

# REPRESENTATION

400-level Undergraduate Course / Graduate Seminar  
Fall 20XX

---

<b>Instructor:</b>	Mark Williamson	<b>Time:</b>	Thursdays 9-11:30am
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:mark.williamson@torontomu.ca">mark.williamson@torontomu.ca</a>	<b>Place:</b>	TBD

---

**Course Description:** Who becomes a politician? How do the characteristics of elected officials affect the health of democracy and the public policies chosen by governments? This course is designed for students interested in the comparative politics of representation. It begins with a review of the classic theoretical approaches to understanding representation, emphasizing the principle-agent relationship between voters and elected officials. It then turns to an examination of why representation of diverse interests might be important in a democracy and what some of the barriers to such representation are. The course concludes with a look at institutional innovations designed to promote the inclusion of women, class interests, ethnic and racial groups, and other under-represented communities. By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- Critically assess theories of what representation means and how it is achieved
- Differentiate between descriptive, substantive and symbolic forms of representation
- Identify the major barriers to the representation of diverse groups of voters and link them to the institutional reforms proposed to address these barriers
- Develop their capacity to conduct original academic research

**Land Acknowledgement:** This course takes place on the [traditional lands](#) of the Mississaugas of the Credit, Anishinaabeg, Chippewa, Haudenosaunee and Wendat peoples. This territory is subject to the [Dish With One Spoon Wampum](#), a treaty between the Anishinaabeg and Haudenosaunee nations that bound them to peacefully share and protect the land. Subsequent Indigenous nations and non-Indigenous settlers have been invited into this covenant. We are also meeting in a place covered by [Treaty 13 and the Williams Treaties](#), two agreements by which the Canadian and Ontario governments have historically failed to honourably abide.

Acknowledging the history of this land is a sign of respect toward its original peoples, but also a call for all those who benefit from the land today to work towards decolonization. I encourage you to learn more about the [Indigenous history of Toronto](#) (from the Haudenosaunee word *Tkarón:to*) and reflect on how you can use what you learn in this course to promote reconciliation.

## COURSE ORGANIZATION

**Class Meetings:** We will have seminar meetings every Thursday from 9 to 11:30am in [room]. Students are expected to have read all materials before each class and come prepared to discuss.

**Office Hours:** Tuesdays 2-4pm, virtually via zoom ([link](#)) or in-person at 714 Jorgenson Hall. Sign up online for a specific time at [calendly.com/mark.williamson/office-hours](https://calendly.com/mark.williamson/office-hours).

**Course Website:** There is a course website on Brightspace. There is no assigned textbook. All important documents (syllabus, readings, lecture slides, assignments, etc.) will be posted there. It is your responsibility to regularly check the page for updates. Written assignments will also be submitted there.

## EVALUATION

There are five components to your grade:

Participation: 20%

Discussion Memos: 20%

Referee Report: 20%

Research Paper or Proposal: 40%

**Participation:** Your participation grade will be based on your attendance and active participation in discussions during our weekly meetings. You are expected to have read all assigned readings before each session and to come prepared with comments for discussion. Please get in touch with the professor if you have to miss class due to illness or other extenuating circumstances.

**Discussion Memos:** To facilitate discussion, you will be required to submit a one-page discussion memo based on the assigned readings for at least six weeks in the course. Your memo should be concise and to the point: list the set of questions or comments that follow from your reading of the paper(s). The memo is not an essay, but should be written sharply, preferably using bullet-points. You may focus on just one of the assigned articles or several. The memos will be posted to a shared folder (link to be provided), where all students in the class can (and should!) read the questions of other students in advance of the class.

**Referee Report:** In our first session, students will be assigned to write a two-page referee report on one paper throughout the term. Your report should not simply summarise the reading. Instead, it will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the paper, critically assess its overall contribution, propose how the paper could be made better, and outline further questions that follow from that paper. Unlike the discussion memo, the report should be written in complete sentences. This exercise is intended to mimic the kind of peer review report that would be created as part of the journal article publication process; the professor will share an example report to follow. In the session in which the assigned paper appears, students who wrote the referee report on that paper will provide a brief (<10 minute) presentation summarizing their report and raising questions for an open discussion among the class. Note: students cannot submit a discussion memo in the same week they are submitting a referee report.

**Research Paper or Proposal:** For the final assignment in this course, undergraduate students must write a paper, while graduate students have the option to write either a paper or research proposal. Research papers should accomplish the following: articulate and motivate a research question; review the relevant literature on this question; develop hypotheses based on coherent theoretical arguments; present evidence from a single case or multiple cases (e.g. countries, elections, politicians) to evaluate the hypotheses;

summarize the study's findings with respect to the initial research question. Research proposals will include these same components, except you will describe the data and empirical strategy you will follow and how you will interpret the possible evidence. Papers and proposals can use either qualitative or quantitative data, or else take a theoretical approach. Papers taking a theoretical approach will take a slightly different form, omitting the data and empirical components. (Please speak to the professor if you are considering a theoretical paper). Additional details on all assignment requirements will be discussed in class.

The required minimum length for either submission type is 12-15 double-spaced pages, excluding references. Students must have their topic approved by the professor. When you have selected a topic for your paper, either come to office hours to discuss or send a one-paragraph summary of your idea to the professor by email. The deadline for this final assignment is **December X**.

## COURSE POLICIES

**Academic Integrity:** Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated. Toronto Metropolitan University's [Policy 60](#) outlines the behaviours that constitute academic dishonesty and the processes for addressing academic offences. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to: providing false information to receive an extension on an exam or assignment; using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement; submission of essentially the same written assignment for two different courses without the prior permission of faculty members; falsifying sources or facts; using unauthorized aids in exams; looking at someone else's answers during an exam; obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on an exam or assignment. Suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be investigated following university procedures. If you have questions or concerns about what constitutes academic dishonesty, appropriate research methods or the use of citations, please reach out to me directly.

**Accommodations:** If you have a need for accommodation documented through the Academic Accommodation Support centre, please have documentation sent to the professor or speak with the professor at your earliest convenience so that I can make sure you receive appropriate accommodation throughout the semester.

**Children in Class:** For students with children, it is understandable that unforeseen disruptions can occur in childcare. Bringing a child to class with you when such disruptions occur is acceptable. In these cases, all students should work together to create a welcoming environment for both the parent and child.

**Decorum:** Students are expected to arrive to class on time and behave in a manner that is respectful to the professors and to fellow students. Opinions held by other students should be respected; harassment, derogatory comments, personal attacks on others, or interrupting the class will not be tolerated. Please avoid the use of cell phones and electronics for non-class related purposes.

**Email:** For logistical questions about the course, students should first read the syllabus and then contact the professor if necessary. All communication should occur via email.

**Regrading:** If you have concerns about a grade, you may ask to have the professor regrade your exam or assignment, with the understanding that your grade could be revised

up or down. Please make requests for re-grades within 10 days of having received the assignment/exam back.

**Late submissions:** Late submissions for the discussion memos and referee reports will not be accepted, because these assignments are designed to facilitate discussion in the class associated with specific readings. Late final projects will be penalized 1/3 of a grade for each 24-hour period in which they are late. In other words, if they are turned in any time after 11:59pm on the due date and before 11:59pm the next day, an assignment that would under normal circumstances receive an A would receive an A-, an assignment that might normally receive an A- would receive a B+ and so forth.

Extensions on the final project will be granted by the professor only when deemed absolutely necessary: because of religious obligations, or medical emergency or illness, or for reasons of accommodation that are documented by a counselor. Please email or speak to the professor as soon as you know about any unforeseen circumstances that conflict with the assignment deadline.

## COURSE OUTLINE & READINGS

For each week in the term, several readings are listed; you are expected to read the *required* readings, but may also find the *recommended* readings to be useful background on topics that you are especially interested in. The one-page discussion memos should be based on the required, not recommended, readings. All articles will be made available on the course page. Electronic copies of the required books are freely available through the library.

While this course is concerned with representation in a comparative perspective, some students may wish to better understand these issues as they pertain to Canadian politics. Readings marked with a (♣) are studies focused on Canada.

### Section I: Classic Debates

#### Week 1: Introduction & Concepts of Representation

##### *Required:*

- Saad Gulzar. 2021. Who enters politics and why? *Annual Review of Political Science* 24:253–275
- Hanna Pitkin. 1967. *The concept of representation*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press (Ch. 7)
- Jane Mansbridge. 2003. Rethinking representation. *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 515–528
- ♣ Meaghan Williams and Robert Schertzer. 2019. Is Indigeneity like Ethnicity? Theorizing and Assessing Models of Indigenous Political Representation. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 52 (4): 677–696

##### *Recommended:*

- Andrew Rehfeld. 2009. Representation rethought: On trustees, delegates, and gyroscopes in the study of political representation and democracy. *American Political Science Review* 103 (2): 214–230

- Shaun Bowler. 2017. Trustees, delegates, and responsiveness in comparative perspective. *Comparative Political Studies* 50 (6): 766–793
- Nadia Urbinati and Mark E. Warren. 2008. The Concept of Representation in Contemporary Democratic Theory. *Annual Review of Political Science* 11
- ✱ Karen Bird. 2015. “We are Not an Ethnic Vote!” Representational Perspectives of Minorities in the Greater Toronto Area. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 48, no. 2 (June): 249–279. Accessed November 16, 2022

## Week 2: Responsiveness & Accountability

### Required:

- Daniel M. Butler and David W. Nickerson. 2011. Can learning constituency opinion affect how legislators vote? Results from a field experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 6 (1): 55–83
- James D. Fearon. 1999. Electoral accountability and the control of politicians: selecting good types versus sanctioning poor performance. In *Democracy, accountability, and representation*, edited by Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes, and Bernard Manin, 55–97
- Claudio Ferraz and Frederico Finan. 2011. Electoral Accountability and Corruption: Evidence from the Audits of Local Governments. *American Economic Review* 101 (4): 1274–1311
- Scott Ashworth. 2012. Electoral Accountability: Recent Theoretical and Empirical Work. *Annual Review of Political Science* 15, no. 1 (June): 183–201

### Recommended:

- Robert Y. Shapiro. 2011. Public opinion and American democracy. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75 (5): 982–1017
- Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes. 1963. Constituency influence in Congress. *American political science review* 57 (1): 45–56
- Thomas Fujiwara. 2015. Voting technology, political responsiveness, and infant health: Evidence from Brazil. *Econometrica* 83 (2): 423–464
- Elizabeth U. Cascio and Ebonya Washington. 2014. Valuing the vote: The redistribution of voting rights and state funds following the voting rights act of 1965. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129 (1): 379–433
- Martin Gilens. 2012. Affluence and influence. In *Affluence and Influence*. Princeton University Press, (Ch. 3)

## Week 3: Public Competence

### Required:

- David E. Broockman and Daniel M. Butler. 2017. The Causal Effects of Elite Position-Taking on Voter Attitudes: Field Experiments with Elite Communication. *American Journal of Political Science* 61, no. 1 (January): 208–221

- ✱ Aengus Bridgman et al. 2020. Unveiling: The electoral consequences of an exogenous mid-campaign court ruling. *The Journal of Politics*, 1–62
- Christopher H. Achen and Larry M. Bartels. 2016. *Democracy for realists: Why elections do not produce responsive government*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, (Ch. 5.)
- Scott Ashworth, Ethan Bueno de Mesquita, and Amanda Friedenberg. 2018. Learning about voter rationality. *American Journal of Political Science* 62 (1): 37–54

*Recommended:*

- Christopher Wlezien. 1995. The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending. *American Journal of Political Science* 39 (4): 981–1000
- Anthony Fowler and Andrew B. Hall. 2018. Do shark attacks influence presidential elections? Reassessing a prominent finding on voter competence. *The Journal of Politics* 80 (4): 1423–1437
- Scott Ashworth and Ethan Bueno De Mesquita. 2014. Is Voter Competence Good for Voters?: Information, Rationality, and Democratic Performance. *American Political Science Review* 108, no. 3 (August): 565–587

## Section II: Identities and the Effects of Representation

### Week 4: Identities & Intersectionality

*Required:*

- Maya Sen and Omar Wasow. 2016. Race as a bundle of sticks: Designs that estimate effects of seemingly immutable characteristics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 19 (1): 499–522
- Kanchan Chandra. 2006. What is ethnic identity and does it matter? Publisher: Annual Reviews, *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 9:397–424
- Tasha S. Philpot and Hanes Walton Jr. 2007. One of our own: Black female candidates and the voters who support them. *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (1): 49–62
- Dara Z. Strolovitch. 2006. Do Interest Groups Represent the Disadvantaged? Advocacy at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender. *The Journal of Politics* 68, no. 4 (November): 894–910

*Recommended:*

- Kimberlé Crenshaw. 1989. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140:139–167
- Lauren D. Davenport, Shanto Iyengar, and Sean J. Westwood. 2022. Racial Identity, Group Consciousness, and Attitudes: A Framework for Assessing Multiracial Self-Classification. *American Journal of Political Science* 66 (3): 570–586
- Patrick J. Egan. 2020. Identity as Dependent Variable: How Americans Shift Their Identities to Align with Their Politics. *American Journal of Political Science* 64 (3): 699–716. Accessed January 3, 2023



- ✱ Pamela D. Palmater. 2011. *Beyond Blood: Rethinking Indigenous Identity*. UBC Press
- Ange-Marie Hancock. 2007. When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on politics* 5 (1): 63–79
- Rachel Brulé and Aliz Toth. 2022. *Do Quotas In Two Dimensions Improve Social Equality? Intersectional Representation & Group Relations*. Working Paper
- Nicholas Carnes. 2015. Does the descriptive representation of the working class “crowd out” women and minorities (and vice versa)? Evidence from the Local Elections in America Project. Publisher: Taylor & Francis, *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 3 (2): 350–365
- ✱ Erin Tolley. 2022. Gender Is Not a Proxy: Race and Intersectionality in Legislative Recruitment. *Politics & Gender*, 1–28

## Week 5: Descriptive Representation

### Required:

- Jane Mansbridge. 1999. Should blacks represent blacks and women represent women? A contingent “yes”. *The Journal of Politics* 61 (3): 628–657
- Suzanne Dovi. 2002. Preferable descriptive representatives: Will just any woman, black, or Latino do? *American Political Science Review* 96 (4): 729–743
- Bernard Manin. 1997. *The principles of representative government*. Cambridge University Press, Ch. 4.

### Recommended:

- Hanna Pitkin. 1967. *The concept of representation*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press (Ch. 4)
- Jane Mansbridge. 2015. Should workers represent workers? Publisher: Wiley Online Library, *Swiss Political Science Review* 21 (2): 261–270
- ✱ Will Kymlicka. 1993. Group Representation in Canadian Politics. In *Equity & Community: The Charter, Interest Advocacy and Representation*, edited by F. Leslie Seidle, 61–89. Montreal, QC and Kingston, ON: Institute for Research on Public Policy; McGill-Queen's University Press
- Anne Phillips. 1998. *The politics of presence*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, Ch.1 (✱ Ch. 5 also focuses specifically on Canada).

## Week 6: Substantive Representation

### Required:

- Daniel M. Butler and David E. Broockman. 2011. Do politicians racially discriminate against constituents? A field experiment on state legislators. *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (3): 463–477
- Raghabendra Chattopadhyay and Esther Duflo. 2004. Women as policy makers: Evidence from a randomized policy experiment in India. *Econometrica* 72 (5): 1409–1443

- Sarah F Anzia and Christopher R Berry. 2011. The Jackie (and Jill) Robinson Effect: Why Do Congresswomen Outperform Congressmen? *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (3): 478–493
- Ramya Parthasarathy, Vijayendra Rao, and Nethra Palaniswamy. 2019. Deliberative democracy in an unequal world: A text-as-data study of south India’s village assemblies. *American Political Science Review* 113 (3): 623–640

*Recommended:*

- Erik Meyersson. 2014. Islamic Rule and the Empowerment of the Poor and Pious. *Econometrica* 82 (1): 229–269
- Trevon D. Logan. 2020. Do Black Politicians Matter? Evidence from Reconstruction. *The Journal of Economic History* 80 (1): 1–37
- David E. Broockman. 2013. Black politicians are more intrinsically motivated to advance blacks’ interests: A field experiment manipulating political incentives. *American Journal of Political Science* 57 (3): 521–536
- Joshua L. Kalla and David E. Broockman. 2016. Campaign contributions facilitate access to congressional officials: A randomized field experiment. *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (3): 545–558
- Nicholas Carnes and Noam Lupu. 2015. Rethinking the comparative perspective on class and representation: Evidence from Latin America. *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (1): 1–18

## Week 7: Symbolic Representation

*Required:*

- Emily A. West. 2017. Descriptive representation and political efficacy: Evidence from Obama and Clinton. *The Journal of Politics* 79 (1): 351–355
- Stephanie Zonszein and Guy Grossman. 2022. *Turnout Turnaround: Ethnic Minority Victories Mobilize White Voters*. Working Paper. <https://osf.io/w2dg8/>
- Lori Beaman et al. 2009. Powerful women: Does exposure reduce bias? *The Quarterly journal of economics* 124 (4): 1497–1540
- Amanda Clayton, Diana Z. O’Brien, and Jennifer M. Piscopo. 2019. All male panels? Representation and democratic legitimacy. *American Journal of Political Science* 63 (1): 113–129

*Recommended:*

- Amy C. Alexander. 2012. Change in women’s descriptive representation and the belief in women’s ability to govern: A virtuous cycle. *Politics & Gender* 8 (4): 437–464
- Tiffany D. Barnes and Stephanie M. 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
- Lori Beaman et al. 2012. Female leadership raises aspirations and educational attainment for girls: A policy experiment in India. *science* 335 (6068): 582–586



- Amanda Clayton. 2015. Women's political engagement under quota-mandated female representation: Evidence from a randomized policy experiment. *Comparative Political Studies* 48 (3): 333–369
- Amanda Clayton. 2018. Do gender quotas really reduce bias? Evidence from a policy experiment in Southern Africa. *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 5 (3): 182–194

### Section III: Barriers to Descriptive Representation

#### Week 8: Who Runs For Office?

##### Required:

- Ernesto Dal Bó et al. 2017. Who becomes a politician? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 132 (4): 1877–1914
- Richard L. Fox 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
- Jessica Preece and Olga Stoddard. 2015. Why women don't run: Experimental evidence on gender differences in political competition aversion. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 117 (September): 296–308
- Nicholas Carnes. 2020. *The Cash Ceiling: Why Only the Rich Run for Office—and What We Can Do about It*. Princeton University Press, (Ch. 3)

##### Recommended:

- Pippa Norris and Joni Lovenduski. 1995. *Political recruitment: Gender, race and class in the British Parliament*. Cambridge University Press (Ch. 8–9)
- Daniel M. Butler and Jessica Robinson Preece. 2016. Recruitment and perceptions of gender bias in party leader support. *Political Research Quarterly* 69 (4): 842–851
- Jennifer L. Lawless and Richard L. Fox. 2010. *It still takes a candidate: Why women don't run for office*. Cambridge University Press
- Joshua Kalla, Frances Rosenbluth, and Dawn Langan Teele. 2018. Are you my mentor? A field experiment on gender, ethnicity, and political self-starters. *The Journal of Politics* 80 (1): 337–341
- Saad Gulzar and Muhammad Yasir Khan. 2018. *Motivating Political Candidacy and Performance: Experimental Evidence from Pakistan*. Technical report. Unpublished manuscript, Stanford University
- ✳ Semra Sevi. 2021. Who Runs? Canadian Federal and Ontario Provincial Candidates from 1867 to 2019. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 54 (2): 471–476

#### Week 9: Parties as Gatekeepers

##### Required:

- ✳ Melanee Thomas and Marc André Bodet. 2013. Sacrificial lambs, women candidates, and district competitiveness in Canada. *Electoral Studies* 32 (1): 153–166

- Guillaume R. Fréchette, Francois Maniquet, and Massimo Morelli. 2008. Incumbents' interests and gender quotas. *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (4): 891–909
- David Doherty, Conor M. Dowling, and Michael G. Miller. 2019. Do local party chairs think women and minority candidates can win? Evidence from a conjoint experiment. *The Journal of Politics* 81 (4): 1282–1297
- Pippa Norris and Joni Lovenduski. 1995. *Political recruitment: Gender, race and class in the British Parliament*. Cambridge University Press (Ch. 7)

*Recommended:*

- Melody Crowder-Meyer. 2013. Gendered recruitment without trying: how local party recruiters affect women's representation. *Politics & Gender* 9 (4): 390–413
- Christopher F. Karpowitz, J. Quin Monson, and Jessica Robinson Preece. 2017. How to elect more women: Gender and candidate success in a field experiment. *American Journal of Political Science* 61 (4): 927–943
- Richard L. Fox and Jennifer L. Lawless. 2010. If only they'd ask: Gender, recruitment, and political ambition. *The Journal of Politics* 72 (2): 310–326
- Kay Lehman Schlozman, Sidney Verba, and Henry E. Brady. 2012. The unheavenly chorus. In *The Unheavenly Chorus*. Princeton University Press (Ch. 15)
- Jennifer L. Lawless and Kathryn Pearson. 2008. The primary reason for women's underrepresentation? Reevaluating the conventional wisdom. *The Journal of Politics* 70 (1): 67–82
- ✦ Royce Koop and Amanda Bittner. 2011. Parachuted into Parliament: candidate nomination, appointed candidates, and legislative roles in Canada. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 21 (4): 431–452
- ✦ Scott Pruyssers and William Cross. 2016. Candidate selection in Canada: Local autonomy, centralization, and competing democratic norms. *American Behavioral Scientist* 60 (7): 781–798

## Week 10: Voter Bias

*Required:*

- Susanne Schwarz and Alexander Coppock. 2022. What Have We Learned about Gender from Candidate Choice Experiments? A Meta-Analysis of Sixty-Seven Factorial Survey Experiments. *The Journal of Politics* 84, no. 2 (April): 655–668
- Avidit Acharya, Matthew Blackwell, and Maya Sen. 2016. The political legacy of American slavery. *The Journal of Politics* 78 (3): 621–641
- Sarah A. Fulton. 2012. Running backwards and in high heels: The gendered quality gap and incumbent electoral success. *Political Research Quarterly* 65 (2): 303–314
- ✦ Quinn M. Albaugh. 2020. *Do Voters Discriminate Against Working-Class Candidates?* Paper presented at the 2020 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. [https://www.qalbaugh.com/s/Albaugh\\_Voter\\_Class\\_Bias.pdf](https://www.qalbaugh.com/s/Albaugh_Voter_Class_Bias.pdf)

*Recommended:*

- Dawn Langan Teele, Joshua Kalla, and Frances Rosenbluth. 2018. The ties that double bind: social roles and women's underrepresentation in politics. *American Political Science Review* 112 (3): 525–541
- Zoltan Hajnal and Jessica Trounstein. 2005. Where turnout matters: The consequences of uneven turnout in city politics. *The Journal of Politics* 67 (2): 515–535
- Vesla M. Weaver. 2012. The Electoral Consequences of Skin Color: The “Hidden” Side of Race in Politics. *Political Behavior* 34, no. 1 (March): 159–192
- Andrew C. Eggers, Nick Vivyan, and Markus Wagner. 2018. Corruption, accountability, and gender: Do female politicians face higher standards in public life? *The Journal of Politics* 80 (1): 321–326
- Kimuli Kasara and Pavithra Suryanarayan. 2015. When do the rich vote less than the poor and why? Explaining turnout inequality across the world. *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (3): 613–627
- Nicholas Carnes and Noam Lupu. 2016. Do voters dislike working-class candidates? Voter biases and the descriptive underrepresentation of the working class. Publisher: Cambridge University Press, *American Political Science Review* 110 (4): 832–844
- ✱ Semra Sevi, Vincent Arel-Bundock, and André Blais. 2019. Do women get fewer votes? No. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 52 (1): 201–210

## Section IV: Representation Reforms

### Week 11: Quotas

#### Required:

- Rikhil R. Bhavnani. 2009. Do electoral quotas work after they are withdrawn? Evidence from a natural experiment in India. *American Political Science Review* 103 (1): 23–35
- Mala Htun. 2004. Is gender like ethnicity? The political representation of identity groups. *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (3): 439–458
- Timothy Besley et al. 2017. Gender quotas and the crisis of the mediocre man: Theory and evidence from Sweden. *American economic review* 107 (8): 2204–42
- ✱ Robert Alexander Milen. 1994. *Canadian Representation and Aboriginal Peoples: A Survey of the Issues*. Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. [https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection\\_2016/bcp-pco/Z1-1991-1-41-94-eng.pdf](https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2016/bcp-pco/Z1-1991-1-41-94-eng.pdf)

#### Recommended:

- Diana Z. O'Brien and Johanna Rickne. 2016. Gender quotas and women's political leadership. *American Political Science Review* 110 (1): 112–126
- Manuel Bagues and Pamela Campa. 2021. Can gender quotas in candidate lists empower women? Evidence from a regression discontinuity design. *Journal of Public Economics* 194:104315

- Maria De Paola, Vincenzo Scoppa, and Rosetta Lombardo. 2010. Can gender quotas break down negative stereotypes? Evidence from changes in electoral rules. *Journal of Public Economics* 94 (5-6): 344–353
- Julia Michal Clark, Alexandra Domike Blackman, and Aytug Sasmaz. 2021. *What Men Want: Politicians' Strategic Response to Gender Quotas*. Working Paper. April. [https://events.ceu.edu/sites/default/files/media/attachment/blackman-gender-quotas\\_april2021.pdf](https://events.ceu.edu/sites/default/files/media/attachment/blackman-gender-quotas_april2021.pdf)
- ✳ Laakkuluk Jessen Williamson. 2006. Inuit gender parity and why it was not accepted in the Nunavut legislature. *Études/Inuit/Studies* 30 (1): 51–68

## Week 12: Alternatives to Quotas

### Required:

- Charles Cameron, David Epstein, and Sharyn O'Halloran. 1996. Do majority-minority districts maximize substantive black representation in Congress? *American Political Science Review* 90 (4): 794–812
- Jessica Trounstein and Melody E. Valdini. 2008. The context matters: The effects of single-member versus at-large districts on city council diversity. *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (3): 554–569
- Happy M. Kayuni and Ragnhild L. Muriaas. 2014. Alternatives to gender quotas: Electoral financing of women candidates in Malawi. *Representation* 50 (3): 393–404
- ✳ Melissa Williams. 2016. There can be no electoral reform without Indigenous input. *The Globe and Mail* (Toronto, Canada) (November). <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/there-can-be-no-electoral-reform-without-indigenous-input/article32712741/>

### Recommended:

- Audinga Baltrunaite et al. 2019. Let the voters choose women. *Journal of Public Economics* 180:104085
- Mona Lena Krook and Pippa Norris. 2014. Beyond quotas: Strategies to promote gender equality in elected office. *Political Studies* 62 (1): 2–20
- Jacob M. Grumbach and Alexander Sahn. 2020. Race and representation in campaign finance. *American Political Science Review* 114 (1): 206–221
- Sona N. Golder et al. 2017. Votes for Women: Electoral Systems and Support for Female Candidates. *Politics & Gender* 13, no. 1 (March): 107–131. Accessed December 22, 2022
- Mitchell Kilborn and Arjun Vishwanath. 2022. Public money talks too: How public campaign financing degrades representation. Publisher: Wiley Online Library, *American Journal of Political Science* 66 (3): 730–744
- ✳ Richard E. Matland and Donley T. Studlar. 1996. The contagion of women candidates in single-member district and proportional representation electoral systems: Canada and Norway. *The journal of politics* 58 (3): 707–733