that in the Israeli case women are unable to benefit from seniority or gain political power as their men colleagues do. Instead, I find that women experience bias within the legislature and that gender-related legislation in Israel occurs primarily because of institutional constraints. Consequently, they are doubly marginalized, first as colleagues and collaborators, and secondly as policy makers.

Sara Hagedorn, University of Colorado-Colorado Springs

Title: Today's Congressional Staff

Abstract: A key feature of earlier books about congressional staff were exhaustive studies of demographics. This is a draft chapter of a current book project on congressional staff. Using original survey data from 2014, as well as more recent interviews of former staff, it looks at the demographics of the modern congressional staffer. This chapter uses the seminal works of Malbin (1980) and Fox and Hammond (1977) as a starting and comparison point, while also getting a bit deeper into the relatively new phenomenon of women and minorities in Congress. While there have been strides made in increased numbers of minorities and women, much remains the same as it was in the 1970's. The previous chapter outlined the different types of staff and their responsibilities. This chapter will further describe the actual staff: age, education levels, experience, ethnicity, gender, job satisfaction, ideology, and personal lives, with a special focus on how things have changed in the last nearly 50 years.

Kenicia Wright, Arizona State University

Title: No Money, No Problem? The Effects of Campaign Contributions on the Electoral Fates of Women in State Legislative Elections

Abstract: Existing research highlights the general importance of money in shaping the electoral success of candidates running for election in the US and the difficulty that women have in generating campaign receipts relative to men. However, the intriguing, persistent pattern of over-representation of minority women in state legislatures raises questions about the importance of money in determining the electoral success of these women based on their race/ethnicity. In this paper, I examine: To what extent do campaign contributions influence the electoral success of women running in state legislative elections? A part of a larger project that explores this relationship over time, I will focus on the relationship in 2020 for this conference. I argue that discourse surrounding minoritized communities throughout former-President Trump's presidency, his rhetoric and broader political and social contexts surrounding the 2020 Presidential Election, and attention to the specific type of voters who are most likely to support women candidates and the influence of party affiliation in such a highly polarized and partisan context, will result in descriptive features providing voters "cues" that will impact voting behavior and reduce the importance of campaign contributions in explaining the electoral fates of women based on their race/ethnicity. Using an innovative dataset that contains information on district-level factors, electoral rules, and candidate characteristics, results provide support for expectations.

Panel 5: Campaigns and Representation

Chair: **Eleanor Powell**, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Discussants: **Jennifer Lucas**, Saint Anselm College, and **Sara Angevine**, Whittier College

Rochelle Snyder, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Title: Claiming Credit for Constituent Service in the U.S. House of Representatives

Abstract: Constituent-facing work, such as providing constituent service and responding to constituent communications, is an important component of the "personal vote" for members of Congress, as it helps legislators build name recognition and goodwill among constituents in ways that are not related to partisanship or policy. However, because the benefits of constituent service for legislators depend on the number of constituents in their districts who need help, which varies based on idiosyncratic factors, it may prove useful for legislators to engage in credit claiming activities that specifically claim credit for individual-level constituent service. Using an original dataset of U.S. House members' constituent-facing activities collected from social media posts, newsletters, and official websites in 2019, as well as aggregate approval data from the 2020 Cooperative Election Study (CES), I present three key findings about constituent service and credit-claiming: 1) sharing constituent service credit-claiming messages in 2019, but not in 2020, has a positive relationship with legislator approval in 2020; 2) there is no relationship between constituent service credit-claiming messages and legislators' margins of victory in 2020; and 3) Democrats are more likely than Republicans to claim credit for constituent service. Together, these results suggest that, although constituent service credit claiming has no electoral benefits for legislators, it increases legislator approval and is a way for those whose legislative efforts have been stymied—this case, House Democrats facing a Republican-controlled Senate and White House—signal their commitment to representation and democratic governance.

Hanna Brant, SUNY Geneseo and **Jordan Butcher**, Arkansas State University

Title: Following the Rainbow: The LGBTQ+ Incumbency (Dis-)Advantage

Abstract: The 2018 state legislative election cycle is referred to as the "Rainbow Wave" because of the high number of LGBTQ+ candidates. However, with this success, came evidence that the election of LGBTQ+ candidates resulted in a backlash within the legislature. We seek to understand if this backlash extends to the electoral arena by following 171 LGBTQ+ incumbents in the 2020 election cycle. Are LGBTQ+ incumbents more likely to face quality challengers or win reelection by smaller margins compared to their straight colleagues? By focusing on LGBTQ+ legislators, our analysis contributes to a broader understanding of legislative career dynamics by examining the diversity and retention in legislatures.

Anna Mahoney, Tulane University, and **Nadia Brown**, Georgetown University

Title: Sister Space: Collective Descriptive Representation and Black Women in Legislative Caucuses

Abstract: Black women in elective office in the United States have demonstrated how descriptive representative transforms democratic institutions. The creation of the Black Maternal Health Caucus (BMHC) and the Congressional Caucus for Black Women and Girls (CCBWG) demonstrate the legislative agency of Black women to form identity and issue-based coalitions that suit the needs of Black women, overlooked by Black men and white women. Caucuses, voluntary associations of legislators, provide the social networking, information sharing, and work distribution necessary for success in polarized legislatures. Historically, memberships in legislative collectives prioritize singular aspects of political

identity, namely, race within Black caucuses and gender within women's caucuses. Single-axis identity-based caucuses are structured in ways that prohibit Black women from advancing previously uncrystallized issues which are intersectional in nature. Although legislative caucuses require Black women to choose either their race or gender as the primary lens from which to frame their advocacy, Black women draw from their intersecting, politically salient identities to work within or against single-axis caucuses. Their participation in and challenges to these caucuses, in addition to the creation of new intersectional ones, advances both individual and collective conceptions of representation. Using an intersectional lens, we use data gathered from personal interviews with the founders of these Black women's caucuses in Congress to explore how Black women representatives utilize membership in caucuses to disavow a single-axis approach to policymaking and build coalitions (or not) between and among other marginalized collectives within legislatures.

Kendall Funk, Arizona State University

Title: Responding to Representation: Trust, Corruption, and Exposure to Women in Government

Abstract: Stereotypical ideas about women have led to the widely-held belief that women politicians are more trustworthy and less corrupt than men. These ideas are so ingrained that political actors worldwide, from political parties to police forces, have deliberately increased women's representation as a way to combat corruption and improve perceptions of the legitimacy and trust in government institutions. This study uses the unique case of Costa Rica to examine whether these relationships persist in a context where women's representation in politics has become commonplace. Costa Rica has experienced consistently high levels of women's representation in the National Assembly, but offers variation in levels of women's representation among its canton-level governments. Analyses using original data collected from local governments merged with public opinion data indicate that increasing women's representation in local legislative and executive offices has mixed effects on attitudes toward government in this context. These findings suggest that the historically strong relationships between women's representation, trust, and perceptions of corruption may not persist in contexts where women have achieved significant levels of representation.

Panel 6: Democratic backsliding/authoritarianism/polarization

Chair: **Melissa Meisels**, Vanderbilt University

Discussant: **Taeko Hiroi**, University of Texas at El Paso, and **Rosalyn Cooperman**, University of Mary Washington

Monica Komer, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Title: Symbolic Representation in New Democracies

Abstract: Findings are mixed regarding whether exposure to women politicians can mitigate biases against women leaders. Much of this work has focused on democratic regimes, yet less is known about symbolic representation at the early stages of democratic transition, where I argue women's presence in office is likely to have limited, or even adverse, symbolic consequences. In this paper, I leverage Tunisia's 2014 parliamentary elections, the country's first since the Arab Spring, and exploit variation in women's representation across districts. Using district-level survey and election data, along with instrumental variable estimation, I find that higher levels of women in office are associated with a decrease in support for women

leaders, particularly among female citizens. I supplement these results with data from 85 countries across 4 time points to offer insights beyond the Tunisian case. The findings offer new insights into women's symbolic representation and the potential for backlash against women leaders during the initial periods of democratic transition.

Silviya Nitsova, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Title: Oligarchic Networks and Legislatures in Developing Democracies: Evidence from Ukraine

Abstract: State capture by wealthy elites is a widespread phenomenon in developing democracies, yet the mechanisms through which it works and the impact it has on political and policy outcomes remain poorly understood. I argue that, to successfully defend their wealth in the context of a competitive political environment and weak rule of law, oligarchs promote as legislators individuals who are linked to them via personal ties, specifically, kinship ties and direct and indirect connections based on common affiliation with businesses, non-profits, and political party organizations. Through their networks of loyal legislators, oligarchs ensure the adoption of policies favorable to their economic interests and shape governing coalition dynamics and key reform processes. To develop and test these arguments, I employ descriptive and inferential social network analysis of original quantitative data on nearly 600 legislators and oligarchs, and interview-based evidence on the case of Ukraine after the Revolution of Dignity (2014-2019). The study has important implications for the literatures on political connections, crony capitalism, neopatrimonialism, and the politics of reform.

Allison Craig and **Bethany Albertson**, University of Texas at Austin

Title: Don't call it a protest: congressional support for democratic norms in the aftermath of January 6th

Abstract: Trump supporters overtook the U.S. Capitol on January 6th 2021 in an attempt to stop the certification of Joe Biden's victory in the 2020 presidential election. The meaning of this attack continues to be subject to immense scrutiny in the context of today's polarized politics with some members of Congress going so far as casting the rioters as "tourists" and "patriots." However, in the immediate aftermath of the insurrection, nearly every Senator and Representative took to Twitter to express their shock and anger over the events of January 6th. A closer look at their tweets reveals that even as the assault was happening, members offered varied interpretation of events. We analyze congressional tweets sent between January 6th and January 8th 2021 and find that while there was near-universal condemnation of the attack, the majority of tweets use one of two frames: an attack on the U.S. system of government (subverting democracy, preventing a transfer of power) vs. a protest that got out of hand (violence is not the answer, a few bad apples). While there is a clear partisan distinction of the choice of frame, we also examine how seniority, ideology, and institutional position explain the significant within-party variation in how members talk about the attack on the Capitol.

Maggie Macdonald, New York University, Joshua Tucker, and Jonathan Nagler

Title: The Democratizing and Polarizing Impact of Fundraising on Twitter: Easy Money, Viral Incentives, and the Catalyzing Role of Mainstream Media

Abstract: What is the effect of social media on campaign fundraising? We propose two pathways through which campaigns can raise money through their tweets: directly via Twitter users seeing their tweets and indirectly through retweets by media and journalists,

who spread a campaign's message beyond the users who would have otherwise seen the tweet. Previous work suggests that a main audience for campaigns on Twitter are journalists and the media. However, we do not know the extent to which this is true, or for which candidates. We find that on the days congressional campaigns received more retweets, they also received more contributions. Further, we find that hundreds of campaigns were retweeted thousands of times by national news media and receive higher predicted contributions than when they were not. This difference is largest when the campaigns tweeted about nationally salient and polarizing topics such as Donald Trump or abortion-- overall, and separately for candidates in safe and competitive seats and for incumbents and non-incumbents. Campaigns in competitive seats and non-incumbents further receive higher predicted contributions when they do not tweet about nationally salient topics and are retweeted by local news media. Our results suggest that Twitter can offer campaigns a pathway to build up resources and support nationwide, but incentivizes politicians to tweet about nationally polarizing and salient topics to gain media coverage and appeal to national, partisan individuals.

Panel 7: Congressional Institutions

Chair: **Jaelyn Kaslovsky**, Rice University

Discussants: **Molly Reynolds**, The Brookings Institution, and **Annelise Russell**, University of Kentucky

Leah Rosenstiel, Vanderbilt University

Title: The Distributive Politics of Grants-in-Aid

Abstract: The federal government provides public goods, income security, and other types of assistance by allocating grants to state and local governments based on demographic characteristics. What is the impact of allocating resources this way? I use decades of data on education grants to show that members of key congressional committees alter assistance programs to procure more funding for their states, but this benefit spills over to other states with similar characteristics. First, I use variation in the timing of program reauthorizations to quantify the benefit to Senate committee chairs and states with similar characteristics. I then show that when chairs represent high poverty states, Congress enacts grant programs that better target funding to all high poverty areas. These results suggest that where the federal government provides public goods and financial assistance depends not only on who has power within Congress, but also the characteristics of those legislators' states.

Elizabeth McCallion, Queen's University

Title: Party Discipline, Partisanship, and the Substantive Representation of Women: The Case of the Canadian Senate

Abstract: Around the world, party discipline mediates women's substantive representation. But in Canada, the Senate recently underwent reforms to reduce partisanship. As a result, a large contingent of independent senators has emerged. As such, the Canadian Senate provides a useful case for studying the effects of party discipline and partisanship on the substantive representation of women. This paper leverages a content analysis of Canadian Senate committee meetings to analyze senators' representation of women's interests. It uses discussions of women to indicate senators' concern for how policies affect women's lives. The paper concludes that independent senators are more likely to speak about women than partisan

senators. But, when Liberal senators were freed from party discipline and remained partisans, they did not start speaking about women more. Rather, it is senators originally appointed as independents who are most likely to talk about women in the course of policymaking. Moreover, the paper finds that women, racialized senators, and intersectional senators are more likely to speak about women than their white and male counterparts. This finding demonstrates the importance of diversity among the newly appointed independent senators. These conclusions suggest that the Canadian Senate is a valuable venue for the substantive representation of women. Moreover, these are promising results with regard to other legislatures around the world with low party discipline. The findings from this paper can enable women's groups to strategically engage with legislators who are more likely to respond to their interests.

Jaclyn Kettler, Boise State University

Title: Obstruction in State Legislatures

Abstract: While the filibuster in the U.S. Senate receives immense attention, tools of obstruction are also available to state legislators (e.g., fleeing the state capital). Obstructionism seems to have become more common in some state legislatures as polarization has increased, causing significant gridlock. However, apart from a few key studies (e.g., Martorano 2004, Squire 2014), little attention has been given to obstruction in state legislatures. As a result, we lack research on what obstruction tactics exist in state legislatures and how their usage varies across chambers and sessions. We know legislative rules influence the power of the majority party and minority parties in legislatures (e.g., Binder 1997; Clark 2015; Martorano 2004). The types of obstruction tactics available also vary across state legislatures due to the diversity in their rules and legislative processes (Miller, Hamm, and Hedlund 2014; Squire and Hamm 2005). Despite some excellent studies on specific types of obstruction (Grossman 2015; Squire 2014), we lack comprehensive research on obstruction tactics in state legislatures. This project seeks to fill this gap by comparing tools of obstruction and obstructionism across state legislatures. This involves first identifying the rules that allow legislators to obstruct legislative activity using state constitutions, chamber rules, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and previous research. I am using this information to create an index of obstruction tools by chamber. Additionally, I plan to research the usage of obstruction tactics in a smaller sample of states to evaluate when obstruction occurs and the consequences of it.

Sara Chatfield, University of Denver

Title: The Politics of Bathroom Access in State Legislatures

Abstract: We know legislative rules influence the power of the majority party and minority parties in legislatures (e.g., Binder 1997; Clark 2015; Martorano 2004). The types of obstruction tactics available also vary across state legislatures due to the diversity in their rules and legislative processes (Miller, Hamm, and Hedlund 2014; Squire and Hamm 2005). Despite some excellent studies on specific types of obstruction (Grossman 2015; Squire 2014), we lack comprehensive research on obstruction tactics in state legislatures.