

## Representing Diversity in Politics and Public Administration

Jun.-Prof. Dr. Christina Zuber, office hour: Wednesdays, 11:45-12:45 in C305, first come first served

Winter term 2019/20, Thursdays 10:00-11:30 in G304 and Saturday, 8 February 2020, 10:00-16:00

### Description

In this seminar we will discuss theoretical expectations and empirical findings regarding the representation of societal diversity in politics and public administration. Starting from Anne Philipps' famous argument about "the politics of presence", we will first discuss why societal groups that have historically been excluded from power (e.g. women, ethnic or racial minorities, migrants) should be present in political decision making bodies as well as administrative organisations, and assess whether there is a difference between representing social identity groups in democratic politics on the one hand, and public administration on the other. Having laid the conceptual ground, we use a research practice session to focus on how different definitions of the concept of representation can be empirically measured. We then ask how empirical differences in the representativeness of political and administrative institutions can be explained, and which institutional changes might increase or decrease the representativeness of their members. Centering on the link between descriptive and substantive representation (concepts used in political science) or passive and active representation (concepts used in the literature dealing with representative bureaucracy), we assess the growing evidence used to testing this link in both fields. Towards the end of the semester, participants choose their own research topic for a seminar paper dealing with one of the topics introduced throughout the seminar. They then present (and comment on) each other's studies of representation of societal diversity during a research workshop at the end of the semester.

### Goals

Participants know the main concepts of the literatures dealing with representation of societal diversity in political science and public administration. They can identify differences and similarities in the representation of societal diversity in different institutions and different cases. They dispose of a set of theoretical explanations for these differences and similarities. They are able to critically assess the case selection and empirical analyses in published research. They are able to measure representation and assess either causes or effects of increasing or decreasing the quality of social identity group representation focusing on one of the topics discussed throughout the seminar in their own research paper.

Standardized goals as defined by the department of politics and public administration relevant for this course:

1. Students acquire the ability to put together a summary of existing research on a topic.
2. Students are able to design a research project.
3. Students are able to collect and analyze data.

### Requirements and modalities

Requirements for this course are threefold: First, you come to class having carefully read and thought about the assigned reading materials for the week and participate actively in class discussions. You may fail to attend two sessions. Please note that the Saturday workshop at the end of the course counts as three individual sessions. If you cannot be present at the workshop, you cannot attend this seminar.

Second, you write two 1-2 page (double spaced, times new roman or similar, 12pt) reviews of two of the assigned readings. You can choose for yourself for which sessions and on which articles you want to do your two reviews. The reviews must be submitted by midnight of the day before the day the text you chose to review is due to be discussed in class. The idea behind the review is that by writing a critique that addresses all elements a good research paper should include, you become better prepared to write your own.

Third, you develop, present at the workshop and hand in a research paper on your chosen topic related to women and/or minority representation. You are free to choose your cases, and you are also free to do a small-N comparative case study or a quantitative large-N analysis. The research paper should be appr. 10-12 pages (double spaced, times new roman or similar, 12pt), and should cover a clearly stated research question, theory and hypotheses that speak to the question, a justified case selection, justification and explanation of the chosen methodological approach and an empirical analysis on the basis of which you answer your question. It must be uploaded to ILIAS as a PDF by 31 March 2019, 00.00h. You present your research plan for this paper at the workshop on Saturday, 2 February 2019. A short handout of your presentation at the workshop must be submitted to ILIAS by 31 January 2019 to give your discussant a chance to prepare comments for the workshop.

Grades will be based on a combination of in-class participation (10%), presentation at the workshop (20%) and the research paper (70%). Submitting the two reviews is a condition for passing the class, but they will not be graded. Late submissions will lower your grade by 0.3 for each day your work is overdue, unless you provide a justified excuse on time. Please note that a student job does not count as a justified excuse.

I will provide you with more detailed guidelines on how to write a review and a research paper in class. I will also provide guidance on narrowing down your topic for the research paper. Please note that I have zero tolerance for plagiarism, which according to the Oxford Dictionary (online edition) is defined as “the practice of taking someone else’s work or ideas and passing them off as one’s own”. Students caught plagiarizing will automatically fail the seminar. For further information see Jones, L.R. (2011): *Academic Integrity & Academic Dishonesty: A Handbook About Cheating & Plagiarism*: <https://repository.lib.fit.edu/handle/11141/2601?show=full>.

## **Individual sessions and literature to be prepared for each week ( \*\* = suited for writing a review)**

### **24 October 2019. Introduction.**

We introduce the topic of the seminar and discuss our plan for the whole semester.

### **31 October 2019. The Concept of Representation**

Pitkin, Hanna. F. (1967). *The concept of representation*. Univ of California Press. Read Introduction (p. 1-13) & Chapter 10 (p. 209-240).

Coleman, Sally. (1997). *The promise of representative bureaucracy*. London/New York: Routledge. Read Introduction (p. 3-12).

Optional: Saward, M. (2010). *The representative claim*. Oxford University Press. Chapter 3 (p. 35-56).

### **7 November 2018. Why Descriptive Representation? Normative Arguments I**

Phillips, Anne. (1995). *The politics of presence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Read chapters 1 & 2.

Optional: Young, Iris M. (1997). Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship. In R.E. Goodin & P. Pettit (Eds.), *Contemporary political philosophy: an anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

### **14 November 2019. Why Minority Representation? Normative Arguments II**

Kymlicka, Will. (1997). Justice and minority rights. In R.E. Goodin & P. Pettit (Eds.), *Contemporary political philosophy: an anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

### **21 November 2019. NO SEMINAR SESSION (ENTERS WORKSHOP)**

### **28 November 2019. How to Achieve Descriptive Representation**

Norris, Pippa. (2006). The impact of electoral reform on women's representation. *Acta politica*, 41(2), 197-213.

Bird, Karen. (2014). Ethnic quotas and ethnic representation worldwide. *International Political Science Review*, 35(1), 12-26.

### **5 December 2019. Research Practice Session: Measuring Representation**

Kroeber, Corinna. (2018). How to Measure the Substantive Representation of Traditionally Excluded Groups in Comparative Research: A Literature Review and New Data. *Representation*, Online first.

→ We will do a measurement exercise in class

### **12 December 2019. Effects of Electoral Systems**

\*\*Lublin, David, & Wright, M. (2013). Engineering inclusion: Assessing the effects of pro-minority representation policies. *Electoral Studies*, 32(4), 746-755.

\*\*Tripp, A. M., & Kang, A. (2008). The global impact of quotas: On the fast track to increased female legislative representation. *Comparative Political Studies*, 41(3), 338-361.

**19 December 2019. Linking Descriptive to Substantive representation: Politics**

\*\*Lončar, Jelena. (2016). Electoral Accountability and Substantive Representation of National Minorities: The Case of Serbia. *East European Politics and Societies*, 30(4), 703-724.

\*\*Jensenius, Francesca R. (2017). *Social justice through inclusion: The consequences of electoral quotas in India*. Oxford University Press. Read Chapters 3 & 4.

**9 January 2020. Linking Passive to Active Representation: Public Administration**

\*\*Keiser, Lael R., Wilkins, Vicky M., Meier, Kenneth J. & Holland, Catherine A. (2002). Lipstick and Logarithms: Gender, Institutional Context, and Representative Bureaucracy. *American Political Science Review*, 96(3): 553-564.

\*\* Wilkins, Vicky. M., & Williams, B. N. (2008). Black or blue: Racial profiling and representative bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*, 68(4), 654-664.

**16 January 2020. Complications: Intersectionality**

\*\*Rocha, R. R., & Hawes, D. P. (2009). Racial diversity, representative bureaucracy, and equity in multiracial school districts. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90(2), 326-344.

\*\*Jensenius, Francesca. R. (2016). Competing inequalities? On the intersection of gender and ethnicity in candidate nominations in Indian elections. *Government and Opposition*, 51(3), 440-463.

**23 January 2020. Participants' topic / last minute questions on workshop presentations**

**Literature tba:** Topic and texts of participants' choice

Your draft presentation for the workshop

**\*\*\*SATURDAY, 8 February 2020 \*\*\***

**Research Workshop "Representing Diversity in Politics and Public Administration**

**University of Konstanz**

**10.00-16.00h, Room tba**

**Speakers and Titles of Presentations tba**