# Once a congressperson becomes a leader, does their ideology shift because of their leadership position? Do they become:

* More conservative
* More liberal
* More moderate
* More extreme

# as a result of their leadership position?

# Data:

## Poole and Rosenthal (2007 is newest book version, 1997 is older version and has different name) - NOMINATE system, what a lot of what I am doing hinges off of

## Nokken and Poole (2004) – Congressional Party Defection, uses NOMINATE but has a different score for each congressperson based on the congress they are in. this will allow us to see how congresspeople change

## Armstrong et al. (2014) – basically the bible of how to analyze this specific spatial data in R, has both Poole and Rosenthal as coauthors for example.

# General Political Leadership

## Sligman (1950) – would be useful if it makes sense to talk about the importance of what modern political leadership is, which Sligman does an excellent job of in this earlier paper. Talks about political leaders often with reference to the executive, but his discussion could easily be used to refer to the strength that some congressional leaders (mcconnell, Boehner, reid, and Pelosi have all used their tactics well) to get their desired outcome.

## Patterson (1960) – uses much of Sligman’s ideas to talk about the legislative branch. His version of congressional leadership is a little outdated but can be expanded on – I want a better source here on post 1970s congressional leadership specifically.

# Spatial Research on Congressional Leadership:

## Harris and Nelson (2008) – “Austin-Boston alliance,” discussion on the “middlemen” theory as how congress chooses leaders versus choosing people at the extremes of your party. There is also a discussion of how competitive these races are among both chambers and parties.

## Grofman, Koetzle, and McGann (2002) – paper that seems to support the idea that leaders are more extreme (towards the wings of their own parties). Includes an interesting discussion on polarization that made me think that a larger discussion of polarization would be useful in this paper

## Heberlig, Hetherington, and Larson (2006) – talks about the importance of fundraising in the ability to get elected to a congressional leadership post

## Jesse and Malhotra (2010) – most recent piece of research that I can find on the topic. One particular fascinating bit is that they used announced candidates to compare against the actual candidates who win to see how representative the winners are. Not sure if this is a great method but it is certainly interesting.

# Polarization:

## Theriault (2008) – strong data based argument with excellent graphics about how polarization has increased up until the modern period, with it getting especially worse later on. Discussion of:

### Redistricting

### Sorting of constituents (the big sort, book)

### Extremism of party activists

### Institutional change

## And how they have driven the increased polarization. Usage of DW-NOMINATE dataset. Could talk about party unity votes as well perhaps, where this is also a large dataset available in the NOMINATE amalgam of datasets

## Abramowitz (2010) – a more popular book on the why citizens, media, and politicans have all become more polarized.

## Fiorina (with Abrams and Pope) (2011, 3rd edition, 2005 – 1st) – the opposite side of Amramowitz’s polarization coin. Fiorina seeks to explain polarization as a problem more of politicians and less of their constituents, who are often in agreement on many issues. Abortion has an excellent example in this book of how it can be made to seem more devisive than it actually is.

# Congress

## Canon (1989) – oft-cited piece. His theory of change incorporates the power that leadership in congress has. Emphasis on external conditions also seems important for the leadership to consider and can be focused on in my own paper

## Mayhew (two editions) – Congress, electoral connection – he tries to show you what would happen if its members were only seeking reelection as a goal.

## Fenno (1978) – how constituencies see those that they’ve elected to Congress. Identifies goals as good public policy, reelection, and more power once they are in congress. “home style.” Trust between the constituent and the leader they have elected to represent them best in Congress.

## Polsby (1968) – haven’t read Polsby yet, but in assembling this I realized that it was often cited. Quick look at the piece makes me think that there is a strong focus on how the House has become more institutionalized, that is, how it has become an older body with politicians having their main career/goal be politics, which “walls” them off from citizens. The house is less personal than it was earlier in the history of the US and much more complex – committee work has grown significantly for example. Could use this to even emphasize the importance of having congressional leaders because you just cannot vote on everybodies bills, there isn’t enough time.

## Rohde! ☺ (1991) – SUPER resource for me – focus on post-reform Congress. CPG (conditional party government). Acceptance that that leaders support initiatives that have a consensus of members in their party. Importance considering the realignment of the South after the democrats started becoming a more northern party and the GOP had the “southern strategy”

## Frantzich (1979) – “who makes our laws?” interesting information about the distribution of power in the House. I’d love to be able to find a similar paper that focused on the Senate.

## Hinckley (1972) – written after her 1970 piece (found below) this one is also useful. Also could be talked about in the ideology section of this paper

## Jacobs, Lawrence, Shapiro, and Smith (1998) – public opinion and it’s effects on the leaders. Haven’t completely finished it yet, but I definitely should, it seems useful.

## Brady and Cooper (1981) – really interesting article, talks about the transition from cannon’s to rayburn’s leadership in the house. Talks about what leaders will do based on so-called “party strength,” basically a measure of loyalty or party line voting almost.

# Congressional Leadership Positions:

## I had little information on whips in many of the articles above, leadership often doesn’t emphasize their participation, but since many of the spatial analysis includes them I think it’s important to maybe make their role a little clearer

## Burden and Frisby (2004) – a case study that looks at how party leaders and especially whips gather the votes for a specific bill. I can use this to justify their inclusion as part of “party leadership.” Also can emphasize the path that whips often take to eventually become leaders/speakers

## Ripley (1964) – early article on the role of the whip, can be useful for any looks before early 70s reform

## Meinke (2008) – not 100% sure that I should use but talks about the networks that whips form and how larger leadership (like speakers and majority leaders) will use them. Interesting observations on the seniority (or lack thereof) of many of the whips. Now I am wondering if their appointment ever placates the more extreme wings of the party

## Becker and Moscardelli (2008) – committee chairs as members of the congressional leadership? Should they be coded as well?

## Hinckley (1970) – a study at why certain leaders become leaders. Has a list of rules about party leaders that are pretty interesting I believe, and would be useful to talk about in my paper. Still need to finish reading 100% of this article, in my drawer and filed away currently

## Oliver (1993) – case study with a policy bent that looks at, among other things, how congressional leaders are able to influence how a specific bill will look when it hits the floor and what will happen to it when it hits the floor.

## Brady (1972) – great paper for me, but only if I talk about the earlier party structure. It still might be good background info in some sort of introduction/background section however.

## Saeki and Shull (2003) – talks about the debate/interactions that the president and the congressional leadership has with one another. It also could be useful as a way to understand ideology, and should also be used in that section of the literature review.

## Jones (1968) – I’m unsure how perfect this piece might be as I need to completely finish it, but I think what’s interesting in it is it’s focus on the middleman thesis (and thus I can put this under an ideology section as well) in addition to its main focus on how leaders attend to the different types of majorities they have. One is just party majority, one is the procedural majority (how a bill might turn out, dems and gop together on a bill)