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ABSTRACT

A great deal of political science literature has illustrated that U.S. Representatives respond to different electoral competition scenarios through modifying voting behaviors, floor statements, and bill sponsorship activities. However, scholarship has yet to significantly assess if and how political competition impacts the ways members of Congress present themselves to their voters and explain policy positions to their constituents. This dissertation longitudinally explores if and compares how members of Congress in different and changing electoral circumstances alter their home style behaviors, or not, due to the presence or lack of robust political competition.

To answer these questions, the work assesses public sources including press releases, local newspapers, franked materials gathered from the Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, government and campaign websites, and social media pages. It explores the degree to which each U.S. Representative illustrates his or her presence at home, engages in allocation politics, highlights service representation, discusses public policy, frames policy dialog in terms of national and/or local importance, and employs partisan and/or ideological rhetoric.

The dependent variable in the study is the home style behavior of each subject who was in Congress during a period between 2003 and 2011. As explained above, the main independent variable is the presence or absence of competition, as measured by Cook’s Partisan Voter Index and general election margins. To fully understand and appreciate home style as a theoretical lens, and to keep within its methodological tradition, longitudinal qualitative research is used. Thus, this document scrutinizes how several legislators behave in various electoral circumstances and considers the influence of political competition on representation.
This work finds that many factors, including competition, may impact the representational personas of federal legislators. Further, any alteration in home style presentations appears to occur at the margins of the representational images of federal legislators. Thus, the chief feature of each representational persona stayed remarkably stable, regardless of competitive circumstances.
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Chapter 1

Practicing Representation: The Impact of Competition on Home Styles


“Incumbent Democrat Joseph P. Courtney broke the photo-finish hex in the state's 2nd Congressional District Tuesday, sweeping through eastern Connecticut in overwhelming fashion and crushing Republican challenger Sean Sullivan” (The Hartford Courant 11-5-08).

Introduction

The quotes above discuss the competitive contexts of two Democrats. The first references Rep. John Dingell of Michigan, the former Dean of the U.S. House of Representatives, first elected to Congress in 1955. Despite representing a district that overwhelmingly favored his party, and being an institution in Michigan politics, the article notes that he was re-elected with 56 percent of the vote in 2010. Given that the partisanship of his district favored Democrats, and that Dingell is a pillar of the local political establishment, earning 56 percent of the vote, his closest race since 1956, likely surprised the incumbent (Office of the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives).

Joe Courtney, on the other hand, enjoyed the proverbial “sophomore surge,” winning re-election to Congress for the first time with a very comfortable 65 percent in 2008. This is despite initially winning the seat in 2006 by just 83 votes (The Courant 11-5-08). Further, the Courant notes that since 2002, the district witnessed a string of extremely close “photo finish” U.S. House elections. Connecticut’s Second District favors Democrats narrowly, and its underlying partisan nature, as is clear from Courtney’s close result in 2006, is competitive for either party.

The timing of the two races highlighted above is important. Dingell’s competitive race came in 2010, a wave election that gave the Republican Party a majority in the House. It was
also one of the worst years for Democrats in recent memory. As a comparison, the Democrats held fewer seats after the 2010 election than they did after the 1994 midterm.

On the other hand, the year Courtney broke the streak of close races in his district was a banner year for Democrats, as they won the most seats in that chamber since the 1992 General Election. Therefore, Dingell’s re-election campaign ran into a robust GOP headwind, while Courtney’s enjoyed a strong Democratic tailwind.

Most importantly for this work, the aftermath of both elections produced uncharted territory for these incumbents. Given that Dingell and Courtney each experienced a large shift in their competitive contexts, did they change their congressional behavior? Did Dingell come home more often, and Courtney less? Did Dingell seek more funding for his constituents, while Courtney focused on other tasks? Did the manner of how they presented themselves to voters change?

Scholars and practitioners alike assume that competition influences the activities of elected officials, and hypothesize about how this phenomenon fashions congressional behavior.

That said, while some scholars have begun to ask important questions about the role of competition in our polity, there is much more work to be done. The relative lack of academic work in this area is surprising since electoral competition is the foundation upon which democratic republics are built. Voters cannot decide who represents them without some degree of choice between competing parties and/or candidates for public office. Therefore, adding to the competition literature is important because the phenomenon is so necessary to the democratic nature of our republic.
But, beyond the concept’s importance to our system of government, why should competition matter to the activities of those who represent us? Principally, because elected officials understand that they can lose an election at any time - just look at Rep. Dingell’s case.

David Mayhew, in his seminal work Congress: The Electoral Connection, reminds readers that winning re-election is an important goal of U.S. Representatives. While other scholars, such as Fenno (1973) in his work on congressional committee assignments, remind us that legislators have additional goals including producing good public policy and gaining prestige within their chambers, Fenno also acknowledges the importance of the re-election goal of members of Congress. He observes, “For most members of Congress most of the time, this electoral goal is primary. It is the prerequisite for a congressional career and, hence, for the pursuit of other member goals” (Fenno 1978, 31).

Therefore, students of politics need to be ever mindful of the electoral concerns of legislators and also that their re-election goals are contingent upon the competitive contexts in which these officials seek office.

As such, competition is important because it is a means by which the people keep their representatives in line with their wishes. A congressperson that is consistently re-elected by wide margins may feel that he or she can act in ways that large portions of his or her district would not approve of without fear of losing re-election. On the other hand, those re-elected closely may believe that they must consistently consider the wishes of constituents out of fear of alienating enough of them to cost the legislators their seats at the next election. Therefore, this topic is grounded in the study and practice of representation.

One notable work that studies the linkage between electoral competition and how members present themselves to voters is an edited volume by Adkins and Dulio (2010). Their

Suddenly faced with an unusually competitive climate, many legislators in the study altered aspects of their behaviors. They adjusted their presentation of themselves towards constituents -- going "local," increasing attention to constituent services, taking advantage of the franking privilege, and intensifying the production of press releases to the local media.

In short, the authors illustrate that these members altered their district oriented activities - more commonly known as home styles - the incomprehensible number of different techniques and mediums through which legislators allocate resources, present themselves to their voters, and explain policy positions to their constituents (Fenno 1978).

The case studies developed by Adkins and Dulio provide a useful genesis for the overarching inquiry this project explores: does, as we might expect, the degree of electoral competition with which a member of Congress contends play a part in fashioning his or her home style behavior? Logically, a connection should exist.

After all, Adkins and Dulio’s work suggests that more robust electoral competition influenced the activities of the subjects in their study. It is clear from their work, in the face of a sudden shift in competition, many members in competitive situations altered their behaviors. Those who changed tended to do better on Election Day.

Using a longitudinal design that seeks to sort out alternative explanations (as will be explained in the following chapters), this study will examine the impact of electoral competition on legislative home styles. I will compare the behaviors of U.S. House members in competitive and noncompetitive conditions. To better sort out the impact of electoral competition from a
district’s underlying partisanship, I also study the behavior, over time, of individual legislators as they successively faced (or not) changing electoral situations.

**Reasons for this Study and Contributions of this Research**

There are several contributions that this project makes to the literature. First, home style is simply underexplored, even if there has been more work on this topic in the last three years (Fenno 2013; Friedman 2007; Grimmer 2013; Grimmer et al. 2015; Parker 2015). Since most constituents do not study roll call votes or other Washington based activities of members, but instead are exposed to legislators’ appearances in the local media, it is surprising that it has taken from the late 70s until recently for scholars to delve more deeply into the ways congresspersons present themselves to their voters.

That said, the connection between citizens and those whom they elect is fundamental to our polity and to representative democracies in general. Therefore, this work is important because it adds to a newly evolving and still underdeveloped literature that explores the dynamics of representation and electoral competition using the constituency as a lens.

Next, many scholars and journalists have discussed implications of the decline of competitive congressional races. Yet, our understanding of the linkage between home styles and the competitive circumstances of legislators is inchoate. This work adds to the study of this linkage.

Related to the importance of political competition itself is the methodology used in the study. As I stated above, the project utilizes two analytical techniques. First, I divided representatives in the work into six different competitive scenarios based on several factors that will be revealed in the methods chapter. I compare the behaviors of these individuals to one
another within each competitive situation and then compare subjects to one another across competitive circumstances. Therefore, I explore if people whose competitive situations are the same act similarly, and compare behaviors of those in different competitive circumstances.

Beyond these assessments within and across competitive scenarios, I also perform a longitudinal study of each subject over time, to consider if each one changed his or her behavior during the study period. I examine whether the home styles of individuals whose competitive situations remained stable exhibited the same behavior throughout their tenure in Congress. I also explore whether those who experienced shifts in the nature of competitive contexts, meaning that they contended with more difficult races and less difficult re-election scenarios, altered their behaviors around changes in the difficulty of being re-elected.

Outline of the Project

The next chapter will be a literature review. It highlights scholarship that discusses the role and importance of competition in our polity. The discussion provides an overview of its benefits, its decline, and identifies less desirable aspects of too much competition. The work also discusses, in detail, what home style is and reviews the scant literature that has utilized this theoretical lens to study legislators and representation. Finally, this chapter links competition to home style, illustrating that we should expect that a relationship exists between the two phenomena.

The third chapter explains, in detail, the project’s methodology. It highlights the two different means I used to measure competition and explains how I operationalized that measure. It underlines hypotheses, discusses data sources, and describes how I used and coded data. The
chapter also introduces my sample and illustrates how I divided that sample into different competitive situations.

Chapters four through nine are the heart of the dissertation. Every chapter examines the subjects that fall into one of the competition categories I describe in chapter three. Chapter four highlights U.S. Representatives whose competitive situations are perpetually safe. Chapter five features the sole member of Congress whose competitive circumstances should be safe. Nevertheless, she constantly faces difficult re-election campaigns. Chapter six chronicles the behaviors of legislators whose competitive scenarios indicate that they should be safely re-elected. However, they find themselves in close re-election contests sometimes and win their re-elections by very large margins other times. Chapter seven examines those whose re-election contests should always be competitive. Yet, like subjects in chapter six, they find themselves in difficult races some years and very easy re-election campaigns in others. Chapter eight studies members of Congress who represent competitive districts, but have always won their contests by wide margins. Finally, chapter nine explores the behaviors of individuals who should always be in a difficult contest and are consistently re-elected closely.

As a reminder, the six chapters outlined above will explore the behavior of each subject individually and over time. The behaviors of individuals within each competitive situation will be compared to one another in the chapter that explores each particular competitive circumstance. Thus, two types of analysis will be occurring in each of the above chapters.

Chapter 10, on the other hand, will compare the behaviors of all the individuals within each chapter to all of the subjects studied in every other chapter. Accordingly, the behaviors of legislators in chapter three, as a group, will be compared to the representatives in chapter four, as a group. Therefore, while chapters four through nine reveal how each individual subject behaves
and also compares the behaviors of subjects within each chapter to one another, chapter 10 compares legislators in a particular competitive situation to members of Congress in other competitive scenarios.

Conclusion

This study is important because it examines fundamental concepts about the nature of democracy and of representation in the United States. Competition should be linked to representation, and representation is a complex concept with many different layers. Therefore, this work will add to our knowledge base on these important concepts. Before it does however, we need to explore what the existing literature says about those ideas. I will now turn to the chapter that reviews the literature.

Chapter 2
A Review of the Literature

Introduction

As mentioned in the first chapter, this project will examine the impact of electoral competition on the home styles of U.S. Representatives. Do members from competitive situations behave differently than those in noncompetitive circumstances?

I am interested in electoral competition because, while it is a particularly important tenet of theories of democracy, its impact on the dynamics of congressional behavior has largely been ignored.

This chapter will review works on the two concepts central to my research: competition and home style. The section on electoral competition will underscore the benefits of the
phenomenon, including its necessity to a functioning democracy, as well as some of the less positive aspects of too much competition. I will then present literature that explores how numerous independent variables, including competition, impact the behaviors of elected officials and candidates for public office. Thus, while competition may impact members of Congress, other factors must also be considered. Next, I will explain Fenno’s concept of home style and engage readers in a discussion of useful ways to study constituency-centered research in today’s media and technological environments. Finally, I will present the literature that studies the relationship between electoral competition and home style.

*The Place of Electoral Competition in our Polity*

This section will highlight the virtues of electoral competition, acquaint readers with debates on the impact of electoral competition on government elites, identify several vices of the phenomenon, and discuss the decline of competitive elections.

Electoral competition plays a central role in the formation and maintenance of democracy, which furnishes our society with particular benefits (McDonald & Samples 2006; Mayer et al. 2006; Shaw 2006; Kahn & Kenney 1999; Franz 2008; Grimmer 2013; Jones 2013). The paragraphs below will elaborate on how scholars believe healthy electoral competition stimulates political participation, provides routes to democratic competence, curbs partisan polarization and strengthens the constituent-representative relationship. All of these are vital benefits to our system of government.

As mentioned, electoral competition stimulates political participation, a fundamental component that makes our polity function (Dahl 1998; Macedo 2005). Without robust electoral competition, voters may decide it is not worth the opportunity cost to go to the polls since they
might view their votes as ineffective. Macedo (2005) argues that a lack of competition may depress the turnout of not only voters whose candidates are destined to lose elections (the minority party), but also those who are predetermined to win (the majority party), dealing two fatal blows to political participation.

Another key requirement for democracy is an informed electorate; a host of scholars note that robust competition bolsters democratic competence (Jones 2013; Kahn & Kenney 1999; Macedo 2005; Shaw 2006). Jones (2013) found that voters in competitive states know more about their senators’ voting records than those in less competitive states. He also found that residents of competitive states are more likely to consider voting records when they go to the polls to re-elect their senators.

Many scholars simply argue that democracy cannot exist without competition, and therefore, the positive effects democracy produces (as outlined above) are also contingent upon this phenomenon (Dahl 1998; Dizerega 1988; Keohane, Macedo and Moravsik 2009; Shumpeter 1942; Sorensen 2008). For example, Sorensen (2008) observes that in order to establish and maintain a democratic system of government, electoral competition, political participation and civil liberties are necessary and vital ingredients.

However, several scholars also argue that competition produces certain negative consequences. These scholars insist that it decreases confidence in government, produces unrepresentative electoral outcomes, fosters parochialism, encourages deadlock, and eliminates high-quality elected officials from office (Brunell 2008; Buchler 2005; Mayer et al. 2006; Powell 2000).

Buchler and Brunell maintain, and Powell acknowledges, that competitive districts foster the greatest number of citizens who will have a representative that is politically and ideologically
opposite of their views. If 48 percent of a given electorate identify as Democrats, and 48 percent identify as Republicans, whichever person wins an election will likely not represent 48 percent of voters. If, instead, a constituency was drawn to overwhelmingly advantage one political party, such as a ratio of 80 to 20, then only 20 percent of the district would not have a legislator with their partisan views serving as their representative. As such, Buchler and Brunell uphold that this latter method produces a more representative legislature and maximizes the amount of voters who would enjoy an official with which they are ideologically and politically compatible.

Furthermore, Brunell and Mayer et al., who differ on the merits of highly competitive environments, recognize that less competition may indicate that voters are satisfied with their officials. Mayer et al. postulate, “If an incumbent runs unopposed because potential challengers know she is unbeatable, and she is unbeatable because a majority thinks she is doing an outstanding job, where is the harm” (2006, 249)? Accordingly, it is clear that most scholars highlight advantages, while several underscore its downsides.

With the exception of Jacobson (1987), there is common agreement among scholars that general election competition has declined, at least at the congressional level (Abramowitz et al. 2006 A; Abramson et al. 2007; Banks & Kiewiet 1989; Burton & Shea 2006; Corrado & Varney 2007; Galston 2010; Goss & Garand 1984; Macedo 2005; Mann 2006; Mayer et al. 2006; Oppenheimer 2005; Shaw 2006). For example, Burton & Shea argue, “when viewed from on high…elections, most of the time, are decided before the race begins” (27).

Abramowitz et al. (2006 C) note that the number of uncompetitive House districts escalated from 156 to 201 between 1992 and 2002, and the number of marginal districts dropped from 157 to 123 during the same time. Abramowitz et al. (2006 A) reveal, “the re-election rates of House incumbents increased from 87 percent between 1946 and 1950, to 94 percent between
1952 and 1980, 97 percent from 1982 and 2000, and 99 percent in the 2002-2004 elections” (74). Abramson et al. (2007) state that the “number of close races (55% or less for the winner) was down sharply to 43 in 2004 compared to 95 in 1996” (294). Galston & Nivola illustrate the drop in districts that voted for one party for president and one party for the House from 1992 to 2004; 100 districts split votes in 1992, while just 59 did so in 2004.

But why has competition declined? Again, the literature has suggested alternative explanations. The first avenue to look towards is redistricting (Abramowitz 2005; Abramowitz et al. 2006 A; Abramowitz et al. 2006 B; Abramowitz et al. 2006 C; Fenno 1978; Galston 2010; Gross & Garand 1984; Mann 2006; Oppenheimer 2005). The curious part of the redistricting literature is that most of it agrees the phenomenon has little to no effect on the decline of competition. Gross & Garand (1984) observe that scholarship has not produced compelling evidence that redistricting leads to less competitive districts. Other researchers agree that redistricting does matter, but minimally (Abramowitz 2005; Mann 2006).

Literature on incumbency advantages also explores the decline in competition through utilization of casework, credit claiming, and the use of the franking privilege (Abramowitz et al. 2006 A; Banks & Kiewiet 1989; Ferejohn & Calvert 1983; Finocchairo 2003; Green 2006; Jacobson 2009; Mann 2006; McDermott & Jones 2003). Yet, not every scholar concurs that incumbents have an automatic advantage (Abramson et al. 2007; Gross & Garand 1984; Jacobson 1987; Jacobson 2009). Abramson et al. (2007) state, “Incumbent success is not an immutable fact of nature. Re-election rates for incumbents vary over time, as we have seen, and vary between parties” (281).
The key point from the literature above is that competition is necessary for our system of
government to function. It is the foundation that democracies rest on and therefore is a vital
component of our polity that gives citizens many benefits.

Regarding the recent few congressional elections being more competitive than those
between 1998 and 2004, I have several comments. First, according to the Center for Responsive
Politics, 94 percent of incumbent representatives were re-elected in 2006 and 2008, the same as
1996. The same organization indicates that 85 percent of House incumbents were re-elected in
2010. It is problematic to compare these numbers to 2012, because a redistricting occurred that
year. However, 90 percent of incumbents were re-elected in 2012 and 95 percent in 2014. Thus,
even though there may have been more robust competition between 2006 and 2010, by far, the
vast majority of incumbents were re-elected between 2006 and 2014.

That said, does competition impact legislative behavior? If so, how? Are there other
factors that influence the activities of elected officials? The next section begins to answer those
questions.

Factors That Impact Legislative Behavior

My project rests upon the notion that members of Congress in competitive environments
should behave differently than those in noncompetitive circumstances. While the methods
chapter will delve into details more thoroughly, this section chronicles literature that broadly
explores this connection. It will also highlight scholarship that discusses other variables that may
impact the behaviors of legislators.

Several scholars argue that vigorous competition curtails certain negative characteristics
that may plague a democracy. Representatives may act in a more partisan manner when faced
with anemic electoral competition since they do not have to contend with viable opponents from the other party, and therefore do not feel the need to moderate behavior. Such extreme partisanship is thought to have numerous adverse consequences, including serving as a contributing factor to the possible degradation of the system of checks and balances, institutional power of the House of Representatives, representation of the minority party, and efficiency of the legislative process (Gordon 2005; Schickler & Peterson 2005; Sinclair 2006).

That said, there is an ongoing debate in the literature that explores the connection between polarization and the degree of political competition with which a member contends. For example, scholarship has assessed the impact of median voter theory and primary elections on polarization. Further, literature has also sought to explain how other factors - such as congressional leadership, candidate replacement, campaign contributions, and redistricting - impact polarization.

First, I will discuss median voter theory - the argument that if a legislator is in a competitive situation, he or she should move to the middle of the voter distribution in order to be as ideologically and politically congruent with the greatest number of electors as possible (Madeco 2005; Abramson et al. 2007; Malbin 2010). Others scholarship argues that median voter theory is illogical (Fiorina 1974; Gulati 2004; Koetzle 1998; Mann 2006).

Arguing in support of median voter theory, Macedo (2005) observes,

“A call for greater competitiveness may seem inconsistent with our concern for polarization among political elites. I contend, however, that one plausible way to curb polarization among members of Congress is to ensure that, to the greatest extent possible, they represent districts with healthy political competition...maintaining competition at the local level is fully compatible with seeking ways to check destructive polarization in Washington” (47).

Non-competitive situations may offer more leeway for incumbents to be polarized and partisan ideologues. Abramson et al. (2007) noted, “virtually no Democratic candidate in 2006
talked about new gun control laws or expanding access to abortions” (290). Both are issues that polarize the electorate. Malbin (2010) postulates that, “Party money is being used overwhelmingly to help candidates in the most competitive races, because their districts are not safe, these incumbents tend toward the moderate rather than the more extreme side of either party” (11).

Peress (2011) assesses the impact of candidates’ ideological positioning utilizing a rational choice lens. Peress theorizes,

“In order for the candidates to be incentivized to move away from the center, three conditions must be met. First, candidate positioning must have a substantial effect on voter turnout (Condition A). Second, this effect must be asymmetric in a way that benefits the mover more than his opponent (Condition B). Third, this effect must be large enough to compensate for the loss of swing voters (Condition C)” (96).

First, Peress finds support for condition A. When candidates polarize voter turnout increases. Regarding condition B, he finds that it is met in roughly half of the elections he studied. In certain circumstances the candidate who polarizes benefits from doing so; in other instances, polarizing benefits his or her opponent.

Finally, Peress insists,

“…candidate positioning has a substantial effect on aggregate turnout and third party voting. This leaves open the possibility that candidates may gain votes from moving away from the center. I find, however, that this is not the case. In all of the elections considered, both major party candidates would gain votes by positioning themselves closer to the center” (102).

Importantly, Peress maintains that “qualitatively,” what he refers to as “securing the base strategy” is correct. Indeed, as candidates polarize, voters at the poles will cast ballots more often. Yet, after accounting for the voters lost by polarizing, it is rational for candidates to move to the center when all factors are considered.
The work written by Ansolabehere, Snyder, and Stewart (2001) is extremely rich with a variety of findings from their study of the 1996 Congressional Election. It is also extensively cited in the literature. On the one hand, their findings do not support median voter theory; they find that candidates, on the whole, do not appear to converge to the center. Instead, Democrats and Republicans running for Congress tend to mirror national party positions and are ideologically distinct.

That said, the same article also indicates that candidates in competitive elections must be treated differently. Speaking to the impact of robust electoral competition on candidate positioning, these authors insist that their findings “are contrary to the Huntington Fiorina hypothesis that heavy electoral competition leads to candidate divergence” (145). In fact, they observe, “that more competitive districts tend to produce more moderate candidates” (143).

In one of their tests, these authors measure the “ideological gap between two candidates” (143). Their independent variables include district conservatism and the quality of candidates. They use share of presidential vote as their measure of safe and marginal districts. Their first observation is that the dependent variable, in this case the ideological gap between those in competitive districts, is much smaller than the ideological gap between candidates in safe constituencies. Thus, they report, “We find that convergence is greater in competitive races, suggesting a view closer to Mayhew’s than to Huntington’s and Fiorina’s” (138).

Thus, their rich work illustrates the complexity of median voter theory, as well as the richness of electoral competition.

That said, there is far more evidence arguing against median voter theory. In fact, the literature is replete with examples opposing this supposition (Fiorina 1974; Gulati 2004; Koetzle 1998; Mann 2006). Mann suggests that, “The commonsensical notion that higher levels of
competition push politicians towards policy moderation, and lower levels of competition toward policy extremism, has not withstood empirical scrutiny over the years” (274). Fiorina (1974) asserts, “Marginal representatives do not adopt compromise, middle-of-the-road positions, vis-à-vis their constituencies. Rather…marginal representatives appear to align solidly with one side or the other of the constituency” (117).

Abramowitz (2010) argues that only members in districts that should be represented by the other party based on how constituents voted in presidential elections were “substantially more moderate than the rest of their party” (151). For example, Democrat Chet Edwards represented a district that voted largely for President Bush in 2004 and John McCain in 2008 in the 111th Congress. According to Abramowitz, he should be less polarized than other congressional Democrats.

Adams et al. (2010) make known, “Basic Downsian theory predicts candidate convergence toward the views of the median voter in two-candidate elections. Common journalistic wisdom, moreover, leads us to expect these centripetal pressures to be strongest when elections are expected to be close. Yet, the available evidence from the US Congress disconfirms this prediction” (417). They insist that it is highly illogical to base an election strategy on the median voter, compared to partisans, since partisans are more likely to vote. Further, partisans are less likely to vote for candidates of the other party compared to the median voter.

They also ask, “Why, specifically, are margin-maximizing candidates motivated to shift away from the center, in the direction of their partisans? The reason is that the marginal change in a candidate's probabilities of attracting her own partisans' votes via policy appeals is higher
than is the marginal change in her probabilities of attracting votes from the rival candidate's partisans” (423).

Brunell and Grofman (2008), in their study of redistricting that will be expanded upon later, tell readers:

“In particular, as party images become more distinct with the disappearance of conservative southern Democrats and liberal northern Republicans, it becomes harder for a candidate of one party to compete successfully to win votes among the partisans of the other party, regardless of the position he or she adopts. This means that we can get party polarization, even in relatively competitive seats” (134).

Similarly, employing both a macro and micro-level analysis, Bafumi and Herron (2010) find that the median member of the 109th Congress was to the right of the median voter in the United States and the median member of the 110th Congress was to the left of the median voter in the country. With this argument advanced, they postulate, “Because, it appears, most members of Congress are politically extreme compared to voters, median voters in congressional districts and states are leapfrogged when, say, a Democratic legislator is replaced by a Republican. We find essentially no evidence of convergence to district median voters” (538). Thus, they make known that one extremist member of Congress often replaced another. They lament that this pattern “leaves moderates with a dearth of representation in Congress” (519).

Kartick and McAfee (2007) discuss the importance of character in a candidate’s presentation to voters. They argue that character means a great deal to voters. Knowing this, they assert that candidates who work hard to highlight their character throughout their careers and campaigns contradict expectations put forth by median voter theory. They postulate, “while the median voter theorem is robust in many theoretical models…it does not appear to be an empirically salient characteristic of many elections” (853).
They theorize that if candidates position themselves at the place of the median voter, then it could be perceived that these candidates will say or do anything to win their elections. However, if candidates diverge from that position, it illustrates they have character, a helpful commodity in their quest at seeking elected office. They argue, “Character quashes the median voter theorem, as strategic candidates pretend to have the positions of candidates with character…As character becomes more important to voters, the behavior of strategic candidates shifts farther away from the ideal policy of the median voter and closer to the behavior of candidates with character” (864).

Then there is scholarship arguing that median voter theory works better in homogenous districts than in heterogeneous districts. Gerber and Lewis (2004) employ voting data from individuals in Los Angeles and NOMINATE scores of legislators to ascertain the preferences of voters. To measure district homogeneity, they observe district income, race, and education levels. Gerber and Lewis observe, “in heterogeneous districts, legislators are largely unconstrained by their overall median, and party pressures dominate legislative behavior. As variance decreases (i.e., as the district becomes more homogeneous), legislators are more constrained by the preferences of their districts’ median voter” (1376).

They further insist that their research “suggests that our standard spatial voting models, with their predictions of convergence to the median, do not apply well to situations in which legislators represent heterogeneous districts” (1378). Gerber and Lewis also note that citizens in homogenous districts are better represented in their policy preferences than residents of heterogeneous districts.

Similarly, Callander (2005), like Gerber and Lewis, demonstrate that median voter theory is more supported in homogenous districts than in heterogeneous constituencies. His data reveal
“that if competition involves many districts and the districts are heterogeneous, then the nature of electoral competition is fundamentally altered; consequently, the parties have incentives to propose distinct and noncentrist policy platforms” (1117). Callander concludes, “I show that when parties are required to compete simultaneously for multiple heterogeneous districts, then they must choose policy platforms divergent from the ideal policy of the median voter. In contrast, convergence of policy platforms to the median voter is complete if competition involves homogeneous districts” (1136).

More theoretically, Dodd (2015) argues that the Downsian model is simply unrealistic when applied to the United States. He insists that a core feature of the Downs theory is that one party will control the entire government after an election, and that this party would enjoy “unlimited freedom of action . . . (with) . . . no limits to its power” (312). Thus, since we have a bicameral legislature with separation of powers among branches, this assumption does not necessarily apply to the United States. Dodd also insists that the Downs model assumes that “each political party is a tight, cohesive team…The representatives are agents of the party, not the people” (312). Quite obviously, this is not the case in our polity.

Alternatively, Dodd cites the virtues of Madisonian Democracy, where citizens constrain the policy actions of political elites, rely on committees in Congress to debate and compromise on policy, operate in a deliberative manner, and require majorities or supermajorities to enact policies. Dodd asserts, “Citizens and elites in a fragmented democracy need a common language by which to understand and debate the principles at stake in politics. Left-right ideologies provide such a language” (314).

Dodd argues that regime-centered decision-making in Congress has a major impact on polarization. He postulates that when citizens demand new significant policies, the chamber
polarizes, and parties become dominant as new policies are debated and enacted. He then theorizes that when citizens do not demand new policies, but instead, insist on maintenance of already enacted laws, parties become weaker, members are less polarized, committees are stronger, and the status quo is maintained. During this time there are fewer major new policies to consider, less disagreement between parties, and less polarization. Finally, Dodd claims that when there is a mixed emphasis on protecting existing programs and advocating for new policy, the chamber responds with moderately strong parties and committees.

Thus, Dodd contends that citizens have a direct impact on legislators, the policies they enact, and even the institutional rules of each house of Congress. He argues that we as citizens, and members of Congress as our representatives, swing between polarized and depolarized regimes.

Dodd theorizes that it takes two generations for Congress to vacillate from a polarized to a depolarized environment and vice versa. He states, “when there is a swing, voters move away from the prioritized role (A) and embrace the alternative role (B). Each swing entails two stages. The first stage begins with Role A and its form of governance prioritized...Problems associated with neglect of Role B are emerging” (317). He argues during this stage there is little impact on Congress, and due to path dependence, Congress tries to resist change. Since Congress does not actually move, citizens supporting a new regime politically attack the institution.

Dodd then postulates, “After almost a generation of reformist effort, a sizable plurality of voters support change and elect large numbers of moderate reformist legislators...Congress embraces reform, blending party and committee government” (317). At this point, there are several policy changes, and activists assert that these changes came about due to reforms in the
chamber. These policy achievements then stimulate more reformers to seek elected office. Dodd insists that this takes a generation.

He argues, “Socialized into politics at the high point of conflict between the old establishment and the insurgent reformers, the new generation embraces the total rejection of the old system. A move from committee government and sustained focus on core functions to purist party government and concentrated focus on new purposes—or vice versa—becomes a righteous crusade” (317). He argues that since the Civil War we have experienced a complete cycle between polarization and depolarization and “are midway through a second” (319).

Thus, he believes that Downs is off the mark, our system of government is much more complicated than his work suggests, polarization is a function of citizen demands on our legislature over a long period of time, and institutional factors within Congress also matter in the story.

It is important to note two things from Dodd as they relate to my dissertation. First, there is a relationship in his theory between citizens and representatives; thus, there is an electoral connection. Second, Dodd illustrates that there are also alternate explanations besides general election competition that impact congressional behavior and polarization.

For example, what of the role of primary elections? Research on the role of primaries on polarization is mixed. Brady, Han and Pope (2007) postulate “that congressional candidates, like their presidential counterparts, are forced to please their primary-election constituency by positioning themselves away from the median voter” (83). Their research shows that ideological moderates are more likely to lose primary elections than those who are polarized, and as a result, candidates learn how to appease their primary constituencies.
Similarly, Burden (2004) argues, “importantly, contested primaries do pull candidates apart. The presence of anything more than a fringe opponent in the party primaries increases the distance between candidates by some 10 points. It is worth pointing out that this rather straightforward effect is precisely the opposite of that in Ansolabehere, Snyder and Stewart's analysis” (221-222).

That said, Ansolabehere, Snyder and Stewart (2001) argue that during the 1996 elections, the candidates who were victorious in primary elections where more centrist on issues in comparison to those who ran in the general election without competing in a primary.

Gerber and Morton (1998) provide a more comprehensive analysis of primary elections, asserting that the type of primary matters. Closed primaries produce candidates that are farthest away from the median voter. They also find that “semi-closed primary systems that allow new voters or independents to participate in the candidate nomination process produce Republican winners whose positions are more liberal and Democratic winners whose positions are more conservative than their closed primary counterparts” (321-322). These scholars observe that open primaries, in particular blanket and nonpartisan primaries, produce the most moderate general election nominees from both major parties. Thus, Gerber and Morton’s analysis emphasizes that election rules may influence polarization.

Beyond primary elections, there has been a debate in the literature over whether redistricting, in this case political gerrymandering, produces more polarized legislators. Carson et al. (2007) argue that redistricting is not the only factor that causes polarization, but it does in fact matter. They employ a longitudinal study, assessing the behaviors of legislators from the 1960s through 2002. They find that members in districts whose lines changed significantly were more polarized than those in districts that underwent less significant changes. They state, “Although
redistricting may not be as influential as some of the authors on the editorial pages or political
pundits would lead us to believe, it would be difficult to conclude, based on our results, that
redistricting plays no role in the divergence between the two major parties in the House” (899).
They continue, “Although the effect is certainly modest, it is statistically discernible and, in an
era of narrow partisan majorities, may well mean the difference between winning and losing
policy battles on Capitol Hill” (899).

Brunell and Grofman (2008) postulate that redistricting did not produce more polarized
members of Congress. They insist, “our findings suggest that redistricting is really not to blame
for the current level of polarization in either the House of Representatives or the Senate” (133).
First, they argue that the Senate, a body that does not experience redistricting, became more
polarized since 1998. They further observe that any apparent impact of redistricting is likely
related to realignment of the electorate and the policy positions of national parties.

Similarly, McCarty, Poole and Rosenthal (2009) believe that while redistricting helped
the GOP secure the House in the 108th Congress, and the “sorting effect has increased over
time… the secular increase in sorting does not appear to be linked to census-triggered
redistricting that would reflect gerrymanders” (678). Instead, they assert, “A good deal of the
increase reflects the gradual disappearance of the one-party south…and increased geographical
sorting on political and social attitudes” (678). Further, they theorize that the difference is not
related to how citizens are allocated into constituencies, but rather how Democratic and GOP
legislators “represent the same districts” (678).

Turning away from redistricting, other scholars assert that perhaps candidate replacement
is the cause of polarization. Here too there is disagreement. Carson et al. (2007) tested whether
first term legislators were more extreme than others. They did not find that they were more
extreme than more senior House members. Therefore, they dispute that replacement is the cause of polarization.

However, Thomsen (2014) argues that polarization in Congress is linked to who is replacing incumbents. He finds, using state legislators as a sample, that liberal Republicans and conservative Democrats are less likely to run for Congress in comparison to conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats. He notes that this finding is particularly true for Republicans.

Fleisher and Bond (2004) find that “replacement is by far the most common path through which partisan non-conformists disappeared from Congress. In the 1960s and 1970s…about nine in ten of moderate and cross-pressured members who disappeared left through retirement or defeat. In the 1980s and 1990s, replacement remains the most common path of exit for partisan misfits…” (445). They also assert that in the 1980s and 1990s, when “non-conformists” were defeated, members who were much more in the mainstreams of their parties replaced them.

Fleisher and Bond (2004) also theorize that leadership has had a role in the nomination process, with party leaders (including those in government) encouraging partisans to run for Congress. These leaders also help their chosen candidates to fund their campaigns. The candidates that party leaders urge to seek office tend to mirror national party positions. This moves onto another potential cause of polarization: congressional leadership.

There is an ongoing debate in the literature discussing whether leaders of congressional parties are near their caucus/conference median, or at the extremes. Jessee and Malhotra (2010) argue that congressional leaders tend to be closer to the median of their parties than the fringes, yet are still to the left of the party median (for Democrats) or to the right of the party median (for Republicans).
Grofman, Koetzle and McGann (2002), utilizing ADA and ACU scores, argue that “Republican leaders tend to be significantly to the right of the median Republican member and Democratic leaders tend to be significantly to the left of the median Democratic member” (87). Heberlig, Hetherington and Larson (2006) observe that when leaders from the fringes of their parties raise more money than those from the median of their parties, these polarized individuals tend to win leadership contests.

That said, congressional leadership plays two important roles: one inside Congress and one in campaigns. Hetherington (2009) insists that congressional leadership changed the culture of Washington by shortening the workweek in 1995. Therefore, fewer legislators moved their families to DC, and fewer friendships developed among legislators and their spouses. Hetherington asserts that spouses were a key part of helping U.S. Representatives work together in the past. Instead, the new environment made attacking opponents easier, since they were around each other less often.

Further, Hetherington (2009) notes that close majorities create a team mentality in a legislature. When this mentality is prevalent, members of Congress polarize on policy votes as leadership limits options that members can consider. Further, this team mentality extends into congressional fundraising where the DCCC and the RCCC bolster the “us versus them” mentality. This situation further polarizes the chamber.

Similarly, Jones (2010) maintains that when congressional leaders have low approval ratings, legislators from their parties, in particular those in marginal seats, suffer at the polls. He notes that low approval ratings of leaders are usually connected with the inability of Congress to pass legislation. Therefore, Jones insists that members support Congressional leaders in their policy requests in order for the public to view them as effective legislators. As such, members
view the speedy production of policy as a tool to help their re-election campaigns. Since the leadership limits options that can be voted on, and legislators bow down to Congressional leaders, this cycle helps to polarize Congress.

We must also consider campaign contributions beyond those from fellow members of Congress. Hetherington (2009) notes that 527s are funded by ideological groups. Since ideological groups presumably expect there to be a difference between the main parties, he offers that these organizations are a likely cause of polarization. That said, Ensley (2009) also found that individual contributors might also cause polarization. His work studying campaign contributions in 1996 found that the more liberal a Democrat, and the more conservative a Republican, the more money these legislators raised for their campaigns.

Finally, Barber and McCarty (2015) point to socioeconomic status as a potential cause for polarization. They state, “Garand (2010) found strong evidence that state-level inequality exacerbates constituency polarization within states and predicts the extremity of Senate voting behavior” (30). Thus, economic features of the electorate may also be a cause of polarization.

As such, this section illustrates that many factors may impact legislative behavior. That said, most importantly, there appears to be common agreement that electoral competition usually plays either a chief or an ancillary role in understanding legislative behavior, even if scholars are not in harmony as to exactly how that relationship works. Median voter theory, primary elections, redistricting, sorting of the electorate, incumbent replacement, the impact of legislative leadership, and the role of campaign contributions all have an important place in exploring the nature of the connection between competition and legislative activities. Most importantly, the rich debate over this connection illustrates that more research is needed.
With this in mind, we now turn to the other chief concept that this dissertation considers - home styles. After an explanation of this theoretical lens, I will review existing literature that reveals a link between home styles and electoral competition.

*Home Style*

Now that I reviewed the literature on electoral competition in our polity, and a number of factors that may influence legislator behavior, I turn to the other significant concept that the dissertation relies on: home style. This section will explain what home styles are, illustrate why Fenno felt his ideas were so critical, and then highlight some other works that continue to utilize this theoretical lens. I illustrate why the concept remains central to the Congress literature and why it is important to understand how electoral competition impacts home style presentations.

Fenno’s work expanded our comprehension of legislators’ district-oriented activities and therefore our understanding of representation. He argues that home styles are strategies that members exploit to present themselves to constituents and involve three basic ingredients: "... The first is the Congressman's allocation of his personal resources and those of his office. The second is the congressman's presentation of self to others. The third is the congressman's explanation of his Washington activities to others" (Fenno 1978, 33).

For example, the study of home style turns our attention to the question of how representatives may balance presentation and explanation of local and national issues, votes on policies, or their partisanship or ideology. On all counts, Fenno’s work highlights the variation among members in terms of their home style presentations while emphasizing the importance of staying local. In fact, the bottom line for most of the legislators Fenno studied was the surprising
extent to which they did in fact adopt a locally focused home style. This local connection is a prime feature of his work.

To clarify his theories, and stress the importance of local factors in home style presentations across a variety of districts, Fenno provided his readers with many illustrations of the various forms that allocation, presentation and explanation behaviors take. So many members of Congress in his work emphasized the importance of locally oriented activities, such as spending time at home, providing casework, and illustrating themselves as being connected to their constituents.

For example, one of Fenno’s legislators takes an extremely localized and hands-on approach to allocating resources to his district. The legislator focused on serving constituents through casework and highlighting the vast resources that he invested in service oriented work. The member was happy to announce to Fenno,

“I’ll go home every weekend…Yesterday morning at 6:00 I was at the Bluffton mill. Were people ever pleased and surprised. ‘We didn’t think you’d be back.’ People get very impressed with themselves around here. I can’t wait to get home every weekend…We have eight staff in the district and six here [in Washington]. That’s a first; at least we’re saying it’s a first. And we have three district offices… My predecessor had one person in one office. People are going bananas. They’ve never seen anything like it” (41).

Then there is Congressman B, a “popular local boy,” who highlights his local roots in his presentation of self, and asserts that he can be trusted because he has such a long history living and working in the district. Fenno describes Congressman B’s electoral coalition as a combination of city voters, along with suburban and rural constituents who are not strongly linked to political parties. When asked why voters should trust him, he answered:

“Mainly because they’ve known me over a period of years. They know my father and my family’s reputation. They know your general reputation, your family name, your kind. They know you in athletics… Someone once said ‘the fear of the unknown is the greatest fear.’ That’s a paraphrase, but that’s it, I think” (1978, 79).
As such, Congressman B’s presentation of self accentuates that, “I am one of you; send me to Congress.”

Similarly, Congressman F, an African American member of Congress from a majority-minority district, who believes that his electoral coalition includes every black constituent, explains his Washington activities the following way:

“When I come home, I go to the church groups and tell them what’s been going on in Washington and explain to them why I voted as I did…The fact is that I have the freedom to do almost anything I want to in Congress and it won’t affect me a bit back home. My constituents don’t know how I vote, but they know me and trust me…It’s a blind faith type of thing” (1978, 152).

Likewise, when Congressman G, whose electoral coalition is composed of “farmers, blue collar workers and academic liberals,” explains his Washington activities, he admits that his constituents, “don’t know much about my votes. Most of what they know is what I tell them” (1978, 153). Fenno describes him as a liberal member of Congress who is able to win conservative votes as long as he presents himself as working for his district. Fenno also notes that Congressman G is careful to avoid certain topics with more conservative groups of constituents, such as Polish Catholics.

As such, while Congressman F, who represents a very homogenous district, is certainly more open than Congressman G about his Washington activities, both have constituents that are relatively lacking of information, and essentially trust their members of Congress to make the right decisions for them.

Therefore, Fenno’s original work clearly defines the theoretical lens that he contributed to scholarship and offers compelling examples of legislators who illustrate his ideas. In addition, the method Fenno used to examine home style has been as important to political scientists as his concepts. He claims that the great majority of scholarship at the time he began to conduct
research was too focused on the Washington activities of legislators. Scholars focused mainly on roll-call votes, committee assignments, and other institutional activities. He writes,

“Political scientists have produced a voluminous amount of literature on the general subject of representative-constituency relations…Despite this outpouring, one question central to the representative-constituency relationship remains underdeveloped. It is: What does an elected representative see when he or she sees a constituency? And…what consequences do these perceptions have for his or her behavior” (xxvi-xxvii)?

When scholars ignore district-oriented activities of members of Congress they overlook a vital ingredient of congressional behavior and ignore a significant portion of the representative-constituency relationship. As Fenno describes it, “This book is…an exploration of the relationship between members of the House of Representatives and their constituents... It is also an exploration of the place where the relationship was thought to originate and thrive - the constituency” (xxv).

Since most scholars do not study district-oriented activities, they fail to account for the portion of representatives’ careers that are spent at home. As such, scholarship has underestimated just how significant constituency-oriented activities are to legislators.

In order to conduct this research and to comprehensively understand how his subjects behaved within their districts while at home, Fenno followed 18 members of Congress around their constituencies. This allowed him to individually and uniquely appreciate each legislator’s actions and also understand each district as well. The author explains that his method allowed a, “degree of immersion…so great that it is a qualitatively different experience from that on Capitol Hill” (249-250).

Fenno eloquently describes the many personal interactions he had with members of Congress in the 36 visits that comprised his field research for his original work. He informed readers about his time driving around alone with representatives in their cars, going out to dinner with the legislators and their spouses, being introduced at churches in their districts, and even
fixing a legislator’s flat tire. He tells readers that these types of personal interactions built
rapport with legislators and this rapport between the researcher and the subject is invaluable to
understanding elected officials and what they see when they look at their districts.

While 30 years later home style still remains an understudied concept, several works have
recently contributed to our understanding of the topic. Friedman (2007) explored how members
of Congress from New York presented themselves and balanced local and national factors. Her
work argues that, at least today, national factors play a bigger role in home style than Fenno
emphasized. Her work also furnishes us with more examples of different legislative home styles.
Former Rep. Carolyn McCarthy maintained a non-partisan home style and refused to endorse in
party primaries. Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez stresses that she represents Latinos in
Congress. Eliot Engel, who represents a very heterogeneous constituency, works to “find
commonalities and assure equal treatment” in handling his different blocks of voters (149) and
also exhibits strong partisanship. All of the above illustrate different examples of the lens known
as home style and reveal how it is manifested.

In this work, home style was examined through the use of what Friedman calls public
record sources--any publicly accessible medium (newspapers, the web) that a legislator utilizes
to "present" and "explain" him or herself and his or her positions to constituents. While her
methodology to study the behaviors of U.S. Representatives did not include the kind of soaking
and poking of the Fenno variety, following them around their districts, readers still gained
insightful knowledge of how these officials present and explain themselves to their
constituencies. For Friedman, "a reliance on public record has the advantage of focusing
attention on what members of Congress actually do as much as it does on what they say they do"
(24). As such, her work emphasizes that home styles can be discerned through other methods
than simply observing how members of Congress deliver speeches in their districts or meet with constituents.

While Fenno's original work was largely based on the actions of members while physically present in their districts, in today's political, social and technological environments, Friedman’s book makes clear that today’s congresspersons can also present themselves to constituents through many diverse mediums. As such, I assert that while the definition of home style remains the same, our ways of tracking legislators’ behaviors need to be expanded beyond following representatives around their geographic districts.

In this vein, consider Grimmer (2013), who studies the influence of electoral competition on the home style behaviors of senators. To do so, he utilizes press releases as his main data source. Grimmer postulates, “Legislators not only create the personal (and in-person) styles that Fenno (1978) describes, but representatives also create public images through impersonal means (Fenno 1978, 136)” (4).

Another “impersonal mean” to study home style is through their television appearances. Fogarty (2009) observes that, “With ABC, NBC, CBS, and FOX news affiliates in every media market, there are vast opportunities for voters to be exposed to political information about their representatives.”

Then there is the Internet to consider (Adler et al. 1998; Friedman 2007; Gulati 2004 B). Adler et al. (1998), in their work, "The Home Style Home Page," explore how legislators utilize their congressional home pages in order to educate their electorates about constituency services. This piece suggests that Internet sites of representatives could be employed as a data source for extrapolating home style activity. Further, one of the independent variables Adler et al. utilized was the competitiveness of a district, further lending credence to the project.
Gulati (2004 B) also studies how representatives present themselves on the Internet. Gulati observes that

“Although presentation of self on the Web is not entirely the same as presentation in the district (Fenno 1978)…the manner in which a person presents oneself in one setting is usually indicative of how one presents oneself in other settings…Thus, we could expect that the images and symbols that members of Congress include on their Web sites are meant, at the very least, to be consistent with the impression of themselves that they are trying to make with a constituent during a face-to-face meeting” (2004 B, 24).

Thus, again, Gulati’s argument provides further support for different ways of examining home style compared to what was possible in Fenno’s time.

With the above stated, I claim that home style is in fact a much broader theoretical lens than the methodology of Fenno’s 1978 and 2013 works suggest, due to an increase in the variety of avenues to observe the phenomenon. Further, I maintain that hill and home styles are more intertwined today, and that public records sources provide the reader and the scholar with useful information in order to assess legislator behavior.

The most important lesson readers should learn from this section is that home styles are congressional behaviors. Therefore, since the section above spent a great deal of time explaining how electoral competition impacts legislator behavior, and this section laid out some of the behaviors that home styles encompass, then electoral competition likely impacts home styles. The next section will introduce existing literature that explores the linkage between these two phenomena.

*Home Style and the Impact of Competition*

To this point, I have explained the importance of competition in our polity, chronicled the literature that assumes that those in competitive circumstances may act differently from those in noncompetitive situations, and presented the home style literature.
As already alluded to, if candidates in different electoral situations behave differently, and home styles are congressional behavior, then competition also likely has an impact on congressional home styles.

Fenno thought a relationship between electoral competition and specific home style traits should exist. In his original monograph, he examined the impact of electoral competition, as measured by marginality, and, to his surprise, found it had little impact on some aspects of home style. Fenno finds, “the frequency of trips home does not increase as electoral margins decrease, or visa-versa. There is just not much of a relationship at all” (35).

Even so, Fenno’s explanation for his null findings highlights that members of Congress are always concerned about losing an election, even if no one else believes it is possible. He acknowledges that legislators do not find comfort in being re-elected by large margins. They are always concerned about the next cycle, regardless of previously safe results. Despite his findings, he affirms that the link between competition and home style is important and “should not be cast aside permanently” (35).

That said, competition is obviously linked to a representative’s broader re-election goal. This is simply because changing electoral circumstances - a stronger challenger, or a new marginal district to run in – increases the difficulty of attaining re-election.

For example, when discussing redistricting, one member of Congress Fenno studied stated, “The 1971 redistricting was the best thing that ever happened to me” (1978, 11). Another insisted, “Only one thing would make me feel worse than this last redistricting - to have my testicles laid on a stump and hit with a mallet” (Fenno 1978, 11-12). Accordingly, evidence exists that the robustness of electoral competition is a concern to legislators.
Fenno (1978) concludes that representatives’ actions are styled in each district by voter preferences and their own re-election interests. He found that members engaged in a strong local presentation style - traveling home often, appearing before constituents frequently, and putting a premium on being in touch with their voters. Hibbing notes that home style exhibits the importance of these notions as legislators continuously strive to be, "the kind of person the represented wants representing them" (Fenno 1978, vii). I assert that being “the kind of person” that constituents want representing them is directly related to the re-election goal of legislators and that re-election goal is connected to the degree of electoral competition with which members contend.

While there are important normative arguments and theoretical suppositions made in the literature above about the role and importance of competition in our society, as Fenno concluded, there is not much literature that chronicles a relationship between competition and the behaviors of elected officials. The scant scholarship that exists on this topic usually focuses on Washington activities, such as roll call votes (Fiorina 1974; Kingdon 1981; Canes-Wrone et al. 2002).

A recent work by Sulkin (2011) posits, “The most common view in the literature on legislative behavior and representation is that more vulnerable legislators, who should be the most concerned about their re-election prospects, should also be the most likely to engage in high levels of reelection promotion behavior” (132). In this case, she discusses members of Congress keeping promises made to constituents. However, she actually finds that safer members keep more promises to constituents than vulnerable members.

Another work focused on Washington activities by Sulkin (2005), found that competition affects members’ bill introductions, floor statements, and bill co-sponsorships through what she calls “issue uptake.” Whatever policy issues opponents highlighted in the last election, Sulkin
found were taken up by legislators in the following congressional term. In Sulkin’s work, she stresses the importance of connecting elected officials’ Washington activities with their experiences on the campaign trail. She also finds that competitiveness impacts issue uptake:

“By far the most important finding from this analysis is that vulnerability exerts a significant impact on legislators’ uptake levels. Uncovering a relationship between vulnerability and legislative behavior is itself a contribution, as many other empirical studies of the electoral connection have failed to find supporting evidence for this often hypothesized linkage” (95-96).

Sulkin’s work is important because she finds that there is a connection between electoral competition and the policymaking behaviors of elected officials.

There are other recent works that help set the stage for what my project hopes to chronicle - that a relationship between electoral competition and legislator presentation exists. First, consider Butler et al. (2012), who found that legislators who respond more often to service representation requests do better on Election Day than those who focus on the policy requests of constituents. Interestingly, Harden (2013) concludes that the safer the district, the less likely a member of Congress will engage in service representation. Thus, these two authors display findings that link electoral competition and service representation. Service representation is important because it is one of the premier home style activities Fenno identified.

Another important locally oriented activity is allocation representation. Griffen and Flavin (2011) study whether “…legislators are more responsive to citizen’s priorities in competitive districts…”(527-528). They find that legislators in competitive seats focus on allocation representation if they believe it is important to their constituents. Thus, Griffin and Flavin illustrate that competition influences congressional behavior and allocation politics, though not under all circumstances. Similarly, Grimmer (2013) finds that those in competitive districts concentrate more on securing federal monies for their districts than those in safer
electoral circumstances. Grimmer also finds that those in safer districts “build their home styles around position taking” (1).

Thus, these few works actually test for a relationship between congressional behavior (beyond roll calls) and the robustness of electoral competition. As with other useful research, they leave room for much more exploration of the connections between competition and home style features, especially since they are recent additions to the literature.

Conclusion

This chapter employed a layered approach to introduce the importance of electoral competition, reveal debates in the literature about how competition impacts candidate and legislator behavior, explain home style as a theory, and chronicle how electoral competition may affect the home styles of members of Congress.

What may not have been explicitly stated thus far is that home styles are a form of representation. More specifically, the manner of how legislators engage in constituent-oriented activities such as allocation politics, how they discuss policy, and how they reveal their partisan and ideological characteristics are a part of the constituent-representative relationship.

If one is to assume that home styles are an important form of representation, and that elected officials are the elites who represent constituents, then electoral competition and home styles should be linked. For example, Fenno (1978) notes, “as long as representatives need electoral support they can be held accountable to those they represent through the electoral process” (233). As such, this linkage shows that electoral competition is important in our republic and that home styles may be influenced by competitive circumstances.

However, as much of the literature above explains, exactly how electoral competition may impact legislator behavior is still a matter for discussion. While the next chapter will reveal
more debates in the literature about the impact of electoral competition on certain home style
traits, this chapter presented some literature that suggested that robust electoral competition may
cause candidates to polarize, and other scholarship that argued electoral competition stimulates
candidates to moderate their behaviors. The debate as to the impact of electoral competition on
home style activities does not end there, but extends to other behaviors important to a legislator’s
representational persona.

As such, the next chapter will do several things. First, it will give readers a definition of
competition. Second, building off this chapter, it will present more debates in the literature as to
how electoral competition may impact home styles and offer hypotheses that address these
debates. Finally, it will introduce data sources, reveal the subjects this project studies, and
explain the novel methodology I employ.

Thus, we move on to Chapter 3, which will explain, in detail, how I test whether electoral
competition impacts the home styles of U.S. Representatives.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

The previous chapter surveyed many normative and positive benefits of electoral
competition and highlighted literature on the home styles of members of Congress. As is clear
from the last section of the chapter, relatively few authors ask how competition influences home
styles.

I question whether legislators in various competitive situations act differently. Do all
members who are constantly re-elected by large margins act a certain way? How do the activities
of these very safe legislators collectively compare to the activities of those who consistently face
difficult re-elections?

Second, I seek to learn the extent to which changes in the robustness of electoral
competition lead members of Congress to alter their home styles. To answer this question, I will
longitudinally examine the behavior of individual members and look for changes in each
representative’s behavior around an increase or decrease in the difficulty of being re-elected.

Accordingly, the dependent variable in the study is the home style behavior of each
member of Congress featured in this work. The main independent variable is the nature of
competition, which may or may not be stable for each legislator, over a series of congressional
elections.

This chapter will explain and justify features of the research design utilized to answer the
broad questions I ask. It will include a description of the longitudinal nature of this work and the
“competition situations” I developed to organize the material. I also outline how I operationalize
electoral competition, reveal hypotheses, describe data sources and coding, and discuss the
particular members of Congress chosen to study.

Longitudinal Design

The traditional mode of examining the impact of competition on some aspect of
legislative behavior has been a basic cross-sectional research design. Researchers simply
compare the behavior of legislators in safe and competitive districts and make a scholarly
assessment. While some of my efforts employ such a design (my A hypotheses), my study adds
a longitudinal element. This methodology furnishes me with a micro-level understanding of how
competition works since it allows me to trace changes in the behavior of a single legislator as he or she responds to shifting competitive environments.

More precisely, to determine the effect of competition on home styles, I will observe how members behave around periods of robust competition and during less competitive times. Then, I will compare member behavior in these contrasting situations to look for similarities and differences in their home styles. A longitudinal study is the most precise way to observe whether the activities of legislators change as competitive contexts shift.

This project examines the home styles of members over a roughly ten-year period. If individual legislators changed their representational personas as the difficulty of being re-elected either increased or decreased, such changes could provide evidence that competition influences congressional action. If, on the other hand, their activities were consistent through their time in office, regardless of the ease of being re-elected, then I must look for other explanations. Further, as a control, I observed if the behaviors of those whose competitive situations remained constant stayed the same throughout their tenure. Not only does longitudinal analysis tell me if individual behavior changed as the strength of competition increased or decreased, but it also informs readers about when those behavioral shifts occurred.

Some illustrations can clarify these ideas. To begin, consider the situation of a member of Congress who was re-elected with 70 percent of the vote from 2002 through 2006, and then earned 53 percent in 2008. Did this representative change his or her behavior in reaction to the increase in electoral competition? I would think so if his or her subsequent behavior was notably different than previously.

However, to really discern if competition impacts home style behavior, we need to look beyond a cross-sectional analysis. It is only after exploring how several members behave over
the longer term, when each experiences an increase and decrease in the difficulty of being re-elected, that I can discern the impact of electoral competition on individual behavior.

I can also observe situations where election margins of an incumbent fluctuate. I can study the behavior of incumbents who are re-elected safely in their first re-elections, win by only a few points in their second races, and then are returned to office by large margins in their third contests. The longitudinal nature of the study allows me to examine if a member acted differently after his or her second race, compared to after his or her first and third elections. As with the above example, if a member behaved differently after being re-elected by a tight margin than after winning comfortably, the data imply that competition influences member behavior. Thus, the only meaningful way to study candidate behavior in these changing circumstances is through a longitudinal lens.

Also, using a longitudinal analysis allows me to work with two additional sets of controls. In employing this method, I was able to observe the individual activities of members who are always electorally safe. In contrast, I am also able to examine the behaviors of legislators who perpetually experience robust electoral competition. To the extent that shifting levels of competition drive behavior, I expect little change in the representational personas of both groups of legislators.

I operationalized this longitudinal design by studying congressional districts that were implemented in 2002, redrawn following the 2000 Census. I collected data published on and after May 1, 2002, as most districts were drawn by then and remained intact throughout the period. The cutoff point for data was April 25, 2011, the day I began collecting data. Again, legislators in the study represented the same districts in 2011 that they first contested in the 2002 General Election.
It is important that the districts remained constant because these are the units where the re-election contest occurs. Therefore, since I explore the impact of competition on each member, the geographic constituency must stay consistent. If district lines change, a legislator may alter his or her re-election strategies.

Finally, a longitudinal design also allows me to assess the plausibility of alternative explanations.

**Competition Situations**

Election results are a point of reference that many scholars use to assess electoral competition (Gross & Garand 1984; Sulkin 2005; Brunell 2008).

The circumstances of individual races and the situations of particular candidates often impact election margins. Alternatively, electoral competition can relate to the party of each candidate in relation to the tendency of voters in that district to vote for nominees of a party.

Therefore, this project considers both individual circumstances of incumbents and their opponents, as well as underlying district partisanship. As such, a congressional contest can be competitive (or safe) based on individual micro-level circumstances or may be competitive (or not) only for the nominees of one particular party.

More precisely, election results are based on numerous factors, including localized circumstances such as the quality of one’s challenger. Members of Congress consistently running against well known local officials, or well funded opponents, will likely face more difficult races than if they are running against unknown candidates with very little funding. Further, the incumbent could be embroiled in a scandal, or be prone to making embarrassing comments that turn off voters. As such, a majority of voters may just not like or trust an incumbent due to these
types of circumstances. Thus, individual situations such as these do have an impact on election results and increase the difficulty of a member winning re-election. However, simply observing election results and the circumstances of individual candidates or incumbents fails to identify all of the competitive elements at play.

In addition to the impact that particular candidates have on election results, we need to consider the unit where elections take place - the individual congressional districts. It is necessary to understand the partisan leanings of the districts where legislators run for re-election, relative to the parties of the challengers and incumbents. How does the party of each incumbent compare to the party enrollment figures of constituents? Does a Republican representing a district that usually votes Democratic in presidential contests consider this fact in her congressional activities? While I explain the mechanics of operationalizing competition below, let us assume that there are two types of underlying district partisanship with which a candidate must contend.

The first type is a district whose underlying partisanship favors a candidate. The second is a district whose underlying partisanship favors a nominee of the other party or is competitive for candidates of either party. Classifying each member’s district as safe or competitive is contingent upon his or her own partisan affiliation in relation to the partisan leanings of his or her district. For example, I will classify a district represented by a Republican whose residents vote overwhelmingly Democratic in presidential elections as unsafe for that Republican. However, if a Democrat held that same seat, I will classify the constituency as safe for that Democrat.

If I consider that members of Congress can represent districts that are either safe or competitive for members of their political parties, and I assert that I must also study the
individual circumstances occurring within each election cycle that impact election results, I suggest that there are six possible competitive situations that a legislator may experience.

These six situations highlight both aspects of a legislator’s competitive environment: election margins and underlying district partisanship in relation to candidates’ partisan affiliations. As such, each legislator could be placed into one of these situations based on his or her election results and the underlying partisanship of his or her district (See Table 3-A Below).

These six situations allow us to look at the behaviors and circumstances of each individual member over the entire project period to study the impact of changes in electoral competition on his or her activities. They also allow us to perform a cross-sectional analysis of the behaviors of a single member, subset of members, or every legislator in the study.

The first situation, which I will call scenario A, consists of very safe legislators. They are in districts safe for their parties and consistently win by a large number of votes. Alternatively, scenario F describes legislators in extremely competitive situations; it is composed of legislators from districts where party competition is strong and where election margins are consistently tight.

Individuals in scenario B represent districts that should be safe for members of their party, yet are consistently re-elected by small margins. Scenario E is the opposite. It is composed of individuals who represent competitive districts, yet consistently win re-election by a large number of votes.

Next, there are scenarios C and D. Scenario C is composed of members whose districts should be safe for each individual’s party, yet whose election results are both comfortable and very close over their tenure in Congress. Scenario D’s members also experience fluctuating margins that are comfortable at certain times and tight at others; however, they represent districts
whose underlying partisanship should indicate that it is competitive for either party. The fluctuating margins of those in these districts manifest themselves in different ways. Some people enjoy comfortable margins at the beginning of the time frame, and then tight results at the end of the program period. Others experience the opposite effect. Still, other legislators shift back and forth between winning by wide and close margins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Underlying District Partisanship</th>
<th>Election Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Safe District</td>
<td>Consistently Safe Electoral Margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Safe District</td>
<td>Consistently Non Safe Margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Safe District</td>
<td>Fluctuating Electoral Margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Competitive District</td>
<td>Fluctuating Electoral Margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Competitive District</td>
<td>Consistently Safe Electoral Margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Competitive District</td>
<td>Consistently Non Safe Electoral Margins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3-A Competitive Situations*

*Measuring Competition*

As is clear from the competitive scenarios, we need a measure to demonstrate a marginal election result and a metric to classify district partisanship. Table 3-B below illustrates how I operationalize these measures. An election result is considered to be marginal if a winner received less than 60 percent of the vote in a contest. Underlying district partisanship is measured through Partisan Voter Index scores.

Cook's Partisan Voter Index (PVI) is a scale that measures the underlying partisanship of a House district based on its presidential vote over two elections. A PVI score is determined by
comparing district vote percentages for each party’s presidential candidate to the national averages in each election. For example, a rating of R+20 indicates that over two elections a district voted 20 percent over the national average for the Republican presidential candidate. A rating of D+5 illustrates that a particular district voted an average of five percent over the national mean for the Democratic candidate over two elections. An Even PVI score denotes that the district voted in the same partisan proportions as the nation.

In this work, a safe PVI is considered to be at or above D or R+10. I assert that members often do not lose re-election if they represent areas with PVI scores of +10 in their favor (though there are exceptions). Competitive PVI scores are at or below D or R+9.

Now that the important difference between election margins and underlying district partisanship is established, I will expand upon the six situations of competition that I explained in Table 3-A. The matrix below accounts for Partisan Voter Index scores (underlying partisan nature of each district) and election results (competitive climate occurring within every election).

First, I will explain the competitive parameters of those who are consistently safe in general elections (scenario A) and those who are never safe (scenario F). A legislator in scenario A always won at least 60 percent of the vote and represented a district with a PVI score of at least +10 in his or her party’s direction. The opposite is true for scenario F. In this category, both measures indicate consistently competitive situations. An individual in scenario F never broke 60 percent of the vote in an election and his or her district’s Partisan Voter Index scores were always below +10 in the legislator’s favor. These members may even be in districts whose underlying partisan characteristics favor their opponents.
Then there are situations E and B. Category E includes legislators who always earned at least 60 percent of the vote, even though their districts’ Partisan Voter Index scores indicated a competitive constituency for either party. Scenario B is the opposite; it is for subjects whose PVI score is over +10 in their favor, yet never once earned above 60 percent of the vote. Thus, even though a legislator in scenario B represents a district that should help him or her win re-election by large margins consistently, as this district strongly favors his or her party in presidential elections, a congressperson in this category is consistently re-elected by small margins.

Finally, situations C and D include members who experience fluctuating election margins. The election returns of every subject in scenario C vacillated above and below 60 percent, even though each of their district’s PVI scores were at least +10 in his or her favor. Members in scenario D experienced fluctuating election results above and below the 60 percent threshold; however, PVI scores indicate these legislators represent districts that are competitive for either party.

Table 3-B below summarizes this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Partisan Voter Index Score</th>
<th>Election Results</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Safe PVI</td>
<td>Consistently Safe Electoral Margins</td>
<td>PVI = D or R+10 and above in favor of each member. Always earned 60 percent of the vote or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Safe PVI</td>
<td>Consistently Non Safe Electoral Margins</td>
<td>PVI = D or R+10 and above in favor of each member. Never earned 60 percent of the vote or more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Safe PVI</td>
<td>Fluctuating Electoral Margins</td>
<td>PVI = D or R+10 and below in favor of each member. Earned above and below 60 percent of the vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Competitive PVI</td>
<td>Fluctuating Electoral Margins</td>
<td>PVI = D or R+9 and below. Earned above and below 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E  Competitive PVI Consistently Safe Electoral Margins PVI = D or R+9 and below. Always earned 60 percent of the vote or more.

F  Competitive PVI Consistently Non Safe Electoral Margins PVI = D or R+9 and below. Always earned less than 60 percent of the vote or more.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses delve into particular features of home styles that are debated in the literature. Individually, each activity has a prominent place in political science scholarship, and taken together, the areas considered by these hypotheses cover a wide range of home style behaviors.

That said, it is important to note that there are two sets of hypotheses for every aspect of home style behavior under consideration. The first, labeled below as the A hypotheses, compares members of Congress in every competitive situation to one another. For example, A hypotheses allow readers to compare and contrast the activities of legislators who are in perpetually safe electoral circumstances (such as those in scenario A) with members of Congress who consistently face robust competitive environments (such as those in scenario F). Thus, these hypotheses allow us to observe if members in competitive situations act differently than those in safer circumstances. The A hypotheses will be assessed in each case study and in the work’s final chapter.

I also compare the behaviors of members within each competitive situation to one another. Thus, every chapter will offer a comparison of the subjects (such as all those in scenario D) within that chapter. Accordingly, even though there is not a set of hypotheses related to this comparison, I anticipate that those within each competitive situation will more or less behave similarly.
The second set of hypotheses, labeled B hypotheses, tackles the other sizable inquiry the project considers: the potential for members to change their behavior as competitive situations shift. I examine if members of Congress, particularly those with fluctuating margins, altered their behaviors as their electoral contexts became more or less competitive. I anticipate that the behaviors of legislators whose election results indicate that they were always safe or never safe will remain consistent.

It must be stated clearly that I consider a legislator to be in a competitive situation if he or she experiences one of the two measures of competition I described in the above writing. Therefore, if the subject either faces difficult election margins or a close underlying district partisanship, I anticipate that he or she will act as other subjects do in competitive circumstances. Therefore, those subjects in scenario B and scenario E are expected to behave as other subjects in competitive situations. The legislator in scenario B never broke 60 percent of the vote. Those in scenario E, while always enjoying more than 60 percent of all votes cast, nevertheless continually contend with marginal underlying district partisanship.

The hypotheses described below can broadly be grouped into three categories. The first set (hypotheses 1 and 2 A & B) explores how competition impacts constituency-oriented activities: service and allocation representation and the frequency of each member’s presence at home. The second set (hypotheses 3 and 4 A & B) addresses how competition influences how legislators present policy to constituents and how they frame policy in either local or national terms. The third set (hypotheses 5 and 6A & B) studies whether competition stimulates robust displays of partisanship and ideology.

As will become clear below, there are debates in the literature that analyze the impact of competition on each of these aspects of home style, leading to arguments and counterarguments.
As I develop the set of expectations for this project, I adopt the framework put forth by Mayhew (1974) and Fenno (1978). That said, overall, the hypotheses test Mayhew’s theoretical lens explored in his famous volume, Congress: The Electoral Connection, and the locally focused theories advanced by Fenno (1978) in his original home style work. More precisely, this project tests the theory that members of Congress act as if they are single-minded seekers of re-election and will put forward a representational persona that advances this goal. Further, as this is a home style work, I test to see if the locally focused personas that Fenno (1978) described in his original monograph are still prevalent. Thus, the hypotheses below, taken together, test the notion that members of Congress constantly engage in re-election pursuits, and in order to do so, in the face of enhanced competition, they focus on constituent-oriented activities, frame policy in a local veneer, and reach out to voters of all parties.

Thus, when the text below references literature that is being tested, the project is testing the theoretical contributions advanced in Mayhew and Fenno’s monographs. Yet, even though there is literature to support these suppositions, there is also significant scholarship that contradicts these theories.

Readers must keep in mind that relatively few scholars explored most of these areas through a home style lens. Additionally, as we will see below, there is more debate than we might have expected on how competition may impact these behaviors.

Each set of hypotheses below will be introduced using a three-step method. First, I will highlight literature that addresses each particular home style feature considered by this dissertation that supports Mayhew’s (1974) and Fenno’s (1978) suppositions. Then, I will chronicle scholarship that advances counterarguments. Finally, I will state each set of
hypotheses that tests the theories most closely linked with Mayhew’s (1974) and Fenno’s (1978) works.

**Hypotheses on Constituent-Oriented Activities**

*Service & Allocation Representation*

Eulau and Karps refer to the provision of casework and constituency services as “service responsiveness” (1977, 243). Increasingly, scholars agree that furnishing such assistance may be a critical key to success. Fenno (1978) argues that members of Congress are concerned about the quality and quantity of constituency services provided, as well as their role in re-election efforts. In fact, readers see real world illustrations of this in the activities of former Representatives Hinchey and Quinn described by Friedman (2007); both maintained seats in competitive districts largely because of proactively helping constituents in concrete ways.

Likewise, Butler et al. (2012) illustrate that casework and constituency assistance are useful tools to win votes. Given their non-partisan nature, the literature above suggests that legislators should have staff members dedicated to these tasks.

This leads to allocation representation. While Fenno discusses allocation in terms of trips home to the district and number of congressional offices established, this paper considers allocation in the manner described by Eulau and Karps (1977). More precisely, allocation in this work means: “pork-barrel politics in legislative allocations of public projects…advantages and benefits presumably accruing to a representative's district as a whole” (Eulau and Karps 1977, 245).

Griffin & Flavin (2011), include in their study of how legislators balance allocation and policy representation that, “Specifically, districts populated by demographic groups that place a
greater emphasis on policy representation tend to be better represented in roll call voting, while districts populated by demographic groups that place a greater emphasis on the allocation of federal money tend to receive more federal contracts” (529).

Rocco and Gordon (2013), drawing a link between securing federal resources and a legislator’s re-election goal assert, “By distributing earmarks and then claiming credit for their delivery, MCs seek to accomplish their immediate goal of receiving campaign contributions from affected groups so that they may accomplish their long-term goal of reelection” (241).

Also, Grimmer et al. (2012), studying how senators claim credit for securing federal funds observe, “Senators with a relatively higher credit claiming propensity enjoy greater constituent support. Further, I show that those constituents are most likely to consume senators’ credit claiming messages. The result is systematic evidence that legislators’ credit claiming efforts actually affect the personal vote” (715).

Thus, several recently published studies connect service representation and allocation politics to re-election and home style.

Yet, a legislator practicing service and allocation representation is not an immutable fact of nature.

Speaking to the former, Fenno (2013) explains the case of Congressman Barber Conable, who the author quotes observing, “If you have a big district staff, you create expectations, you encourage people to come to you, and you get a huge caseload…So I deliberately wanted to underplay the district activity” (36). Fenno noted that Conable’s district was about one-third urban, one-third suburban, and one-third rural. Conable represented a competitive seat, with the urban part of the district voting Democratic, the suburban part splitting between both parties, and the rural areas voting mostly Republican.
Regarding the latter, while the literature exploring allocation politics is largely uniform, the Griffin and Flavin (2011) citation above indicates that not every district cares about allocation. Some districts care more about roll call voting. Therefore, these authors appear to argue that it should not be taken for granted that each legislator in a competitive environment would immediately invest time in securing federal funding for constituents, regardless of competitive circumstances.

Thus, while more literature supports the notion that legislators engage in constituent-oriented activities, there is still scholarship that contradicts these arguments.

That said, if the suppositions advanced by Mayhew (1974) and Fenno (1978) are correct:

**Hypothesis 1A:** Legislators in competitive situations will be more likely to appear to engage in higher amounts of service and allocation representation than legislators in noncompetitive environments.

**Hypothesis 1B:** Over time, as a legislator faces more competition, he/she will engage in more service and allocation representation after or beginning at the same time as the shift in competitive circumstances.

**Presence at Home**

Fenno’s work, published in 2013, cites Barber Conable, a legislator in competitive circumstances who insisted, “‘I have never come home less than forty times a year,’ he said during my first visit. And he repeated that statement during every one of our subsequent visits. It was all about connectedness” (27). Thus, this work illustrates a legislator in a competitive district placing a premium on being at home.

Further, Fenno states, "one sees House members working to maintain and enlarge their political support at home by going to the district and doing things there" (Fenno 1978, 32).
Yet, the literature is not unanimous on the linkage between competition and a legislator’s presence at home. Fenno (1977) suggests, “One standard supposition would be that representatives in electoral jeopardy will decide to spend more of their time at home than will representatives whose seats are well protected” (892). Yet, Fenno did not find that a relationship exists between the two. He stated, “the frequency of trips home does not increase as electoral margins decrease, or visa-versa. There is just not much of a relationship at all.” (35). That said, he argued that this question should not be put aside simply because his research did not support his theories.

Therefore, if theoretical suppositions that Mayhew (1974) and Fenno (1978) advance in their monographs are correct:

**Hypothesis 2A:** Subjects in competitive circumstances will be at home more regularly than those in noncompetitive environments.

**Hypothesis 2B:** Over time, if a legislator faces more competition, he/she will appear in the district more regularly after or beginning at the same time as the shift in competitive circumstances.

**Hypotheses on Policy**

The next set of hypotheses are concerned with public policy. First, hypotheses 3 A and B make suppositions about whether electoral competition stimulates or discourages dialog on public policy in order to gather whether various competitive situations produce more policy oriented discussions than others. These are different from hypotheses 4 A and B, which consider the national and local balance of these conversations, a major issue discussed by both Fenno (1978) in his writing and Friedman in her more recent work.
Elections are not simply about constituency services or bringing home financial resources. Elections are about public policy.

Jacobson (2009) identifies some of the risks that candidates and incumbents take when they discuss public policy. He suggests, “the more familiar voters are with candidates, the more likely they are to discover things they both like and dislike. Familiarity by no means breeds only favorable responses” (26). Therefore, the author acknowledges the hazard in discussing policy, which is the possibility of having voters disagree with you over an issue. Jacobson recognizes that this may in fact cost some members votes.

That said, there are also counter arguments that appear in the literature. Kahn & Kenney (1999), citing Kingdon (1968), “found that candidates offer more specific issue positions in competitive contests than in noncompetitive ones” (13). Macedo states, “candidates…are also compelled to be more specific about their issue positions” in competitive campaigns (45). Jacobson (2009) argues that, “competitive challengers also make it possible for more voters to make…policy distinctions between House candidates…producing contests that are more like Senate elections, in which issues…usually play a larger role” (146). As such, these scholars note the importance of the specter of losing re-election in forcing candidates to discuss policy. The authors highlight the significance of competition in keeping elected officials accountable to the public regarding their issue positions.

Therefore, while some literature illustrates that competition may cause an uptick in a candidate’s policy conversation, other scholarship insists that it may actually curtail that discourse.
Thus, if the suppositions advanced by Mayhew (1974) and Fenno (1978) in their literature are correct:

**Hypothesis 3A:** Legislators in competitive situations will discuss, present and explain policy less than their counterparts in less competitive conditions.

**Hypothesis 3B:** Over time, if a legislator faces more competition, he/she will discuss, present and explain policy less regularly after or beginning at the same time as the shift in competitive circumstances.

---

**Local and National Balance of Policy Conversation**

Fenno highlighted the importance of “going local” at the time his original monograph was penned. McDermott and Jones (2003) assert that congressional races can be considered “largely local affairs” but that national factors may also be at play (157). Abramson et al. (2007) note that in the 2006 elections, 34 percent of voters said local issues were more important than national ones, while 60 percent stated that national were more significant than local concerns. Jacobson (2009) suggests, “when challengers…found that they could win votes by linking the incumbent to national policy failures…national issues reentered the electoral equation” (147).

That said, keeping Fenno’s (1978) locally focused theories in mind, along with Mayhew’s arguments about legislators seeking re-election, if the theoretical suppositions advanced in these works are correct:

**Hypothesis 4A:** Legislators in competitive situations will frame policy in local terms more than their counterparts in less competitive conditions.

**Hypothesis 4B:** Over time, if a legislator faces more competition, he/she will frame policy more in local terms after or beginning at the same time as the shift in competitive circumstances.
Hypotheses on Partisanship & Ideology

The next set of hypotheses will explore whether the home styles of representatives in competitive situations will be partisan, bipartisan, ideological, or moderate in nature. The purpose of these suppositions is to explore the ways that competitiveness affects the presentation of partisanship and ideology. This is important because, as was explained in Chapter 2, intense partisanship and ideology may have negative impacts on the structures of government and the policy outputs it produces.

Party and Ideology

There has been an ongoing debate in the literature regarding the connection between partisanship/ideology and the degree of political competition with which a member contends. Peress (2011) argues that candidates in competitive situations should not polarize, but come to the center of the voter distribution in order to maximize the amount of votes they may receive. Ansolabehere, Snyder, and Stewart (2001) found that candidates in competitive situations behave differently than those in noncompetitive scenarios. While those in noncompetitive environments largely mirror national party positions, candidates in competitive circumstances tend to moderate their behaviors. Abramson et al. (2007) observe that Democrats during 2006 moderated their images by avoiding discourse on social issues. Macedo (2005) asserts that competition simply curbs polarization of political elites, and insists that the best way to keep these officials in the mainstream is to ensure that they have healthy electoral competition.

Yet, there is a great deal of literature to suggest that robust competition produces partisan and ideologically polarized candidates (Fiorina 1974). Mann (2006) observes that the notion that median voter theory is correct has not withstood empirical scrutiny. Adams et al. (2010) assert
that it is highly illogical that a candidate would find it advantageous to moderate his or her appearance. They argue that strong partisans are far more likely to go out and vote for that candidate, compared to moderate voters who are just as likely to vote for that candidate’s opponent. Kartick and McAfee (2007) insist that moderating illustrates that candidates have no character, and they are more likely to gain votes by polarizing, thus illustrating that they have principles and will not say anything in order to win their elections.

Thus, the question of whether these candidates present themselves as ideological and partisan moderates, given their competitive circumstances, is still open for debate. In fact, more literature argues against median voter theory than can be found in its support.

That said, if the suppositions put forward by Fenno (1978) and Mayhew (1974) in their scholarship are correct:

**Hypothesis 5A:** Legislators in competitive situations will exhibit a more moderate partisanship than their counterparts in less competitive conditions.

**Hypothesis 5B:** Over time, if a legislator faces more competition, he/she will exhibit a more moderate partisanship after or beginning at the same time as the shift in competitive circumstances.

and

**Hypothesis 6A:** Legislators in competitive situations will exhibit a more moderate ideology than their counterparts in less competitive conditions.

**Hypothesis 6B:** Over time, if a legislator faces more competition, he/she will exhibit a more moderate ideology after or beginning at the same time as the shift in competitive circumstances.
Qualitative Nature of the Study

Since I endeavor to acquire a holistic picture of a member’s activities and comprehensively understand the role that competition plays in explaining a legislator’s behavior, the bulk of this study is based on qualitative work. In order to paint a picture of each representative’s home style, as related to the hypotheses, I used case studies of individual members.

There are many reasons for utilizing a largely qualitative methodology. I endeavored to keep this work in the qualitative tradition of other home style works as this methodology allows us to appreciate and explain the rich variety of factors that influence a legislator’s behavior and re-election circumstances. Further, qualitative methodology is an underutilized approach in political science literature. Also, the question I am asking is an underexplored question. Finally, little research exists connecting home styles to electoral competition and a qualitative study allows researchers to “get their bearings” on this subject matter.

That said, as mentioned, qualitative case studies are traditional in the home style literature (Fenno 1978 and 2013; Friedman 2007; Parker 2015; Sidlow 2007). The full case studies provided by these authors certainly enriched our understanding of legislative behavior, and thick description allows us to explore real world, practical politics - something that has become a rarity in political science. It is one thing to learn that a particular phenomenon may be occurring based on regression models; but it is entirely another to understand the causal mechanisms for why something is happening on a micro-level. Unfortunately, quantitative methods often overlook these important why questions or may oversimplify research. Fenno laments: “This is a kind of research - the study of people in their natural setting - that is not
much written about by political scientists” (1978, 249). Yet he insists, “…a case study can have broad benefits” (1978, 249).

An in-depth methodology allows us to comprehend district contexts, which may help mold members’ behaviors. These qualitative factors are significant for different reasons. First, legislators are politicians who seek to be re-elected. As Fenno (2013) so eloquently stated, “Representing begins with the election of an ambitious politician. And it ends with the politician’s accountability to the people” (7). Most members of Congress rely heavily on political support from party activists, community leaders, labor and trade organizations and others back home in their districts. The array of supporters a legislator counts on certainly helps mold his or her activities. The most fruitful avenue to appreciate the cumulative impact of all of these factors is a qualitative design.

Further, each official needs to balance local and national issues and represent unique districts with their own particular tastes for politics and expectations of government. Certainly, constituents from Wyoming’s At-Large and Connecticut’s Third Districts each have different situations, contexts, expectations, and ideologies. Fenno (2013) articulately asserts, “The representational practices of our House members open up for us 435 separate research windows on 435 political worlds beyond the national legislature” (7). Qualitatively sorting through these different circumstances helps us to truly appreciate the numerous, complicated factors that modern federal legislators balance and address in order to keep constituents, political supporters, and donors content.

A multitude of additional dynamics impacts the environment shaping a legislator’s behavior. In a given election cycle, congressional races could be influenced by national factors such as a wave election, or local features, such as a stronger than expected challenger. Further,
candidate behavior could also be manipulated by underlying district partisanship. Keeping the complexities of electoral contexts in mind must be a foremost consideration in understanding political competition and its potential impact on home styles.

Third, district and personal characteristics are often not considered in the multitude of quantitative studies published; thus, political scientists have underutilized qualitative studies. Fenno (2013) succinctly discusses this problem. He laments, “… individual politicians have usually ended up as integers destined for burial in large data collections. Except for the occasional biographical references, the activities of particular individuals have not become central objects of political science research” (1). Agreeing with Fenno, I claim that members of Congress themselves, as well as the contexts that legislators operate in, are often unique. Appreciating the personalities of legislators and the distinct character of local situations is necessary to our understanding of congressional behavior; I affirm that the most fruitful instrument to make us comprehend the richness of these dynamics is a qualitative case study.

Finally, these case studies are important as scholars begin to understand the effect of competition - a rich phenomenon in its own right - on home styles. Thus, this study is an early one in a series of inquiries into this matter that will be refined as our understanding of these two concepts continues to develop. A small N study helps us to simply begin to understand if a relationship exists between these two forces and what that connection may look like (Fenno 2013).

It is worth noting, however, that there is a quantitative component to this study. Press releases and franked documents of legislators were coded to reveal how the actions of members featured in these documents relate to each of the hypotheses. Simple frequencies of the findings of this coding will be presented to readers in tables within each case study.
A major criticism of my work will be in its limited ability to generalize findings. While I believe valuable insights can be gained from this methodology, qualitative studies are an easy target for those who believe 14 in-depth cases are ill equipped to provide a useful picture of the chamber as a whole. However, as Fenno (2013) states of the subjects in his latest home style book, the legislators I study, “…are in no sense statistical - or a ‘representative’ – sample. They are flavorful vehicles through which to make an argument in support of constituency centric research on the United States Congress” (2).

I will now identify and discuss the data used to conduct that constituency-centered research.

Data

As with other home style works (Fenno 1978; Friedman 2007; Sidlow 2007; Fenno 2013; Parker 2015), the bulk of this research is qualitative. While Fenno “soaked and poked” and personally followed representatives around their districts, public record sources were utilized in this study.

Though this choice was largely based on feasibility, such a focus also has advantages. Friedman’s (2007) work, which relies on public sources, demonstrates that home style projects can make contributions to our understanding of Congress using this type of data. She states, "a reliance on public record has the advantage of focusing attention on what members of Congress actually do as much as it does on what they say they do.”

In addition, several works (Adler et al. 1998; Grimmer 2013; and Grimmer et al. 2015) show that much can be learned about the behaviors of members of Congress through analyzing website home pages and legislative press releases. While I will concede that such a methodology
misses the very personal kinds of interactions Fenno so eloquently documented, I still maintain its usefulness in seeking to answer the questions I am posing.

Also, my project strives to preserve the importance of the outsider’s view (Friedman 2007) by using public sources rather than interviews of legislators. Friedman suggests that this outsider perspective, "has the advantage of mirroring the sources available to an interested constituent attempting to glean information as to the activities of his or her legislator. Thus, I depict home styles as they might be apparent to constituents" (23-24).

While some may disagree that these sources epitomize the behaviors of officials as they are in the district meeting with voters, Friedman (2007), Adler et al. (1998) and Grimmer (2013) illustrate that much can be learned from this outsider perspective. Further, Grimmer (2013) observes, “that press releases are an important component of senators’ home styles, and they are indicative of senators’ broader communication strategies” (2). Thus, he asserts that these types of data sources are consistent with how representatives regularly display their home styles.

Accordingly, I employed data furnished directly by legislators as well as other public accounts of representatives’ behaviors. This allowed me to observe the ways that members disseminate information to constituents while also discovering how different sources portray subjects. The data comprise sources traditionally used by scholarship, including LexisNexis and Westlaw, to gather local newspapers of each member of Congress; franked information collected from the Clerk of the House of Representatives; and current and archived government and re-election websites of officials viewed through Way Back Machine and through the electronic collection of the Library of Congress. It also included new resources that have the potential to give scholars a more comprehensive picture of legislative behavior, such as the Facebook and Twitter pages of representatives.
Newspapers are a major source of local information and continue to furnish researchers with valuable data. As a project focusing on home style, the decision was made early on to only use papers read in each legislator’s district. For example, how a legislator from Alaska is covered by the New York Post probably differs from his coverage in the Anchorage Daily News. Since most of this member’s voters are more likely to read the latter publication, I thought it methodologically proper to use the local source.

LexisNexis and Westlaw were employed to gather information on how legislators are presented in their local print media. A full listing of newspapers used for each member is in Table 3-C. A special trip to the University of Illinois-Chicago was made to gather articles from the Kansas City Star. In total, 34,653 Word pages of newspaper articles were assessed.

In each case study, representative exemplars of how each member of Congress is presented in local news sources are furnished to readers. Further, I paid attention to shifts in member statements and portrayals in response to changes in the robustness of electoral competition, and report those shifts to the readers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Newspaper(s)</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Newspaper(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Next, each member’s franked materials were gathered from the Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives in October 2011. They were coded to address each hypothesis (see the next section of the chapter for an explanation of codes) in order to furnish readers with an overview of member behavior. Since this is a qualitative study, only frequencies have been analyzed.

This leads us to the 7,248 press releases gathered from government congressional websites, which were also coded in the same manner as franked materials. Frequencies of press release codes are also furnished to readers in tables in each case study.

The way frequencies will be presented allows me to longitudinally study the behaviors of legislators. Those representatives in situations A, B, E and F (see Table 3-A) are in competitive circumstances that remained constant throughout the project period. No subject in these categories experienced any large changes in PVI scores. Every member’s district is either perpetually competitive or not competitive. As far as election returns, every legislator in these
categories either always earned above or consistently below 60 percent of the vote. Therefore, in order to observe representatives in these situations, I simply divided their tenure in Congress (or over the study period) in half. If a member of Congress was in office for eight years, I compared the first four years to the second four. Presenting information this way allows me to demonstrate large changes in the behaviors of members of Congress over time.

It is also important to clarify that I expect members in these situations to maintain the same behavioral characteristics over time since their circumstances have not changed. Even those in scenario E, whose districts are perpetually competitive in light of PVI scores, but who continually earned above 60 percent of the vote, should not change their behaviors because their election results remained consistently safe.

The electoral contexts of those in scenarios C and D are more complicated. Since a primary purpose of this study is to see if legislators altered their behaviors as competition changed, I expect representatives in these categories to shift behaviors around the time of a variation in competitive contexts. More specifically, I anticipate members will act differently in more competitive climates than when their re-election prospects were more favorable. For example, if a member was electorally safe in 2002 and 2004, but fell below 60 percent of the vote in 2006, I expect her to behave differently after her electoral margins dropped below 60 percent. Thus, as competitive situations change, I anticipate home styles will shift as well.

Therefore, data will be presented a bit differently for each member in these two categories. I will illustrate if behavioral changes occurred just before, during or after variations in competitive contexts. I will also indicate if their behavior looks the same during noncompetitive times (or competitive times), even if these periods occur at different points during their tenure in
Congress. So, the presentation of data will be specifically tailored to each subject in these two
categories.

Further, in identifying variations in legislative behavior, I will generally identify and explain any shifts in coded categories of at least ten percent. For example, if a member in scenario F addressed an issue in eight percent of press releases from 2004 to 2007, and discussed the same policy concern in 18 percent of news releases from 2008 to 2011, the case study will engage readers in a discussion of this change.

In addition to newspapers, franked documents and press releases, I studied each member’s Congressional and re-election websites, Twitter and Facebook pages. Archives of Congressional and many campaign websites dating back to 1996 are accessible through the Library of Congress and Way Back Machine. As with franked newsletters available from the Clerk of the House, these sources provide information directly illustrating news as representatives want it exhibited.

Each franked document and press release was coded to address every set of hypotheses, yielding a data set of over 7,200 documents.

These codes were binary; either a document had a particular feature that related to a hypothesis or it did not. For example, if a press release announced that a legislator secured one million dollars for the district, a one was placed in the allocation column of the spreadsheet for that particular press release. This one, placed in the allocation column, indicated that this document addressed allocation representation. If that same press release did not, for example, indicate partisan activity, then it received a zero in the partisan column. A zero in a column indicates that it did not address that particular issue. Each press release and franked document was coded in this matter, receiving a one for meeting a certain criteria, or a zero for not.
Since I described each hypothesis in detail, and since there is an appendix further clarifying coding procedures, this section will describe some of the more difficult decisions underlying this methodology.

The simplest codes to understand are the at home, policy and party/ideology codes. The at home code was applied if a representative indicated he or she was in his or her district, or in few cases, in his or her home state. The policy code was used if a legislator addressed a policy issue either generally by discussing something like the importance of clean water, or if he or she referenced a particular bill or law. In addition to this general public policy code, codes were made for every policy area. For example, there were individual codes for trade, health, and immigration policy, etc.

There were several different party codes. The first was applied if a member indicated he or she was affiliated with a political party. Another party code was applied if a representative made a partisan statement either in support of his or her own party or in criticism of the opposite party. A third party code was used if a member made a bipartisan statement, indicating that he or she was willing to work with the opposite party, or that the legislator actually worked with the other party. An ideological code was applied if a member indicated his or her ideology, or if a legislator made an ideological statement similar in tone to partisan statements. Several decisions needed to be made regarding all of the other codes.

First, consider allocation and service representation. Since allocation is securing some kind of government benefit to some important segment of the district, I needed to exclude instances where particular individuals would receive a government benefit. I decided early on that in order for an activity to be considered allocation, the entity benefiting from the federal monies had to be a government or corporate entity of some sort. Thus, tax stimulus checks (such
as the ones distributed nationwide in 2007), social security checks, or federal student loans did not count as allocation since individuals received the government expenditure.

Inversely, consistent with common understandings, service representation is considered to be a particularized benefit to a person or a group of persons. An example of the latter would be workers from a single company for which a legislator helped to obtain trade assistance benefits. To be coded positively, the press release needed to clearly identify the individuals who were benefitting from the casework.

Next, I considered three aspects of the local/national paradigm. Coding accounted for instances where members of Congress discussed local ordinances or state laws. I observed when legislators framed the impact of federal laws in national terms, meaning that the discussion of the legislation had no particular mention to how it impacts a member’s district. Instead, in these instances, the legislator discussed how a bill affected the country as a whole. Finally, documents were coded as to the extent to which legislators highlighted the impact of national policy on some aspect of local level politics, e.g. the effect a proposed education law might have on local students.

One final point needs to be made about coding; a document can contain many different codes. For example, a press release discussing a check presentation to help ameliorate a public safety issue provides an example of a member being physically present in the district, practicing allocation representation, illustrating the impact of federal policy on the constituency, and addressing a specific policy issue (crime).

Subjects
Table 3-D below gives data on the 14 officials studied in this work, all of whom were re-elected to Congress at least once. In picking my sample, I strove to account, as much as possible, for geographic and partisan diversity, as well as differences in length of tenure in the House.

All legislators were in Congress between 2003 and 2011 (or parts thereof). If the member was elected after November 2002, I started collecting newspaper and campaign website data from May 1 of the year he/she was elected because district lines were largely established by that date. As such, I collected data on several congresspersons before they were actually elected. For example, for Rep. Cleaver, first elected in November 2004, data collection began on May 1, 2004 in order to consider his general election circumstances and the degree of electoral competition with which he contended. In the case where a member was elected in a special election, I began data collection at least four months prior to the special election date.

In terms of the final sample, five of the subjects were Democrats and nine were Republicans; every competition situation included at least one person from each party, except for scenario B, where Jean Schmidt was the only member of Congress to fall into that circumstance who had served more than one term.

One of the difficulties in choosing a sample for small N studies is attempting to achieve proper diversity on as many levels as possible (Fenno 1978; 2013). Beyond party diversity, which I have already discussed, I strove for tenure diversity. Two members were first elected in the 1970s, one in 1988, five in the 1990s, and six after 2000. I also struggled to achieve geographic diversity. Two subjects were from the Northeast, three from the West, four from the South, and the remainder from the Midwest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3-D</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>First Elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A) Safe PVI, Safe Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Capuano</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Scalise</td>
<td>2008 (Special Election)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B) Safe PVI, Competitive Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jean Schmidt</td>
<td>2005 (Special Election)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C) Safe PVI, Fluctuating Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel Cleaver</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McCaul</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Young</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D) Competitive PVI, Fluctuating Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judy Biggert</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Calvert</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Michaud</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E) Competitive PVI, Safe Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Costello</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Ryan</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.W. Bill Young</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F) Competitive PVI, Competitive Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry Kissell</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Reichert</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

As hypotheses have outlined, I explored six different facets of the dependent variable - member behavior - utilizing a variety of data sources. I studied these legislators’ activities over time, comparing legislators with changing and stable levels of competition. The dimensions of competition, outlined in Table 3-A and 3-B, help us to sort out causal mechanisms - and to date - I have not seen other studies utilize this matrix. Therefore, the methodology employed in this work offers an original contribution to the literature.

The case studies of subjects in each competition situation will comprise a chapter in this work. Thus, all members in scenario A will be grouped into one chapter. As mentioned previously, all subjects within each chapter will be compared to one another in order to see if there are similarities among subjects within each dimension of competition.
The most important considerations for the reader to keep in mind while reading the following chapters are the main independent variable - degree of competition - and the main dependent variable - member behavior. While there are other potential influences on a member’s actions that will be explained if needed, the most significant aspect of this work is the influence of competition on a legislator’s behavior.

The case studies will be organized in a similar manner. I present brief backgrounds on each member, as well as a discussion of his or her electoral characteristics, and then transition into an explanation of each legislator’s home style. Each profile concludes with an examination of how the legislator’s behavior changed over time.

APPENDIX EXPLAINING CODING

Service Representation (Hypotheses 1A&B)

Service representation is considered to be particularized assistance, largely known as casework, furnished to individuals. Helping to obtain veterans benefits for a constituent, navigating regulations within the Social Security Administration for a disabled adult, or aiding a local person in acquiring Medicare are examples. I also considered service representation to include instances where members of Congress urged their constituents to contact staff to help them with concerns.

Allocation (Hypotheses 1 A&B)

Allocation representation is considered any attempt by a legislator to secure funding for their states and/or districts or to deliver a contract to a local entity. It also includes attempting to bring a federal project to the district, like an army base. To be coded as allocation, a local entity
must be the target of the funding or exist primarily due to federal resources, such as a Department of Energy research laboratory.

Cutting interest rates on student loans, while putting money in the pockets of constituents, is not considered allocation because it is a private benefit. However, delivering or attempting to deliver an army contract to a local manufacturer, or funding for roads to a local government, fall into this category.

**Presence in the District (Hypotheses 2 A&B)**

The number of instances when a member of Congress was in his or her district, or in some instances in his or her state, was recorded from mentions in press releases and franked documents. From other sources, I also qualitatively observed when each legislator was in his or her constituency and described his or her activities while at home.

**Addresses Policy (Hypotheses 3 A&B)**

I coded member references to public policy in any of the public record sources utilized. Coding included referencing a legislative proposal like the Affordable Care Act, or simply discussing the impact of an issue, such as free trade. I paid attention to the policy issues that legislators gave high priority and looked for changes in their policy conversations over time. Every single policy issue that a member addressed was given its own unique code. I recorded each time a legislator addressed a policy issue.

**Local and National Balance of the Policy Conversation (Hypotheses 4 A&B)**
To simplify the complicated variety of ways a member may balance his or her local and national policy presentation, I looked for three different congressional behaviors. The first is a member framing the impact of federal policy locally. This classification was applied to behavior where a legislator indicated that a policy has any impact on his or her district. The second activity is a representative framing policy impact only through a national lens. Members did not discuss their districts or constituents in these statements. Third, congresspersons also discussed state and municipal policies; I counted the few instances that they addressed these issues.

Party and Ideology (Hypotheses 5 and 6 A&B)

Party codes were applied if a member indicated his or her own political party or made a partisan statement that either extolled the party they belong to or criticized the opposing party. I also coded bipartisan behavior, such as a legislator making a statement that praised the other party or indicated he/she was willing to work across party lines. I coded every instance where a member indicated they held a party position, such as a regional whip’s post.

Ideological codes were applied to a franked document or press release if a member specified his/her own ideology, made an ideological statement either extolling his/her own ideology or criticizing another, or indicated he or she was a moderate or centrist. I also accounted for the particular ideology each legislator emphasized. Unique codes were applied if a member indicated he or she was a conservative, a moderate or centrist, or a progressive.

Chapter 4
Safe Districts, Safe Margins

Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to chronicle the behaviors of two members of Congress who enjoy safe districts and safe electoral margins. Each of these legislators earned above 60 percent of the vote in every election contested over the program period. Further, these members represent districts that continually favor each of their political parties.

Since their competitive circumstances remained stable, I hypothesize that their home style behaviors — on all dimensions described in this and the last chapter — will also stay constant.

Beyond this, I anticipate that these legislators will not spend a great deal of time on constituent-oriented activities such as allocation politics and service representation. I also do not believe that they will often be found at home. On policy, I expect that these U.S. Representatives will frame issues in a national lens frequently. Finally, the literature tested by hypotheses suggest that these members of Congress will act as staunch partisans and robust ideologues.

More specifically, this chapter examines the home style presentations of Representatives Steve Scalise (R-LA) and Michael Capuano (D-MA). These congressmen were chosen for this category of legislators — those from safe districts with safe electoral margins— due to the political diversity they bring to the project. Scalise is an ardent conservative from the South, first elected in 2008. Capuano is a staunch progressive from the Northeast who has been in Congress since the late 1990s. Nevertheless, both legislators show remarkable similarities in their behaviors.

Most significantly, they each focus on issues that are important in a local context. Capuano addresses finance and transportation a great deal, which are important locally. Scalise acts as a powerful voice for the citizens of his state, particularly on energy and disaster relief.
The data generally support the overall thesis of this project. Scalise clearly meets the expectations of the author; by any of the measures utilized here, there is little change in his home style behavior. There is also a good deal of stability in many of Capuano’s activities; at the same time, the shift in his focus is greater than I anticipated. I trace this behavioral modification to alterations in Capuano’s electoral ambitions for higher political office, showing the impact of electoral competition, more broadly defined, on home style presentations.

Each of the case studies in this and subsequent chapters will be organized in a similar fashion. Sections will furnish readers with a background of each member’s district characteristics and electoral circumstances, outline the most important aspects of his/her home style behavior, and explain what changes occurred in a representative’s activities.

It is worth noting that in organizing the presentation of each profile as a discussion of the most important elements each member highlights, I am not following the order of the hypotheses discussed in earlier chapters.

That said, we now turn to this work’s first story, that of Rep. Steve Scalise of Louisiana.

**Rep. Steve Scalise – A Voice for Louisiana**

“‘The president ought not kick the people of Louisiana when they’re down,’ said Rep. Steve Scalise…at a press conference before a meeting that Gulf Coast senators and House members will have today with Secretary of Interior Ken Salazar” (New Orleans Times-Picayune 6-16-10).

Steve Scalise entered Congress in a special election in 2008. He was born in New Orleans and lived in Louisiana his entire life. His government website states, “Scalise started his political career at [Louisiana State University], twice being elected Speaker of the Student Government Association.” He also spent over 12 years in the Louisiana State Legislature, as both a state
representative and a state senator. His biography also makes known that he worked as a systems engineer for Louisiana-based technology companies, utilizing his computer science degree (Congressional Website 8-28-08, 5-12-09, 4-6-11).

Given his roots in the state, and in harmony with the quote at the beginning of this case study, it is no surprise that the chief feature of his home style is that of a strong voice for all of Louisiana. More specifically, as the paragraph above makes known, he was born in New Orleans, went to college in Baton Rouge, and represented an area around Lake Pontchartrain in the state legislature.

Beyond his connection to his home state, both Louisiana and his district were greatly affected by Hurricane Katrina and the BP Oil Spill. The impact of these events is still affecting the state. Further, these disasters not only touched the environment, but also the local economy, including energy production.

Due to the way emergency relief works, when the state benefits from federal assistance, so do his constituents. Further, as will be clearly explained later on, the ban on oil drilling after the BP spill also had an impact on jobs in his district. Therefore, advocating for Louisiana’s interests is a vehicle he uses to support constituent priorities. Thus, given this information, it is no surprise he spends most of his time illustrating how federal policies impact Louisiana’s interests and fighting to help secure funding for the state.

Next, in terms of Scalise’s place in the entire project, he represents a district with a deep GOP DNA. In addition to being meticulously Republican in their voting behavior, his constituents are also extraordinarily conservative in their ideology (Times-Picayune 9-24-10).

Further, this member consistently earned above 60 percent of the vote in every election he contested. Thus, given the constancy of very favorable electoral circumstances, I anticipate
that Scalise’s behavior will remain the same throughout the study period. The data illustrate that his activities largely met my expectations.

That said, a more dimensional explanation of his district will now be proffered.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

*District Traits*

The map below indicates that Congressman Scalise represents a relatively suburban district (Louisiana’s First) in the Deep South. It is about 75 miles long by 50 miles wide, at its longest and widest points, and has Lake Pontchartrain at its center.

Government and service jobs are very abundant, as 21.8 percent of the labor force works in education services, healthcare and social assistance. Table A indicates that 12.1 percent of residents work in retail and 10.6 percent are employed in professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services.

The median household income of $51,240 is only a few hundred dollars less than the nation’s average. The percentage of families below poverty level is 9.6 percent, compared to 9.9 percent for the country. Finally, 28.8 percent of residents have a B.A. or higher, compared to a national mean of 27.5 percent.

The district has a large proportion of two particular European ethnicities. A total of 19.4 percent of the population identify French roots, while 13.4 percent claim Italian heritage. These numbers are well above the national averages. The data illustrate that this district is largely Caucasian (75.6%).

Beyond these features, the intersection of energy, environmental, and disaster policy are major local issues.
First, Hurricane Katrina (in 2005) and Hurricane Gustav (in 2008) were natural disasters that hurt the region in a variety of ways (Times-Picayune 9-5-08, 7-3-10). Beyond natural disasters, the BP oil spill in 2010 had significant implications for the state.

Further, all three tragedies served as focusing events that brought attention to coastal erosion, the inadequacy of flood mitigation systems, as well as the fragility of local wildlife (Times-Picayune 10-15-09, 2-21-10, 12-1-10).

All three events also hurt the state’s ability to produce oil. According to Scalise, oil “plays a fundamental role in Louisiana's economy” (5-21-10, 6-7-10).

Thus, as will be revealed in the following pages, energy, environmental and disaster issues are connected and play a key role in Scalise’s story.

Table A
Census Data on the 1st District of Louisiana from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Traits</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$ 51,240</td>
<td>$ 51,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80
Families Below Poverty Level

9.6 % 9.9 %

**Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>21.8 %</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>10.6 %</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>12.1 %</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>38.5 %</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>75.6 %</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>28.8 %</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competitive Contexts**

Table A-1 shows that Steve Scalise represents one of the strongest Republican districts in the country; its citizens voted roughly 20 percent more Republican than the nation in the last three presidential elections. The New Orleans Times-Picayune declares it “one of the state's most reliable GOP-leaning districts” (2-12-08). It is no surprise then that Table A-1 also indicates that Scalise never once earned less than 66 percent of the vote.

The only general election contest that he competed in with any noticeable amount of competition came in November 2008 (New Orleans Times-Picayune 5-4-08, 8-16-08). Table A-1 indicates that Jim Harlan, Scalise’s Democratic challenger, spent over two million dollars in this race, far outraising the incumbent. Even so, the New Orleans Times-Picayune described this election in the following terms: “For all the money Democratic challenger Jim Harlan is throwing at incumbent Republican Steve Scalise, it's hard to find any experts who think a
Democrat can win” (10-26-08). Those experts were correct; Scalise took two-thirds of all votes cast on Election Day (Table A-1). Otherwise, his opponents spent little money challenging this member.

Accordingly, when the Times-Picayune calls the district “heavily Republican,” they are not exaggerating (7-10-10). We now move to lay out Scalise’s story in more detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Scalise Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$1,168,588</td>
<td>Gilda Reed</td>
<td>$148,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Election</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$759,682</td>
<td>Jim Harlan</td>
<td>$2,158,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>$1,077,473</td>
<td>Myron Katz</td>
<td>$60,708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Home Style Overview

Tables A-2 through A-5 illustrate the emphasis that Scalise places on Louisiana. Since this local focus is the most prominent feature of his home style, I will start to unpack his behavior by first discussing the attention he gives to his district and state by focusing on constituent-oriented activities. Next, his policy discourse will be revealed. Finally, I turn to his partisan and ideological rhetoric.

In total, Scalise circulated 312 press releases and 12 franked documents between 2008 and 2011 (Tables A-2 and A-4). The analysis below is based on an examination of these documents as well as information from Scalise’s official and campaign websites and coverage in the New Orleans Times-Picayune.
That said, we now turn our attention to Scalise’s concern for Louisiana’s interests.

Table A-2
Steve Scalise’s Press Releases
Entire Program Period                   N = 312 Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 312, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.

Table A-3
Steve Scalise’s Press Releases
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed       N= 257 Press Releases That Address Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Policy</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Policy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-4
Steve Scalise’s Franked Materials
Entire Program Period                   N = 12 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-5  
Steve Scalise’s Franked Materials  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Public Policy Issues Addressed</th>
<th>N= 8 Franked Documents That Address Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Rep. Steve Scalise, being a locally oriented member of Congress, was found often in his district. Table A-4 indicates that 83 percent of franked materials portray Scalise at home. Also, Table A-2 illustrates that over one in ten press releases show the member in the district.

In addition, social media display Scalise’s presence at home. For example, consider, “Scalise and experts from a number of agencies will be available to help teach children about health, education and safety issues” (Facebook 3-6-09). Facebook also makes known that Scalise is “Attending Tea Parties in Hammond, Covington, and Metairie today” (Facebook 4-15-09).

Further, the Times-Picayune frequently chronicles Scalise at home. A representative exemplar of Scalise highlighting this home style feature includes, “…two Louisiana Republican House members will lead a group of their GOP colleagues on a tour of offshore drilling operations. ‘This will be an excellent opportunity to highlight how safe drilling is done offshore...”
and to see how important it is to lift the existing congressional moratorium on drilling on the rest of the Outer Continental Shelf,’ Rep. Steve Scalise, said” (8-17-08).

The paper also makes known that “U.S. Rep. Steve Scalise, R-Jefferson, will address graduates at Southeastern Louisiana University's spring commencement May 16…” (5-7-09). Further, this publication cites Scalise reporting, “Following this field hearing, I will host an oil spill town hall…” (6-5-10).

Moving to another home style trait, this legislator practices allocation representation zealously. Table A-2 indicates that 23 percent of press releases highlight allocation politics. Many newspaper articles also illustrate Scalise’s zeal to secure federal dollars for his state.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune prominently chronicles Scalise’s allocation activities. Consider, “A Department of Veterans Affairs authorization bill sets aside $625 million for construction of a new VA hospital in New Orleans...Rep. Steve Scalise, R-Jefferson, said. ‘Now we have the federal dollars authorized to move forward’” (5-25-08). Another example includes, “‘This funding will help local hospitals and providers become more financially stable so they can continue to provide services to the community,’ said Rep. Steve Scalise, R-Jefferson, who was one of several members of Louisiana's congressional delegation to laud the release of the money” (1-7-09). Also, regarding disaster relief, the paper reports, “The city of Gretna, the Jefferson Parish public schools and the Sheriff's Office are slated to receive nearly $16.5 million in federal reimbursements for damages caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Gustav, U.S. Rep. Steve Scalise… recently announced” (1-31-10). Accordingly, Scalise often seeks financial rewards for his state, bolstering his locally oriented representational image.

Yet, despite being such a locally oriented official, service representation is simply not an important aspect of Scalise’s home style. Just five franked documents (Table A-4) and seven
press releases (Table A-2) highlight this aspect of his home style. Further, there is little to no evidence of this discourse in local newspapers.

Nevertheless, his focus on allocation politics and this legislator’s robust presence at home are indicative of a locally focused member of Congress.

B) Broad Policy Discourse

Scalise spends a great deal of time illustrating how national policy impacts Louisiana locally. Table A-2 illustrates that an overwhelming 67 percent of Scalise’s press releases illustrate the impact of national policy on the local level. Removing press releases that also portray allocation politics, 55 percent of press releases frame national policy in a local lens.

Table A-4 shows that three of the eight franked documents that discuss policy also highlight the effect of federal policies on his state or district. In addition, a great many newspaper articles highlight this activity. In particular and not surprisingly, Scalise’s focus on Louisiana concentrates on disaster relief and energy policy.

Given the number of serious Hurricanes to make landfall over Louisiana since 2005, it is easy to see why this issue is so important locally. Table A-3 indicates that 28 percent of press releases that address public policy consider disaster related issues. This makes it the most prominent policy concern that appears in his news releases.

The Times-Picayune also chronicles Scalise’s attention to disaster relief. For example, "‘St. Tammany suffered severe damage from Hurricane Gustav,’ Scalise said. ‘I have been fighting for this with FEMA since the storm hit . . . This will help the entire parish recover from the storm and get reimbursed for the work they have done’” (9-19-08). The paper also reports, “…Scalise…declare(d)…that his constituents deserved more than a ‘drive-through daiquiri
summit.’ The administration does not ‘fully grasp the changes that need to be made in the rebuilding of our region,’ Scalise said…” (10-14-09). Further, the Times-Picayune features Scalise lamenting, "Congress should work to pass the Gulf Coast Restoration Act…” (12-1-10).

The second policy area that Scalise often considers is energy. This focus is logical since he described Louisiana as an “energy producing” state (New Orleans Times-Picayune 7-3-08). Table A-3 indicates that 23 percent of policy related press releases address energy issues. Further, Table A-5 illustrates that 38 percent of franked materials emphasize this policy area.

The Times-Picayune chronicles this member addressing energy policy throughout his tenure. A typical statement from Scalise discussing this topic includes, “U.S. Rep. Steve Scalise will hold town hall meetings today in Mandeville and Gretna, and the main topic of discussion will be a plan for lowering gas prices” (6-14-08). On his appointment to the Energy and Commerce Committee, Scalise is quoted extolling “Developing a strong comprehensive national energy policy … will help create good jobs in Louisiana” (1-18-09). Also on this important local topic, the paper makes known, “Scalise said he finds the legislation ‘devastating’ and wants to introduce his own energy bill to protect the economy and recognize the natural resources of Louisiana's energy industry” (5-3-09). Finally, this publication reports, "While we're focused on safety, we need to also make sure radical environmentalists, like those behind the 'cap and trade' energy tax, are not able to make policies that will be harmful to Southeast Louisiana's economy…”(10-14-09 B).

It is interesting to note that Scalise’s dialog often combines these two policy issues, a focus which is understandable as hurricanes greatly damaged the state’s offshore drilling operation. Consider, “Scalise said he would file the Grow American Supply, or GAS, Act to end a ban on oil and gas production in regions of the Outer Continental Shelf… The bill would also
give Louisiana a greater slice of profits from any oil and gas reserves unearthed beyond its shores, a move Scalise said could provide ‘hundreds of millions of dollars’ for coastal restoration and flood protection” (Times-Picayune 7-3-08).

Similarly, the BP Oil Spill sparked Scalise to address disaster relief and energy policy. His dialog also illustrates the intersection of these two issues with environmental policy. The member illustrated his concern for his state in the following terms: “Scalise is one of the most outspoken critics of the Obama administration's response to the BP oil spill, and he has been particularly vocal about the economic harm he says the administration's six-month [drilling] moratorium has caused Louisiana” (Times-Picayune 6-30-10).

Thus, by addressing these two policy areas, Scalise continues to illustrate that he is a fighter for the State of Louisiana, and as explained in the introduction, his district.

On substantive policy concerns, regardless of the local or national presentation of issues, Scalise’s conservatism is extremely prominent. We now explore his partisan and ideological rhetoric.

C) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Louisiana is clearly a conservative state that reliably votes Republican.1 Further, we have already explained in the section on competitive contexts that Scalise’s district has consistently supported GOP candidates. To reinforce this point once more, the Times-Picayune branded the district, “highly conservative and heavily Republican” (9-24-10). Therefore, since the voting patterns of the state and the district are so similar, it should come as no surprise that this member of Congress is highly ideological and rather partisan.

1 As of this writing, all but one statewide official and member of Congress are Republicans.
Given that Scalise is more ideological than partisan, we will first address his conservatism, an ideology which is a chief characteristic of his home style. Table A-2 indicates that 12 percent of press releases contain ideological statements. Newspaper articles and other website data strongly highlight this feature of his persona.

Campaign website data revealing his conservative brand includes, “there is a new era of conservative reform sweeping across the state. Steve Scalise has led the fight for this reform movement” (1-1-08). Also, his 2010 campaign slogan was “Conservative Leadership. Real Results” (1-1-10). His government website declared, “Scalise is known as a staunch conservative who advocates for…conservative principles…” (8-28-08, 5-12-09, 4-6-11).

Newspaper also reveal his conservative nature. For example, in his initial race, the Times-Picayune declares, “Scalise… looked to position himself as the race's sole champion of conservative values” (3-1-08). Other newspaper evidence illustrating his conservative credentials includes Scalise arguing, "I will be working to support and promote conservative policies…in Washington" (1-9-09) and “Like many of his fellow Louisiana Republicans, 1st District U.S. Rep. Steve Scalise lines up issue for issue with hard-line conservatives” (1-6-11).

Much less conspicuously than ideology, Scalise often indicates his party in the Times-Picayune and web sources. An example of his partisan language includes Scalise claiming, “As we begin this new Congress, I am honored to join Congressman Cantor and the Republican leadership team…” (Times-Picayune 1-9-09). Further, the Times-Picayune described Scalise as, “one of the House's most loyal Republicans, voting with his party's majority 98 percent of the time in 2009” (2-21-10). A government website snapshot taken on 4-6-11, identifies his position as an Assistant Republican Whip.
Accordingly, ideology and partisanship are noticeable aspects of Scalise’s home style. Since Scalise is so staunchly conservative, he is lucky to have found a constituency in which to project his own ideological beliefs.

D) Overall Assessment of Home Style

Since Scalise is in a non-competitive situation, if the literature that this project tests is correct, he should eschew constituent-oriented activities, address policy in a national veneer, and place a premium on partisanship and ideological polarization.

Scalise practices allocation politics prolifically, working particularly hard to secure disaster relief funding for his state. He is also at home very often. Yet, he does not highlight service representation meaningfully. Thus, despite the literature, Scalise practices more constituent-oriented activities than he ignores.

Concerning policy, by and large, this member frames policy in a local veneer. Thus, despite the literature that this project tests suggesting otherwise, Scalise is a legislator that spends a great deal of time connecting federal policy to his constituents.

Finally, Scalise robustly highlights his conservative ideology and partisan affiliation. Thus, in this instance, the literature that this project tests is supported. Indeed, this legislator, who is in a noncompetitive situation, is a robust partisan and a strong ideologue.

On the whole, Scalise is a locally oriented legislator who fights for his constituents. He is at home often connecting with voters and works hard to secure funding for those he represents. He also concentrates on issues of local import and frames the impact of policy in a local veneer. Finally, he highlights his conservative ideology and Republican affiliation regularly. These
convictions mirror the ideological and partisan predilections of his district. Thus, on the whole, Scalise is a very locally oriented legislator who fights for Louisiana.

**Home Style Changes**

Since Scalise represents a strongly Republican district and always enjoyed comfortable election results, I expect his behavior to remain constant over the study period.

Since his electoral results were stable, I compared Scalise’s behavior in the first half of his tenure (5-1-08 to 12-31-09) to his actions in the second half of the program period (1-1-10 to 4-25-11). I believe this method is the most fruitful way to evaluate the home styles of those whose competitive situations remained the same over time. Cutting the program period in two allows us to focus on the most significant aspects of a legislator’s conduct that changed.

The results below illustrate that Scalise largely met expectations. He varied his behavior in very few areas. Further, as will be explained, none of the ways he altered his behavior changed the main feature of his home style. Throughout his tenure, Scalise was a local advocate.

That said, there were some minor changes in his home style. Following the table below, changes in his policy discourse will be discussed. Then, I will highlight alterations in his bipartisan and partisan rhetoric, before furnishing readers with an overall assessment of his representational persona.

I present and discuss what I believe are the most significant changes in this member’s home style first, and the least noteworthy shifts last. Thus, behavioral variations are presented in order of importance, as determined by the author.
Table A-6
Steve Scalise’s Press Releases
Major Shifts Over Time  N = 312 Unless Otherwise Noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipartisan and Partisan Activities</th>
<th>5/1/08 to 12/31/09 N</th>
<th>5/1/08 to 12/31/09 Mean</th>
<th>1/1/10 to 4/25/11 N</th>
<th>1/1/10 to 4/25/11 Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Issues Addressed</th>
<th>5/1/08 to 12/31/09 N</th>
<th>5/1/08 to 12/31/09 Mean</th>
<th>1/1/10 to 4/25/11 N</th>
<th>1/1/10 to 4/25/11 Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Resource Policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alterations in Policy Discourse

Consideration of unemployment policy skyrocketed in 2010. It was discussed in just four percent of press releases in the first half of his tenure, but was emphasized in 23% of news releases in the second (Table A-6).

First, this behavioral modification may be related to the economic crisis. Members of Congress had no choice but to focus on economic issues after the crash in 2008.

This shift may also be related to power politics. It is clear that from 2008 to 2011, Democrats in power were not able to mitigate the unemployment problem facing the nation. Thus, addressing this area in press releases appears to highlight an issue that was popular for Republicans in 2010. This is not connected to his own competitive context, but to a potent national issue that benefitted the GOP throughout the nation in that midterm election.

Finally, unemployment may have been emphasized to push his district’s conservative voters to the polls in order to re-elect a scandal plagued David Vitter to the U.S. Senate in
Thus, stressing this issue was not related to his own competitive situation, but possibly, to his party’s. While this explanation is pure speculation, it should not be entirely discounted.

Beyond unemployment, discussion of environmental policy escalated during the second half of his tenure. Table A-6 indicates that just four percent of press releases addressed this issue in 2008 and 2009, while 21 percent did so in 2010 and 2011. This is understandable as the BP oil spill occurred in 2010, which had significant environmental ramifications for Louisiana. Thus, since this disaster was located off the coast of his state, Scalise addressing this policy area more often during the second half of the study is understandable.

As such, changes in his focus on two policy areas are not related to alterations in electoral competition, but to issues that became very prominent during his time in office. First, he discussed unemployment in a conservative lens. Second, he focused on environmental policy following a major local disaster.

Consequently, there were few changes in his policy dialog. Also, very importantly, those two changes reinforced his local focus.

**Shifts in Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric**

Next, press release data suggest that in the second half of Scalise’s tenure, he increased bipartisan statements. His bipartisan statements in news releases escalated from being present in four percent between 2008 and 2009, to 14 percent between 2010 and 2011. His bipartisan assertions were often related to issues particularly important to Louisiana, especially policies linked to the 2010 oil spill. Accordingly, Scalise portrayed willingness to work across the aisle on policies that had a disproportionate impact on his state.
As such, I believe that most of the partisan and bipartisan shifts in his behavior are linked to a local disaster and Scalise’s readiness to work across the aisle to assist his state following this event. This, once again, stresses his local focus.

*Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes*

Two things are important to note. First, on the whole, Scalise’s behavior changed very little over time.

Second, when he altered his behavior, he did so in a manner that was not related to electoral competition. Unemployment was an important national issue that he framed in conservative terms. Further, a local disaster likely stimulated his discussion of environmental policy later in his career, which came along with a newly found interest in bipartisanship. It is not out of the realm of possibility that bipartisan dialog may have increased in order to help constituents recover from the BP oil spill.

Thus, throughout his tenure, Scalise was a locally focused member of Congress who worked to meet the needs of his district.

*Concluding Discussion*

I argued that Scalise acted as a voice for the interests of Louisiana. He is at home often, seeks funding for his district and state frequently, frames policy implications locally, and personifies the dominant local ideology consistently. Thus, a strong local focus characterizes virtually every aspect of his behavior.
The few changes in his home style appear to be related to his advocacy for his state. Following the Gulf Coast oil spill in 2010, he indicated that he was willing to work across party lines to help Louisiana recover.

Further, the few changes he made are not related to electoral competition, but to other circumstances as elaborated on in the above text.

Thus, Scalise met expectations. Over time, his home style was largely consistent. Even when he changed his activities, he did so in a way that reinforced the overarching feature of his representational persona.

**Rep. Michael Capuano – Playing Politics at the National and Local Levels**

“Like most members of Congress, Michael Everett Capuano is almost famous. He plays politics at the national level, but is out of mind for almost anyone who does not live in his compact, Boston-anchored district… he is a blend of traditional urban Democratic orthodoxy, liberal social sensibilities, and the power politics practiced while mayor of Somerville for nine years” (Boston Globe 12-26-04).

Rep. Michael Capuano entered Congress following a special election in 1998 (Boston Globe 2-8-04). Born and raised in the area, he frequently illustrates his lifelong residence in Somerville. He chose a political career, serving as an alderman and a longtime local mayor (Campaign and Government Websites). While considering a run for Governor of Massachusetts in 2006, he was described as, “a hard-charging city guy who's a little rough around the edges” and described himself as a "'city guy at heart’ … ‘You poke me in the eye, I'll hit you in the mouth’" (Boston Globe 12-26-04). Capuano’s upbringing and local roots figure prominently into his representational style.

That said, as the quote at the beginning of this section makes clear, Capuano plays politics at the local and national levels. Nationally, he is well known as an expert on the Sudanese genocide. He dedicates a large portion of his policy dialog to this issue.
Locally, he often underscores issues that are important to constituents. Further, he is often found at home meeting with voters. This legislator habitually seeks federal funding for important local needs, particularly urban transportation projects that have a significant impact on the municipalities this legislator represents. Simply, Capuano looks after his district.

Also, Capuano is a staunch progressive. His progressive ideology is apparent in his policy discourse and in his ideological portrayal.

Beyond Capuano himself, as will be explained more in the following pages, his geographically compact district includes parts of Boston and surrounding areas, including Cambridge, the home of Harvard University. It is one of the most liberal districts in the United States. It is not surprising then that this urban constituency is so reliably Democratic that a Republican opponent did not challenge Capuano from 2002 through 2010.

Given that his electoral circumstances remained constant, I expect little change in this member’s behavior over time.

As we shall see, this is not always the case. There are more variations in the member’s home style than we might expect given his electoral safety. Because some of these changes can be attributed to Capuano’s attempts at seeking higher office, I speculate that this legislator altered his home style based on anticipated as well as actual changes in levels of competition. Thus, this discussion of Capuano’s behavior will clarify that even in extraordinarily safe electoral environments, competition still matters.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

*District Traits*
As the map below indicates, the district is so irregularly shaped that it is difficult to furnish readers with actual dimensions of its true size. However, we can agree that it is geographically tiny. To illustrate just how small it is, the scale to measure its dimensions is just 10 miles long, the smallest of any district in the study. Accordingly, the map makes clear that Capuano represents a very urban environment.

The district includes roughly 70 percent of Boston, the state capitol, and his home of Somerville. Further, he also represents Cambridge, Massachusetts and highlights that the district contains Harvard University (Capuano Government Website). Capuano also noted in 2007 that one in five Nobel Prize winners lived or worked in his district at some point in their lives (Capuano Government Website). The district also includes Logan Airport.

Given this information, it comes as no surprise that over 46 percent of the population earned at least a baccalaureate degree, greatly higher than the national mean. Further, since 30.8 years is the median age in the district, residents are younger than the nation as a whole (Table B).

Education, government and service jobs are very abundant, as 31 percent of residents work in education services, healthcare and social assistance. Also, 16.3 percent are public administrators.

That said, this constituency is a textbook example of a heavily liberal area. It is an urban, highly educated constituency, with many government workers, and an abundant supply of young people. It is no surprise then that Capuano’s policy positions and ideological focus are so thoroughly progressive.

We will now turn to a larger discussion of the partisan and ideological leanings of Capuano’s liberal district, while I explain his competitive circumstances.
Table B
Census Data on the 8th District of Massachusetts
from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

**Economic Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$ 51,757</td>
<td>$ 51,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Competitive Contexts

As the PVI scores in Table B-1 below show, Capuano represents one of the most well-established Democratic districts in the country. Its residents voted over 30 percent more Democratic than the nation in three consecutive presidential elections.

Table B-1 also indicates that no Republican opposed Capuano during the period under study. In fact, he only encountered a challenger in 2006, when he received 91 percent of the vote running against a Socialist Worker’s Party nominee.

Finally, the campaign finance data in Table B-1 make clear that Capuano was able to raise large amounts of money, even in this very safe electoral environment. Thus, this legislator could serve in Congress as long as he desires.

However, this member’s story is more complicated. Electoral ambition, if not re-election circumstances, likely influenced this representative’s behavior. Capuano publicly deliberated on pursuing the Democratic nomination for Governor of Massachusetts in 2006 (Boston Globe 1-8-05). Further, he sought the Democratic Party nomination for United States Senate during a 2009 special election. While he decided against seeking the governor’s office, and was unsuccessful in the Senate primary, I argue that, more than one might expect, these events must be accounted for in understanding his home style.

Most importantly, despite deliberating about and then actually seeking higher office, Capuano cared about those he represented and concentrated on constituent-oriented activities. He was a progressive champion who concentrated on issues important to constituents while also
engaging in a national dialog on particular policy concerns. That said, we now turn to a fuller explanation of his home style.

### Table B-1

**Michael Capuano Election Results and Campaign Finance Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Capuano Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$448,947</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$953,347</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>$626,800</td>
<td>Laura Garza</td>
<td>No FEC Report Filed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,087,339</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,939,043</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Massachusetts’ 8th District Partisan Voter Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D+33</td>
<td>D+32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Home Style Overview

Tables B-2 through B-4 furnish readers with an overview of Capuano’s home style activities by outlining how he presents himself in the 169 press releases and 42 franked documents that he circulated.

In addition, the Boston Globe was used as a data source to observe Capuano’s image in local papers. Further, his government and campaign websites and social media tools were analyzed.

As already outlined above, Capuano plays politics at the local and national levels. Thus, after Tables B-2 through B-4, I will begin to develop Capuano’s case study by explaining his constituent-oriented activities. Next, I will present his policy dialog, which is often nationally framed. Finally, I will turn to his partisan and ideological rhetoric where his progressive ideology will be chronicled.
### Table B-2

**Michael Capuano’s Press Releases**

**Entire Program Period**  
*N = 169 Press Releases*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 155, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.

### Table B-3

**Michael Capuano’s Press Releases**

**Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period**  
*N=155 Press Releases That Address Public Policy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Policy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Policy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B-4

**Michael Capuano’s Franked Materials**

**Entire Program Period**  
*N = 42 Franked Documents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Lens*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Portraying National Policy
Impact on the Local Level*
Indicates Own Party 12 92%
Makes Partisan Statement 9 21%
Indicates Own Ideology 5 12%
* This percentage is calculated out of 13, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy.

A) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Since I argue that Capuano highlights his roots in the district regularly, thus playing politics at the local level, it is logical to begin with explaining this member’s presence at home. A variety of data sources portray Capuano in the district frequently.

An overwhelming 88 percent of franked materials announce or discuss town hall meetings featuring Rep. Capuano (Table B-4). Further, a great deal of coverage in the Boston Globe portrays a member of Congress who is in his district often.

The paper consistently chronicles his attendance at local functions. For example, consider, “Senator Ted Kennedy and Congressman Mike Capuano were at the Schepens Eye Research Institute of Boston yesterday…”(4-15-03). Another example of this member at a local event includes “… US Representative Michael E. Capuano broke ground yesterday at a new home in Jamaica Plain for Community Servings, which provides free, home-delivered meals for the critically ill” (10-11-06). Finally, when Congress was out of session, Capuano made known that “there was ‘no way’ he was spending the congressional recess in Washington” (2-10-10).

Accordingly, the data taken as a whole indicate that Capuano is often found at home meeting with voters. The congressman’s presence in the district highlights his strong local connection.
Capuano’s allocation activities are presented similarly to his presence at home. Newspaper articles and website data (other than press releases) routinely illustrate him securing federal money for his district.

To chronicle Capuano’s enthusiasm for obtaining federal dollars, the Boston Globe reports, “Several Massachusetts House members do prominently display their earmark requests [on congressional websites]… ‘I'm proud of mine,’ said Capuano, the Somerville Democrat whose earmark requests - all 90 of them, totaling $271 million - are listed under the headline ‘Transparency’” (7-12-10). Regarding GOP plans to end earmarks, Rep. Capuano asserted, “I think it's a horrendous decision...as long as they're public, people can see it. I have no problem with that” (Boston Globe 11-12-10).

Sources also present this legislator’s efforts to secure funds for significant municipal transportation projects, an important issue in his urban constituency. Consider, “Representative Michael Capuano brought home the bacon with a $1 million Economic Development Administration grant, to help renovate East Boston's shipyard” (10-20-02). Regarding a major transportation bill, Capuano’s government website reveals that he “is fighting to protect Massachusetts' share of federal transportation dollars as the debate over funding levels for the ‘Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users’ continues” (Government Website 3-3-05). On an important local endeavor, “… Capuano has also announced that he has secured $1 million in the US House transportation bill to extend the path all the way to the North Point Development in Cambridge” (5-1-05). Also, to illustrate his commitment to different types of local transportation, this member “… secured authorization for $25 million in federal funds for the [railroad] stop” (2-13-11). Thus, several sources consistently exhibit Capuano obtaining federal monies, stressing his focus on meeting the needs of his constituents.
Unlike the other two constituent-oriented activities under study, service representation is simply not a substantial property of Rep. Capuano’s home style. Tables B-2 and B-4 indicate that only two percent of press releases and franked documents highlight this activity and other data sources utilized do not address this topic in any meaningful way.

That said, it is clear that franked documents, government websites, and local newspapers indicate that this member is present at home frequently and engages in allocation politics regularly. Therefore, concentrating on these two activities is indicative of a legislator that meets the needs of constituents.

B) Broad Policy Discourse

Table B-2 reveals that 63 percent of these press releases illustrate Capuano framing issues in a solely national lens, compared to 35 percent that specify how federal policies impact his district locally (Table B-2). Removing those press releases that also portray this member practicing allocation politics, 67 percent of press releases portray Capuano highlighting policy in a national lens, while just 31 percent present him discussing the impact of national policy on his district.

That said, 12 out of 13 franked documents that discuss policy, illustrate how federal policy affects the local level (Table B-4).

First, Capuano concentrates on several issues of local import. Capuano focuses on transportation policy and finance policy a great deal. In total, 17 percent of press releases focus on the former, while 10 percent address the latter (Table B-2). He also spends a great deal of time highlighting how these two issues impact his urban district in other data sources.
More precisely, finance is an important concern in his district as 8.6 percent of constituents are employed in finance, insurance and real estate (Census Data). Also, Capuano highlighted how important the topic is in his 1-5-04 franked piece referring to “Boston’s finance industry.”

Beyond finance, transportation issues are prominent to voters. Capuano revealed, "… my district has South Station, Logan Airport, the Big Dig, and Boston Harbor, as well as most of the city's mass transit…” (Boston Globe 6-28-02). Thus, the evidence emphasizes the importance of these two issues in the congressman’s district. It also clarifies why these policy areas are important locally.

Of these two, he focused on transportation policy most frequently, when all sources are considered. Beyond press releases, 92 percent of franked materials that address policy underscored this issue area (Table B-3), and the Boston Globe consistently chronicled Capuano's attention to this concern.

The Boston Globe reported, “US Representative Michael E. Capuano yesterday asked the inspector general of the US Department of Transportation to investigate the $1.6 billion in construction cost overruns that have sent the Big Dig's budget skyrocketing in recent years” (2-13-03). Fighting for his local airport, “…Capuano… asked FAA Administrator Marion C. Blakey why the more advanced safety system wasn't being installed at busier airports such as Logan” (11-3-05). Also regarding Logan, the Globe reports, “The FAA is pretty big, Massport is pretty big, and I don't know who to specifically point the finger at, but I do know that this noise was not fairly managed through any process that involved the public,’…US Representative Michael E. Capuano said…” (5-8-08). Further, highlighting the intersection of this issue with allocation representation, this paper quotes Capuano asserting, “In Congress, I've also won
record federal funding for transportation projects” (11-3-09). Thus, Capuano addresses transportation policy consistently throughout the study period in a way that illustrates the impact of federal policy on his district.

Capuano’s policy discourse is also indicative of a legislator who engages in politics at the national level. In particular, he emphasizes foreign policy issues.

Table B-3 reveals that 25 percent of the legislator’s press releases address foreign policy, the most of any issue he discusses. This is largely, but not exclusively due to his service as chair of the Congressional Sudan Caucus. As such, many of the congressman’s press releases address American foreign policy towards the Sudan.

The Boston Globe often features Capuano’s discourse on foreign policy, framed in a national lens. Consider, “…The question is whether this is the time or the place to commit American troops to the first preemptive strike in the nation's history…” (10-3-02). Regarding Sudan, the paper reports that this member “who is cochairman of the Congressional Caucus on Sudan, said he would try to redirect $50 million of that Darfur aid appropriation awaiting Senate approval to increase US-funded food aid” (4-29-06). Regarding the Iraq War, the paper published, “Bush could end up getting exactly what he wants - money for war, minus any conditions. That's one possibility cited by US Representative Michael Capuano of Massachusetts, a war opponent who supports immediate withdrawal of troops from Iraq” (5-6-07).

Thus, his policy conversation clearly shows that he plays politics on the local and national levels. His rich policy discourse illustrates the care and attention he gives his constituents, and also reveals an expert on foreign policy. What is also clear from these
conversations is that Capuano is a progressive legislator. We now explore his ideology and partisan dialog in greater detail.

C) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Michael Capuano portrays his Democratic Party affiliation and progressive ideology regularly. Given the strongly liberal and Democratic character of the district as explained in Table B-1, it should not come as a surprise that these are notable features of this legislator’s behavior.

Capuano frequently makes partisan statements, indicates party positions, and/or discloses his Democratic affiliation. Table B-2 illustrates that Capuano reveals his partisan affiliation in 32 percent and makes partisan statements in seven percent of press releases. Further, he identifies his own party in 21 percent and makes partisan statements in 12 percent of franked materials (Table B-4). Newspaper articles also exhibit this member’s party positions and chronicle many of Capuano’s partisan statements.

Boston Globe articles illustrating the congressman’s partisanship include Capuano suggesting, “I understand where some good Democrats would agree with me on everything but this and I want them in the party” (5-4-05). The paper reveals, “Capuano is a member of the Steering and Policy Committee, which decides committee assignments and the Democratic agenda…”(11-1-06). The Globe also reports, “Representative Michael Capuano... believes Republicans are playing unfairly. ‘We either have to give Republicans everything they want or they'll take their ball and go home? Well, go home then,’ he said” (9-14-10). Thus, Capuano highlights his partisan activities often; however, his ideological portrayal is presented differently.
Tables B-2 and B-4 show that Capuano never stresses ideology in his franked materials and press releases; however, newspaper articles and campaign websites display this member’s liberal brand as regularly as his partisanship. The Boston Globe makes known that, “Representative Michael J. Capuano …Says… ‘We need more people who think like us’ as in, progressive liberals…” (1-15-06). The Boston Globe cites Capuano asserting “…I'm very proud to say it, even with the cameras here, I'm a liberal,’ Capuano said to applause…” (10-13-09). He also defends his fellow liberals, insisting, ”The allegation or implication that progressives are antibusiness is both wrong and offensive, [Capuano] said” (1-25-11). On 1-8-05, the Boston Globe described Capuano as “a hard-edged urban populist from Somerville with liberal social views.” Capuano’s 2010 campaign website declares, “I've represented the 8th district of Massachusetts for six terms and have a strong record of standing up for progressive beliefs in Congress.” Thus, newspaper articles and web sources continue to illustrate this member’s liberal beliefs.

Accordingly, party and ideology are meaningful features of Rep. Capuano’s home style. Given the district’s progressive DNA and strongly Democratic voting record, this persona is logical.

D) Overall Assessment of Home Style

Capuano represents a safe district and is perpetually re-elected by wide margins. Therefore, if the literature that this project tests is correct, he should ignore constituent-oriented activities, frame policy in a national lens often, and embrace partisan and ideological discourse.

Capuano’s behavior largely does not support the literature being tested that addresses constituent-oriented activities. This legislator is home often and practices allocation politics.
prolifically. Yet, he also does not engage in service representation. Thus, his activities suggest that members of Congress in safer electoral circumstances go home often and also work to secure funding for their districts.

Regarding his policy dialog, most of his conversation is framed in national terms. Press releases in particular frame policy in this manner. His discourse in newspapers is more mixed between framing issues in a national frame and a local lens. Finally, his franked materials are mostly framed in a local veneer. Thus, there is mixed support for the literature that this project tests.

Finally, Capuano is highly partisan and strongly ideological. Thus, there is support for the literature tested by hypotheses. Lack of electoral competition appears to stimulate these activities.

Thus, on the whole, Capuano cares about his constituents. He appears at home regularly, seeks funding often, and concentrates on issues of local import. Yet, he also engages in a robust foreign policy dialog at the national level. Finally, he is a robust partisan and a staunch progressive.

Home Style Changes

To assess the member’s home style changes, I compared Capuano’s activities in the first half of the study period (2002 to 2006) to his behavior in the second half (2007 to 2011).

Since he represents a strongly Democratic district and he consistently enjoys comfortable electoral margins, I expect, based on the congressman’s continual electoral safety, that his actions should have remained the same over time. As will be explained below, despite considerable stability in much of the representative’s behavior, the legislator altered his home
style more than I might have anticipated based on hypotheses highlighting the role of competition.

First, I describe shifts in his policy conversation, including the national and local focus of the legislator’s policy dialog, as well as alterations in the frequency of which he addresses certain issue areas. Then, I move to his partisan identification.

### Table B-5
**Michael Capuano’s Press Releases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Shifts Over Time</th>
<th>N=169 Unless Otherwise Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National and Local Portrayal of Policy</strong></td>
<td>N=155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Issues Addressed</th>
<th>N=155</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Policy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Policy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipartisan and Partisan Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alterations in Policy Discourse

The largest change in Capuano’s behavior concerned the local and national balance of his policy dialog. The percentage of news releases containing solely national policy discourse escalated from 50 percent from 2002 through 2006 to 79 percent between 2007 and 2011 (Table B-5). Further, Table B-5 shows that during the first half of the study period, 44 percent of press
releases illustrated how national policy affected the Boston area; from 2007 to 2011, just 22 percent framed policy in this manner.

I believe that many of the member’s home style changes occurred due to his electoral ambitions and desire to attain higher office.

First, newspaper articles indicate that Rep. Capuano publicly considered seeking the Democratic nomination for Governor of Massachusetts in 2006, in the first half of the project period (Boston Globe 7-30-03, 12-26-04, 1-8-05). Also, he sought the Democratic Party nomination for U.S. Senate in a 2009 special election. The nature of each of these races likely altered the balance of his home style activities because he would represent a different set of constituents. Also, the timing of the contests is important to remember. He considered seeking the governorship during the first half of the project period and actually ran for the U.S. Senate during the second half. Therefore, he may have produced a more local focus while seeking the governorship, and a more national focus while pursuing a seat in the U.S. Senate.

First, I will discuss the gubernatorial race. Newspaper sources indicate that he deliberated on pursuing this office over a long period. He considered the race as early as 2003 and into 2005 (Boston Globe 7-30-03, 12-26-04, 1-8-05), during much of the first half of the study period. Since I argued that Capuano consistently reflected the wishes of his district, I speculate that he sought to represent not only his constituents, but those he wished to make his constituents. I assert that the member’s electoral ambition for this particular office caused him to frame issues more locally during this time frame.

Accordingly, through press releases, I propose that Capuano behaved more like a governor prior to 2006. More precisely, I claim that the majority of governors are often most concerned with policies that impact their states and that Capuano’s behavior fit this description
during this time frame. He wanted to be the governor, so he acted as he thought a governor of his state should. It is typical of the attention he pays to the wants and concerns of those he represents.

Similarly, I submit that he acted more like a U.S. Senator around 2009. Throughout this period, he regularly framed issues in a national lens. Justin Grimmer (2013), speaking of John Kerry and Ted Kennedy during their time representing Massachusetts in the U.S. Senate, observes that their “focus on national policy began with the statements and press releases from their offices, where both senators regularly expressed positions in policy debates” (4). Thus, there is evidence that U.S. Senators from Massachusetts engage in national political conversations regularly. Accordingly, I speculate that Capuano, in seeking to be the type of senator that he believed Massachusetts wanted, framed issues in a more national context during the second half of the study.

There is one important caveat to make. While he clearly changed the manner of how he frames policy, this does not truly change the overarching nature of his home style: throughout his tenure he played politics at the local and national levels.

Moving on, the degree to which Capuano spoke about certain policy areas also changed. However, while the data above indicate that he framed issues in a national context most often, two of the items he discussed regularly were prominent local issues. Therefore, the policy concerns addressed below have a significant impact on his constituents.

Finance policy, again a prominent local concern, was addressed in just six percent of press releases during the first half of the program period (Table B-5). Thirty percent of news releases highlighted this topic from 2007 through 2011. This shift is likely not related to the competitive context of his seat. As Capuano was a member of the House Committee on Financial
Services during the world financial collapse in 2008, this change was likely due to the economic breakdown of the country. The economic crisis obviously had a strong local impact given the Boston area’s robust financial sector.

It is also significant to note that there was even more dialog on transportation policy in the second half of the study period (Table B-5). Press releases addressing this issue also increased from 19 percent in the first half of the study to 27 percent in the second half. This is another prominent local matter that Capuano paid more attention to over time.

His discussion of housing policy, on the other hand, which he identified as a prominent local concern, greatly decreased (Franked Documents 2-29-02, 6-25-02, 1-7-03). Table B-5 reveals that Capuano’s conversation on this issue plummeted to being nonexistent in press releases during the second half of the study. This is a 15 percent variation from the first half of the project period.

Thus, he paid more attention to two locally important policy issues, finance and transportation, from 2007 to 2011. During the same time frame, he totally ignored housing policy in press releases, which is an issue significant to the representative’s voters. Therefore, even when he was becoming more nationally oriented in his appearance in this medium, Capuano reinforced his connection to constituents by addressing two prominent local policy concerns. As such, again, on the whole, he played politics at the national and local levels.

**Changes in Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric**

Table B-5 illustrates that Capuano revealed his Democratic affiliation less often in press releases over time. Thirty-eight percent of these documents highlighted partisanship from 2002 through 2006, while 14 percent did so between 2007 and 2011.
I cannot find any explanation for this activity given the ease of his re-election, along with the fact that Capuano’s district is heavily Democratic. Further, as I have already explained his ambitions at seeking statewide office in arguably one of the most Democratic and liberal states in the nation, I can only speculate that he viewed his reliably Democratic state as less Democratic than his district. Therefore, while he still exhibited his partisan affiliation frequently, he did so less often.

*Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes*

The data above clearly illustrate that Capuano’s presentation of home style activities shifted more than originally predicted. That said, I take away three observations from the nature of these changes.

First, the project set out to focus solely on the competitive context taking place within a congressional district. Despite the continuing electoral safety that Capuano enjoyed, we see that his home style underwent significant changes. Capuano’s competitive circumstances seemed to have mattered, but in a somewhat different way than originally anticipated. He clearly took a broader view of his electoral circumstances, anticipating the needs of potential future constituents.

The data suggest that he changed home style presentations when he considered seeking a higher office and when he actually pursued one. This indicates that to truly understand how electoral competition influences home styles, we must not only appreciate what is occurring within a constituency, but also explore the extent to which a member has an eye towards seeking an office outside of its boundaries.
Accordingly, putting a broader spin on the meaning of the term electoral competition is necessary. Further, this more encompassing interpretation of competition indicates that it was a force fashioning this member’s home style.

Next, even though Capuano changed policy discourse and partisan activities, the chief feature of his home style was largely stable. Regardless of how he framed issues, he played politics at both the local and national levels. While he became more national in tone in the second half of his career, the legislator paid more attention to two issues of local import.

**Concluding Discussion**

As the case study makes clear, Michael Capuano can be found at home often and consistently works to ensure the district gets its share of federal funds. He concentrates on issues of local import, while also robustly engaging in discourse on foreign policy. Finally, he is a progressive partisan.

Did competition matter? Competition within his actual district did not; it did when considering a broader set of circumstances. Capuano worked to meet the expectations of a new set of constituents, in this case, voters from the entire State of Massachusetts. Those expectations were fashioned to each particular office he was seeking. He appeared to act as the governor he believed voters wanted when he considered seeking that position from 2003 to 2006, by often focusing on local concerns. He seemed to behave as the U.S. Senator he thought Massachusetts desired by framing issues in a national lens around the time he actually sought that seat in 2009.

Thus, a significant finding of this study suggests that Capuano consistently behaved in a manner that was acceptable to his actual—and sometimes prospective—constituents. Therefore,
competition fashioned his home style and explains most of the changes he made to his representational persona.

Chapter Conclusion

The case studies in this chapter revealed that a liberal Democrat from the Northeast and a conservative Republican from the South behave similarly. Most strikingly, each paid great attention to local priorities.

In an effort to address hypotheses and compare the two legislators in this chapter, based on the literature this project tests, I anticipated that both members of Congress would not dedicate a great deal of effort to constituent-oriented activities. In strong contrast to this literature, both legislators were featured at home regularly, particularly through franked materials and local news articles. Further, newspapers frequently highlighted each engaging in allocation representation with gusto. The only constituent-oriented home style dimension that both members did not engage in was service representation.

Regarding policy discourse, there were similarities and differences. Based on the literature that I test, I expected both members of Congress to frame the impact of policy in national terms more often than in a local frame. Capuano somewhat met this expectation, while Scalise did not.

That said, both legislators concentrated on issues of import to constituents. Scalise focused on issues that were potent to voters such as disaster relief and energy. Capuano discussed transportation and finance issues regularly, which are important local concerns. Yet, he also spent a great deal of time on foreign policy.

Thus, after a deeper analysis, it is clear that both representatives, regardless of how they framed policy, addressed issues that were prominent to residents frequently. This is a significant
finding since it gives credence to more research on the question of whether the nature of how legislators frame policy may not be as important as the particular issues on which public officials concentrate.

Finally, in line with expectations from the literature that I test, both representatives placed a premium on partisanship and ideological displays. Capuano is a staunch liberal who is proud of his Democratic Party affiliation. Scalise highlights both his GOP affiliation and his conservative values. Of the two, Scalise places even greater emphasis on his right-wing ideology than his Republican affiliation. Thus, in this regard, their behavior suggests that legislators in safe districts have leeway to display their partisan and ideological convictions. As such, both met expectations.

Regarding the stability of their home styles and the impact of competition on each of their representational images, Scalise’s home style was very stable throughout, while Capuano’s exhibited more changes than anticipated.

That said, on the whole, it should not be suggested that Capuano completely altered his image. Throughout his tenure he played politics at the local and national levels. Thus, the changes in his home style were at the margins.

Finally, and importantly, did electoral competition play a role in fashioning Capuano’s image, even if not in the manner envisioned by the author? Capuano’s electoral ambitions beyond his House seat did impact his representational image. His behavior illustrated that in order to understand how competition affects home style we must look beyond the political contexts within each congressperson’s district. This member shows that competition manifests itself in many places, including within an elected official’s own career goals. This may be the
most important finding of this chapter as it illustrates the richness of electoral competition and the complexity of how this phenomenon impacts congressional behavior.

We next turn to the story of a member, who like Capuano and Scalise, represents a district that should be safe for a legislator of her party; yet, she has never earned 60 percent of the vote. The story of Rep. Jean Schmidt of Ohio presents a unique example of the role of competition in our polity.

Chapter 5

Safe Districts and Unsafe Margins

Introduction

This chapter is organized somewhat differently than others since it presents information on only one legislator. The story of the sole U.S. Representative, serving more than one term, who perpetually earned less than 60 percent of the vote despite enjoying an overwhelming partisan advantage is chronicled in this section.

Rep. Jean Schmidt provides a unique contribution to the literature because of her exceptional circumstances. In particular, as will be elaborated on below, she illustrates how the quality of a candidate impacts the marginality of an election. Simply, as many of her controversial actions indicate, Schmidt is an anomaly. Her outspoken nature led her to make several notable mistakes in the ways she presented herself to constituents.

That said, Schmidt is a conservative advocate who stresses her local connection to her district. She focused on constituent-oriented activities, framed policy in a conservative lens in both local and national terms, and portrayed a robustly ideological and noticeably partisan persona.
Further, it appears that these continually competitive circumstances likely caused her to fortify the chief features of her home style. Not only did Schmidt face a series of competitive general elections, she also contended with a sequence of primary challengers. Interestingly, in 2008 and 2010, the candidates seeking to take the Republican nomination from her appeared to be more conservative than Schmidt.

As such, the complexity of her competitive circumstances may have been important in shaping her representational image.

We now learn more about Jean Schmidt’s home style, the author’s expectations regarding her behavior, and the legislator’s competitive circumstances.

**Rep. Jean Schmidt – A Conservative Advocate with Local Roots**

“‘The voters of the district responded the way they have so many times in the past - by sending a proven conservative to represent them in Congress,’ Schmidt said” (Cincinnati Enquirer 8-3-05).

“Schmidt...a... disciplined advocate for the people of her district” (Schmidt Government Website).

Rep. Jean Schmidt entered Congress in 2005 after a special election. The Cincinnati Enquirer described her in the following terms: “Teacher, mother, community volunteer…” (5-15-05). This article indicated that she served as a municipal official for ten years, and a state representative for four years. Schmidt then narrowly lost a GOP primary for a state senate seat in 2004, relinquishing her service in the state legislature.

Beyond holding public office, Schmidt has a track record serving in party and community positions. This legislator was an elected member of the Republican Central Committee of her county for over 30 years at the time of her first election to Congress (Cincinnati Enquirer 4-12-10). Further, Schmidt was the president of Right to Life of Greater Cincinnati when she was elected to the House (Cincinnati Enquirer 6-3-05).
Thus, Schmidt knows her community. She served this district as a local official and state legislator, and also held an elected political party position. Further, this legislator has a track record of standing up for conservative causes that are major national issues, particularly in the anti-abortion movement. As such, her conservative policy positions address both local and national concerns.

That said, Schmidt is a conservative advocate who routinely highlights her local roots. She was found in her district often, exhibited her GOP affiliation regularly, displayed her conservative credentials robustly, and discussed social and economic issues in conservative terms.

The district is an amalgamation of urban areas, including the east side of Cincinnati; wealthy suburban neighborhoods; and vast stretches of rural America (Cincinnati Enquirer 7-11-05). A local elected official observed that the constituency contains "From the richest to the poorest. And everything in between” (Cincinnati Enquirer 5-18-05). That said, the district is dominated by rural and suburban voters (Cincinnati Enquirer 6-12-05).

The same article notes that the constituency contains rich pockets of social conservatives, particularly in the rural areas, mixed with more socially moderate suburban Republicans. Yet, the Cincinnati Enquirer is clear that constituents are economically conservative despite differences on social issues (5-18-05). They also regularly vote for Republicans in presidential contests.

While this legislator is cut from the same conservative cloth as the majority of her constituents, Schmidt is an electoral anomaly in Congress. She was the only legislator (who was not a freshman) that consistently earned less than 60 percent of the vote while representing a district that strongly favored his or her own party. At the risk of being repetitive, this is
astounding given how congruous her conservative views are with her constituents’ positions and that she has strong roots in the district. Thus, Schmidt offers readers a unique story.

This chapter will also highlight how Schmidt managed to find herself in continuously competitive circumstances, not only in general elections, but also in primary contests.

That said, since she continuously faced close electoral margins regardless of underlying district partisanship that favors her party, if the literature that this project tests is correct, Schmidt should stress constituent-oriented activities, frame issues in a local lens, and emphasize bipartisanship and ideological centrism.

Further, given the constancy of her electoral circumstances, I expect that her home style will be stable throughout her tenure in office.

By and large, more aspects of her representational persona changed than anticipated. However, most of these behavioral variations, instead of greatly modifying her home style, only reinforced the central feature of her image.

Throughout this chapter, it is essential to keep in mind that Schmidt’s story defies political logic. The fact that she finds herself in constant electoral difficulties is stunning.

**District & Competitive Contexts**

*District Traits*

The Dayton Daily News tells readers, “The 2nd District is near Cincinnati. It stretches from the eastern edge of the city eastward, through affluent suburbs and then into rural areas” (2-20-08). The Cincinnati Enquirer notes that the urban and suburban areas in the western end of the district in and around Cincinnati make up just over half of the votes in the district (5-18-05).
Rural voters dominate the rest of the constituency. As the map below indicates, the district is about 100 miles wide by 45 miles long at its most extreme points.

Table C illustrates that the district is largely white, with 90.5 percent of voters identifying as Caucasian; is slightly more educated than the nation as a whole as over 32.4 percent of the population has a B.A. or higher; and the median age of residents is 37.9 years.

In terms of economics, 21.4 percent of constituents work in education services, and health care and social assistance; 15.1 percent of the labor force are employed in manufacturing; 11.9 percent work in professional, science and management, and administrative and waste management services; and 11.7 percent of residents are in retail.

Most importantly, these numbers reveal that a large subset of the population works in manufacturing. Given the decline of this industry in the past 20 years, it is not surprising that economic issues dominate the politics of Ohio’s Second District (Cincinnati Enquirer 5-18-05, 7-5-05). The Cincinnati Enquirer cites a local minister who observes, “‘This is a part of Ohio where it is always hard for people to find jobs,’ Johnson said. ‘People want to hear their candidates talk about what they are going to do to get the local economy going. Concerns over taxes and the long-term health of Social Security and Medicare also rank high with 2nd District voters’”(7-5-05).

This is largely because the western end of the district contains affluent Cincinnati suburbs, while rural and urban poverty plague the rest of the constituency. Consider, “From the gated subdivisions of million-dollar homes on its western fringe to the trailers and corrugated metal shacks that line dark hollows of Big Beaver Creek in Pike County a hundred miles to the east, Ohio's 2nd Congressional District is a place of stark contrasts” (Cincinnati Enquirer 5-18-
This same article notes that five of the seven counties are classified by the federal government as part of Appalachia.

Thus, economic factors, for very different reasons, play a prominent role. I speculate that in the two suburban counties, conservative economic policies appear to be thought of as a means of staying affluent. I believe in the other parts of the district, conservative economic positions are viewed as a ticket out of poverty.

That said, the district is also home to a large number of social conservatives. Again, the Cincinnati Enquirer cites a local minister, who argues,

"All I can say is that any candidate who comes into Adams County and says he is against having the Ten Commandments displayed on public property is not going to get elected to anything,’ Johnson said. Johnson said the upcoming primary presents a ‘difficult choice’ for conservative Christians because ‘most of the Republican candidates are pro-life, pro-Ten Commandments, against gay marriage. They're on the right side of the issues”’ (5-18-05).

Yet, not every Republican in the district cares about social issues. The Cincinnati Enquirer quotes the mayor of Blue Ash, Ohio, one of the affluent suburbs in the western end of the district who asserts, "‘Out here in the suburbs, we're more moderate Republicans,’ Bryan said. ‘This is the home of the soccer mom. The swing voters - quite conservative on some issues, but more moderate on social issues’” (5-18-05).

Given the diversity of the district in economic and social terms, it is not surprising that the Cincinnati Enquirer observed, “It is vital for the House member from this district, stretching from the East Side of Cincinnati and Hamilton County through Clermont and Warren counties to Pike County - to represent a balance of interests and be an advocate for urban and rural areas, affluent and poor constituents” (6-12-05). Given that the district is heavily Republican in terms of underlying district partisanship, it is not surprising that much of this dichotomy concerns the Republican Party. Those living in the western end of the district with
“six-figure family incomes and driveways full of SUVs” are economically conservative and socially moderate. Those in the eastern end of the constituency, in “a land of one-traffic-light villages, rolling farmland, sylvan foothills and problems of chronic joblessness and poverty that can barely be imagined in the comfortable suburbs that ring Cincinnati” are conservative on economic and social issues (5-18-05). Yet, they certainly care about social issues more than their suburban counterparts.

Thus, representing moderate Republicans and “moral values voters” is a difficult task (Cincinnati Enquirer 6-3-05). It is also a necessity in this heterogeneous district.

There are also other concerns in the district that are essential to understanding Schmidt’s home style. Given that the district is large geographically and is rural, it should be no surprise that agriculture is also critical to many constituents. Energy is also a vital local issue due to the number of corn farmers who have an interest in ethanol, and also due to a local power plant that can either create jobs through a Department of Energy grant or be used as a potential nuclear waste facility (Cincinnati Enquirer 8-21-05, 11-30-06, 5-12-07).

Finally, the Cincinnati Enquirer notes that transportation is a major local concern as residents across the constituency support building an interstate highway through Southern Ohio (5-18-05). Unlike social issues, this is one concern that unites the district, per the Cincinnati Enquirer.

That said, given the characteristics of this district, it is not surprising that Schmidt emphasizes economic issues most prominently in her home style. Yet, it is important to note that she is also socially conservative. Thus, her job appears to be balancing economic and social concerns, without alienating large subsets of the primary and general election electorates.
Speaking more to electoral competition, the constituency is known for its conservatism and its propensity to support Republicans in presidential races (Cincinnati Enquirer 5-18-05, 6-12-05). Thus, in terms of underlying district partisanship, the district is heavily Republican, even if the district contains socially conservative and socially moderate Republicans.

I now explain more about the competitive nature of this district and outline the curious electoral circumstances of Jean Schmidt. Most importantly, Schmidt survived a series of Republican primaries and strong Democratic challengers in each general election she contested.

Table C
Census Data on the 2nd District of Ohio from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Traits</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$ 56,136</td>
<td>$ 51,425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.9 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ohio (18 Districts)
Educational services, and health care and social assistance 21.4% NA
Manufacturing 15.1% NA
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services 11.9% NA
Retail 11.7% NA

**Social Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competitive Contexts**

As the PVI scores in Table C-1 below show, Schmidt represents a safely Republican district, at least in presidential elections. The Cincinnati Enquirer notes that there is a “nearly 2-1 GOP advantage in the 2nd District” (8-7-06). The Dayton Daily News called it “a hugely Republican District” (2-20-08). The Cincinnati Enquirer observes, “Despite the wide disparity in how people work and live, it is a consistently conservative and Republican place, one that gave George W. Bush 64 percent of its vote and Portman 72 percent in last fall's election” (5-18-05). This same publication also calls the constituency “a conservative rural-suburban district” (6-12-05). Thus, in partisan terms, it is a Republican district. In ideological terms, it is a conservative constituency.

It is not surprising then that Schmidt labeled herself a dedicated conservative in her first race for Congress in 2005. The issues she focused on included “national security, tax reform and ‘a comprehensive energy strategy’” (Cincinnati Enquirer 7-27-05). She was also “aggressive in courting the Christian conservative ‘moral values’ voters” (Cincinnati Enquirer 6-3-05). Thus,
mixing economic and social issues appears to reach out widely to different factions of the Republican Party that she represents.

   Given that her Republican predecessor won the district by large margins, there does not appear to be a reason why she would not have run as a conservative Republican in 2005.

   Her Democratic opponent was Paul Hackett, an attorney and former Marine (Cincinnati Enquirer 7-5-05, 8-3-05). Hackett is a conservative Democrat who supports the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Amendment and did a tour of duty in Iraq in a district “where military service is valued and where it is hard to find anyone who does not have a friend, neighbor or family member serving in Iraq…” (Cincinnati Enquirer 7-5-05). He portrayed Schmidt as a rubber stamp for President Bush and former Ohio Governor Bob Taft; he also continually emphasized his service in Iraq and his experience running a small business (Cincinnati Enquirer 7-27-05). Table C-1 reveals that Hackett actually outspent Schmidt in the contest.

   Notwithstanding her lengthy political career and the titanic partisan advantage she enjoyed, Schmidt won just 52 percent of the vote. While special elections are often different from general elections in terms of voter turnout, and are not usually subject to coattail voting, it is very important to note the closeness of this election. Given the underlying partisanship of the district and a lower voter turnout, Schmidt should have won by a large margin. Yet, she did not.

   After her initial election to Congress, Schmidt committed a serious gaffe. While in the House for just a few months, she implied that former Congressman John Murtha, a decorated veteran of the Marine Corps, was a coward for arguing that troops should be pulled out of Iraq (Cincinnati Enquirer 11-19-05). The story was recounted in newspapers across the country. Saturday Night Live even poked fun at the incident on its program.
Given that I cited the Cincinnati Enquirer (7-5-05) observing the reverence that voters in the district have towards veterans and active military, and that such a large proportion of constituents knew someone serving in Iraq, this incident hurt her image.

That said, it is not surprising that Schmidt attracted a serious primary election challenger in 2006. Former U.S. Representative Bob McEwan ran against Schmidt for the GOP nomination. The Cincinnati Enquirer noted, “McEwen and Schmidt share positions on such issues as taxes, spending, jobs and economic growth” (4-20-2006). Even so, McEwen’s main argument was that he served in Congress for 12 years, and was thus better able to represent the district effectively (Cincinnati Enquirer 4-20-06). Yet, since they agreed on so many issues, policy concerns were not prominently featured in the local media.

The main issue during the campaign was McEwen’s residency. He lived in Virginia since 1997, yet voted in Ohio every year from 1978 to 2002. He was removed from the voter rolls by the Hamilton County Board of Elections in 2003. He then re-enrolled at a different address in Hamilton County, and once again voted in Ohio in 2004 (Cincinnati Enquirer 4-16-06). He affirms he was an Ohio resident, despite having a child in a Virginia public school during this time. Schmidt even hired a lawyer to claim that McEwen voted illegally in Ohio (Cincinnati Enquirer 4-16-06). Then, later in the campaign, she argued that he was not currently an Ohio resident and sued in federal court to have him barred from the voter rolls and the primary ballot (Cincinnati Enquirer 4-26-06). In response to the lawsuit, McEwen’s campaign manager argued, “This is a dying gasp from a desperate campaign that has cut and run from Republicans, and now even seeks to avoid the election” (Cincinnati Enquirer 4-26-06).

The Ohio Elections Commission dismissed Schmidt’s challenge to McEwen’s residency. Still, Schmidt persisted up to the primary claiming McEwen was a Virginia resident. She stated
“I know, because I have been sending him Christmas cards there for the past 15 years” (Cincinnati Enquirer 4-26-06).

To make the race even more of a spectacle, immediately before the primary, Schmidt received a reprimand from the Ohio Elections Commission for falsely telling people that she earned a second undergraduate degree from the University of Cincinnati (4-28-06).

Schmidt beat McEwen by just six points.

In the 2006 General Election, Democrats nominated Victoria Wells Wulsin, a local physician. Wells Wulsin gathered a significant campaign war chest to contest the race (Table C-1; Cincinnati Enquirer 7-3-06, 9-3-08).

The 2006 election featured a great deal of negative campaigning. A Schmidt advertisement stated, “I'm Congresswoman Jean Schmidt, and I approve this message… What will Victoria Wulsin think of next? Her proposal to repeal the tax cuts equals an average tax hike of over $2,000 for families with children. And the gas tax? Wulsin wants to raise gas taxes, even as gas prices are coming down” (Cincinnati Enquirer 10-12-06). Wells Wulsin also went on the offensive, asserting, “In her 10 months in Congress, Jean Schmidt has cut and run on the 2nd District… The truth is Jean Schmidt has spent 10 months in Congress voting against the interests of her constituents” (Cincinnati Enquirer 7-3-06).

The Cincinnati Enquirer tells readers that, beyond her Murtha row, Schmidt was enveloped in “a controversy over which degrees she earned at the University of Cincinnati, and more recently a GOP opinion piece her staff recycled with her name on it” (10-29-06). Further, the same article notes that Schmidt tried to “invoke House rules to stop a commercial by her Democratic opponent, Dr. Victoria Wulsin, to whom House rules don't apply” (10-29-06). Thus, Schmidt damaged her credibility, appeared incompetent, and compromised her rapport with
voters who support the military. It is not surprising then that Wells Wulsin earned a stunning 49 percent of the vote in the 2006 race.

In 2008, Schmidt faced a primary challenge from State Rep. Thomas Brinkman, described by the Cincinnati Enquirer as “a hard-line conservative and anti-tax Republican” who “has often tangled with party leadership” (12-13-07). The Cincinnati Enquirer reported, “Brinkman also is an Ohio state legislator known as a rock-ribbed conservative and an implacable opponent of tax increases… he repeatedly has helped defeat school tax levies and other tax measures. Brinkman's campaign is based largely on his assessment that Schmidt's performance in office has been too liberal for 2nd District tastes” (2-24-08).

Schmidt was “Asked to describe her most important philosophical difference with Brinkman, she said, ‘I will reach across the aisle and work with Democrats. (Republicans) can be so hard-edged in our beliefs that we can't work together’” (2-24-08). Schmidt beat Brinkman by almost 20 points on primary day. This race did not receive the same attention as the 2006 primary.

In the general election, Schmidt once again faced Wells Wulsin; the rematch between these two women was dubbed, “The hottest congressional race in Southwest Ohio” by the Dayton Daily News (9-7-08). As a clear indicator of the competitive nature of the contest, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee spent $145,000 on television commercials (Cincinnati Enquirer 10-21-08). Further, Wells Wulsin outspent Schmidt.

That said, between her 2006 re-election and the 2008 race, Schmidt’s problems with the military and veterans continued. The Cincinnati Enquirer informed readers, “Rep. Jean Schmidt wrote in her weekly column on her Web site Monday that media reports about living conditions at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, one of the nation's main facilities for treating veterans
wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, were ‘overblown’” (3-21-07). One does not have to be an erudite historian to know of the public outrage over the Walter Reed scandal. This was just another statement by Schmidt that greatly hurt her image.

Further, the Cincinnati Enquirer reported, “Democrats called Friday for the House ethics committee to investigate U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt's chief of staff for improperly working on her re-election campaign while also heading up her congressional office” (7-19-08).

The most interesting and disturbing part of the 2008 campaign came from Schmidt’s camp accusing Wells Wulsin of “taking part in a ‘grotesque’ human experiment that involved injecting malaria into AIDS victims” in a fundraising letter (Dayton Daily News 9-8-08).

The Dayton Daily News editorial that endorsed Wulsin said of Schmidt, “Some people love her very conservative politics. But judged on nonideological, nonpartisan grounds, she deserves to be replaced” (10-31-08). Schmidt was re-elected with an abysmal 45 percent of the vote.

Schmidt received another primary from a right-wing challenger in 2010. The Dayton Daily News remarked, “Schmidt must be on the edge of a record for number of times challenged in a primary” (4-30-10). Prior to declaring his run for Congress, Warren County Commissioner Mike Kilburn asserted, “People tell me they can't tell the difference anymore between a Democrat and a Republican…What we need is less taxing, less spending, more individual responsibilities at work in our everyday lives” (Cincinnati Enquirer 6-21-09).

Kilburn became nationally known during 2010 when he “caught the attention of national media this year when he said he would let Warren County go broke before accepting President Barack Obama's ‘filthy’ economic stimulus money” (Cincinnati Enquirer 10-16-09). He ran for Congress because he insisted, “I believe the reason that we have a liberal agenda in Congress and
in Washington right now, from the White House into the Capitol Building, is because Republicans have lost their way…We somehow sent a lot of Republicans-in-name-only to Washington and they began a spending program that put us in a debt spiral that we find ourselves in today” (10-16-09). Kilburn said “he wants to get rid of the Departments of Energy and Education, means-test for Social Security benefits, establish a flat tax and eliminate the corporate income tax” (Cincinnati Enquirer 3-31-10).

Despite all of his rhetoric, Kilburn did not raise significant money. As of March 31, 2010, just over a month before the election, he did not raise enough money to even file a statement with the FEC (Cincinnati Enquirer). It is not surprising then that Schmidt beat her opponent by almost 40 percentage points, according to the Ohio Secretary of State’s Office.

Interestingly, not only did Schmidt have a primary election for her congressional seat, the Tea Party also challenged her for her GOP precinct executive position in Miami Township that she held for 36 years (Cincinnati Enquirer 4-12-10). According to the Clermont County Board of Elections, she won 81 percent of the vote to retain her party position. Thus, she had two races on primary day.

The General Election of 2010 pitted Schmidt against Surya Yalaman, a political novice who was greatly outspent by the incumbent. This raced garnered little attention. Yet, despite the fact that Yalaman was a lackluster candidate, with little money, during a wave election that supported the GOP, Schmidt still did not receive 60 percent of the vote.

Two important points must be made regarding her primary elections. In her 2006 primary, there were virtually no ideological and policy differences at all between the two candidates. Much of the election centered on her opponent’s residency. This election was her closest race.
More importantly, Schmidt was not the most extreme candidate running in 2008 and 2010. Thus, while she is certainly a conservative, she was not the most conservative Republican in either race. Yet, she won both primary elections comfortably. It is not out of the realm of possibility that she had to run to the base in these primary elections, perhaps appearing as more conservative than the district. If this is the case, it is not surprising that she had tough general election contests.

That said, and with the point just made in mind, in a district that should be comfortably held by Republicans, it is astounding that Schmidt had a difficult time winning re-election. While it is not out of the realm of possibility that the group of voters that opposed her in the primary voted for the Democrat, given that her 2008 and 2010 primary elections featured more conservative candidates than Schmidt, this is unlikely.

It is more likely that the wave elections in 2006 and 2008 hurt Schmidt. Alternatively, and in my opinion most likely, it is more probable that Schmidt’s own actions caused her to be in a state of perpetually robust competition. The gaffes she committed continued to plague her candidacy.

If her gaffes are to blame, DNC Chair Howard Dean correctly prophesied, “‘She'll have a perpetual strong challenger for as long as she stays’ in that seat…” (Cincinnati Enquirer 1-11-07). Indeed, she had a strong challenger in almost every election she contested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$ 798,305</td>
<td>Paul Hackett</td>
<td>$ 868,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$ 1,280,259</td>
<td>Victoria Wells Wilson</td>
<td>$ 1,041,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$ 1,276,579</td>
<td>Victoria Wells Wilson</td>
<td>$ 1,972,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>$ 981,058</td>
<td>Surya Yalaman</td>
<td>$ 253,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Partisan Voter Index Scores
2006   R + 13
2009   R + 13

Home Style Overview

Tables C-2 through C-5 below furnish readers with an overview of Schmidt’s home style activities by outlining how she presents herself in the 139 press releases and 50 franked documents she circulated over the study period. The Cincinnati Enquirer primarily, as well as the Dayton Daily News, chronicle Schmidt’s activities throughout her tenure.

The data reveal that she presents herself as a conservative advocate with local roots. The case study will first highlight her policy dialog as this illustrates her conservative policy positions and her local connection. I will then highlight her ideological and partisan portrayal, which continues to illustrate her conservatism. Finally, I will discuss her constituency-oriented activities that illustrate her local connections.

Table C-2
Jean Schmidt Press Releases
Entire Program Period N = 139 Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 120, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.
Table C-3
Press Releases
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit/Spending/Debt Policy</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Unemployment Policy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation Policy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security Policy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-4
Jean Schmidt Franked Materials
Entire Program Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 19, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy.

Table C-5
Jean Schmidt Franked Materials
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local/Personal Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/Border Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq/Afghanistan Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A) Broad Policy Discourse

Schmidt frames the impact of public policy in both local and national terms. Table C-2 reveals that 52.5 percent of press releases frame policy in a solely national lens, while 47.5 percent highlight the impact of federal policy locally. After removing those press releases that also portray allocation representation, 54 percent of news releases discuss policy in a solely national frame, while 46 percent stress how federal legislation impacts her constituency.

Schmidt places a great focus on economic issues that she frames in both local and national terms. Importantly, her conversation is indicative of her conservative nature.

Table C-3 reveals that 28 percent of press releases address economic policy, 26 percent highlight deficit and spending issues, 23 percent concentrate on jobs and unemployment, and 18 percent discuss tax policy.

Her conservative economic dialog is also featured in local news sources. The Cincinnati Enquirer quoted Schmidt asserting, “We need to support our entrepreneurs and small-business owners by continuing to develop an environment built upon lower taxes and less government interference” (12-5-05). On spending, the Cincinnati Enquirer told readers, “Rep. Jean Schmidt…said that while her main focus is on the big three - Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, which together account for nearly 40 percent of the federal budget - she also would cut space spending” (2-5-07). Discussing the 2008 financial bailout bill, this legislator stated, “…it is the only option. Let me be clear. I absolutely despise this bill. I am angry that we are being forced to decide whether taxpayers pay for the mistakes of others” (Cincinnati Enquirer 10-4-08). Concerning a major piece of legislation, the Cincinnati Enquirer cites Schmidt observing, “Quite simply, the bill was a reckless excuse for spending in the name of a real emergency and
provides very little stimulus" (1-29-09). Further, Schmidt insisted, “The American people are angry. They demand responsible leadership and decreased federal spending. This budget is simply irresponsible" (2-2-10). Finally, Schmidt extolled, "I'm glad I can now focus my time on issues such as moving the economy and creating and keeping jobs” (Dayton Daily News 5-5-10).

There were also some very locally oriented exemplars regarding economic policy. For example, “Schmidt said that she changed her vote because she learned that some of the largest employers in the 2nd Congressional District…would not be able to find the liquidity they need to meet current payrolls” (Cincinnati Enquirer 10-4-08). Also, consider, “U.S. Reps. Mike Turner and Jean Schmidt, both Republicans, plan to introduce a bill that would allow communities refusing stimulus money to return that money to the U.S. Treasury. The bill comes after Warren County commissioners refused $373,400 in stimulus money for transit buses in March…” (Dayton Daily News 4-25-09).

Accordingly, Schmidt focused on economic and fiscal policy in both national and local terms. Most importantly, her dialog carried a conservative hue that speaks to her ideological convictions.

She also discussed energy policy in 18 percent of press releases.

Further, illustrating the intersection of agriculture policy and energy policy, Schmidt advocated on behalf of the corn farmers in her district by supporting ethanol. The Cincinnati Enquirer cites this legislator arguing, “‘We've got to reduce our dependence on foreign oil,’ she said. Increased use of less-polluting ethanol would help achieve that goal, help corn farmers in her district and help the environment, she said” (8-21-05). Further, the Cincinnati Enquirer told readers, “U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt, R-Miami Township, said Wednesday that she…bought an ethanol-powered vehicle. ‘I will be one of the first in line to buy ethanol this month,’ said
Schmidt, the proud owner of a red 2007 Chevy Tahoe that runs on either the E85 blend of 85 percent ethanol and 15 percent gasoline or - if it must - gasoline. Her license plate reads: ‘E85 4 OH’” (8-10-06).

Beyond ethanol, Schmidt was cited insisting, “Today, you are proving very tangible progress is being made in our struggle to relieve ourselves of dependence on foreign oil” (Cincinnati Enquirer 10-15-05). Also, it was reported that a local energy issue, “played a key role in the 2nd Congressional District race after Rep. Jean Schmidt said she supported an effort by the Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative (SODI) and a Cleveland-based company called SONIC to seek the DOE grant to study whether to locate the facility in Piketon” (Cincinnati Enquirer 11-30-06). Further, consider, “If anyone has any doubts about Rep. Jean Schmidt's plans for the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Piketon, a bill she and two colleagues introduced on Friday …would ensure that no funds from the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) may be used for the creation of a permanent storage facility for spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste” (Cincinnati Enquirer 5-12-07). Finally, “U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt, R-Miami Township, lauded the new energy initiative and predicted thousands of jobs would be created in a ripple of economic activity. She pointed out that 86 percent of Ohio's energy is produced by coal-burning power plants. ‘We have to find a better way,’ she said” (Cincinnati Enquirer 10-19-09).

Thus, her conversation on energy is more complex than her very conservative dialog on the economy. Yet, there is also a conservative element to many of these statements. Importantly, she makes it well known that the country must remove its dependence on foreign oil. While alternative energy is certainly not a conservative policy position, energy independence is often championed by conservatives, even if ethanol is not. Thus, while her conversation on energy is
certainly not the most conservative aspect of her policy dialog, there are still conservative elements imbued in her discourse.

Finally, this legislator spends a great deal of time on transportation policy. The Cincinnati Enquirer told readers, “Do you have a horror story to tell about being trapped on an airplane for hours on end, sitting in your cramped seat wondering why the plane is parked on the runway, going nowhere instead of whisking you to your fabulous destination? If so, U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt wants to hear from you” (2-19-07). Regarding a major local bridge, the Cincinnati Enquirer reported, “U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt told the Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce on Monday that financing for the new Brent Spence Bridge is a question yet to be answered. Schmidt said…‘I don't know how we are going to find the money, but the money has to be found’” (6-12-07). Schmidt happily announced, “The passage of my flight data collection language is a victory for anyone whose flight has been delayed or has been stuck on a tarmac” (Cincinnati Enquirer 9-24-07). Further, Schmidt claims, “With rising gas prices and a shaky economy, ‘the notion of a federal gas tax increase is just absurd’” (Cincinnati Enquirer 1-28-08). Finally, regarding a local infrastructure proposal, Schmidt is quoted observing, “‘This would modernize the east-west roadway network to eastern Cincinnati,’ said U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt, R-Miami Township, a member of the House Transportation Committee. She and local officials are fighting to get federal funds for the railway into a transportation bill this year” (Cincinnati Enquirer 4-3-11). Thus, her dialog on transportation contains some conservative elements. It also illustrates this legislator fighting for her constituents on these issues.

Thus, Schmidt concentrated on three issues. Importantly, to varying degrees, there is a conservative element in her discourse. Further, she not only spoke of these concerns in national terms, but also with a local focus. As such, there are two important points. First, she is clearly
conservative in her policy discourse. Second, she engaged in a nationally framed policy dialog, while also illustrating her connection to her home, and advocating for her constituents.

B) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Schmidt’s discourse contains a significant amount of ideological rhetoric. Newspapers prominently chronicle this aspect of her representational image. The Dayton Daily News quoted Schmidt asserting, “Left-wingers seem to be willing to fund losers” (9-21-08). This same publication revealed, “In 2008, her voting record got a 100 percent approval rating from the conservative Family Research Council and a 94 percent from the Chamber of Commerce” (4-30-10). The Cincinnati Enquirer reported, “Schmidt… says it's about time to elect a conservative woman” (5-29-05). Further, this paper cites the legislator insisting, “I am the candidate who is in tune with the people of the 2nd District…My opponent is a liberal Democrat who is out of step with the district” (8-3-05 B). She is quoted insisting “If standing up and speaking out makes me a target of Howard Dean and the liberals, then that is fine with me” (Cincinnati Enquirer 12-14-05). Also, consider, “Down 'n' dirty, Schmidt calls Wulsin 'liberal’” (Cincinnati Enquirer 10-27-06). Finally, Schmidt is cited exclaiming, “I am a social conservative as well as a fiscal conservative, and I have a voting record that proves that” (Cincinnati Enquirer 3-31-10).

Beyond this, her campaign website clearly illustrates her conservative credentials. One quote from 2005 on the website declares, “Jean Schmidt will fight to protect our conservative values in Washington and ensure that Clermont County remains a great place to live, work and raise a family” (June 2005). Another quote from June 2006 makes known, “Conservative organization ‘The Family Research Council (FRC)’ reports that Rep. Jean Schmidt supported the interests of FRC 100% in 2005.”
Thus, her conservative identity and castigating those who do not measure up to it is an important feature of her home style. These statements clearly reveal her conservative nature, a chief feature of her representational image.

Beyond ideology, partisan dialog is also a noticeable aspect of her persona. Table C-2 reveals that almost one in five press releases (18 percent) display her GOP affiliation. Also, Table C-2 highlights that 14 percent of press releases promulgate a partisan statement either extolling the virtues of the Republican Party or castigating the Democratic Party. Thus, while her conservative portrayal is certainly more robust than her partisan display, party is still a noticeable aspect of her image.

Thus, Schmidt is often found castigating liberals, portraying her conservative nature, criticizing Democrats, and emphasizing her partisan affiliation. First, she is clearly a conservative and was a conservative before her election to Congress. Perhaps, given that she faced a series of Republican primary elections, particularly two from the right in 2008 and 2010, she was forced to illustrate her conservative credentials more than she would under other circumstances. Whether this is true or not, Schmidt was never afraid to display her conservative ideology. As such, it is one of the chief features of her home style.

C) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Schmidt’s presence in the district is a prominent feature of her home style. Table C-2 reveals that 64 percent of franked documents demonstrate her presence at home and 66 percent of franked documents depict her hosting town halls. Local newspapers also notably featured Schmidt at home.
The Cincinnati Enquirer told readers, “…during the Northeast Community Challenge Coalition's annual Red Ribbon kickoff breakfast Oct. 24 at the Embassy Suites Hotel, Blue Ash. U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt spoke…” (10-29-05). Also, in an effort to connect with those she represents, this publication made known, “Rep. Jean Schmidt, R-Miami Township, will hold another of her series of ‘Coffee and Conversation’ hours 5:30-6:30 p.m. in City Council chambers, 120 W. Loveland Ave…” (1-4-06). Further, as she is an active runner, it was revealed that “Jean Schmidt: Will be back in Cincinnati this weekend to run the Flying Pig Marathon” (Cincinnati Enquirer 5-4-06). Highlighting a connection with a relatively conservative cause, the Cincinnati Enquirer reported, “U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt, R-Ohio, will address the Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce Monday during a luncheon from 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. at the Radisson Hotel Cincinnati Riverfront…” (6-8-07). Finally, in an effort to connect with veterans, the Cincinnati Enquirer wrote, “U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt, R-Miami Township, and state Rep. Connie Pillich, D-Montgomery, participated in Friday's dedication ceremony” at the Women Veterans’ Health Center in Corryville (2-5-11).

The Dayton Daily News also discusses Schmidt’s presence at home. Consider, “…U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt, R-Loveland, [is] to attend a 10 a.m. press conference Thursday, June 18… Energy Secretary Steven Chu has been invited, and is scheduled to be in Cincinnati that day” (6-17-09). Further, this publication notes that the legislator was in her district jogging when she was hit by a car in a hit and run accident (10-12-08). While she recovered from this mishap, it was notable in two instances. First, members of Congress are not typically struck by cars, especially while jogging. Second, it illustrates that while she is at home, she is comfortable traversing her district, alone, on foot. While I do not overemphasize this point, this activity nevertheless shows a connection with her community.
Thus, I maintain that her robust presence in the district is indicative of her local roots and connection to her constituents.

Moving to her service representation activities, Table C-4 shows that 24 percent of franked documents highlight this home style trait. Since she publishes a relatively large number of franked documents, the fact that almost one in four highlight individualized service to her constituents is significant. Thus, service representation is a noticeable part of her home style and connected to her penchant for helping residents of her district.

Regarding allocation politics, the way she balances her fiscal conservatism with the practical needs of her constituents is fascinating.

First, her willingness to practice allocation representation is less noticeable than other constituent-oriented activities. Schmidt balanced being attentive to the policy interests of her constituents by working to secure funds only when they were sorely needed. The Cincinnati Enquirer notes the relatively few instances when she asked for or secured federal monies. For example, consider “Schmidt also is asking for the $3.19 million needed for the street grid project” (3-16-06). The Cincinnati Enquirer also informs readers, “…federal funds will go to the Duck Creek Flood Control Project …The project's $11.8 million - attached to the Energy and Water Appropriation bill by U.S. Rep. Jean Schmidt - passed the House of Representatives July 17” (7-22-07). Finally, in another effort to help with local infrastructure, “Rep. Jean Schmidt of Miami Township has $10.6 million in the bill, including $500,000 for sewer improvements” (Cincinnati Enquirer 3-6-09).

Thus, this legislator’s constituent-oriented activities are indicative of those of an advocate of her constituents. She is at home often meeting with voters, noticeably features service
representation in franked documents that were published often, and balances securing
government monies with her conservative fiscal ideology.

D) Overview of Home Style Activities

Given that Jean Schmidt was consistently re-elected with under 60 percent of the vote, I
anticipate that this legislator will behave similarly to other subjects in competitive circumstances.
Thus, if the literature that this project tests is correct, I expect that she will stress constituent-
oriented activities, frame policy in a local veneer, and underscore ideological centrism and
bipartisanship.

Schmidt emphasizes constituent-oriented activities. She is at home regularly. The large
number of franked documents she publishes stress service representation. Finally, Schmidt
advocates for the allocation needs of her constituents only when the funds are desperately
needed, balancing her conservative ideology with the practical realities of parochial politics.

Her policy conversation is split between addressing issues in a national frame and a local
lens. Thus, despite expectations from the literature that this project tests, Schmidt’s conservative
policy positions are framed more nationally than the literature would lead us to expect.

Finally, Schmidt is very ideological and noticeably partisan. Thus, despite the literature I
test suggesting otherwise, this legislator illustrates her conservative policy positions and reveals
her partisan affiliation.

Consequently, Schmidt is a legislator that emphasizes constituent-oriented activities,
frames policy positions in both local and national terms, and emphasizes her conservative
ideological convictions. Her conservatism is evident in her ideological rhetoric and her policy
discourse. Beyond this, Schmidt has strong local roots, and appears to care about her
constituents. This is apparent through her constituent-oriented activities and her policy dialog. Thus, Schmidt is a conservative advocate with local roots.

Home Style Changes

Since Schmidt never broke 60 percent of the vote despite representing a district that overwhelmingly favors her party, I anticipate that her representational image will not change significantly. As with other legislators who did not experience shifts in competitive climates, I compared Schmidt’s activities in the first half of her tenure (8-1-05 to 6-15-08) to her behavior in the second half (6-16-08 to 4-25-2011).

While it appears that Tables C-6 and C-7 reveal many behavioral variations, simply because of the number of items listed in the tables, a closer examination indicates that most of the alterations in her home style do not present a fundamental shift in her persona. Throughout her tenure Schmidt remained a conservative advocate emphasizing her local roots.

First, I will present shifts in her policy dialog. Next, the modifications in her partisan and ideological rhetoric will be explained. Finally, the one change in her constituent-oriented activities will be highlighted.

Table C-6
Jean Schmidt Press Releases
Major Shifts Over Time N=139 Unless Otherwise Noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>8/1/05-6/15/08 N</th>
<th>8/1/05-6/15/08 Mean</th>
<th>6/16/08-4/25/11 N</th>
<th>6/16/08-4/25/11 Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Home</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Issues Addressed N=120 Item</td>
<td>8/1/05-6/15/08 N</td>
<td>8/1/05-6/15/08 Mean</td>
<td>6/16/08-4/25/11 N</td>
<td>6/16/08-4/25/11 Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt/Spending/Deficit Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the second half of her tenure, Schmidt addressed economic issues much more robustly. Table C-6 notes that she highlighted debt and spending policy in 16 percent of news releases in the first half of her time in office and in 38 percent in the second, more than doubling her attention to this topic. Similarly, she increased her attention to jobs and unemployment policy by 20 percent after 6-15-08 (Table C-6).

At the same time, she sharply decreased emphasis on homeland security policy. In the first half of her tenure, 25 percent of news releases addressed this topic; only two percent did so in the latter part of her time in office.

It is important to remember that economic issues are particularly important to constituents, more so than homeland security policy (Cincinnati Enquirer 5-18-05, 7-11-05). Also, beyond the local importance of economic policy, it would be wholly shocking if she did
not increase her attention to these concerns given the economic crisis that struck in 2008, particularly due to the significance of economic policy to the nation and to those she represents. Thus, she certainly responded to a major crisis.

That said, given the string of marginal electoral contests, competition may have been a factor sparking this behavioral variation. It is logical that a legislator would emphasize issues of local and national import when continually faced with difficult re-election campaigns.

Regardless of the reasons for this behavioral modification, this project illustrates that Schmidt’s policy dialog on economic issues is conservative in tone. Emphasizing economic policy more often in the second half of her time in Congress reinforces her conservative image.

One more point is important to mention. In the second half of her tenure, Schmidt did not discuss policy in any of the franked materials that she circulated (Table C-7). In the first half of her time in office, 40 percent of franked materials highlighted policy (this is a change in 19 documents).

There are two important points regarding this behavioral variation. First, it is likely that she curtailed her policy discourse in this medium due to her continued electoral difficulties. It is not out of the realm of possibility that facing a string of competitive contests, despite her affiliation with the dominant party in her district, may have caused her to think about how she presents herself in franked documents. As such, in this medium, she may have decided it is best to say nothing at all regarding important issues of the day, and instead focus on other tasks that cultivate votes, like constituent-oriented activities.

Franked material, more than any other data source used in this project, is solely intended for constituents. It is the only document delivered directly to each constituent’s home. Thus,
perhaps she curtailed her policy conversation in her franked documents because she believed that constituents were most likely to read these papers.

Second, if this is the case, does it represent a fundamental change in her home style? I maintain it does not. While it does not fortify her image, I do not see how it harms her persona either. This shift is simply an item that is important to note, that may be caused by competitive circumstances, and that I believe has a neutral impact on her home style.

Changes in Partisan & Ideological Rhetoric

Table C-6 reveals that Schmidt became more partisan over time. In the second half of her time in Congress, she more than doubled the instances when she exhibited her Republican Party affiliation. In the first half of her tenure, 10 percent of press releases featured her GOP affiliation, while 28 percent did so in the second half. Further, she also more than doubled partisan sentiments in news releases. Just nine percent of news releases contained partisan rhetoric prior to 6-16-08, while 21 percent did so after this date.

There are several possible explanations that may reveal why she became more partisan over time. First, after Barack Obama entered the White House in 2009, it is possible that she had more opportunities to criticize the President of the United States. George Bush was in the White House during the entire first half of her duration in the House and it is unlikely that she would have lambasted him, particularly in comparison to President Obama, due to her conservatism and Republican affiliation.

Second, given the overwhelming GOP nature of her district, her continued electoral difficulties may have sparked Schmidt to highlight her connection to the dominant party in her district more robustly. Thus, despite median voter theory, hearty electoral competition may have
forced her to polarize her image. If this is the case, competition played a role in fashioning her representational persona and the literature that this project tests is not supported. Beyond this, Schmidt faced a series of primary opponents, and was even challenged for her GOP precinct executive committee seat in 2010. Thus, since these were party contests, it is likely that Schmidt continued to emphasize her partisan credentials in order to do well in the Republican primaries. This is especially true in 2008 and 2010 when Schmidt was running against extreme right-wing candidates.

Regardless of the explanations for these changes, given the overwhelmingly Republican district that she represents, these shifts do not embody a wholesale change in her image.

**Shifts in Constituent-Oriented Activities**

Alterations in her presence at home are an outlier. In the first half of her tenure, 17 percent of press releases indicated that she was in her district; in the second half, just seven percent chronicled Schmidt at home. Thus, on the one hand, 17 percent of press releases is not a particularly robust measure of her presence at home. In fact, her activities within her district were usually chronicled by local newspapers. Even so, given her prominent local connection, this change represents a departure from the core of her persona.

Further, given her continued electoral difficulties, it is wholly surprising that Schmidt would not stress this piece of her image in any home style tool she had at her disposal, including press releases. While there was not a noticeable shift in her appearance at home in newspapers, this behavioral modification is still curious. I am at a loss to explain why she highlighted her presence in the district less often, particularly in light of her electoral circumstances. Perhaps she
relied on newspapers to illustrate her presence at home, since this is the medium that does so most robustly.

**Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes**

Even though Schmidt appeared to make many changes in her home style, most are easily explained and do not alter the chief feature of her presentation to constituents. Her appearance at home, as portrayed in press releases, is an outlier. While I did not expect her to change her behavior at all, I certainly did not anticipate that she would present herself as appearing at home less often in any medium. That said, this one outlier should not be overemphasized as other data sources presented a stable image of Schmidt being in her district regularly. As such, I maintain that her home style image was largely intact throughout her tenure.

Further, it is not out of the realm of possibility that competition may have been a factor in explaining the changes in her behavior. While theories outlined in this dissertation would lead readers to believe that the unchanging nature of electoral circumstances, regardless of vulnerability, should produce stable home styles, Schmidt’s case is unique.

Attacking John Murtha, misrepresenting her educational credentials, downplaying the issues at Walter Reed Medical Center, attempting to apply rules that pertain only to U.S. Representatives to her opponent, and having her chief of staff being accused of campaigning while on government time certainly damaged her credibility. On top of that, a string of Republican primaries certainly took a toll on the cohesion of the local GOP party organization in her congressional district. Challengers even contested her Republican committee seat. That clearly states that Jean Schmidt was not popular in her own party.
As such, Schmidt was continually faced with robust electoral competition, not only in general elections, but in primary contests.

Thus, both general election and primary competition may have caused her to focus more on the economy, which she did in conservative terms; discuss policy less in franked documents; and connect her affiliation with the dominant party in her district. While I offered potential alternative explanations, competition may have been a factor stimulating these changes.

That said, it is still important to stress that by and large, these behavioral shifts only reinforce her conservatism and her local connection. As such, while Schmidt likely did not anticipate that she would find herself in a state of perpetually robust electoral competition, she appears to have responded by reinforcing the chief features of her home style.

**Chapter Conclusion**

It must be acknowledged at the outset that Schmidt is an anomaly. Her story is also important to the study of Congress and campaigns and elections.

The tale of Jean Schmidt suggests that there are certain instances when the quality of one candidate simply matters, regardless of partisan affiliation and the underlying partisanship of a district. If a nominee alienates enough voters then he or she may contend with continuously competitive circumstances in both general and primary elections. This is true regardless of being a well-known presence in the community, framing policy in a manner that most constituents agree with, or matching the partisan and ideological predilections of constituents.

Jean Schmidt also illustrates how well funded challengers and the press can keep legislators accountable for their actions, the sentiments they express, and the statements they make. Therefore, this case makes clear that individual candidates matter in our democracy. It is
also heartening as the study illustrates that other factors besides district lines can fashion elections, even if this legislator’s story is unique. This is healthy for our republic.

That said, Jean Schmidt is a conservative advocate with local roots. She is at home often, highlights service representation in many franked documents, and secures funding when it is sorely needed. Schmidt concentrates on economic, energy, and transportation policy. She frames these in both local and national terms. Importantly, her dialog on these issues has a conservative veneer. Finally, this legislator highlights her GOP affiliation, publishes partisan sentiments, and robustly stresses her conservative convictions.

How does this behavior relate to hypotheses? Given that Schmidt perpetually faced difficult electoral circumstances, the literature tested by hypotheses suggests that she will stress constituent-oriented activities and frame issues in a local lens. Further, she should stress bipartisanship and ideological centrism.

Also, I anticipated that she will not change her home style between the first and second half of her tenure.

First, she largely met expectations of the literature regarding constituent-oriented activities. She appeared at home often, highlighted service representation in franked documents, and obtained earmarks when they were sorely needed.

Concerning policy, she split her dialog between addressing issues in a solely national lens and illustrating the impact of policy on her constituents. Thus, her activities provide mixed support for the literature this project tests. Instead of stressing a locally focused policy conversation, her dialog is more nationally focused than the literature that hypotheses test would lead us to believe.
Regarding partisanship and ideology, instead of eschewing robust partisan and ideological displays as median voter theory suggests, she highlighted her partisan sentiments and ideological rhetoric. This is particularly true regarding her conservative convictions. This part of her story is important, as it illustrates that in certain circumstances, it may be rational to be more partisan and ideological than many rational choice scholars would lead us to believe.

Speaking to the stability of her home style, while there were several variations in her policy dialog and partisan rhetoric, these changes largely reinforced her image. Further, highlighting policy less in franked documents in the second half of her tenure does not appear to negate or fortify her persona. Yet, portraying herself at home less often in the second half of her tenure through press releases is an outlier. Even so, on the whole, the alterations made to her home style were minimal.

Did competition impact her home style? I advanced an argument that this phenomenon may have been a factor explaining shifts in the particular policy issues she stressed in the second half of her tenure and in her partisan and ideological discourse. She stressed her ideology by highlighting her conservative economic policy convictions even more robustly in the second part of her time in office. Further, in the second half of her tenure, she emphasized her connection with GOP voters. Given her string of primary challenges, these behavioral modifications are logical.

However, I also offered alternate explanations, including the financial crisis stimulating an uptick in discourse on economic policy and having a Democrat in the White House as a potential spark for increasing partisan sentiments.
On addressing policy much less often in franked documents in the second half of her tenure, I believe that competition caused this change. I am at a loss to offer any other explanation.

Finally, regarding illustrating her presence at home less, here too I am at a loss for whether competition mattered, particularly as this is a significant departure from the chief feature of her home style. Further, the literature hypotheses test suggest that if she were to change her persona, she should illustrate her presence at home more often, not less. As such, her behavior does not support the literature I test.

Thus, while I cannot confirm that competition mattered, it still may have been a factor fashioning her representational persona at the margins. While the core of her image remained intact, competition may have caused her to reinforce the chief features of her home style.

I now turn to discuss U.S. Representatives in a different situation. The next chapter presents those whose margins fluctuate above and below 60 percent, even though Partisan Voter Index Scores suggest that these legislators should be safely re-elected.

Chapter 6
Safe Districts and Fluctuating Margins
Introduction

This chapter highlights three legislators who represent districts in which they should be re-elected comfortably. However, the election margins of these members of Congress fluctuated above and below 60 percent of the vote. Thus, they were re-elected easily in some instances and fought bitter campaigns in others.
Given these volatile circumstances, I expect that the nature of each of their presentational styles would change after each legislator’s vote margins escalated above or fell below 60 percent of the vote.

Following an election where each legislator did not achieve 60 percent of the vote, the literature that this project tests suggest that members of Congress will spend more time on constituent-oriented activities. Thus, they should practice allocation and service representation more robustly and appear in the district more regularly. Further, if this literature is correct, I also anticipate that in more competitive periods they will frame policy in a more local veneer more frequently. Finally, the literature I test leads me to believe that they will tone down partisan and ideological rhetoric following a competitive contest.

That said, this chapter explores the home style activities of Representatives Don Young (R-AK), Mike McCaul (R-TX) and Emanuel Cleaver (D-MO). For a variety of reasons that will be highlighted below, these members of Congress experienced peaks and valleys in the robustness of electoral competition.

Don Young, as of this writing, is the longest serving GOP member of the House of Representatives. While he holds conservative positions on many social issues, he is willing to fight anyone to protect the interests of Alaska. His determination to stand up for his state extends to groups who he can generally count on for support: members of his party and conservative interest groups. In the face of any conflict between the positions of these groups and the interests of his constituents, Young becomes “Mr. Alaska” first and foremost.

In contrast, Mike McCaul is a former U.S. Attorney who represents a very heterogeneous district in Texas. McCaul can affectionately be called a “Delay Baby,” since his district was created as a result of the controversial 2004 gerrymandering. Nevertheless, McCaul is certainly
more moderate than Delay and has become a national leader on issues that are important to his constituents.

The Rev. Emanuel Cleaver was elected the same year as Mike McCaul, and like McCaul, is both a local advocate and a national leader. This former Mayor of Kansas City, and United Methodist pastor, fights for the concerns of his urban constituents. Cleaver has taken up leadership roles in the Congressional Black Caucus and on a select committee on global warming.

Contrary to expectations, while each member changed some behaviors, the data below suggest that the chief feature of each of their representational personas was stable. As such, the shifts in each of their behaviors occurred at the margins and do not equate to a wholesale alteration in each of their home styles. In fact, as will be chronicled, many changes in their activities only reinforced the main appearance that each presents.

That said, I now turn to the story of the first legislator in this chapter, Rep. Don Young, the “Congressman For All Alaska.”

Rep. Don Young - “Congressman For All Alaska”

“‘The Club for Growth is one of the most extreme groups in Washington, DC,’ Young said at a debate last week. ‘This is a group that does not want to spend any money on Alaskans, period. To me that's wrong. A congressman must represent the people of Alaska, not some special interest group in Washington, DC’” (Anchorage Daily News 8-10-08).

“Young's advice will be familiar to Alaskans, especially in the wake of his refusal to back the House GOP's recent one-year moratorium on earmarks. [New Orleans Representative Joseph] Cao ‘was elected to represent his district. That’s the most important thing you have to remember,’ Young said” (Anchorage Daily News 3-16-10).

Don Young, the Republican Dean of the United States House of Representatives at the time of this writing, has represented the entire State of Alaska in Congress since 1973 (U.S.
House Biographical Directory). His government Facebook page describes him in the following terms: “Merchant Marine, Teacher, State Rep, State Senator and finally Congressman for all Alaska for the last 37 years” (2-15-10).

Further, Don Young is an anachronism in the Republican Party. His behavior is not governed by ideological considerations like those in the Tea Party Caucus or in Paul Ryan’s “Young Guns” program. He is on record openly defying the policy priorities of the House GOP Conference when its policy positions are not in the interest of his constituents.

For example, after the GOP took over the majority in the House in 2010 with a fresh crop of “fiscal hawks,” his party leadership implemented a one-year ban on earmarks. This legislator openly defied the ban, publicly criticized the GOP conference for instituting the earmark moratorium, and visibly scolded congressional leadership for adopting a policy that hurt Alaska (Anchorage Daily News 12-1-2010).

That said, and as the exemplars from the Anchorage Daily News above clearly reveal, the primary characteristic of Don Young’s home style is his advocacy for his constituents. Over his tenure in the House, he consistently focused on issues important to his state. In particular, he pays attention to environmental and resource policy, energy, transportation and American Indian/Native Alaskan issues. He also practices allocation politics zealously. This member is not exaggerating when he calls himself “Congressman For All Alaska.”

Understanding the needs of the state is imperative in appreciating this member’s representational persona. It is geographically the largest state in the union, has an underdeveloped transportation system, is home to pockets of Alaskan Natives, contains many isolated communities, and is rich in natural resources that residents rely on to sustain themselves.
In terms of electoral competition, Alaska typically votes Republican in presidential elections. While it has elected Democrats and independents statewide, the GOP is by far the dominant party. As such, Young should consistently win re-election by wide margins. However, he fell below 60 percent of the vote in 2006. Young faced a bruising primary in 2008 from a sitting lieutenant governor that he managed to win by just 304 votes. He also barely survived re-election in the 2008 General Election. Prior to and following these contests, this member was re-elected comfortably.

During his most competitive time, if the literature that this project tests is correct, Young should frame issues locally, concentrate on constituent-oriented activities, and produce less partisan rhetoric.

Data reveal that though there were changes in Young’s home style post 2006, many of these alterations only reinforced his image as an advocate for Alaska. As such, in all things, this legislator represents his state, whether during a difficult re-election contest, or an easy race.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

*District Traits*

The map below demonstrates the vastness of the constituency that Don Young represents. Since it is well known that Alaska is the largest state by area, it is no surprise that obviously, it is also the largest single congressional district by geography in the United States.

Given its size, the underdevelopment of roads in the state is stunning. If one accesses the website of the Alaska Department of Transportation, one could see that there are no highways connecting most of the state’s residents to one another (Alaska Department of Transportation Website). This is not just true in the archipelagos of Pacific Alaska, but throughout its vast territory. Thus, air and boat travel are essential throughout the state.
Beyond geography, Table D reveals that government and service jobs are very abundant, as 22 percent of the labor force work in education services, healthcare and social assistance. Further 10.3 percent of residents are public administrators.

Table D also illustrates that the district is largely white, with 65.6 percent of voters identifying as Caucasian. Significantly, 13.2 percent of residents are American Indians or Alaska Natives. Also, 26.5 percent of inhabitants earned an undergraduate degree, which is below the national mean. The population is slightly younger than the rest of the country since 32.7 years is their median age.

The underdevelopment of roads, large proportion of Native Alaskans and American Indians, and the state’s industries explain Don Young’s policy discourse and his zealousness to secure earmarks for constituents. Alaska clearly needs a great deal of transportation funding, since highways are few and far between. Native Alaskans and American Indians in the state have no other advocate in the House of Representatives. Further, as we will see, Alaska relies on a great deal of federal funding to support its economy. Thus, this legislator’s local focus is understandable given the needs of constituents.
Table D  
Census Data Alaska  
from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau  

**Economic Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$ 64,635</td>
<td>$ 51,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competitive Contexts**

The PVI scores in Table D-1 illustrate that Alaska reliably votes for Republicans in presidential contests. Lyndon Johnson is the only Democratic presidential nominee to have carried the state (National Archives).

That said, Don Young was re-elected with over 70 percent of the vote in 2002 and 2004. His election margin dropped below 60 percent in 2006 and he barely managed to win in 2008. The congressperson recovered in 2010, once again almost earning 70 percent of the vote.

But why, after such a long career, did this legislator suddenly face two very competitive races? Unfortunately, he was embroiled in scandals from 2006 through August of 2010. In January of 2006, this legislator became linked to the Abramoff lobbying firm’s attempts to
influence the activities of members of Congress (Anchorage Daily News 1-26-06). The Anchorage Daily News reported:

“The taint from the Jack Abramoff lobbying scandal has reached Alaska Rep. Don Young. The congressman in 2002 signed a letter prepared by Mr. Abramoff, urging a federal agency to change its bidding rules on a building lease -- a change that would help steer the lease toward one of the lobbyist's clients. Five weeks later, two of Mr. Abramoff's Indian tribal clients gave Rep. Young's leadership political action committee $7,000” (2-2-06).

Additionally, he was accused of providing money to help a fellow legislator under fire.

“Political disclosure reports filed last month show Alaska Congressman Don Young gave $5,000 last fall to help Rep. Duke Cunningham fight bribery charges. But Cunningham's fight was short-lived. The California Republican pleaded guilty in November to conspiring to accept bribes and tax evasion” (Anchorage Daily News 2-6-06).

In response, Young’s 2006 contest became surprisingly close. His opponent was Diane Benson, a mother of an Iraqi War Veteran who lost his legs in combat (Anchorage Daily News 7-29-06, 10-1-06). The race received very little media coverage until November 1, as Benson was virtually unknown in the state. At that point, a poll showed that Benson was only nine points behind the incumbent and Young himself acknowledged, “It's going to be closer than people maybe thought it would be…I'm very confident Alaska has recognized the importance of seniority and the ability to do the job’” (Anchorage Daily News 11-8-06). The congressperson was correct; he received 57 percent of the vote, despite outspending Benson 19 to one (Anchorage Daily News 11-8-06).

Scandal continued to plague him into 2007, when one of his staffers was sentenced to prison on corruption charges. The Anchorage Daily News reported,

“An aide to former House Transportation Committee Chairman Don Young pleaded guilty Tuesday to helping convicted lobbyist Jack Abramoff get business and inside government information in exchange for cash, gifts and job favors. Mark Zachares, a
lawyer on Young's Transportation Committee staff between 2002 and 2005, faces a likely
two-year prison term under a deal with the government requiring him and his wife,
Cynthia, to cooperate in the widening corruption probe that has already reached a dozen
Capitol Hill figures” (4-25-07).

Just after the news on Zachares broke, the Anchorage Daily News made known, “Rep.
Young shrugged off reports Thursday that he steered millions of dollars to help a prominent
campaign contributor with a Florida road project…Young in a New York Times story describing
how he sponsored $10 million for a road project that helped Florida real estate developer Daniel
Aronoff, days after Aronoff helped raise $40,000 for Young's political funds” (6-8-07). The
following month, it was announced that the FBI was investigating this legislator in another “pay
to play” scandal known as the Veco case, where he allegedly accepted personal gifts in exchange
for favors (Anchorage Daily News 7-26-07).

Given this information, it is no surprise that the 2008 campaign was extremely
competitive. In fact, in addition to a competitive general election, Young faced an extremely
competitive primary from Sean Parnell, Alaska’s Lieutenant Governor (Anchorage Daily News
3-15-08). Parnell announced his candidacy at the state Republican convention. He told delegates,
“I just think it's about restoring trust to government” (Anchorage Daily News 3-15-08). Parnell
was immediately endorsed by Governor Sarah Palin, which is not entirely surprising as they ran
on a ticket together in 2006 (Anchorage Daily News 3-15-08). He also received support from
Young’s nemesis - the conservative Club for Growth (Anchorage Daily News 6-7-08). Parnell
accused Young of not doing enough to create an Alaskan natural gas pipeline (Anchorage Daily
News 5-17-08, 6-12-08). He also supported banning earmarks for a year in order to assess the
practice (Anchorage Daily News 6-7-08).

Young was not cavalier about this primary. He told the GOP convention "I beat your dad,
and I'm going to beat you," referencing the 1980 General Election where Young received 70
percent of the vote against Parnell’s father who ran as a Democrat (Anchorage Daily News 3-15-08). Young argued that he should be re-elected because his seniority placed him in the best position to deliver for Alaska. Upon Parnell receiving the endorsement from the Club for Growth, Young

“was contemptuous of the endorsement, saying the Club For Growth has never supported anything in Alaska and it just shows how out of touch Parnell is with the state and its people. He said Parnell is nothing but a surrogate for Gov. Sarah Palin. ‘He has done nothing, if you'll check his legislative record,’ Young said. ‘He is a zero. A zero. It's amazing to me, I've never seen a candidate try to hook on and live off of someone else as he's doing’” (Anchorage Daily News 6-7-08).

Regarding Parnell’s call for a one-year ban on earmarks, “Young said Alaskans -- cities, groups and individuals -- ask him for the earmarks to fill needs the state won't. He said calling for a moratorium on earmarks is a losing strategy for Parnell” (Anchorage Daily News 6-7-08). The same article also cites Young arguing that if Parnell wins the primary, not fighting for the allocation needs of his constituents will ensure he loses re-election. Later in the campaign, Young called Parnell “incompetent” (Anchorage Daily News 8-24-08).

After the bitter and divisive campaign, Young won the Republican primary by just 304 votes. In his long political history, this was his closest contest.

Turning now to the 2008 General Election, given the record of scandal and Young’s close race in 2006, it is not surprising that as early as June of 2007, reports indicate that the DCCC tried to recruit Mark Begich, then Mayor of Anchorage, to challenge Young (Anchorage Daily News 6-29-07). Other Democrats with political experience started declaring their intentions to compete against the incumbent in July of 2007.

Recognizing how difficult his re-election campaign would be, Young told supporters, "I'm going to be in the state every month for the rest of this year…I will be running as hard as
you've ever seen me run" (1-13-08). It is important to note that he made this statement before Sean Parnell declared his candidacy in March of 2008.

The Democrats nominated Ethan Berkowitz, the former Alaska State House Minority Leader. The candidate spent $1.6 million, and the race received media coverage in all parts of the country. Berkowitz, on a host of issues including ANWR, criticized this legislator for not being effective and attacked his style, arguing he was too confrontational (Anchorage Daily News 10-7-08). As he had done in 2006 and during his 2008 primary, the incumbent insisted that his seniority in the House was essential for Alaska (Anchorage Daily News, 3-15-08). Further, Young countered that he used his persona to defend Alaska’s interests (Anchorage Daily News 10-17-08).

In the end, Berkowitz lost in what was called “a stunning upset” based on polls (Anchorage Daily News 11-5-08). The Anchorage Daily News on 6-30-2009 reported that the investigation into the incumbent’s activities was the major theme of the 2008 campaign.

Eventually, the member was cleared of any wrongdoing. On August 5, 2010, the Anchorage Daily News reported that no official charges would be filed against this legislator, and the scandals finally disappeared from the media.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Young Election Result</th>
<th>Young Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$ 1, 576,053</td>
<td>Clifford M. Greene</td>
<td>$ 980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$ 1, 747,901</td>
<td>Thomas Higgins</td>
<td>$ NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>$ 1, 959,811</td>
<td>Diane Benson</td>
<td>$ 192,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$ 3, 213,536</td>
<td>Ethan Berkowitz</td>
<td>$ 1, 634,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$ 887,310</td>
<td>Harry Crawford</td>
<td>$ 235,571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alaska’s Partisan Voter Index Scores
2006  R +14
2009  R +13
Home Style Overview

Tables D-2 through D-5 furnish readers with an overview of Young’s home style activities portrayed in the 753 press releases and eight franked documents he circulated. In addition, he receives considerable coverage in the state’s largest newspaper, the Anchorage Daily News.

As already explained, the most prominent aspect of Young’s representational image is that of an advocate for all of Alaska. To illustrate this point, first, I will discuss his policy dialog. The congressman spends much of his time framing how national policy impacts Alaska locally and highlighting policy issues that are significant to constituents. Next, I will chronicle his constituent-oriented activities. While he is one of the country’s most prolific practitioners of allocation politics, the distance from Alaska to DC, and the distribution of its population make service representation and being present at home challenging. Nevertheless, the degree to which he seeks funding for the state fortifies his locally focused persona. Finally, I will explain his partisanship, which is not a prominent feature of his home style. State and local concerns are more important to him than partisan considerations.

| Table D - 2 |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| **Don Young Press Releases** | **N = 753** Press Releases | **Percent of Total** |
| **Entire Program Period** | **Total Number** | **Percent of Total** |
| Allocation Representation | 160 | 21% |
| Presence At Home | 9 | 1% |
| Town Hall | 4 | 1% |
| Service Representation | 6 | 1% |
| Mentions Public Policy Issue | 674 | 90% |
| Discusses Local Policy Issue* | 4 | 1% |
| Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens* | 197 | 29% |
| Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level* | 475 | 70% |
| Indicates Own Party | 105 | 14% |
| Makes Partisan Statement | 34 | 5% |
| Makes Bipartisan Statement | 65 | 9% |
Indicates Own Ideology 7 1%
* This percentage is calculated out of 674, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.

### Table D-3
**Don Young Press Releases**

**Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N= 674 Press Releases That Address Public Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Resource Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D-4
**Don Young Franked Materials**

**Entire Program Period** N= 8 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Number</strong></th>
<th><strong>Percent of Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 6, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy.

### Table D-5
**Don Young Franked Materials**

**Major Public Policy Issues Addressed** N= 6 Franked Documents That Address Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Number</strong></th>
<th><strong>Percent of Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A) Broad Policy Discourse

Table D-2 illustrates that almost three quarters of Young’s press releases (70 percent) highlight how national policy impacts Alaska. Removing press releases that also illustrate this member practicing allocation politics, 61 percent illustrate how national policy impacts the state.

Social media sources also highlight his commitment to advocating for his state. Consider, “Rep. Don Young Works With Democrat Leadership For Alaska’s Federal Employees” (Government Twitter Page 10-8-09). Young also made known, “Today I reintroduced the Sealaska Land Entitlement Bill” (Government Twitter Page 4-6-11). Another example includes, “Don Young met with Secretary of the Army John McHugh this evening to discuss issues of importance to Alaska…” (Government Facebook Page 6-22-10). Regarding a major transportation initiative, his Facebook page declares, “Rep. Young Praises Decision To Proceed With Knik Arm Bridge” (12-15-10).

Similarly, the Anchorage Daily News prominently features many examples of the congressperson framing policy as it impacts Alaska. On a local natural resource issue, the publication reports, “A bill sponsored by Alaska Congressman Don Young would open more of Denali National Park and Preserve to snowmobiles” (5-15-02). Also consider, “Alaska's lone congressman, Don Young, was returned to Washington, D.C., to continue looking out for the state's interests from his powerful Transportation chairmanship” (11-5-04). Defending Alaska’s interests on the Resources Committee, the paper chronicled, “Rep. Don Young, R-Alaska, who has often been at odds with Miller over the California congressman's involvement in Alaska issues, immediately fired back” (9-26-07). Further, it was documented that, “U.S. Rep. Don Young, R-Alaska, decried the proposed rule as ‘yet another attempt to halt resource production and development in Alaska, and a step towards making the whole state a national park for the
enjoyment of outsiders”” (12-2-09). On the Affordable Care Act, “Young…said Friday that he will continue to fight against federal intrusion into the lives of Alaskans, starting with the health care bill” (8-22-10).

Since this legislator is a zealous advocate for his district, it is also worth noting that the particular policy issues that he focuses on are some of those most important to the state. More precisely, the legislator widely discusses transportation policy, American Indian/Native Alaskan policy, environment and resource policy, and energy policy.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Resources Committee have jurisdiction over many of these issues. Young not only sat on these bodies, but also served as the chairman of these two powerful committees (House Government Website 1-14-11).

Twenty nine percent of press releases address environment and resource policy. Part and parcel to this issue area, 17 percent of press releases that address policy concentrate on energy. This overlap is particularly evident in discussions about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), a prominent issue that is important for Alaska, but also has national implications.

Regarding ANWR, the Anchorage Daily News cites this legislator discussing the issue throughout the time that this study took place. For example, “Young said even if ANWR does not ultimately pass, the energy bill would be important to Alaska because of what it would do for the gas pipeline” (4-12-03). Chronicling his efforts to allow oil drilling in the reserve, the paper states, “ANWR legislation now goes back to the House of Representatives, where Alaska's lone member, Don Young, long has been its champion. ANWR bills have already passed the House four times before and Young said yesterday ‘we will try to get it done again’” (3-17-05). Related to this, the paper quotes the member saying, “I'll introduce my bill, as usual…But the reality is,
it's not going to get out of the Senate, and the reality is, Obama's not going to sign it. I'm realistic. I've done this 11 times” (12-7-10).

He is covered on other environmental issues as well. Consider, “U.S. Sen. Ted Stevens and Rep. Don Young touched off a national ruckus last month when they launched a secret, last-minute maneuver to ram through new timber-friendly federal laws for Alaska's controversial Tongass National Forest” (3-10-03). On a very controversial issue, the paper documents that “Murkowski and Alaska Rep. Don Young worked to get a provision that would allow North Slope whaling captains to deduct up to $10,000 in costs of the hunt, such as all the equipment and fuel, from their federal income taxes” (10-6-04). Chronicling the intersection of the environment and Alaska’s economy, the paper quotes this member asserting, “Postponing the sale of oil and gas leases in the Chukchi Sea to consider polar bear habitat could do irreparable harm to Alaska's economy” (1-24-08). Again, many of these environmental discussions illustrate the overlap this policy area has with energy issues and all highlight his advocacy for Alaska.

Another prominent concern that is indicative of the legislator’s advocacy for his constituents is American Indian and Native Alaskan policy. Seventeen percent of press releases highlight this policy area (Table D-2). The Anchorage Daily News coverage of Native Alaskan issues includes, “A bill cleared the House Resources Committee on Thursday that would allow Alaska Native Vietnam veterans to choose 160 acres of federal land in Alaska to make their own. ‘I just think this is the right thing to do,’ said Rep. Don Young” (9-13-02). Illustrating his commitment to native peoples, the paper makes known, “Alaska Congressman Don Young said opponents were merely parroting the message of environmentalists. ‘My people, my people in Kaktovik want this drilling. The Eskimos who live there want this drilling,’” said Young (4-11-03). Also, the Anchorage Daily News informs readers, “Young defended 8(a) contracting, saying
it has allowed Alaska Natives ‘to begin to realize economic and social self-determination, something that has long been the goal of Federal Indian policy’” (7-17-09). Finally, the paper chronicles the representative explaining, "I believe very strongly that if you read the Constitution and our agreement with the American Indians and Alaska Natives, we have an obligation” (1-29-11).

Finally, transportation policy is also frequently presented in a way that illustrates the impact of federal policy on Alaska. In total, 18 percent of his press releases address this issue (Table D-2). Coverage of this topic in the Anchorage Daily News includes, “Alaska Congressman Don Young, the transportation committee chairman, added a sentence to the bill directing the Corps to study the feasibility of ‘carrying out a project for hydropower, recreation, and related purposes on the Susitna River, Alaska’” (7-24-03). Explaining how Alaskan auto jobs are tied with national policy, he reveals, "‘Tonight I voted for the automaker loan because I felt it was the right thing to do.’ Young said a collapse of the domestic auto industry could imperil 3,600 jobs in Alaska” (12-11-08). On a maritime transportation issue, the paper reports, “U.S. Rep. Don Young has introduced a bill aimed at studying the potential for an Arctic deep water port” (2-8-10). Finally, regarding air transportation, the newspaper cites him declaring, “Essential Air Service ‘is essential for a reason,’ Young said. ‘It's a means of survival and it is very important to our state’” (2-17-11).

Don Young was also chair of Transportation and Infrastructure until the GOP lost majority status in the 2006 election. This helps to explain why 26 percent of his news releases framed policy in a completely national lens (Table D-2). There are examples of this legislator discussing this policy area in a national frame in the Anchorage Daily News that are isolated to his tenure as chair. Consider, “Alaska Rep. Don Young ushered a $4.4 billion highway
construction bill through the House Tuesday, beating back incursions on the law that makes the transportation committee he leads so powerful” (5-15-02 B). Another exemplar makes known that “Don Young's move to increase the federal gasoline tax was a wakeup call to the nation about the inadequate and deteriorating shape of its highways” (2-5-03). Finally, he stated, “While I'm pleased the House approved this legislation, I'm still going to work for additional improvements because this is one piece of legislation that will determine the future of our nation's surface transportation system in the coming years” (4-3-04).

While there are other instances of this congressperson framing policy issues in solely national terms throughout his career, they are far less prominent than his discourse illustrating the impact of federal legislation on Alaska.

Finally, it is important to note that much of his policy dialog is not typical of current Republican philosophy. For example, “Congressman Don Young has been an outspoken critic of the Patriot Act and is co-sponsoring the Freedom to Read Act, which exempts libraries and bookstores from the scope of the Patriot Act's intrusive surveillance powers” (10-9-03). Further, because it is in Alaska’s best interest, he makes known that he “supported an increase in the federal minimum wage because working Americans deserve an increase in their minimum wages” (2-1-07). Regarding SCHIP, this legislator insists, "My priority is not politicking…but making sure our children are properly cared for. At this stage in the game, this bill does what we need it to do. It provides an additional $35 billion in funding over the next five years and does not raid Medicare” (9-27-07).

Most of the bills mentioned in the paragraph above are important to Alaska. Thus, it is not surprising that he supports these measures, regardless of the views of the majority of the
GOP. Further, when Young frames issues in a national lens, he does so to advocate for issues that are important to Alaskans.

Based on the research in this project, I assert that Young has staunch non-economic libertarian views on firearms, many forms of federal government interference, and freedom of speech. Wholly in line with these views is his opposition to the Patriot Act.

At the same time, when it comes to government spending, he can best be described as liberal. It seems to be expected that Alaska’s federal delegation seeks funds for constituents. For example, “Although both Murkowski and Alaska Rep. Don Young aren't sure how they'll be able to submit earmarks as Republicans, they still intend to try” (Anchorage Daily News 11-22-10). Also, consider, “Young said the Medicaid cuts in particular would be bad for Alaska” (Anchorage Daily News 11-9-05). Thus, federal funding for SCHIP and support for Medicare appear to be things that Alaskans support, and so does Don Young, since he is their advocate in Congress.

B) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Given what has been presented about this member so far, it should come as no surprise that a central feature of his home style is his propensity to engage in allocation politics. Simply, this member routinely seeks funding for his state.

A full 21 percent of press releases and four of the eight franked documents published highlight allocation politics (Tables D-2 and D-4).

The Anchorage Daily News chronicles many examples of Congressman Young furnishing or attempting to deliver federal resources to his state. To illustrate his commitment to allocating federal dollars, he shows off that he was given “the Golden Fleece award from
Taxpayers for Common Sense, a group that monitors federal spending,” to which Young said he was “Very proud of that” (Anchorage Daily News 7-2-03). The same article states, “Young cited big building projects as his priorities for Alaska in coming years, including the proposed $1 billion bridge from Anchorage over Knik Arm to Point Mac-Kenzie and a $190 million bridge in Ketchikan.”

Also, consider, “U.S. Rep. Don Young, chairman of the House Transportation Committee put $1 million in this year's highway bill to plan and design road access for Point MacKenzie” (8-5-04). On another transportation issue, the paper reports, “Young says transportation bill will include $2.1 billion for Alaska” (2-18-05). Illustrating his commitment to Alaskan Natives and American Indians, the Anchorage Dailey News tells readers, “It's not unusual for U.S. Rep. Don Young to defend his legendary federal appropriations to Alaska… as he fought to keep $34 million in the House budget for educational programs that benefit Alaska Natives” (7-19-07). Finally, consider:

“Rep. Don Young (R-Alaska) netted $1.5 million in earmarks in that bill, including $700,000 for Cook Inlet Beluga Whale research by the National Marine Science Foundation; $500,000 for police officer hiring and training in the Northwest Arctic Borough; and $300,000 for outreach and education for the Steller Sea Lion program at the Alaska Sea Otter and Steller Sea Lion Commission in Anchorage” (7-18-08).

As indicated above, he opposed efforts by GOP leaders to ban earmarks. The Anchorage Daily News reports, “Alaska Rep. Don Young plans to barrel through the Republican Party's ban on earmarks by submitting requests regardless of his own party's one-year moratorium on the practice” (3-23-10). The paper also notifies readers,

“Young said he's just doing his job, getting Alaska the funding that the young state needs. ‘My leadership made that decision, didn't consult with its members and said it for political reasons,’ Young said, shaking his finger. ‘They did not elect me, you elect me, and every earmark I've ever put in any bill you've asked for.’ Young said earmarks are his Constitutional duty, the role of Congress to appropriate money. He said he had 300 earmark requests this year from Alaska, and he's listed them on his website” (5-16-10).
Thus, in theory and in practice, this member is a staunch advocate for securing federal funding for his district, regardless of the wishes of conservative interest groups and party leaders.

That said, even though the data clearly suggest that Don Young is a champion of his constituents, he is not often found in his district, sponsors few town halls, and does not highlight service representation. Just one percent of press releases chronicle him at home and indicate sponsorship of town hall meetings (Table D-2). No franked documents do so (Table D-4), and information in the Anchorage Daily News and on social media on these topics is sporadic at best. Further, regarding service representation, only one percent of press releases and two franked documents highlight this activity (Tables D-2 and D-4). It is not featured in newspapers or social media sources.

Given the great distance between Washington, DC and his district, it is not surprising that the representative does not come home often. Additionally, as described above, Alaska is geographically enormous and has an underdeveloped infrastructure, impeding the feasibility of regularly hosting town halls or meeting one on one with constituent liaisons.

As his presence at home and casework are not major features of his home style, we will move on to another area that is not prominently featured by Young, his partisan and ideological dialog.

C) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Party and ideology are at the periphery of Don Young’s home style. He makes partisan statements in less than five percent of press releases and in just one franked document (Tables D-2 and D-4). He indicates his ideology in one percent of news releases and in no franked documents. While he illustrates that he is a Republican in 14 percent of press releases, placing
“R-AK” in a news release is not a signal of strong partisanship. Further, there are not many partisan or ideological statements in newspaper or social media sources.

Table D-2 also indicates that nine percent of news releases contain bipartisan statements, but there is not much bipartisan discourse in any other medium. Thus, this aspect of his home style is not prominent.

As this legislator bills himself as the “Congressman For All Alaska,” it is understandable why he would not be overwhelmingly partisan. Partisanship does not necessarily secure Alaska what it needs, particularly when the GOP is in the minority. Further, when his party does something that hurts his state, the data above indicate that he has no hesitation criticizing Republicans in Congress. As such, blazing displays of partisanship may take away from the ability of a legislator to deliver for his or her district. Consequently, Young focuses less on his party and more on Alaska.

D) Overall Assessment of Home Style

If the literature that this project tests is correct, Young should place a premium on constituent-oriented activities, frame policy in a local lens, and embrace ideological centrism and bipartisan displays.

Regarding constituent-oriented activities, Young practiced allocation politics zealously. In particular, he leveraged his post as the Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to deliver earmarks for Alaska. He also criticized any groups, campaign challengers, or party leaders that did not support earmarks. That said, he was not home often and did not highlight service representation robustly. This is likely due to the long distance from Alaska to
Washington, and the population of his state being spread widely apart. Thus, at best, there is mixed support for the literature I test.

Regarding his policy discourse, this legislator often framed the federal impact of policy on Alaska. He also concentrated on issues of local import. As such, this member’s activities clearly support the literature that this project tests.

Finally, Young should eschew partisan and ideological portrayals. He is largely non-partisan and has a record of working with Democrats in order to deliver for Alaska. Therefore, his behavior largely supports the literature.

Don Young is a zealous advocate for the state of Alaska. He routinely practices allocation representation, frames policy in a local veneer, and addresses issues of local import. Ideological or partisan considerations do not interfere with his ability to fight for his constituents. Consequently, a great deal of Young’s behavior supports the literature this project tests.

**Home Style Changes**

Don Young was re-elected with over 60 percent of the vote in 2002 and 2004. His election margins fell below 60 percent in 2006 and 2008. Young once again broke 60 percent in 2010. Therefore, I expect that he will behave differently following Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010. During this time frame, I anticipate that his policy discourse will be more locally oriented. I also anticipate that he will concentrate on constituent-oriented activities more frequently and will reveal partisan and ideological sentiments less often.

Despite several behavioral shifts, as will be revealed below, the legislator remained an advocate for all of Alaska throughout his tenure. Thus, most of the changes in his home style did not meet my expectations.
That said, first I will discuss his policy discourse. Next, we will focus on allocation politics. Finally, I will highlight one change in his partisan and ideological presentation.

### Table D-6

**Changes in Don Young’s Press Releases Around Changes in Competitive Margins**

*Subjects that referenced both federal and state or local policies in the same press release are marked with an asterisk. This practice caused the sums illustrated below to exceed 100 percent.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N=753</th>
<th>Policy N=674</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Above 60% 2002 to 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituent-Oriented Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National and Local Portrayal of Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bipartisan and Partisan Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Issues Addressed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Resource Policy</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Policy</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alterations in Policy Discourse**

Table D-6 reveals that, over the course of the program period, Young addressed policy in a solely national lens less often. Before Election Day 2006, 36 percent of press releases framed policy solely in a national lens. Following the 2006 General Election, through Election Day 2010, 26 percent of press releases discussed policy exclusively in a national frame. After the 2010 race, 22 percent did so. Thus, over time, despite competitive circumstances or expectations from the literature that this project tests, he became more locally oriented in his policy dialog.
Beyond this, over time, his concentration on environmental and resource policy, issues near and dear to Alaskans, increased dramatically. Press releases on this topic escalated almost 20 percent from the end of 2006 through 2011 (Table D-6).

There are several possible explanations for these changes.

First, perhaps competition was a factor. Despite winning comfortably in 2010, he may have maintained an even more locally focused persona and concentrated on an important issue to constituents after his extremely close result in 2008 in order to help with his 2012 re-election. Thus, while he did not shift back to a more nationally oriented veneer after the 2010 contest, or focus less on environmental policy, the shock of the 2008 result could have had a long term impact on his home style.

Second, and more likely, the reason for the shift in these activities could be related to the Democrats becoming the majority party after the 2006 General Election. With the GOP becoming the minority party that year, Don Young also ceased being the Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Vice Chair of the Resources Committee. Thus, one likely explanation for this change in his behavior is that he was not forced to address several issues, all of which are important to Alaska, in a national frame.

Finally, there was a decline in his conversation on defense policy. Table D-6 notes that it dropped from 17 percent prior to Election Day 2006 to just seven percent after the 2010 General Election. While this change may be related to competition, for the same reasons as indicated in the discourse above, it is much more likely connected to the waning down of the war in Iraq.

Nevertheless, Young largely strengthened his persona as an advocate for the state.

*Shifts in Constituent-Oriented Activities*
Table D-6 illustrates that Young practiced allocation politics less often throughout his tenure. Prior to Election Day 2006, 27 percent of press releases highlighted allocation politics. Following the 2006 General Election through Election Day 2010, 18 percent of press releases did so. After the 2010 General Election, 16 percent of press releases chronicled allocation representation. If competition influenced this aspect of his home style, I expect that he would behave differently following Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010. However, this is not the case.

As mentioned already, after the 2006 midterm, Republicans lost their majority and Young lost his positions as Chair of Transportation and Infrastructure and Vice Chair of Resources. As the chief author of major transportation funding bills, in addition to being the Vice Chair of the Resources Committee, he was able to deliver significant funding to Alaska while his party was in the majority (Anchorage Daily News 1-23-03).

Importantly, while he secured less money due to his lack of committee chairmanships, newspaper evidence indicates that he was no less an advocate for Alaska as he openly and vigorously opposed his party’s stance on earmarks for his state, regardless of the power of “deficit hawks” in his conference (Anchorage Daily News 3-22-10, 5-16-10, 11-22-10, 12-1-10). Thus, he was still an advocate for Alaska throughout the period under study.

Yet, it must be noted that due to circumstances beyond his competitive climate, his behavior does not support the literature tested by this project.

Changes in Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Finally, the sole behavioral alteration that mirrored the fluctuations in his competitive climate was his propensity to indicate his partisan affiliation. Table D-6 makes known that he
revealed his Republican affiliation more often during his most competitive period. Prior to Election Day 2006, just seven percent of press releases highlighted his party. Following the 2006 General Election through Election Day 2010, 19 percent did so. Finally, after the 2010 election, 13 percent emphasized his party.

One could make an argument that he tried to reinforce his commitment to Alaska’s strong GOP DNA during his most competitive time, again showing his solidarity with the state that he advocates for so often.

Further, he likely increased his partisan portrayal due to his very competitive primary in 2008.

However, the literature that this project tests suggests that during his most competitive period, he should have decreased his partisan portrayal. Thus, on one hand, this appears to be an area where electoral competition might have altered his home style, but not in the way that supports the literature tested. Yet, the impact of his primary election must also be taken into consideration when assessing the literature.

That said, if my assessment is correct, during his most competitive time, he connected more often with Alaska’s dominant party, the GOP. Thus, here too, it appears that competition did not change his commitment to Alaska.

**Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes**

The data above suggest that, over all, changes in Young’s home style appear to be connected to his own positions in Congress, the nature of the GOP Conference, and its majority party status. Further, the changes above by and large did not alter the most significant aspect of his home style – that of an advocate for Alaska.
Over time, he framed issues in a local lens more frequently, continued to advocate for funding for the state even if he was less successful in attaining it, and even played to Alaska’s GOP sentiments during his most competitive period.

That said, competition might have mattered. The extremely close result in 2008 could have had a long-term impact on his representational persona, permanently adjusting his home style presentation, even after safely being re-elected in 2010.

In this vein, during his most competitive time, he revealed his partisan affiliation more prominently. In doing so, he appealed to Alaska’s Republican attitudes. Importantly, this is the only behavioral alteration that suggests competition affected his representational persona in the manner anticipated at the outset of this project. Young acted in the same fashion prior to falling below 60 percent of the vote in 2006, as he did after once again earning 60 percent in 2010. During his most competitive time, he behaved differently than otherwise.

On the one hand, his behavior suggests that competition molded his home style. This supports expectations. However, the literature that this project tests suggested that he would behave less partisan during his most competitive time. In fact, he was more partisan.

Accordingly, competition could have made a difference. On the other hand, it may not have mattered. Nevertheless, Don Young was always Alaska’s voice in the House.

**Concluding Discussion**

Don Young presented himself as an advocate for his constituents throughout the period this project studies. The “Congressman For All Alaska” focuses on issues important to his state, highlights how policy impacts his constituents regularly, and seeks funding for Alaska despite his party’s ban on earmarking.
It is significant to note that the scandals that came to light within a four-year time span likely challenged his electoral stability. Once he was cleared of wrongdoing, Young was safely re-elected. Thus, scandals impact electoral fortunes, at least in the short-term.

But, did scandals and/or electoral competition impact Young’s home style persona? The short answer is perhaps. I believe they changed his campaigns, in that, he knew he had to run much harder races, including during his primary in 2008. I also insist, regardless of scandals and robust electoral competition, he would have continued to stress his image as a champion for his state. Thus, his home style was arguably too consistent over time to meet the project’s expectations.

We now move on to a member of Congress with a very different home style - Rep. Mike McCaul of Texas.

**Rep. Mike McCaul - Seeking Broad Appeal**

“Though he benefited from DeLay's draftsmanship, McCaul is of a more moderate mold, reflecting the political hegemony of a district that includes moderate and conservative Republicans as well as North Austin Democrats and Libertarians…McCaul led Republican efforts to name the new education building in Washington after LBJ, has met with peace groups, and supported an effort by Rep. Lloyd Doggett, D-Austin, to offer tax credits for buyers of hybrid cars” (Austin American Statesman 4-29-07).

Rep. Mike McCaul was elected to Congress in 2004. Before his time in the House, he was the Deputy Attorney General for Criminal Justice of the State of Texas and an Assistant U.S. Attorney. He served as the section chief of terrorism and national security in the Austin U.S. Attorney’s Office (Austin American Statesman 10-17-04). During his first campaign for Congress, the Houston Chronicle described him as follows: “McCaul was a federal prosecutor and has extensive experience fighting terrorism. He promises to use his experience to make Texas safer” (10-17-04). As of this writing, McCaul chairs the House Committee on Homeland Security (U.S. House of Representatives).
This background must be understood in relation to the district he represents. As the quote at the beginning of this chapter makes known, this member represents Texas, a border state. Thus, illegal immigration, which is profoundly related to the issue of homeland security, is a prominent local concern.

That said, the exemplar above from the Austin American Statesman also reveals that McCaul represents a heterogeneous district that stretches from Austin to Houston. As will be explained more below, there are competing interests in the constituency that make it difficult for McCaul to represent all residents effectively on substantive policy issues. In particular, this is true on energy, another prominent local concern, given Austin’s role in renewable energy and Houston being home to the oil industry.

The district is also heterogeneous in terms of partisan affiliation. McCaul represents a combination of Democrats, traditional Republicans, and Libertarians (Austin American Statesman 4-29-07).

Given competing interests in the district, it is no surprise that the chief feature of his representational persona is most aptly described as seeking broad appeal. He works to appease as many factions in his district and his party as possible. He exemplifies this image in his policy discourse, constituent-oriented activities, and partisan and ideological rhetoric.

Beyond this, factions in his constituency and their different political leanings and ideologies also explain the competitive circumstances that I will document. The district was initially thought to lean heavily Republican since it was created out of Tom DeLay’s efforts to increase GOP representation in the House. In fact, Democrats did not even field a candidate in 2004. Yet, it became clear early on that the competitive nature of the 10th District of Texas was
far more complicated (Austin American Statesman 6-21-04). When left-leaning Austin residents vote in large numbers, contests are much closer than originally anticipated.

As such, while McCaul won the district handily in 2004 and 2010, his election margins were close in 2006 and 2008. Consistent with the hypotheses of this project, I expect shifts in his home style in response to breaking or falling below 60 percent of the vote. Accordingly, if the literature that this project tests is correct, I anticipate that this member increased the propensity to which he practiced constituent-oriented activities, framed policy in a more local veneer, and reduced partisan dialog between Election Day 2006 and Election Day 2010.

While McCaul changed his home style in several ways that will be documented below, the chief image of his home style, that of seeking broad appeal, remained intact throughout this project.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

*District Traits*

The map below illustrates an irregularly shaped district, roughly 120 miles wide, that stretches from the suburbs of Houston to Austin, Texas.

The Census Bureau makes known that 18.8 percent of district residents work in education services, and health care and social assistance; 12.8 percent have careers in professional, scientific, and management and administrative and waste management services; 11 percent hold jobs in manufacturing; and 11.1 percent are employed in retail trade (Table E).

Also, the district is affluent, as the median household income is $62,261 compared to a U.S. median household income of $51,425 (Table E). Further, Table E illustrates that 7.7 percent of families are below the poverty line, compared to 9.9 percent in the United States.
Beyond economic demographics, 35.3 percent of residents have a B.A. compared to a national mean of 27.5 percent. The population is younger than the rest of the country, since 32.3 years is its median age, compared to a national median age of 36.5 years.

There are several important industries that are important to McCaul’s story. First, at the risk of being cliché, since Apollo 13 made known that “Houston we have a problem,” the aerospace industry is important to the area, as is the high tech sector in Austin (McCaul Government Facebook Page 3-9-11). Further, and often at odds with the high tech sector that frequently engages in research in renewable energy, many parts of the district are home to employees of the oil industry (Austin American Statesman 5-26-08).

Also, it must explicitly be said that the district is in a border state; immigration/ border security is a prominent local concern.

As will be illustrated below, the geographic location of the district and the particular industries identified in this section play a prominent role in McCaul’s home style persona: that of seeking broad appeal.

District characteristics also clearly contribute to the competitive climate he experiences. That climate will now be explained more thoroughly.
Table E
Census Data on the 10th District of Texas
from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

**Economic Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$ 62,261</td>
<td>$ 51,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and management and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competitive Contexts**
The district supports Republicans in presidential races, with PVI scores of R+13 and R+10. However, the competitive circumstances of the district are more complicated. The Austin American Statesman notes, “...it is a peculiar district, and we hope next year's redistricting does away with the bizarre political marriage of folks in Austin and folks near Houston” (10-10-10).

More precisely, the same publication observes,

“Perhaps more than anything else, environmental issues illustrate the push-pull nature of McCaul's political world. On the west side of the 10th Congressional District is Travis County, arguably the most liberal in Texas and an area where many voters measure politicians by their environmental sensibilities. On the east side, in and around Houston's Harris County, live thousands of people who work in the energy and oil sectors” (5-26-08).

Thus, this “bizarre political marriage” meshes conservative and progressive voters that help rationalize the balance in McCaul’s home style presentation. The diversity of interests also explains McCaul’s close contests in 2006 and 2008, after being initially elected with no Democratic opposition in 2004.

Even with 2006 being a Democratic landslide, given the gerrymandered nature of the district as presented in the introduction to this case study, it came as a shock to everyone that Ted Ankrum performed well on Election Day 2006. Ankrum - a veteran, engineer, and former administrator for NASA - spent just under $65,000 on the campaign. Yet, McCaul only earned 55 percent of the vote (Austin American Statesman 10-20-06). Ankrum’s campaign argued that due to the incumbent’s policy positions, “McCaul represents the Republican leadership, not the people of the district” (Austin American Statesman 4-12-06).

Following this race, the Houston Chronicle noted that McCaul, “was re-elected to a second term in 2006 with the slimmest margin (55 percent) of any incumbent Republican congressman from Texas” (9-3-07).
Unlike his two previous contests, McCaul’s 2008 re-election campaign was widely chronicled in local newspapers. Democrats began announcing their candidacies to challenge the incumbent as early as May 2007 (Austin American Statesman 5-3-07). The Democratic Primary was won by Larry Joe Doherty, a lawyer and local reality TV show personality in Texas (Austin American Statesman 3-5-08).

Doherty argued for troop withdrawal in Iraq and sharply criticized McCaul for supporting the Iraq War (Houston Chronicle 9-3-07). The Houston Chronicle noted, “McCaul is in a tight race against Houston lawyer Larry Joe Doherty, according to some polls” (6-26-08). The Austin American Statesman endorsed Doherty citing that McCaul’s support of President Bush is out of step with the Austin end of the district (10-21-08).

Doherty spent almost $1.2 million against McCaul, over 18 times what Ankrum spent in 2006. Yet, Doherty earned just one point better than Ankrum; McCaul earned 54 percent of the vote.

Ted Ankrum ran again in 2010 and spent just $20,000. There was little press in this race; McCaul earned 65 percent of the vote.

Thus, McCaul was initially elected by an enormous margin in 2004. He then experienced two very tight races, before being re-elected comfortably in 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>$ 2,988,395</td>
<td>Robert Fritsche (Libertarian)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$ 1,111,986</td>
<td>Ted Ankrum</td>
<td>$ 64,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>$ 1,728,344</td>
<td>Larry Joe Doherty</td>
<td>$ 1,189,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$ 2,137,670</td>
<td>Ted Ankrum</td>
<td>$ 20,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Home Style Overview

Tables E-2 through E-5 furnish readers with an overview of McCaul’s home style activities portrayed in the 271 press releases and 28 franked documents that he circulated. His activities are widely covered in the Austin American Statesman and the Houston Chronicle.

As already explained, McCaul works to seek broad appeal from the diverse interests he represents. This is the chief feature of his home style persona.

To chronicle his image, first I will discuss his policy conversation. The issues that he addresses and the manner of how he frames those concerns clearly exhibit the prime characteristic of his representational persona. Next, I will highlight the manner of how he balances partisan and bipartisan rhetoric. This conversation is also indicative of a legislator that reaches out to individuals across the political spectrum. Finally, his constituent-oriented activities will be explained. His attempts to please different factions in his district are also revealed in this set of home style features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table E-2</th>
<th>Mike McCaul Press Releases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Program Period</td>
<td>N = 271 Press Releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicates Own Party 227 84%
Makes Partisan Statement 46 17%
Makes Bipartisan Statement 47 17%
Indicates Own Ideology 2 1%
* This percentage is calculated out of 255, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.

Table E-3
Mike McCaul Press Releases
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period
N=255 Press Releases That Address Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security Policy</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/Border Policy</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology/Space Policy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment/Jobs Policy</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E-4
Mike McCaul Franked Materials
Entire Program Period       N = 28 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Lens*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* This percentage is calculated out of 20, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy.
**Table E-5**
Mike McCaul Franked Materials
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed
N= 20 Franked Documents That Address Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security Policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/Border Policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Broad Policy Discourse

McCaul’s policy discourse is multifaceted. On the one hand, news releases tend to frame issues in a national lens. On the other hand, local and national factors are addressed in a more balanced approach in franked, newspaper, and social media sources.

Table E-2 shows that 63 percent of McCaul’s press releases address issues in a solely national frame, while only 35 percent explain how national policy impacts Texas. Removing those press releases that also reveal allocation representation, 75 percent of news releases are nationally focused, while 23 percent highlight the impact of policy on Texas.

The legislator’s policy conversation portrayed in newspapers and social media is more diverse. The dialog in these sources frames issues in a national context slightly more often. Further, half of the franked documents address policy in a national frame, and half illustrate the impact of national policy locally (Table E-4).

It is important to note that this member focuses on issues that are significant to all or large subsets of constituents. These concerns include homeland/border security, space/technology, and energy. Therefore, even when addressing issues in a national frame, there is an important local element to his discourse. Further, McCaul’s policy dialog demonstrates the main feature of his home style: seeking broad appeal.
That said, homeland security policy was addressed in 42 percent of press releases and immigration/border security was highlighted in 21 percent of news releases (Table E-3). Further, 30 percent of franked documents mention homeland security and immigration/border policy, respectively (Table E-4).

A clearly nationally oriented exemplar from social media on this important local topic includes: “McCaul to appear in story on ABC's Good Morning America shortly after 7am CST on intel failure” (Government Twitter Page 1-8-10). Further, consider, “Emotional testimony in today's Radicalization hearing from a father [whose] son was sent to Yemen to be radicalized…The threat to America lies within our own country. It's not Congress that is attacking Muslim-Americans but Al Qaeda that is targeting and attacking our Muslim youth” (Government Facebook Page 3-10-11).

I would normally code the following exemplars as nationally oriented since the dialog does not specifically mention Texas. However, even though the southern border runs through several states, there is still a local element to these assertions as Texas is also on the border. His Twitter page reveals, “McCaul urges more $$ for border sheriffs to fight cartels and secure border…” (4-8-09). Further, his Facebook page tells readers, “Watch Congressman McCaul live on CNN with Deb Feyerick at appx 1:10pm CT discussing Mexican drug cartels and the need to secure the border” (4-17-11).

Beyond social media, local newspapers widely chronicle McCaul speaking about homeland security and immigration policy. Consider, “‘I want to make our borders more secure and help to provide Americans with peace of mind knowing that our nation is truly secure,’ McCaul said” (Austin American Statesman 1-8-05). Next, the Houston Chronicle reveals, “Another provision authored by McCaul would let state and local agencies use homeland
security grants to carry out federal border enforcement duties. ‘The reason we are talking about this is because of 9/11’” (12-17-05). Further, discussing physical boundaries at the border, McCaul makes known, “As with the United States Border Patrol, I support placing physical barriers in the populated areas as we have done in El Paso and San Diego. I support a virtual wall of technology between our populated areas along our Southwest border” (Austin American Statesman 4-16-06). The Houston Chronicle reports, “Rep. Michael McCaul, R-Austin, said he was ‘frustrated that we can't get funding on this side that our Border Patrol and sheriffs desperately need’” (7-2-08).

Beyond border policy, the Houston Chronicle informs readers, “McCaul, briefed by federal authorities in his role as the ranking Republican on the House Committee on Homeland Security panel that handles intelligence and terrorism risk assessment, said Hasan's steady radicalization during the course of his Army career at Walter Reed Hospital and Fort Hood at least raised the possibility of outside influence” (Houston Chronicle 11-7-09). Finally, the paper states, “U.S. Rep. Michael McCaul, a Republican from Austin whose district stretches into Harris County, said ICE officials told him the attack raised ‘a grave concern’ that cartels were now targeting U.S. law enforcement agents” (Houston Chronicle 2-17-11).

Thus, homeland security and immigration are clearly the most pervasive issues that McCaul addresses across a variety of mediums. The exemplars stated above contain both local and national elements. Again, while he does not specifically mention Texas in most instances, and takes a more nationally oriented approach to border policy, there are also clearly local elements to this discourse too. For example, many border agents live in this state. The balance struck on this issue clearly reveals a home style that seeks broad appeal on homeland security.
Next, McCaul highlights technology and space policy often. In total, 15 percent of press documents address this issue. Local newspaper statements on this policy area include the Austin American Statesman reporting that McCaul “said that the United States ‘must adopt the same enthusiasm’ for space exploration as when Americans first landed on the moon 36 years ago this week” (7-23-05). Regarding an issue with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, McCaul makes known, “if NASA violated its own rules by knowingly allowing astronauts to fly while intoxicated, that is a very serious and unacceptable safety violation” (Houston Chronicle 7-27-07). Finally, also regarding this agency, McCaul states, “he was ‘pleased that the GAO report gives NASA credit for the progress that it has made in improving its acquisitions management’” (Houston Chronicle 3-5-09).

These issues are clearly framed in a national veneer. However, since NASA has a base in Houston, there are also local elements to these statements. As such, here too, his conversation blurs the lines between framing an issue in a national lens while also speaking to a prominent local concern. Thus, concentrating on this issue again illustrates McCaul reaching out to a large subset of individuals in his district who work in this field.

Lastly, McCaul spends a great deal of time addressing energy policy. First, 30 percent of franked documents concentrate on this issue (Table E-4). Exemplars in newspapers on this topic include McCaul extolling, “I voted for most of the alternative energy legislation that's in this bill at the committee level. My constituents in Austin support alternative energy, as do I. The concern I had with this bill is that it really didn't do enough to bring down the price of gas at the pump” (Austin American Statesman 12-17-07). The Austin American Statesman also reports, “U.S. Rep. Michael McCaul gathered business leaders in Washington last month to promote energy-efficient technology and voted late last year for the first major increase in fuel-efficiency standards for automobiles in more than 30 years. But the Austin
Republican also has voted against extending some tax incentives for renewable energy, and the League of Conservation Voters gives him low marks” (5-26-08).

Finally, McCaul is quoted saying, “he favors an ‘all of the above’ strategy for energy production, including drilling in areas now off-limits, developing nuclear and hydroelectric power and streamlining the permitting process for construction of oil refineries” (Austin American Statesman 8-17-08).

The first example above is clearly the most locally oriented, as McCaul singles out Austin residents in the statement. The other two appear to be framed in national terms. However, given Austin’s prominence in the renewable energy sector, and Houston’s place in the oil industry, energy is clearly an important local issue. Further, these exemplars suggest that this member works hard to appeal to both sets of constituents.

Beyond seeking broad appeal from different sets of voters in his policy dialog, this behavior is also imbued in his partisan and ideological rhetoric that is next addressed.

B) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

It is important to note that 84 percent of press releases indicate that McCaul is a Republican (Table E-2). That is clearly significant; he wants individuals to know his partisan affiliation.

However, and counter intuitively given this statistic, I do not characterize him as a staunch partisan. While he may criticize Democrats on policy positions, he also expresses interest in and actually works with Democrats on a variety of issues. Thus, as the Austin American Statesman quote cited at the beginning of this case study made clear, “McCaul is of a more moderate mold” (4-29-07) than Tom DeLay. Data support this characterization.
First, 17 percent of press releases illustrate McCaul putting forward some type of partisan declaration either extolling the virtues of the Republican Party or lambasting Democrats (Table E-2). At the same time, 17 percent of press releases also chronicle McCaul issuing bipartisan statements. Similarly, while 14 percent of franked documents indicate that McCaul is a Republican, 11 percent also contain bipartisan language (Table E-4).

This partisan/bipartisan balance that appeals to a base of Republicans and reaches out to Democrats is also apparent in newspaper and social media sources. While I will illustrate several examples of McCaul’s partisan rhetoric, it is important to note that these are not overwhelmingly prominent.

One example of partisanship includes, “I am a Republican, so I am typically in line with the leadership” (Houston Chronicle 5-7-06). On a major policy issue, the Houston Chronicle reports, “McCaul opened the meeting at the Merrell Center by calling Democratic efforts at health-care reform an ‘abuse of power,’ pushed through without enough thought or hearings” (9-10-09). Also on health care, this same publication makes known, “Rep. Michael McCaul, R-Austin, said the lawmakers gleaned a ‘very loud and clear’ message from consultations with Houston-area hospital officials who fear the Democrats' health care reform will destroy American medicine” (11-5-09).

His social media sources are also used to display partisan rhetoric. Consider, “Did you know: The fed [government] will run up a $1.5 trillion deficit this year? 11 times the 10-yr ‘savings’ Democrats claim is in the bill” (Government Twitter 3-20-10).

Thus, these partisan declarations clearly reach out to his Republican base. Yet, he does not make these types of statements regularly. Many more examples are present that reveal bipartisan sentiments and illustrate this legislator working with Democrats.
His Facebook page makes known that McCaul was “Proud to stand with my co-chair on the High Tech Caucus, Rep. Doris Matsui [D-CA], and my friend Rep. Kevin Brady from Houston, in support of legislation to increase R&D tax credits and make them permanent” (3-9-11). His Government Twitter page declares, “Great initial bipartisan caucus for TX delegation tonight. New border czar addressed us. We'll keep this going regularly” (4-27-09).

The Austin American Statesman notes, “McCaul led Republican efforts to name the new education building in Washington after LBJ… and supported an effort by Rep. Lloyd Doggett, D-Austin, to offer tax credits for buyers of hybrid cars” (4-29-07). The same article makes known that when McCaul was “asked to name colleagues he most admires, he mentioned Rep. Joseph Crowley, D-N.Y., and former Speaker Dennis Hastert, R-Ill.”

Further, the Austin-American Statesman reports that “McCaul, a Republican, introduced the bipartisan bill based on the group's report Tuesday with fellow Reps. Frank Wolf, R-Va., Mark Udall, D-Colo., and Daniel Lipinski, D-IlI” (6-7-07). Regarding a homeland security issue, this same publication makes known, “McCaul said in response that he repeatedly has reached across the aisle, pointing to his efforts with Rep. Henry Cuellar, D-Laredo, to fight the drug flow across the U.S.-Mexico border” (3-6-08). Finally, the Austin American Statesman chronicles, “U.S. Reps. Henry Cuellar, D-Laredo, and, Michael McCaul, R-Austin, said the technology in development at Applied Physical Electronics could stop smugglers in their tracks by shutting down vehicles' electrical systems” (6-2-10). Lastly, the Houston Chronicle notes, “With the wind at their backs (and their tongues in their cheeks), more than 20 members of the Texas delegation want to enter into a ‘free-trade agreement’… ‘It is a fully bipartisan effort,’ said Rep. Michael McCaul…” (6-5-05).
Thus, McCaul balances partisan statements with bipartisan dialog. As he showcases his Republican affiliation, and in some cases his strong support for the party’s issue positions, he also clearly indicates his willingness and track record of working with Democrats on policy issues. Thus, McCaul reaches out to his own party base, as well as those who are not Republicans, again illustrating a home style that seeks broad appeal.

The chief feature of his home style is also evident in his constituent-oriented activities that will now be presented.

C) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

While McCaul focused on allocation politics regularly, he did not spend much time illustrating his presence at home or practicing service representation.

First, regarding allocation politics, a total of 18 percent of news releases and franked documents, respectively, portray McCaul engaging in some form of allocation representation (Table E-2 and Table E-4).

Local newspapers also chronicle McCaul’s allocation activities. The Houston Chronicle reports, “U.S. Rep. Michael McCaul, R-Austin, whose 10th district includes the city of Tomball, said he would help city leaders pursue FAA Airport Improvement Program grant funds…” (1-26-06). Also, this paper makes known, “Rep. Mike McCaul, R-Austin, has asked for funding for 38 local projects, including $750,000 for a ladder truck for the Prairie View Volunteer Fire Department” (7-1-07). Finally, the Austin American Statesman tells readers, “The Austin Police Department is asking the federal government for $12 million to buy three new helicopters…The office of U.S. Rep. Mike McCaul said the Austin Republican ‘has been working closely with
APD ... to secure additional air assets’” (10-3-10). However, this is not the complete tale of McCaul’s allocation activities. In fact, this part of McCaul’s story is much more complicated.

On March 25, 2008, the Houston Chronicle declared, “McCaul, a two-term congressman widely viewed as the most politically vulnerable Republican House member from Texas, joins a small but growing number of lawmakers who have rejected earmarks, which are special orders to federal agencies to fund specific projects.” Oddly, the same article notes that McCaul requested $20 million for his district in that same budget year.

Two years later, on April 26, 2010, the Houston Chronicle noted that McCaul “stopped requesting earmarks in 2008.” Yet, there were examples of McCaul practicing allocation politics between March of 2008 and April of 2010.

For example, on September 17, 2009, the Houston Chronicle quotes McCaul asserting, “‘The expansion of U.S. 290 is a number one priority for me,’ McCaul said. ‘We are working together as a team on the federal, state and local levels to make sure we get funding to expand 290.’” His Government Twitter Page discusses fighting to keep a government contract with BAE systems, a defense contractor with 3,000 jobs in his district (10-1-09). The Houston Chronicle also confirms the attention he paid to making sure a contract was allocated to BAE systems (9-25-09).

Thus, on one hand, McCaul swears off earmarks, and on the other, he fights for road funding and a government contract for a local company.

The Austin American Statesman produced an explanation of how he managed to present these two incongruous personas. This article reports, “McCaul routinely writes letters of support for entities in his district that are applying for federal competitive grants…for projects that range
in scope from alternative energy to law enforcement to health and domestic violence programs” (Austin American Statesman 1-5-11).

Accordingly, Mike McCaul delivers for his constituents while also appeasing deficit hawks. He swore off earmarks, yet still advocated for government funding and contracts for local interests by other means. Thus, his allocation activities further demonstrate his ability to seek broad appeal.

The other two constituent-oriented home style traits are truly at the periphery of his representational image.

Just 11 percent of his press releases and franked documents chronicle McCaul in his district (Tables E-2 and E-4). In newspaper articles, he is presented as being at home regularly, but not overwhelmingly. Some examples of his presence at home in local papers include McCaul throwing out the first pitch at a Houston Astros game (Houston Chronicle 5-1-05), speaking at the Metropolitan Breakfast Club (Austin American Statesman 8-5-08), hosting a town hall on health care reform (Houston Chronicle 9-3-09), and hosting a press conference in Austin on global security (Austin American Statesman 3-24-11). Thus, particularly in newspaper articles, while McCaul may seek broad appeal by being at home regularly, it is not the defining feature of his representational image.

Neither is service representation, where only three percent of press releases (Table E-2) highlight this activity. Newspapers are also missing information on this home style trait. The lack of information in these two mediums is somewhat balanced by the 43 percent of franked documents that underscore this home style feature (Table E-4). Yet, that 43 percent represents only 12 documents published over seven years. Thus, service representation is not an overwhelming aspect of McCaul’s persona.
D) Overall Assessment of Home Style

If the literature that this project tests is correct, McCaul should concentrate on constituent-oriented activities, frame policy in a local veneer, and place a premium on bipartisan displays and ideological centrism.

Regarding constituent-oriented activities, he does engage in allocation politics regularly, even if not through earmarks. In fact, his ability to still advocate for the allocation needs of his constituents, while also not alienating conservatives is fascinating. That said, this legislator is not home as often as he could be and does not highlight service representation robustly. Therefore, on the whole, McCaul does not focus on constituent-oriented activities.

His policy dialog is most often framed in national terms. In particular, his press releases are far more nationally oriented than any other medium. His social media, newspaper and franked materials also exhibit a strong national tone. At the same time, it must also be acknowledged that this legislator often concentrated on issues of local import, even if he framed these concerns in a national lens. Even so, on the whole, the literature that this project tests is largely not supported by McCaul’s actions.

Finally, while McCaul highlights his GOP affiliation, this legislator balances partisan statements with bipartisan rhetoric. He is also not very ideological in tone. Therefore, his activities largely support the literature that this project tests.

That said, it is evident that this legislator sought broad appeal in his heterogeneous district. He practiced allocation politics while eschewing earmarks. Thus, he met local needs while not alienating conservatives. McCaul also framed local issues in a national lens, appearing as a statesman of the nation and an advocate of his district. Finally, he displayed his Republican
affiliation and made partisan statements while also calling for bipartisan solutions to problems. As such, his behavior both did and did not support the literature that I test.

**Home Style Changes**

As noted, McCaul won comfortably in 2004. His election margins were below 60 percent in 2006 and 2008. Finally, he earned over 60 percent of the vote in 2010.

Accordingly, and in line with hypotheses, I anticipate that McCaul will behave differently between Election Day 2006 and Election Day 2010, compared to prior to and after this time frame.

The data suggest that Mike McCaul altered his behavior in several ways. In some cases, press releases reveal that changes in his home style follow the shifts in his electoral margins. However, most of his behavioral shifts did not conform to the expected pattern.

In line with the discussion above, first, I will highlight changes in his policy discourse. Next, I will identify shifts in his partisan dialog and ideological rhetoric. Finally, I turn to alterations in his constituent-oriented activities.

Most importantly, regardless of competitive circumstances, I argue that McCaul acted as a member of Congress who sought broad appeal throughout his time in office.

**Table E-6**

* Changes in Mike McCaul’s Press Releases Around Changes in Competitive Margins

* Subjects that referenced both federal and state or local policies in the same press release are marked with an asterisk. This practice caused the sums illustrated below to exceed 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Above 60% 2004 to 2006</th>
<th>Above 60% 2006-2010</th>
<th>Below 60% 2006-2010</th>
<th>Above 60% 2010 - 2011</th>
<th>Above 60% 2010 - 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Constituent-Oriented Activities

| Allocation Representation | 11 | 19% | 36 | 19% | 1 | 4% |
| Presence At Home | 3 | 5% | 27 | 14% | 1 | 4% |

National and Local Portrayal of Policy

| Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens* | 28 | 53% | 115 | 64% | 18 | 78% |
| Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level* | 24 | 45% | 61 | 34% | 5 | 22% |

Bipartisan and Partisan Activities

| Makes Partisan Statement | 1 | 2% | 41 | 22% | 4 | 17% |

Policy Issues Addressed

| Immigration/Border Security Policy | 13 | 25% | 33 | 18% | 7 | 30% |
| Economic Policy | 4 | 8% | 34 | 19% | 3 | 13% |
| Technology/Space Policy | 1 | 2% | 29 | 16% | 7 | 30% |

Alterations in Policy Discourse

First, through press releases, McCaul increasingly framed issues in a national lens throughout his career (Table E-6). Prior to Election Day 2006, 53 percent of press releases addressed policy in a solely national lens. Following the 2006 General Election through Election Day 2010, 64 percent of press releases framed policy in this manner. Finally, after the 2010 General Election, 78 percent of press releases addressed policy in a solely national lens.

It is not clear why McCaul framed policy more nationally over time. One possible explanation is that he became the ranking member of a homeland security subcommittee after 2006 and chair of a homeland security subcommittee after 2010.

That said, I stress that framing issues in press releases in a national lens more frequently over time is not entirely significant. The policy areas that he highlighted, which changed throughout his tenure, are important to consider.

First, McCaul focused on technology and space policy much more robustly over time. Two percent of press releases stressed this issue from 2005 to Election Day 2006. Following
Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010, 16 percent of news releases focused on this policy area. After the 2010 General Election, 30 percent of these documents emphasized this topic.

Also, his concentration on immigration/border policy fluctuated. Twenty five percent of press releases spoke to this issue prior to Election Day 2006. Following Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010, 18 percent underscored this policy area. After the 2010 General Election, 30 percent of news releases featured this topic. Thus, he consistently focused on immigration, though to varying degrees of intensity.

Finally, Table E-6 illustrates that discourse on economic policy escalated during his most competitive period. Prior to the 2006 General Election, eight percent of press releases addressed this topic. During his most competitive time, after Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010, 19 percent of press releases focused on this issue. Following Election Day 2010, 13 percent of press releases highlighted economic policy.

With the above said, I argue McCaul’s policy discourse did not significantly change. With the exception of economic policy that will be discussed in the next paragraph, regardless of how this member framed policy issues, he concentrated on concerns of local import throughout his tenure. Thus, McCaul always sought broad appeal in his district, whether he framed immigration or space policy in a national manner or a local lens, because of the importance of these issues to his constituents.

Regarding economic policy, it is likely that he addressed this issue far more from November 2006 through November 2010 due to the economic crisis. I do not believe that this change was connected to competitive circumstances.
Thus, I assert that McCaul’s policy dialog was rather stable, and that competition did not significantly change his home style image.

*Changes in Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric*


One possible factor that may explain this sharp increase in partisan statements following the 2006 General Election concerns the Democrats new status as the majority party in Congress. Further, after 2009, President Obama was in the White House. Therefore, McCaul likely increased his partisan dialog in response to Democratic Congressional proposals, and then proposals shared by Democrats in Congress and President Obama. Finally after 2010, he likely continued his partisan dialog by criticizing President Obama and the Senate.

At the same time, McCaul’s fluctuation in partisan activities must be taken into account with the fact that while he increased partisan statements, he also increased bipartisan rhetoric. Thus, over time, it is typical for McCaul to criticize those in the opposite party in one breath, while offering to work with them in the next.
Thus, I assert that in this area too, McCaul’s image of seeking broad appeal did not change.

**Shifts in Constituent-Oriented Activities**

Prior to Election Day 2010, 19 percent of press releases chronicled McCaul’s allocation efforts. However, only four percent did so following the 2010 General Election.

Newspapers also document a shift in McCaul’s allocation activities. In December 2007, the Austin American Statesman cited McCaul asserting his ability to defend the legitimacy of earmark requests he made while in Congress (12-21-07). Then, several months later, the Houston Chronicle noted, “With public opinion incensed over Alaskan bridges to nowhere and other wasteful outrages, the term ‘earmark’ has become a dirty word. U.S. Rep. Michael McCaul, R-Austin, facing a vigorous challenge to his re-election, feels so vulnerable he swore off requesting that Congress order federal agencies to fund pet projects” (3-26-08).

After McCaul “swore off” earmarks in 2008, the Austin American Statesman noted that McCaul’s challenger in the general election made the same vow and questioned the sincerity of McCaul’s oath to not request funding through earmarks (3-25-08). Thus, it appears that competition may have caused a shift in his propensity to request earmarks since McCaul’s 2008 race was competitive and his opponent questioned his sincerity to not submit earmark requests.

However, in light of the chief feature of his home style, that of seeking broad appeal, this large shift in his allocation activities after 2010 made sense. With the Tea Party surge at the 2010 General Election, McCaul representing a large number of conservatives and libertarians, and now being in the majority beginning in 2011 - McCaul curbing allocation requests actually increased his appeal within his party and with fiscal conservatives.
As such, while competition may have led to changes in his allocation efforts, the timing of the shift only fortified his image as a legislator that seeks broad appeal from various subsets of constituents.

Beyond allocation, McCaul’s presence at home, as depicted in press releases, also changed (Table E-6). Prior to Election Day 2006, only five percent of press releases chronicled his presence at home. Following Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010, 14 percent of press releases did so. After Election Day 2010, just four percent of press releases exhibited McCaul in the district.

McCaul’s presence at home greatly increased during his most competitive period, in line with the literature that this project tests. I can find no other explanation to clarify this behavioral shift.

Importantly, his more robust presence at home during his most competitive era indicates that during this time frame, he sought broad appeal from constituents since he was at home more often.

Thus, his presence at home also reinforced the chief feature of his home style, that of seeking broad appeal.

*Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes*

Did competition alter McCaul’s home style, and if so, why? Out of all of the changes outlined above, only three met the expectation that McCaul would behave differently from Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010 (discussion of immigration/border policy, economic policy discourse, and presence at home), compared to prior to and following this period.
Yet, out of these three instances, only McCaul’s presence at home truly follows shifts in his election margins, and is the only area where I cannot find an alternative explanation to rationalize his behavior during his most competitive time.

That said, as explained above, whether or not competition changed some aspects of his home style in a manner that supports the literature that this project tests, McCaul consistently appealed to different subsets of constituents throughout his time in office. Therefore, I maintain that competition did not alter the most fundamental aspect of his representational image.

Concluding Discussion

McCaul appeals to different subsets of constituents through his home style. He discussed issues that were important in his district, reached out to the GOP as well as those in other parties, and met allocation expectations of both those he represented and other deficit hawks that do not live in his district.

Regarding whether or not competition changed McCaul’s home style, the data indicate that it likely affected his constituent-oriented activities. It probably caused him to be at home more often and change his position on earmarks, if not allocation representation as a whole.

Yet, while there were more changes to his home style than I anticipated, I assert that he continuously sought broad appeal throughout his tenure. He concentrated on local issues constantly, regardless of how they were framed; reached out to all parties frequently; and practiced allocation representation, whether through earmarking or other methods, consistently. Consequently, McCaul’s case is both interesting and complicated.

Perhaps most importantly, the data show a truly remarkable case of the impact of political gerrymandering on American democracy. McCaul’s district was thought to be so secure for the
GOP, that the Democrats did not even nominate a candidate to run in the first election that took place in the constituency. After finding someone to contest the following election on a shoe-string budget, local politicos were shocked to learn that the district was not nearly as secure for the dominant party as originally thought. Thus, McCaul’s case contains an important lesson for students of redistricting: sometimes a district is not what it appears. This has broad implications for candidate recruitment and substantive representation beyond the scope of this project.

We now move on to a member of Congress whose approach is not all that different from McCaul’s, Rep. Emanuel Cleaver of Missouri.

**Rep. Emanuel Cleaver - A Local Advocate with a National Voice**

“As I begin to lead the [Congressional Black Caucus], I pledge myself to the 5th District of MO first and foremost. I'll continue to work with you to make our nation stronger, better, just and fair” (Emanuel Cleaver Facebook Wall 1-5-2011).

The Rev. Emanuel Cleaver was elected to Congress in 2004 (Kansas City Star 11-4-04). Prior to that, he spent over 30 years as the senior pastor of St. James’ United Methodist Church, a congregation in his congressional district that he grew from less than 50 members in 1972, to over 2000 today (Kansas City Star 4-6-08). Of Cleaver, a local newspaper observes, “Many Kansas Citians have experienced the Full Cleaver -- a lectern-pounding, speaker-distorting blast from the local congressman and minister” (Kansas City Star 8-29-08).

Just as importantly, he served on the Kansas City Council for 12 years, and then was elected mayor (Kansas City Star 6-25-04). His position as mayor likely influenced Cleaver’s persona in two ways. First, it certainly sparked him to fight for the local needs of his constituents, an important job of any mayor. Second, since he was the chief executive of Missouri’s largest city, this position gave him a voice statewide, and even nationally.
It follows then, as the quote at the beginning of his case study suggests, that Cleaver acts as a local advocate with a national voice. As will be explained more below, beyond frequently practicing many constituent-oriented activities, he uses his positions in Congress to address issues that clearly impact his largely urban district, while also speaking on policies that affect the world beyond its borders (Kansas City 12-18-05; Facebook Wall 1-5-2011).

Shifting to a discussion of the area he represents, Cleaver is the only African-American Democrat in the House that represents a majority-white constituency (Kansas City Star 10-5-08). In addition, as will be explained more, the urban nature of the district, as well as its location on the Missouri River, figure prominently into Cleaver’s story and reinforce the chief feature of his home style. Equally important is the district’s competitive climate.

Cleaver’s district should be safe for members of the Democratic Party; yet, his vote totals fluctuated above and below 60 percent. He was initially elected with less than 60 percent of the vote in 2004, earned more than 60 percent in 2006 and 2008, and once again fell below that mark in 2010.

The literature that this project tests indicates that he will frame issues more nationally in his policy dialog, concentrate less on constituent-oriented activities, and produce more partisan rhetoric between Election Day 2006 and Election Day 2010, a less competitive era compared to other periods.

He altered his home style, even if largely not in the ways suggested by the literature. However, these changes only reinforced his representational image. Thus, despite the deviations in his persona, Cleaver always acted as a local advocate with a national voice.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**
**District Traits**

The map below depicts a relatively compact constituency with an urban core home to most of its population. At its widest points, the district is no more than 25 miles long by 25 miles wide. Large population centers in the district include Kansas City and Independence (Kansas City Star 12-18-05).

The Census Bureau indicates that 20.2 percent of district residents work in education services, and health care and social assistance; 11.4 percent work in professional, scientific, and management and administrative and waste management services; 11.3 percent work in retail trade; and 9.7 percent are in manufacturing. Also, Missouri’s Fifth is poorer than the nation as a whole, as the median household income is $45,307, compared to a U.S. median household income of $51,425. Further, 11.4 percent of families are below the poverty line, compared to 9.9 percent in the United States.

Additionally, 26.3 percent have a B.A. compared to a national mean of 27.5 percent. The population is slightly younger than the rest of the country, since 36.1 years is their median age, compared to a national median age of 36.5 years.

Table F illustrates that the constituency is majority white, with 64.3 percent of voters identifying as Caucasian. Significantly, 8.1 percent of voters are Hispanic and 23.5 percent are African-American.

That said, Cleaver worked to build trust with his constituents who are not African-American. The Kansas City Star reported that Cleaver “has decided not to pursue the chairmanship of the Congressional Black Caucus now or ever because he doesn't want to emphasize one type of people in his district over the rest…‘I don't think I need to serve as the chair of a caucus for one segment of the district’” (12-18-05).
Despite this sentiment, and after winning reelection handily in 2006, Cleaver eventually assumed the chairmanship of the CBC. This suggests his ties to the African-American community are strong and that he may have waited to make sure he developed the trust of the wider district before deciding to focus on his ties to one subset of constituents.

Beyond this, two of the district’s features help us understand Cleaver’s home style. First, the district sits on the Missouri River, which frequently floods. This impacts his allocation activities and reinforces his persona as a local advocate. Second, it is a highly urbanized area. It is no surprise then that Cleaver addresses urban policy issues often.

Table F
Census Data on the 5th District of Missouri from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Traits</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$45,307</td>
<td>$51,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Missouri’s Fifth district is Democratic. Table F-1 notes that its PVI scores are D+12 for 2006 and D+10 for 2009.

With this context in mind, Cleaver’s 2004 election was far closer than most observers initially prophesied (Kansas City Star 10-24-04). Because Cleaver had been mayor of Kansas City, the 2004 race received considerable attention. The closeness of the election was largely due to the resources of his opponent, Jeanne Patterson, a millionaire who cited her job as “Charitable work, First Hand Foundation” (Kansas City Star 5-28-04, 10-23-04).

Regarding this election, the Kansas City Star reported, “political insiders of both parties have been saying for days - that the race for the traditionally safe Democratic seat has tightened after Patterson's unprecedented personal investment of nearly $3 million in the race” (10-24-04). Table F-1 illustrates that she outspent Cleaver more than two to one. The Kansas City Star reports that Patterson produced “a television ad assault not seen before in Kansas City” (10-26-04). In regards to the television campaign launched by Patterson, a long time local political
operative told the Kansas City Star, “I don't think Mother Teresa could have survived a hit like this” (10-26-04). In the end, Cleaver won with 55 percent of the vote.

In the next three elections, Cleaver’s opponent was Jacob Turk, a Marine Corps veteran and computer programmer (Kansas City Star 10-24-06). Since the 2006 and 2008 races were wholly uncompetitive, and Turk spent very little money in either race, there was little newspaper coverage in the Kansas City Star.

There was more reporting on the 2010 campaign. Of the third race between Turk and Cleaver, the Kansas City Star noted, “the political landscape of 2010 is vastly different than it was just two years ago. Antipathy to established politicians is running high” (10-20-10). The same article reported, “The poll of 500 likely voters showed Turk trailing Cleaver by nine percentage points. In 2008, he lost to Cleaver by 28 percentage points.” The Kansas City Star observed that healthcare and the stimulus package were two important sticking points of Turk’s campaign (10-20-10). It is also important to note that 2010 was a Republican tidal wave midterm election. Cleaver won the contest with 55 percent of the vote, the same vote percentage he was initially elected with in 2004.

Thus, Cleaver prevailed in a tight contest in 2004. He then enjoyed safe margins in two elections, before once again facing a close race, though the same opponent in 2010. I believe there are two important lessons from this story. First, in 2004, a strong campaign war chest mattered in an open seat. Second, despite facing the same opponent in 2006 and 2008, it is likely that the national mood of the country made the 2010 election so close. It does not appear that the credentials or main message of Turk changed in 2010, just that voters were more sympathetic towards the GOP that year.

Table F-1
Emanuel Cleaver Election Results and Campaign Finance Information
Tables F-2 through F-4 furnish readers with a synopsis of Cleaver’s home style activities portrayed in the 162 press releases and seven franked documents that he circulated. In addition, the writing below also uses the Kansas City Star as a data source.

As introduced at the outset of this chapter, Cleaver is a local advocate who maintains a national voice. The data below will be presented in a manner that illustrates this chief feature of his home style.

First, I will discuss his policy dialog. The issues he addresses and the manner of how he frames those concerns clearly bolster both the local and national aspects of his representational image. Second, I will address his constituent-oriented activities; these features reinforce the local characteristic of his persona. Finally, his partisan and ideological rhetoric exemplifies his national voice.

Accordingly, the amalgamation of these three home style features gives us a holistic description of Emanuel Cleaver’s image.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$1,521,744</td>
<td>Jeanne Patterson</td>
<td>$3,207,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$617,752</td>
<td>Jacob Turk</td>
<td>$31,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$554,041</td>
<td>Jacob Turk</td>
<td>$56,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$607,575</td>
<td>Jacob Turk</td>
<td>$260,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Partisan Voter Index Scores
2006 D + 12
2009 D + 10

Home Style Overview

Tables F-2 through F-4 furnish readers with a synopsis of Cleaver’s home style activities portrayed in the 162 press releases and seven franked documents that he circulated. In addition, the writing below also uses the Kansas City Star as a data source.

As introduced at the outset of this chapter, Cleaver is a local advocate who maintains a national voice. The data below will be presented in a manner that illustrates this chief feature of his home style.

First, I will discuss his policy dialog. The issues he addresses and the manner of how he frames those concerns clearly bolster both the local and national aspects of his representational image. Second, I will address his constituent-oriented activities; these features reinforce the local characteristic of his persona. Finally, his partisan and ideological rhetoric exemplifies his national voice.

Accordingly, the amalgamation of these three home style features gives us a holistic description of Emanuel Cleaver’s image.

Table F - 2
Emanuel Cleaver Press Releases
Entire Program Period  N = 162 Press Releases
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Town Hall 18 11%
Service Representation 5 3%
Mentions Public Policy Issue 130 80%
Discusses Local Policy Issue* 5 4%
Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens* 41 32%
Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level* 87 67%
Indicates Own Party 58 36%
Makes Partisan Statement 5 3%
Makes Bipartisan Statement 17 10%
Indicates Own Ideology 0 0%
* This percentage is calculated out of 130, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.

Table F - 3
Emanuel Cleaver Press Releases
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period
N=130 Press Releases That Address Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Resource Policy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Policy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Policy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F – 4
Emanuel Cleaver Franked Materials
Entire Program Period N = 7 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* This percentage is calculated out of 20, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy.
A) Broad Policy Discourse

Table F-2 shows that 67 percent of press releases depict Cleaver discussing how national policy impacts the district locally, while just 32 percent frame policy in a solely national lens.

Yet, removing those press releases that also indicate Rep. Cleaver engaging in allocation politics reveals that 51 percent of news releases highlight how national policy affects Missouri, while 47 percent frame policy solely in a national lens. This much more even distribution clearly portrays a member of Congress that cares about his constituents, while also engaging in nationally oriented policy conversations.

Related to this, 15 percent of press releases highlight this legislator discussing environmental issues and 12 percent depict him addressing urban policy (Table F-3). The Kansas City Star illustrates Cleaver spending equal time discussing these two issues in a national frame and a local lens.

There are many exemplars in this publication citing Cleaver addressing environmental policy as it relates to his district. For instance, “The Environmental Protection Agency said Monday that it may put the Bannister Federal Complex on a priority list for cleanup…U.S. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver …was pleased” (4-27-10). Similarly, the Kansas City Star cites Cleaver insisting, “A federal agency did not always take appropriate steps to protect its employees from environmental hazards, according to a scathing inspector general’s report released Monday… ‘All of those faults are completely and utterly unacceptable’” (11-8-10). Further, the paper makes known, “Part of the Bannister Federal Complex is contaminated by beryllium that was used to make parts for nuclear bombs…Cleaver wants the Environmental Protection Agency to expand its ongoing investigations into those areas” (1-23-11).
The paper also reports more nationally oriented examples of Cleaver speaking on the environment. This publication makes known: “U.S. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver…introduced a rules change that would require members of Congress to lease energy-efficient vehicles” (5-12-06). Regarding climate change, this publication reports, “Emanuel Cleaver has been ordained to go out into the world and convert the unbelievers. Not in Christianity this time but in global warming. The Missouri Democrat is suddenly in good position to spread his environmental zeal: He's one of nine Democrats on a new House select panel on reducing greenhouse gases” (3-28-07). On emission standards, Cleaver states, "I believe it is incumbent on members of Congress to raise the CAFE standards as high as possible, without doing substantial damage to the automakers and to the UAW” (8-11-07). The Kansas City Star also observes, “When it comes to the environment, Emanuel Cleaver is a jolly green giant. The U.S. Congressman and Methodist preacher is a national leader in environmentalism” (4-2-08).

Social media too illustrates Cleaver framing environmental policy in a national lens. His Facebook wall makes known, “I have spent a great deal of time in the last few weeks working with my colleagues on the Energy Independence and Global Warming Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee on a measure that will curb greenhouse gas emissions” (7-26-09).

Cleaver mixes his penchant for environmental issues with his urban policy interest. Consider the following example of this legislator acting as a local advocate:

“A huge project envisioned for Kansas City could make this and the world a greener place, but it could also cost a lot of green, as in money. A ‘climate sustainability center’ on Brush Creek would include research labs, a business incubator, classrooms and a botanical garden, all aimed at promoting ‘green-collar’ jobs…Emanuel Cleaver, who is nurturing the project as a centerpiece of the Green Impact Zone, is optimistic that the proposed center will become a reality” (9-8-10).
Yet, he also speaks about the virtues of this issue for the whole country. The Kansas City Star reveals, “Congressman Emanuel Cleaver has planted an idea that could become a national model for using federal stimulus funds to revive urban cores. Cleaver has challenged local neighborhood, business and political leaders to target tens of millions of dollars for what the Kansas City Democrat has labeled a ‘Green Impact Zone’” (4-17-09).

It follows then that the local and national features of his home style are also prominent in his discourse on urban policies, many of which relate heavily to African-American voters.

The Kansas City Star is replete with instances of Cleaver advocating for his district on urban issues. Consider, “U.S. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver called the covenants ‘a national embarrassment’ and agreed that the legislature needs to address the issue. ‘I think the Missouri General Assembly should entertain legislation that would remove the racial covenants,’ said Cleaver” (2-13-05). On an important federal program, this publication observes Cleaver stating, “The Community Development Block Grant program…would be consolidated with 17 other programs…‘At first glance, it might seem like whining (by) municipal and congressional leaders from urban areas,’ said U.S. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver…‘But this will impact every single community around the country and we think wreak devastation, particularly among the poor’” (2-19-05). Regarding the impact of a local referendum on his ability to advocate for Kansas City’s transportation needs, “U.S. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver…warns that if voters approve the ballot measure and federal transit officials conclude it is unworkable, the city could find it impossible to present a better plan in the future” (10-23-06). Finally, regarding voter disenfranchisement in his urban district, Cleaver insists, "We do know there have been attempts to suppress minority voting in Kansas City before…It's not a stretch to believe such a motive was at play here” (5-11-07).
The Kansas City Star also contains instances of this member speaking with a nationally oriented voice on urban policy. The paper reveals, “In May, Cleaver introduced a bipartisan resolution condemning the existence of [racial] covenants in housing documents and urging states to address the problem” (7-13-05). On an issue that impacts many African-Americans who live in urban areas, Cleaver argues, “They are making a request for people to vote on the basis of skin color…and many of us have spent our adult lives fighting for the reverse” (9-10-07).

Further, also regarding the intersection of racial and urban issues, Cleaver insists, “The next president…should seize the moment to call on the nation to have an honest, painful and constructive conversation about race” (6-11-08). Finally, Cleaver notes, “The Congressional Black Caucus is relevant as long as we continue to have work in front of us. As long as the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, we’re relevant” (1-18-11).

Thus, on urban issues, many of which are related to race, Cleaver acts as a local advocate who also uses a national voice.

Given that Cleaver was a local official in Kansas City prior to his tenure in Congress, and has a long track record of advocating for those he represents, it is not surprising that he pays a great deal of attention to his constituents. Simply, Cleaver was always cognizant of the individuals who elected him.

Further, since Cleaver was not just a local mayor, but the mayor of the largest city in Missouri, it follows that he was comfortable addressing issues in a national frame. Cleaver observed of his time as mayor: “When you're mayor of the largest city in the state of Missouri, everything you do over the course of an eight-hour or 15-hour day is of interest to the media” (Kansas City Star 12-18-05).
Thus, given his roles on the House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming and in the Congressional Black Caucus, it is not surprising that Cleaver also discussed issues in a national frame.

Turning now more towards his local advocacy, I will examine his constituent-oriented activities.

B) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Rep. Cleaver practices allocation politics with gusto. In total, 27 percent of press releases highlight this home style trait (Table F-2).

Social media sources also depict Cleaver securing federal dollars for his district. His Twitter page reveals that Cleaver is “Proud to announce @MARCKCMetro received $4.5 million grant” (3-23-11). This member’s Facebook wall makes known, “The federal stimulus money will be combined with $24 million in private investment from Kansas City Power & Light and its energy partners to create a ‘smart grid’ demonstration project, which many see as the future of the electric industry” (11-30-09). Further, Cleaver reports, “On Thursday, it was my pleasure to be joined by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Deputy Secretary Ron Sims to announce two grants totaling $4.5 million for planning in the Green Impact Zone and surrounding communities” (Facebook Wall 3-28-11).

The Kansas City Star also contains many examples of Cleaver working to procure funding for his district. Consider, “Rep. Emanuel Cleaver's office said he had secured $4 million for a Kansas City SmartPort, a high-tech project for carrying freight on highway and rail, and $2.4 million to finish realignment at the triangle of interstates 435 and 470 and U.S. 71” (7-29-05). This publication reports, “U.S. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver today will announce a $175,000
federal grant to help revitalize neighborhoods in older, northwestern Independence” (8-30-07).

Regarding a local transportation issue, “U.S. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver…already has stated publicly that he plans to seek a half-billion dollars in the next federal transportation bill for a new metropolitan transit system” (10-13-09). Further, the paper informs readers, “Cleaver and Sims also announced a $250,000 grant to for the Chouteau Courts on Independence Avenue in Northeast Kansas City” (3-24-11).

In a more general sense, the Kansas City Star also chronicles Cleaver’s thoughts on earmarking. This publication quoted Cleaver asserting, “There are people who are opposed to earmarks…This country is better because of people like Senator Bond who have been able to bring dollars to the city” (8-29-07). Another article noted, “U.S. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver likes earmarks. His rule: If they come to his district, federal funds are well worth wrangling over, especially for infrastructure repairs and nonprofit causes” (5-10-09).

Thus, allocation representation is an important feature of Cleaver’s home style and bolsters his image as an advocate for those he represents.

Given this local focus, it follows then that this legislator is often found at home. In this regard, 22 percent of news releases depict Cleaver’s presence in the district; additionally, 11 percent promote town hall meetings (Table F-2).

Social media sources frequently illustrate his presence in the district. Consider, “It was my honor to join leaders in Lone Jack on Tuesday to open an interchange at Highway 50 and Bynum Road” (Emanuel Cleaver Facebook Wall 11-15-10). His Twitter page makes known, “Looking forward to teaching a government lesson to the 8th graders at Notre Dame de Sion” (3-21-11) and “Join me @kcitycoffee for coffee with Cleaver now! 412 Delaware Ste. B in the River Market” (Emanuel Cleaver Twitter Page 4-23-11).
His robust presence at home is often exhibited in the Kansas City Star; consider, “Speaking in a Kansas City union hall, the Democrat from Missouri's 5th District said the president's effort to restructure Social Security continues a long Republican agenda to destroy the program” (2-22-05). The paper reports that, “U.S. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver will be host of a town hall meeting Thursday about the government's practice of wiretapping phone calls in the United States” (1-25-06). Another article noted, “Congressman Emanuel Cleaver II, will hold a public meeting about mortgage solutions tonight. The meeting will run from 5 to 8 p.m. at the Palmer Senior Center, 218 N. Pleasant St. in Independence” (5-28-08). Finally, the paper tells readers, “Community Christian Church has planned a big celebration to honor its senior pastor, the Rev. Robert Lee Hill…U.S. Rep. Emanuel Cleaver will speak at the event…” (5-1-10).

Oddly, given his other constituent-oriented activities, he does not frequently portray a commitment to service representation. It is one of the least noticeable aspects of Cleaver’s home style persona. Table F-3 notes that just three percent of press releases feature service representation, and Table F-4 reveals that no franked documents chronicle this activity. Also, there is almost no evidence of the legislator performing casework in the Kansas City Star or in social media sources. Thus, this is not an important feature of his representational persona.

With that said, given the public offices Cleaver held prior to his tenure in Congress, it is no surprise that he practiced allocation politics regularly. Further, until 2008, Cleaver continued to serve as a pastor at his local church in Missouri, thus stimulating his presence at home. As such, Cleaver concentrates on two out of three constituent-oriented activities that this dissertation considers. Accordingly, on the whole, these home style activities bolster his image as a local advocate.
His partisan and bipartisan rhetoric are far less geared towards his district, and more focused on his national voice. We now explore this home style feature.

C) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

By far, the most prominent display of partisanship is illustrated in Cleaver’s press releases, where 36 percent of documents display his Democratic affiliation. Beyond this medium, party and ideology are not featured prominently. Only three percent of news releases illustrate Cleaver making partisan statements (Table F-2).

The Kansas City Star reported very rare instances of Cleaver advancing partisan statements, such as: “I think it's going to be difficult. As the president was talking about private accounts, the R's (Republicans) were very slow in standing. It was very telling” (2-3-05). This paper also quotes this member stating, “‘I give Republicans credit,’ said Cleaver, who is black. ‘They have discovered that some African-Americans will abandon their concern about and interest in issues that impact their congregations in favor of a candidate who speaks in opposition to homosexuality’” (7-17-06). Again, while I have furnished several examples of Cleaver advancing partisan assertions, this is not a normal occurrence.

Beyond party, Cleaver also is not afraid to call himself a liberal, though he does not do so often. The Kansas City Star cites Cleaver insisting, “I’m not one to shy away from being called a liberal” (3-12-05). Another rare example of Cleaver espousing his ideology includes, "If liberal means I'm concerned about children, if liberal means I don't to want investigate people's bedrooms ... then color me liberal" (7-9-05). Finally, this legislator is reported stating, "If being a hard-line liberal means I want to preserve jobs in the United States, call me an IGNORANT HARD-LINE LIBERAL” (8-29-08).
Thus, while Cleaver indicates his partisan affiliation often, he does not make partisan or ideological statements frequently. Yet, the rare instances of him doing so exhibited in the Kansas City Star are strongly worded.

Of much greater import, Cleaver displays bipartisanship much more frequently. Table F-2 makes known that 10 percent of press releases depict Cleaver declaring bipartisan sentiments. Further, the Kansas City Star often features Cleaver practicing bipartisanship.

This publication quotes Cleaver observing, “People hire us to go to Washington to get things done…They don't hire us to fight people across the aisle. The vitriol has replaced the debates in Congress” (6-25-04 B). Further, the paper notes that Cleaver’s mission after being elected is to work at “returning civility to the nation's Capitol” (11-4-04). Finally, the Kansas City Star reports, “Democratic Rep. Emanuel Cleaver of Kansas City said he hopes that a bipartisan budget will emerge from Congress” (2-27-09) and “During a recent interview, Cleaver said he plans on seeking bipartisanship whenever he can” (1-18-11).

Thus, while on the whole, these characteristics are certainly at the periphery of Cleaver’s home style compared to his constituent-oriented activities and his policy discourse, none of the exemplars above reference his district. As such, while I do not assert that this member is a hardline partisan or a robust ideologue, the evidence suggests that in the rare instances that he engages in these activities, he does so with a national voice.

D) Overall Assessment of Home Style

The literature that this project tests leads me to believe that Cleaver should embrace constituent-oriented activities, frame policy largely in a local veneer, and reveal bipartisan displays and ideological centrism.
Concerning his constituent-oriented activities, he spends a great deal of time practicing allocation politics. He works hard at securing resources for his district. This legislator is also at home a great deal. This is not surprising since he held a pastoral position at the same time as sitting as a member of Congress. Yet, despite the strong attention he gives to these two activities, he does not concentrate on service representation in any meaningful way. Even so, his behavior largely supports the literature that this project tests.

His policy conversation, on the other hand, is mixed. This member frames policy in a local lens while also engaging in a robust national policy discourse. Thus, his activities reveal mixed support for the literature that this project tests.

Regarding his partisan dialog and ideological rhetoric, with the exception of exhibiting his partisan affiliation regularly, this legislator does not routinely display partisan discourse or ideological convictions. That said, in the rare instances when he does so, his statements are extremely robust. Thus, when he elects to act in a partisan or ideological manner, the assertions are intended to garner attention.

On the whole, Cleaver works hard to connect with his constituents and secure funding for their needs, is involved in locally focused and nationally oriented policy dialog, and is largely nonpartisan. As such, this legislator is a local advocate with a national voice.

**Home Style Changes**

As described above, after a close election in his initial 2004 race, Rep. Cleaver enjoyed two campaigns (2006 and 2008) where he won with over 60 percent of the vote. Thereafter, his 2010 election margin again dipped below 60 percent.
Because of the fluctuations in Cleaver’s election margins, I anticipate that his home style will change in tandem with shifts in these results. Emanuel Cleaver altered several aspects of his behavior. Some of these shifts followed the timing of the fluctuations in his election margins.

That said, the following is an outline of how his behavioral modifications will be discussed. First, his policy discourse will be addressed, including the issues he focuses on and the national and local balance of how he frames policy. Second, I turn my focus to constituent-oriented activities, in this case, allocation representation and town hall meetings. Lastly, I highlight the degree to which he illustrates his partisan identification.

Importantly, this section will argue that none of the shifts in his behavior altered the central feature of his home style. Throughout his tenure Cleaver remained a local advocate with a national voice.

**Table F – 5**

*Changes in Emanuel Cleaver’s Press Releases Around Changes in Competitive Margins*

*Subjects that referenced both federal and state or local policies in the same press release are marked with an asterisk. This practice caused the sums illustrated below to exceed 100 percent.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Below 60% 2004 to 2006</th>
<th>Below 60% 2006</th>
<th>Above 60% 2006-2010</th>
<th>Above 60% 2006-2010</th>
<th>Below 60% 2010 - 2011</th>
<th>Below 60% 2010 - 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituent-Oriented Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National and Local Portrayal of Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bipartisan and Partisan Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Issues Addressed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alterations in Policy Discourse

Table F-6 illustrates that his concentration on environmental policy peaked between 2006 and 2010. Further, his discourse on disaster policy dropped sharply after November 2006.

More importantly, his policy dialog became more locally focused. As Table F-6 illustrates, Cleaver framed the impact of policy in a local lens in 86 percent of press releases following Election Day 2010. This is a 20 percent change in this activity from the previous two periods.

Regarding addressing environmental policy more after 2006, it was during this time frame that he sat on the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming. This was established after the Democrats took control of Congress in 2007 and disbanded by the GOP when they regained majority status in 2011 (Guardian 9-14-14). Thus, it appears that his committee assignment sparked this change in Cleaver’s representational persona.

Focusing less on disaster policy was not related to his committee positions, but linked to the needs of his district. Flooding in Kansas City was a prominent local concern at the beginning of his tenure, given its location on the Missouri River (Kansas City Star 10-24-06, 11-12-07). The Kansas City Star notes that the area’s flood control system was out of date and Cleaver worked to secure funding to fix the obsolete infrastructure (Kansas City Star 10-24-06, 11-2-07, 2-10-09). Thus, he likely addressed this issue less over time because he secured funding to ameliorate the problem.

Moving beyond particular policy areas, and perhaps more importantly, competition may have sparked Cleaver to frame policies in a more local lens after the 2010 General Election. In line with the literature that this project tests, after falling below 60 percent of the vote, this member became less nationally oriented.
But if competition is the driver of this change, why did he not behave in a similar manner in his first term, during another competitive time? It is plausible that Cleaver attributed his low election result in 2004 to his millionaire opponent and also not being an incumbent. However, after enjoying very safe results in 2006 and 2008, once again earning just 55 percent of the vote in 2010 may have shocked Cleaver. Thus, it is plausible that competition did alter these aspects of his home style after 2010.

But the timing of these changes is also important in relation to another significant moment in Cleaver’s career. Beginning in 2011, Cleaver assumed the chairmanship of the Congressional Black Caucus (Emanuel Cleaver Facebook Wall 1-5-2011). This is a prominent national position.

Thus, either competition sparked this change, or this member presented a stronger local presence in his press releases in order to balance a more pronounced national voice in his role as the chair of the CBC. One may speculate that this is due to the fact that he represented a majority white district. One may also consider that he simply wanted to show Missouri that his position in the CBC did not change his focus on constituents.

As such, while competition may have sparked a change in his home style, his behavioral shifts may also be related to reassuring constituents while holding a prominent national position.

That said, I argue that the core of his representational persona did not change, when considering Cleaver’s home style as a whole.

*Shifts in Constituent-Oriented Activities*

Table F-6 illustrates that there was a 14 percent increase in his allocation activities following the 2006 General Election. It appears that competition does not explain why Cleaver
practiced allocation more robustly after breaking 60 percent of the vote. However, since he is a Democrat, and his party became the majority in 2007, it is likely that Democratic control of the House made it easier for him to secure funds for his district.

Beyond allocation, Table F-6 reveals that there was a ten percent decline in Cleaver hosting town halls following November 2006. Competition may have mattered in this regard. The literature that this project tests leads me to believe that less robust competitive climates should spark a greater presence at home. Town hall meetings are clearly included in this category. As such, when Cleaver broke 60 percent of the vote, he curtailed this activity greatly. This is in line with expectations from the literature I test.

Importantly, none of these changes altered the prime characteristic of his persona. Cleaver increased his local advocacy by more zealously securing resources for his district, while, at the same time, hosting fewer town halls. While this member increased one constituent-oriented activity, he decreased another. Thus, on the whole, this balance does not change the overall equilibrium of this legislator’s constituent-oriented behavior, and thus, the chief feature of his home style.

Changes in Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Finally, there was one noticeable change in his partisan activities. His propensity to indicate his party affiliation increased greatly following Election Day 2006 and continued to climb upwards following Election Day 2010.

The literature that this project tests expresses that more robust competition mitigates partisan displays. Cleaver indicated his party more often after the 2006 General Election, when he broke 60 percent of the vote, in line with expectations from the literature I test. But, oddly, he
also illustrated his party even more frequently after once again falling below this electoral
threshold in 2010. Therefore, given the unevenness of his behavior in relation to the literature
tested, it is likely that competition did not impact this home style trait.

Further, his partisan activities simply do not connect to the chief feature of his home
style.

**Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes**

The above reveals that throughout the period under study, Cleaver made many alterations
in his behavior. But were these changes due to shifts in competitive circumstances? The data
presented above demonstrate that while competition may have mattered in certain instances, such
as holding fewer town halls, other circumstances also came into play.

Several of the shifts in his policy discourse appeared to be due to variations in his
committee assignments and the changing needs of his district. Further, alterations in the national
and local balance of his policy conversation may relate to assuming the chairmanship of the
Congressional Black Caucus. Yet, competition may also have influenced alterations in the
balance of his local and national policy discourse at particular points in his career.

Much more importantly, I advanced an argument that while there were many changes in
Cleaver’s home style, none altered the prime feature of his representational persona. When
assessing the overarching image of this member’s home style, the changes often bolster his aura
as a local advocate with a national voice.

**Concluding Discussion**

The data presented in this chapter explored the home style persona of Emanuel Cleaver,
who acts as a local advocate for constituents by framing the impact of many policy areas in a
local lens, practicing allocation representation prolifically, and being at home often. He also acts
as a national voice on many urban policy initiatives through his leadership positions in the
Congressional Black Caucus and on environmental issues through sitting on the Select
Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming. While one may say that there are two
Cleavers, a Missouri man and a Washington power player, the truth is, these two personas taken
together are “The Full Cleaver.”

On the whole, his activities appear to fit well with the district he represents. He advocates
for local needs, while also having leeway to engage in nationally oriented policy
conversations. Much of this dialog matches the interests of at least a subset of his constituents.

Beyond this, despite expectations, competition may have caused some changes to this
member’s home style. On the other hand, other explanations might explain Cleaver’s behavioral
shifts.

What can be said is that he altered many aspects of his behavior. Thus, from this case
study, we learn that other factors may be at play in fashioning and maintaining home style
personas. As such, congressional careers are complicated to understand.

Chapter Conclusion

The members of Congress in this chapter, despite representing contrasting districts in
different regions, behave similarly in a variety of ways.

Each legislator practices allocation representation often, regardless of whether or not
those efforts are earmarks. Further, none of the members in this chapter practice service
representation regularly. Of the three representatives, only Cleaver is at home consistently.

On policy issues, Young largely frames the impact of policy in a local veneer, while
Cleaver and McCaul are much more mixed in this regard. However, most importantly, all three
spend the vast majority of their time focusing on issues of local import. As such, regardless of how each frames policy, each places a premium on constituent concerns.

Regarding party and ideology, on the whole, the members are not very partisan or ideological. Young, with one exception, is largely non-partisan. Neither is he ideological. Cleaver and McCaul both indicate their partisan affiliation often; however, Cleaver very rarely produces partisan and ideological remarks. Yet, in the rare instances that he does so, they are extremely robust in tone. McCaul makes partisan statements; however, he usually balances these declarations with bipartisan sentiments.

Given the above, two things are of particular importance in the mind of the author. First, allocation played a role in each of their stories. It may have been documented in different ways, but it was extremely noticeable. Second, and more importantly, each of these legislators highlighted policy concerns that were prominent locally, regardless of the national and local balance of the conversations. As such, these legislators concentrate on local issues.

To assess how the literature that this project tests fared, I anticipated that each subject would dedicate a great deal of effort to constituent-oriented activities during their most competitive time frame. Regarding allocation politics: Young secured funding less over time. McCaul’s allocation activities stayed the same over two different competitive periods, before dropping sharply after once again breaking 60 percent of the vote in 2010. Cleaver’s allocation efforts were most robust during his least competitive time frame.

Regarding presence in the district, the only legislator who met expectations from the literature, in that he was home most often during his most competitive period, was McCaul. Further, as none of the representatives in this study spent a great deal of time on service
representation, it should come as no surprise that there were no major behavioral shifts in this regard.

Policy conversations were complicated. None of the legislators met expectations from the literature concerning the national and local balance of policy dialog. Young’s discourse turned to a more local frame over time. McCaul’s became more nationally oriented, regardless of shifts in competitive circumstances. Cleaver’s was stable until 2010, when he once again earned below 60 percent of the vote. Following this race, he increased his locally oriented frame by 20 percent.

It is uncertain whether changes in Young and Cleaver’s behavior were related to falling below 60 percent of the vote. However, one cannot discount the possibility. Therefore, these two legislators may have altered their home styles, in line with expectations from the literature, following a difficult re-election.

Also, despite legislators paying certain attention to specific policy areas more robustly during different times in their careers, the only pattern that met expectations was Cleaver discussing environmental policy most often during his least competitive time. He did so much less prior to breaking 60 percent of the vote (before 2006) and after once again falling below that mark (in 2010). However, this phenomenon is related to his position on a special select committee during the time in the majority, before the GOP disbanded the committee when they retook control of the House in 2011. Therefore, this was clearly not related to electoral competition.

Next, while McCaul’s partisan dialog was stable over time, Young and Cleaver each changed at least one aspect of their partisan rhetoric. After Cleaver was re-elected comfortably in 2006, his propensity to identify his partisan affiliation skyrocketed from being present in seven percent of press releases, to being revealed in 63 percent. Even after falling below 60 percent in
2010, he still exhibited his Democratic affiliation frequently. Therefore, it is hard to discern whether competition changed his home style. His behavior also supports and does not support the literature that this project tests.

Finally, Young was most partisan during his most competitive period. Before falling below 60 percent in 2004, and after breaking 60 percent in 2010, he was less partisan than otherwise. Therefore, on the one hand, it appears competition altered his behavior in line with expectations. However, his behavior was the opposite of what the literature that this project tests predicted. Instead of being less partisan during difficult times, he was more partisan. This may be related to his very robust Republican primary that he won by 304 votes in 2008. It is not entirely surprising that he would reveal his party affiliation more when he was challenged for his party’s nomination for Congress.

The above said, did electoral competition play a role in fashioning these legislators’ images? On the whole, with the exception of McCaul being at home more often during his most competitive period (which matched expectations from the literature perfectly), and Young being most partisan during his most competitive time (which does not support the literature I test), it is hard to discern whether competition influenced the behaviors of the legislators in this chapter.

Nevertheless, we should not discount the possibility that during at least part of each of their tenure in Congress, competition may have mattered at the margins. Accordingly, while the core of each of their representational personas remained intact, falling below 60 percent of the vote appeared to matter in some instances, and at certain times in their careers.

For example, Cleaver became very locally oriented after 2010, when he fell below 60 percent of the vote. While he was initially elected with 55 percent in 2004, it is not out of the realm of possibility that a close contest in 2010, after winning by robust margins in 2006 and
2008, caused him to alter his behavior. Therefore, competition can have an impact at certain times. That is the main lesson of this chapter.

We next turn to the story of legislators, who like the subjects in this chapter, enjoyed very comfortable re-elections and experienced close races. Yet, given their marginal districts, it is no surprise they experienced peaks and valleys in their results. Thus, we now turn to a set of legislators in competitive districts.

Chapter 7

Competitive Districts, Fluctuating Margins

Introduction

This chapter features legislators whose election margins fluctuated above and below 60 percent of the vote. Further, Partisan Voter Index Scores of the districts they represent suggest that these members are in marginal seats.

Since their election results were not consistent, I anticipate that these legislators will change their behaviors after they either fall below or earn above 60 percent of the vote.

More precisely, if the literature that this project tests is correct, I expect that after dropping below 60 percent, they will frame policy more often in local terms, stress constituent-oriented activities, and emphasize bipartisanship.

That said, the home style personas of Rep. Michael Michaud (D-ME), Rep. Judy Biggert (R-IL), and Rep. Ken Calvert (R-CA) are featured in this chapter. They collectively bring diversity to this project, not only in the issues they emphasize, but due to their backgrounds and the contrasting districts they represent.

Michaud presents a prominent local image, fighting for Maine’s interests. He works hard to portray himself as a citizen of Maine rather than a Washington insider. Therefore, he not only
addresses issues that are important to his state but also concentrates on constituent-oriented activities. The legislator also robustly displays bipartisanship and ideological moderation.

Judy Biggert, a prominent centrist from Illinois, is an issue-oriented legislator. She is in her district often and protects the interests of her voters. Her policy dialog is complex. She concentrates on issues important to constituents, in addition to other national concerns that are relatively non-controversial. She addresses policy in both local and national frames regularly. Thus, her multifaceted policy dialog is an important feature of her home style.

Ken Calvert resonates matters of local import in a national frame. Further, of the three subjects in this chapter, Calvert is by far the most partisan. This is not surprising given his long history as an activist in the Republican Party. His competitive circumstances also take into account the impact of scandal.

Thus, when assessing all home style activities of each legislator, Michaud is clearly the most local of the three and Calvert is the most nationally focused. Biggert is balanced in between. This observation includes their constituent-oriented activities, policy dialog, and partisan rhetoric.

Regarding the impact of competition, the data analyzed below suggest that these members changed particular aspects of their home style personas to different degrees around variations in their competitive climates. Thus, competition may have played a role in each of their stories.

That said, many of their behavioral shifts did not meet the expected pattern. While I offer alternative explanations, it appears that competition may have altered the images they present to constituents in some instances, at least in the short term. Yet, this chapter also illustrates that many other factors are at play that may also fashion their representational personas.
The home style of Rep. Mike Michaud of Maine will be explained first.

**Mike Michaud: A Millworker in Congress with Maine on his Mind**

“‘You know why he's going to win?’ one woman rhetorically asked a reporter outside the pub, where Michaud greeted raucous supporters…‘Because ... he's one of us’” (Bangor Daily News 7-5-2002).

**Introduction**

Rep. Mike Michaud was elected to represent Maine’s Second House District in 2002. Prior to his time in Congress, he worked in a local paper mill. He enjoys reminding reporters and constituents alike that voters “elected someone who punched a time clock to make a living” (Bangor Daily News 1-25-03).

Michaud is no stranger to elected office. The Portland Press Herald reports that this legislator spent “14 years in the Maine House of Representatives and eight years in the Senate” (5-22-02). At the time of his election to Congress, this member served as President of the Maine State Senate, one of the state’s highest offices (Bangor Daily News 5-13-02).

Michaud reinforces this portrayal of a devoted public servant and millworker throughout his tenure in the House of Representatives (Portland Press Herald 10-17-02,11-9-06; Bangor Daily News 4-9-11).

As the quote at the beginning of this case study suggests, Michaud illustrates a strong connection to his district and his state. His local focus is the chief feature of his home style. In its 2006 endorsement, the Portland Press Herald acknowledges that the “…former millworker makes it clear he always has his constituency in mind” (10-22-06). This local connection is the prime characteristic of his home style. It appears Michaud cares about Mainers because “he is one of” them.
Maine only sends two representatives to the U.S. House. Michaud represents a sparsely populated district that encompasses most of the geographic area of the state. Therefore, it is a rural district. Further, the constituency is largely blue-collar, is home to a robust manufacturing base, and has a rather low median household income due to a decline in manufacturing. It also relies on federal funds to meet local needs, particularly on energy and transportation.

This district, once represented by Olympia Snowe, also votes for both Democrats and Republicans in various contests. Its electorally competitive nature is apparent in this legislator’s election results. Michaud was initially elected with 52 percent of the vote in 2002 and was re-elected with 58 percent in 2004. He then enjoyed results well above 60 percent in 2006 and 2008. Yet, in 2010, he earned just 55 percent.

If competition impacts Michaud’s home style, I anticipate that he should act differently between Election Day 2006 and Election Day 2010, than prior to or following this period. More precisely, if the literature that this project tests is correct, I anticipate that he will focus on constituent-oriented activities, frame policy in a much more local veneer, and eschew partisan displays prior to the 2006 General Election and following Election Day 2010.

As will be explained, the presentation of his allocation activities and the local balance of his policy dialog moderated after 2010. He was still primarily locally focused, and practiced allocation politics often, but not to the degree prior to the 2010 General Election.

Further, it is important to note that despite his behavioral modifications, the core of his persona remained intact throughout his tenure in Congress.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

*District Traits*
Maine’s Second District includes most of the state; the Bangor Daily News reports that it is “the geographically largest congressional district east of the Mississippi River” (10-11-08).

The economic traits of the district are important to understand and reveal a constituency that is poorer than the nation as a whole. According to Table G-1, the median household income of the district was $40,678 with 10.5 percent of families below the poverty level. In total, 25.5 percent of the labor force works in education services, and health care and social assistance; 13.7 percent are employed in retail trade; and 10.7 percent of constituents are in the manufacturing industry.

Social traits tell a tale of an aged, white, less educated, ethnically unique district with a high concentration of veterans. Table G-1 shows that constituents are slightly older than the nation’s citizens; they have a median age of 41.4 years. Caucasians compose 94.9 percent of residents. Interestingly, there are unusually large numbers of those with French Ancestry, over 232,000 (U.S. Census Bureau). The bureau also indicates that 20.2 percent of the population has a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared to 27.5 percent of the nation. Also of note, the Census Bureau illustrates that veterans compose 13.7 percent of the population in contrast to a 10.1 percent national average. The Bangor Daily News quotes Michaud claiming that Maine “is home to about 154,000 veterans” (4-22-08).

Several of these factors are important to understanding Michaud’s representational persona. The legislator’s strong depiction of himself as a blue-collar worker clearly relates to this district’s reliance on manufacturing. Beyond that, much of his conversation on the economy, unemployment, and trade policy connect to the decline in manufacturing in his district, as well as other economic issues. This is a central feature of his image.
He also highlights veterans’ issues frequently, not surprising given the large number of veterans he represents. His focus on energy is mostly related to fighting for the Home Energy Assistance Program that helps Mainers heat their homes during their harsh winter. A great deal of his environmental discourse connects to Acadia National Park, located in his district. Finally, if one were to look at a map of Northern Maine, one would see a relatively underdeveloped road system. As such, his focus on transportation often centers on infrastructure improvements for his state.

Thus, these characteristics shed light on many of Michaud’s home style activities that will be outlined more thoroughly in the below text. Importantly, the vast majority of his dialog clearly connects to his attention to Maine.

Table G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Traits</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census Data on the 2nd District of Maine from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Median Household Income $40,678 $51,425
Families Below Poverty Level 10.5% 9.9%

Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation and accommodation and food services.</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competitive Contexts

Table G-1 illustrates that Michaud faced a variety of electoral circumstances in a district that slightly leans Democratic in presidential contests, with ratings of D+4 and D+3.

In 2002, Kevin Raye, Senator Snowe’s former chief of staff, was Michaud’s strongest challenger. Of the election, the Bangor Daily News reported, “With less than six weeks to go before Election Day most polls suggest the contest is well within the margin of error, with Michaud holding a slim lead over the Republican Raye and more than 20 percent of voters still undecided” (9-28-02). As the campaign finance data below indicate, both candidates spent over one million dollars in this contest.

Michaud asserted that Raye was a Washington insider who had no record in public office. “‘They're trying to get away from the fact that [Raye] doesn't have a record,’ Michaud press secretary Monica Castellanos said of U.S. Sen. Olympia Snowe's former chief of staff… ‘Kevin's
never voted for anything’” (Bangor Daily News 10-2-02). Further, the same publication chronicles Michaud insisting, “Maybe I'm just too much of a Mainer, but I don't think Washington insiders like my opponent have all the answers” (10-28-02).

Raye, who was endorsed by both major newspapers, presented himself as a moderate Republican in the tradition of Senators Snowe and Susan Collins. Consider: “Raye said that ‘while Mike talks about his bipartisanship, during the debates he has been sharply partisan’” (Portland Press Herald 10-17-02). The same article quotes Raye observing, “the most obvious difference between the two candidates is that he is a member of the Republican Pro-Choice Coalition and Michaud is for more limited abortion rights.”

On Election Day, Michaud bested Raye with 52 percent.

The degree of competition in the 2004 race was not as intense as 2002 since the GOP could not secure a strong challenger; nevertheless, the National Republican Campaign Committee spent resources on the race (Portland Press Herald 6-8-03). The challenger, Brian Hamel, “has a reputation for having a high energy level, and in addition to his job at Loring [a local air force base], he serves as chairman of the board of the Maine Community College System and the Maine Winter Sports Center” (Portland Press Herald 10-3-04). The same article cites that Hamel “promises to create a new jobs strategy for every town in the district. He trumpets tax cuts, saying the state has lost manufacturing jobs not because of trade agreements, but because of Maine's poor business climate.”

As the campaign went on, due to the extreme difference in campaign bank accounts, and dismal polling numbers for Hamel, the election was seen as less competitive than initially thought. Michaud won with 58 percent of the vote.
In 2006, Michaud was re-elected with 70 percent. The GOP nominee was Scott “D'Amboise, 42…a former selectman in Lisbon, a town in the southern tip of the district outside of Lewiston. He counts job creation, tax reform and national security among his top priorities in running for the 2nd District” (Bangor Daily News 3-11-06).

The legislator’s opponent in 2008 was a retired history professor, John Frary. The Portland Press Herald observed that Frary, “has no illusions about his chances of unseating Michaud. In fact, he jokes that his biggest fear is that he'll win” (4-13-08). Michaud handily trounced Frary with 67 percent of the vote.

The general election of 2010 was a different matter. Polling throughout September and October indicated that Jason Levesque’s challenge was far stronger than earlier predictions (Bangor Daily News 9-11-10; Portland Press Herald 9-19-10). Michaud was underperforming in earlier polls; the Bangor Daily News even reported the race was within the margin of error (10-30-10). Further, the Portland Press Herald cites Jason Levesque asserting, “The fact that this is the first time he (Michaud) has been on TV in over four years indicates he recognizes he is in trouble” (10-3-10).

The Bangor Daily News describes Levesque as “An Auburn resident and owner of an Internet marketing firm, the 35-year-old Levesque said he has been campaigning in the district for eight months and has raised slightly more than $100,000, almost all in individual contributions” (3-12-10). Levesque told this same publication, “As far as I'm concerned this is what it is all about. We need jobs. The unemployment rate is out of control and Congress' answer is to keep taxing and spending the people of Maine into greater debt” (5-15-10). His campaign focusing on economic issues was rather effective, as Michaud received just 55 percent of the vote.
There are several important points to emphasize regarding Michaud’s competitive circumstances. First, wave elections mattered. The Democratic Party had difficult contests in 2002 and 2010 in particular; they were clearly Michaud’s most competitive races. Further, his easiest wins occurred in 2006 and 2008, banner years for Democrats. Second, there was only one challenger who would be considered top tier by any measure – Kevin Raye — his 2002 opponent. His 2010 opponent performed very well against an incumbent; yet he was a political neophyte who was able to capitalize on a mood of discontent in Maine. Thus, it is interesting to note that his closest re-election campaign likely was more connected to a wave year for the GOP than to the strength of a particular challenger. Finally, the 2002 and 2010 races also featured a great deal of parochial politics, focusing largely on issues important to Maine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$1,172,768</td>
<td>Kevin Raye</td>
<td>$1,128,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>$1,309,200</td>
<td>Brian Hamel</td>
<td>$667,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$737,825</td>
<td>L. Scott D’Amboise</td>
<td>$18,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$569,119</td>
<td>John Frary</td>
<td>$297,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$1,244,848</td>
<td>Jason Levesque</td>
<td>$529,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Partisan Voter Index Scores
2006 D + 4
2009 D + 3

Home Style Overview

Tables G-2 through G-5 furnish readers with an overview of Michaud’s home style activities chronicled in 1,074 press releases and 16 franked documents. The Bangor Daily News and the Portland Press Herald also consistently follow Michaud’s activities.
He is a locally oriented legislator who is concerned about those who send him to Congress. Therefore, this member’s constituent-oriented activities will first be highlighted, followed by his policy dialog. His partisan and ideological rhetoric will be addressed last as it appears to be the least central to his home style.

Table G - 2
Mike Michaud Press Releases
Entire Program Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 1,029, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.

Table G - 3
Mike Michaud Press Releases
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Unemployment Policy</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ Policy</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Resources Policy</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Policy</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Policy</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G–4
Mike Michaud Franked Materials

Entire Program Period  
N = 16 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Lens*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 14, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy.

Table G-5
Mike Michaud Franked Materials

Major Public Policy Issues Addressed  
N=14 Franked Documents That Address Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ Policy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Allocation representation is one of Michaud’s foremost home style activities. He highlights this feature in 38 percent of all press releases (Table G-2). Further, Table G-4 reveals that 31 percent of franked materials illustrate this legislator engaging in allocation representation.

The congressman also displays a high degree of allocation politics in local news sources. To demonstrate his commitment to obtaining federal funding for Maine, prior to being sworn into office, Michaud exclaimed, "If you look at transportation funding, we're near the bottom of
the list … We definitely have to make a concerted effort to bring more federal dollars into the state” (Bangor Daily News 12-13-02). After he was elected, the Portland Press Herald reports,

“So when Rep. Michaud says he got the $47 million in earmarks from hard work and others say he just got plugged into a formula for dividing the spoils, you could conclude that, like so much in politics, neither tells the entire story. He would have gotten plenty had he showed up to the committee and spent his time reading his favorite newspaper. But he got even more for Maine because he pestered the committee leadership to help him fund the state's infrastructure. And that added money represents a ton of work. Persistence and good timing may be the best investments yet for Maine” (4-17-04).

Another exemplar makes known, “Michaud recently was able to secure $500,000 in federal money for the Warden Service” (Portland Press Herald 1-16-05). Also, the Portland Press Herald quotes Michaud asserting, “some projects that get earmarks are worth supporting. ‘A lot of projects would not have come to Maine if it were not for earmarks’” (Portland Press Herald 3-13-08). Finally, the Bangor Daily News tells readers that Michaud acquired “a federal grant for town use several years ago, the $500,000 must be used for recreational purposes” (10-9-09).

In 2004, his campaign website exhibits Michaud securing federal funding for a local bridge, other transportation projects, and a jobs program. One of the campaign press releases bares the title “Michaud announces release of funding for Waldo-Hancock Bridge” and another reveals that “Congressman Michaud Announces $489,682 Grant for Job Access.” In 2010, his campaign website claims, “Michaud secured over $600,000 to fund Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife search and rescue programs.”

Therefore, Michaud engages in a high degree of allocation, a hallmark of a locally oriented legislator.

Since he is so focused on constituents, it follows that he portrays a robust presence in the district. News sources, in particular, document how often this member is found at home.
The Bangor Daily News reports that Michaud was “at the Brewer Auditorium…to meet with displaced workers” (1-22-04) and patronizing “A ‘wicked good’ benefit spaghetti dinner… where he was a ‘featured guest’” (Bangor Daily News 3-16-04). He also spoke at many local college graduations. He was the keynote at Eastern Maine Community College’s commencement in 2006 and at the University of Maine Presque Isle’s graduation in 2009 (Bangor Daily News 5-15-06, 4-29-09). Michaud visited senior centers (Bangor Daily News 3-28-08) and made himself available in the district to read an “official proclamation by Gov. John Baldacci making June 26 Maine Whoopie Pie Day” (Bangor Daily News 6-28-10).

Twitter and Facebook were also employed to demonstrate the member’s presence at home. For example, Michaud Tweeted that he “Had a great tour today of Penobscot Community Health’s new Brewer facility” (6-21-10). He also made known, “After a great weekend in Maine, headed back to DC” (Twitter 3-9-09). His Facebook Page illustrates him attending a “workshop of biomass harvesting for small woodland owners” in Mercer, Maine (1-25-10).

He also prides himself on attending many events concerning veterans. For example, he brought a congressional hearing on veterans’ affairs to the district (Bangor Daily News 4-22-08), attended an Independence Day Parade where he honored veterans (Bangor Daily News 7-5-06), and often hosted local events to present medals to veterans who never received the honors while on active duty (Bangor Daily News 4-19-06, 8-23-10). Thus, his robust presence in the district, as well as his emphasis on veterans, continues to tell the story of a locally oriented member of Congress.

Beyond this, Michaud emphasized service representation in social media, news sources, and franked documents. Nineteen percent of franked documents highlight service representation (Table G-4). There is also a great deal of overlap between press releases, local news sources, and
social media promoting special office hours. A typical news story regarding this topic makes known that “Michael Michaud has announced community office hours. Sara Stevens, Michaud's constituent services representative, will be available from 10 to 11 a.m. Tuesday, Feb. 21, at Corinna town hall… and at the Dixmont town office” (Bangor Daily News 2-14-06).

This form of dialog also appears on Michaud’s Government Facebook Page. Consider, “… staff from my Presque Isle office will be in St. Agatha on Thursday, so please call 207-764-1036 to set up an appointment if you’re in that area” (2-22-11). Twitter is also employed to communicate these messages. For example, “Next week, in Brownville and Surry, my staff will be available to meet with constituents on issues they are facing…” (Twitter 2-9-11). Thus, Michaud utilizes a variety of tools to demonstrate service representation.

That said, Michaud engages in allocation politics robustly, makes his presence known in the district frequently, and emphasizes service representation prominently. All of these activities portray a member of Congress who is focused on constituents.

B) Broad Policy Discourse

Michaud has a tendency to frame policy in local terms. Table G-2 indicates that a striking 72 percent of press releases that engage in policy discourse illustrate the impact of national policy on his constituents. Once press releases that also exhibit allocation politics are removed, 54 percent of press releases address the impact of policy on the district. Further, Table G-4 reveals that 64 percent of franked materials that address policy depict the impact of federal policy locally, while just 36 percent feature policy in a solely national lens.

Newspapers follow this locally oriented pattern. The Bangor Daily News reported that Michaud “…announced at the event that today he would introduce a bill designed to provide
relief for unemployed Maine workers...Called the Invest in American Workers Act” (9-7-04). Michaud stressed that the Northern Border Economic Development Commission bill “will help address Maine's transportation and infrastructure challenges” (Bangor Daily News 11-21-07). Another penetrating example of this pattern is found in Michaud arguing, "The people of Maine's 2nd Congressional District, which I represent, have been devastated by the disastrous Bush economic policies…”(Bangor Daily News 10-17-08).

Likewise, the member employed social media to illustrate the care and attention he gives to Maine. His government Twitter page stated, “House passes bill formalizing Maine’s Gulf of Maine Ocean Observing System; cleared for President's signature…” (3-25-09). Further, he announced, “The House just passed my amendment that will help Maine and other states process DNA evidence backlogs” (Twitter 6-18-09). Finally, Michaud lamented, “Mainers Unemployment Benefits to Stop after this Weekend Due to Senate Inaction” (Twitter 2-26-10). His Facebook Page noted, “In response to a report on U.S. free trade agreements, I spoke on the House floor today about how our country’s bad trade deals are really affecting Maine workers and businesses”(5-19-10).

Thus, this legislator framed a great deal of his policy in local terms. He also focused on policy areas that are prominent with constituents. Of particular interest to Michaud, again highlighting his focus on those he represents, are economic policy concerns including trade and job related issues. Table G-2 reveals that there is discourse on economic policy in 32 percent of press releases, trade policy in 12 percent, small business concerns in eight percent, and unemployment and job creation policy in 28 percent. Given a district with a relatively low median income, a high unemployment rate, and where over one in ten employees work in manufacturing, his attention to these areas is rational.
In addition to economic issues, Michaud engaged in a great deal of discourse on veterans’, transportation, environmental, and energy policy (Table G-2). All of these are also significant locally. Michaud stressed veterans’ concerns in 18 percent of press releases and transportation and the environment in 13 percent of these documents. His concentration on a handful of policy interests continues to paint a picture of Michaud focusing on areas that are important to Mainers.

Veterans’ issues also appear to be particularly potent to Michaud since such a high proportion of residents in his district are veterans (Bangor Daily News 4-22-08). Also, given the large size of the constituency, its rural nature, its location in the north, and it being home to Acadia National Park - it is clear why transportation, the environment, and energy are also of local import.

Further, Michaud holds conservative positions on certain social issues; this is not surprising given the rural nature of his district. Regarding guns, Michaud illustrates his support for hunting, and by extension gun owner rights (Bangor Daily News 5-13-02; Portland Press Herald 9-14-04). The Bangor Daily News informs readers that Michaud “…boasts endorsement from the Sportsman's Alliance of Maine…”(5-13-02) to demonstrate his support for issues important to gun owners. Guns are clearly a potent local issue for Michaud and his attitude towards them is indicative of behaviors that are unusual for a Democrat.

In the less prominent instances when this legislator frames policy in national terms, his contributions also center on issues that he often frames in a local lens. Regarding the economy, Michaud says of President Bush, “I think he's done a terrible job on health care and the economy” (Bangor Daily News 9-15-03). On trade policy, Michaud observed, “under NAFTA, consumers actually do not save any money because of lower-cost imports “ (Bangor Daily News
Regarding transportation, another prominent local concern, the Bangor Daily News chronicles Michaud asserting, “If you are looking at the federal level and seeking the most bang for your buck, infrastructure provides it” (12-15-08). Discussing veterans, Michaud argued, “Veterans with PTSD should get the care they need, not regulatory burdens” (Bangor Daily News 7-26-10). That said, while he addressed prominent local issues in a national frame, these instances are dwarfed by the enormous data chronicling this legislator displaying the impact of federal policy on Maine.

That said, the data reveal a largely locally focused policy conversation concentrated on several prominent constituent issues, most notably the economy and veterans’ affairs policy. Thus, the manner of how Michaud frames the impact of federal policy, in addition to the particular issues he addresses, continues to exhibit his locally focused home style.

C) Party and Ideology

Rep. Michaud’s home style rarely features partisan statements and ideological rhetoric. The congressman defines himself as a Democrat in just four percent of press releases and makes partisan statements in just two percent (Table G-2). As with press releases, franked materials also do not offer much partisan information. He highlights his Democratic Party membership in just one of 16 franked pieces (Table G-4).

Perhaps most unusual of anything in Michaud’s data is that he revealed his party positions of “Assistant Whip” and “Senior Whip” on his letterhead, yet never indicated his Democratic affiliation (Michaud Franked Material 8-15-05, 10-14-05, 4-27-06). That said, partisan politics is certainly at the periphery of Michaud’s home style.
Michaud displays a more bipartisan persona. He produces bipartisan statements in 14 percent of news releases (Table G-2). The member also has a record, though a relatively marginal one, of discussing bipartisanship in newspapers.

Regarding an energy bill in late 2003, the Portland Press Herald quotes Michaud lamenting that “This is a bill authored in the back rooms of the Capitol without bipartisan participation, and the result is a bill that fails the American people” (11-19-03). The Bangor Daily News documents Michaud insisting, “a bipartisan stimulus package is needed so that we can provide immediate relief to struggling Americans” (1-19-08). During his tough 2010 re-election campaign, the Portland Press Herald again cites Michaud declaring, “‘If we work in a bipartisan manner, we can have better legislation,’ he said. ‘It's easy for me to work in a nonpartisan manner’” (10-22-10).

Therefore, on the whole, Michaud’s home style depicts an image of a regularly nonpartisan member of Congress, who makes efforts at being bipartisan.

Correspondingly, Michaud also avoids generating ideological statements or discussing his own ideology. Only two percent of press releases contain an ideological statement (Table G-2). In these documents, this legislator described himself as either a conservative or a moderate. In almost all instances, when he is defining himself in these terms, it is to indicate his membership in the House Blue Dog Coalition that is often described as socially moderate and fiscally conservative. Again, this is a minor trait of Michaud’s home style.

Likewise, local news media portrayed Michaud as a conservative and/or a moderate Democrat. The Portland Press Herald observed, “Michaud has been known for his centrist politics as a member of the Blue Dog Coalition and for conservative positions on some issues,
such as his opposition to abortion” (9-26-10). This same publication also acknowledges that Michaud is “a member of the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Democrats…” (4-15-11).

Therefore, data suggest that Michaud does not go to great lengths to define himself as a partisan or an ideologue at any time in his career. Given the very competitive nature of his district, and his locally oriented focus, this section continues to present evidence of a legislator who concentrates on his constituents and resonates their views in Washington.

D) Overall Assessment of Home Style Activities

If the literature that this project tests is correct, Michaud should focus on constituent-oriented activities, appearing at home regularly, practicing allocation politics often, and engaging in casework activities frequently. Michaud does so; he places a premium on constituent-oriented tasks.

Further, the literature I am testing suggests this member should be more locally focused in his policy dialog. He is much more locally focused than otherwise. He also consistently addresses issues that are important to Mainers.

Finally, the literature this project tests argues that this legislator should embrace bipartisanship and ideological moderation. Michaud holds policy positions on social issues to the right of mainstream Democrats. He is largely nonpartisan in nature and embraces bipartisanship. Also, he routinely illustrates his affiliation with the conservative Blue Dog caucus.

Thus, on the whole, Michaud’s home style largely supports the suppositions put forward by the literature. He is a locally oriented legislator who cares about Maine.

**Home Style Changes**
In 2002 and 2004, this member earned less than 60 percent of all votes cast. Michaud achieved 67 percent of the vote at the 2006 General Election and 70 percent on Election Day 2008. Once again in 2010, he fell below the 60 percent threshold.

As such, I anticipate that he will behave differently between Election Day 2006 and Election Day 2010, than prior to and following this time frame.

While Michaud’s appearances in newspapers and social media sources remained largely stable, and the vast majority of his home style activities in press releases did as well, there are several noteworthy variations in his persona. Most of the changes I speak of represent a shift towards a less locally focused image following his difficult 2010 re-election.

As the vast majority of these behavioral alterations occurred in his policy discourse, I will discuss this area first. Next, I will highlight variations in the degree to which Michaud practiced allocation politics.

Table G-6
Changes in Mike Michaud Press Releases Around Changes in Competitive Margins
* Subjects that referenced both federal and state or local policies in the same press release are marked with an asterisk. This practice caused the sums illustrated below to exceed 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Below 60% 2003 to 2006</th>
<th>Above 60% 2003 to 2006</th>
<th>Below 60% 2006-2010</th>
<th>Above 60% 2006-2010</th>
<th>Below 60% 2010 - 2011</th>
<th>Above 60% 2010 - 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituent-Oriented Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National and Local Portray of Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Issues Addressed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Alterations in Policy Discourse

Following the 2010 General Election, Michaud altered the manner of how he framed policy. More precisely, he framed a great deal more policy discourse in a nationally oriented lens at the end of 2010 through April 2011 - the end of the project period - than previously.

From November 2006 through November 2010, policy was framed in a solely nationally oriented lens in 27 percent of press releases (Table G-6). Following Election Day 2010, 44 percent of news releases addressed policy in this manner. Similarly, prior to the 2010 election, 72 percent of press releases explained the local impact of federal policy. After November 2010, 56 percent of press releases did so.

On the one hand, it appears that Michaud’s home style activities could have been influenced by electoral competition. Following a very difficult race in 2010, Michaud changed a major feature of his persona. Yet, the manner of how he changed his behavior does not support the literature that this project tests.

On the other hand, he did not behave similarly during a comparative competitive period prior to Election Day 2006. Thus, despite expectations from the literature I test, this legislator appeared to be more nationally oriented after Election Day 2010.

That said, there were no changes in his committee assignments or positions, no new major national issues to debate like the ACA or ARRA, and no crises in Maine like a natural disaster. In fact, the only thing that appeared to change is that Michaud fell below 60 percent of the vote after 2010, a phenomenon that had not occurred since 2004.
As such, it is likely that competition may have influenced this aspect of his behavior since he exhibited a large behavioral shift immediately following a very close election. Yet, this does not suggest why this legislator would become so sharply nationally focused.

One possible explanation is that perhaps he thought his opponent’s fiscally conservative message resonated with voters. Therefore, perhaps Michaud decided to mimic several of his opponent’s economically conservative policy positions in order to insulate him from another campaign against this challenger in 2014.

Alternatively, perhaps when the GOP retook control of the House, he simply addressed issues more in a national frame because he had more policy proposals to criticize. More precisely, with the Tea Party surge of 2010, and the infusion of rather extreme right-wing ideology, perhaps he had more opportunities to criticize the Republican Conference and chose to do so in a national frame.

Thus, several factors may explain this behavioral shift.

That said, regarding specific policy issues, this legislator addressed economic and jobs/unemployment policy more often from Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010, compared to the previous period (Table G-6). Given the recession, and the impact of the economic downturn on Maine explained above, this change in his behavior is understandable.

Shifts in Constituent-Oriented Activities

Table G-6 reveals that his focus on allocation politics dropped greatly following the 2010 General Election. Michaud highlighted allocation representation in 41 percent of press releases from November 2006 through November 2010, and only did so in 19 percent of news releases following Election Day 2010.
There are several possible explanations for this shift. One is that competition, particularly strong opposition from an economically conservative opponent who performed well in 2010, caused him to decrease this activity. It is not out of the realm of possibility that he responded to this close race by modifying his home style to match his opponent’s economically conservative positions. If this is the case, what appears to be a deviation from the chief feature of his persona at face value, is actually an effort to reinforce his local emphasis by responding to the policy wishes of a large portion of his district whose votes he did not receive in the 2010 contest.

Alternatively, it is likely that the Democrats losing majority status at the beginning of 2011 curtailed this activity. First, it is not out of the realm of possibility that the minority party would get less funding. Second, and much more likely, the GOP instituted an earmark ban when they regained power in 2011.

Thus, several alternate explanations rationalize his behavior. If competition is the cause, it sparked Michaud to forgo allocation representation. If competition is not the reason for this behavioral modification, then this shift may be related to the Democrat’s new place in the minority party.

Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes

In several important ways, Michaud appeared to become more nationally oriented following the 2010 election when he fell below 60 percent of the vote. Oddly, his behaviors after 2010 were not consistent with his image prior to Election Day 2006, which was another competitive period.

That said, it is important to emphasize that the majority of his policy dialog was still locally oriented after 2010. His policy discourse was simply not as robustly local after the 2010
General Election. Further, while he halved his conversation on allocation after 2010, 19 percent of press releases still highlighted allocation representation. Thus, while there were changes to his home style, they were not complete transformations of the overarching feature of his representational persona.

Further, despite the literature tested by hypotheses, during a more competitive period (after 2010), he framed policy in a more national veneer and focused on allocation less. Thus, his behavior did not support the literature that this project tests.

But why did he modify his behavior? I speculate that these changes likely occurred because he found himself in the minority party in 2011. Being in the minority certainly influenced his ability to secure funding, particularly with the GOP earmark ban. It also may have caused him to address policy in more nationally focused terms since he likely had more opportunities to criticize GOP House leadership.

Speaking to the potential role of competition, I also speculate that Michaud may have been responding to his constituents who voted in large numbers for a fiscal conservative in 2010. Perhaps his close result caused him to highlight allocation less and address concerns raised by his opponent in a national focus. If he did so, his behavior would certainly correspond with Tracy Sulkin’s work that found incumbents took up the issues of their opponents after winning re-election. This phenomenon has been dubbed by Sulkin as issue uptake.

In my opinion, it is most likely that a combination of these two factors were the driving force causing a shift in his persona. Thus, I believe that competition and institutional factors caused these alterations.
That said, as already stated, the data clearly illustrate that Michaud was still primarily locally focused after the 2010 contest, even if he was less so than prior to this date. Consequently, these changes did not cause a wholesale alteration in his image.

**Concluding Discussion**

The data above make clear that Michaud practices allocation representation with gusto, is home often, and emphasizes service representation regularly. His policy dialog is far more locally oriented than nationally focused, and he concentrates on issues that are prominent in his district including economic, transportation, environmental and veterans’ issues. Finally, this legislator’s bipartisan and moderate veneer is also important given the competitive features of his district. Beyond this, he often exhibits his blue-collar credentials and his French roots, emphasizing his connection to important local features. Thus, Michaud is simply a locally oriented member of Congress.

Beyond this, it is imperative to note that there were several relatively large changes in his home style image. Following a close race in 2010, after enjoying two easy re-election contests, he appears to become more nationally oriented than at any other time in his campaign. He was still primarily locally focused, just less so following the 2010 General Election.

Further, it must be acknowledged that his behavior was very consistent prior to the 2010 General Election. There were no noticeable shifts in his home style from 2003, when he took office, until Election Day 2010. Thus, even after achieving over 60 percent of the vote for the first time in 2006, his behavior was not very different than previously. The modifications in his behavior occurred following the 2010 General Election. That said, there are two important points.
First, competition may have influenced the local and national balance of his policy dialog and his efforts at allocation politics. He may have adopted positions of his conservative 2010 challenger who earned 45 percent of the vote.

Second, institutional factors, especially his place in the minority following the 2010 General Election, also likely influenced his representational persona. The House GOP banned earmarks, and Michaud was likely presented with an opportunity to criticize the GOP on policy.

Thus, at the risk of being repetitive, Michaud was still primarily locally oriented on the whole at every point in his career. Thus, despite mitigating this presentation following the 2010 General Election, this legislator focused on Maine first and foremost consistently.

We now move on to discuss another member of Congress whose competitive circumstances are similar to Michaud, but whose home style is not, Rep. Judy Biggert of Illinois.


“Biggert has managed to actively participate in national policy-making while not neglecting her district” (Chicago Daily Herald 10-25-02).

**Introduction**

Judy Biggert, an attorney by profession, was first elected to Congress in 1998, following several years as an Illinois State Representative (Chicago Sun Times 4-13-04; government website). Prior to her service in her state’s legislature, she was a former local board of education president and village planning board chair. On her tenure in the House, the Chicago Daily Herald praises Biggert telling readers she “failed to cast a vote only 0.5 percent of the time” (8-23-08). Thus, she is a former local official with roots in the district who takes her role as a legislator seriously.
That said, as the quote at the beginning of this case study reveals, Biggert is an issue-oriented legislator. She spends a great deal of effort highlighting issues important to constituents in both local and national frames (Chicago Daily Herald 10-25-05, 1-17-08, 2-14-11). As such, she is able to advocate on behalf of her district and engage in political discourse in the national arena. Beyond this, she often displays herself at home, practices allocation politics, presents a bipartisan image, and emphasizes a centrist ideology.

This persona fits her very white, extremely wealthy, highly educated, classically suburban Chicago-land district well. Many constituents work in finance and scientific research, and the chapter will explain how her policy work speaks to individuals in these sectors. Further, the district relies on the Mississippi River and access to Lake Michigan for its economy to flourish. This information is also extremely important in understanding her persona.

Beyond this, Biggert’s district is extremely competitive in presidential races. Not surprisingly then, her election margins fluctuated above and below the 60 percent threshold. In 2002, 2004, and 2010 she was re-elected comfortably with well over 60 percent. She fell below this measure in 2006 and experienced a very competitive election in 2008.

That said, if the literature that the hypotheses test is correct, I expect that she will behave differently from Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010. In particular, she should frame issues in a local lens more often, concentrate on constituent-oriented activities, and stress bipartisan and moderate displays during this time frame.

Biggert altered her home style a great deal, and some of her behavioral variations support the literature tested by the hypotheses. Thus, competition appears to play a role in her story. Yet, her case study also suggests that other factors such as committee assignments and majority party status also fashion home style images.
District & Competitive Characteristics

District Traits

Illinois’ 13th is a geographically compact district, roughly 20 miles long by 20 miles wide. It is a suburb of Chicago and is composed of parts of DuPage, Will and Cook Counties (United States Geological Survey).

The constituency is extremely affluent compared to the nation as a whole. Table H illustrates that its median household income was $81,730, roughly $30,000 above the nation’s median. Further, 20.2 percent of constituents work in education services, healthcare and social assistance; 13.2 percent are employed in professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services; and 11.3 percent of the labor force work in retail trade. Also importantly, 10.3 percent of residents are employed in finance, insurance and real estate.

The median age of residents, 36.5 years, is also the national median age. Illinois’ 13th is largely Caucasian, with 79.7 percent of residents identifying as white. Also important to mention are the significant numbers of those of Polish Ancestry (14.7 percent) and Italian Ancestry (11.3 percent); in addition, 18.3 percent identify as Irish Americans. Thus, Biggert represents a district that includes a variety of white ethnic groups. Further, 8.6 percent of the population is classified as Asian, compared to a national mean of 4.4 percent.

The Census Bureau also indicates that 45.1 percent of constituents hold a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared to 27.5 percent of the nation. Therefore, this district has a highly educated population.

Given this high education level, it should not be surprising that it is home to two research
laboratories (Biggert Government Twitter Page 3-23-09; Chicago Daily Herald 7-11-03). Biggert spends a great deal of time protecting and promoting these labs and stressing science policy. Further, the district is composed of counties that border Lake Michigan. Her focus on Asian Carp, an invasive species, is also a significant part of her home style. Finally, given the noticeable percentage of residents that work in finance, it is not surprising that she stresses finance policy.

Thus, she emphasizes many issues important to her suburban constituents.

That said, like many other suburban areas, the district splits its votes between Democrats and Republicans. I will now explain more about its competitive contests.

![Congressional District 13 map](image)

**Table H**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Data on the 13th District of Illinois from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Traits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and management and waste management services</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competitive Contexts

The PVI Scores for the district were R+5 and R+1. Accordingly, this district may slightly lean Republican, but is clearly winnable for Democrats.

It is surprising then that Biggert ran against a series of weak opponents. Not one challenger was a prominent local or state official and it appears none ever held an elected office.

A Chicago Daily Herald editorial described Thomas P. Mann, Biggert’s 2002 opponent, who did not raise sufficient funds to file Federal Election Commission reports, as “a weak challenge to a strong candidate like Biggert” (October 25, 2002).

Gloria S. Anderson, an educator who challenged Biggert in 2004, put up a much feistier campaign than Mann. The Chicago Daily Herald indicated that Anderson’s most prominent issues were investing in public transit (10-25-04), reforming or abolishing No Child Left Behind (10-25-04), promoting vocational programs (10-27-04), protecting religious freedom (10-19-04, 10-27-04), and “honoring 40 hour work weeks while protecting the economy” (10-27-04). While Anderson was certainly a livelier opponent than Mann, Biggert easily dispatched her.
Joseph Shannon, the challenger in 2006, was far more conservative than Anderson, and even more conservative than Biggert on several issues. Shannon, a trial attorney who was not afraid to criticize Biggert asserted, "Since 2000, the federal government has grown 25 percent” (Chicago Daily Herald 3-22-06). Shannon also urged reform of the “wheeling and dealing surrounding…'earmark’ projects” (Chicago Daily Herald 10-16-06). On social issues, Shannon opposed abortion rights and embryonic stem cell research, while Biggert supported both (Chicago Daily Herald 10-17-06, 10-28-06).

The most prominent moment of the campaign came during the Congressional Page Scandal, when Biggert was thrust into national news for her position on the House Ethics Committee, the body charged with investigating Rep. Foley’s behavior (Chicago Daily Herald 10-12-06, 10-16-06). Shannon seized the opportunity to criticize his opponent for sitting on the “dormant House Ethics Committee” (Chicago Daily Herald 10-12-06). Even with the scandal, Biggert was re-elected with 58 percent of the vote, which was her lowest margin at that point in her tenure.

In 2008 and 2010, Biggert ran against Scott Harper, a doctoral student at Oxford who returned to the district to mount a campaign against her. Harper was an extraordinarily effective fundraiser, collecting over one million dollars in 2008. He stressed healthcare, college tuition, and social security solvency (Chicago Daily Herald 8-24-07). Harper insisted that "The congresswoman has supported Bush’s failed economic policies and she’s supported his war in Iraq. The voters are ready for a change and I am that person who can provide that change” (Chicago Daily Herald 10-23-08). Harper’s campaign proved rather effective, furnishing Biggert with her lowest vote percentage ever of just 54 percent.
Harper ran again in 2010; Biggert was clearly not cavalier about the outcome of her 2008 race. The Chicago Daily Herald on May 20, 2009 reported that Biggert “was one of the first 10 Republicans to sign on Tuesday for special help from the national party for the 2010 elections.” The same publication also told readers that the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee recruited Harper to run again in 2010. Curiously, Harper raised less money in 2010 with the help of the DCCC than he did in 2008 without its resources (Table H-1). The theme of the campaign was the same as 2008. A GOP tidal wave, and/or a more aggressive campaign by Biggert, gave the incumbent 64 percent of the vote.

Thus, Biggert’s campaign activity fluctuated a great deal from 2002 through 2010 based on the strength of her opponents’ campaigns.

From Biggert’s campaign history, it appears that wave elections certainly mattered in her 2006 and 2008 contests. Most prominently, her race in 2008, with then Senator Barack Obama of Illinois on the ballot for President, illustrates the importance of national factors in her local election results. In fact, Roll Call reveals that Senator Obama carried her district in the 2008 race, despite Biggert managing to win re-election (10-31-12). Thus, wave elections matter.

That said, Biggert was clearly an effective candidate. In particular, she worked hard from 2006 through 2010 to win re-election. After her close race in 2008, she almost immediately began running for re-election, seeking party money very early to boost her chances at being successful in 2010. Thus, both national and local political factors certainly affected her campaign efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table H-1

Judy Biggert Election Results and Campaign Finance Information
2002  70%  $ 464,057  Thomas P. Mason  $  N/A
2004  65%  $ 542,738  Gloria Anderson  $  42,132
2006  58%  $1,014,823  Joseph Shannon  $  205,902
2008  54%  $1,585,541  Scott Harper  $  1,070,204
2010  64%  $1,236,454  Scott Harper  $  616,389

District Partisan Voter Index Scores
2006  R + 5
2009  R + 1

Home Style

Tables H-2 through H-5 provide an overview of Biggert’s home style activities portrayed in 495 press releases and 27 franked documents. Since Chicago is a large metropolis, the Chicago Daily Herald, the Chicago Tribune, and the Chicago Sun Times covered her activities.

Biggert is an issue-oriented legislator. She serves as an advocate for constituents while also engaging in nationally oriented policy discourse.

As such, first, I will present information on her policy dialog. She frames issues in both local and national terms. Next, I will highlight her constituent-oriented activities; she engages in most of these tasks regularly. Finally, I will chronicle her partisan and ideological rhetoric.

Biggert works with legislators from both parties on policy concerns, reaching out to Democrats at home and in DC.

Table H-2
Judy Biggert Press Releases
Entire Program Period  N = 495 Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact on the Local Level* 296 64%
Indicates Own Party 445 90%
Makes Partisan Statement 28 6%
Makes Bipartisan Statement 90 18%
Indicates Own Ideology 2 0%
* This percentage is calculated out of 462, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.

Table H-3
Judy Biggert Press Releases
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period
N=462 Press Releases That Address Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology Policy</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Unemployment Policy</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Resources Policy</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Policy</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H-4
Judy Biggert Franked Materials
Entire Program Period
N=27 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* This percentage is calculated out of 21, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy.

Table H-5
Judy Biggert Franked Materials
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>N=21 Franked Documents That Address</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Broad Policy Discourse

Biggert engages in a rich policy discourse. On the one hand, she utilized press releases and franked materials to frame policy most prominently in terms of local impact. On the other hand, newspapers, social media, and Internet sources present more nationally focused policy conversations.

Table H-2 reveals that she discussed policy solely in national terms in 34 percent of press releases and portrayed the impact of national policy on her district in 64 percent of news releases. Removing those press releases that also reveal allocation politics, 53 percent of press releases highlight how national policy affects constituents, while 46 percent frame policy in a national lens. Table H-4 shows that 43 percent of franked documents addressed policy in an entirely national frame, while 57 percent highlight the impact of policy on her district.

Alternatively, comments in local newspapers vigorously illustrated Biggert discussing policy in exclusively national terms. Representative comments of this dialog include the Chicago Daily Herald arguing “On the national front, Biggert has taken a strong leadership role in one of the most important initiatives of our time…focusing on issues such as reducing reliance on foreign energy in favor of renewable resources and promoting economic growth with lower taxes” (10-16-06). Discussing the deficit, in 2009 Biggert exclaimed, “Obama should know better than to claim his coverage plan wouldn't add to the nation's deficit” (Chicago Daily Herald 9-11-09). Also, she observed, “The administration must recognize enemy combatants held at
Guantanamo Bay have no place on American soil or in civilian courtrooms” (Chicago Daily Herald 1-28-10). Thus, newspapers cover her attention to issues that are framed with a national focus.

Similarly, her Government Twitter Page declared, “Unemployment fell to 9.4% in December – a good sign but also a reminder that job creation must continue to be our top priority” (1-7-11). Her Government Facebook Page made known, “My priorities will be restoring stability to the housing market, eliminating wasteful government bailouts, and ensuring that our financial policies promote economic growth” (12-9-10).

As such, newspapers and social media were widely utilized to engage in nationally oriented policy dialog.

That said, Biggert addressed economic policy in 33 percent of her press releases and unemployment in 20 percent. She emphasized this issue area in both local and national terms.

A nationally oriented exemplar of economic discourse includes Biggert insisting, ”Many of the items Congress is considering are worthy priorities but they have nothing to do with stimulating the economy” (Chicago Daily Herald 2-6-09). The same publication cited her lambasting President Obama’s "Proposals for more job-killing tax hikes on energy and massive new spending on government-run health care [that] only further undermine growth and add to the economic uncertainty of American families and small businesses” (10-10-09).

More locally, Biggert illustrated how economic policy affected her district. Her Government Twitter Page revealed, “Sun-Times article explains how extending the homebuyer tax credit could help boost the Chicagoland economy” (10-22-09) and “49 states have lost jobs since the ‘09 stimulus bill -- including 177,000 jobs lost in IL” (9-21-10).
Her focus on the economy is not surprising given that much of her dialog on this topic is clustered around the recession. Further, it is important to remember that 10.3 percent of constituents work in finance, insurance and real estate. Thus, the banking crisis certainly had a major impact on her district given its large finance sector. Also, beyond sitting on the Financial Services Committee, she was a ranking member or chair of one of its subcommittees from 2007 through the end of the program period (Government Website 4-1-2008, 2-1-09, 4-1-2011). This committee assignment gave her a platform to speak on an important local concern in a national lens. Accordingly, in this policy realm she advocates for her district, while also speaking to a national policy concern.

In addition to economic policy, Biggert addressed other locally important concerns robustly in press releases. More precisely, Biggert engaged in a great deal of conversation on science and technology, energy policy, and the Asian Carp problem surrounding the Great Lake’s region. Science and technology issues are discussed in 22 percent of press releases. Environmental (focused on Asian Carp) and energy policy are each described in 19 percent of news releases.

Representative quotes of her discussing science policy include the Chicago Daily Herald citing Biggert exclaiming, "Nanotechnology with its broad applications and endless possibilities could on its own contribute to half the economic growth of the next 50 years” (5-7-05). Further, this publication told readers, “Biggert of Hinsdale, a member of the House Science Committee, believes technology can make vehicles more efficient without compromising safety” (2-8-07). Her government website discussed a “bill I introduced, the Genetic Information Non-Discrimination Act…would update our laws to ensure that Americans can fully utilize genetic
testing to improve health and reduce costs without worrying that they will lose their jobs or health insurance” (11-1-06).

On science, first, as a reminder, her district was home to two nationally funded research labs. Second, while in the majority prior to 2007, she was the chair of the Science and Technology Subcommittee on Energy (Chicago Sun Times 10-24-05). As such, whether she framed this issue locally or nationally, Biggert focused on a prominent local concern. She also held a position to address science policy in a national lens.

Next, Asian Carp was an extremely important local concern. In fact, out of every area she addressed, she framed this issue in local terms most robustly. The Chicago Sun Times quoted Biggert lamenting, “Carp have reached Starved Rock State Park, 21 miles from the barrier. Because they travel more than 40 miles a year, ‘they're six months from Romeoville and a little over a year from Lake Michigan’” (10-14-04). In response to the defeat of a bill to cut off Chicago waterways from Lake Michigan, the Chicago Daily Herald cited Biggert exclaiming, "It's a great relief that we were able to defeat this amendment" (2-19-11). Her government website declared that Biggert “Secured funding and authorization language for original demonstration barriers and construction of new permanent barriers to keep Asian Carp out of the Great Lakes” (11-1-06). Her Government Facebook Page made known, “Today, the Army Corps released the progress of its latest study on the threat of invasive species & Asian Carp to the Great Lakes” (11-9-10). Thus, the Asian Carp issue was an important local concern that Biggert stressed throughout her career. She worked hard to ensure that her residents were protected from the impact of federal legislation that might harm them economically.

It is significant to note, given the competitive nature of her district, that Biggert, a Republican, is a strong supporter of embryonic stem cell research, is pro-choice, and even made
a statement opposing abstinence only sex education (Chicago Tribune 5-17-05; House Government Website 11-1-06; Chicago Daily Herald 1-15-07, 1-25-08; Campaign Website 11-4-04). Thus, on three social issues addressed in a national frame, Biggert strikes a centrist tone.

That said, Biggert’s policy conversation focuses on issues important to constituents. Yet her discourse on many of these concerns is often framed in national terms. It is worth noting that the vast majority of her policy dialog avoids contentious issues. While there was broad disagreement on the ways to fix the economy, people largely agreed government needed to fix the issue. Further, her attention to finance, science and Asian Carp do not appear to be controversial in her district. Thus, she focuses on relatively noncontroversial policy concerns in both local and national terms. She is very much a legislator who cares about issues.

We now move on to the care and attention she gives her constituents.

B) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Biggert highlights allocation politics in 23 percent of press releases (Table H-2). The Chicago Daily Herald regularly chronicles the congresswoman engaging in this activity. This publication made known that, “Biggert has helped secure federal funds in support of teacher training at Benedictine University” (10-25-02). Further, the paper told readers, “U.S. Rep. Judy Biggert of Hinsdale announced Friday that a House committee approved her request for $5 million to widen Interstate 55…” (3-27-04). Also, consider, “DuPage County schools received $143,000 in federal funds Thursday to help fight childhood obesity. U.S. Rep. Judy Biggert…presented the check to the county's regional office of education…” (2-22-08). In a 2006 editorial endorsing Biggert, the Chicago Daily Herald extols, “Biggert has the political skill to bring needed federal funds into her district” (10-16-06).
Social media and government and campaign websites also reveal her allocation efforts. For example, Biggert’s government website unveils that she “Secured $12.828 million for 13th District transportation projects in H.R. 3, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act…” (11-1-06). Her Government Twitter Page on 4-2-09 claims, “Argonne National Lab received $13.1M for upgrades - this is the kind of project that the stimulus bill should have focused on!” Biggert’s Government Facebook Page makes known, “Judy visited Benedictine University this week to announce funds she helped secure for their new Women’s Entrepreneurial Education and Workforce Development Initiative” (1-13-10).

Thus, a variety of sources were utilized by Biggert to chronicle her penchant for securing funding for her district.

Similarly to her focus on allocation, Biggert highlights her robust presence at home in a consistent manner throughout her career. Table H-2 makes known that 24 percent of press releases chronicle her presence in the district. Further, 41 percent of franked documents indicate her presence at home (Table H-4).

Newspaper sources frequently exhibit Biggert in her district. The Chicago Daily Herald revealed, “At the Argonne entrance, Schillerstrom met with other guests including U.S. Reps. Judy Biggert of Hinsdale…” (7-24-02). The same publication made known, “Naperville Central High School hoops star Candace Parker will be honored today…A press conference to celebrate her selection is scheduled…at Naperville Central and will include an appearance by U.S. Rep. Judy Biggert” (4-13-04). On 8-7-06, the herald informed readers, “U.S. Rep. Judy Biggert has organized two Internet safety forums this month…Biggert, along with representatives from the Naperville Police Department and local school districts will be available.” Further, Biggert “met
with nearly 100 seniors Wednesday morning at Mayslake Village in Oak Brook” (Chicago Daily Herald 4-21-11).

Social media sources also regularly display this legislator at home. Her Government Twitter account declares, “Congress is in recess for the next two weeks - hope to see you around the district” (4-3-09). She noted she was “speak[ing] at Lemont Fire Protection District” (Government Facebook 6-3-09). Her Campaign Twitter Page proclaimed, “It was a pleasure meeting so many cheerful & festive people [at] today's St. Patrick's Day Parade in Lemont” (3-6-10).

As such, a variety of mediums chronicle this legislator at home frequently.

That said, surprisingly, service representation is not a prominent home style feature. Only franked materials highlight casework consistently. Table H-4 reveals that 56 percent of franked documents promote service representation. Thus, given the quantity of her data, this feature is at the periphery of her home style.

Nevertheless, Biggert practices allocation politics often and is found in her district regularly; she is a legislator concerned about her constituents.

C) Partisan & Ideological Rhetoric

Biggert circulated partisan statements in six percent of press releases (Table H-2). Table H-2 also notes that she published bipartisan sentiments in 18 percent of press releases. Likewise, only seven percent of franked documents highlight her party and just four percent include a partisan statement (Table H-4).

Newspaper sources follow this pattern. The only true partisan statement that could be found in this medium was the following regarding health care reform: “Biggert joked that she
heard Democrats ‘breaking knee caps’ to get the votes” (Chicago Daily Herald 3-20-10).

Statements about and by Biggert were more similar to: “Biggert called for a bipartisan solution to the projected shortfall but did not give any specifics” (Chicago Daily Herald 1-27-08).

Similarly, she stated, “In Congress, we are working to accomplish what we set out to do, despite the fact that bipartisan, common-sense solutions are more elusive during the end of session” (Franked Material 7-8-04). Further, the Chicago Daily Herald observed,

“While Rep. Mark Kirk of Highland Park has the reputation for bipartisanship, the latest tally by washingtonpost.com's Votes Database shows Rep. Judy Biggert of Hinsdale as the state delegation's new independence czar. She's followed the GOP line on only 85.9 percent of the votes. To put that into perspective, only 20 Republican members of the entire Congress have split with the party more” (7-18-09).

Her social media data also reveal a great deal of bipartisan rhetoric including, “Judy was recently voted one of the most bipartisan lawmakers in the House of Representatives by other members” (Government Facebook Page 5-5-09). This same source tells readers, “We just passed a short-term CR to avoid a government shutdown…with $4 billion in bipartisan cuts. It should be noted that more than 100 Democrats supported the measure and Leader Reid has committed to getting it passed in the Senate” (3-1-11). Thus, there were many examples of this member calling for bipartisanship and being recognized as a legislator that is bipartisan in her policy conversations.

Ideology was a minor aspect of her representational persona. When it was revealed, news sources painted Biggert as a centrist. For example, the Chicago Daily Herald stated, “Those moderates include…U.S. Rep. Judy Biggert of Clarendon Hills” (4-17-04). The Chicago Sun Times declared, “House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert dumped new rules he imposed on the ethics committee, under pressure from GOP House moderates…including Rep. Judy Biggert” (4-28-05).
Therefore, while Biggert revealed her Republican affiliation in all of her press releases, it would be folly to classify her as a strong partisan or an ideologue. Newspapers widely praised this member for her moderate nature and her willingness to work across party lines. Further, press releases circulated many bipartisan sentiments. Thus, Biggert places a premium on centrism and bipartisanship.

D) Overall Assessment of Home Style Activities

If the literature that this project tests is correct, Biggert should focus on constituent-oriented activities. She should be at home often, engage in allocation representation regularly, and focus on service representation. She is regularly found in her district and routinely secures federal resources for constituents. However, she does not emphasize casework.

Beyond this, if the literature I test is correct, she should frame policy in a local lens frequently. Her policy dialog is framed in both national and local terms. More precisely, she stresses important national issues like the economy, which she frames both nationally and locally. She also addresses science and finance – prominent constituent concerns- in both local and national terms. Biggert largely concentrates on Asian Carp by framing the impact of federal policy proposals on constituents. Thus, my data support and contradict the literature. In some instances, she frames policy nationally; in others, she concentrates on local issues in a local frame.

Finally, if the literature I am testing holds, Biggert should embrace ideological centrism and bipartisanship. She does both. She was called an “independence czar,” holds positions to the left of mainstream Republicans on social policy, and reaches out to Democrats.
Thus, on the whole, the evidence suggests that Judy Biggert concentrates on issues of local import, while engaging in nationally focused policy conversations. Further, she practices allocation representation regularly, is present in her district often, and illustrates bipartisanship and ideological centrism frequently.

**Home Style Changes**

Biggert won re-election with over 60 percent of the vote in 2002 and 2004, fell below this mark in 2006 and 2008, and once again hit 60 percent in 2010. Since her competitive circumstances shifted, I expect to see a concomitant change in her home style. Hypotheses suggest that she should have behaved differently after Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010, compared to prior to and following this period. Further, I expect that her behavior after the 2010 General Election will be similar to her home style prior to Election Day 2006.

More precisely, during this time frame, if the literature I test is correct, I expect that she will frame policy in a more local veneer, place a greater emphasis on constituent-oriented activities, and increase her bipartisan and centrist portrayal.

That said, Biggert changed her behavior a great deal. While several behavioral modifications follow shifts in her competitive contexts, a majority of variations do not. This suggests that other factors besides competition molded certain aspects of her behavior. Even so, the data reveal that competition likely altered parts of her home style image.

First, I will discuss changes to her policy dialog, followed by shifts in her constituent-oriented activities. Finally, variations in her partisan discourse are revealed. It is important to
note that while there were several changes in her home style, most of the shifts in her behavior
do not represent a wholesale change in her representational persona.

Table H-6
Changes in Judy Biggert Press Releases Around Changes in Competitive Margins

* Subjects that referenced both federal and state or local policies in the same press release are marked with an asterisk. This practice caused the sums illustrated below to exceed 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Above 60% 2002 to 2006</th>
<th>Above 60% 2002 to 2006</th>
<th>Below 60% 2006-2010</th>
<th>Below 60% 2006-2010</th>
<th>Above 60% 2010 - 2011</th>
<th>Above 60% 2010 - 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituent-Oriented Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National and Local Portrayal of Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bipartisan and Partisan Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Issues Addressed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space &amp; Technology Policy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment/Job Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alterations in Policy Discourse**

Supporting the literature my hypotheses test, Table H-6 reveals that during her most competitive period, Biggert framed policy more locally than otherwise. Yet, her change prior to
and following the 2006 General Election was very minimal. The most noticeable shift in the manner of how she framed policy occurred following her 2010 contest.


Table H-6 also indicates that from 2002 through Election Day 2006, 62 percent of press releases framed the impact of national policy locally. Following Election Day 2006, through Election Day 2010, 66 percent of press releases discussed policy in this manner. Finally, following the 2010 General Election, 55 percent of news releases addressed the impact of national policy on constituents.

Thus, Biggert was most locally oriented during her most competitive time - from Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010. In particular, her behavior was more nationally focused after the 2010 General Election when she once again broke 60 percent of the vote, and when her party regained the majority. Consequently, regarding the local and national balance of her dialog, it appears that competition made the largest difference after the 2010 race, as there were large shifts in her press releases following this election.

Still, even though there was a very marginal change prior to and following the 2006 election, she was still the most locally focused during her most competitive time.

Thus, primarily following the 2010 election, she met expectations of the literature that the hypotheses test. After once again breaking 60 percent of the vote, her policy conversation in press releases took on a more national tone.
There are two possible explanations for this change. First, the shift in competition could have made a difference. After winning two close races, she may have felt that she turned the page on her electoral difficulties, and so had leeway to concentrate more often on her national policy conversations.

Alternatively, once back in the majority in 2011, she once again took up the gavel as a subcommittee chair, this time on the Financial Services Committee. Therefore, after four years of serving as a ranking member, being thrust into the chair’s position may have given her a more prominent national role, where she was forced to address policy in a more nationally oriented veneer.

Moving on, Table H-6 reveals several changes in the policy areas she addressed. This member greatly increased her attention to economic policy and unemployment after falling below 60 percent of the vote. Following the 2010 General Election, she decreased her discourse on energy and science and technology policy.

Given the importance of the economy and unemployment following the 2008 recession, it is not surprising that Biggert highlighted these issues more often around this time, compared to before that period. Further, I find no evidence that her shifting focus on science policy and energy policy are in any way related to her competitive situation. As she focused more on unemployment issues, it appears that she decreased her attention to other concerns.

Importantly, prior to 2007, she was chair of the Science and Technology Subcommittee on Energy. In 2007, the legislator acquired a ranking member position on a Financial Services subcommittee, and assumed the chairmanship of this subcommittee in 2011. Therefore, her committee positions likely affected her policy dialog.
Thus, there were many more changes in Biggert’s policy dialog than originally anticipated, including in the policy areas she stresses.

*Shifts in Constituent-Oriented Activities*

From 2002 through Election Day 2006, 44 percent of press releases addressed allocation politics (Table H-6). From the day following the 2006 General Election through Election Day 2010, 35 percent of press releases chronicled allocation activities (Table H-6). After the 2010 election, just three percent of news releases addressed allocation, a very significant decrease. Further, after 2010, allocation representation virtually disappeared in Biggert’s newspaper appearances.

While there were changes in this aspect of her home style persona, these shifts may or may not be related to the robustness of electoral competition. She highlighted allocation politics most frequently from 2002 through Election Day 2006, a timeframe when her margins were above 60 percent of the vote. Further, following the 2010 General Election, another time frame when her election results broke 60 percent, she stressed allocation politics the least. Thus, due to this inconsistency, it is hard to discern the impact of electoral competition on her home style. In fact, her behavior prior to and following the 2006 General Election is inconsistent with the literature tested by hypotheses.

Alternatively, two other factors may explain the downward increase in her practice of allocation politics. First, from January 2007 through January 2011, Biggert was a member of the minority party. This change in status may have caused her to bring home fewer dollars. Further, also during this time frame, there was simply less money to go around as the recession hit.
Related to this, after the 2010 General Election, when she was once again in the majority, the GOP instituted a one-year ban on earmarks due to the power of “fiscal hawks” in the Republican Conference.

Therefore, even though there was a major shift in her electoral fortunes at the 2010 General Election, these other circumstances likely played a major role in why she decreased her allocation activities following Election Day 2006.

Beyond allocation, Table H-6 indicates that there were fluctuations in her appearances at home. During her most competitive time, Election Day 2006 through Election Day 2010, 28 percent of news releases revealed her presence in the district. Prior to this period, 17 percent of press releases did so. Following the 2010 General Election, 23 percent contained this feature.

Thus, this behavioral shift followed the changes in her election margins. Also notably, Biggert appeared to be home most often during her most competitive period. Therefore, it appears that competition initiated this variation. As such, her behavior appears to support the literature tested by hypotheses. It appears that close election returns caused her to connect with constituents more regularly, even if this change is not particularly robust.

Changes in Partisan & Ideological Rhetoric

Table H-6 demonstrates that Biggert displayed her Republican affiliation more robustly throughout the program period. Biggert also greatly increased her partisan and bipartisan rhetoric in tandem with each other.

From 2002 through Election Day 2006, 10 percent of press releases revealed bipartisan rhetoric; 21 percent did so following Election Day 2006 through the 2010 General Election. Finally, 35 percent contained these sentiments after Election Day 2010. Thus, regardless of the
literature tested by hypotheses that suggests she should be most bipartisan during her most competitive time, she displayed more and more bipartisan dialog throughout the program period.

Yet, while she increased her bipartisan rhetoric, she also increased her partisan dialog. Only one percent of press releases prior to Election Day 2006 contained partisan sentiments. Seven percent of news releases from the 2006 General Election through Election Day 2010 featured partisan discourse. Finally, 15 percent revealed partisan sentiments after the 2010 race.

Thus, regardless of hypotheses suggesting she should be least partisan during her most competitive time, and more partisan during her least competitive period, she became both more partisan and bipartisan throughout her tenure. That said, her increase in bipartisan dialog was far more robust than her increase in partisan discourse.

What of the impact of competition on her partisan and bipartisan rhetoric? Regarding her bipartisan discourse, it is possible that after winning re-election closely in 2006 and 2008, she permanently embraced a more bipartisan veneer. Thus, I suggest that perhaps these close races made a lasting impact on her home style.

Regarding her partisan conversations, with Democrats taking control of Congress in 2007, and President Obama being sworn into office in 2009, this legislator had more opportunities to criticize Democrats.

Therefore, her own competitive circumstances, along with moving from the majority to the minority party, in addition to the party of the incumbent in the White House may have helped to mold her partisan and bipartisan dialog.

This is particularly true since the changes in her behavior do not follow the competitive pattern of her election returns. Thus, it appears that the literature this project tests is both
supported and contradicted. She became both more partisan and bipartisan throughout her tenure, regardless of electoral circumstances.

**Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes**

I have three observations regarding Biggert’s behavior. First, many aspects of her home style were not consistent from 2002 through 2011. Thus, she changed her activities more than anticipated, even if her home style was not fundamentally altered. Second, some of the changes follow shifts in her election margins. Third, most modifications in her image did not follow this pattern.

Accordingly, competition may have mattered in some instances. In particular, it is important to stress that she was the most locally oriented during her most competitive period. Further, she was home most often during her most competitive time. While I have offered other potential explanations, the impact of these two findings should not be cast aside. They indicate that changes in levels of competition may support the literature my hypotheses test.

However, given the variety of alternate explanations offered, we must remember that there are many other factors that impact representational personas. These include status in the majority or minority, committee assignments, policy implemented by the majority party in the House, and the party of the President.

Therefore, while competition may have caused her to be more locally focused in her policy dialog and at home more often during her most competitive period, the large number of changes in her overall representational persona indicate that many forces – including competition - may fashion home style presentations. That is an important contribution to this project.
**Concluding Discussion**

Biggert is a member of Congress who is concerned about her constituents, and also, at the same time, engages in many nationally framed policy conversations. She is at home often, practices allocation representation frequently, portrays herself as an ideological centrist, and appears to be a legislator who cherishes bipartisanship.

That said, there were many changes in her home style persona. She curtailed her allocation efforts, increased her presence at home, and greatly bolstered her bipartisan rhetoric.

Even so, I assert that throughout the project period, she engaged in a robust issues dialog. First, she stressed concerns of local import. Second, she engaged in important national policy debates.

Thus, Biggert illustrates several things. First, home styles are complicated. Many different factors may impact how a legislator presents him or herself to constituents.

Second, there were numerous changes in particular facets of her home style; yet even so, Biggert’s central image remained intact throughout the study period. She consistently focused on issues throughout her tenure.

Third, competition may have mattered in certain instances, and may explain several changes in her image (particularly her presence at home and the national and local balance of her policy dialog). Thus, Biggert’s story illustrates the complexity of representation.

That said, we now analyze a member of Congress whose policy dialog shares some similarities with Judy Biggert, Rep. Ken Calvert of California.

“Over the years his committee assignments enabled him to address issues such as the Endangered Species Act, agriculture, energy, water and others critical to Riverside County, California and the nation” (campaign website 10-2-08).

Introduction

Rep. Ken Calvert, a former restaurant manager and real estate entrepreneur, was elected to represent Southern California in Congress in 1992 (OC Weekly 10-25-07). He was raised in Corona, a municipality of Riverside County, and part of the district he still represents and calls home (Government Facebook Page). At a young age, Calvert became involved in the Republican Party, working on various campaigns in his native state, including those of Ronald Reagan and Governor Pete Wilson.

That said, as the quote at the beginning of this case study reveals, this hometown legislator cares about concerns of local import. More precisely, the member regularly discusses issues that are of particular consequence to constituents, but he does so in a national frame. Important local issues include space and defense policy; the district is home to many military installations as well as a notable aerospace sector. Also, given Southern California’s notable drought, and its location near the Mexican border, water policy and illegal immigration are also chief local concerns. All of these facts are important in understanding how Calvert addresses policy.

Beyond his issues dialog, he concentrates on one constituent-oriented activity – allocation politics - while eschewing the other two. Finally, while he circulates bipartisan rhetoric, there is a noticeable amount of partisan dialog in his home style.

His Southern California district is extremely interesting. It is geographically compact, with large portions of Asian and Hispanic constituents.

In terms of electoral competition, Calvert dropped below 60 percent of the vote at the
2006 election. He stayed below this threshold in both 2008 and 2010. Thus, if the literature that hypotheses test is correct, I expect that following Election Day 2006, Calvert will stress constituent-oriented activities, frame policy in a local veneer more often, and emphasize bipartisan and ideological moderation.

Findings reveal that this legislator altered his home style marginally. Yet, the behavioral shifts he made did not change the chief feature of his representational persona. Throughout his tenure he resonated local concerns in a national lens, focused on allocation efforts, and behaved in a relatively partisan fashion.

Further, while competition may have been a cause explaining alterations he made to his home style, I have identified other potential factors. Most importantly, when he changed his home style, he did so in a way that contradicts the literature this project tests.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

*District Traits*

California’s 44th District is geographically compact, approximately 40 miles long by 20 miles wide (United States Geological Survey). It contains parts of Orange and Riverside Counties.

The economic traits of the district reveal a constituency that is extremely affluent compared to the nation as a whole. The median household income of the district is $70,397 compared to a national median household income of $51,425 (Table I). A total of 19.5 percent of residents work in education services, healthcare and social assistance; 12.1 percent of constituents are employed in professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services; 11 percent are in retail trade; and 10.5 percent are employed in
Importantly, only 42.5 percent of residents identify as white (Table I). Table I reveals that among constituents are significant numbers of Hispanics (36.1 percent) and Asians (12.1 percent). Further, 30 percent of district residents identify as Mexican American. Thus, there are three large racial groups that Calvert represents.

Beyond this, the median age of residents in the district is 32 years of age. The bureau also indicates that 25.5 percent of the population has a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared to 27.5 percent of the nation.

Significantly, the district is home to several military installations including March Air Reserve Base, Camp Pendleton, the Naval Surface Warfare Center, and the San Clemente Island Range Complex (Calvert Government Website). Further, thousands of residents are employed in the aerospace industry (Orange County Register 1-28-05).

Of particular importance to understanding Calvert’s home style are the district’s economic characteristics, including its many military installations, and the water concerns of California. Further, it is imperative to keep in mind his district’s racial heterogeneity during his conversation on policy.
Table I  
Census Data on the 44th District of California  
from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

**Economic Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$ 70,397</td>
<td>$ 51,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and management, and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Competitive Contexts

Calvert faced just two opponents over five election cycles. The first was Louis Vandenberg, a college administrator who ran in 2002, 2004 and 2006. Vandenberg was not considered a serious political challenger; therefore, coverage in local papers did not prominently highlight his election platform or policy views. Several fundraising reports appeared sporadically from 2002 through 2006 illustrating colossal fundraising by Calvert and virtually none by Vandenberg. That said, Vandenberg did manage to pull Calvert below 60 percent of the vote in 2006, during a banner year for Democrats.

The other challenger was Bill Hedrick who ran in 2008 and 2010. He was the Riverside County Board of Education President, a teacher, and union official (San Bernardino County Sun 9-26-02; Orange County Register 10-27-08). The 2008 and 2010 races received significantly more attention in the local media.

In 2008, Hedrick earned 48% of the vote while being dramatically outspent. The Orange County Register reported that Hedrick attempted to debate Calvert (10-27-08). Calvert refused, accusing Hedrick of running a “negative and desperate” campaign. This article cited Hedrick asserting, “The economic crisis combined with Calvert’s support of the bailout bill has frustrated voters.” The same article also claimed, “Calvert has four times more money than Hedrick.” Calvert earned just 52 percent of the vote.

After an extremely competitive race in 2008, as early as May of 2009, the DCCC was already supporting Hedrick in the next race and started commissioning attack advertisements against Rep. Calvert (Orange County Register 5-3-09). The Inland Valley Bulletin observed that Rep. Calvert is “going to be working very hard” at his re-election in 2010 (6-20-09). The Orange County Register cited Calvert exclaiming, “This time I’m going to leave no chances out there.
I’m going to make sure we raise a significant amount of money and do the ground game a little different” (10-17-09).

The Orange County Register illustrated that Hedrick addressed Social Security privatization, job creation, another stimulus bill, and tax credits for employers who hire new employees (9-27-10). Particularly through social media sources, Calvert also campaigned greatly with a “Fire Pelosi” theme, thus using California politics to turn his election into a referendum on San Francisco Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi.

This was clearly a competitive contest. Rep. Calvert raised more money and campaigned more zealously than he did in 2008. Hedrick also raised significant revenue and garnered DCCC support.

While 2010 was a strong year for the Republican Party, Calvert only won with 56 percent of the vote.

It is important to note that there were additional dynamics at play in 2008 and 2010 that likely hurt Calvert politically. The incumbent found himself embroiled in a series of scandals. While he was never formally charged with any wrongdoing, he was nevertheless under investigation by the FBI.

Influencing the 2008 campaign, the Inland Valley Daily Bulletin reported:

“Calvert...caught investigators' attention because he had been receiving campaign donations since 1999 from a lobbying firm that has close ties with Rep. Jerry Lewis... The FBI had been investigating links between Lewis... and the lobbying firm Copeland, Lowery, Jacquez, Denton & White. Neither Lewis and Calvert [have] been charged with any wrongdoing. But that Calvert's name has been linked to these probes and is temporarily replacing the closely scrutinized Doolittle has some raising objections” (5-10-07).

Beyond this, consider, “Calvert has drawn CREW's ire...for allegedly using earmarks to benefit projects that increased the value of his own property...”(San Bernardino Sun 9-23-09). The San
Bernardino Sun also revealed, “Calvert cooperating with FBI over alleged land deal. The FBI would neither confirm or deny Saturday a report that a Southern California congressman is being investigated by the FBI over an alleged inside deal to buy publicly-owned land” (10-17-09).

Thus, it is important to note that the timing of these scandals likely influenced his 2008 and 2010 contests, adding another element to his competitive circumstances.

### Table I-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$643,411</td>
<td>Louis Vandenberg</td>
<td>$N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$687,471</td>
<td>Louis Vandenberg</td>
<td>$6,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>$854,536</td>
<td>Louis Vandenberg</td>
<td>$3,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$1,150,439</td>
<td>Bill Hendrick</td>
<td>$191,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$1,540,252</td>
<td>Bill Hendrick</td>
<td>$561,785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District Partisan Voter Index Scores

- 2006  R + 6
- 2009  R + 6

### Home Style Overview

Tables I-2 through I-5 furnish readers with an overview of the 469 press releases and 52 franked documents that Calvert circulated. In addition, many local newspapers chronicled his activities in Congress, the Orange County Register most prominently. However, other papers also covered his career, including the Inland Valley Bulletin, the San Bernardino Sun, OC Weekly, and the Daily News of Los Angeles.

As already noted, Rep. Ken Calvert addresses many prominent local issues in a national frame. He also concentrates on some constituent-oriented activities, illustrating his local connection. His partisan dialog is relatively robust in nature, not surprising given his long roots in the party.
That said, first, I will highlight his policy discourse. Then, I will present his constituent-oriented activities. Finally, his partisan and ideological rhetoric will be revealed.

### Table I-2

**Ken Calvert Press Releases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N = 469 Press Releases</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This percentage is calculated out of 455, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.*

### Table I-3

**Ken Calvert Press Releases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N = 455 Press Releases That Address Public Policy</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense Policy</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Resources Policy</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Technology Policy</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Policy</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/Border Policy</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table I-4

**Ken Calvert Franked Materials**
Entire Program Period
N = 52 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 45, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy.

Table I-5
Ken Calvert Franked Materials
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed
N=45 Franked Documents That Address Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation Policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/Border Policy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/Resource Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Broad Policy Discourse

Rep. Calvert’s policy discourse, on the whole, is evenly split between presenting policy entirely in national terms and portraying the impact of federal policy on constituents. Table I-2 illustrates that 50 percent of press releases frame policy solely in a national lens, while 49 percent portray the impact of national policy locally. Yet, after removing those press releases that
also reveal allocation politics, 65 percent frame policy in a national lens, while 33 percent portray the impact of national policy on his district.

Table I-4 indicates that his franked documents are also rather split, with 51 percent highlighting policy in national terms, and 44 percent framing the impact of national policy on constituents.

That said, regardless of how he frames policy, Calvert resonates local concerns in a national frame. Table I-3 reveals that 19 percent of press releases focus on defense policy, 18 percent on the environment and resources, 16 percent on science and technology as well as water issues, 15 percent on immigration and the border, and ten percent on economic policy (Table I-3).

Similarly, the Orange County Register often published policy goals of local legislators; consider the following published by this daily on 2-23-05 regarding Calvert’s agenda:

“2005 goals Space: Get authorization bill passed for NASA to reinvigorate space program; get shuttle flying, finish space station. Transportation: Get an additional $10 million to $12 million in transportation bill for Riverside (91) Freeway. Water: Develop new water technology program; look at water reclamation throughout the country. Military: Work to protect Southern California bases from being closed by the next base-closure commission. Immigration: Pass bill that would phase in mandatory program for employers to check workers' Social Security numbers to make sure they are legally entitled to work in the United States.”

The same paper published an updated version of Calvert’s policy goals on 1-21-07, which has a striking similarity:

“2007 Goals...Immigration: Make the Employment Eligibility Verification System mandatory. Transportation: Get federal funding for transportation projects such as work on the Riverside (91) Freeway, grade separations, the San Diego (I-5) Freeway/Ortega (74) Highway interchange and the Foothill (241) Toll Road extension. Taxes: Get bill passed to keep banks out of the real estate business. Military: Ensure that the House supports more C-17s for future production. NASA: Seek reports and hearings to ensure that the agency adheres to the NASA Authorization Act of 2005.”
Thus, several issues received great attention from this member in both press releases and newspapers, including: defense, immigration and employee verification, resources and water, and science and technology. This legislator is chronicled framing these concerns in both national and local terms.

More locally oriented, this member tells readers, "The federal government will start cutting the flow of Colorado River water to Southern California taps on Jan. 1…‘This isn't over yet,’ said Rep. Ken Calvert…‘We have some time, not a lot of time, to convince IID that we need to come to a resolution of this immediately if not sooner’” (The Press-Enterprise 12-11-02). Regarding a defense issue that impacts his district, the Long Beach Press-Telegram reports, “Rep. Ken Calvert, R-Riverside, argued that current laws hurt Marines training at Camp Pendleton where, he said, 40 miles of beachfront is closed to training” (5-22-03). Speaking to space policy, the paper tells readers, “With tens of thousands of aerospace jobs in Orange County and other southern California communities, Calvert said, he also wants to focus on improving U.S. competitiveness in space technologies” (Orange County Register 1-28-05). Finally, illustrating the intersection of a local transportation issue and his focus on illegal immigration, Calvert is cited observing, "The commission's rejection of the toll road is similar to their rejection of building the border fence at Smuggler's Gulch because of birds” (Orange County Register 2-8-08).

He also frequently addresses these same issues in a national lens. Consider Calvert noting, “Obviously the war has sucked up a lot of the oxygen in Washington, in terms of our priorities" (Orange County Register 1-19-04). Regarding illegal immigration, Calvert insists, “There is a growing consensus in America that we must improve our employee verification system and turn off the job magnet, which is the major cause of illegal immigration” (Daily
Assessing space policy, this legislator observes, “‘I worry that we're not taking these challenges from other nations seriously,' said Rep. Ken Calvert, chairman of the Space and Aeronautics subcommittee. ‘We must maximize every penny to keep our great nation competitive,’ said Calvert, R-Corona, noting China is planning a lunar mission by 2017” (Orange County Register 2-17-06). Discussing defense policy, the legislator asserts, "This nation voted for change, but they didn't vote for us to be defenseless or have a self-inflicted defeat” (Orange County Register 2-17-07). Finally, concerning the Iraq War, Calvert makes known, “We've got troops in there right now. Shutting off the funding just isn't right. We all want our troops to come home safely and soon. But we have a national security interest in that area” (Orange County Register 10-1-10).

Calvert’s websites also exhibited these same issues. Regarding E-verify, a program to ensure new employees are not illegal immigrants, Calvert’s government website declared, “Congressman Calvert has introduced legislation in the 111th Congress that would make employment verification mandatory over a period of seven years” (10-1-09). Addressing the aerospace industry, the member makes known, “My top priority as Chairman was to pass into law the NASA Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155); the first reauthorization bill of our civilian space and aeronautics agency in five years” (4-1-08). Finally, focusing on resource policy, the legislator reports, “One of California’s major concerns is water…I have been working relentlessly to secure more water for California by means of HR 3208, the Western Water Security and Enhancement Act of 2001” (4-1-03).

Further, his campaign website (11-11-10) tells readers, “In the 111th Congress, Calvert’s priorities have been: supporting our military in the Global War on Terror; improving our local and national economies; strengthening our borders and reforming the immigration system; creating long-term solutions to California’s energy and water problems; working towards the implementation and
funding of new transportation corridors vital to Riverside and Orange County’s future; further reinvigorating the nation’s space program; and much more.”


Notably, Calvert reveals to readers how his committee assignments impact his constituents through his government website. Regarding his service on the Science, Space and Technology Committee, this legislator observes “The Science Committee has jurisdiction over many issues of importance to the 44th District, and California as a whole. The research and development of new technologies involves many of our local universities and industries…I will work to ensure California maintains its position as the world's leader in space research, education, technology, manufacturing, services, and transportation” (4-1-05).

Further, he declared, “I am again serving on the Armed Services Committee during the 108th Congress. Riverside County has always had a strong military tradition with March Air Force Base… and the Naval Warfare Assessment Station in Norco.”

To clarify his attention to resource policy, his government website explains: “The Resources Committee has jurisdiction over national forests and park land issues, the ESA, offshore energy and others which is close to the hearts of all southern Californians. My priority has been to achieve an appropriate balance between public access and conservation of our country's natural environment” (4-1-05).

Finally, given that his district is extremely close to the Mexican Border, it should be no surprise why immigration and border security are also extremely important issues to constituents.
Accordingly, the most prominent feature of Calvert’s home style is his ability to address local policy concerns in a national frame, particularly through press releases. Even though press releases are more nationally oriented, other sources provide a greater national and local equilibrium. Yet, most importantly, the particular issues he stresses are important local concerns, regardless of how they are framed. I assert that this is the defining feature of his home style.

B) Constituent-Oriented Activities

Calvert underscored allocation politics in 23 percent of all press releases (Table I-2) and 19 percent of all franked documents (Table I-4).

Newspaper articles also depicted a congressman engaged in a great deal of allocation politics from 2002 through 2008. The Orange County Register quotes Calvert extolling, “‘There were a lot of regions in the country that were trying to get on this list,’ said Rep. Ken Calvert, R-Corona, who championed Riverside County’s efforts to Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta. ‘Down the road, we're going to be looking for money, and this doesn't hurt’” (11-1-02). Another citation makes known, “On Nov. 20 the House of Representatives passed a $388 billion nationwide appropriations bill that includes $178,000 requested by Congressman Ken Calvert… for a San Clemente shoreline erosion study” (Orange County Register 11-30-04). Further, the Orange County Register told readers, “Calvert announced Thursday that he introduced two bills to increase the volume of recycled water in Orange County and Riverside County communities. Included was $5 million for a San Clemente project to double the treatment plant's ability to turn sewage into water suitable for irrigation” (2-20-07).

Calvert continued his allocation conversation on government websites. In 2002, his website insisted, “Calvert has worked during his past four terms to secure federal funds for critical projects in Riverside County” (10-1-02). The snapshot of his government website on 10-
1-07 similarly argued, “During his past seven terms, Calvert has focused on securing federal funds for critical projects in Riverside County.” His website on 10-1-09 also stated, “During his past eight terms, Calvert has focused on securing federal funds for critical projects in Riverside County.”

Thus, through a variety of home style tools, he showcased his allocation efforts.

That said, service representation is at the periphery of Calvert’s persona. The data contain very scant evidence of this legislator highlighting casework through most of the instruments of home style that members of Congress have at their disposal. Table I-2 indicates that just three percent of press releases address service representation; few accounts of this activity appear in other sources.

Likewise, Calvert did not emphasize his presence at home. Table I-2 indicates that just five percent of press releases feature Calvert in his district. This was not a noticeable aspect of his newspaper, web, and social media sources. I speculate that representing a West-Coast district makes traveling back and forth from Washington difficult.

Thus, his constituent-oriented activities illustrate that while he underscores allocation representation, he does not emphasize service representation or appearing at home regularly. Therefore, he stresses certain constituent-oriented activities while eschewing others. Nevertheless, the attention he pays to allocation illustrates his attention to his district.

C) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Rep. Calvert’s home style contained a noticeable, but not overwhelming display of partisan dialog. He circulated partisan statements in 15 percent of press releases (Table I-2) and in 10 percent of franked documents (Table I-4). Table I-2 also illustrates that 74 percent of news releases revealed that the legislator was a Republican.
This member utilized newspapers throughout his career to sporadically display partisan
dialog. Typical exemplars range from Calvert declaring his Republican affiliation to this
legislator lambasting Democrats.

For example, he observes, "The Democrats want to drill where there's no oil" (Orange
County Register 7-18-08). The same paper reported Calvert arguing,

"I doubt there will be much traction heading into November for amnesty...This would
mean that after many Democrats are thrown out of office, Obama and Pelosi, with the
help of elected officials no longer accountable to their constituents, will force through
legislation to provide citizenship to 12 million people whose first action was to break our
laws" (7-4-10).

Social media was utilized greatly during 2010 to display some of his harshest partisan
statements. His campaign Twitter Page proclaimed, "Democrats continue to demonstrate that
they are unable to govern our country" (6-23-10). His government Facebook Page declared,
“Thanks to the Democrats, we are on track to end 2010 with huge deficits and start 2011 with a
massive tax hike, which spells uncertainty for American jobs” (10-4-10). Other typical examples
of partisan social media declarations included, “Obama’s speech brings out the most tired Dem
playing card: raise taxes” (Calvert’s Government Twitter Page 4-13-11). Also, consider, “When
will Washington Democrats learn that we can't spend our way out of our economic problems”
(Campaign Twitter Page 8-10-10)? Thus, social media was greatly utilized to exhibit a partisan
tone in his home style more than any other data source.

Even though a great deal of evidence reveals a partisan air in Calvert’s home style, not
surprising given his roots in the California Republican Party, he also circulates bipartisan dialog.
Calvert made bipartisan statements in nine percent of press releases (Table I-2) and 10 percent of
franked documents (Table I-4). Again, while not overwhelming, these periodic statements are
still noticeable.
Sporadic bipartisan displays in newspapers include, "We just had 385 members vote for the NASA reauthorization bill, Republicans and Democrats together moving ahead on this” (Orange County Register 7-26-05). Another exemplar cites Calvert observing, “President Obama's speech was serious and reflected many areas of common ground for Republicans such as the emphasis on personal responsibility” (Inland Valley Daily Bulletin 1-20-09).

Also, his government website tells readers, “The new Democrat Administration and the committees of jurisdiction in the Congress will be the driving forces in developing federal education policy in the 111th Congress. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address any lapses in federal leadership and aid for our nation’s schools” (10-1-09). Further, his Facebook page states, “House passes bipartisan two week funding bill with $4 billion in cuts” (3-1-11).

Beyond party, ideology was discussed far less than either bipartisanship or partisanship, appearing in only two percent of press releases throughout the study (Table I-2). There was no ideological discussion in franked documents and very minimal dialog on the topic in newspaper sources. Thus, ideology is not a prominent feature of his representational image.

Given that his district leans Republican, and he has a long history working with the California GOP, it makes sense that he would highlight partisanship. Thus, while partisanship is not the most striking aspect of Calvert’s home style, and he circulates bipartisan sentiments as well, he is nevertheless a relatively partisan legislator.

D) Overall Assessment of Home Style

If the literature that this project tests is correct, Calvert should place a premium on constituent-oriented activities. Thus, he should be at home often, practice allocation robustly, and concentrate on service representation. Of these three, he only focuses on allocation politics. In
fact, he worked diligently at obtaining a place on the Appropriations Committee, a perch that makes it easy for a legislator to secure funds for constituents. Thus, I am comfortable calling Calvert a legislator who stresses allocation representation. That said, he was not in his district often, which I speculate may be due to the distance from Washington, DC to Southern California. Also, he did not emphasize casework in any meaningful way.

Regarding policy, if the literature that this project tests is supported, this legislator should frame the impact of national policy in local terms prolifically. He does not. Instead, this member often frames policy in national terms. However, it is imperative to recognize that Calvert continually discusses issues of local import, but he does so in a national frame. Thus, resonating the parochial policy concerns of his district in a national lens is the chief feature of his representational persona.

Finally, the literature hypotheses test suggests that he should place a premium on bipartisanship and embrace ideological centrism. While there is evidence of bipartisan dialog, he circulates a great deal of partisan rhetoric. Further, ideology is not often discussed by this legislator.

Thus, he practices allocation often, resonates local policy concerns in a national frame, and is a relatively partisan member of Congress. Given that he is a hometown legislator, who grew up in the district, with a history of volunteering in the Republican Party from an early age, this persona matches these characteristics well.

**Home Style Changes**

This legislator fell below 60 percent of the vote on Election Day 2006 and did not again break that threshold. Therefore, I anticipate that he will behave differently following that general
election. More precisely, if the literature that this project tests is correct, I anticipate that he will frame policy in a more local veneer, place a premium on constituent-oriented activities, and underscore bipartisan dialog after Election Day 2006.

...Indeed, there were several areas in which he modified his home style behavior. Yet, most of these changes do not represent a wholesale alteration in his persona.

...First, I will present changes in his policy discourse. Next, I will highlight shifts in his constituent-oriented activities. Finally, variations in his partisan rhetoric will be revealed.

Table I-6
Changes in Ken Calvert Press Releases Around Changes in Competitive Margins
* Subjects that referenced both federal and state or local policies in the same press release are marked with an asterisk. This practice caused the sums illustrated below to exceed 100 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Above 60% 2002 to 2006</th>
<th>Above 60% 2002 to 2006</th>
<th>Below 60% 2006-2011</th>
<th>Below 60% 2006-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituent-Oriented Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and Local Portrayal of Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipartisan and Partisan Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Issues Addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology/Space Policy</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Policy</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alterations in Policy Discourse
Table I-6 reveals that prior to Election Day 2006, 45 percent of press releases addressed policy in national terms. Following this day, 58 percent of news releases stressed issues in this manner.

There was also a decline in the degree to which he framed the impact of federal policy in local terms. In total, 54 percent of press releases framed policy in this manner prior to the 2006 General Election; 42 percent did so after that date.

Therefore, on the one hand, he met expectations since he shifted his behavior following an alteration in competitive circumstances. On the other hand, instead of becoming more locally oriented as hypotheses suggest, he presented a more nationally focused image. Thus, he behaved contrary to the literature that this project tests.

There are two possible factors that may explain this behavioral change. First, it is likely that he increased his criticism of the Democrats and their policy positions following Election Day 2006. Thus, he may have addressed policy in a more national lens since he responded to policy proposals offered by the new congressional majority, and then by President Obama.

If he criticized Democratic proposals during this time frame, it is likely that these issues also appeared in his re-election campaigns. As such, he may have addressed these concerns in a national frame to help win votes, or to respond to his challengers. Therefore, competition also may have caused this behavioral modification.

Regarding discussing water and space policy less often after 2006, this shift is likely related to being awarded a coveted seat on the House Appropriations Committee in 2009, and therefore, relinquishing his positions on the science and resources committees. Therefore, while those issues were no less important to constituents, he lost his forum to concentrate on those policy concerns. As such, this alteration is likely related to his committee assignments.
Shifts in Constituent-Oriented Activities

Table I-6 indicates that Calvert highlighted allocation politics a great deal less regularly following Election Day 2006. Prior to this point, Calvert underscored allocation representation in 31 percent of press releases. Following that date, just 12 percent of press releases emphasized this home style activity.

Further, anti-allocation statements began appearing in his data sources. Consider, “Today House Republicans voted for a moratorium on earmark requests” (Calvert’s Government Facebook Page 3-11-10) and “I stand with my GOP colleagues in the House and Senate and support a moratorium on earmarks” (Government Twitter 11-16-10). Further, Calvert asserts, “Good news, Senate Approp[riations] Chairman has stated he will enforce earmark ban in the Senate” (Government Twitter 2-2-11). Even so, after 2006, this legislator seeks federal funding for constituents, even if less robustly than prior to this time.

Thus, there was a notable alteration in this aspect of his representational persona, and a change that was not anticipated by the literature tested by hypotheses. He still secured funding for constituents, even if less so than prior to the 2006 General Election, while supporting GOP efforts to reduce earmarks. While this may seem to be contradictory, given the GOP character of his district, and his propensity to resonate local concerns in a national frame, it makes sense.

In particular, many of the earmarks he requested after the 2006 race are related to defense interests in the district, something conservative constituents adore. Therefore, this modification to his representational persona reinforced his image of speaking to conservative and Republican interests, while also securing funding for local concerns, particularly in an area that conservatives tend to support.
Did competition force him to change his home style? There are three possibilities that may explain this behavioral shift. One is that the close elections caused him to run to the conservative GOP base. Thus, he requested fewer earmarks, but focused on securing monies for items that Republicans tend to support.

Alternatively, there are two institutional factors that may also explain this shift. First, he was in the minority from 2007 through the beginning of 2011. Therefore, he may have obtained less funding due to losing majority status.

Further, the earmark ban instituted by the GOP Conference after 2010 certainly curtailed the allocation efforts of the entire House. Thus, institutional factors may have mattered in this instance.

Finally, it is not out of the realm of possibility that all of these forces were at play, and their cumulative effects sharply curtailed his allocation activities.

Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Following the 2006 General Election, Calvert’s press releases became far more partisan. Table I-6 shows that he increased the degree that he displayed his partisan affiliation from 68 percent of press releases prior to Election Day 2006, to 83 percent following this event.

More potently, following the 2006 General Election, 31 percent of press releases contained partisan statements. Before this date, just four percent of press releases exhibited this quality.

Therefore, regardless of expectations, Calvert became more partisan over time. This does not support the literature tested by hypotheses.
This shift may be explained in two ways. First, competitive circumstances may have caused him to connect more to his GOP base. As such, instead of moderating after a close contest, he polarized. Therefore, competition may have mattered.

Alternatively, the Democrats took control of Congress in 2007 and the White House in 2009. Consequently, the national policies being considered by Congress from 2007 through 2010 were sharply different from issues being discussed prior to 2006. Thus, more policy proposals existed that this legislator was likely to criticize.

**Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes**

This section illustrates that Calvert made several changes to his home style after he fell below 60 percent of the vote. He framed policy in a national lens more often, chronicled his allocation efforts less frequently, and circulated more partisan rhetoric. Further, and importantly, these changes do not support the literature that hypotheses test.

That said, competition may be a major factor that explains his behavioral alterations. More precisely, perhaps he cut allocation activities and became more partisan in hope of reaching out to and energizing his GOP base of voters. Yet, institutional dynamics such as Calvert’s place in the minority from 2007 through the beginning of 2011, Democrats taking control of the White House in 2009, and the earmark ban that Republicans instituted in 2011, are also elements that may explain these behavioral modifications.

Regarding the nationally oriented shift in his policy discourse, there are two important points. First, since he still largely focused on local issues, I do not believe this change was an important alteration in his representational image. Second, beyond changes in his competitive status, I can only surmise that he became more nationally focused in efforts to rebuke policies
proposed by the Democratic House Majority after 2007 and the Democratic controlled White House after 2009.

Still, any variations in his policy dialog, partisan activities, and allocation efforts, for reasons explained above, do not represent a noteworthy shift in his persona. He still practiced allocation, particularly on defense issues. Calvert always resonated local concerns in a national lens. Finally, this legislator was always relatively partisan, even if he was more so after 2007.

Thus, there are several factors that may explain these shifts in his home style, which I do not believe change the core of his representational persona in any meaningful way.

Concluding Discussion

Calvert concentrated on policy concerns important to constituents, framed local issues in largely national terms, stressed allocation politics while eschewing other constituent-oriented activities, and circulated both partisan rhetoric and bipartisan dialog. He paid attention to constituents and their needs, while resonating their concerns in nationally oriented policy conversations.

That said, while it is curious that he engaged in an extensive dialog on illegal immigration given the large proportion of Hispanic constituents, perhaps he ameliorates these concerns by also working on policies important to all those he represents such as water policy. Yet, it must be explicitly stated that stressing illegal immigration to the degree he does runs the risk of alienating a large portion of voters with Latino roots. Thus, it does not appear that he consistently represents every portion of his district equally. Like his partisan activities, he appears to run to his base of GOP voters on this issue.
Shifts in his policy dialog, partisan activities and allocation efforts only reinforce the central feature of his representational persona. Throughout his tenure he concentrated on issues of local import, practiced allocation politics to varying degrees, and was a relatively partisan legislator.

Did variations in the difficulty of winning re-election impact his persona? The answer is perhaps. Yet, at the same time, there may be other explanations revolving around the majority party in Congress and the party of the President of the United States. Still, on the whole, he changed relatively few aspects of his home style; Calvert’s image was largely stable throughout the program period.

One more thing must be stated. Scandals certainly played a role in this story, and appeared to impact his 2008 and 2010 re-elections. As such, it is not out of the realm of possibility that these events caused an uptick in electoral competition. Even so, I advanced an argument that the core of his home style remained intact; thus, the impact of these scandals on his persona appears to be minimal.

Chapter Conclusion

The three legislators in this chapter are from very different districts in different regions of the country. Michaud is from the Northeast. Biggert lives in the Midwest. Calvert grew up in the Southwest. Calvert was elected in 1992. Biggert won her first election in 1998. Michaud took office after the 2002 General Election. Michaud was a millworker. Biggert is a lawyer. Calvert has a career in business. They are a very diverse sample.
That said, each was re-elected in close contests during some years and by large margins in other elections. Yet, they share similarities in their representational styles.

Each legislator practiced allocation representation a great deal prior to roughly 2008. Michaud did so most prolifically. While Biggert and Calvert still engaged in this activity, they did so less in comparison. In fact, Michaud’s allocation efforts are one of the key features of his home style presentation. Biggert fought hard to protect local federally funded science labs. Calvert advocated for defense installations throughout his time in office. Their propensity to secure earmarks fluctuated with their status in the majority, and also due to the financial crisis.

Biggert and Michaud were both at home regularly, placing a premium on being connected with constituents. Calvert, perhaps due to representing the West Coast, did not emphasize this home style trait.

Regarding service representation, Michaud was the only legislator in this chapter that engaged in any noticeable degree of casework.

Thus, while each subject emphasized at least one constituent-oriented activity, Michaud stressed these areas more than the other legislators in this chapter.

Concerning their policy dialog, there are two interesting findings. First, each legislator emphasized concerns of local import to constituents throughout his or her tenure in office. Second, each was rather different in the manner of how he or she framed policy concerns. Michaud was the most locally focused in terms of how he framed issues. Biggert discussed issues of local import, in addition to more national concerns, in both local and national terms. Calvert stressed issues important to constituents in a national lens. Thus, on the one hand, they concentrate on policies that are important to those they represent. On the other hand, they frame issues rather differently.
Finally, Michaud and Biggert were certainly ideological centrists who placed a premium on bipartisanship. Both were extolled by local news sources for their moderation and bipartisan approaches to governing. Calvert, on the whole, was more partisan than bipartisan. Given that he has a track record as a Republican Party activist prior to his election to Congress, this is not surprising.

Turning to hypotheses, if the literature this project tests is supported, I expect that each would emphasize constituent-oriented activities more during his or her most competitive periods.

Regarding allocation politics, Michaud marginally stressed allocation more during his least competitive time, while he was in the majority. After a difficult re-election in 2010, his allocation efforts dropped by over 20 percent. This may be due to competition. It may also be due to his position in the minority, the GOP earmark ban in 2011, or the financial crisis. Further, it may be an amalgamation of all four reasons.

Biggert and Calvert practiced allocation politics less throughout the study period, regardless of electoral circumstances. More precisely, Calvert practiced allocation representation less during his most competitive time. Instead of competition influencing this behavior, it appears this change is related to both their status in the minority from 2007 through the beginning of 2011, and then due to the GOP Conference imposing an earmark ban in 2011.

Regarding their presence at home, Biggert was in her district the most often during her most competitive time. Thus, it appears that competition likely sparked this change. Michaud and Calvert’s activities were consistent throughout their tenure.

Each legislator did not change the degree that he or she practiced service representation. Michaud was the only subject that robustly emphasized casework throughout his tenure.
On the whole then, it appears that while competition may have mattered in terms of allocation representation and Biggert’s presence at home, otherwise, it likely had little impact on the constituent-oriented activities of these subjects.

Concerning the national and local equilibrium of their policy discourse, if the literature tested by this work is correct, during their most competitive times, their policy dialog would be the most locally focused.

Michaud’s policy dialog was fairly stable prior to 2010; he robustly framed policy locally. He then made a sharp national shift after his close 2010 re-election. Biggert’s policy was framed in the most local terms during her most competitive period. Calvert was more nationally focused during his most competitive time.

Thus, Biggert is the only legislator who met the expected pattern, even if marginally. During her most competitive period, she addressed policy more in a local frame. Michaud and Calvert’s behavior does not support the literature that this project tests.

Michaud and Calvert’s nationally focused turns coincide with their status as minority party legislators. Thus, it is possible that they criticized the majority party more regularly during their time in the minority, and therefore, the nature of their conversations were not often framed in local terms.

Finally, if the literature being tested is correct, hypotheses suggest legislators would underscore bipartisanship during competitive times.

The nature of Michaud’s policy discourse was stable throughout his tenure, while Biggert’s became both more partisan and more bipartisan over the study. Calvert’s simply became more partisan in tone.
I anticipate that entering the minority party in 2007, and having the GOP lose the White House in 2008, contributed to more partisan displays for the Republicans in this chapter. That said, Biggert balanced her partisan rhetoric with bipartisan dialog, meeting expectations of the literature on one hand, while not supporting these expectations on the other. Calvert’s behavior appears to run counter to hypotheses; he connected to his Republican base during his most competitive time frame.

When considering each legislator’s home style, Michaud exhibited the most significant changes from the chief feature of his representational image. Mike Michaud became a great deal more nationally focused and concentrated less on allocation politics following his close race in 2010.

Did competition matter? I believe it had the most prominent impact on Calvert’s partisan dialog, almost certainly stimulating him to emphasize his GOP affiliation to stress his connection to his base. Further, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that this phenomenon shifted Michaud’s policy dialog and his allocation activities. These two issues could certainly be influenced by competition.

Still, as with my analysis of the many changes in Biggert’s home style, there were a number of factors at play that may have lead to variations in their activities. These include majority party status and the policies of the majority party on earmarks. Further, the financial crisis and fluctuations in the importance of local issues also play a role.

Thus, competition may be one of several factors fashioning home styles. Yet, by and large, the chief features of each of their personas remained intact, despite fluctuations in competitive circumstances. Accordingly, if competition and/or other factors fashioned home style images, they did so at the margins.
This work will now explore the home styles of members of Congress whose districts are similar to those in this chapter. More precisely, the districts are competitive for either party. However, the subjects in the next chapter earned above 60 percent of the vote in each election they contested. Unlike Michaud, Biggert and Calvert – these legislators insulated themselves from competitive contests - regardless of the quality of each of their challengers. We now explore the home styles of Rep. C.W. Bill Young of Florida, Rep. Jerry Costello of Illinois, and Rep. Paul Ryan of Wisconsin.

Chapter 8

Competitive Districts and Safe Margins

Introduction

Despite representing competitive districts, the legislators chronicled in this chapter consistently won re-election by wide margins. While most of their challengers were political novices with little funding, that has not universally been the case. Thus, these members found ways to insulate themselves from competitive underlying district partisanship, and in some instances, strong opponents.

Given these circumstances I have several expectations. Broadly, I expect that these members will act similarly to other legislators in competitive circumstances. This is largely due to the fact that their districts are competitive for either party, even if the subjects examined in this chapter managed to isolate themselves from close elections.

More precisely, if the literature that this project tests is correct, I predict that these members will focus on constituent-oriented activities. I anticipate that they will practice allocation politics often, appear in the district regularly, and focus on service representation
frequently. I also expect that they will frame policy in a local veneer robustly, thus illustrating the impact of national policy on constituents. Finally, if this literature is correct, these members of Congress should place a premium on bipartisan activities and ideological centrism.

Beyond this, since their electoral conditions remained constant, I also expect that their representational personas will be stable as well. Since they continually enjoyed electoral success, it is unlikely that these legislators would deviate substantially from their representational personas. In other words, presuming that their home styles helped these members comfortably win in competitive districts, I do not expect that they will deviate from images that may have helped them win re-election.


Rep. Bill Young of Florida was the longest serving GOP House member at the time of his death in 2013. His representational image focused on constituents and defense and veterans’ policy. Speaking to the former, Young robustly engaged in allocation politics and was at home often. Beyond this, while defense and veterans’ issues are important local concerns, as his district relies on the defense industry and is home to many veterans, he also played a major national role on these issues through his posts on the Committee on Appropriations.

Congressman Jerry Costello is a locally focused legislator. This member resolutely practiced allocation representation. Further, he addressed issues that are important to constituents - particularly flood mitigation policy. Costello’s focus on flooding is understandable given that many rural and urban communities in his district are found on the banks of the Mississippi River.

Rep. Paul Ryan’s home style is distinct from the other subjects in this chapter. He is much more nationally focused in his policy dialog. That said, he hosts many town hall meetings
on a regular basis, and despite not illustrating the impact of federal policy on constituents, places a premium on connecting with voters.

Their home styles were generally stable. Even so, aspects of their representational personas changed slightly. Costello marginally focused on constituent-oriented activities less in the second half of his tenure. Young became more locally oriented in the second half of the program period, while Ryan became far more nationally focused. Also Ryan’s partisan portrayal and discourse changed rather significantly after 2007.

I found reasonable explanations for most of these changes that are not connected to competitive circumstances. I stress that when considering their representational images as a whole, most of the alterations to their personas were small. Very few aspects of their home styles in the second half of their tenure deviated sharply from their images in the first part of the program period.

That said, I will begin with the story of C.W. Bill Young of Florida.

C.W. Bill Young – Concentrating on Constituents, Defense & Veterans

"‘Frankly, I have brought a lot of projects to Pinellas County,’ Young said. Young expects to be chairman of an Appropriations subcommittee for defense spending next year, rather than chairman of the full committee, and said he wants to use that position to make sure disabled soldiers are getting the full benefits they deserve” (St. Petersburg Times 10-26-04).

Charles William (Bill) Young was first elected to Congress in 1970. Prior to his tenure in the House, he was a member of the Florida State Senate for a decade (Biographical Directory of the U.S. House of Representatives). This legislator died in office on October 18, 2013; at the time of his death he was the longest serving Republican in the House (Politico). Given his long tenure, newspapers and local politicos placed him on a constant retirement watch (St. Petersburg
Thus, Bill Young was a career politician who knew how to win re-election.

Beyond his political career, this legislator frequently highlighted his 15 years of service in the Army National Guard and showcased himself as an expert on defense and veterans’ issues. This was important in the defense-oriented district he represented, which is also home to a large number of veterans.

That said, the citation above from the St. Petersburg Times illustrates the major feature of C.W. Bill Young’s home style: a member of Congress who cared about his constituents, defense and veterans. He practiced allocation representation zealously, was at home often, and addressed defense and veterans’ issues in both local and national terms.

This persona was often highlighted during his tenure as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee or the chair or ranking member of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee. In very local terms, he protected MacDill Air Force Base and a very large number of defense contractors in his district; he also focused on problems at local VA healthcare facilities (Tampa Tribune 7-5-07; St. Petersburg Times 3-22-10). At the same time, he played a major national role in funding the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan during 2003 and 2004 from his perch on the Appropriations Committee. Thus, he was also a national expert on defense policy.

Given this information, despite representing a district that either just leaned Democratic, or slightly leaned Republican in terms of how it votes in presidential elections, Young was consistently re-elected with over 60 percent of the vote. Accordingly, I anticipate that his home style remained stable throughout his tenure in office since his competitive circumstances were constant. Beyond that, given the split partisan nature of his district, even if he was constantly re-
elected comfortably, the literature I am testing suggests that he will focus on constituent-oriented activities, concentrate on local issues, and behave in a bipartisan manner.

If this literature is correct, then focusing on constituent-oriented activities would gain him votes without engaging in risky policy conversations. Further, framing issues in a local veneer and concentrating on concerns of import to constituents should also illustrate the care and attention he gives to those he represents. Finally, should median voter theory be correct, given the split nature of his district, he should reach out to voters of both parties by eschewing partisanship.

Young largely met expectations. Most importantly, his home style was rather stable throughout the program period. The relatively few changes that he made only reinforced his image.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

*District Traits*

The map below illustrates a geographically compact district. The small size clearly reveals its urban characteristics. The Tampa Tribune notes that it “includes all of Pinellas County south of Clearwater except for south St. Petersburg” (7-17-08). The map also indicates that Young represents what the Tampa Tribune calls “beach communities.”

Table J reveals that 19.6 percent of district residents work in educational services, and healthcare and social services; 12.9 percent are employed in professional, scientific and management and administrative and waste management services; 12.6 percent hold jobs in retail; and 10 percent have finance, insurance and real estate careers.
The district is largely white, with 83.6 percent of voters identifying as Caucasian; is slightly less educated than constituencies around the nation, as 26.5 percent of residents have a B.A. or higher; and its population is far older than the country’s average, since 45.4 years is its median age (Table J).

Most importantly for understanding Bill Young’s home style, the Tampa Tribune observes that the constituency is “a district where a number of major defense contractors have operations, including General Dynamics Ordnance and Tactical Systems, based in St. Petersburg, and Raytheon Co., which has plants in St. Petersburg and Largo” (7-5-07 B). Further, the district is also home to MacDill Air Force Base, a major local employer (St. Petersburg Times 3-22-10). Beyond this, 14.7 percent of residents are civilian veterans; this is higher than the national average of 10.1 percent (U.S. Census Bureau).

Given the demographics of the district, it is understandable why it is so electorally competitive. On the one hand, it is an urban district, and urban districts tend to lean Democratic. On the other, this same urban area is heavily invested in the military and defense contractors; these industries tend to support Republicans. There is no evidence that these are two separate constituencies in this district. Rather, it is an urban district that has a large defense industry. Therefore, the split underlying partisanship of the district can likely be explained due to these two conflicting characteristics.
Table J
Census Data on the 10th District of Florida
from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

**Economic Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$45,035</td>
<td>$51,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Competitive Contexts

Young’s district is almost evenly split in terms of how it votes in presidential races. Its PVI score’s are D+1 and R+1, respectively. The St. Petersburg Times describes the competitive nature of this constituency in the following terms: “Congressional District 10…is the country's most Democratic U.S. House seat now held by a Republican. Al Gore won it with 51 percent of the vote in 2000, and President Bush won it with 51 percent in 2004. Democratic chief financial officer candidate Alex Sink won it by 9 percentage points in 2006” (3-16-07). Accordingly, this district splits its votes between parties. On paper, it appears to be one of the most competitive districts in the country.

However, for a variety of reasons, Bill Young never earned below 60 percent of the vote. In 2002, Young was re-elected unopposed. In 2004, his race against Bob Derry was described by the Tampa Tribune in the following terms: “Congressman Bill Young hasn't so much as acknowledged the man's existence…C.W. ‘Bill’ Young, 73, has been the Republican U.S. representative from Florida's 10th District for nearly 34 years… But he does have opposition this year: Bob Derry. No Household Name” (9-19-04).

In 2006, Young beat Samm Simpson who was constantly described in the media as “a grandmother” (St. Petersburg Times 5-17-06). The Tampa Tribune reported, “The race was virtually nonexistent, with Young, 75, doing little campaigning and his Democratic opponent… struggling for media attention” (11-8-06).

The 2008 campaign was different; Young’s opponent was Dunedin Mayor Bob Hackworth. Hackworth was “a political nobody when he beat a respected longtime incumbent for the Dunedin City Commission in 2002…He senses a parallel between this race and his first in Dunedin, where the mood on issues had shifted and voters turned against the incumbent” (St.
Petersburg Times 8-31-08). Even with a much stronger opponent, Young easily dispatched Hackworth.

Finally, in 2010, Young faced his strongest challenger over the course of this study (St. Petersburg Times 5-21-10). His name was State Senator Charlie Justice. Compared to Hackworth - who represented a city of less than 40,000 - Justice served over 400,000 constituents (U.S. Census Bureau; National Conference of State Legislatures). Thus, he was far better known than any previous challenger; he also had a larger campaign war chest (Table J-1).

This race featured negative campaigning. The St. Petersburg Times reported, “Rep. Young to step up campaigning, run his own ‘truth meter’… to counter the attacks by Democrat Charlie Justice in their race for Young's House seat” (St. Petersburg Times 5-21-10). This same article quotes Young observing, “our opponent has made this campaign personal and that will require our response. Instead of talking about the important issues before our nation, he just puts out lies, distortions and personal attacks against me and my family, plus a little name calling.” This same publication features Young asserting, “We will respond to these attacks and will even add to our web site a truth meter to set the record straight." Significantly, Justice raised more money than the three previous challengers combined, only to get trounced in the contest (Table J-1). Young earned 66 percent of the vote.

Thus, regardless of the quality of his opponent, this legislator easily won every race. Bill Young was simply an institution in Florida politics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Election Results and Campaign Finance Information</th>
<th>Opponent Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>C.W. Bill Young</td>
<td>$ 487,595</td>
<td>No Opponent</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 681,753</td>
<td>Bob Derry</td>
<td>$ 85,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2006   66%   $ 506,476   Samm Simpson   $ 39,747
2008   61%   $ 969,228   Bob Hackworth   $ 155,593
2010   66%   $ 965,474   Charlie Justice   $ 320,532

District Partisan Voter Index Scores
2006    D + 1
2009    R + 1

Home Style Overview

Tables J-2 through J-5 furnish readers with an overview of Young’s home style activities portrayed in the 270 press releases and 31 franked documents that he circulated. The St. Petersburg Times and the Tampa Tribune widely chronicled Young’s home style activities.

As mentioned already in the beginning of this case study, Bill Young focused on constituents. He also was a national leader on defense and veterans’ issues.

First, I will present his constituent-oriented behaviors. Next, I will discuss his policy conversations. Finally, his partisan and ideological discourse will be chronicled.

Table J-2
C.W. Bill Young’s Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Program Period</td>
<td>N = 270 Press Releases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Lens*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 202, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.
### Table J-3
C.W. Bill Young’s Press Releases
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period
N = 202 Press Releases That Address Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense Policy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security Policy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq/Afghan Policy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Resource Policy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table J-4
C.W. Bill Young’s Franked Materials
Entire Program Period N = 31 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* This percentage is calculated out of 23, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy.

### Table J-5
C.W. Bill Young’s Franked Materials
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed N = 23 Franked Documents That Address Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aging Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Table J-2 illustrates that 18 percent of press releases highlighted Young engaging in allocation politics. Even though this number is not overwhelming, it is still high. Further, allocation representation is the foremost feature of his appearances in newspapers.

Consider, “Young, an affable Republican with a Conway Twitty hairstyle, is one of the most influential people in Congress, able to divert millions of dollars with the stroke of a pen. He is a good person to know if you want to preserve federal sand dollars for your district” (St. Petersburg Times 5-13-02). During his final months as Chair of Appropriations, the St. Petersburg Times reported that he “opened the federal spigot and showered millions of dollars on the Tampa Bay area” (St. Petersburg Times 11-21-04). After his tenure as chair, it was made known that “Rep. C.W. Bill Young...still managed to shovel more than $240-million in political pork to the Tampa Bay area, plus $80-million elsewhere in the state” (St. Petersburg Times 12-23-05). The Tampa Tribune observed, “In fact, of the 435 members of the U.S. House, only majority leader Steny Hoyer, a Democrat from Maryland, got more special projects funded in the 2008 budget than did Young, although his 95 projects totaled $139 million - $30 million less than Young's 88 projects…” (Tampa Tribune 3-26-08). Finally, it was made known that “At the same time, a handful of ardent earmarkers retired. Young remains one of the kings. In 2010 alone, he sponsored or co-sponsored $128 million, more than anyone else in the House. He is always quick to recite the clause in the Constitution that says Congress controls the purse: ‘Article 1, Section 9 is very specific’” (St. Petersburg Times 3-19-2011).
More specifically, there were many accounts of Young’s allocation efforts related to defense, including: “MacDill Air Force Base, which in recent years has fought to keep from getting closed, seems to have secured its future…According to U.S. Rep. C.W. Bill Young, MacDill is slated to get 32 KC-767A refueling tankers, $202.1-million in military construction and 103 officers and 252 enlisted personnel…Young's aides characterized it as the biggest news to hit MacDill in decades” (St. Petersburg Times 6-14-03). The St. Petersburg Times made known, “For the Tampa Bay area, Young has been a one-man ATM, dispensing federal cash for colleges, defense projects and roads” (6-28-04). In his effort to strengthen MacDill, the Tampa Tribune reported, “Young pointed out that on Thursday, the House Appropriations Committee, of which he is a member, appropriated $67 million for a joint intelligence center at MacDill and $11 million for security forces there” (5-14-05). This publication also tells readers, “Young's district ranks third out of 25 Florida congressional districts in the value of its federal contract awards and 72nd out of 435 districts nationwide” (Tampa Tribune 7-5-07). The St. Petersburg Times observes, “…Rep. C.W. Bill Young, who will send more money home than all but one member of the U.S. House. Young, 76, a Republican from Indian Shores, has slipped $128-million for pet projects into federal appropriations bills, mostly for defense contractors and colleges in Pinellas County” (St. Petersburg Times 11-8-07). This same publication stated, “Rep. C.W. Bill Young of Indian Shores, the top Republican on the defense appropriations committee and one of the most prolific earmark writers in Congress, has funneled hundreds of millions over the years to defense contractors in the Tampa Bay area” (St. Petersburg Times 3-12-09). Finally, regarding MacDill Air Force Base, Young was credited with submitting “a $9.6 million request to begin work on a parking garage for United States Central Command at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa” (St. Petersburg Times 3-22-10).
Thus, the degree to which Young practiced allocation representation is clear evidence that he focused on constituents.

This member’s routine presence in the district continues to advance this argument. Table J-2 indicates that 32 percent of press releases chronicled Young at home meeting with constituents. Further, newspaper articles often featured the legislator in his district.

The Tampa Tribune reveals, “Veterans Affairs Medical Center at Bay Pines, 10000 Bay Pines Blvd., will hold a Memorial Day ceremony from 9 to 10 a.m. May 27. Rep. C.W. Bill Young will be the speaker” (5-12-02). Another exemplar makes known, “The field show, featuring several marching bands and a fireworks display, will be a ‘big patriotic event with Congressman Bill Young conducting the musical finale’” (Tampa Tribune 4-6-03). He was present at the opening of a local library where he spoke “during the ribbon-cutting ceremony at 1 p.m.” (St. Petersburg Times 7-31-05). Illustrating the intersection of allocation politics and his presence at home, the St. Petersburg Times reports, “U.S. Rep. Young will attend the ribbon-cutting ceremony on a bridge that he helped secure a $50-million grant for and that has subsequently been named in his honor” (8-19-07). Finally, consider, “Community Health Centers of Pinellas will have a grand opening Friday…U.S. Rep. C.W. Bill Young plans to attend the ceremony, scheduled from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m., to be recognized for his contributions to the center” (St. Petersburg Times 3-26-09).

These examples from newspapers continue to support my argument that Young concentrated on constituents.

That said, even though Young was at home often and allocated funding for his district frequently, newspapers did not chronicle Young engaging in service representation. Further,
Tables J-2 and J-4 note that only one percent of press releases and no franked documents focused on service representation.

Even so, the remainder of his home style traits discussed thus far are indicative of an elected official focused on constituents. Likewise, his policy conversation focused on issues of local import, mainly defense and veterans’ concerns. While he framed these areas in local terms often, he was also a nationally respected leader on defense policy. Thus, we now explore his policy dialog.

B) Broader Policy Discourse

Table J-2 reveals that 61 percent of issues conversations discussed the impact of federal policy on Young’s district, while 38 percent framed policy conversations in a solely national manner. Removing policy related press releases that also reveal allocation representation, 51 percent of news releases are solely nationally oriented, while 48 percent illustrate the impact of federal policy on the district.

Table J-2 shows that 30 percent of Young’s policy discourse in press releases focused on defense policy, 23 percent on homeland security, and 11 percent on Iraq and Afghanistan. He framed dialog on these issues in both local and national terms.

Many newspaper articles cite this member framing these issues nationally. Consider, “‘I was ahead of the game,’ said Young, who first pushed funding for antiterrorism efforts after the Oklahoma City bombing” (Tampa Tribune 6-28-02). Regarding the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, “Young said he would make sure the administration got the money it needed. ‘Our troops are going to be in harm's way. I will do everything I can to make sure our troops know they are being supported’” (St. Petersburg Times 3-19-03). On another defense issue, Young insists,
“Reservists do have a right to have some ability to organize their lives and prepare for their mobilization” (Tampa Tribune 1-22-04). Regarding homeland security, “Young said that passage of the Patriot Act and appointment of John Negroponte as intelligence czar, which gives one person access to all information generated by the intelligence community, would help resolve future problems” (St. Petersburg Times 8-10-05). Discussing an issue important to active military, the St. Petersburg Times reported, “During his speech, Young noted that President Bush on Monday signed into law the Respect for America's Fallen Heroes Act, which restricts protests at military funerals and national ceremonies” (5-30-06). Speaking to the ongoing issue of Iraq, it was made known that “Rep. C.W. Bill Young of Indian Shores, the senior Republican on the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, says he isn't ready to endorse the president's plan but wants to make sure the United States can win decisively” (St. Petersburg Times 1-13-07). He also stated, “I'll be glad to take criticism all day long for my consistent support for a strong national defense. As I have said so many times before, I don't want to send our American pilots into combat in one of the best aircraft. I want to send our pilots into combat in the very best fighter aircraft available” (St. Petersburg Times 7-22-09). Criticizing President Obama, the paper tells readers, “U.S. Rep. C.W. Bill Young, R-Indian Shores, agreed Obama had no choice. But he said the decision should have been left to Defense Secretary Robert Gates…‘There's something there that caused this man to risk what is otherwise a tremendously successful military career’” (St. Petersburg Times 6-23-10).

Newspapers also contain many examples of Young framing the impact of military and veterans’ issues locally. Consider this from the St. Petersburg Times: “House Appropriations Chairman C.W. Bill Young said Tuesday he has ordered a special investigative team to look into allegations of mismanagement at Bay Pines VA Medical Center… where allegations have
surfaced that patient care has declined because of poor management and that the hospital is a hostile work environment for employees” (2-18-04). Regarding the same situation, it was reported, “The Veterans Affairs inspector general will open a permanent office in Florida in response to the problems at Bay Pines VA Medical Center, House Appropriations Chairman C.W. Bill Young said Thursday night” (St. Petersburg Times 4-2-04). In his efforts to protect a local Air Force base, Young said, “Based on conversations I've had, I'm satisfied MacDill will not be on that list” of military installations slated for closure (St Petersburg Times 5-12-05).

Regarding an issue in his district, the news made known, “A week after a paralyzed Marine was injured at the James A. Haley VA Medical Center, U.S. Rep. C.W. Bill Young asked the head of Veterans Affairs to review the quality of medical care at the hospital” (St. Petersburg Times 5-13-05). Finally, in an effort to protect MacDill, the paper quotes the legislator who said “he saw bricks and mortar as the best way to ensure MacDill's survival…‘We decided if we were going to make MacDill very, very permanent, we needed to begin a construction program to make the facility new, modern and workable’” (St. Petersburg Times 3-1-08).

Thus, Young played an important national role on defense and veterans’ policy. Yet, he also framed the impact of these issues locally.

More precisely, many of the examples cited above regarding military and veterans’ policies are connected to Bill Young’s posts on the Committee on Appropriations. Therefore, he had the opportunity to ensure that the military was funded properly while serving in Iraq. He also held the power to protect local defense contractors, Veterans’ Affairs facilities, and MacDill Air Force Base (St. Petersburg Times 7-23-09, 10-9-03; Tampa Tribune 2-6-05).
We now turn to explore his ideological rhetoric and partisan discourse. If literature referenced in the hypotheses is correct, he should embrace bipartisanship and ideological centrism.

C) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Bill Young is neither partisan nor ideological. He has a record of rebelling against his party and practicing bipartisanship.

Table J-2 makes known that Young displayed his partisan affiliation in just three percent of press releases. Further, less than one percent of these documents chronicled the legislator circulating partisan statements; none revealed his ideology. Local newspapers illustrate Young engaging in bipartisanship and defying his party.

Regarding bipartisanship, the St. Petersburg Times reported, “Collender says Young ‘has done extremely well. He's one of the few people in the House who has operated in a purely bipartisan way’” (9-30-02). Speaking on homeland security, this same publication made known, “Rep. C.W. Bill Young, R-Largo, told members of the Suncoast Tiger Bay club. ‘Our approach to terrorism should be bipartisan. We should be on the same side!’” (4-8-04). Assessing the culture in Washington, “Young said he is saddened that the Capitol ‘has become very, very partisan. I've had to tell some of my dear friends in both parties that this is not a political convention. This is the United States Congress’” (St. Petersburg Times 5-18-06). Finally, consider, “‘The real measure of Bill Young, which Americans would have observed had they been with him in those votes, is the decency of Bill Young, the collegiality of Bill Young, of his inclination to reach across the aisle,’ said House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer” (St. Petersburg Times 5-14-09).
Local news sources also chronicle several instances of this member being at odds with GOP leadership. For example, “Republican congressional leaders have rebuffed Young's request, delaying the controversial bills until the 108th Congress convenes next year. That prompted Young, the Largo Republican who chairs the House Appropriations Committee, on Friday to urge President Bush to ask congressional leaders to pass the bills before Christmas” (St. Petersburg Times 11-17-02). Young was quoted asserting, “‘I just view this as a feeble attempt to make it look like we're doing something significant - which we're not,’ said Rep. C.W. Bill Young, R-Indian Shores, one of only 24 Republicans to vote against the measure” (St. Petersburg Times 9-15-06). The St. Petersburg Times reported, “In an era when Congress is tarnished by scandal, partisanship and special interests, U.S. Rep. C.W. Bill Young is a throwback…He stands up to House leaders when he disagrees with them…He detests the obsession with fundraising and works well with members from both parties” (10-16-06). While criticizing President Bush, the St. Petersburg Times observed, “Even the measured Rep. C.W. Bill Young… hardly a hard-line conservative, voted against it…When a Republican administration loses a moderate like Young on a defining economic vote, it needs a better plan or a better sales pitch” (9-30-08). Finally, consider, “Tampa Bay area Congressmen C.W. Bill Young and Gus Bilirakis were among six Florida Republicans who voted with Democrats today to extend benefits to about 2.5 million unemployed Americans, including 200,000 in the Sunshine State” (St. Petersburg Times 7-22-10).

Thus, given what we know about his district, it does not come as a surprise, if median voter theory is correct, that Young worked to eschew partisanship and display bipartisan tendencies.
D) Overall Assessment of Home Style

In terms of the policy areas that Young concentrated on, his penchant for allocation politics, his focus on military issues, his robust presence at home, and even his non-partisan display - he appeared to care about constituents.

If the literature tested is correct, Young should focus on constituent-oriented activities. He should be at home regularly, and engage in service and allocation representation frequently. Young was in his district often, placing a premium on connecting with voters. He also practiced allocation politics zealously, securing millions of dollars each year for his district. That said, he did not engage in service representation in any meaningful way. Thus, he focused on two out of three constituent-oriented activities under study.

Regarding policy, if the literature tested is supported, Young should frame policy in a local veneer. First, his policy discourse was split between highlighting the impact of policy in local and national terms. In particular, he concentrated on defense and veterans’ policy, two prominent local concerns. Thus, on the one hand, the literature is disputed since he is mixed in his approach to policy; on the other hand, he concentrates on issues of local import.

Finally, if the literature tested is correct, Young should be non-partisan, and non-ideological, and illustrate a centrist policy veneer. He does not discuss ideology and is largely non-partisan. He also engages in bipartisan activities.

Home Style Changes

As a reminder, Young never earned below 60 percent of the vote, despite representing a marginal district. Since his competitive circumstances remained stable, I expect that his home style will not change significantly over time.
As with other legislators who did not experience shifts in competitive climates, to assess the member’s home style changes, I compared Young’s activities in the first half of the program period (2002 through 2006) to his behavior in the second half (2007 through 2011).

On the whole, his home style was largely stable. Many of the changes in his persona, including those in press releases, appear to bolster the chief features of his home style. Most of the conversation below is limited to his policy discourse, which became more locally focused throughout the program period.

### Table J-6
C.W. Bill Young’s Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Shifts Over Time</th>
<th>N= 270 Unless Otherwise Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Issues Addressed</strong></td>
<td>N=202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security Policy</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National and Local Portrayal of Policy**

| Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens | 38 | 51% | 39 | 31% |
| Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level | 36 | 48% | 87 | 69% |

### Table J-7
C.W. Bill Young’s Franked Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Shifts Over Time</th>
<th>N= 31 Unless Otherwise Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National and Local Portrayal of Policy</strong></td>
<td>N= 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alterations in Policy Discourse*
Tables J-6 and J-7 illustrate that Bill Young was less nationally oriented in his policy discourse in the second half of the project period. He framed issues solely in a national lens in 51 percent of press releases from 2002 through 2006. Only 31 percent framed policy in this manner from 2007 through 2011.

Table J-7 reveals that 100 percent of franked documents (N=7) that discussed policy framed issues in a national lens during the first part of the program period, while 81 percent (N=13) did so in the second half. His appearance in newspapers did not change dramatically.

The shifts in Young’s policy dialog may be related to three circumstances. First, the most likely reason for this behavioral shift is that Young did not hold any full committee or subcommittee chairmanships from 2007 to the beginning of 2011. From 2002 to 2004, Young was the Chair of the Committee on Appropriations. From 2005 through 2006, he was also the Chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. These furnished him with prominent national roles in the spending process, particularly for a country occupying Iraq. After 2007, when his party lost majority status, he lost the chair’s gavel. Thus, he had less reason to frame policy in a national veneer.

Second, in 2008 and 2010, Young ran against local officials. As already explained, they were higher quality challengers than previous opponents. While he was re-elected by large margins, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that these opponents caused him to pursue a more local emphasis. His opponents were certainly stronger challengers than those who ran in 2004 and 2006.

Further, 2006 and 2008 were Democratic tidal waves. Since I stated that he was a politician who knew how to win re-election, it is not out of the realm of possibility that these
wave elections caused him to take a more local veneer in order to avoid the potential threat of losing re-election.

Regardless of the reasoning for this shift, throughout time, this legislator bolstered his local focus.

Beyond the local and national balance of his policy dialog, Table J-6 reveals that Young stressed homeland security policy less in the second half of the program period. Correspondingly, the member also addressed the Iraq War less often in newspaper articles from 2007 through 2011.

I am confident that this shift in policy conversations in newspapers is wholly not related to political competition, but is instead connected to the import of issues at a given time. The war in Iraq became less potent; homeland security too became a less prominent issue in 2007. Accordingly, I believe this behavioral change is not affected by competitive circumstances.

This alteration does not impact the chief feature of his image.

Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes

In line with expectations, Young revealed relatively few changes in his home style. The variation in the national and local balance of his policy dialog fortified his local image. Thus, this legislator framed issues more often in local terms in the second half of the program period.

Beyond this, shifts in the particular policy areas he emphasized do not appear to impact his persona.

That said, did competition play a role in his story? It is not out of the realm of possibility given that he ran against a local mayor in 2008 and a state senator in 2010. He simply did not face a quality challenger between 2002 and 2006. Therefore, being challenged by two top-tier
opponents may have caused him to shift to a more local focus. Thus, Young may have responded by stressing the attention he gives to constituents.

Beyond that, he may have also seen the political tides of the country turning after the 2006 race, and took a more local focus in order to attempt to isolate himself from the unpopularity of the GOP between 2006 and 2008. Simply, perhaps he became more locally focused to distance himself from the national Republican Party.

This behavioral variation may also be connected to no longer serving as the Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, or as one of the “cardinals,” when he was chairing the defense subcommittee. Therefore, while it cannot be entirely discounted that competition made a difference, this alternative explanation must be considered.

Nevertheless, on the whole, his representational image became more locally focused throughout the project period.

**Concluding Discussion**

Bill Young was a powerhouse in American politics. He chaired the prestigious Committee on Appropriations, and at the time of his death, was the longest serving member of the GOP in his chamber. He was a national leader on issues of local import, primarily defense and veterans’ concerns. These issues were framed in both local and national terms. Beyond policy, he also practiced allocation politics prolifically, was at home often, and displayed his bipartisan attitudes frequently. Thus, despite his important national roles, he continually cared for constituents.

Beyond this, Bill Young met expectations. His image was very stable throughout the program period. Further, the one major change in his policy discourse, framing policy in a more
local veneer, only became more pronounced in the second half of the program period. This reinforced his home style image.

Did competition usher in this change? Perhaps, but I believe this one variation was linked to no longer holding a chairmanship from 2007 through 2010. As such, while I cannot totally discount the potential influence of competition, I believe the alternative explanation is more powerful.

Regarding hypotheses, competition may play a role in this story, but there are other forces at play too.

The chapter will now highlight the home style of a legislator who also practiced allocation politics zealously, Rep. Jerry Costello of Illinois.

**Rep. Jerry Costello - A Locally Focused Legislator Stressing Allocation Representation**

“I am proud of my record in Congress. It is a record of standing up for the people of our area on difficult issues, of staying in touch by coming home from Washington every weekend, participating in public meetings and forums, and bringing home our share of tax money to create jobs and improve our economy”- Rep. Jerry Costello (St. Louis Post Dispatch 3-17-06).

Prior to his time as an elected official, Jerry Costello was an investigator in the St. Clair’s County Sherriff’s Office, the county director of probation, and a police officer. He also served as Chair of the St. Clair County Board preceding his election to Congress in 1988 (St. Louis Post Dispatch 10-22-04). Thus, this legislator held a variety of municipal positions where he gained hands on experience familiarizing himself with the communities he served.

That said, and as the quote above from the St. Louis Post Dispatch reveals, his local focus, including robustly practicing allocation representation, is the chief feature of Costello’s home style. This locally oriented image is personified in several ways. He concentrated on
constituent-oriented activities. He also emphasized major local policy concerns, including flood issues. Finally, while not necessarily connected to his locally robust image, Costello reached out to both parties through his moderate policy positions, illustrated bipartisan activity, and did not engage in partisan rhetoric.

Costello’s district is in South West Illinois, and the Mississippi River serves as its western border. Its population is also rather heterogeneous as it contains urban pockets and agricultural areas (Costello House Website). River transportation is an important issue, and constituents in both urban and rural parts of the district are often victims of flooding.

Given its heterogeneous nature, it should not be surprising that either party could win an election in the district. Despite representing an area that votes for both Democrats and Republicans, Costello managed to hold the constituency comfortably over the program period.

Due to this underlying partisanship, if the literature this project tests is correct, I expect that he will place a premium on constituent-oriented activities, frame the impact of policy in a local lens, and not engage in partisan or ideological displays. He largely meets expectations.

Further, I expect that his home style will remain stable since his competitive circumstances were constant.

While there were several variations in his persona, on the whole, these changes were small. Further, none of these shifts truly damaged the chief feature of his image. Finally, I will argue that the alterations in his behavior are not related to his competitive circumstances.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

*District Traits*
The map below reveals that the western end of the district follows the Mississippi River in Southwestern Illinois. Costello’s website indicates that the district contains a mixture of “partially industrial” and agricultural counties. Thus, it is somewhat heterogeneous. It is also a fairly large district, over 100 miles long (Costello House Website).

Table K makes known that 24.4 percent of district residents have careers in education services, and health care and social assistance; 11.4 percent are employed in retail trade; and 10.5 percent work in manufacturing.

The district is poorer than the nation as a whole, as the median household income is $41,975 compared to a U.S. median household income of $51,425. Further, 12.5 percent of families are below the poverty line, compared to a national average of 9.9 percent in the United States.

Beyond economic demographics, Table K illustrates that the district’s population is majority white, with 78.4 percent of voters identifying as Caucasian. Also of significance, 17.4 percent of residents are African-American. Additionally, 20 percent have a B.A. compared to a national mean of 27.5 percent. The population is slightly older than the rest of the country, since 37 years is its median age.

That said, the relatively large proportion of African-American constituents and the fact that the district is a mix of urban and rural areas sheds light on why it is electorally competitive. There are clearly several diverse sub-constituencies that Costello must appease. The district includes inner city parts of East St. Louis and other urban areas throughout the constituency, mixed with a large farming community.

This is a likely reason why Costello has six district offices in different parts of the constituency. One office is in almost wholly African-American East St. Louis; three others are in
more racially mixed Belleville, Chester, and Carbondale; and two are in largely white Granite City and West Frankfort (Costello Franked Material; U.S. Census Bureau). Half of these cities, including East St. Louis, are located directly on the Mississippi River. Beyond this, it is important to note that Belleville is home to Scott Air Force Base.

Given the diversity of the district, it is not surprising that Costello works so robustly to meet local needs. It is important to stress the large number of district offices that he has available for constituents to utilize. Further, as will be explained below, this legislator spends a great deal of time on issues that connect to the Mississippi River, such as flooding. Also, Costello’s robust allocation efforts intersect both flood mitigation concerns and protecting Scott Air Force Base.

Thus, Costello’s robust local emphasis likely works in his favor at each election. His competitive circumstances will now be explained in greater detail.
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**Table K**

*Census Data on the 12th District of Illinois*
from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

**Economic Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$ 41,975</td>
<td>$ 51,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competitive Contexts**

Table K-1 reveals that the PVI scores for this district are D+5 and D+3. Thus, while the constituency leans slightly Democratic, it is clearly within reach for a Republican. However, over the time period of this study, no serious opponent challenged Costello.

For example, as Table K-1 indicates, in three of the five elections under study, candidates did not raise the required sum of money to file financial reports with the FEC. When candidates did break the threshold, they raised so little money it was almost negligible.

That said, it was hard to find information about Costello’s challengers in local newspapers. The coverage of the 2002 race simply featured an endorsement of Costello and reported that his opponent did not raise enough money to file campaign finance statements with the FEC (St. Louis Post Dispatch 7-19-02, 10-22-02). The coverage of the 2004 race featured only a brief mention of the challenger, noting that Erin Zweigert’s campaign was “energetic,” but
that she was too conservative on many issues (St. Louis Post Dispatch 10-22-04, 10-26-04). The St. Louis Post Dispatch reported that no candidate challenged Costello in 2006 (4-23-06) and Costello faced only “token opposition” in 2008 and 2010 (St. Louis Post Dispatch 10-21-08, 10-19-10).

Thus, over the project period, despite representing a competitive constituency, Costello faced either weak challengers or no opponent at all.

Table K-1

Jerry Costello Election Results and Campaign Finance Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$466,186</td>
<td>David Sadler</td>
<td>$NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$637,573</td>
<td>Erin Zweigart</td>
<td>$15,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$757,060</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>$830,948</td>
<td>Tim J. Richardson</td>
<td>$NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$1,420,273</td>
<td>Teri Newman</td>
<td>$44,762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Partisan Voter Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>D +5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>D +3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Home Style Overview

Tables K-2 through K-5 furnish readers with an overview of this legislator’s home style activities portrayed in the 1,993 press releases and 81 franked documents that he circulated. The St. Louis Post Dispatch widely chronicled this member.

As already argued, Jerry Costello was a locally oriented member of Congress. He concentrated on local issues and resonated the interests of constituents in Congress.

That said, first I will explain his constituent-oriented activities. I will follow with an explanation of his policy dialog. These two areas clearly reveal his local focus. Finally, his partisan activities will be presented to readers.
Table K-2
Jerry Costello Press Releases
Entire Program Period N = 1,993 Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 1,741, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.

Table K-3
Jerry Costello Press Releases
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period N=1741 Press Releases That Address Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety/ Crime Policy</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Policy</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Policy</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology/Space Policy</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K-4
Jerry Costello Franked Materials
Entire Program Period N = 81 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*
Indicates Own Party 2 2%
Makes Partisan Statement 7 9%
Makes Bipartisan Statement 0 0%
Indicates Own Ideology 4 5%

* This percentage is calculated out of 73, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy. There are 11 pieces that we know discuss policy, but I am unable to determine the national and local balance of those conversations.

Table K-5
Jerry Costello Franked Materials
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed N= 73 Franked Documents That Address Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aging Entitlement Policy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ Policy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq/Afghanistan Policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Constituent-Oriented Activities

Allocation representation is the foremost feature of Costello’s home style image. An overwhelming 66 percent of press releases highlighted this activity. Since Costello published 1,993 press releases over the program period, this amounts to 1,323 press releases that chronicled allocation politics. It is not surprising then that the St. Louis Post Dispatch is replete with examples of this legislator securing resources for his district.

Consider, “Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, has announced $100,000 in federal funding toward a Great Rivers Research and Education Center in the Alton-Godfrey area” (5-7-02). This paper makes known that, “U.S. Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, said he is working to get between $6 billion and $8 billion set aside in the House version for so-called megaprojects” (2-2-05). Helping a local contractor, this publication reports, “Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, won $1 million for lightweight metallic armor, developed by Magnesium Elektron North America, of
Madison…” (10-10-07). Finally, working with the Senator from Missouri, readers are told, “Take the Mississippi River bridge under construction…Funded in part by earmarks secured by Bond and U.S. Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, the $660 million bridge project is a big job creator in the St. Louis metro area” (10-20-10).

Costello also fought to protect Scott Air Force Base from closure. The St. Louis Post Dispatch quoted this legislator articulating, “‘We're very concerned,’ said Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Ill., a leading advocate for Scott… ‘But given the fact that the secretary of defense has said this is going to be the mother of all BRACs (base realignment and closure), I think we have to be very, very concerned about the next round of base closings’” (10-27-03). Similarly, Costello asserted “that he's encouraged by the nominees to a commission reviewing military bases and optimistic that Scott Air Force Base will fare well in a process that appears focused more on realignments than closure” (3-17-05). Finally, “At Scott Air Force Base, a five-decades-old medical evacuation facility with a leaking roof and an often-flooded basement will give way to a new two-story building. Sen. Dick Durbin, D-Ill., and Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, obtained the $7.4 million earmark for the facility” (St. Louis Post Dispatch 12-16-09).

Accordingly, not only did Costello seek funding for his district in a variety of areas, but he also protected local federal assets. His penchant for seeking funding for his district illustrates the degree to which he advocated for and cared about his constituents.

He also combined allocation activities with his robust presence in the district, another indicator of the attention he gave his constituents. There are many exemplars in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of Costello at home presenting a check he helped secure. For example, “The village has received an $18,000 federal grant to buy a new police squad car. The check was presented this week by U.S. Rep. Jerry F. Costello, D-Belleville, to Mayor Weldon Harber and
Police Chief Ed Wilkerson at the Millstadt Police Department” (7-24-03). Costello also presented “a check for $20,000 to the O'Fallon Police Department last week to buy data terminals for two traffic control cars, the first to be installed by the department” (8-14-03). Further, he was on hand to give a check to “the East Alton Fire Department on Tuesday” (3-31-05).

Beyond the examples presented above, consider, “Virginia Secrest of Alton hands a flag that has flown over the U.S. Capitol to Jack Harlan of East Alton VFW Post 794 so it could be raised at dedication ceremonies Saturday for the new flagpole at Upper Alton Cemetery. U.S. Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, presented the flag for the ceremony” (7-25-02). The member also held a local forum “to provide information concerning services that are offered to area veterans at the state and federal level” (3-1-04). Further, it was reported, “On hand for the groundbreaking were several state, county and local officials, including U. S. Rep. Jerry Costello” (9-17-06). Finally, discussing a prominent local concern in this constituency, this legislator met with, “Chef Philippe Parola…about his vision for Asian carp as part of the grand opening of the National Great Rivers Research & Education Center in Alton” (11-3-10).

It should come as no surprise then that Costello was put on record asserting, “I am proud of my record…of staying in touch by coming home from Washington every weekend” (St. Louis Post Dispatch 3-17-06). Thus, being present at home “every weekend,” continues to illustrate Costello’s local focus.

Similarly, this member’s casework activities were prominently displayed in newspaper articles. Given that this legislator operates six district offices, his focus on service representation is expected.
In particular, Costello placed a premium on securing medals for veterans who never received the honors while on active duty; he then personally presented these awards to veterans in his district. The St. Louis Post Dispatch reported, “World War II aviator Chester Schmidt, 85, of Columbia, has been honored with the Distinguished Flying Cross for his 32 bombing missions over Europe as a radio operator and gunner nearly 60 years ago. The award was presented Monday by U.S. Rep. Jerry F. Costello, D-Belleville” (6-26-03). Another exemplar states, “World War II veteran William T. Cook of Belleville recently received the Bronze Star and five other belated military awards for his service as an infantryman in Europe. They were presented by U.S. Rep. Jerry F. Costello, D-Belleville” (St. Louis Post Dispatch 4-29-04). Finally, since the veteran receiving the award was deceased, “Costello plans to present several medals to Wuebbles' widow, Margaret, at his congressional district office at 1363 Niedringhaus Avenue” (St. Louis Post Dispatch 2-7-05).

He engaged in constituency service in a variety of other contexts. The St. Louis Post Dispatch told readers, “U.S. Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, is accepting applications from young men and women interested in attending a U.S. military academy” (8-21-03). Further, he helped constituents’ recover “thousands of dollars of tax refunds for 125 people who live, or have lived, in Illinois' 12th Congressional District… Rep. Jerry F. Costello, D-Belleville, has their names. He has posted them at his Web site…” (11-5-05). He also held “open office hours from noon to 1 p.m. on Tuesday in Wood River” (8-26-06). Finally, “U.S. Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, has posted information regarding undeliverable tax refunds from the Internal Revenue Service for 2009 on his website” (12-6-10). Thus, Costello often engages in constituency service representation.
Accordingly, this member focused on constituent-oriented activities. He prolifically practiced allocation politics, illustrated his presence at home, and highlighted service representation. He also combined these three activities, such as being in the district while presenting checks to community leaders for government projects. As such, Costello was a locally oriented legislator. It is also important to stress, once again, the amount of time he spent on allocation politics.

B) Broader Policy Discourse

Table K-2 shows that 89 percent of press releases illustrated Costello discussing how national policy affected the district, while just 11 percent framed issues in a solely national lens. When I isolate the policy conversations not related to allocation politics, 55 percent of news documents explained the impact of federal policy on the district.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch chronicled Costello’s local focus. Regarding ethanol, a prominent concern for Illinois farmers, “Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, a member of the transportation panel, said Illinois would do better in large part because of a change in the way ethanol is taxed that favors big ethanol-producing states” (4-2-04). Speaking to liability laws, "‘Half the states have passed various medical malpractice reform laws, and the state of Illinois needs to address the issue in the state Legislature,’ Costello said. ‘I do not believe the federal government should pre-empt the laws that have been passed by half the states in the union’" (1-2-05). Since his district is located on the Mississippi River, the Post-Dispatch cites Costello insisting, "We can either modernize the upper Mississippi and the Illinois waterways, or we can do nothing and continue to cost the taxpayers millions" (7-15-05). Similarly, it was reported that, “Costello and U.S. Rep. John Shimkus, R-Collinsville, co-sponsored an amendment to flood
insurance legislation that was approved by the U.S. House on Thursday… FEMA's remapping process in the Missouri part of the St. Louis region is about three years behind that in Illinois, and it would not be fair for the new requirements to go into effect years apart in different parts of the same watershed, Costello said” (9-30-07). Similarly, consider, “Legislation to keep Metro East property owners from having to buy flood insurance in areas where levees are being fixed has been introduced by U.S. Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville” (8-1-09). Also, due to flooding, local reporters highlight that this member, “continues to seek passage of legislation that would delay changes to flood insurance rate maps for up to seven years in areas where local officials are actively working to fix levees” (1-18-10). Thus, Costello spends a great deal of time working on issues that are important to the diverse set of constituents who live along the Mississippi River.

That said, he also noticeably addressed transportation policy in a national lens. This explains why 55 percent of press releases, once the overwhelming number of allocation related news releases are removed, frame policy in national terms.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch told readers, “‘It is kind of the nature of the business,’ said U.S. Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Belleville, who has long championed the light rail service. ‘You have to keep the fares low for middle- and low-income people who use public transportation, and you have continued to see an increase in costs’” (10-19-03). On an important air travel issue, Costello asserts, “If the FAA gets to implement its last offer, the incentive is not there at the bargaining table for it to reach an agreement. It's a very unfair process…This is about the air traffic control system in the United States; it's about fairness and the safety of the flying public” (5-28-06). The paper also cites this legislator insisting, “It's ‘unacceptable’ that FAA hasn't proposed regulations requiring aircraft manufacturers to show their planes can fly safely in all
kinds of icy weather, said Rep. Jerry Costello, D-Ill., chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee's aviation subcommittee” (2-25-10).

That said, first, these nationally oriented transportation conversations are a small fraction of Costello’s home style dialog. Further, this is the only area addressed in such a nationally focused framework. It is likely that this member discussed transportation in a national lens due to being either the ranking member or chair on the Transportation & Infrastructure’s Subcommittee on Aviation throughout the program period of this dissertation (St. Louis Post Dispatch 3-17-06, 4-16-08). Thus, particularly throughout his time as a subcommittee chair, he produced many nationally oriented press releases regarding transportation issues over which his subcommittee had jurisdiction.

Importantly, the transportation issues he addressed were not controversial. Further, given that the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is responsible for allocating many earmarks, it is reasonable to assume that Costello would like to hold a leadership position on a subcommittee. Thus, holding this position does not hurt his image or his electoral fortunes.

Nevertheless, on the whole, Costello’s news releases reveal a very locally oriented legislator.

C) Party and Ideology

While Table K-2 reveals that 97 percent of press releases unveiled that Costello is a Democrat, just one percent include partisan statements and three percent contain bipartisan assertions. Further, nine percent of franked documents chronicle partisan sentiments while none contain bipartisan rhetoric (Table K-4).
Costello did not exhibit his ideology often. Not a single press release and just five percent of franked documents highlighted this home style feature.

Thus, this legislator wants people to know that he is a Democrat. Yet, he does not engage in partisan, bipartisan, or ideological dialog meaningfully. First, I speculate that given that Illinois maintains a tradition of strong political machines, it is not wholly surprising that Costello reveals his party to voters. On the other hand, given that his district is competitive for either party, not making strong partisan statements or ideological avowals is also logical. Thus, given this information, it appears that this member is nonpartisan and non-ideological. His activities also suggest that he is a centrist Democrat.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, upon the Democrats winning their landslide in the House in 2006, reported, “…Rep. Jerry Costello, of Belleville, a moderate Democrat who won re-election easily on Tuesday, said Pelosi has been assuring him and other party members that she will operate as a centrist” (11-9-06). This publication also illustrates Costello voting with Republicans on numerous pieces of legislation (9-24-04, 10-2-05, 2-22-11). Finally, on social issues, the Post-Dispatch notes that Costello did not support abortion rights and was opposed to same-gender marriage (2-25-04, 3-18-10). His positions on these social issues illustrate his moderate nature since he takes positions that are socially conservative and are at odds with the platform of the Democratic Party.

Thus, on the whole, Costello is neither a strong partisan nor a robust ideologue. He also illustrates his bipartisan voting record and holds positions to the right of most Democrats. As such, I assert that he is a moderate Democrat.

D) Overall Assessment of Home Style
Since I treat Costello’s election circumstances as competitive, due to PVI scores, I anticipate that if the literature this project tests is correct, he would place a premium on constituent-oriented activities, frame policy in a local veneer, and eschew partisan activities.

On all of these counts, Costello met expectations. He is arguably the work’s most prolific practitioner of allocation representation, is at home often, and practices service representation regularly. He concentrates on issues of local import, and largely frames the impact of federal policy in local terms. Finally, his partisan activities are isolated to revealing his party affiliation. Otherwise, he has a record of voting with Republicans and holding positions to the right of mainstream Democrats. Thus, I assert that he is a centrist Democrat.

Beyond hypotheses, in almost every facet of his home style, Costello was a locally focused advocate for the people he represented. This combination of representational images is likely how Jerry Costello, despite such a closely divided district, was able to comfortably win re-election for so many years. We will now examine if his home style persona was consistent throughout the period this project studies.

**Home Style Changes**

As I have said, Costello consistently earned at least 60 percent of the vote in every election he contested over the program period. Given the stability of his political circumstances, and his lack of a serious opponent, I anticipate that his behavior would remain stable throughout the project period.

As with other officials whose competitive climates remained unchanged, I divided his tenure in half and examined his behavior in each time frame. I studied his activities from 2002 through 2006 and between 2007 and 2011.
The data suggest that Rep. Costello did change his behavior in several areas. Yet, these shifts do not represent a wholesale change to his persona as a locally focused advocate for his constituents. Thus, while Tables K-6 and K-7 reveal that he altered his home style in a number of ways, and there were several noticeable changes to his persona in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, all are easily explained and none appear to be due to changes in his electoral circumstances.

### Table K-6

**Jerry Costello’s Press Releases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Shifts Over Time</th>
<th>N=1993 Unless Otherwise Noted</th>
<th>Constituent-Oriented Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002-2006 Mean</td>
<td>2007-2011 Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National and Local Balance of Policy Conversation</th>
<th>N= 1741</th>
<th>2002-2006 Mean</th>
<th>2007-2011 Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shifts in Constituent-Oriented Behavior

Regarding allocation politics, Table K-6 reveals that 71 percent of press releases highlight Costello engaging in allocation representation in the first half of the program period, while 61 percent do so in the second half.

Though he appeared to engage in allocation politics less from 2007 to 2011 through this source, this shift in his home style is rather minimal. I assert that 61 percent of press releases dedicated to this activity is still overwhelming. Therefore, given that this was the foremost feature of his image, I insist that this behavioral shift was nominal.
That said, I have no reasonable explanation for why he displayed his allocation efforts less in the second part of the program period. I speculate that this shift is a result of the earmark ban that the GOP implemented in 2011. Otherwise, I am at a loss to explain why he practiced allocation politics less during the second half of the program period.

Next, Table K-6 notes that Costello was home less often during the second half of his tenure. Seventeen percent of press releases portrayed this legislator in the district from 2002 through 2006, while just seven percent did so from 2007 through 2011. This behavioral change is also apparent in his coverage in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

That said, Costello’s local paper is primarily responsible for chronicling his robust presence at home, while press releases illustrate this activity to a far lesser degree. Therefore, again, while there is a change in his home style activities as indicated by press releases, these changes were on the whole small. Further, while he appeared to be at home less during the second half of the program period, newspaper articles still portrayed him in his district frequently.

Finally, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch highlighted Costello’s service representation activities less after 2007. Yet, evidence still existed of Costello performing casework in this publication, though there were fewer instances chronicled.

Thus, it must be stated that three of the core features of Costello’s home style were not displayed as prominently beginning in 2007. That point is important to mention, particularly in light of his stable electoral circumstances.

Nevertheless, these activities were still highlighted regularly by this legislator and local newspapers, even if not to the same degree as they were prior to 2006. While I acknowledge these shifts, I do not believe the data indicate that the core of his image altered greatly.
Alterations in Policy Discourse

Table K-6 indicates that Costello framed policy in solely national terms in six percent of press releases from 2002 through 2006, and in 16 percent after 2007. Beyond this, his conversation, as covered in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, was still primarily locally focused during the second half of the program period. That said, there was far more nationally oriented policy discourse during that time as well.

This change appears to be related to Costello assuming the chairmanship of a subcommittee in 2007 and holding that position until the beginning of 2011. During this time he addressed federal aviation issues in a national lens more robustly, again, due to his position on the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Aviation.

That said, it is important to not overemphasize the impact of this shift. This home style variation is not a wholesale alteration to his persona, but a small adjustment.

Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes

On the one hand, there were four significant changes to Costello’s home style. In the second half of the project, he did not practice allocation politics as often, was not at home to the same degree, and did not highlight service representation as regularly. He also framed policy more in a national lens in the second half of the program period. I acknowledge these changes; they are important.

On the other hand, none of these behavioral variations were overwhelming departures from his image prior to 2007. He still practiced allocation politics zealously, appeared at home
often, practiced service representation frequently, and framed the impact of national policy on constituents robustly. He simply practiced these activities more often prior to 2007.

Thus, while I acknowledge these changes, I still postulate that many of Costello’s behavioral modifications do not significantly alter the chief feature of his home style. He is still primarily locally focused throughout his tenure, even if slightly less so.

Beyond that, the data also show that assuming the chairmanship of a subcommittee certainly altered his policy discourse. While I cannot be certain it influenced the changes in his constituency-oriented activities, it certainly caused him to address transportation policy in a national lens a great deal more than otherwise. Thus, the slight changes in his policy conversation are likely due to institutional factors in Washington.

Most importantly, no behavioral shifts came about through any change in competitive contexts. There were other forces at work. Thus, Costello’s home style alterations are easily explained and do not take away from his persona as a locally focused advocate.

As such, Table K-6 does not suggest that this legislator altered his home style image in a meaningful way.

**Concluding Discussion**

Costello was one of the chamber’s most prolific practitioners of allocation politics, was at home regularly, and concentrated on service representation. He frequently illustrated how national policies affected his district. The legislator was also a conservative Democrat on social issues, particularly abortion and same-gender marriage. Finally, revealing his Democratic affiliation was the only partisan activity that he practiced often.
That said, while Costello remained locally focused throughout his entire tenure, he was less so while chair of the Aviation Subcommittee from 2007 through 2011. Thus, this case likely represents the importance of majority party status on a member’s home style. Nevertheless, he spent the bulk of his time concentrating on his constituents and practicing allocation politics. Thus, throughout his tenure, the foremost aspect of Jerry Costello’s image remained intact. Accordingly, with the caveats outlined above, Costello was a locally focused advocate of those he represented.

The home style image of the next subject in this chapter departs significantly from those of C.W. Bill Young and Jerry Costello. The representational persona of Paul Ryan of Wisconsin will now be presented.


“Monetary policy was always my first love” – Rep. Paul Ryan (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 11-21-10).

“Paul Ryan, House Republican from Janesville, has 31 town-hall meetings lined up” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 2-21-05).

The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel described Paul Ryan in the following terms when first elected to Congress in 1998: “a voluble, boyishly handsome 28-year-old bachelor then, an Irish Catholic from the fifth generation of a successful Janesville family” (4-4-05). Professionally, prior to his tenure in Congress, he worked briefly for his family’s construction company founded by his great-grandfather in the 1880s. Beyond this, he was also a legislative director for Senator Sam Brownback. As such, Ryan has professional experience in policymaking at the federal level.
Thus, there are two important points that help to explain his home style. First, it is evident that Ryan has deep roots in Wisconsin. Second, through his tenure in Brownback’s office, he gained a fundamental understanding of the workings of federal policy.

Not surprisingly then, and as the quotes at the beginning of this chapter make clear, the chief features of his representational image focus on his attention to public policy and staying connected with his Wisconsin constituents. As will be presented below, his robust policy dialog finds itself in almost every aspect of his persona, including the many town halls that Ryan routinely sponsors.

That said, Ryan’s district is competitive for either party; President Obama even carried the area in 2008 (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 4-26-09). Yet, despite President Obama winning the constituency, Ryan managed to comfortably hold his seat throughout his tenure in Congress.

As the district is competitive for either party, if the literature that this project tests is correct, this legislator should focus on constituent-oriented activities, frame policy in a local veneer, and portray bipartisanship. His behavior supports some of the literature that this project considers while contradicting other aspects of the literature this project tests.

Further, since Ryan’s competitive circumstances remained stable throughout the time frame that this dissertation considers, I expect that he will present a relatively stable home style. Findings reveal that the core nature of his representational image remained stable; there was only one major departure from the chief feature of his persona.

Importantly, I find that competition does not play a role in explaining his behavioral variations.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

363
District Traits

The map below reveals that the district is confined to the Southeast section of Wisconsin. The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel notes that it includes “Walworth, Racine and Kenosha counties and parts of Rock, Waukesha and Milwaukee counties” (8-19-04).

Table L shows that 20.5 percent of district residents hold jobs in manufacturing. That is over one in five voters and is an extremely significant statistic that is above the national average. Table L also indicates that 20.9 percent of constituents have careers in educational services, and healthcare and social services. Finally, 11.6 percent of locals work in retail.

In total, 84.4 percent of voters identify as Caucasian. Further, 24.9 percent of the population has a B.A. or higher, which is less than the national mean. Finally, its population is slightly older than the country as 38.1 years is the population’s median age.

The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel said that district “was once a Democratic stronghold -- the result of a large, active labor union presence. The district has grown more conservative over the years...” (10-31-04). This publication also told readers that there were still many blue-collar voters in the constituency in 2010. It also noted that the district had a very high unemployment rate, largely due to the recession. Further, it was noted that many automakers in Southern Wisconsin went out of business, which had a large impact on the district (11-21-10).

That said, while white, blue-collar workers have a tradition of voting Democratic due to their presence in the labor movement, this once reliable base has been supporting Republicans recently. Essentially, this subset of voters is competitive territory for both parties and makes up a large block of electors in this constituency.
Thus, given the demographics of the district, it is understandable that it is electorally competitive. On the one hand, there is a large group of citizens who have a tradition of voting Democratic. On the other hand, this group has been trending Republican.

Beyond this, the district is heterogeneous in terms of its population. It contains the cities of Racine, Kenosha, and Janesville, which tend to vote Democratic. Suburbs of these cities, along with suburban Milwaukee, often split their votes between parties. It also contains largely suburban Waukesha and rural Walworth Counties, which are two of the most reliably Republican areas in Wisconsin.

Thus, given these demographics, it is not surprising that it is electorally competitive; I now will explain those competitive circumstances in greater detail.

Table L
Census Data on the 1st District of Wisconsin from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Traits</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$ 57,790</td>
<td>$ 51,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Competitive Contexts

Table L-1 reveals that Ryan’s district leans slightly Republican in presidential races, with PVI scores of just R+1 and R+2. As already mentioned, President Obama carried the district in 2008 (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 4-26-09). In high turnout elections in particular, this district is easily within striking distance for the Democratic Party.

That said, despite a very competitive underlying district partisanship, Paul Ryan consistently won re-election by wide margins. From 2002 to 2010, he ran against a series of underfunded Democrats who never held public office.

He trounced Jeffrey Thomas - a retired physician from Janesville - in 2002, 2004, and 2006 (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 11-6-02). In 2008, he beat Marge Krupp, a chemical engineer who lived in the district her entire life. Finally, of the 2010 race, the Janesville Gazette reported, “Six days before the filing deadline, the Democratic Party has no candidate to run against incumbent Paul Ryan for the 1st District Congressional seat” (7-7-10). The party managed to
nominate John Heckenlively, a local party activist whose occupation was listed in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel as “unemployed schoolteacher” (10-15-10).

Given the quality of the challengers, it should not be surprising that these races received little attention in the local media. Thus, Ryan has a track record of winning by large margins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$1,143,014</td>
<td>Jeffrey Thomas</td>
<td>$206,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$849,370</td>
<td>Jeffrey Thomas</td>
<td>$41,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$1,316,885</td>
<td>Jeffrey Thomas</td>
<td>$27,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$2,367,724</td>
<td>Marge Krupp</td>
<td>$143,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$1,781,673</td>
<td>John Heckenlively</td>
<td>$11,649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Partisan Voter Index Scores
2006 R+1
2009 R+2

Home Style Overview

Tables L-2 through L-5 furnish readers with an overview of Ryan’s home style activities portrayed in the 451 press releases and 67 franked documents that he circulated. The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel and the Janesville Gazette widely chronicle this legislator’s home style activities.

Paul Ryan focuses on public policy and connecting with constituents. As such, first I will discuss his policy dialog. I will next highlight his constituent-oriented home style activities. Finally, I will address his partisan discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N = 451 Press Releases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>Total Number 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presence At Home  46  10%
Town Hall  31  7%
Service Representation  46  10%
Mentions Public Policy Issue  358  79%
Discusses Local Policy Issue*  11  3%
Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*  206  58%
Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*  151  42%
Indicates Own Party  81  18%
Makes Partisan Statement  35  8%
Makes Bipartisan Statement  58  13%
Indicates Own Ideology  0  0%
* This percentage is calculated out of 358, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.

Table L-3
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period
N= 358 Press Releases That Address Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficit &amp; Spending Policy</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation Policy</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement Policy</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging Policy</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table L-4
Entire Program Period  N = 67 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table L-5
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed N= 57 Franked Documents That Address Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare/ Social Security</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation Policy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Broad Policy Discourse

Table L-2 illustrates that 58 percent of Ryan’s press releases frame policy in a solely national lens, while 42 percent address the impact of federal policy on his constituents. After removing those press releases that also feature allocation representation, 62 percent of press releases illustrate this legislator framing policy in a solely national lens, while 38 percent discuss the local impact of federal policy.

Table L-4 notes that this nationally oriented dialog is also prevalent in his franked materials, as 63 percent of franked documents that address public policy are also wholly nationally oriented. Thus, only 37 percent frame the influence of federal policy locally.

That said, this legislator focuses on fiscal and economic issues, including the budget and taxation. More precisely, he discusses entitlement programs like Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and healthcare policy in a fiscal lens. Thus, Ryan cares about the federal budget.

It should not be surprising then that 27 percent of press releases highlight budget deficits and spending policy, 26 percent emphasize economic policy, and 24 percent each underscore
healthcare and taxation (Table L-3). Further, Table L-3 reveals that 22 percent of press releases consider entitlement and aging policy, respectively.

Regarding the issues Ryan addressed in franked documents, 54 percent are related to healthcare, 53 percent underscore entitlements, 46 percent address taxation, 44 percent emphasize the economy, and 40 percent speak to deficit and spending issues (Table L-5).

His discourse on these issues centered around fiscal concerns. Given that Ryan served on the Ways & Means Committee throughout the entire program period, and the Budget Committee for most of the program period, it is not surprising that his dialog on these issues were fiscal in nature.

Further, Ryan has been a national GOP spokesman on fiscal and budget issues since 2007, when he became the GOP ranking member on the Budget Committee. In 2011 he assumed the chairmanship of the committee.

Local newspapers feature Ryan stressing these issues in a national frame. His robust policy conversation in this medium focuses on the intersection of economic, fiscal, entitlement, and budget concerns.

First, many of his statements address the economy. For example, “‘It's important that we build things in America,’ Ryan said. ‘Not only for national security reasons but for economic diversification reasons. We don't want to become wholly a service economy’” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 11-5-03). Trying to explain the 2008 recession, the paper tells readers, “Ryan said the economy’s troubles were related to bad mortgages issued to unqualified borrowers, but he said Congress could make matters worse by attacking the problem in the wrong way” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 3-28-08). This publication also reports, “Rep. Paul Ryan, the top Republican on the Budget Committee, plans to continue to focus on issues dealing with the
economy, fiscal policy, federal spending and the ballooning national debt” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 1-11-09). Ryan observes, “The line-item veto will equip the president with an important tool to change business as usual in Washington. Congress must earn back the trust of those they serve to tackle our most pressing economic and fiscal challenges” (Janesville Gazette 3-4-09).

Other discourse relates to the budget, tax cuts and spending. Ryan was quoted asserting, “The tax cuts clearly played a key role in building the economic recovery under way. The last thing we want to do is stop that recovery” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 1-21-04). Further, this legislator insists, “‘This is one thing we need to do to begin to change the culture of spending in Congress,’ said Paul Ryan, the Janesville Republican who is the chief sponsor of the measure” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 6-22-06). Illustrating the intersection of agriculture policy and spending, the member observes, “The House farm bill is being held together by gimmicks. Not only is it shallow reform, it also breaks the budget. My number one job is to protect and watch over taxpayer money” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 7-25-07). Also, consider this member stating, “It is my hope that by highlighting these abusive spending practices, we can greatly reduce the loss of taxpayer dollars to federal government waste” (Janesville Gazette 4-6-08). Ryan argues, “We will introduce a budget that is lower on spending, that is lower on taxes, that is lower on debt and higher on jobs” (Janesville Gazette 4-1-09). Finally, this congressperson reveals, “We think the country is ready for an honest conversation. We think Americans want to be talked to like adults, not like children, and we think they're ready for a fact-based budget without the spending gimmicks and the usual empty promises” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 4-5-11).

He also routinely addresses entitlement policy in a fiscal lens. For example, he argues, "If we don't fix our entitlement problems, according to Social Security actuaries, we're going to have
FICA taxes over 20 percent in about 10 to 20 years… And you can't have a good, growing economy when we send a fifth of our income to the government for two programs before we even pay any other tax" (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 4-4-05). Regarding social security, readers were told, “Ryan pushes own remedy for Social Security Lawmaker sees solution in private accounts” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 1-30-05). Also on this important topic, Ryan stated, “I will be making major proposals this year…One will be a Social Security reform plan to bring solvency to the system in the long term and preserve it for future generations” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 1-20-08). He argues, “As for mandatory entitlements such as Medicare — the biggest drivers of future spending — Ryan said: ‘We’re not going to propose cutting but reforming these programs so they grow at more sustainable rates’” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 3-29-09). The paper tells readers, “Young Guns might differ on social issues, Ryan said…The only litmus test is whether they're going to take on this debt and deficits and entitlement spending when they get here, or are they going to buckle when pressure occurs” (Janesville Gazette 7-22-10)?

Thus, the vast majority of his policy conversations revolve around different branches of fiscal policy. Given the prominent committee positions he holds, and his passion for fiscal issues, his nationally oriented conversations certainly strike a national tone.

That said, Ryan also addresses economic concerns in a local lens, though less robustly in comparison to his national oriented dialog. For example, the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel cites Ryan insisting, “The most important thing in Wisconsin is manufacturing, and manufacturing is coming back faster than in any other state” (8-7-04). Another exemplar tells readers, “But Rep. Paul Ryan…said keeping current commodity subsidies hurts small family farmers in Wisconsin who can’t compete with mega-farms elsewhere in the country and closes off new international
markets to farmers because of the trade-distorting subsidies” (4-28-08). Finally, Ryan observes, “Should they fail to overturn this decision, the administration is sending a clear signal to the Midwest that political ideology is a higher priority than the livelihoods of Wisconsin families” (6-27-10).

That said, while there are some examples of Ryan addressing local economic concerns, by and large, the bulk of his conversation framed these issues in a national lens. Therefore, it is important to not overemphasize these locally oriented exemplars.

Thus, Paul Ryan is a policy expert who addressed fiscal, budgetary, entitlement and economic issues robustly. Further, it is important to stress that the bulk of his policy conversation is nationally focused.

B) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Paul Ryan is often found at home connecting with voters. Table L-4 illustrates that 45 percent of Ryan’s franked documents announce or discuss town hall meetings, and 45 percent indicate his presence in the district. Table L-2 reveals that seven percent of press releases highlight town halls and 10 percent of news releases feature Ryan at home.

Based on these numbers, it appears that news releases do not illustrate a member often home in his district. Yet, just one press release announces numerous town hall meetings. While I would not delve into this deep a level of analysis on most subjects, Ryan’s press release on October 8, 2003 announced 21 listening sessions. Another news release on May 12, 2004 publicized 35 listening sessions. Thus, a deeper analysis reveals a legislator who is at home frequently connecting with constituents.
More precisely, local newspapers reveal that Ryan discusses policy issues with constituents regularly at town hall meetings. The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel tells readers, “These meetings provide an opportunity for district residents to share their ideas and concerns and ask questions they have about federal government issues” (4-16-06).

Prior to 2005, Iraq was an important issue addressed at his town hall meetings. The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel cites this legislator noting, “‘I've done 26 town hall meetings in the past month,’ says Ryan, …‘It was almost 60-40 against war in the first round. This last week it was 90-10 for the war’” (3-2-03). Also revealing how he connects with constituents on Iraq, Ryan is quoted observing, “I think Iraq and terrorism have dominated the headlines and dominated the psyche of average Wisconsin voters…I just did 35 town hall meetings. I didn't hear one person talk about the economy in great detail” (6-20-04).

Ryan also used town hall meetings to connect with residents on entitlements. Addressing Social Security, the paper reports, “Paul Ryan, House Republican from Janesville, has 31 town-hall meetings lined up. The four-term lawmaker is a key advocate of personal retirement accounts” (2-21-05). Also addressing entitlements, the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel notes, “A village hall packed with about 170 people offered a large measure of support and a few suggestions to U.S. Rep Paul Ryan, R-Wis., on Monday at the first of 19 listening sessions on his plans for massive spending cuts and wholesale changes to Medicare” (4-18-11).

Not surprising, he also discusses other fiscal and economic issues beyond only entitlements at these meetings. It was revealed, “At Ryan’s listening session in Janesville last Tuesday, the congressman wanted to talk about a new economic plan he unveiled just last week. Calling it a new ‘Roadmap for America’s Future,’ Ryan spoke at 16 listening sessions from
Racine to Lake Geneva to New Berlin about his proposals to revamp Medicare, the health care
system and the tax code” (6-1-08).

Thus, these exemplars make known that he hosts many town halls to connect with
constituents on a diverse range of policy concerns.

Also of note, he consistently holds listening sessions exclusively for African-Americans
and bi-lingual town hall meetings where his Hispanic constituents can discuss issues important to
their communities (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 8-24-03, 5-8-05, 9-16-05, 8-20-06, 8-10-08).
These are forums where policy is discussed. Consider the following: “Lumpkin and Ryan will be
hosts of an African-American Community Forum on Monday in Racine to provide a venue to
discuss issues …including the strengthening of Social Security… the high unemployment rate
among African-Americans, faith-based initiatives and opportunities for small-business owners”
(Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 9-16-05).

Thus, Ryan connects with voters that are both Hispanic and African-American every
year. He not only hosts a large number of town hall meetings, and is home every weekend
(Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 4-26-09), but he also gives minority constituents their own forum to
connect with this legislator. He uses these meetings to discuss policy and stay connected to those
he represents.

That said, neither service representation nor allocation politics are major features of his
home style. Just 10 percent of press releases and nine percent of franked documents address
service representation (Tables L-2, L-4).

Regarding allocation, only five percent of press releases address this topic (Table L-2).
No franked documents focus on allocation (Table L-4).
Further, the instances of Ryan securing funding for constituents are few and far between. One of these rare occurrences includes: “Ryan obtained $190,000 for a feasibility study examining dredging the Kenosha Harbor in order to extend its north pier, and $160,000 for a study on ecosystem restoration at Lake Koshkonong, southwest of Fort Atkinson” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 11-28-04). The Janesville Gazette also told readers, “Rep. Paul Ryan is joining the village of Sharon to fight the loss of $547,000 in stimulus money used to build a stormwater retention system” (12-18-09).

Thus, while Ryan is certainly connected to constituents, hosting many listening sessions and town halls, these other constituent-oriented activities are the periphery of his home style. Nevertheless, his robust presence at home and his robust efforts at reaching out to constituents should not be underestimated. These are chief features of his representational persona and key elements in his story.

C) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Table L-2 reveals that 18 percent of press releases feature Ryan citing his Republican affiliation and just eight percent display him promulgating a partisan statement. His franked materials are totally void of these characteristics (Table L-4). Further, 13 percent of press releases and four percent of franked documents illustrate Ryan putting forward bipartisan statements.

Ryan has a track record of criticizing the GOP on policy issues. On allocation politics, Ryan asserts, “‘The system was designed by the Democrats, and we never changed the system,’ says Ryan of the way pet projects and ‘earmarks’ are approved… Ryan says he supports some of Obey’s legislative reforms” (1-23-06). Further, reflecting on the GOP’s time in the majority,
Ryan observes, “We as a party governed by the weakest among us, by our weakest link. We governed at the lowest common denominator on policies and principles” (11-9-06). Finally, consider, “I didn't write this with the expectation that my party would embrace it,” Ryan told the Journal Sentinel editorial board Wednesday. ‘It's not my job to represent the party’” (9-9-10).

There are also many examples of this legislator bucking his party. The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel tells readers, “In the Wisconsin delegation, each of the five Democrats voted for the measure; each Republican voted against it, except for Paul Ryan, who voted in favor” (7-24-02). Further, the Janesville Gazette makes known, “Over the past six months, Ryan bucked his party and the White House, but he worked closely with the United Auto Workers, GM, the House Ways and Means Committee and House and Senate pension bill conferees to reach the compromise” (8-1-06). Another exemplar includes, “Ryan, who balked at an earlier version of the proposal, said he would return to Wisconsin with a ‘heavy heart’ after Congress failed to address the economic challenges facing the nation. He was one of only 65 Republicans who voted for the bill” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 9-30-08).

Thus, Ryan’s partisan rhetoric is limited. While he noticeably highlights his party affiliation, he rarely makes partisan statements. Further, his bipartisan rhetoric is more pronounced than his partisan dialog. Beyond that, if he disagreed with legislation that his conference supported, he cast a no vote. He even told the editorial board of a local newspaper that “It's not my job to represent the party” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 9-9-10). Thus, by and large, he is not robustly partisan.

That said, while neither franked documents nor press releases include ideological rhetoric, his policy discourse routinely reveals his conservative nature. Consider the following in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel: “In the high-stakes debate over prescription drug coverage for
seniors… Paul Ryan has become a key conservative voice…Ryan wrote a letter to the White House signaling that many Republicans would withdraw their support if the final bill failed to include the competitive Medicare reforms they demand” (7-16-03). This same publication reports, “House Republican Paul Ryan of Janesville, a mainstream conservative, acknowledged that he differed with Kleczka in ideology and on most issues” (12-20-04). Ryan is also quoted insisting, “If you wanted to be the biggest collectivist, the biggest left-wing liberal in the world to try to decentralize the concentration of wealth in America, you couldn’t redistribute our income system more than this proposal would” (Milwaukee Journal Sentinel 2-10-05). The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel also tells readers, “Asked about Bush’s plan to trim back the growth in benefits for people above a low-income threshold, Ryan said…‘Liberals would prefer to redistribute wealth more, take away from higher income and give to lower income. That’s what this does’” (5-8-05 B). Further, this publication reveals, “Rep. Paul Ryan knocked Robert ‘Fighting Bob’ LaFollette and his progressive ideas during a speech Wednesday at a health care forum…Ryan said Wisconsin’s LaFollete and other progressive thinkers ‘sowed the seeds for the paramount political problem of our time: centralized administration’” (1-17-10).

There are several takeaways from these exemplars. First, Ryan’s conservative nature is apparent through his policy positions. Second, while he certainly criticizes progressives on policy, I could not find any instances of him actually labeling himself a conservative. As such, Ryan’s conservatism is most apparent in his policy views and in the instances when he chastises liberals.

As such, I do not believe that this legislator is a robust partisan. Finally, his policy positions clearly indicate that he is a conservative, even if he does not clearly brand himself as such.
D) Overall Assessment of Home Style Activities

If the literature that this project tests is correct, Ryan would stress constituent-oriented activities, frame policy in a local veneer, and embrace bipartisan dialog and centrist rhetoric.

While Ryan is at home often connecting with constituents, he rarely engages in service and allocation representation. Yet, it must be noted that he is home so often, his robust presence in the district likely mitigates the fact that this legislator ignores the other two constituent-oriented activities that this project considers. Further, the vast majority of his dialog, which stresses economic and fiscal concerns, is nationally focused. In particular, it is much more so than the literature that this project tests would lead readers to believe. Also, while I do not believe he is a robust partisan, his conservative views clearly reveal his ideological predilection.

As such, his robust presence at home and relatively non-partisan tone meet expectations. In all other ways, he deviated from the literature that this project tests.

That said, his policy conversation is found in every facet of his home style. In particular, he is clearly concerned with fiscal policy. He worries often about the health of America’s economy. Ryan clearly thinks our country taxes and spends too much money. He has long theorized about the damaging impact of entitlement programs on our federal economy, and the long-term stability of Social Security. These issues are often prominently discussed in the many town hall meetings he hosts.

Thus, the foremost features of his home style are found in his robust policy conversation and his routine presence in the district.

**Home Style Changes**
As we know, Ryan consistently earned above 60 percent of the vote while representing a swing district. Since his competitive circumstances remained stable, I expect that his home style will not change significantly between the first half of the program period (2002 through 2006) and the second half (2007 to 2011).

As will be explained, several features of Ryan’s home style did change. However, these shifts are not wholesale alterations to his persona and are easily explained. Further, and most importantly, these alterations only reinforce the central argument that I advanced throughout this case study: Paul Ryan is a policy expert who highlights and discusses issues prominently.

That said, first I will discuss changes in his policy discourse, followed by shifts in his partisan activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficit/spending Policy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Unemployment Policy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation Policy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Local and National Portrayal of Policy N= 358 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens* | 104 | 52% | 102 | 65% |
| Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level* | 96 | 48% | 55 | 35% |
### Bipartisan and Partisan Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alterations in Policy Discourse

The issues this legislator addressed changed in the second half of the program period. After 2007, Ryan almost quadrupled his discourse on budget policy, tripled his dialog on the deficit and spending, and increased his conversation on taxation policy by 19 percent (Table L-6). Further, he increased his concentration on economic and jobs/unemployment by 11 percent (Table L-6). In newspapers, this member addressed healthcare policy a great deal more in the second half of the study period.

Ryan became the ranking Republican on the House Budget Committee in December of 2006 (Janesville Gazette 12-12-06). This new position, particularly in light of the recession, is the likely explanation for why he increased discourse on economic, tax, and budgetary issues after 2007. Regarding healthcare, Ryan underscored this issue more in the second half of his tenure due to the Affordable Care Act debate occurring in 2009.

Thus, this legislator always focused on policy. Yet, he concentrated on certain issues more robustly than others at certain times. The specific policy areas he focused on changed with his committee positions and the potency of national concerns at a given time.

Related to this, Ryan increased the degree to which he framed policy in solely national terms in the second half of the program period. In total, there was a 13 percent increase in this activity (Table L-6).
Thus, over time, Ryan became even more nationally oriented. Since he became the national spokesman for the House GOP on budget issues in 2007, it is understandable that this legislator addressed policy more often in a national frame in the second half of his tenure.

It is also important to note that while he changed the way he addressed policy, the central core of his home style persona remained intact.

Changes in Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

After 2007, Ryan revealed his GOP affiliation more regularly. Ten percent of press releases did so in the first half of the program period, while 28 percent highlighted his party in the second. Further, he circulated more partisan rhetoric in the latter part of the program period. Just one percent of press releases contained partisan sentiments from 2002 through 2006; 17 percent did so after this time.

It is important to acknowledge these changes. I speculate that he increased partisan displays due to his leadership posts on the House Budget Committee that he assumed in 2007. While it is true that he never needed a plum committee position to criticize the Democratic Party or praise the GOP before this time, being a leader on the committee charged with drafting the federal budget certainly put him in a position where he would need to criticize the opposite party more frequently.

This is particularly true since he was in the minority from 2007 through the beginning of 2011. Further, the Democrats had unified control of the federal government from 2009 through the beginning of 2011. Thus, Democrats had the power to manufacture public policy during this time – policy that Ryan likely did not support. Simply, he had a position and the circumstances to criticize the opposing party during this period.
Thus, as the chief spokesman of the House Republicans on budget issues, it appears he used this post to engage in more partisan discourse from 2007 to the end of the program period. Before this time, he simply did not need to engage in this rhetoric, nor were major news networks necessarily seeking his opinion for the GOP position on budgetary concerns.

*Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes*

Regardless of the issues that Ryan focused on, the foremost features of his home style did not change. Paul Ryan remained a policy expert who stayed connected with his constituents. As such, despite what appears to be shifts at the margins in the issues he focused on, and in his partisan dialog, I assert that Ryan’s home style was largely stable throughout his tenure.

Simply, when this legislator declared to the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel that, “Monetary policy was always my first love,” (11-21-10) he was not exaggerating. Further, since he continued to host many town halls throughout his district several times a year, he continually stayed connected with constituents.

*Concluding Discussion*

Paul Ryan is often found in his district connecting with voters through many town hall meetings that he sponsors throughout the year. Yet, he does not highlight allocation politics or service representation in any meaningful way. He is a policy expert who considers economic, budgetary, entitlement and fiscal issues in a national lens regularly. In fact, he has become a national leader on these concerns through his leadership positions on the Budget Committee beginning in 2007.
On the whole, he is not a robust partisan. When he disagrees with the GOP leadership on a policy, he criticizes them and votes his conscience. In 2010, he also clearly stated he does not necessarily represent his party. This is a strong statement for a ranking member of a committee to make. His conservatism is most evident in the policy positions that he holds. He also has been known to criticize progressives. That said, I still could not find evidence of Ryan labeling himself a conservative.

Regarding the stability of his home style, I do not consider changes to the policy positions he addressed to be a meaningful alteration in his representational persona. These changes appear to be due to his post as the ranking GOP member of the House Budget Committee. Further, assuming this position on the Budget Committee also explains why he framed issues in a national lens more robustly in the second half of the program period. Thus, changes to his policy discourse actually fortified prominent features of his home style.

The largest variation in his representational persona occurred in his policy rhetoric. He became more partisan throughout his tenure. Given the prominent role he assumed on the House Budget Committee, his place in the minority party, and the Democrats taking the White House in 2008, this more partisan tone is understandable. Simply, he became a party leader on important issues, and had more opportunity to criticize the opposite party on policy concerns.

Thus, with the exception of partisan dialog, on the whole, Ryan presented a very stable representational persona. The changes he made to his home style stress the importance of committee positions on representational images, and reveal that certain aspects of home styles are intimately connected to posts held in Congress. Thus, Ryan’s contribution to this study may be that home styles are not entirely removed from Washington circumstances.
Chapter Conclusion

One legislator in this chapter was elected in the 1970s, another in the 1980s, and the last in the 1990s. Their backgrounds before coming to Congress are also diverse. Young sold insurance and served as a state legislator. Costello was in law enforcement before holding municipal office. Ryan worked for Sam Brownback and the family business. Thus, they are a diverse sample.

That said, they each managed to win re-election by wide margins, despite representing constituencies whose underlying district partisanship is competitive.

The similarities do not end there. Each legislator highlighted his robust presence in the district. For different reasons, and in different ways, each worked to connect with voters. Ryan largely connects with constituents through the prolific number of town hall meetings he sponsors. Young and Costello go home and attend many community events.

While all three concentrated on at least one constituent-oriented activity, Costello was the only legislator to focus on service representation. More precisely, he secured service medals for veterans and worked to return IRS refunds to constituents.

Regarding allocation, Young and Costello placed a premium on securing funding as the literature I am testing anticipated. Yet, Ryan did not concentrate on bringing home monies in any noticeable way.

On the whole, all three legislatures meet some of the expectations from the literature that this project tests. They all focused on at least one constituency-oriented activity.

On policy, Young and Costello concentrated on prominent local issues. Young is well known as an expert on defense, a prominent concern to constituents. Costello was focused on issues related to the Mississippi River, including flood mitigation. While Young addressed
defense and veterans’ issues in both a local and national frame, and Costello discussed transportation in a national lens, there is still a great deal of evidence of these legislators explaining the impact of federal policy on constituents. The literature I am testing predicted this would be the case.

Yet, Paul Ryan, on the other hand, focused on fiscal policy in a national lens. He rarely framed issues in a local focus, particularly in comparison to Young and Costello. Thus, in this regard, Ryan is an outlier.

Beyond this, again meeting expectations from the literature, these legislators are not robust partisans. While Costello reveals his party most of the time, and Ryan became more partisan due to his committee posts, the data do not indicate that these members are strong partisans. All three voted against the policy wishes of party leadership on numerous occasions. Young, in the chamber since the 1970s, lamented the uptick in partisanship within the House. He also ran his committee in a bipartisan fashion. Costello highlights his conservative social positions and is described as a moderate. Ryan has a track record of criticizing his party on policy and voting his conscience regardless of partisan considerations.

That said, I expected that their representational personas would remain steady.

Costello marginally concentrated less on constituent-oriented activities throughout his tenure. Ryan became slightly more partisan after 2007. On policy, Bill Young’s image became more locally focused in the second half of the program period. Paul Ryan’s veneer became more nationally oriented. Costello also slightly framed policy in a more national tone in the second half of the program period. Thus, there were more changes than the project anticipated, even if many aspects of each of their representational personas were stable.
Speaking to the role of competition in their stories, Bill Young is the only legislator in this chapter whose activities may have been influenced by competitive circumstances. While he was constantly re-elected with over 60 percent of the vote, in 2008 and 2010, he ran against much stronger challengers than previously. In 2008, a local mayor contested the seat, and in 2010, a state senator. Thus, it is possible that he fortified his local persona in order to insulate himself from running against a municipal executive and a state legislator, both of whom would likely place a premium on local concerns. Again, he did not change his home style, he simply “doubled-down” on its chief feature.

More likely however, given the seniority of each of these members, and their positions as the chairs and or ranking members of either subcommittees or full committees, any variations in their policy conversations are likely related to changes in their committee posts. Young was no longer chair of the full Committee on Appropriations beginning in 2005, despite being chair of its Defense Subcommittee from 2005 through 2007. Costello ascended to a transportation subcommittee chair in 2007, and held that post until 2011. Ryan became the ranking GOP member of the House Budget Committee in 2007, and chair of the full committee in 2011.

Thus, Young was no longer in the national spotlight, and in one of the most important positions in Congress after 2004. Costello took on a more national role on Transportation & Infrastructure in 2007, which likely explains the slight shift in focus in his policy dialog, and perhaps the slight modification he made to his constituent-oriented activities. Ryan became the GOP’s voice on budgetary matters beginning in 2007. I speculate that this also affected his partisan rhetoric, since he assumed a prominent national position where he could criticize Democrats on budgetary policy. As such, the alterations in their images appear to follow the
changes in their committee positions, many of which correspond with whether they were in the majority or the minority.

Accordingly, as Friedman 2007 found, hill and home styles are certainly more intertwined today than in Fenno’s time. Second, committee positions appear to impact a legislator’s representational persona. I assert that these are the main lessons from this chapter.

That said, we now move on to the final chapter that composes the heart of this dissertation. It will explore two representatives whose competitive situations are also stable, yet are far from ideal. Larry Kissell and Dave Reichert represent districts that are competitive for either party. Additionally, their election results were constantly below 60 percent of the vote. Thus, these members find themselves in perpetually competitive environments.

Chapter 9
Unsafe Districts, Unsafe Margins

Introduction

The members of Congress featured in this chapter are among the most electorally vulnerable in the chamber. They represent districts that are competitive for either party and each consistently earned less than 60 percent of the vote.

That said, since each legislator is constantly faced with electoral difficulty, I hypothesize that each member’s home style behavior will stay constant.

Due to their vulnerability, if the literature that this project tests is correct, I anticipate that these congresspersons will emphasize constituent-oriented activities: practicing allocation politics frequently, appearing at home often, and highlighting service representation regularly. I expect that they will frame policy discourse in a local veneer. Finally, if the literature that this
project tests is correct, I anticipate that these legislators will place a premium on bipartisan behavior and ideological centrum.

More precisely, this chapter examines the home style presentations of Representatives Larry Kissell (D-NC) and David Reichert (R-WA). Kissell is a conservative Democrat from the South elected in 2008. This legislator is locally oriented, placing the needs of his constituents above all else. Reichert is a moderate Republican from the West, elected to Congress in 2004, representing a formerly safe GOP district. He is an ideological centrist that engages in bipartisan efforts, often voting with the Democratic Party in order to represent his district effectively.

Both members practice bipartisanship regularly and are ideologically moderate. Each subject in this chapter also concentrates on issues of local import. Thus, despite remarkably different districts, there are similarities in their personas.

Regarding the stability of their home style images, while there were more changes in Reichert’s home style than anticipated, none of these behavioral shifts altered the fundamental character of his representational persona. Kissell’s presentation was far more stable than Reichert’s. Further, the relatively few changes exhibited in Kissell’s home style fortify the main feature of his image.

The case studies will argue that consistently robust electoral competition likely served as a catalyst for these members of Congress to fundamentally “double down” on their representational personas. Thus, robust competition did not cause them to alter the chief characteristics of their home style images, but to reinforce those traits.

That said, we now turn to the rich story of Larry Kissell, a legislator who represents the district he lived in most of his life.

**Rep. Larry Kissell – North Carolina’s Locally Focused Representative**
“Kissell was born in 1951 in this town of 1,750 people on the edge of the Uwharrie National Forest. His father worked in the post office, and his mother -- who still lives in Biscoe -- was a teacher. His older brother is a local banker, and his wife works for a neighboring school district. Folks in Biscoe know Kissell as a middle-class family man who likes to help others” (Fayetteville Observer 12-14-08).

The quote above reveals that Congressman Larry Kissell was born and raised in his district. He worked in a local textile mill for 27 years following his graduation from Wake Forest University (Independent Tribune 10-23-08). After his tenure at this mill, he joined the social studies faculty at a local high school. Kissell indicated that he ran for Congress because of his pupils. The congressman, “was influenced by the faces of his students that he saw every day in class… ‘I don't think if I had ever started teaching that the run for Congress ever would have happened’” (Fayetteville Observer 12-14-08). Thus, data sources suggest that not only does Larry Kissell have deep roots in the district he represents in Congress, but also, he truly cares about his constituents.

This connection fashioned his representational image: that of an overwhelmingly locally focused member of Congress. Kissell is in the district often meeting with voters, works on securing funds for his constituents’ needs regularly, and discusses service representation frequently. Beyond these constituent-oriented activities, his policy discourse prominently highlights the impact of federal policies on North Carolina. In addition to the manner of how he frames these policies, the particular issues he addresses are also important locally. Finally, his bipartisan conversation and centrist rhetoric fit in well with his district’s views.

North Carolina’s Eight District has a fairly low-income level, a high unemployment rate, and a heavy manufacturing base. It is also electorally competitive for both parties. Importantly, the district slightly leans Republican in presidential elections. Given the district’s marginality, and the fact that this member is a Democrat, this legislator ran against two well-funded opponents, being outspent by $2.4 million in 2008.
Since his competitive climate remained constant, as has been explained already, I expect little change in the legislator’s behavior. This is largely true. Throughout his tenure, Kissell remained focused on his constituents, and even reinforced this emphasis somewhat over time.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

*District Traits*

As the map below reveals, the district is roughly 50 miles long and 100 miles wide at its most extreme points. It is home to cities, rural areas, and suburbs (Kissell House Government Website).

Table M indicates that the district is majority white; 57.5 percent of voters are Caucasian. It is less educated than the nation as a whole since just 19.6 percent of the population has a B.A. or higher. The median age of residents is 33.9 years.

Education, government and service jobs are very abundant, as 21.8 percent of the residents work in education services, healthcare and social assistance. Additionally, 12.8 percent of employees work in manufacturing. Finally, 12.5 percent of constituents work in retail.

The district is poorer than the nation, as the median income is just $42,262. It is therefore not surprising that the number of families below the poverty level (13.6%) is higher than the national mean.

Trade policy and the decline of manufacturing in the United States are major local concerns. The Fayetteville Observer informs readers about how important this industry is to the district. This paper reported that Kissell, who worked in a factory, watched “the plant change ownership three times…At the same time, other textile plants were closing all around as
companies found cheaper labor overseas. Kissell's 8th Congressional District…was hit hard” (12-14-08).

Further, there are also several military installations in this district, including Fort Bragg (Fayetteville Observer 4-25-10). As such, defense spending, as well as base realignment issues made by the Defense Department, are major local concerns.

Accordingly, it is also easy to see why trade, unemployment, and defense spending, along with robustly practicing allocation politics, are major features of Kissell’s home style.

Beyond how local factors impact the member’s representational image, given the traits above, it is not surprising that the district is competitive. First, it contains a combination of cities that support Democrats, rural areas that trend Republican, and suburbs that are competitive ground. Further, while the constituency is majority white, it is not overwhelmingly white. Thus, Democratic votes cast by the large proportion of minority voters tend to cancel out many of the Republican votes cast by white constituents. Further, there are relatively large numbers of blue-collar workers that lean Democratic, living in the same district with a large portion of residents that make their living off of the Defense Department, and tend to vote Republican.

We now explore the nature of electoral competition in this district in greater detail.
### Table M

**Census Data on the 8th District of North Carolina**
from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

**Economic Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$42,462</td>
<td>$51,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competitive Contexts**
As the PVI scores in Table M-1 illustrate, Kissell’s district slightly leans Republican in presidential contests. However, “There are 17 percent more registered Democrats than Republicans in the 8th District” (Fayetteville Observer 11-5-08). Of the constituency, a local GOP chair observed, “Even though the district is majority Democrat, it's more conservative Democrats” (Fayetteville Observer 9-28-08).

That said, Kissell first ran for Congress in 2006, losing to Rep. Robin Hayes by just 329 votes. He then beat this incumbent in 2008 and won a hotly contested re-election in 2010.

Of the 2008 election, David Wasserman, a Cook Political Report analyst, stated, "I think Larry Kissell isn't really Robin Hayes' opponent. Robin Hayes' opponent is the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. Kissell has next to no money. The question is how heavily the DCCC wants to weigh into this district…” (Fayetteville Observer 9-28-08). To be fair, Table M-1 notes that Kissell spent $1.4 million in the race, while Hayes spent almost $4 million. In the North Carolina media market, this was an expensive contest.

TV sports anchor Harold Johnson opposed Kissell in 2010. The Fayetteville Observer noted, “Outside groups have funneled almost $3 million into the U.S. House race… far more than any other congressional campaign in the state” (10-21-10). Kissell spent about $50,000 more than Johnson in 2010; both raised over $1 million for their campaigns.

Therefore, North Carolina’s Eighth was extremely competitive. In line with hypotheses, I assert this robust electoral environment had a role in fashioning Kissell’s locally oriented representational persona. That home style image will be explained below in detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Larry Kissell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table M-1
Larry Kissell’s Election Results and Campaign Finance Information
Home Style Overview

Tables M-2 through M-5 below chronicle the attention that Kissell gives to his district in 128 press releases and 11 franked documents. His locally focused activities are also exhibited in the Fayetteville Observer, the Independent Tribune, and the Stanly News and Press.

Given the chief feature of his home style, it follows that his constituent-oriented activities will be explained first. Following this, the manner of how he frames policy and the particular issues he addresses will be described. Finally, I will discuss his partisan and ideological rhetoric.

Table M–2
Kissell Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N This percentage is calculated out of 100, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.
Table M-3  
Kissell Press Releases  
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period  
N= 100  Press Releases That Address Public Policy  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Unemployment Policy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Policy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Policy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table M-4  
Kissell Franked Materials  
Entire Program Period  
N = 11 Franked Documents  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* This percentage is calculated out of nine, the number of franked documents where the member discusses public policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table M-5  
Kissell Franked Materials  
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed  
N= 9 Franked Documents That Address Policy  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Unemployment Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

The most striking of these three very prominently displayed activities is Kissell’s presence in the district. Tables M-2 and M-4 show that 30 percent of press releases and 45 percent of franked documents chronicle Kissell at home. All three local newspapers portray this member in his district frequently.

The Independent Tribune reveals, “Kissell and others spoke at the Cabarrus Regional Chamber of Commerce’s annual meeting at Embassy Suites” (1-17-09). The same publication noted, “Congressman Larry Kissell talked during the ground-breaking about what benefits CHA is bringing to Cabarrus County” (1-21-11). The Stanly News and Press observed, “Congressman Larry Kissell hosted the Stanly County Federal Contracting Symposium at the Stanly Agri-Civic Center on Monday” (11-18-09). This paper also made known, “Oakboro Elementary received a visit from U.S. Rep. Larry Kissell (NC-08) Friday” (9-8-10). The Fayetteville Observer reported, “Congressman Larry Kissell will tour Clean Burn Fuels, a Raeford ethanol plant, at 4 p.m. today” (8-30-10). Further, this paper told readers, “U.S. Rep. Larry Kissell, a Democrat from Biscoe, said he has formed an 8th District Military Families Council, which met for the first time Thursday in Fayetteville” (4-25-11).

Social media was also employed to display his presence at home. His Twitter page declared, “U.S. Representative Larry Kissell (NC-8) speaks to Communities In Schools students at Carver Middle School” (3-9-11). This legislator’s government Facebook and Twitter pages informed readers that Kissell was “Glad to be in Hoke County this afternoon to help announce Unilever expansion, creation of an additional 65 jobs for our area” (4-21-11).

Consequently, due to his robust presence in his district, he almost certainly hears many constituent problems. Thus, service representation is also a leading feature of this member’s
home style. Table M-4 portrays that this home style trait is displayed in 36 percent of Kissell’s franked documents. Further, there is a consistent and noticeable discussion of his casework efforts in the Independent Tribune and the Fayetteville Observer.

One very moving instance was chronicled in the Independent Tribune, which reported, “Congressman Larry Kissell and his staff had a hand in helping to secure the funding for a bone marrow transplant that leukemia patient Steve Moose could not otherwise afford” (7-29-09). Beyond this, there was a great deal of discussion about office hours, including, “U.S. Rep. Larry Kissell of the 8th District announced last week that his staff will be available to constituents at the following locations and times…” (Fayetteville Observer 7-5-10). Also, consider, “Hoke County residents will get a chance to talk with representatives from Rep. Larry Kissell's office on Jan. 25” (Fayetteville Observer 1-5-11).

Beyond service representation, allocation politics is also a prominent feature of Kissell’s home style. Seventeen percent of press releases display this member practicing allocation representation (Table M-2), as do 55 percent of franked documents (Table M-4). All three local newspapers exhibit this legislator securing resources for his district frequently.

The Fayetteville Observer noted, “Local schools could be getting an eight-figure windfall from the stimulus package Congress is considering, according to a release issued by Rep. Larry Kissell's office Tuesday afternoon” (1-27-09). This paper also documented, “Kissell, who just won a second term, hauled in $42.5 million in earmarks for fiscal 2010, ranking him 63 out of 435 representatives…” (11-18-10). The Stanly News and Press tells readers, “Larry Kissell has announced that $56,345,356 in Justice Assistance Grant funding is coming to North Carolina…” (3-9-09). Further, the paper reported, “Congressman Larry Kissell (NC-08) and Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack announced that the City of Locust has been approved for a $2,175,000
loan to build a municipal building” (4-21-10). The Independent Tribune states, “U.S. Congressman Larry Kissell announced last week that $620,535 … will come to North Carolina's Eighth District through the Emergency Food and Shelter Program” (4-14-09). This publication also reveals, “The Department of Housing and Urban Development has awarded two grants totally $1.6 million to the City of Concord and the HOME Consortium for fiscal year 2011, Congressman Larry Kissell (NC-08) announced this week” (7-16-10).

Accordingly, it is clear that Rep. Kissell exhibited a strong local presentation, being at home often, providing copious office hours for constituents to seek casework assistance, and working to secure earmarks. These activities bolster his local focus - the defining characteristic of his home style. A discussion of his policy dialog next continues to exemplify this foremost aspect of his representational persona.

B) Broad Policy Dialog

An overwhelming 73 percent of press releases and 100 percent of franked documents that discuss policy highlight the impact of federal laws on his district (Tables M-2, M-4). Removing press releases that also feature allocation politics, 65 percent of press releases frame national policy in local terms. Beyond press releases, newspapers also vividly depict this legislator framing policy in a local veneer.

On trade policy, the Independent Tribune quotes Kissell explaining the impact of the Central American Free Trade Agreement on jobs in his district. Kissell states, “‘As soon as I heard of the CATFA betrayal, I knew we needed a change,’ Kissell said. ‘I remember hearing that and saying enough is enough’…Kissell believes CAFTA is one of the driving forces behind the district's job losses” (10-26-08). Regarding economic policy, including jobs, the Independent
Tribune quotes Kissell asserting, "It is about the economy… We need to look at every opportunity we have to bring jobs to North Carolina” (1-23-11). On defense policy, the Fayetteville Observer quotes Kissell observing, "‘Such a large portion of the 8th District will be impacted by BRAC,’ Kissell said. ‘While we are all excited and welcome Forces Command and the U.S. Reserve Command to Fort Bragg, I want to make sure our district is not only ready for the enormous benefits of the BRAC move, but prepared for any challenges it may pose to our communities’” (4-25-10). Discussing why he voted for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the Fayetteville Observer quotes this legislator explaining, “As Fort Bragg continues to move forward in the base expansion, it is important that we support it in any way we can, not only because of their critical job in the ongoing war on terror, but because of the good it brings our entire community… This is one of the major reasons why I voted for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act” (4-29-09).

The issues that he framed locally in newspapers are also prominently displayed in his press releases and franked documents. A total of 25 percent of press releases and 56 percent of franked documents highlight unemployment/jobs policy (Tables M-3 and M-5). Table M-3 reveals that 13 percent of press releases address trade policy, as do 67 percent of policy related franked documents (Table M-5). Tables M-3 and M-5 show that 23 percent of press releases and 44 percent of franked documents consider economic policy. Defense was chronicled in 13 percent of press releases (Table M-3). Finally, Kissell discussed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in 13 percent of press releases and 44 percent of franked documents (Tables M-3 and M-5).

These policies relate to Kissell’s home style as they are important to a district with high unemployment, many military installations, and a heavy manufacturing base. Thus, not only does
this legislator frame many of these policies in a local lens, but simply concentrating on these particular areas demonstrates this member’s local focus.

That said, I now discuss partisan and ideological rhetoric.

C) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Kissell is a centrist who displays bipartisanship frequently. Table M-2 reveals that just seven percent of press releases exhibit his Democratic affiliation and Table M-5 illustrates that his franked documents are void of any partisan and ideological rhetoric or identification. His appearances in local newspapers reinforce this image.

The Stanly News and Press quotes Kissell reflecting on not winning Stanly County in his 2008 campaign. He stated, “That's okay for tomorrow morning there are no 'Ds' and no 'Rs' in the 8th District and I'll work just as hard for these people as for everyone else in the district” (1-2-09). The Fayetteville Observer noted, “Kissell has been a moderate during his first term, voting against health care reform and other issues that his party has supported” (9-6-10). This paper also reports, “Kissell said his victory came because of his record as a moderate who has been independent of the Democratic leadership” (11-3-10). Finally this publication observes, "Congressman Kissell has good friendships with many of his Republican colleagues…” (1-20-11).

Thus, while this is far from the foremost feature of Kissell’s home style, he still demonstrates a noticeable commitment to being a moderate and working across party lines. As his district, as described above, has more enrolled Democrats than Republicans, yet leans GOP in presidential elections, this particular home style trait is indicative of a legislator personifying a constituency that is split in partisan terms.
As such, he works to be acceptable to constituents in both parties.

D) Overall Assessment of Home Style

If the literature that this project tests is correct, this legislator should practice constituent-oriented activities prolifically, frame policy in a local veneer often, and present a bipartisan and centrist image regularly.

This legislator places a premium on each constituent-oriented activity that this project considers. He is at home often connecting with voters. Kissell practices allocation politics robustly, securing funding for important local concerns. Further, this member emphasizes service representation, helping constituents with individualized problems.

Regarding policy, this legislator concentrates on issues of local import and routinely frames the impact of federal policy in a local lens. Thus, his local focus not only appears in his constituent-oriented activities, but in his policy pursuits.

Finally, Kissell is an ideological centrist who routinely displays bipartisan tendencies. Given that his constituency contains many conservative Democrats, and Republican presidential candidates win his district, this legislator clearly believes that coming to the center of the ideological spectrum and reaching out to the GOP is important.

Thus, Kissell’s behavior clearly supports all of the literature that this project tests.

As such, his local focus is imbued in his constituent-oriented activities and policy dialog. Further, while his ideological centrism and bipartisan displays may not necessarily fortify his local image, they are still logical if one embraces median voter theory.

Home Style Changes
As we already know, this member never broke 60 percent of the vote in any race he contested. He also represents a competitive district for nominees of either party.

Since Kissell’s competitive situation was stable, I expect his home style to be as well. Accordingly, I compared this legislator’s activities in the first half of his time in office (1-1-09 to 2-28-10) to his behavior in the second half (3-1-10 to 4-25-11).

Table M-6 indicates that Kissell’s representational persona was relatively consistent over his tenure. Of the changes he made to his home style, which were minimal, none mitigated the fundamental focus of his presentation. Throughout time, he focused even more robustly on his district and/or his constituents’ wishes.

Following the table below, shifts in constituent-oriented activities will be addressed. Next, changes to Kissell’s partisan and ideological centrism will be explained. Finally, I will identify any alterations in his policy discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table M-6</th>
<th>Kissell Press Releases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Shifts Over Time</td>
<td>N=128 Unless Otherwise Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Areas Addressed</td>
<td>N= 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1/1/09–2/28/10 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Unemployment Policy</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constituent-Oriented Activities

| Item | 1/1/09–2/28/10 N | 1/1/09–2/28/10 Mean | 1/1/09–2/28/10 N | 1/1/09–2/28/10 Mean |
| Allocation | 12 | 24% | 10 | 13% |

Partisan and Bipartisan Activities

| Indicates Own Party | 8 | 16% | 1 | 1% |
Shifts in Constituent-Oriented Activities

The Fayetteville Observer depicted Kissell highlighting office hours more frequently during the second half of his tenure. For example, more notices such as “Congressman Larry Kissell’s staff will hold satellite office hours in Raeford from 2 to 3 p.m. on Feb. 16” were displayed later in his time in office (2-4-11).

Thus, while all other mediums were rather consistent in this regard, stressing office hours more frequently clearly illustrates this member strengthening his strong local emphasis by concentrating on the needs of his district even more prominently.

Changes in Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

The Fayetteville Observer also portrayed Kissell’s partisan centrism more prominently in the second part of the study period. For example, statements similar to Kissell insisting, “I have never subscribed to the idea that good ideas are the monopoly of one party or another,” were far more prominent after March of 2010 (2-7-11).

Related to this, Table M-6 depicts a change in the degree to which Kissell exhibited his partisan affiliation. This legislator displayed his party membership in 16 percent of press releases during the beginning of his career, while only doing so in one percent in the second half.

While illustrating his partisanship less often and disseminating bipartisan sentiments more eminently may not appear to reveal a stronger local concentration, one must understand the nature of his district to see how these activities reinforce his image. As his district is so split in partisan terms, illustrating nonpartisanship and bipartisanship much more prominently reaches out more broadly to all constituents.
Alterations in Policy Discourse

Finally, he changed the policy areas he focused on somewhat. He highlighted trade policy in five percent of press releases during the first half of his tenure, while doing so in 19 percent in the second half (Table M-6). Also, he addressed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in 22 percent of news releases in the first part of his time in the House, while just seven percent did so in the second.

This case study revealed the importance of trade policy to Kissell’s blue-collar district; discussing this issue more prominently bolsters this member’s locally oriented presentation.

Beyond trade, discussing the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act less, while an important change in policy dialog, was likely due to the fact that this bill was passed in February of 2009. Therefore, Kissell likely argued more for its passage before March of 2009, and then discussed it less frequently after it was passed into law. Yet, I offer that this does not change his commitment to his district, rather that this bill passed into law, and therefore, garnered less attention.

Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes

The above shows that on the whole, there were relatively few changes in Kissell’s representational persona over the time period that this project studies. But were these changes due to competition? One may argue that, in line with expectations from the literature being tested, being constantly confronted with a difficult re-election, Kissell placed an even greater premium on service representation, on bipartisan activities, and on the important local issue of trade policy. Thus, one can speculate that competition might have mattered in these three areas.
However, given that Kissell is predominantly locally focused, the changes in his representational persona discussed above are rather minimal when considering the number of home style activities this project studies. Further, his behavioral modifications either reinforce his local focus by bolstering his connection to his constituents, or, at the very least, do not mitigate this image.

Therefore, due to the few shifts in his behavior, I argue that this legislator’s representational persona was relatively stable. Given the constant nature of his competitive environment, he largely met my expectations.

Concluding Discussion

The case study above clearly illustrates that Larry Kissell is a locally oriented member of Congress. He meets voters at home routinely, highlights casework regularly, and seeks funding for his district often. Kissell describes the impact of federal policies on his district frequently and concentrates on issues of local import to a blue-collar district that relies on the defense industry. Lastly, he behaves in a bipartisan manner regularly and is an ideological moderate. Thus, he reaches out to members of both parties in his very competitive district.

While it is not entirely clear whether the few aspects of Larry Kissell’s image that changed were affected by electoral competition, or not, it is clear that this legislator cares about the district he grew up in and advocates for his constituents. The relatively minute changes in his representational persona reinforced his local focus.

That said, given that alterations in his home style were limited, his image was largely stable throughout his service in the House of Representatives, as the theory laid out in this work anticipated.
Rep. David Reichert – A Prominent Centrist in Congress

“The National Journal, a nonpartisan publication about politics, in February graded Reichert’s voting record as being centrist, boosting his credentials as an independent thinker” (Seattle Times 4-5-06).

David Reichert of Washington State was elected to Congress in 2004. Prior to his time in the House, he worked in law enforcement for 32 years, culminating in an appointment as Sheriff of King County, Washington (Seattle Times 8-25-04). Of his tenure as sheriff, the Seattle Times observed that Reichert, “avoided turning the department into a partisan political operation, say people from both parties” (8-25-04). Further, while he was initially appointed sheriff to fill a vacancy, he was elected to a full term in the position as a Republican in a Democratic stronghold (Seattle Times 8-25-04). Therefore, Reichert’s background is one of working in a nonpartisan manner and reaching out to the opposite party.

He behaves similarly as a U.S. Representative. As the exemplar from the Seattle Times at the beginning of this case study makes known, the chief feature of Congressman David Reichert’s home style is that of a centrist.

The legislator is moderate in his partisan and ideological rhetoric and works with Democrats on a variety of issues. Beyond this, the Seattle Times chronicles many examples of this member voting against his party’s positions in Congress. Further, while he is a centrist on a host of policy positions, the data below reveal that Reichert works especially hard to highlight his moderate positions on the environment.

This representational persona is likely related to his background and the partisan nature of his district. As has already been revealed in the beginning of this chapter, this constituency is split in partisan terms. Further, as will be explained, on environmental policy in particular, voters are liberal (Seattle Times 6-7-10). As such, the centrism that Reichert displays is linked to his district’s partisan characteristics and the policy positions of residents.
Equally important, since the district is so competitive, it is no surprise that Reichert ran against a series of well-funded Democrats, being outspent twice. Given Reichert’s consistently unsafe electoral margins, in line with hypotheses outlined earlier, I expect stability in the legislator’s behavior. While there were more changes over time than I expected, none of these tarnished his centrist image.

**District & Competitive Characteristics**

*District Traits*

The map below displays a district 70 miles long by 50 miles wide at its most extreme points. The Seattle Times observes that the constituency is largely suburban (8-28-04). Yet, in 2008, the Seattle Times described Washington’s Eighth District as “a classic swing district, with changing demographics and a mix of urban and rural areas” (8-20-08).

Table N illustrates that 84.1 percent of voters identify as Caucasian. The district is more educated than the nation, as over 37 percent of the population has a B.A. or higher. Further, its residents are slightly younger than the country, since 35.8 years is their median age.

In economic terms, 16 percent of the labor force works in education services, healthcare and social assistance. There is also a reasonably large manufacturing base, as 15.5 percent of employees work in this field (Table N).

Related to the economy, the district is located in the State of Washington, an area rich in natural resources and national parks. It is home to the Puget Sound, Mount Rainier and Olympic National Park. According to the National Park Service, over 13 national parks are located in Washington State and over seven million individuals visited these parks in 2013 (National Park Service).
That said, and as will be elaborated on more thoroughly in this chapter, environmental concerns are extremely important to district residents for two reasons. First, in practical terms, the large number of tourists that visit their natural resources are an essential economic engine. Beyond that, in more normative terms, the data below will reveal that constituents are truly concerned about the environment globally as a matter of ideology. They are environmentalists because they believe in protecting the environment.

As will be explained more below, Reichert’s activities surrounding environmental policy are both a prominent feature of his home style and also exhibit his centrism.

Finally, beyond environmental issues, since suburbs are currently a battleground area where both Democrats and Republicans fight for votes, and given that the district also includes both urban and rural areas, it is understandable that it is so electorally competitive. Those competitive characteristics will now be explained more thoroughly.
**Table N**

Census Data on the 8th District of Washington State from the American Community Survey of the United States Census Bureau

### Economic Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$ 63,854</td>
<td>$ 51,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>9.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top Industries Where Constituents are Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational services, and health care and social assistance</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>District Data</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent with a B.A. or higher</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Competitive Contexts

Given what we already know about this constituency, it is not surprising that PVI scores reveal it is competitive for both parties, even if it leans slightly Democratic in presidential races (Table N-1). Regarding its competitive nature, the Seattle Times observed,

“The 8th District has long been a Republican stronghold. But parts of the district, particularly Mercer Island and Bellevue, are becoming more Democratic, as evidenced by the increasing number of Democrats in the Legislature. The district, which covers eastern King and Pierce counties, voted twice for Bill Clinton, once for Al Gore, for John Kerry, for Democratic Gov. Gary Locke, for Republican Congresswoman Jennifer Dunn and for Republican Dino Rossi for governor” (3-31-05).

As one might expect in such a competitive district, the Seattle Times paid constant attention to Reichert’s activities. He was covered often, and there was frequent speculation as to
the nature of his future opponents. A brief description of his electoral career highlights this level of competition.

Reichert barely beat a radio talk show host in 2004, earning 51 percent of the vote (Seattle Times 7-8-04). The Seattle Times noted that both parties bought over one million dollars in airtime to try to persuade voters in “one of the few hotly contested House seats in the country” (10-1-04). The same article notes that while both candidates welcomed the money, they were put in an awkward position, as neither wanted to be painted as being too close to national party organizations. The Seattle Times assessed the race in the following terms: “Reichert ‘presents as a guy who makes a decision and sticks with it,’ whereas Ross comes across as a ‘thoughtful guy, [who] has more complex positions on issues,’ pollster Stuart Elway said” (10-4-04). Healthcare, jobs, and homeland security were major issues in the race (Seattle Times 10-28-04). In the end, Reichert bested Ross.

In 2006 and 2008, former Microsoft executive Darcy Burner ran against Reichert earning 49 and 48 percent of the vote respectively (Seattle Times 9-24-06, 8-20-08). The competitive nature of the 2006 contest was widely known as the Seattle Times revealed that Burner raised twice the funds as the incumbent in the first quarter of 2006 (4-5-06). This publication also referred to Reichert as “the most vulnerable Republican” in Washington State (4-6-06). While Burner criticized Reichert for changing policy positions, the Seattle Times, in an editorial, praised the legislator for opposing drilling in ANWR, as well as standing against parts of George W. Bush’s energy policy. They also appreciated his independent persona (10-15-06). He once again earned 51 percent of the vote.

The 2008 race appeared to be a continuation of the 2006 election. In August of 2008, local newspapers noted Burner observing, “There are clear signs that voters are looking for
change” (8-20-08). Yet, while concentrating on the same issues, Reichert actually earned 52 percent, better than he did in the last two elections.

Another Microsoft executive, Suzan Del Bene, challenged Reichert in 2010. Del Bene put herself forward as an experienced business executive, focused on strengthening the economy (6-28-10). Like Burner, Del Bene raised a large sum of money, actually spending over one million dollars more than Reichert. The Seattle Times endorsed Del Bene asserting that “On issues ranging from the wars to the economy, three-term Republican incumbent Reichert is unstudied and comes up short. After six years in office, this is unacceptable” (8-6-10). Beyond the economy, women’s issues also featured prominently in this campaign, as both sides discussed a host of concerns important to women (Seattle Times 10-30-10). In the end, Reichert earned 53 percent of the vote (Seattle Times 11-3-10).

With affluent business executives running in three races, it is no shock that Table N-1 illustrates that the contests were expensive. Table N-1 reveals that the incumbent was outspent in the 2008 and 2010 elections by very wide margins. Thus, all of the challengers had well funded campaign war chests and caused Reichert to contend with perpetually robust electoral circumstances.

It is likely that his ability to win elections in this competitive district fortifies his centrist home style presentation. Consider the following from the Seattle Times: “If either Democrats or Republicans expect to win the open congressional seat on the Eastside, they better run candidates toward the center rather than the extremes” (5-9-04). That moderate image imbued in his home style persona will now be explained in detail.
Table N-1
David Reichert Election Results and Campaign Finance Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Election Result</th>
<th>Reichert Total Funds Distributed</th>
<th>Opponent Name</th>
<th>Opponent Total Funds Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$1,569,198</td>
<td>Dave Ross</td>
<td>$1,446,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>$3,051,923</td>
<td>Darcy Burner</td>
<td>$3,048,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$2,852,519</td>
<td>Darcy Burner</td>
<td>$4,462,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>$2,770,292</td>
<td>Suzan Del Bene</td>
<td>$3,942,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Washington’s 8th District Partisan Voter Index Scores
2006  D + 2
2009  D + 3

Home Style Overview

Tables N-2 through N-5 furnish readers with an overview of Reichert’s home style activities portrayed in the 562 press releases and 59 franked documents he circulated. The Seattle Times chronicled Reichert’s activities widely.

As I have already identified the chief feature of this member’s representational persona -- his centrism-- it follows that his partisan and ideological rhetoric will be explained first.

Following this, I will explain how Reichert’s moderate image is imbued in his policy discourse.

Finally, his constituency-oriented activities, which are at the periphery of his behavior, will then be addressed.

Table N-2
David Reichert’s Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entire Program Period</th>
<th>N = 562 Press Releases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Total Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table N-3
David Reichert’s Press Releases
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period
N=505 Press Releases That Address Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Public Safety Policy</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security Policy</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/Unemployment Policy</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Policy</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N-4
David Reichert’s Franked Materials
Entire Program Period N = 59 Franked Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Representation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence At Home</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Representation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions Public Policy Issue</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses Local Policy Issue*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Policy Issue in National Lens*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraying National Policy</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on the Local Level*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Party</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Partisan Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates Own Ideology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This percentage is calculated out of 505, the number of press releases where the member discusses public policy.
Table N-5
David Reichert’s Franked Materials
Major Public Policy Issues Addressed During Program Period
N=59 Press Releases That Address Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Policy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Policy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation Policy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Policy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security Policy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric

Bipartisanship, as well as partisan and ideological moderation, are the foremost features of Reichert’s home style. Table N-2 illustrates that 27 percent of press releases portray this legislator encouraging bipartisanship. Table N-4 shows that 15 percent of franked documents exhibit bipartisan statements.

Bipartisanship was also evident in Reichert’s social media sources. His government Facebook page explained, “Washington State Congressmen Dave Reichert (WA-08) and Adam Smith (WA-09) teamed up today to pass a bipartisan amendment providing new assistance to disadvantaged small businesses” (7-8-09). Reichert’s government Twitter page stated very informally, “Today, I introduced bipartisan legislation that will modernize the outdated tax code stifling the growth of so many small biz in WA” (4-12-11).

The Seattle Times often features this member voting with Democrats throughout his tenure in Congress. For example, “Reichert was one of only five Republicans who voted against a bill that allowed Schiavo's parents to ask a federal court to intervene to have her feeding tube replaced” (3-22-05). On an important environmental issue, the paper observed, “Reichert was the only GOP member of the state's congressional delegation to vote against drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge…” (6-7-05). Regarding social policy, the paper reported, “Rep. Dave
Reichert plans to support a compromise bill that would increase health-insurance coverage for children of low-income families…The Auburn Republican has notified the White House and Republican leaders of his intention…despite repeated veto threats by the president…” (9-25-07). Finally, illustrating his propensity to vote against his party, this paper reveals “…Congressman Dave Reichert… was one of only seven Republicans to vote against a measure that was nevertheless billed as ‘defunding NPR’” (3-20-11).

In addition, the Seattle Times labeled Reichert a centrist on several other occasions. Consider, “But environmentalists are focusing their lobbying efforts on moderates in both chambers, running ads against Smith and Rep. Dave Reichert…” (11-3-05). Also, this publication makes known, “Reichert is among a small group of moderate Republicans being pressured by the Democratic Caucus to back the Democrats' bill instead of an alternative proposed by Republicans” (8-1-07). Finally, it was reported, “Reichert bases much of his re-election in the 8th District on being an independent, moderate Republican” (8-31-08).

Thus, Reichert has a track record of working with Democrats and voting against his party, solidifying his position as a bipartisan and moderate member of Congress. We now turn to his policy dialog, which continues to portray the central feature of his home style.

B) Broad Policy Discourse

This member concentrates on issues that are important to constituents. Further, Reichert’s policy discourse is split between framing issues in a national lens and informing constituents about how these national policies impact those he represents. As such, this section chronicles this member of Congress framing issues in both national and local terms.
Table N-2 shows that 52 percent of Reichert’s press releases frame policy solely in nationally oriented terms, while 48 percent discuss the impact of federal policy on his district. Removing press releases that also feature allocation politics, 60 percent of press releases are nationally oriented, while 40 percent explain how federal policy impacts the district. While this is less balanced, throughout his tenure, this congressperson always concentrated on issues that matter to constituents, regardless of how they were framed.

For example, while Reichert framed much of his conversation in national terms, the Seattle Times reveals many examples of this legislator doing so on issues of particular significance to constituents. For example, regarding the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge located in Alaska, this publication reported, “Republican leaders and the White House have lobbied heavily to open ANWR to drilling...‘I told them I'm not inclined to vote for this,’ Reichert said” (10-31-05). On this same issue, the Seattle Times observed, “In July alone, Reichert voted seven times against bills to allow drilling offshore and in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR), his campaign says” (9-8-08). The paper made known that, “Reichert is trying to bolster his ‘green’ credentials in his swing district...he wrote an op-ed in The Hill newspaper calling for Republicans to embrace environmentalism” (10-1-07). Finally, on the Affordable Care Act, this newspaper published the following: “‘This is America. We're supposed to have the freedom of choice.’ That was Eastside Congressman Dave Reichert, at a Republican news conference last week denouncing the health-care-reform bill” (3-21-10).

These nationally focused exemplars are balanced with an equally significant quantity of statements in which this representative illustrates the impact of federal policies on his district. For example, on an issue affecting a local waterway, the Seattle Times noted, “Acting Majority Leader Roy Blunt, R-Mo., credited Reichert this month with persuading GOP leaders to remove
a provision in the House energy bill that would have allowed more oil tankers in Puget Sound” (10-31-05). Concerning the 1989 Exxon Valdex oil spill that negatively affected Seattle’s fishing industry, “Reichert, R-Auburn, said he wants the chairman and CEO of Exxon Mobil, Rex Tillerson, to resolve the protracted litigation and ‘pay up’... By calling for the payment, Reichert may be bucking some powerful people in his party, as well as his own backers” (3-25-06). On an important issue illustrating the convergence of transportation and the environment, the Seattle Times made known that, “Environmental groups are hailing a new plan to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area east of Seattle by 22,000 acres. A bill sponsored by Rep. Dave Reichert, R-Auburn, would designate land near Interstate 90, east of North Bend, as federally protected wilderness” (11-9-07). Finally, Reichert declares, “I will continue to look for ways to help the 8th District and the entire Puget Sound region, and as people who know me can attest, I am very persistent,’ Reichert said” (2-15-08).

The national and local balance of his dialog does not explain his moderate persona. In order to understand his centrism we must focus on his issue positions and the frequency of this legislator displaying those policy convictions. The exemplars above portray a member of Congress frequently at odds with the mainstream GOP on environmental policy in particular. Reichert’s own words clarify why this is the case:

“Reichert, three-term congressman from Auburn, told a recent gathering of Republican precinct committee officers that to remain in office there are ‘certain moves, chess pieces, strategies I have to employ.’ He said he toes the party line most of the time but suggested a few select environmental votes keep environmental groups from spending millions of dollars to defeat him” (6-7-10).

Thus, since he addresses environmental policy so often, and does so in a moderate veneer, the nature of this discourse bolsters his centrist image. With that said, I now turn to the least notable aspect of his home style: his constituent-oriented activities.
C) Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Constituent-oriented activities are addressed last; they are not as prominently featured as the degree to which he displays his bipartisan endeavors or policy dialog.

Of the three constituent-oriented activities under study, his presence at home is the most significant. Table N-4 shows that 59 percent of franked documents portray Reichert in the constituency. The Seattle Times sporadically chronicled his presence in the district as well. Consider, “U.S. Rep. Dave Reichert, R-Auburn, will host a Social Security forum tonight…” (3-29-05). This publication also made known, “U.S. Rep Dave Reichert, R-Auburn, will be among the speakers at a Bellevue rally on Saturday in support of U.S. troops” (10-18-07). Finally, this paper reports, “Reichert has held business round tables in Issaquah and Bellevue” (8-11-10). Thus, as only nine percent of press releases (Table N-2) display this legislator at home, and few examples of this activity are featured in the Seattle Times, this is not an important aspect of his representational persona.

Even less prominently exhibited is this member practicing allocation politics. Twelve percent of press releases (Table N-2) and franked documents (Table N-4) depicted Reichert securing resources for his district. Few examples of this activity are chronicled in the Seattle Times, such as this legislator declaring, “Traffic in our region is a mess. I'll work hard to obtain federal funding to solve our region’s traffic problems” (10-22-04). He also worked with liberal Democrat Jim McDermott of Seattle to obtain one million dollars “for a self-inflating sleep pad from Cascade Designs in Seattle, used by the Marines” (12-10-07). Finally, working with Democratic U.S. Senator Patty Murray, Reichert secured “$1.7 million in federal money” for the City of Bellevue, WA (3-19-08). Even though I documented several instances of Reichert
engaging in allocation representation, on the whole, this is simply not a foremost home style feature.

Finally, only one percent of press releases (Table N-2) portray Reichert serving constituents through casework. There are no examples of this activity in the Seattle Times. Further, while 25 percent of franked documents (Table N-4) were coded for service representation, these materials simply encourage constituents to call the office for assistance. They do not depict Reichert’s office providing individual service to Washingtonians.

Thus, constituent-oriented activities are at the periphery of his home style.

D) Overall Assessment of Home Style

If the literature that this project tests is correct, I anticipate that this member of Congress will place a premium on constituent-oriented activities, largely frame issues in a local lens, and emphasize bipartisanship and ideological moderation.

This legislator does not appear at home regularly. It is likely that his district on the West Coast makes traveling home difficult. Further, this member does not engage in allocation politics robustly. Finally, there is almost no evidence of this member highlighting service representation. Thus, despite his extremely competitive circumstances, Reichert does not stress constituent-oriented activities. As such, his actions do not support the literature that this project tests.

Regarding his policy conversation, while he clearly concentrates on issues prominent locally – particularly the environment - he largely frames his policy dialog in a national lens. While there are certainly some examples of this legislator addressing how federal environmental policy impacts his district, most of his dialog is framed in a national lens. Thus, there is at best, mixed support for the literature that this project tests.
Finally, the chief feature of his home style is his centrism. This legislator not only produces a great deal of moderate and bipartisan rhetoric, but his centrism is also apparent in his policy positions. Accordingly, his behavior supports the literature that suggests legislators in competitive circumstances moderate their appearances.

With the above said, this legislator’s behavior does not support most of the literature that this project tests. Most surprisingly, Reichert eschews constituent-oriented activities. Nevertheless, the chief feature of his persona - his centrist image - supports the literature I test. His centrism is apparent in his partisan dialog, ideological portrayal, and policy discourse.

**Home Style Changes**

As explained at the outset of this case study, Reichert represents a competitive district and never achieved 60 percent of the vote in all four elections covered in this dissertation.

Since his competitive circumstances remained stable, I expect little change in his home style. As with other legislators who did not experience shifts in competitive climates, I compared Reichert’s activities in the first half of his time in office (1-1-05 to 2-28-08) to his behavior in the second half (3-1-08 to 4-25-11).

Unexpectedly, Reichert altered his behavior more than anticipated. However, the fundamental centrist character of his home style was unchanged. In fact, as will be revealed below, over time he reinforced this image in various ways.

The changes in his representational image will be reviewed in the following order: First, shifts in his policy dialog will be discussed. Next, alterations in his bipartisan rhetoric are addressed. Finally, I identify major shifts in his constituent-oriented activities.
Table N-6
David Reichert’s Press Releases
Major Shifts Over Time    N=562 Unless Otherwise Noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Policy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation Policy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Public Safety Policy</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Policy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security Policy</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Policy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bipartisan and Partisan Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bipartisan Statement</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constituent-Oriented Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N-7
David Reichert’s Franked Materials
Major Shifts Over Time    N=59 Unless Otherwise Noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Home</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Allocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy Issues Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging Policy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement Policy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Policy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran’s Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alterations in Policy Discourse

First, Reichert moderated his position on embryonic stem cell policy. The Seattle Times reports that he opposed embryonic stem cell research early in his career, citing his affiliation with the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church to justify his opposition (9-10-04, 5-23-05). In 2006, he altered his opinion to support stem cell research; an extremely detailed article chronicled this change of heart (7-20-06).

Since Reichert’s district was held by a safe and conservative Republican - Jennifer Dunn - for many years, it appears that Reichert may not have been ready for the demographic changes that were identified by the Seattle Times in August of 2008 (8-20-08). In other words, the district was far more competitive than in Dunn’s heyday.

Related to this sentiment, it is not beyond reason that he was surprised by the robust nature of his campaign opponents, and the closeness of his re-election margins. Therefore, given that the district appeared to become more and more moderate, and that Reichert himself encountered robust challengers, it is likely that stem-cell research was a popular issue to change his position on to illustrate a more moderate image.

Accordingly, the Seattle Times reports, “Darcy Burner, his Democratic challenger in this fall's election, has said Reichert's position on stem-cell research is a sign that he's too
conservative and out of touch with his Eastside district” (7-20-06). At the end the article, following Reichert’s vote to override President Bush’s veto on expanding stem-cell research, the same article quotes Reichert’s challenger insisting that he changed his vote "when [Reichert] realized he was facing the fight of his life." Thus, it is likely that competition caused Reichert to alter his stance on this issue. Yet, importantly, changing his thoughts on stem cell research policy bolstered his centrist image.

Beyond the change in his position on stem cell policy, newspapers depicted this legislator concentrating on healthcare policy more eminently in 2009. Further, Table N-6 shows that there was an 11 percent increase in the discussion of healthcare in press releases after March of 2008. Given the timing of the Affordable Care Act debates beginning in 2009, it is likely that concentrating on healthcare policy more during this time frame is a result of addressing a prominent national issue during the period when the policy was being debated in Congress. Therefore, this issue does not appear to be related to his re-election campaign. It also does not diminish his moderate image.

Similarly, Table N-6 also reveals that from March 2008 through the end of the program period, Reichert focused much more on economic policy and less on crime and homeland security. His concentration on the former coincides with the national economic crisis that started in 2008. The timing suggests that he simply addressed a prominent national issue, which took time away from other concerns (crime and homeland security) that seemed to be less important during the recession. As such, as with healthcare, it appears that the change in his policy discourse was not related to competition, but to the timing of a national debate. Further, altering his concentration in this manner does not tarnish his moderate image.
Thus, of the changes that were made in his policy dialog, only altering his position on stem cell policy is likely related to his competitive circumstances. Further, in line with expectations from the literature that this project tests, when he changed his policy on this issue, he did so in a manner that bolstered his centrist persona.

*Changes in Partisan and Ideological Rhetoric*

Reichert illustrated even more bipartisan behavior over time. Table N-6 makes known that during the first half of his tenure, 21 percent of press releases contained bipartisan statements. In the second half, 32 percent of press releases highlighted his commitment to bipartisanship.

While I did not expect this member to change his behavior at all, bolstering his bipartisan persona as he continued to run in extremely close races against well-funded challengers is logical. Throughout time, he continued to bolster his moderate image, reaching out to voters of the other party, or those not enrolled in any party. This change continues to illustrate his centrism.

*Shifts in Constituent-Oriented Activities*

As judged by several measures, Reichert focused less on constituency-oriented activities in the second half of his time in office.

Table N-6 indicates that he discussed allocation representation in 18 percent of press releases in the first half of his tenure and only in eight percent in the second half. Also, 19 percent of franked documents (N = 6) highlighted allocation politics from January 2005 through February of 2008, while only four percent (N = 1) did so after March 2008.
He also greatly decreased the presentation of himself at home in franked materials. Table N-7 reveals in the first half of his time in Congress, 72 percent of franked documents (N = 23) depicted this legislator in the district. In the second half, 44 percent did so (N = 12).

Reichert focused on service representation less in the second half of his tenure, as portrayed in franked documents. While 38 percent of these materials highlight service representation in the first half of his career (N = 12), only 11 percent (N = 3) do so in the latter part.

Beyond the fact that I did not expect him to change behavior at all, when he did alter his policy dialog and partisan rhetoric, he did so in a manner that reaches out to voters from the other party and illustrates his centrism. Further, the shift in his partisan rhetoric in particular is in harmony with the literature that this project tests.

Changing his persona on constituent-oriented activities does not take away from his moderate image, it also does not support the literature that this project tests. One would think that competing in a series of extremely difficult re-election campaigns would spark an incumbent to concentrate on constituent-oriented activities that reach out to voters across the spectrum. Yet, for whatever reason, Reichert does not.

I have no explanation for this behavioral shift. Yet, I assert that despite these changes, his moderate home style was not tarnished.

*Overall Assessment of Home Style Changes*

As already alluded to, while there were many changes in his representational image, none transformed his centrist persona. Taking a more liberal position on embryonic stem cell research
and increasing already prominently displayed bipartisan rhetoric only fortified his centrist character.

While I am left with no explanation for the shifts in each of his constituent-oriented activities in a way that appears to be logical given the competitive nature of his constituency, it must be said that these changes, while significant to note, do not take away from his moderate image. Thus, while the shifts in his presence at home, in allocation politics, and in service representation do not strengthen the chief feature of his home style, they do not mitigate it either.

Concluding Discussion

David Reichert places a premium on displaying bipartisanship and portraying himself as an ideological centrist. He focuses on policies that are important to constituents and frequently frames these issues in both local and national terms. Finally, he is not home very often, does not engage in allocation politics robustly, and practices service representation minimally.

Given this information, primarily due to his bipartisan displays and the manner in which he frames policy, when assessing his home style as a whole, I assert that his centrism is the prime feature of his representational persona.

That said, did competition impact this legislator’s home style? I believe it did. His honesty discussing why he voted against his party on environmental roll calls (Seattle Times 6-7-10) clearly illustrates that electoral competition does have an impact on his home style and that robust competitive climates stimulate policy moderation and a commitment to bipartisanship. That is in and of itself a contribution to our understanding of Congress.
Perhaps most importantly, the data support a supposition that he would not be as moderate in less competitive circumstances. Again, when discussing his moderate policy votes on issues, he asserted that there were “certain moves, chess pieces, strategies I have to employ” in order to keep environmental groups from spending large sums of money to defeat him (Seattle Times 6-7-10). This suggests that if he lived in a less competitive district, he would be more likely to vote with his party on this issue, instead of aligning himself with the opposite party.

Related to this, did competition change Reichert’s home style? In several ways I believe it caused him to fortify his centrist persona. He moderated his position on stem-cell research policy and displayed even more bipartisan behavior. These are hallmarks of a moderate image.

That said, since the changes in his home style either bolstered his moderate image, or did not mitigate it, I assert that the core of his persona remained intact.

**Chapter Conclusion**

If the literature that this project tests is correct, I anticipated that both members of Congress would dedicate a great deal of effort to constituent-oriented activities. While Reichert was not in the district robustly, Kissell placed a greater emphasis on being found at home. Kissell also emphasized allocation politics and service representation much more than Reichert. In fact, over time, Reichert decreased his relatively scant attention to these home style features.

On policy, there were similarities and differences. If the literature that this project tests is correct, I expected that both members of Congress would frame the impact of policy on their districts most often. Kissell clearly supports the literature, while Reichert split his conversation more between illustrating the impact of policy on his constituents and addressing issues in a national lens. However, after a deeper analysis, it is clear that both legislators, regardless of how
they framed policy, addressed issues that were prominent to residents frequently. Thus, they both often highlighted important constituent concerns.

Finally, in line with expectations from the literature I test, both members of Congress placed a premium on displays of bipartisanship and ideological centrism. In fact, centrism is the main feature of Reichert’s home style.

Regarding the changes in their home style portrayals, Kissell’s home style was relatively stable throughout his tenure in Congress. Many of Reichert’s activities, on the other hand, changed. Further, their behavioral shifts either reinforced or did not mitigate the central features of each of their home styles. Reichert was always a centrist; Kissell was constantly concerned with constituents. Thus, on the one hand, there was stability in the overarching features of their representational images, and on the other hand, there were more changes than anticipated.

In particular, it appears that competition mattered more for Reichert than Kissell, as I have proffered evidence of him explaining moderate votes on policy issues in order to appease environmental interests in his district. With that in mind, competition did play a part in fashioning his home style. Thus, competition is an important force that impacts home style behaviors.

That said, we next turn to the final chapter in this work. In the following section, members of Congress across competitive contexts will be assessed.

Chapter 10
Concluding Analyses
Introduction
I began the first chapter of this work with the stories of two Democratic members of the House of Representatives. It is only fitting that I start the final chapter of this volume with the stories of two additional Democratic members of Congress.

Grimmer et al. (2015) introduce readers to the story of former Rep. Stephanie Herseth-Sandlin, a Democrat who represented all of South Dakota in the House of Representatives from 2004 through 2011. Electorally, the authors describe South Dakota in the following terms: “morally conservative, agrarian and pragmatic. And polls confirm a sizable Republican advantage in party identification” (5). Thus, Herseth-Sandlin faced a dilemma; she needed to appeal to her base of Democratic voters, in addition to independents and moderate Republicans, in order to secure re-election. This is particularly true after winning 51 percent of the vote in her initial race, and 53 percent in her first re-election contest.

In order to do so, Grimmer et al. observe that this legislator presented a locally focused representational image, making the case that she was “an effective advocate for South Dakota,” and forging a centrist reputation as a Blue Dog (8). Grimmer et al. note, “Indeed, Herseth-Sandlin’s nonpartisan reputation was so effective that local newspapers would occasionally misidentify her as a Republican” (8). As such, given a competitive district and several close elections, Herseth-Sandlin presented a bipartisan, locally oriented, ideologically moderate persona.

That said, consider former Rep. Maurice Hinchey, a Democrat from New York’s Hudson Valley, who also represented a competitive district and experienced a string of close elections. In 1992, he won with just over 50 percent of all votes cast (Federal Elections Commission). Hinchey prevailed by a mere 1,233 votes in 1994 (Friedman 2007). The legislator earned only 55
percent of the vote in 1996. Thus, it is not surprising that the Times Union stated, “Hinchey knows he’s a target” (Friedman 2007, 207).

On the one hand, similarly to Herseth-Sandlin, Hinchey paid a great deal of attention to constituents. However, rather differently, Hinchey embraced his Democratic affiliation and held liberal views on most policy issues. Friedman, who chronicled this legislator in her 2007 work, cites Politics in America that states Hinchey is “firmly entrenched in the Democratic Party’s liberal wing…he is a member of the Progressive Caucus, the furthest left of the Hill’s policy groups” (202). Friedman goes on to chronicle Hinchey’s support for government intervention in economic matters, abortion rights, and nationalized health care. It is not surprising that during April of 2010, during a highly competitive campaign, his congressional webpage described him as “a progressive Democrat.”

If we are to assume that both legislators endeavored to win re-election, and they certainly did at the time these activities were chronicled, why did these two members in extremely competitive circumstances present such starkly contrasting home styles? Why was Herseth-Sandlin a Blue Dog and Hinchey a member of the Progressive Caucus? Why did Herseth-Sandlin present a robust local focus as an “advocate for South Dakota,” while Hinchey engaged in contentious nationally oriented policy conversations? Did robust electoral competition play a role in fashioning these images?

That said, I worked in the previous chapters to consider the extent to which competition affected the home styles of federal legislators. In doing so, I also furnished readers with the stories of 14 members of Congress and the constituencies that they represent.
Yet, to this point, the findings of this work may seem somewhat disjointed. It is the goal of this final chapter to weave the findings from these case studies together, and offer a concise assessment as to what extent data support or contradict hypotheses.

Thus, the next section will assess A hypotheses, those that make suppositions about legislators in competitive and noncompetitive circumstances. Following this, an overall analysis of the stability of the behaviors of legislators will be furnished to readers, along with an assessment of B hypotheses. The chapter will then return to where this dissertation began, with an explanation for what the findings of this project mean for democracy and representation. Contributions and challenges will then be overviewed.

To make the pages that follow easier to understand, Table 10 below catalogs every legislator in this work. It divides subjects into competitive situations, and also indicates the number of press releases and franked documents each member of Congress circulated.

While this table does not tell readers much beyond the fact that there is wide variation in the number of press releases and franked documents circulated by each subject, with no apparent linkage between competitive circumstances and the number of documents published, it should help readers understand the pages that follow.

Thus, following Table 10, we begin our overall assessment of the impact of competition on home styles by turning to an appraisal of our A hypotheses and a comparison of those in contrasting competitive conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
<th>Sample of Legislators Chronicled in this Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Safe PVI, Safe Election Results (Chapter 4)</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Capuano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Scalise</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Schmidt</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel Cleaver</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McCaul</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Young</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Biggert</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Calvert</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Michaud</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Costello</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Ryan</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.W. Bill</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Kissell</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Reichert</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparing Legislators Across Competitive Scenarios**

Table 10-1

Home Style Features of Legislators in Different Competitive Circumstances

Based on Overall Assessment of All Data Sources

* = Behavior Support Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>At Home</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>More Local or National</th>
<th>Partisan</th>
<th>Bipartisan</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scalise</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capuano</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High*</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Young</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaul</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section will engage readers in a dialog on the similarities and differences of legislators in competitive and noncompetitive circumstances. In doing so, this work will assess the A hypotheses.

The A hypotheses suggest that the subjects who represent safe districts and enjoy safe margins (Rep. Scalise and Rep. Capuano), should act differently compared to all others in this work. They are the only members that continually enjoy election margins over 60 percent of the vote, and whose Partisan Voter Index Scores are over +10 in their favor (See Table 10-1). More precisely, A hypotheses suggest that these two legislators have the leeway to largely ignore constituent-oriented activities, frame policy in a national veneer, and present themselves as robust partisans and ideologues.

Hypotheses also suggest that every other subject listed in Table 10-1, those who do not represent safe districts and continually enjoy safe election margins, should regularly highlight
constituent-oriented work, discuss the national impact of policy locally, reveal a nonpartisan or bipartisan persona, and emphasize ideological centrum.

Thus, if hypotheses are supported, those with safe districts and safe margins should behave differently from subjects in the other five competitive scenarios presented in Table 10-1. That said, Table 10-1 will be used widely in this final chapter. This table presents a summary of all of the home style activities of each subject in this work.

More precisely, it offers an ordinal measure of the degree to which each legislator practiced a certain home style trait. Regarding the national and local presentation of a subject’s policy discourse, the measure indicates whether his or her policy dialog was mostly local, highly national, or largely mixed between these two possibilities. For all other home style traits under study, the table reveals whether subjects practiced these activities robustly (revealed by the word high); noticeably, but not overwhelmingly (illustrated by the words mixed or medium); or rarely (indicated by the word low).

Table 10-1 is based on a qualitative analysis of the activities of each legislator. These measures are not constructed on any hard number of press releases or franked documents. Instead, these assessments are grounded in how each member presented him or herself in all data sources considered in this project, and mirrors the arguments chronicled in each case study. Table 10-1 above considers press releases, franked documents, newspapers, and web and social media sources. Again, these are qualitative measures for a qualitative project.

The table also includes an indicator of whether the persona of each legislator supports hypotheses.
That said, I will present an overview of legislative activities in the order that I presented hypotheses in Chapter 3. First, I will discuss constituent-oriented activities, followed by policy discourse. Last, I will cover how legislators presented their partisan and ideological dialog.

Significant Constituent-Oriented Activities

Many citizens may not care how legislators vote on policy issues. However, people often pay attention to members of Congress securing funding for local water treatment plants, meeting constituents at local senior centers, or helping residents secure benefits from the Social Security Administration. Engaging in these activities is often a noncontroversial way for members of Congress to cultivate votes. They also are efforts that often have an impression on constituents.

That said, hypotheses suggest that legislators in safe seats, who enjoy safe margins, have the leeway to not present allocation efforts or casework endeavors, and not often reveal their presence in their districts. Consequently, if the literature tested by hypotheses is correct, all other subjects in this work should place a premium on highlighting these same activities.

Regarding allocation politics, Table 10-1 reveals that allocation representation is a central feature of the home styles of 11 of the 14 subjects that this work studies. Thus, the vast majority of legislators in this project practice allocation representation.

Importantly, both members who represent safe districts and enjoy safe margins stress their allocation activities robustly. Further, nine of the 12 representatives in competitive circumstances also heartily reveal their allocation efforts. As such, this pattern indicates that the hypothesis is not supported.

That said, Jean Schmidt, Paul Ryan, and David Reichert highlight allocation the least. As revealed in the case studies, Ryan and Schmidt’s conservative views and their antipathy toward
government spending may explain why they eschew stressing this activity. Ryan and Schmidt are among this work’s most conservative subjects. As such, perhaps ideology plays a role in sparking or curbing the presentation of allocation efforts.

However, even though he is the exception, it is curious that David Reichert does not routinely highlight his allocation efforts. He is exactly the type of legislator that hypotheses suggest should underscore his allocation activities robustly since he not only represents a district that leans Democratic, but never earned above 53 percent of the vote during the timeframe that this project studies. His electoral circumstances are not slightly competitive; they are absurdly competitive. This finding is curious not only in relation to his competitive circumstances, but also due to his ideology. Reichert is one of the most centrist legislators in this study.

Turning to service representation, Table 10-1 illustrates that only four of the 14 legislators highlight service representation noticeably. Thus, most subjects simply do not advertise their casework activities. It must be stated that I am not suggesting these representatives do not have staff members that engage in service representation, but that most members simply do not underscore casework in any noticeable manner.

That said, if the literature tested by hypotheses is correct, subjects in robust competitive conditions should stress their service efforts more than others. First, the two members in noncompetitive environments do not highlight casework to any noticeable degree. However, neither do eight of the 12 subjects in competitive circumstances. Consequently, it appears that there is little support for this hypothesis.

But who stressed service representation? Michael Michaud, Jerry Costello and Larry Kissell emphasize service representation robustly through a variety of home style mediums. Jean
Schmidt highlights this activity noticeably, but only in her copious number of franked documents.

Michaud, Costello, and Kissell are among the most locally oriented legislators in this study. Their attention to constituents and local concerns, on a variety of measures, is robust and well established. As such, it is not surprising that they emphasize service representation frequently.

Beyond this, while Schmidt is certainly more nationally oriented compared to the three subjects mentioned above, she nevertheless underscores her connection to constituents regularly. As such, it is not entirely surprising that this legislator emphasizes service representation in her copious number of franked documents.

Finally, regarding the last constituent-oriented activity under study, a total of 10 legislators in this project routinely reveal their presence in their districts.

Despite expectations from the hypotheses, the two members in constantly noncompetitive circumstances are often found in their districts, meeting with voters. Of the 12 legislators in competitive environments, eight subjects stress that they are often at home. Thus, it appears that literature tested by this hypothesis is not supported.

It seems that the geographic location of a member’s district may be one of the factors that might explain this variation. Don Young, Ken Calvert, and Dave Reichert are the only legislators from the West in the study. According to Table 10-1, they are also three of the four subjects who do not stress their presence in their districts. Thus, it is likely that travel to and from DC takes a great deal more time for these members compared to other representatives.
Table 10-1 also reveals that Rep. McCaul is the sole legislator from a different geographic location who does not heartily portray himself in his district. I am at a loss to explain why he does not often emphasize his presence at home.

Turning now to an overall assessment of their constituent-oriented activities, there is a great degree of uniformity from the subjects in this work in the degree to which they underscore constituent-oriented activities. Most legislators stressed their presence at home often and highlighted their allocation efforts robustly, regardless of competitive circumstances. Similarly, most representatives did not emphasize casework activities. Consequently this section illustrates that there is not much difference in the presentation of constituent-oriented activities between those in noncompetitive and competitive environments.

**Broad Policy Discourse**

The work will now address the rich and robust policy dialog of legislators in this project. First, it will assess the centrality of policy portrayed in their home styles. Second, it will chronicle the local and national balance of their policy discourse.

This section is particularly important to our understanding of representation since Congress is the branch of government that makes laws. As such, a large portion of their time should focus on lawmaking and therefore policy. Yet, since legislators do not operate in vacuums, it is important to appreciate the place of competition on how these representatives present their policy positions to constituents.

That said, before turning to the local and national balance of policy conversations, we start more broadly, asking whether competition stimulates or curtails the policy dialog of legislators. To these ends, hypotheses suggest that members in competitive circumstances should
curtail their policy dialog, while those who enjoy safe margins and safe electoral situations should feel free to discuss policy energetically.

Table 10-1 illustrates that every subject in this study routinely and heartily engaged in a robust policy dialog regardless of competitive situations. There is no variation between those with safe margins who represent safe districts and those in competitive circumstances. Simply stated, our lawmakers discuss laws. As such, hypotheses are not supported, as there is no variation between the legislators in consistently safe circumstances, and those in competitive environments.

Now that it has been established that each member addressed policy, Chapter 2 also reveals that there is a debate in the literature over the connection between the competitive environments of legislators and the national and local balance of their policy conversations. Thus, hypotheses suggest that those subjects who represent safe districts and enjoy safe election margins should feel free to address the impact of federal policy in national terms far more robustly than those in competitive situations. Alternatively then, hypotheses also suggest that all other representatives identified in Table 10-1 should frame the impact of federal policy locally.

Table 10-1 reveals that the policy rhetoric of just two representatives is robustly national in tone. In addition, six legislators present their policy conversations fairly evenly, in both local and national terms. Another six members of Congress stress the local impact of national policy most robustly in their policy presentations. Thus, Table 10-1 indicates that there is great variation in the national and local balance of how subjects present policy.

In order to assess whether there is support for this hypothesis, we need to compare members who represent safe districts and enjoy safe margins to all other members. Table 10-1 illustrates that one member in safe electoral circumstances balances his policy conversation in
both local and national frames, while the other legislator in a safe setting robustly frames the impact of federal policy on his district. Thus, despite expectations from the A hypotheses, neither of these two legislators are totally nationally oriented in their home style presentations.

Turning now to the 12 members of Congress who experience competitive conditions on at least one measure, five frame the impact of federal policy on the district regularly. Another five U.S. Representatives balance highlighting the impact of policy in both local and national terms. Finally, only two largely address policy in a national veneer.

Thus, there is a great deal of variation in the manner of how members of Congress present policy. Further, there appears to be no link between competitive situations and how federal legislators frame policy.

Beyond this, Table 10-1 also reveals that there is variation within each competitive scenario in the manner of how legislators present policy. There is not a single competitive situation (with more than one member) where every subject framed policy in a similar manner.

Thus, since there is a great deal of variety in the home styles of subjects, regardless of competitive circumstances, the data suggest that hypotheses are not supported.

That said, the qualitative nature of this work led to an unexpected, yet notable finding.

Fully, 13 of the 14 subjects under study robustly concentrate on issues that are clearly chief local concerns. The manner of how they frame their dialog is almost negligible compared to the fact that legislators prominently address local interests. Thus, I argue that even if representatives frame policy in a national lens, these members of Congress appear to be district advocates when speaking to concerns of local import. I discuss the implications of this finding later in the chapter.
To illustrate this point, Calvert often framed science and technology policy in a national veneer. The aerospace sector is important to constituents. Bill Young frequently (though not overwhelmingly) addressed defense in a national manner; however, defense policy is vital in his district. Reichert regularly discussed environmental concerns in local and national terms; yet, given its importance to residents, he constantly appeared to highlight a chief local issue.

Paul Ryan is the only person in the study who does not convincingly display this characteristic. His robust conversation on entitlement, budget, and fiscal policy clearly overshadows issues that are more solidly connected to constituents. Thus, while one can argue that the policy areas Ryan emphasizes impact all Americans, he is unique since these concerns do not appear to be specifically related to his district.

This finding expands our understanding of the complexities of policy discourse. First, there does not appear to be a connection between the nature of electoral competition and how members of Congress present their policy dialog. Second, perhaps in order to understand the policy conversations of legislators, examining framing is simply not as important as the issues that members of Congress address regularly. Third, in order to appreciate the constituent-representative relationship, we must gain an understanding of the districts that legislators represent in relation to the policy areas that these members discuss.

As such, this section reveals that policy conversations are rich and multidimensional, and there is indeed a connection between representatives and the represented. That said, there is little support for either of the hypotheses that address policy.

*Partisan Dialog and Ideological Rhetoric*
We currently live in a polarized political climate where both party and ideology have taken center stage in debates over policy concerns. A great deal of literature has hypothesized about the genesis of polarization. That said, given this political climate, understanding how a legislator presents his or her partisan and ideological discourse is important in our understanding of representation.

Hypotheses suggest that legislators who represent safe districts and enjoy safe election margins should have the competitive leeway to be robust partisans and ideologues. Thus, hypotheses also suggest that all other legislators chronicled in Table 10-1 should be either nonpartisan in tone or embrace bipartisanship often. In addition, they should either ignore ideology altogether, or present themselves as centrists.

Table 10-1 discloses that just three members of Congress are extremely partisan and robustly ideological, and an additional two are somewhat partisan and ideological. The other nine subjects in this work do not present noticeable partisan displays. In a notably partisan era this finding should not be lost.

More precisely, the two subjects that enjoy safe circumstances present themselves as robust partisans and hearty ideologues, while nine of the 12 subjects in competitive environments are not noticeably partisan or ideological. Thus, this data suggest support for the hypotheses.

That said, Table 10-1 also suggests that underlying district partisanship is a factor correlated with the propensity of legislators to emphasize partisanship and ideology.

Steve Scalise, Michael Capuano, and Jean Schmidt produce many partisan statements. Ideologically, Scalise and Schmidt often display their conservative credentials while criticizing liberals. Capuano proudly reveals his progressive nature and derides conservatives.
Further, Ken Calvert and Emanuel Cleaver are not regularly partisan or ideological, but are certainly more partisan and ideological than other subjects (excluding Scalise, Schmidt and Capuano). Calvert produces many partisan statements that he often balances with bipartisan sentiments. Cleaver rarely circulates partisan and ideological dialog; yet when he does, his discourse is extremely robust in nature.

Importantly, these five subjects each represent districts that favor their own parties. Scalise, Capuano, Schmidt and Cleaver each hold seats whose underlying district partisanship strongly favors each of their parties. Calvert, while in more competitive circumstances, still enjoys an underlying district partisanship that favors Republicans.

Alternatively, Table 10-1 reveals that two of the most centrist legislators in this work, Larry Kissell and David Reichert, are in extraordinarily competitive circumstances. The last chapter illustrates that they each represent districts that lean towards the opposite party.

Thus, if a legislator is going to present him or herself as strongly partisan or ideological, in all likelihood, he or she will represent a district that favors his or her own party by a healthy margin.

Thus, this finding too suggests support for the literature tested by hypotheses. Consequently, since the most partisan legislators represent the most partisan districts, if we seek to understand why legislators act in a partisan manner, we need to turn our attention to the districts they represent.

Assessment of the Home Styles of Legislators in Contrasting Competitive Circumstances
This section will offer a summary of findings, review support for hypotheses, and discuss major implications of my findings. It will follow the pattern of the above presentation, focusing on constituent-oriented activities first, policy discourse second, and party and ideology last.

First, Table 10-1 reveals that subjects practice constituent-oriented activities regardless of competitive circumstances. Generally, members often present themselves at home and highlight their allocation efforts. That said, most subjects do not highlight service representation. As such, a major finding of this work is that generally, variations in competitive climates are not a useful tool to understand a legislator’s constituent-oriented activities.

More importantly however, data suggest that members of the House of Representatives, who populate the sector of government that was originally meant to be closest to the people, do appear to present themselves as being connected to constituents. Thus, hypotheses are largely not supported since there is generally not much variation between legislators in competitive and noncompetitive climates, and there is a great deal of uniformity in the constituency-oriented activities of legislators in this study.

Concerning policy, every subject in this work engages in robust policy dialogs. Thus, our legislative branch, the branch that makes laws, discusses policy often.

Regarding the national and local balance of policy conversations, the data suggest that the literature tested by hypotheses is largely contradicted. There appears to be no relationship between competitive circumstances and the manner of how legislators framed policy. Further, there is not even uniformity in how members in each competitive situation frame policy.

At the same time, 13 of the 14 lawmakers overwhelmingly concentrated on issues of local import, regardless of the manner of how they framed issues. Therefore, the major implication of this finding is that in order to understand representation, we need to be less
concerned with how legislators frame their policy discourse, and turn our attention to the particular issues that members of Congress address regularly.

Finally, turning to party and ideology, the hypotheses are largely supported as both members in safe districts who enjoy safe margins present themselves as robust partisans and ideologues, and most subjects in competitive scenarios do not.

Perhaps most importantly, every subject who is either strongly or noticeably partisan or ideological represents a constituency whose underlying district partisanship supports his or her own party. Thus, when assessing the role of competition in producing or stimulating partisan and ideological rhetoric, the data imply that we should look less at electoral margins and more at Partisan Voter Index scores.

Perhaps then this finding puts a different spin on the redistricting literature, most of which explores the connection between underlying partisanship of a district and the policy votes of legislators. Further, this literature argues that redistricting is not a factor, or at best a small factor, causing polarization within the House of Representatives (Brunell and Grofman 2008; McCarty, Poole and Rosenthal 2009; Carson et al. 2007). As such, this work suggests that when scholarship studies polarization and redistricting, we must look beyond policy votes to home styles.

Thus, the major findings of this work suggests that there is little support for hypotheses concerning constituent-oriented activities and policy, and support for hypotheses that theorize about the connection between competition and the manner of how legislators present their partisan and ideological rhetoric.

We now enter into a broader conversation summarizing the findings of the previous six chapters that assess if and how home styles changed as competitive situations shifted.
Do Changing Levels of Competition Impact Home Styles?

Hypotheses suggest that legislators in unchanging competitive circumstances will present stable home styles, while those with fluctuating margins will alter their representational images around shifts in competitive climates. More precisely, the B hypotheses suggest that members who experience an increase in the difficulty of winning re-election should present a more robust focus on constituent-oriented activities, stress a locally oriented policy veneer, and eschew partisan and ideological displays around the time that their competitive circumstances became more robust.

That said, this section summarizes findings of the previous six chapters. First, I will provide an overall assessment of the stability of the home styles of federal legislators and compare the representational personas of those in different competitive circumstances (revealed in Table 10-2 below). Second, it will assess some of the ways that legislators altered their behaviors, and consider whether changing competitive circumstances led to behavioral shifts (See Tables 10-3 and 10-4). Finally, I will assess B hypotheses and explore if the nature of the home style shifts exhibited by those with fluctuating election margins met expectations.

That said, since this section assesses the stability of home styles, it is useful to remind readers of the metrics utilized by the author to consider a behavioral change to be noteworthy. Generally speaking, I identified and explained any shifts in coded categories of press releases of at least ten percent. For example, if a legislator in Chapter 9 presented his allocation efforts in 12 percent of press releases from 2004 to 2007, but highlighted allocation in 22 percent of news releases from 2008 to 2011, that is considered a noteworthy shift in behavior.
Beyond press releases, qualitative changes in other data sources such as franked documents, newspaper appearances, or social and web sources will also be presented. These latter assessments are not based on any hard numbers, but my overall analysis of the representational styles of legislators over the time period under study.

One more important point must be made. Due to the thick description that is a hallmark of home style research, we must assess the stability of representational personas through two different lenses. First, readers are required to appreciate the main feature of each legislator’s image on a macro-level. In other words, what is the chief characteristic of each member’s home style portrayal?

Second, turning to a more micro-analysis, we are obliged to examine the component parts of each legislator’s persona, individually examining the manner of how a representative presents his or her constituent-oriented activities, policy dialog, and partisan and ideological discourse.

This is important because, as will be clarified more below, if competition had an impact on the home styles of federal legislators, it was at the margins, and at the more micro-level of analysis.

That said, we now examine the stability of the representational images of legislators in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10-2</th>
<th>Stability of the Home Style Features of Legislators in Different Competitive Circumstances Based on Overall Assessment of All Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allocation Rep.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Districts, Safe Margins</td>
<td>Scalise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before engaging readers in a dialog on the particular ways that the home styles of legislators changed, we must first look at the stability of the chief features of their personas. Significantly, the main characteristic of each of their images remained intact throughout the program period.

Steve Scalise always stressed his advocacy for Louisiana. Bill Young perpetually highlighted his focus on constituents, veterans and defense. David Reichert consistently displayed a prominent centrist image.
Importantly, this finding is also true of not only those subjects whose competitive environments remained stable, but also those whose election results fluctuated above and below 60 percent of the vote. Don Young unwaveringly emphasized his advocacy on behalf of Alaska. Mike McCaul sought broad appeal in his heterogeneous constituency throughout his tenure. Judy Biggert consistently engaged in a broad policy discourse.

Thus, once a legislator forged an overarching home style image, regardless of competitive circumstances, that home style persona remained remarkably durable. This finding must not be lost; it matters.

That said, while the chief characteristics of their personas remained intact, that does not mean that every component part of their representational images stayed stable over the program period. In fact, as Table 10-2 reveals, particular aspects of each of their home styles changed.

Table 10-2 illustrates that there were more alterations in specific aspects of the personas of legislators than originally anticipated. In total, roughly 35 percent of home style activities assessed in this work among the 14 subjects changed (Table 10-2)\(^2\). Thus, this monograph chronicles many shifts in particular aspects of the home styles of federal legislators.

If we isolate those in stable competitive circumstances from those with fluctuating margins, legislators in stable circumstances changed around 30 percent\(^3\) of their behaviors, while subjects with fluctuating margins altered roughly 42 percent of their home style activities.\(^4\)

---

\(^2\) Table 10-2 covers the behaviors of 14 subjects. Each subject engaged in eight different types of home style activities. If one multiplies eight different types of activities, by 14 subjects, this work assessed 112 different home style activities among all subjects. Thus, percentages are based on the total number of boxes in Table 10-2 that indicate change (39 in total), divided by 112. That yields a total of 35 percent.

\(^3\) Regarding those in stable circumstances, and based on Table 10-2, there are eight subjects who engaged in eight different home style activities. Thus, the legislators in stable situations engaged in a total of 64 home style activities chronicled in Table 10-2. In total, 19 behaviors among the eight subjects changed. Thus, 19 divided by 64 yields a result of 30 percent.
Thus, Table 10-2 indicates that contrary to expectations, there were more changes in the home styles of those in stable competitive circumstances than originally anticipated, and perhaps, there were fewer alterations in the home style activities of those with fluctuating margins than expected.

But in what ways did each legislator alter his or her representational image, and did the behavioral changes of those with fluctuating competitive margins support the B hypotheses?

### Table 10 - 3
Home Style Features That Altered for Legislators in Constant Competitive Circumstances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Major Behavioral Shifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Districts, Safe Margins</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalise</td>
<td>● More Bipartisan Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capuano</td>
<td>● More Nationally Oriented Policy Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reveals Party Less Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Districts, Unsafe Margins</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>● At Home Less Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Mentions Policy Less (Franked Materials Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reveals Party More Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● More Partisan Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsafe Districts, Safe Margins</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Young</td>
<td>● More Locally Oriented Policy Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costello</td>
<td>● Less Allocation Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● At Home Less Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● More Nationally Oriented Policy Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>● More Nationally Oriented Policy Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reveals Party More Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● More Partisan Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding those with fluctuating margins, and based on Table 10-2, there are six subjects who engaged in eight different home style activities. Thus, the legislators with fluctuating margins engaged in a total of 48 home style activities chronicled in Table 10-2. In total, 20 behaviors among the six subjects changed. Thus, 20 divided by 48 yields a result of 42 percent.
Based on the previous chapters, Table 10-3 identifies the manner of how each subject in a stable competitive environment altered his or her home style.

Table 10-3 reveals that Michael Capuano altered the national and local balance of his policy conversation. During the first part of the study the legislator presented a far more locally focused policy dialog. Importantly, he considered seeking the governorship during his most locally focused time. He took a nationally oriented turn when seeking an open U.S. Senate seat in 2009. As Grimmer (2013) illustrates that U.S. Senators from Massachusetts appear to be largely nationally oriented in their representational styles, Capuano’s case suggests that competition likely modified this aspect of his image.

More precisely, he likely altered his persona in light of anticipated competitive circumstances. He was most locally focused when he considered running for governor, and then more nationally oriented during his campaign for the U.S. Senate. Thus, Capuano’s behavior illustrates that competition can play a role in altering the manner of how a legislator presents him or herself when considering seeking higher office. This goes beyond the manner of how I expected competition to fashion representational images.

Competition also likely played a role in altering Jean Schmidt’s partisan rhetoric as Table 10-3 shows she became more partisan over time. Schmidt constantly faced a series of competitive primary challengers. Accordingly, she likely increased her partisan portrayal to
connect with the primary electorate. Thus, when considering competition’s impact on home styles, Schmidt teaches us that we must look to primary, as well as general election contests.

Beyond primary elections, the behaviors of David Reichert and Larry Kissell, legislators who face consistently tight electoral margins and represent districts that lean towards the other party, illustrate that members in extraordinarily robust competitive climates may alter their home styles to assist with re-election pursuits.

David Reichert publicly moderated his position on stem cell research. Larry Kissell highlighted service representation more often and his party less frequently (Table 10-3). In light of their robust competitive environments, these changes are not entirely surprising. Thus, their behaviors illustrate that research should not simply assume that those who are in consistently competitive circumstances will not present certain aspects of themselves differently in order to gain votes.

Consequently, those in stable electoral environments illustrate that certain aspects of the personas of legislators may change due to considering to seek or seeking higher office, in order to fend off competitive primary challengers, or to help a legislator win re-election in a very competitive environment. As such, while competition did not alter the chief images of these legislators, it nevertheless played a role in fashioning the margins of their personas.

Moving on, Bill Young may have altered his image due to competitive circumstances. He became more locally oriented in his policy discourse during the second half of the program period (Table 10-3). It is not out of the realm of possibility that his 2008 and 2010 contests, against a local mayor and state senator respectively, inspired this member to present a more local veneer. He previously faced much weaker challengers, if he was challenged at all. As such, competitive circumstances may have motivated this legislator to change his persona.
That said, beginning in 2007, Young no longer chaired the House Appropriations Committee or its Defense Subcommittee since the GOP lost majority status that year. These were particularly nationally oriented positions during the Iraq War. As such, Bill Young may have presented a more local focus since he was not center stage in the national efforts to fund a war. Thus, institutional factors, including majority party status and committee posts, may also help explain this home style shift.

Building on this finding, and moving firmly beyond the role of competition in altering the periphery of the home styles of federal legislators, there is also evidence to suggest that committee posts and majority party status affected the personas of subjects. As Table 10-3 reveals, Paul Ryan became more partisan in the second half of his tenure and took on an even more robust national appearance. Ryan assumed the ranking GOP position on the House Budget Committee in 2007, and thus became the national spokesperson for his party on budget concerns. Therefore, he likely became more partisan and even more nationally oriented due to his new position. Simply, he had a platform to criticize the new Democratic majority in the House, and did so through a partisan lens. He also continued to present himself as a nationally oriented policy expert due to his important discourse on the federal budget.

Further, Jerry Costello very marginally framed policy in local terms less in the second half of his tenure (Table 10-3). This is likely due to assuming the chairmanship of the Aviation Subcommittee in the House in 2007, which he gained upon the Democrats assuming majority party status.

Also, Table 10-3 reveals that Rep. Scalise became more bipartisan over time; this is likely due to working with the Democratic House Majority to secure funds for his constituents after Hurricane Katrina.
Accordingly, the section above reveals several important findings. First, those who are in stable competitive circumstances are not out of reach of the impact of electoral competition. The home styles of these legislators can exhibit marginal changes. Legislators may alter their personas as a result of political ambitions, a primary contest, a consistently competitive environment, or a strong challenger.

Beyond competitive factors, members of Congress may also change their images, at least marginally, when they assume or lose committee chairmanships or ranking member posts. This is often due to a change in majority party status. Further, major local circumstances, like a disaster, may also have an impact on how a legislator presents him or herself to constituents.

Consequently, the lesson from this subset of members is that competition may fashion home style images at the margins, but so do other factors. As such, representation is influenced by many variables.

Table 10 – 4
Home Style Features That Altered for Legislators in Shifting Competitive Circumstances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Major Behavioral Shifts</th>
<th>Shift in Expected Direction?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe Districts, Fluctuating Margins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Young</td>
<td>1. Less Allocation Representation</td>
<td>1. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reveals Party More Often</td>
<td>3. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCaul</td>
<td>1. Less Allocation Representation</td>
<td>1. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. At Home More Often</td>
<td>2. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaver</td>
<td>1. More Allocation Representation</td>
<td>1. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reveals Party More Often</td>
<td>3. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Districts, Fluctuating Margins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michaud</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Less Allocation Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More Nationally Oriented Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biggert</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Less Allocation Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At Home More Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More Locally Oriented Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reveals Party More Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More Bipartisan Rhetoric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. More Partisan Rhetoric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calvert</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Less Allocation Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More National Oriented Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reveals Party More Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More Partisan Rhetoric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10-4, which is similar to Table 10-3, lists all of the behavioral changes that legislators with fluctuating margins exhibited, as discussed in the previous chapters. This table not only identifies the alterations that these U.S. Representatives illustrated in their home styles, but also, whether the behavioral shifts that these members made were in the direction anticipated by the B hypotheses.

As a reminder, B hypotheses suggest that around the time when legislators fall below 60 percent of the vote they should focus on presenting constituent-oriented activities, framing policy issues in a local lens, and eschewing partisan and ideological displays. At the same time, after legislators break 60 percent, they should concentrate less on presenting constituent-oriented tasks, addressing policy in a national veneer, and circulating partisan and ideological discourse. Thus, according to B hypotheses, if competition impacts home styles, the representational images of these legislators should vacillate.
Table 10-4 reveals that only three behavioral alterations support B hypotheses. First, both Judy Biggert and Mike McCaul presented themselves at home most often during their most competitive periods. Second, Judy Biggert’s policy discourse appears the most locally focused during her most competitive era. Thus, given the number of legislators studied in this work, and the amount of home style activities the project considered, on the whole, there is little support for the B hypotheses.

Yet, shifting election margins might have mattered in other ways, even if not in the manner that supports hypotheses. Table 10-4 above reveals that instead of more robust competition mitigating partisan rhetoric, as B hypotheses suggest, it may have actually inspired an uptick in some form of partisan behavior for all but one member chronicled in Table 10-4. Don Young, Mike McCaul, Emanuel Cleaver, Judy Biggert, and Ken Calvert appear most partisan during their most competitive periods, or simply became more partisan over time, beginning at the point of a change to a more competitive environment.

As such, it is likely that instead of legislators coming to the center of the voter distribution during their most competitive periods, these members of Congress decided to polarize, and reach out to their bases of voters in order to win re-election.

It must also be noted that Don Young was challenged for the GOP nomination for Congress in 2008 by Lt. Governor Sean Parnell. Thus, this uptick in partisan language may also be related to competing in an extremely competitive primary contest.

This finding is important as it illustrates that more robust general and primary election competition may have motivated these legislators to display their party and circulate partisan rhetoric more often, as opposed to mitigating partisan portrayals. Thus, changing levels of
competition likely fashioned home style images in this regard, even though not in the expected direction.

Table 10-4 also reveals that many legislators changed the national and local balance of their policy conversations. Did shifting levels of competition inspire these behavioral alterations?

Regarding the activities of Rep. Cleaver and Rep. Michaud – perhaps - but only after the 2010 General Election. After very close election results in 2010, Cleaver presented a far more locally oriented veneer in his policy discourse, while Michaud’s policy dialog took on a more nationally oriented hue. It is plausible that the close contests motivated these legislators to change their policy conversations. Cleaver may have tried to reinforce his connection to constituents after a close race. Michaud may have been speaking nationally on issues important to Mainers in order to address some of the concerns his 2010 opponent stressed that gained traction with local voters.

Moving on, all subjects in Table 10-4 altered the manner of how they presented their allocation efforts. Importantly, Mike Michaud and Emanuel Cleaver, the only Democrats in this table, highlighted their allocation activities most robustly during their least competitive times. It was also the period when they belonged to the majority party.

The GOP members highlighted allocation efforts less over time. This is likely due to being in the minority between 2007 and 2011, and also, because of the House GOP earmark ban that was instituted in 2011. Thus, it appears that the shifts in the allocation activities of each of these legislators are not connected to changes in their competitive climates.

Consequently, Table 10-4 leads us to make several observations. First, by and large, B hypotheses are largely not supported. Second, changing levels of competition had the most
robust impact on legislators’ partisan discourse. That said, instead of more robust competition mitigating the presentation of partisan behavior, it seems to have motivated it.

Finally, it is not competition that appears to have altered the presentation of allocation activities, but rather two institutional factors. First, was a member’s status in the majority party. Second, was the majority party’s earmark ban instituted in 2011.

As such, this section continues to illustrate that home styles are complicated and affected by many variables.

Concluding Thoughts on the Changes in Home Style Behaviors

Beyond the fact that there is little support for B hypotheses, there are two important findings that need to be addressed once more.

First, despite the many changes at the margins of each of their home style personas, the core of each subject’s image remained intact throughout the study period. Thus, once the overarching feature of a home style image is forged, it seems that persona endures. Certainly, Grimmer et al. (2015) illustrate that this is the case with the story of Rep. Herseth-Sandlin. Friedman reveals that many subjects in her work, including Rep. Carolyn McCarthy and Rep. Eliot Engle, presented a largely stable home style (2007). Fenno’s 2013 work that chronicles the story of Rep. Barber Conable also supports this finding. As such, despite my expectations, it appears that the main features of home styles are largely stable.

While I will speculate what that means for the competition literature later in this chapter, that is an important finding. That said, arguing that the main characteristics of home styles are mostly stable does not suggest that aspects of these images cannot change, at least in the short
run, in important ways. Thus, it appears that competition can fashion the margins of home style portrayals.

Beyond competition, institutional factors, particularly majority party status and committee positions, are important in explaining the representational personas of members of Congress. Many of the behavioral shifts chronicled in Tables 10-3 and 10-4 above can be explained due to these circumstances. As such, this section shows that not only can the competitive environment that a legislator operates in impact his or her home style, but so can the institutional setting and rules with which a member of Congress contends.

Implications For Democracy & Representation

The genesis of this work began with a reading of Cases in Congressional Campaigns by Adkins and Dulio (2010), which illustrates how Republican members of Congress during the 2008 General Election changed their home styles in response to increases in the robustness of electoral competition. The authors found that legislators became more locally oriented and circulated more franked documents and press releases in order to assist with their re-election campaigns and build political support. Thus, this volume illustrates that there is a connection between home styles and electoral competition, and therefore, home styles and democracy.

Fenno too, the father of home style, presumed that there is a linkage between democracy and representational images. He observed, “For most members of Congress most of the time, this electoral goal is primary” (1978, 31). Fenno notes that one of the tools that an elected official employs to gain political support in an election is his or her home style persona. Fenno, in his 1977 work, eloquently states: “The response politicians seek from others is political support. And the impressions they try to foster are those that will engender political support.
House member politicians believe that a great deal of their support is won by the kind of individual self they present to others, i.e., to their constituents” (1977, 898).

As such, Fenno situates his theoretical lens in the context of a functioning democracy. More precisely, home style is a tool that legislators use to gain genuine political support; connect to constituents; and engage in, or at the very least explain, policy advocacy on behalf of those they represent.

Further, Fenno assumed that legislators would change their home styles in order to gain political support. For example, he conducted a hard test between the competitiveness of a house member’s electoral circumstances and the frequency in which a subject returned to his or her district. Yet, he found no connection.

Thus, this work began with a puzzle. Adkins and Dulio led us to believe that there should be a connection between competition and home styles in their empirical findings. Also, Fenno, who spoke widely about electoral competition and representation, theorized that while he did not find a connection between competition and homes styles, that the exploration of this potential linkage “should not be cast aside permanently” (35).

Given this literature, this work sought to ask the question of how does competition impact home style personas? In doing so, it more broadly asks how an important aspect of democracy affects representation. Consequently, this dissertation is built on a foundation that the opinions that voters make through the ballot box should fashion the behaviors of U.S. Representatives. Accordingly, as Shumpeter (1942) observes, democracy rests upon “the people’s vote” (269). In theory, so should home styles.

That said, how do my findings fit in with the above literature, and more importantly, what do my findings mean for representation in a democracy?
First, the data suggest that electoral competition, and changes in its robustness, do not produce a wholesale shift in the representational personas of federal legislators. Thus, examining the home styles of subjects, as a whole, does not illustrate that electoral competition strongly fashions representational images. This finding concurs with Fenno’s research from 1978.

Given the importance of the role of electoral competition in democratic theory, and in Fenno’s and Adkins and Dulio’s works, I make two concessions. First, on the whole, there does not appear to be a pattern that indicates that the home style portrayals of those in competitive circumstances are distinct from those in noncompetitive situations. Second, I concede that changes in the robustness of competition had less of an impact on the home styles of legislators than I thought at the outset of this project.

As such, given the importance of other factors that legislators contend with, including what Friedman (2007) refers to as the “predilections of these legislators to put their own stamp on their activities,” it appears that I placed too much emphasis on the impact of electoral competition on fashioning the overarching features of the home styles of U.S. Representatives.

That said, building off of Friedman’s writing above, given the variety of dynamics that legislators must contend with, is it truly realistic for legislators to present a wholesale change in their personas? The data illustrate that the answer is no.

Yet, that is not the whole story. My findings reveal that electoral competition appears to mold the periphery of the home styles of members of Congress. Data suggest that several legislators changed aspects of their representational personas, and there is convincing data to suggest that these marginal shifts were due to competitive circumstances.

For example, Mike Capuano appears to become more nationally focused in response to his changing political ambitions. While this legislator always engaged in both locally and
nationally framed policy discourse, he addressed issues in a more local veneer when he
considered seeking the governorship, and a more national lens when running for the U.S. Senate.
Thus, while the overarching feature of his image, that of playing politics at the local and national
levels remained intact, the degree to which he addressed policy in a local or national frame
fluctuated with his competitive circumstances.

Or consider Dave Reichert, who altered his position on embryonic stem-cell research in
2006. Newspaper data I furnished to readers illustrated how this change was likely connected to
his robust electoral circumstances. Thus, he moderated his stance on a significant social issue,
likely to help win re-election in his district that slightly leans Democratic in presidential races.
Yet, this change only fortified the chief feature of his home style: that of a prominent centrist. As
such, changing levels of competition did not lead to a wholesale alteration in his persona, but a
shift at the margin.

Also, illustrating that competition does not have to only occur in a general election, Jean
Schmidt and Don Young both became more partisan over time. In fact, Young was most partisan
when he was challenged in a highly competitive primary from Lt. Governor Sean Parnell. Thus,
it is likely that competition led to this shift. Yet, the overarching features of each of their home
style images, nevertheless, remained intact.

Further, five of the six legislators with fluctuating margins were most partisan during
their most competitive time frames. That is not to say that these were robust partisans, but it is
nevertheless an important finding to note that increases in their partisan images occurred at the
same time as increases in the difficulty of winning re-election.

Thus, I believe this project illustrates that in order to understand how competition impacts
legislators, we must employ a micro-level analysis by assessing the component parts of each
member’s representational persona. Perhaps then, electoral competition does indeed fashion home styles, even if not in the way or to the degree that I originally anticipated.

Further, it is not out of the realm of possibility that electoral competition may have already determined which home styles are acceptable to constituents during a legislator’s initial election to Congress. Simply, U.S. Representatives likely would not win election initially or continue to hold office if their home style personas were anathema to the majority of constituents. If nothing else, this dissertation has demonstrated how much attention members of Congress pay to those they represent.

Thus, perhaps elected officials establish the chief features of their home styles early in their careers, won election partly because of the images they put forward in their initial contests, and simply modify aspects of their personas in response to the various dynamics that they contend with throughout their tenure.

If this is the case, then electoral competition has largely determined which legislators will represent us. This research shows that expecting U.S. Representatives to completely makeover their representational images at the drop of a hat in response to facing difficult competitive circumstances, particularly in light of other factors, is not realistic.

If it were the case that U.S. Representatives illustrated a wholesale change in their personas after a close election, then perhaps instead of a republic, we would fall into the classification of a direct democracy. This would bring along all of the downsides of this model of government. Thus, perhaps this project reveals that electoral competition is playing the correct role in our polity. It may determine who wins office initially, and mold behaviors at the margins.

Consequently, it may have been naïve on the part of the author to theorize that electoral competition would produce a wholesale change in the personas of legislators. Importantly,
competition matters at the margins, as one of many variables that U.S. Representatives consider.

**Implications For Median Voter Theory**

In the literature review I cited Dodd (2015), who asserts that most scholars that attempt to test Median Voter Theory fail to account for the assumptions that Downs established. In particular, the model used by Downs bears little relation to the United States. For example, Dodd notes that the Downsian Model appears to rely on a unicameral government with no system of checks and balances or separation of powers. Further, the Downsian Model assumes that legislators are “agents of the party, not the people” (312). Thus, Median Voter Theory, as originally conceived, is not based on the United States electoral system.

That said, even if the theory was based on the United States, Downsian Theory would lead us to believe that members of Congress should moderate their behaviors in order to be as acceptable to the largest number of voters as possible. In other words, legislators should endeavor to position themselves at the center of the voter distribution.

So significant has this theory been to scholarship, and also, to journalists and many politicos, that every single hypothesis in this work is based upon Median Voter Theory. Simply, I theorized that federal legislators would portray themselves as close as possible to the center of the voter distribution.

More precisely, I anticipated that those in competitive circumstances, or who experienced an uptick in political competition, would engage in constituent-oriented activities in order to connect to voters on almost any facet of the ideological spectrum. I also expected these legislators to discuss policy in a local manner in order to underscore their connection to as many
constituents as possible. Finally, I hypothesized that they would stress bipartisanship and ideological moderation.

That said, this work illustrates that there is, at best, little support for Median Voter Theory.

On the one hand, the most partisan legislators in this work represent districts that favored their own parties. In the cases of Rep. Capuano, Rep. Scalise, and Rep. Jean Schmidt - their districts heavily favor their own parties. On the other hand, the data suggest that nine of the 12 legislators in competitive circumstances are not largely partisan or ideological.

At the same time, when examining the subset of members of Congress who are in fluctuating competitive circumstances, five of these six legislators were most partisan during their most competitive periods.

Then there are the special cases of Rep. Jean Schmidt and Rep. Don Young. Each of these legislators not only faced competitive general election challengers, but also, competitive primary opponents. It is not surprising then that Young was most partisan during the time frame when he experienced his tough primary election. Also, Jean Schmidt became more partisan over time, likely due to her string of primary elections.

That said, Young and Schmidt faced an additional dilemma. Not only did they contend with tough nomination battles, they also faced robust general election challengers. Therefore, Downsian Theory suggests that after winning their respective primaries, they would immediately embrace bipartisanship. This was not the case.

In fact, it appears, and perhaps not surprisingly given that each of their districts favors the GOP, that instead of embracing the median voter, each ran to his or her base. In other words, they underscored their partisan affiliations in their competitive primary and general elections.
Thus, data suggest that Median Voter Theory is largely not supported. While the most partisan legislators are from districts that favor their own parties, competition sparked members with fluctuating margins to be most partisan during their most competitive periods. Further, Schmidt and Don Young carried the partisan veneer that they embraced in primary contests into their general election battles. Consequently, it appears that Dodd is correct; Downsian Theory is too simplified for the complexities of the American political system.

But why did Median Voter Theory not fare relatively well in this project, particularly for those in fluctuating electoral circumstances?

First, the simplicity of the theory laid out by Downs clearly fails to account for the differences between primary and general elections. As Fenno reminds us in his original home style monograph, there are different sets of constituencies. He differentiates between the primary constituency and the general election constituency, among others. The former is the subset of citizens that votes for a representative in a primary contest, while the latter supports a member of Congress in a general election.

While this is beyond the scope of the project, the myriad of rules relating to who can vote in primary elections illustrates the complex dynamics of these contests across the United States (see Gerber and Morton 1998 in Chapter 2). It also deals a blow to a supposition as simplified as Median Voter Theory.

Gerber and Morton argue that closed primaries tend to produce the most polarized nominees, while open primaries tend to produce the most centrist. Those in semi-open contests tend to be somewhere in the middle. Since Jean Schmidt is from Ohio, it is worth noting that this state operates an open primary where any voter can choose any party’s ballot he or she wishes (Ohio Secretary of State’s Office). The Alaska Division of Elections reveals that Alaska
Republicans nominated Don Young in a semi-open primary, where only Republicans and independents are franchised.

Thus, Jean Schmidt needed to consider any voter who chose to cast a ballot in a Republican primary. Therefore, since there is an opportunity for every voter in the constituency to do so, it may make sense why she did not moderate in a general election. Simply, since those who consider themselves Democrats may choose to vote in a GOP primary, there may be, in theory, great overlap between the primary and general election constituencies. Essentially, liberal Democrats can choose to vote in a Republican nominating contest.

On the other hand, there is no opportunity for Democrats to cast ballots in a Republican nominating contest in Alaska. That said, all independent voters may do so. Therefore, assuming that a large number of ideological liberals register as Democrats, the general election constituency in Alaska is certainly more liberal than the Republican primary constituency.

As such, unlike Schmidt’s case that may entail a large degree of overlap between primary and general election constituencies, that is not the case for Don Young. Therefore, either Young did not attempt to attract Democrats in 2008, or he simply worked hard to ensure that those who voted for him in the primary had the same reasons to vote for him in the general election. Thus, perhaps the size of his primary electoral coalition, he felt, was big enough to ensure a victory in the general election. That would explain why he did not moderate and contradicts the much maligned Median Voter Theory.

Thus, the complex rules of primary contests that differ from state to state may explain why Median Voter Theory fails in many instances.

Second, why did five of the six legislators in fluctuating circumstances become most partisan during their most competitive periods? First, it is imperative to remember that all six of
these members of Congress are not themselves robustly partisan. Thus, party and ideology are
not chief features of their home style images. That being said, when they faced difficult electoral
circumstances, as opposed to becoming even more centrist, most instead became more polarized.
Yet, the behavioral shifts were nevertheless marginal. Not one legislator morphed into a robust
partisan similar to Steve Scalise or Mike Capuano.

This means that it is very likely that home styles only change at the margins because
legislators felt they had the leeway to alter their personas at the margins. As such, it appears that
members of Congress are given a relatively wide berth in which they may present themselves.

Consequently, these legislators shifted to a more partisan home style in a manner that was
noticeable, but not revolutionary. More precisely, these representatives did not rebrand
themselves, but instead, likely operated within boundaries set by constituents to reach out to the
bases of their parties. Thus, I speculate that Median Voter Theory failed in this case because
incumbents felt that they had the freedom to reach out to their bases more so than otherwise.

Beyond primaries and partisan portrayals, there is policy to consider. This project is not
about policy votes; it is about presentation of policy positions. Scholarship tends to utilize policy
votes, and the various measures of them - whether ADA, ACU or DW-Nominate scores - to
assess polarization (Grofman, Koetzle and McGann 2002; Jessee and Malhotra 2010; Carson et
al. 2007).

Thus, if we assume that candidates come to the center of the voter distribution, as Median
Voter Theory speculates, then policy positions must neatly align on a left to right political
spectrum. Indeed, in the realm of policy, many votes do align neatly on the left to right political
spectrum.
That said, we must remember that a legislator may only vote three possible ways on a bill: aye, nay, or present. Most do not vote present. Thus, assessing Median Voter Theory through policy votes produces something that is far simpler than assessing Median Voter Theory through the manner of how a federal legislator highlights public policy. Simply, home style dialog on policy concerns is richer and more multi-faceted.

Therefore, since this project studied the ways members highlight policy (among other things), Median Voter Theory may fail here for several reasons.

First, some issues simply might not conform to liberal or conservative policy positions. Further, elected officials may discuss the importance of significant local issues, but may not do so in a way that mirrors ideology. For example, it is one thing to say that a district needs more jobs. It is another to connect how free-trade, a relatively right-wing position, took jobs away from a local area. Not many individuals will disagree with the former; many will disagree with the latter.

Similarly, on a more national level, a statement like the country needs better healthcare will likely not elicit much opposition. It is entirely another thing to say that government should provide healthcare. The former does not equate to ideology, the latter does.

Thus, in this realm too, it appears that Median Voter Theory fails to account for the complexities of representation in our polity. Policy dialog today is simply too complex, and therefore, the goals of legislators are also too complex to support such a simplified rational actor model.

Thus, it appears that legislators are aiming to accomplish multiple goals. First, is winning re-election. This includes winning both primary and general election constituencies. Importantly,
it is vital to remember that election rules matter - especially in primary situations - in order to understand why legislators may present themselves as robust partisans or as centrists.

Second, it appears that these legislators have leeway in how they present themselves to constituents. While five of the six legislators were most partisan during their most robust electoral timeframes, they were not, on the whole, robustly partisan legislators. They did however reach out to their bases more during difficult re-election environments. Thus, these legislators became more partisan, but only marginally so when considering the entire range of their representational personas.

Finally, policy conversations are complicated, and this work suggests that in order to understand policy conversations in relation to Median Voter Theory, instead of only examining roll call votes, we should also look to the manner of how federal legislators discuss and present policy.

Thus, Median Voter Theory, for a variety of reasons, I believe is not useful because of how simplified it is in relation to the multiple goals our federal legislators work towards, and due to the various environments in which these U.S. Representatives operate.

**This Project’s Contributions**

Congressional Institutional Factors Matter For Representation

This work found that competition impacts the margins of the home styles of federal legislators. Yet, the dissertation also identified other variables that fashion representational personas.
That said, Fleisher and Bond (2004), Hetherington (2009), and Jones (2010) reveal that institutional factors affect congressional behavior. My work agrees; committee assignments and majority party status influence representational images.

Majority party status clearly affected allocation politics. Many of the Democrats in the study presented their allocation efforts most robustly while the party was in the majority. This can most clearly be seen in the case of Emanuel Cleaver of Missouri whose allocation efforts peaked during his time in the majority.

Republicans most prolifically practiced allocation representation prior to 2007, during their first stint as members of the majority. Ken Calvert and Judy Biggert in particular illustrate this phenomenon. In fact, Calvert appeared to be a bit disappointed that he finally earned a seat on the Appropriations Committee during a time when earmarks were curtailed and then eliminated. Further, while always embracing allocation representation, Don Young and Bill Young were the czars of earmarks prior to 2006 when they controlled the Appropriations and Transportation & Infrastructure Committees respectively. The GOP conference did not allow this type of earmarking after they retook the majority in 2011.

When the GOP took control of the chamber again in 2011, the GOP Conference instituted a one-year ban on earmarks. This not only affected Republicans, but also Democrats in Congress. Thus, the policies of the majority party can impact representational personas as legislators had a harder time claiming credit for their allocation efforts.

Beyond this, the committees that members sit on, and the positions that legislators hold on committees also impact their policy dialog. Importantly, there appears to be a correlation between the particular issues that members address robustly, and the committees on which they sit. For example, Don Young, Jerry Costello, Mike Michaud and Mike Capuano all sat on the
Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; transportation issues were prominently discussed by each of these legislators.

Alternatively, Ken Calvert’s conversation on space policy dropped a great deal when he joined the Appropriations Committee and had to relinquish his spot on Science, Space and Technology. David Reichert’s dialog on homeland security dipped sharply after securing a seat on Ways and Means and thus no longer holding a spot on the Homeland Security Committee. Institutional factors prevent these legislators from sitting on prestige committees and constituent committees simultaneously.

Further, when a legislator ascends to a ranking member or a chair’s position, that member often addresses issues that their subcommittee or full committee oversees much more robustly than otherwise. Biggert’s dialog on finance policy escalated when she became the ranking member and then chair of a subcommittee on Financial Services. Even though Biggert sat on Financial Services throughout the entire program period, there was an uptick in her finance dialog once she assumed a subcommittee leadership position.

Beyond the issues that legislator’s address, holding a chair’s position often coincides with more nationally framed policy dialog on the particular area that the chair’s committee has jurisdiction. Don Young and Bill Young’s policy conversations were more nationally oriented than at other times while each chaired a full committee in Congress at the beginning of the program period, before presenting a more robust local emphasis. Even Jerry Costello, a legislator who is about as locally oriented as possible, became slightly more nationally oriented when he chaired the Aviation Subcommittee from 2007 to 2011.

It appears to me that the key word in that sentence is slightly. As I stated at the beginning of this section, most of the changes brought about by institutional factors were themselves not
wholesale alterations in the chief features of their home styles. Instead, they were marginal shifts.

This could suggest two things that are likely connected.

First, as conjectured in the writing above, perhaps there is a range of acceptable behaviors in which members of Congress feel that they are able to act. If that is the case, perhaps then we see the marginal changes that I speak of being carried out because of these institutional factors. Again, not one legislator in this study completely remade him or herself over the timeframe that this project took place due to being in the majority or holding a chair or ranking member post. It is simply that they marginally adjusted their home styles due to the new circumstances under which they operated. In doing so, it appeared that each legislator did not alienate or lose touch with his or her constituents.

In fact, as evidenced from every case study, each legislator in some way connected with his or her constituents in a variety of ways throughout the program period. Every legislator in this study engaged in at least one type of constituent-oriented activity in either a noticeable or extraordinarily robust degree. Even the most nationally oriented legislator, Paul Ryan, was routinely at home meeting with voters and hosted a plethora of town hall meetings. This is true even after holding major positions on the House Budget Committee.

Even if one might argue that some of these members should have practiced constituent-oriented activities more robustly - such as Ken Calvert or David Reichert – these legislators still regularly stressed their connection to constituents by concentrating on issues of local import perpetually. Calvert addressed water policy, defense concerns, and border issues throughout the program period after securing a seat on Appropriations. Reichert underscored environmental
policy throughout his tenure, even taking votes that Republicans would not normally take in order to stay connected with constituents, even after joining Ways and Means.

Judy Biggert’s focus on financial policy after assuming a subcommittee ranking member position on Financial Services illustrates her connection to constituents since there is a large finance sector in her Chicagoland district.

Don Young, while Chairman of Transportation and Infrastructure, made sure that his constituents received monumental numbers of earmarks for which he claimed credit and was very much revered. He even secured the money for the fabled “Bridge To Nowhere.”

After he was no longer able to secure earmarks after 2011, Don Young, one of the most senior members of the House, openly criticized the earmark ban arguing that it was bad for Alaska. He even went so far as to criticize his party leadership. For Young it was not a partisan issue; it was that he illustrated to constituents that he cared about Alaska more than partisan concerns. He was connected to voters when chair of a major committee, and connected to Alaska when his party openly hurt his constituents. His connection to those he represented never waivered, even if the amount of money he was able to secure plummeted due to institutional rules. Simply, his persona remained intact throughout. It is plausible that his Alaska constituents would expect nothing less.

Bill Young too, the longest serving GOP member at the time I began writing this dissertation, stayed connected to constituents throughout his tenure whether chairing the Appropriations Committee or not. When he was chair of the full committee, he brought home a monumental number of earmarks and protected a local military base. He also addressed defense and veterans’ issues in a district that cherishes those concerns consistently. In 2011, even after no longer being able to secure earmarks, he still illustrated his connection to constituents as the
chair of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. Thus, he still stayed connected to his
district by continuing to address issues of local import, even when he was the Dean of the
Republican delegation in the House. For Bill Young too, it was always about issues important to
those he represented, despite extreme seniority and other changing institutional factors.

Emanuel Cleaver too, who assumed the chairmanship of the Congressional Black Caucus
in 2011, immediately started stressing his local connection even more robustly than previously.
While he always engaged local and national issues, in order to reinsurance his constituents of his
dedication to their well-being, he stressed local concerns more than at other times in his tenure.
It is quite possible that his majority Caucasian district might have been troubled otherwise.

Simply, these examples illustrate that despite positions of prestige or length of tenure
fashioning certain aspects of their home styles, these legislators still worked hard to connect to
constituents. As such, even though institutional effects marginally fashioned their home styles,
they did not thoroughly transform the representational persona of any subject in this work.

Thus, majority party status, committee positions, and longevity - factors that are
institutional in nature - impact how members of Congress present themselves at home. Yet, they
do so marginally. As such, when studying home styles, researchers must look towards
institutional factors in Washington to understand certain aspects of congressional
representation. Yet, they must also take into consideration the wishes of constituents.

A Unique Home Style Project

Fenno and Friedman produced volumes that acquainted readers with thick descriptions of
the representational activities of around 30 legislators in total. Fenno’s goal in his research was
to establish that home styles exist and furnish readers with examples of contrasting
representational personas. He was most interested in the importance of constituency-centered research. Friedman argued that national factors that members of Congress contend with were more important during the time frame her monograph studied, in comparison to when Fenno penned his original home style volume.

My home style project, while building on these works, is different. Its primary goal is to assess if home styles are affected by electoral competition. Thus, it apportioned all legislators in this work into one of six categories based on underlying district partisanship and general election margins.

The methods utilized in my project also differ from Fenno’s and Friedman’s works. The dissertation allowed readers to assess the behaviors of legislators in two ways. First, the volume offered a cross-sectional analysis. Second, the project longitudinally assessed the behaviors of legislators over a ten-year period. No other home style work employed this methodology.

Thus, this monograph examined home styles at a single point in time and observed if representational images changed as a result of competitive circumstances. It set up a hard test for exploring if competition affects representational personas.

In doing so, this study produced 14 new and qualitatively rich case studies that add to our understanding of congressional behavior and chronicle a variety of factors that fashion that behavior. But also, the cases reveal the impact, or lack thereof, of competition on home styles. Thus, it tells the stories of federal legislators through competitive contexts.

As such, this project produced a different lens to study home styles, explored if competition affected representational personas, and added to our understanding of representation by furnishing readers with constituent-centered research on 14 members of the U.S. House.
Reconsidering The Local and National Question

Fenno’s original monograph illustrates that members of Congress were more locally oriented than otherwise. Friedman (2007) asserts that national factors are more important today than they were when Fenno penned his seminal 1978 work.

In many ways, my volume adds to our understanding of the national and local balance of a legislator’s home style. In particular, the project establishes a three-pronged approach to studying the presentation of local and national policy conversations. In doing so, it refines previous work on national and local home style elements.

First, the monograph accounts for instances that representatives illustrate the impact of national policy on their constituents. Second, it acknowledges the number of occasions when legislators frame policy in an entirely national lens. Finally, the dissertation accounts for the occurrences when a member of Congress discussed state policies or municipal ordinances. Thus, while this work does not necessarily account for the conditions under which a legislator frames policy in a particular manner, it provides readers with a framework for more precise analysis of how legislators address policy.

I have not seen other works differentiate the local and national nature of policy presentations in this manner. Therefore, my volume builds on both Friedman and Fenno as it further refines important questions they ask. It also clearly reveals the complexity of policy conversations.

Therefore, this volume adds to the literature in that it distinguishes different ways that legislators frame policy. This framework could certainly be used to engage in research projects that explore the conditions under which legislators frame policy in a particular manner and
therefore, study why policy is framed in a certain way. It provides scholars with signposts to code policy. Therefore, future scholarship can build off of this framework.

That said, my project illustrates that the nature of how a legislator may frame policy may be less important than the particular policy concerns that a representative addresses. Thus, I insist that a major contribution of this dissertation is illustrating that 13 of the 14 subjects concentrate on issues of local import throughout their careers. As such, even when members seem to be nationally oriented in their dialog, these legislators appear to be locally oriented to their constituents since they are addressing issues prominent in their districts. In other words, national and local elements of home styles are interconnected today.

This finding suggests that future researchers should also look beyond the ways a legislator frames policy. Instead, in order to understand why members of Congress discuss certain issues, scholars might consider exploring which policies are important to each legislator’s constituents.

More precisely, this project clearly reveals that issues important to constituents matter and appear to fashion the policy conversations of virtually every legislator in this study. This finding also suggests that this contribution explains the importance of qualitative research since large N studies would likely not account for the context taking place within each district.

Of all the complicated and rich home style traits under study in this dissertation, this is the feature that I hope to continue to explore as it, in my opinion, provides the most fruitful avenue for future research on congressional home styles. Not only might future researchers utilize the framework of the different ways that legislators frame policy, but the finding that issues important to constituents usually appear to fashion the policy conversations of U.S. Representatives also deserves more exploration. These are significant issues for representation.
I aim to explore both of these issues further by assessing the particular policies a larger sample of federal legislators highlights, and how those concerns are significant (or not) to constituents. Further, I plan to examine how legislators frame policy, utilizing the framework above, and compare those findings to the conclusions reached in this dissertation.

**Challenges**

Data Sources: Differences & Accuracy of Presentation

I endeavored to present the most robust features of each legislator’s image. This was not always an easy goal as newspaper sources may show a member of Congress at home regularly, while press releases do not. Thus, the foundations of the personas I present are found in an amalgamated analysis of every home style tool each subject employs. That said, I relied upon press releases and local newspapers the most heavily when assessing home styles. This is due to the large quantity of congressional activities that these mediums chronicled throughout the program period.

One may argue that newspapers do not accurately portray congressional activity, but are simply a function of how a reporter covers a legislator. While I concede that there may be a seed of truth in that statement, I do not believe that legislators are consistently misrepresented in the news media.

First, Gulati (2004 B) asserts that legislative home styles are largely consistent across mediums. Second, Grimmer (2013) notes that there is a connection between congressional press releases and newspaper stories. Thus, while there may not be a perfect harmony between the two, there is at least a connection.
Further, given that these legislators were known local brands, I insist that local news
sources do not consistently misrepresent members of Congress. While the first duty of a
newspaper is to the truth, I doubt that U.S. Representatives would stand idly by while they are
being misrepresented on a consistent basis.

Also, if legislators felt they were misrepresented, they had other tools at their disposal to
dispute local newspaper coverage. This is clearly not the case.

Therefore, I assert that my presentation of the home styles of these legislators is largely
accurate, and that these members utilize a variety of sources to present their personas to
constituents.

Three Wave Elections in a Row

One of the difficulties with choosing a sample was the high turnover in Congress from
2007 through 2011. In 2006 and 2008, a large number of Republican legislators retired or were
defeated in a general election. In 2010, many Democrats retired or were also defeated, including
a number initially elected in 2006 and 2008.

Therefore, while there was no shortage of subjects from category A (safe on both
measures), there were far fewer individuals in Congress in the other categories in office during
2011 who served more than one term. In fact, there were less than ten legislators who
represented competitive districts and consistently earned less than 60 percent of the vote.

As such, while I began this project prior to the 2010 election, my initial potential sample
dwindled rapidly following this race. That said, given these circumstances, with the exception of
legislators from the “always safe” category, I have a reasonably sized sample of members in
every other competitive circumstance that served more than one term.
Consequently, while this was a challenge that needs to be recognized, it did not hurt my project.

Further, these wave elections also provide an opportunity for more research. As Fleisher and Bond (2004) and Thomsen (2014) cited in Chapter 2 of this monograph reveal, comparing the behaviors of new members of Congress to those these legislators replaced has a tradition in scholarship. As such, since 2006 through 2010 was a time of great congressional turnover, but stability in district lines, if the supposition that constituents set the boundaries for what is an acceptable home style is accurate, there may be some likenesses in the behaviors between legislators and the members of Congress they replaced. In other words, what are the similarities and differences between newer U.S. Representatives and their predecessors, and can we attribute these similarities to cues given by constituents?

For example, take former Rep. Michael McMahon of New York, and the former member who replaced him, Rep. Michael Grimm. I clearly recall both legislators highlighting that they were the most centrist office holders in the chamber during their first terms, despite belonging to different parties. Did constituents from this district reject displays of strong partisanship and therefore signal to these members to do the same?

At the same time, regardless of this anecdotal evidence, given the polarization in American politics, is it reasonable to expect overlap between members of different parties more generally? The wave elections of 2006 through 2010 give scholars the opportunity to explore these questions.

Limits of the Work
This is a small N study. Therefore, while readers certainly learned lessons and gained an understanding of the home styles of 14 members of Congress, I concede that its applicability to other legislators, or the chamber, might be limited.

That said, we know of one area where my findings match those of a large N study. Grimmer et al. (2015) found that Republicans practiced allocation representation robustly prior to 2009. Beginning in 2009, with the advent of the Tea Party Movement, most Republicans greatly curtailed their allocation efforts. My work concurs with this finding. Thus, if my findings match those of a prominent scholar who conducted a large N study, perhaps the stories of the federal legislators in this project are more typical of the activities of members of Congress than some may have otherwise believed.

Even so, the work was conceived in order to start to ask questions about the impact of electoral competition, if any, on home styles. Its genesis came about to add to the sparse home style literature, examine competition using a novel methodology, and serve as a baseline for future research. I sought to add to scholarship by exploring a series of items debated in the literature. The project met these goals.

Therefore, first, due to Grimmer’s monograph on allocation activities, the findings of this work may be far from anecdotal. Second, and just as importantly, the results here serve as a baseline for future research.

“And So We Commence”

Fenno (1978) states, “when we speak of constituency careers, we speak primarily of the pursuit of re-election” (215). In that same chapter, the author also cited a sophomore legislator who observed “the first two years, I spent all of my time getting myself re-elected. That last two
years, I spent getting myself a district so that I could get re-elected” (215). Thus, in his home style work, Fenno underscores the importance of the re-election goal, and also, the significance of the constituency.

That said, it was a goal of the present work to enrich our understanding of how competitive circumstances taking place within a district impact the representational images of our federal legislators. Thus, it presumes that a connection exists between electoral competition and home styles. Consequently, it theorizes that important aspects of democracy are linked to important facets of representation.

More precisely, the dissertation assessed how federal legislators reacted to the changing cues constituents gave U.S. Representatives on Election Day.

First, it must be restated clearly that legislators did not wildly alter their home style personas due to changes in competitive circumstances. Thus, on the whole, the personas of members of Congress largely remained intact. Yet, that was not the whole story.

Findings also suggest that the level of competition that our federal representatives contend with may fashion aspects of how a U.S. Representative presents him or herself to constituents.

Perhaps most importantly, this is true in terms of presentation of partisanship. Without a doubt, the most partisan subjects all represent constituencies whose underlying district partisanship favors their own parties. Yet, oddly given this information, those whose election margins fluctuated, including subjects in competitive districts, presented themselves as most partisan during their most competitive periods.

Thus, on the one hand, a district that strongly favors one party appears to be linked to a member of Congress robustly presenting partisan sentiments. On the other hand, for the other
subjects in this study whose districts are more marginal in terms of underlying district partisanship, an increase in the difficulty of winning re-election appears to cause an uptick in the presentation of partisan rhetoric.

That said, again illustrating the constituent-representative connection, the case studies have shown that each legislator in this study focuses on constituents in some manner. They may stress local issues, emphasize allocation efforts, or present themselves at home regularly. As Fenno stated in his 2013 work, each member of Congress “appeared to ‘fit’ his or her constituency reasonably well…and each adopted a pattern of political activity responsive to that particular place” (2013, 229). Thus, as might not be surprising, legislators do pay attention to their constituents. They spend a great deal of time building support through their home styles and slightly modifying their representational images as they feel is necessary to keep this connection strong.

Thus, to end this work, I assert that constituents matter. The opinions that voters make known through elections fashion home styles, even if marginally, and therefore, representation. Surely, this is healthy for the workings of a strong democracy.

**POSTSCRIPT**

Several elections passed since I began collecting data in April of 2011. I thought it helpful to update readers on the careers and lives of the legislators presented in this work.

As to the representatives considered in Chapter 4, Steve Scalise rose to the powerful position of Majority Whip, making him the third most powerful Republican in the House. Mike Capuano still represents his district in Congress.
Jean Schmidt, chronicled in Chapter 5, was finally defeated in a GOP primary election in 2012 and has left the chamber.

In Chapter 6, Don Young, Mike McCaul and Emanuel Cleaver still represent their districts in Congress. Notably, McCaul assumed the chairmanship of the full Homeland Security Committee in 2013.

Only Ken Calvert is still in Congress out of the three legislators presented in Chapter 7. He shed the Orange County side of his district, and represents a constituency focused in his native Riverside County. Judy Biggert was defeated for re-election in 2012 after a comprehensive redistricting that favored Democrats. Mike Michaud gave up his seat in the House in 2014 in order to unsuccessfully seek Maine’s governorship in a three-way election.

Paul Ryan, chronicled in Chapter 8, still represents Wisconsin in Congress. He was re-elected to the House in 2012, as Wisconsin law allows legislators to seek re-election and the Vice Presidency simultaneously. After rising to national prominence as a Vice Presidential nominee, Ryan continued to serve as the Budget Committee Chair through 2014. In January of 2015, he took over as the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. He was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives after John Boehner’s resignation in October of 2015.

Regarding the other legislators in Chapter 8, C.W. Bill Young died in office in October of 2013. Jerry Costello retired from the House at the 2012 General Election.

Finally, as to the legislators covered in Chapter 9, Larry Kissell lost re-election in 2012 after lines were redrawn by the North Carolina Legislature to favor Republicans. David Reichert is still in Congress, representing a district somewhat friendlier to the GOP. He has yet to win 60 percent of the vote, but came just shy of this measure in 2014. Interestingly, his 2010 opponent,
Suzan Del Bene now represents Washington’s First District in Congress. She defeated Darcy Burner, Reichert’s opponent in 2006 and 2008, in a primary.
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Newspaper Citations By Chapter:

Chapter 1
The Hartford Courant
11-5-08. Courtney Re-Elected to Congress by Wide Margin
The Michigan Daily

Chapter 4
Rep. Steve Scalise Newspaper Citations

New Orleans Times-Picayune
2-12-08. GOP Ready to Reward Patient Steve.
3-1-08. 1st District Rivals Follow Familiar Paths at Forum; it’s the Last Big Clash Before March 8 Vote.
5-4-08. Scalise Easily Takes 1st District; GOP Controls Seat it Has Held for Decades.
5-25-08. On the Hill; News from the Louisiana Delegation in the Nation's Capital.
6-14-08. Reagan Takes up Residence in Town; Also: Scalise Holding Town Meeting in Mandeville; Hamauei to Meet with Constituents; GOP Club to Host Annual Dinner.
7-3-08. Supply is Key to Easing Fuel Woes, Scalise Says; He Backs Increasing Offshore Drilling.
8-16-08. Rivals Vie to Unseat Scalise; 2 Demos Seeking Shot at 1st House District.
8-17-08. On the Hill; News from the Louisiana Delegation in the Nation's Capital.
9-5-08. Tammany, Tangipahoa Now on FEMA List; Individuals Can File for Grants, Loans.
9-19-08. FEMA Allows Gustav Aid for Parish; Cleanup Costs Can Now be Reimbursed.
10-26-08. Contrasts Define Race for Congress; Harlan, Scalise Offer 1st District Option.
1-7-09. Hospitals Will Get Financial Lifeline; $130 Million Slated for Providers in State.
1-9-09. Cao Learns Which Panels He'll Get; Boustany Takes Spot on Ways and Means.
1-18-09. On the Hill; News from the Louisiana Delegation in the Nation's Capital.
5-3-09. Entergy Pushing Emissions Cap Bill; Most Utilities Oppose Climate Measure.
10-14-09. Not So Fast.
10-14-09 B. Anti-Terrorism Bill Tightens Chemical Plant Regulations; it Would Require Safer Materials, Technologies
10-15-09. President Visits Today; School, Town Hall on Short N.O. Agenda.
2-21-10. Conservative Steve Scalise Making Mark; Congressman Known for Sharp Rhetoric.
5-17-09. Senator Asks Congress to Share Oil Revenues; Spill Shows Gulf States Bear Risks, She Says.

6.5.10. Scalise Sets Public Meeting
6-7-10. Raising Liability Cap Becomes Partisan Issue; but There is One Consensus: it’s Too Low Now.
6-16-10. Drilling Critics Hammer at Oil Execs Over Spill Emergency Plans; but Moratorium Foes Press for Relief.
6-30-10. Scalise Says Money for Gulf Trip Denied; Tour of Spill's Effects “Not Eligible.”
7-10-10. Last-Day Rush Gives Vitter Full Slate of Senate Rivals.
7-23-10. House Proposal Cuts $400 Million from Road Home; La. Lawmakers Vow to Restore Money.
9-24-10. Scalise Hails GOP Plan; Cao Has Concerns; La. Candidates Weigh in on Pledge.
12-1-10. Broad Drilling Overhaul Sputters; Senate Instead Tries to Pass “Narrow Bill.”
1-6-11. Political Opposites Have Plenty in Common.

Michael Capuano Newspaper Citations

Boston Globe
2-13-03. Capuano Asks Us to Investigate $1.6b in Construction Overruns.
4-15-03. Baby Talk for Lockhart and Lin; Beach Boy is Bound for Boston.
7-30-03. Dreamin' Season for Democrats.
2-8-04. Capuano Has One Eye on Beacon Hill
12-26-04. “City Guy” Weighs State Run.
1-8-05. Capuano Won't Run for Governor, Raising Questions on Party Unity.
5-1-05. 300 Into the Mystic.
5-4-05. Democrats Expected to Back Gay Marriage.
11-3-05. FAA is Set to Improve Ground Radar at Logan.
4-29-06. UN Cuts Darfur Food Aid in Half, Saying it Lacks Funds.
1-1-06. Mass. Democrats Eye Power Grab; Poised for Key House Posts if Party Prevails.
5-6-07. Bush Winning the Political War.
5-8-08. Citizens Sue FAA Over Air Traffic.
10-3-09. The State Senate Hopefuls Try for Edge in Face-Off.
11-3-09. Capuano's Pitch as Insider Has Benefit, Risk; Use of US Funds May Be Key Issue.

2-10-10. With D.C. in Drifts, Some Lawmakers Dig in at Home; House Shuttered as Another
          Storm Batters Capital. Senators Prove Hardier Bunch.

6-28-10. Capuano Gets Transportation Seat.

7-12-10. Uneven Response on House Earmarks; Delegation Varies in Visibility of Data.

Chapter 5
Jean Schmidt Newspaper Articles

Cincinnati Enquirer

5-15-05. 2nd District Candidates.
5-18-05. Rural Counties Wield Clout in Race to Replace Portman.
5-29-05. On Road to Congress, Integrity Still Matters.
6-3-05. Candidates in 2nd District Heed “Values.”
6-12-05. Eleven Choices - and No One's Perfect.
7-5-05. Candidates Run Hard for Voters' Attention.
7-11-05. Schmidt Rents Private Jet.
7-27-05. Hackett Paints Schmidt as a Taft “Rubber Stamp.”
8-3-05. Schmidt Wins Tight Race.
8-3-05 B. Closeness of Race a Surprise.
8-7-06. Schmidt Win is Not Assured, Dems Promise.
8-15-05. Whole Lot of Talk on Gas Pains.
10-29-05. Pediatrician Honored for His Work With Youth Initiative.
12-5-05. Ex-Opponent Jabs Schmidt on Tax Fight.
12-14-05. The Speech' Haunts Schmidt.
1-4-06. News Briefs.
3-16-06. Banks at Top of List for Funds.
4-16-06. McEwen's Residency an Issue.
4-20-06. Debaters Display Mutual Disdain.
4-26-06. Schmidt Sues to Bar McEwen from Voting.
4-28-06. Vote Board Reprimands Schmidt.
5-4-06. Democrats Shift Focus, Target 3 in Congress.
7-3-06. Wulsin Starts 2nd District Campaign With a 'Cut and Run' Jab at Schmidt.
8-10-06. Schmidt's New SUV Can Use Ethanol.
10-12-06. Adwatch/Strange Ideas.
10-27-06. Down 'N' Dirty, Schmidt Calls Wulsin “Liberal.”
10-29-06. Re-Elect Schmidt.
11-30-06. Piketon on List for Nuclear-Recycling Plant.
2-5-07. Lawmakers Have Ideas on Budget.

2-13-11. Assembly Square Station Gets Go-Ahead, Lifting Hopes for Redevelopment of Site
          Into a Riverfront Complex MBTA Approves $22m for Green Line Extension, Crosses
          Fingers for US Funding.

11-12-10. Bay State Could Lose $200m in Funding; House GOP Leaders, Obama Target
          Earmarks.

2-13-11. Assembly Square Station Gets Go-Ahead, Lifting Hopes for Redevelopment of Site
          Into a Riverfront Complex MBTA Approves $22m for Green Line Extension, Crosses
          Fingers for US Funding.

Chapter 5
Jean Schmidt Newspaper Articles

Cincinnati Enquirer

5-15-05. 2nd District Candidates.
5-18-05. Rural Counties Wield Clout in Race to Replace Portman.
5-29-05. On Road to Congress, Integrity Still Matters.
6-3-05. Candidates in 2nd District Heed “Values.”
6-12-05. Eleven Choices - and No One's Perfect.
7-5-05. Candidates Run Hard for Voters' Attention.
7-11-05. Schmidt Rents Private Jet.
7-27-05. Hackett Paints Schmidt as a Taft “Rubber Stamp.”
8-3-05. Schmidt Wins Tight Race.
8-3-05 B. Closeness of Race a Surprise.
8-7-06. Schmidt Win is Not Assured, Dems Promise.
8-21-05. Whole Lot of Talk on Gas Pains.
10-29-05. Pediatrician Honored for His Work With Youth Initiative.
12-5-05. Ex-Opponent Jabs Schmidt on Tax Fight.
12-14-05. The Speech' Haunts Schmidt.
1-4-06. News Briefs.
3-16-06. Banks at Top of List for Funds.
4-16-06. McEwen's Residency an Issue.
4-20-06. Debaters Display Mutual Disdain.
4-26-06. Schmidt Sues to Bar McEwen from Voting.
4-28-06. Vote Board Reprimands Schmidt.
5-4-06. Democrats Shift Focus, Target 3 in Congress.
7-3-06. Wulsin Starts 2nd District Campaign With a 'Cut and Run' Jab at Schmidt.
8-10-06. Schmidt's New SUV Can Use Ethanol.
10-12-06. Adwatch/Strange Ideas.
10-27-06. Down 'N' Dirty, Schmidt Calls Wulsin “Liberal.”
10-29-06. Re-Elect Schmidt.
11-30-06. Piketon on List for Nuclear-Recycling Plant.
2-5-07. Lawmakers Have Ideas on Budget.

2-13-11. Assembly Square Station Gets Go-Ahead, Lifting Hopes for Redevelopment of Site
          Into a Riverfront Complex MBTA Approves $22m for Green Line Extension, Crosses
          Fingers for US Funding.

11-12-10. Bay State Could Lose $200m in Funding; House GOP Leaders, Obama Target
          Earmarks.

2-13-11. Assembly Square Station Gets Go-Ahead, Lifting Hopes for Redevelopment of Site
          Into a Riverfront Complex MBTA Approves $22m for Green Line Extension, Crosses
          Fingers for US Funding.
1-11-07. Gov. Fletcher a Key Target of Democrats.
3-21-07. Hospital Not That Bad, Schmidt Says.
6-8-07. NKY Keep it Brief.
6-12-07. Schmidt: I-75 Bridge Money is up in Air.
7-22-07. Hamilton & Clermont Counties.
9-24-07. Schmidt's Airline-Delay Bill Passes.
1-20-08. Steve Black Gets Debate With Wulsin.
2-24-08. Schmidt Faces Two GOP Challengers.
7-19-08. Dem Files Ethics Complaint on Schmidt.
9-3-08. 3rd Candidate Makes Waves in 2nd.
10-4-08. Schmidt Changes Bailout Vote to Yes.
10-21-08. Democrats Put Money on Wulsin.
1-29-09. Local GOP Reps All Vote No.
3-6-09. Chabot Out, but Not Projects.
6-21-09. Kilburn Comfortable Making Waves.
10-10-09. Nuclear Plant Would Cost $10B.
10-16-09. GOP Commissioner Will Challenge Schmidt.
10-12-08. U.S. Rep Jean Schmidt is Hit by Car While Jogging.
10-31-08. Aiming High Requires Turner, Wulsin, Neuhardt
4-25-09. Bill Follows Stimulus Rejection; Proposal Would Let Communities Refusing Funds to Send That Money Back to Treasury.
6-17-09. Nuclear Power Plant in Works; Piketon Project Could Bring 4,000 Jobs to State, but Process Will be Drawn Out.
1-5-10. Turner, Austria, Boehner and Schmidt Win Easily.
4-30-10. They Will Just Not Leave Poor Jean Schmidt Alone.

Chapter 6
Rep. Don Young Newspaper Citations

Anchorage Daily News
5-15-02 B. Young Slides Road Construction Bill Through House; Highways: Congressman Leads Fight to Pass the $4.4 Billion Measure.
1-23-03. Alaska Digest.
2-5-03. Voice of the Times.
3-10-03. Opinion.
4-11-03. ANWR to Stay in House Energy Bill.
4-12-03. House Passes Bill Including ANWR.
7-2-03. Young to Run Again for House; 17th Term: Hard "If Not Impossible" to Beat Him, One Rival Says.
7-24-03. Dam Plan May Get 2nd Look; Susitna River: Young Seeks Feasibility Study for Massive Project.
10-9-03. Support Effort to Weaken Patriot Act; Compass: Points of View from the Community.
4-3-04. House Says Yes to Transportation Bill; $ 275 Billion: Young; Nails Biggest Earmarks for Alaska Projects.
8-5-04. Work is Now Under Way on $13 Million Port Mackenzie Expansion Project; Busy Crews: Workers on the Job Around the Clock in an Effort to Finish the Project This Year.
10-6-04. Tax Incentives Make Gas Line Bill; the Right Stuff? State's GOP Delegation Can't Deliver All That Oil Companies Need.
2-18-05. Young Says Transportation Bill Will Include $2.1 Billion for Alaska; Plans: Congressman Seeks Money for Bridges, New Road, Congestion.
3-17-05. Voice of the Times; Stevens, Murkowski Score Big With . . . ANWR Win.
11-9-05. ANWR a Hitch in House Budget; Vote: Young Upbeat, Won't "Jump Off of a Bridge If We Don't Win."
1-26-06. Young Linked to Abramoff's Tribal Clients.
2-2-06. Young and Abramoff.
2-6-06. Birthday Protest Turns on Stevens.
10-1-06. Supporters Substitute for Money; Diane Benson: She's Got Way, Way Less Funding Than Her Opponent, Rep. Don Young.
11-8-06. Young Amasses Solid Lead to Hold His U.S. House Seat; Incumbent Strength: Alaska's Lone Representative Touted Seniority and Enjoyed a Big Fund-Raising Lead.
2-1-07. Alaska Delegation Favors Increase to Minimum Wage; Congress: the Senate Wants Tax Credits for Small Businesses.
4-25-07. Former Young Aide Pleads Guilty in Corruption Case; Abramoff Scandal: Alaska Congressman Was Not Implicated or Named During Court Hearing.
6-8-07. Coconut Road Deal More Recycled News, Young Says; Denies Tradeoffs: He Says Senior Congressmen on Powerful Committees Just Get More Money.
6-29-07. Democrats Ready Young Attack Ads; Voting: Radio Spots to Question His Military Voting Record.
7-19-07. Threats to Native Program Unleash Young's Fury; 'My Money': Congressman Tells New Jersey Republican, "Those That Bite Me Will be Bitten Back."
7-26-07. Ethics Complaint Targets Murkowski Land Deal; Profitable Purchase: Group Says She Got Special Treatment.
9-26-07. Californian Files Bill to End Alaska Aerial Wolf Control; Don Young is Fired Up: Congressman Often at Odds With U.S. Rep. George Miller.
9-27-07. Insuring Kids Don Young is Surprise Yea; President Bush is Question Mark.
1-13-08. Young in the Race of His Life; Stiff Competition: He'll be Campaigning in Alaska Every Month.
1-24-08. Young Warns Against Halting Chukchi Leases.
3-15-08. Palin Backs Candidate Who Shocked GOP Convention.
5-17-08. Four Candidates, Minus Young, Greet Council; Run for House: Scheduling Conflict Keeps Incumbent Away.
6-7-08. Parnell Cultivates Support from Right; Young's Primary Rival: Club for Growth Endorses Him; Backing Means Money.
6-12-08. Parnell Aims to Restore Public Trust; Problems With Young: Lieutenant Governor Thinks Incumbent is Out of Touch.
7-18-08. What's Hot @Adn.Com.
8-10-08. Donors Wait Out House Primary; GOP: Many Big Alaska Contributors Hold Back as Outsiders Fund Race.
8-24-08. Young Fires up House Primary; Energized: He Calls Challenger Sean Parnell "Incompetent."
10-7-08. House Hopefuls Tangle Onstage; First Debate: Berkowitz and Young Duke it Out on ANWR, Palin and Bailout.
10-17-08. Berkowitz, Young Clash Over Incumbent's Style; Debate: Republican is a Bully or Man Who Stands up for the State.
12-11-08. Young Votes for Bailout.
6-17-09. Alaskans Defend Native Contracts; Senate: Oversight Committee Cites Benefits, but Also Chance of Abuse.
12-2-09. NOAA Proposes Critical Habitat for Inlet Belugas.
2-8-10. Alaska Digest.
3-23-10. Young to Seek Earmarks in Defiance of GOP's 1-Year Ban.
3-16-10. The Surprising Friendship of Don Young and Anh Cao.
3-22-10. Alaska's Young Votes No, Calling Health Bill “Gobbledygook.”
5-16-10. Former ACS Executive Takes on 18-Term Young; GOP Primary: Yale Law School Grad, 47, Focuses on Earmarks.
8-5-10. Federal Prosecutors Drop Young Case.
8-22-10. Long-Shot Fisher Challenges Young in Primary.
11-22-10. Alaska Moving Into New Era as Federal Earmarking Fades Begich Favors Vetting; Murkowski Sees Need; Young Defied Ban.
12-1-10. Murkowski and Begich Join Vote Against Eliminating Earmarks ‘Gateway Drug’: Alaska Still Has Need for Money, They Say.
12-7-10. Battle Over Arctic Alaska Refuge Heats up Again in Washington.
1-29-11. Dealmaker Will Pull No Punches in 20th Term.
2-17-11. Airfare Subsidies Threatened, but Alaska's May Survive Essential: Senate Could Vote Today on Cutting Program That Serves Rural Communities.

Rep. Mike McCaul Newspaper Citations
Austin American Statesman
6-21-04. McCaul Hoping to be a Leader in Congress; Likely Representative of Redrawn District 10 Making Rounds in D.C.
10-17-04. Congress.
1-8-05. McCaul, Cuellar on Preferred Committees.
7-23-05. House Shoots for Moon in NASA Bill; Legislation Calls for More Space Money, Supports Mars Plan
4-12-06. Radnofsky Waltzes Past Kelly for Senate Race.
4-16-06. Austin-Area Lawmakers' Views Vary on Reform.
10-20-06. Redrawn Maps Affect Races.
4-29-07. As a Republican in Austin, McCaul Knows All About Diplomacy.
5-3-07. McCaul Gains Challenger for U.S. House Position.
6-7-07. GOP Leaders Reluctant to Push Iraq Bill.
12-17-07. Local Lawmakers Diverge on Climate Change.
12-21-07. Lawmakers Tout 'Earmarks' Going to Area Projects.
1-8-08. Literary Calendar.
3-5-08. Doherty Captures District 10 Nod, Now to Take on McCaul.
3-6-08. Democrat Doherty Takes Aim at GOP Incumbent McCaul.
5-26-08. Green Politics Can Be Tricky for McCaul.
10-21-08. Candidates Look Out for Area's Interests.
6-2-10. Portable EMP Devices Can Stop Trouble in Its Tracks... in a Flash
10-3-10. Police Seek Cash for Copters.
3-24-11. McCaul: Missed Chance to 'Take Out' Gadhafi.

_Houston Chronicle_
10-17-04. The Chronicle Endorses Candidates in Houston-Area Races for the House of Representatives.
5-1-05. Delegation Watch; Quotable Fun on Cornyn's Web Site; Interactive Item Invites Browsers to Guess Which Senators Said What.
6-5-05. Delegation Watch; Texans in D.C. Try to Scoop up Blue Bell; the Lawmakers Pitch a 'Free-Trade' Plan to Bring the Popular Ice Cream to Nation's Capital.
12-17-05. Focus on Immigration; House Near Vote on Narrow Bill That Targets Enforcement Only; Measure Allows for Tighter Borders and Higher Fines for Employers.
1-26-06. Tomball Leaders Have Eye on Hooks Airport; Plans to Buy Moving Forward Despite Lengthy Timeline.
5-7-06. Delegation Watch; Freshman Representative Made Part of GOP Whip Team; McCaul Is Also Chairman of a New Homeland Security Subcommittee.
7-1-07. Local GOP on the Hill Push Own Spending Wish Lists; Paul, Culberson Defend Earmarks for Area Projects.
9-3-07. One Costly Lesson in State Politics.
3-25-08. Lawmaker, Opponent Swear Off Earmarks; McCaul's Foe in Fragile House Bid Skeptical of Move but Agrees to Also Forgo Spending.
3-26-08. Quibbling; Earmarks or No Earmarks, the Pressing Problem Is Uncontrolled Federal Spending.
6-26-08. Obama to Bring Campaign Fight, Funding to Texas; Democrat Hopes to at Least Drive up Turnout and Influence Local Contests.
7-2-08. Funds to Aid Mexico Facing Delay; Plan to Deliver $400 Million in Anti-Drug Fight Not Yet Developed.
3-5-09. GAO Says NASA Projects Are Too Long, Too Costly Agency Says Complex Missions Hard to Estimate.
9-3-09. Health Care Congressman Calls Town Hall.
9-10-09. Democratic Health-Care Reform Opponents Speak Out Hundreds Attend Town-Hall Meeting in Katy.
9-17-09. Cy-Fair Leaders Discuss Transit Options Funding Remains a Problem for U.S. 290 Project.
11-5-09. GOP Lawmakers Rap Federal 'Control' Medical Center Will Suffer Under Overhaul, They Say.
11-7-09. Rampage at Fort Hood Profile Depth of Suspect's Troubles Hidden New Details of Hasan's Life Reveal Conflicts Hasan: “Did Not Come Across As an Angry Person.”
4-26-10. Earmarks: Texas Gets Its Share Hutchison Got $1.2 Billion; Area Lawmakers Asked for $322 Million Earmarks: 4 Texans Sought $0.00.

**Rep. Emanuel Cleaver Newspaper Citations**

*Kansas City Star*

5-28-04. 5th District Hopefuls Disclose Finances.
6-25-04. Cleaver Took HUD Job After Leaving Mayor's Post.
6-25-04. B. Cleaver Stresses Creation of Jobs.
10-23-04. 5th District Race Gets Personal.
10-24-04. Missouri's 5th District Race Tightens.
10-26-04. Money Isn't Only Problem for Cleaver.
11-4-04. Deciphering Meaning of Election Day in KC.
11-4-04. B. Cleaver Wants to Work for Political Civility.
2-3-05. What KC Area Members of Congress Had to Say.
2-13-05. 'Curse of Covenant' Persists - Restrictive Rules, While Unenforceable, Have Lingering Legacy.
2-19-05. Area Mayors Decry Potential Grant Cuts.
3-12-05. Critics Assail Cuts in Federal Grants.
7-13-05. Racist Covenant Language Must Go.
7-29-05. Area Reaps Billions for Road Work.
12-18-05. Cleaver Plays it Low-Key.
1-25-06. Metropolitan Digest.
5-12-06. Cleaver Wants Congressional Fuel Efficiency.
7-17-06. Cleaver at Odds With Other Clergy, Other Lawmakers - the Congressman, a Minister, Opposes Amending Constitution to Bar Gay Marriages.

10-23-06. Is Light Rail on Its Last Run? - Chastain and His Critics Agree That the Nov. 7 Ballot Proposal Could Be KC's Final Chance.

10-24-06. Skelton, Cleaver Deserve Re-Election.

3-28-07. In a National Pulpit, Cleaver to Preach on Global Warming Congressman Will Reach Out to Religious Leaders on Subject of Protecting Earth.


8-11-07. Lawmakers Are at Odds Over Fuel Efficiency Targets.

8-29-07. National Archives Formally Announces Plan to Relocate Branch Near Union Station.


9-10-07. Cleaver Finds Himself at Odds With Black Clergy As He Defends Fellow Congressman.

11-12-07. Water Resources Bill Includes Upgrades to Kansas City Area Levees.

4-2-08. Greenest Politician: Emanuel Cleaver.

4-6-08. In Surprise Announcement, Cleaver Tells His Church He Will Step Down As Senior Pastor.

5-28-08. Cleaver Meeting to Focus on Foreclosures.

6-11-08. The Buzz: Writer, on the Storm.

8-29-08. Conventional Buzz: Behold, the Full Cleaver.

10-5-08. Roundtable Discussion on Race in Politics in Missouri.

2-10-09. Economic Stimulus Package: Worthwhile or Waste?

10-13-09. Jackson County Executive Unveils Plan for a Regional Commuter Rail System.

4-27-10. EPA to Reassess Hazards at Bannister Federal Complex.

5-1-10. The Rev. Robert Lee Hill to Be Honored Sunday.

9-8-10. Doubts Surround a Green Dream for KC.

10-20-10. Three Challengers Seek to Topple Cleaver in 5th District.

10-8-10. Agency Skewered in Report on Toxic Contamination at Bannister Complex.

1-23-11. Two Reports Look at Beryllium Contamination at Bannister Complex.

3-24-11. Federal Grant to Coordinate Work on Corridors.

Chapter 7

Rep. Mike Michaud Newspaper Citations

Bangor Daily News

5-13-02. Michael Michaud; State Senator Boats Union Support in Crowded Congressional Race.

5-22-02. 2nd District Candidates Talk Issues, Differences; in a Meeting With the Paper's Editorial Board, the Six Democrats Stress Their Experience and Priorities.

7-5-02. 2nd District Champion to Take Long Road to D.C.; Raye, Michaud Fans Look to End Hometown Drought.


10-2-02. Rivals Don't Wait for Debate; Michaud Blasts New GOP Ads.
10-28-02. Mike Michaud; Rural Roots Frame Candidate's D.C. Bid.
12-13-02. Michaud: Transportation Key to Economy.
1-25-03. Valley Favorite Michaud Addresses Chamber.
1-12-04. Economy's Ills Beyond NAFTA.
1-22-04. City May Stop Wastewater from Eastern; Mill's 9-Month Payment Hiatus Has Brewer Officials Frustrated.
3-16-04. Spaghetti Dinner to Aid Millworkers.
9-7-04. Labor Leaders See Workers Repeat Old Struggles.
2-14-06. Michaud Sets Hours in Corinna, Dixmont.
3-11-06. Lisbon's D'Amboise Announces GOP Bid for 2nd District Seat.
4-19-06. Presque Isle Man Receives Belated War Medals.
5-15-06. EMMC, Husson Graduates Widely Diverse.
7-5-06. Celebrating, Honoring Independence; Bangor's Fourth Belongs to Veterans.
3-28-08. IRS Reminds Seniors to File for Tax Rebate.
4-22-08. Veterans Speak Out at Hearing on Health Services.
4-13-08. Relishing a Bully Pulpit Meet John Frary - Professor, Lover of Quips and Candidate for Congress; the GOP Candidate Wasn't Running Until a Reporter E-Mailed and Asked Who Was.
10-17-08. Palin Rallies 5,000 in Bangor; Maverick from Alaska Delivers Folksy GOP Message.
4-29-09. UMPI to Celebrate Centennial Commencement.
10-9-09. Millinocket Oks $625,000 Trial; Council Votes 6-0 in Favor of Deal With DOT for Walking, Biking Path.
4-23-10. Veteran of Three Wars Honored at Party.
5-15-10. Republican Candidate Launches New Website
6-28-10. Awful Good Whoopie Pies Draw 3,500 to Dover-Foxcroft; from Peanut-Butter-Filled to Mint; Sweet Treats Pass Lip-Smacking Test.
7-26-10. Helping Veterans.
4-9-11. Mill Closes After Talks Come to End; Buyer: Slow Pace Doomed Sale.
Portland Press Herald
10-17-02. Candidates Stress Their Differences; but 2nd District Hopefuls Michael Michaud (D) and Kevin Raye (R) Both Point to Their Political Experience.
6-8-03. National GOP to Target Michaud in 2004.
9-15-03. Iraq, Economic Policies Will Pay Off, Bush Says; the President Meets With Regional Reporters to Promote Tax Cuts and His Spending Plan for Iraq.
4-17-04. Members of Congress, Lend Me Your Earmarks.
9-14-04. Michaud Gets Endorsement of Sportsman's Alliance.
10-3-04. Job Creation's the Focus of Hamel's Campaign; the GOP Challenger Who Helped Revitalize Loring Describes Himself As a 'Professional Job Recruiter.'
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1-16-05. IFW Funding Crisis So Dire, Sunday Hunting May Come to Pass.
10-22-06. Michael Michaud Best for 2nd District; the Former Millworker Makes it Clear He Always Has His Constituency in Mind.
3-13-08. One-Year Ban on Earmarks Debated; Two of Maine's Lawmakers Oppose the Idea Because it Would Block Earmarks 'No Matter How Valuable.'
9-26-10. Michaud Facing Challenge from Levesque; There Are Indications That the Congressman May Be in for His Toughest Political Fight Since He Succeeded John Baldacci.
10-3-10. The 2nd District: Democratic Incumbent Mike Michaud Mike Michaud Still Leads in the Latest Survey, but His GOP Challenger Is Narrowing the Gap.
10-22-10. Michaud, Levesque Field Questions; the Two Candidates for Maine's 2nd District Meet With Maine today Media's Endorsement Board.
10-30-10. GOP Congressional Challengers Gaining.
Rep. Judy Biggert Newspaper Citations

Chicago Daily Herald
7-24-02. President Makes Impression on Naperville Men.
3-27-04. I-55 Slated for Funding.
4-13-04. Parker Honored Yet Again.
4-17-04. Dillard Sets New Agenda for DuPage GOP.
10-25-04. Rivals Focus on Domestic Issues.
10-27-04. 13th Congressional District.
5-7-05. Science Plays Nanosecond Fiddle Politics Dog Blagojevich at Argonne Event.
10-24-05. Two Big League Tech Players Worth Knowing.
3-22-06. Biggert to Face Democrat Shannon in the Fall.
10-12-06. Foley Scandal Draws Focus to 13th District Race.
10-28-06. A Twist in the Stem-Cell Debate in the 13th District, the Democrat Opposes Research Using Embryos.
2-8-07. How the Midwest Figures Into Global Warming.
8-24-07. Naperville Native Plans to Take on Biggert.
1-25-08. Candidates Differ on Health Care Ideas.
1-27-08. Hopefuls Offer up Ideas to Aid Economy.
2-22-08. County Schools Get Fitness Funds.
10-23-08. TV Debate Draws Out Candidates.
2-6-09. LaHood Outlines Illinois' Gains from Stimulus Bill.
7-18-09. Ms. Independent.
9-11-09. Suburban GOP Unmoved by Speech Area Lawmakers Say Obama Isn't Addressing Their Issues.
10-10-09. Jobless Numbers Bring Out Political Differences on Economy.
1-28-10. What Your Lawmakers Want to Happen Next.
2-19-11. Lawmakers Kill Plan to Close Canal Due to Carp.
4-21-11. Biggert Eases Seniors' Fears.

Chicago Sun Times
10-14-04. Feds Kick in $6.8 Million to Keep Out Asian Carp; Electrified Barrier to Stop Fish from Making it to Lake.
4-28-06. Hastert Yields to Pressure from GOP Moderates, Panel Members

Chicago Tribune
5-17-05. Bill to Lift Stem Cell Limits Set to Pass House, Illinois Republicans Say.

Rep. Ken Calvert Newspaper Citations

Daily News of Los Angeles
9-22-05. GAO: Identity Fraud Rampant; Feds Failing to Provide Verifiable Papers

Inland Valley Daily Bulletin
5-10-07. Calvert's Appointment Creates Concern.
1-20-09. Local Lawmakers React to Inauguration Speech
6-20-09. Democratic Group Targets Republican Congressional Districts.

Long Beach Press-Telegram
5-22-03. $400B Bill for Defense Passes.

Orange County Register
1-19-04. War Takes Toll on Agendas; O.C. Congressional Members See Some Legislative Goals Fall by Wayside, but Gain Satisfaction from Committee and Other Work.
11-30-04. City to Learn More About Its Dwindling Beaches; San Clemente Gets $178,000 Federal Appropriation for Study of Sand Here.
2-23-05. Ready to Tackle Issues.
7-26-05. Space Chairman Says NASA Still Important; Calvert Expects Mars Mission to Provide Jobs in This Region.
2-17-06. Full Funding Urged for NASA; at Space Agency's Budget Hearing, Lawmakers Emphasize Need to Keep up With Competing Nations.
2-17-07. Iraq Vote Splits County.
2-20-07. Our Town.
2-8-08. Toll Road Reaction; San Clementeans Weigh in on Decision.
7-18-08. Local Energy Bills Lack Bipartisan Support; Measures on Drilling and Solar Panels Will Likely Stall Throughout This Year.
10-27-08. O.C. Political Don Quixotes Battle House Incumbents; Congress Members Have More Money, Experience and People from Their Party Voting Nov. 4.
5-3-09. Party Gap Stands Out at Local Polls.
10-17-09. Incumbents Lead 2010 Fundraising.
7-4-10. Tea Party Activists Rally.
8-1-10. Time to Fund War Strategy Shift.
*OC Weekly*
10-25-07. OC's Scariest People; Our Congressional Delegation Tops This Year's List of 33 Villains.
*San Bernardino County Sun*
9-26-02. Dems Rally at Local Level; Governor's Wife Defends Energy Crisis, Criticizes Bush.
9-23-09. Two Inland Empire Lawmakers Among '15 Worst,' Watchdog Group Says.
10-17-09. Crime and Public Safety, October 18.
*The Press Enterprise*

**Chapter 8**
*Rep. C.W. Bill Young Newspaper Citations*
*St. Petersburg Times*
5-13-02. Sandmen.
9-30-02. Internal Tugs of War Stall Federal Budget.
11-7-02. As Spending Bills Stall, Young Seeks White House Help.
3-19-03. Hussein: I'm Not Budging.
6-14-03. MacDill Lands 32 New Tankers.
10-9-03. Young: Iraq Aid Will Be Gift, Not Loan.
12-5-03. Hospital to Take Young's Name.
2-18-04. Inquiry Ordered at VA Hospital.
4-2-04. Bay Pines to Be Base for Agency Watchdog.
4-8-04. Congressman Urges Unity in Time of War.
6-28-04. Sweet Relief Greets Job End.
11-21-04. For His Finale, Young Slices His Pork Thick.
5-12-05. Hopes for MacDill's Survival Run High.
5-13-05. VA Asked to Do Review of Local Hospital.
7-31-05. Strike up the Band; Library Is Opening.
8-10-05. Reports: 9/11 Clue Hid in Tampa.
12-23-05. Young's Bay Area Largesse Sizzles.
5-17-06. By Challenging Young, Democrat Takes on Bush.
5-18-06. Young: Fed Up, but Not Quick to Quit.
5-30-06. Heroism Not Forgotten.
9-4-06. Earmark Rule Adds Accountability to 'Pork.'
10-16-06. Choices for a Better Congress.
3-16-07. Democrats Target Young's Seat.
11-8-07. Young Brings Home Bacon.
3-1-08. MacDill Builds Base for a Strong Future.
8-31-08. Mayor a Nobody No Longer.
9-30-08. Failure in Washington.
3-12-09. Florida Gets $252m in Earmarks.
3-26-09. Clerk Pleads Guilty in Food Stamp Fraud.
5-14-09. 20,000 Votes and Still Going Strong.
7-22-09. The Buzz: Florida Politics.
7-23-09. The Buzz: Florida Politics.
3-22-10. No Earmarks for Bill Young -- Except One.
5-21-10. Bay Buzz: Political News of Tampa Bay.
6-23-10. The Buzz: Florida Politics.
7-22-10. The Buzz: Florida Politics.
10-6-10. Committee to Study Rules Governing Cell Phone Tower Locations.

_Tampa Tribune_
5-12-02. Ceremonies Scheduled for Memorial Day.
6-28-02. $60M Defense Strategy.
4-6-03. Festival of States to Celebrate America.
2-6-05. Center Honors Young.
5-14-05. MacDill Spared.
11-8-06. Brown-Waite, Young, Castor Also Winners.
7-5-07. Uncle Sam Spends Billions With Local Companies.
7-5-07 B. Uncle Sam Says See for Yourself.
1-6-08. 4 Eager to Unseat 'Nice Guy' Bilirakis.
3-26-08. Lawmakers' Wish-Lists Carve Pork for Bay Area.
7-17-08. Survey Shows Gaps in U.S. Well-Being.

_Rep. Jerry Costello Newspaper Citations_

_St. Lois Post-Dispatch_
4-2-04. Transportation Bill Faces Vote in House Today/ Veto Is Threatened Although Measure Is Smaller Than Senate's/ Passage Appears Certain.
5-7-02. Local Briefs.
7-19-02. Shimkus Has Double the Cash in Race Against Opponent Phelps.
7-25-02. A Special Flag.
10-22-02. For Congress from Illinois.
6-26-03. News Briefs.
7-24-03. Village Gets Grant for New Police Car.
8-14-03. News Briefs.
8-21-03. News Briefs.
10-19-03. St. Clair County Transit Cuts Loom; Bus, Metrolink Service Face Slashes Starting in January.
10-27-03. Scott Air Force Base Faces Stiff Test in New Round of Closings; 13,000 Jobs There, Many Elsewhere Are at Stake As Local Leaders Mobilize.
2-25-04. Where Lawmakers Stand.
3-1-04. What's Happening.
4-29-04. Spotlight.
9-24-04. House Oks "Pledge Protection Act."
10-22-04. 12th District Incumbent Faces 2.
10-26-04. For Congress.
1-2-05. Insurance Regulations Bear Blame, Critics Say.
2-5-05. Toll Plan Could Speed Project.
2-7-05. News Briefs.
3-31-05. News Briefs.
11-5-05. Costello Lists Refunds for You -- and Others.
3-17-06. U.S. Representative 12th District: Democrat.
4-23-06. Even Low-Pressure Races Burn Campaign Cash.
8-26-06. News Briefs.
9-17-06. Arch-View Perch Breaks Ground in East St. Louis.
11-9-06. The People Have Spoken and Just What Did They Say? Iraq Was Key, and Leaders Hear Call for Moderation and Cooperation.
10-7-07. Spotlight So Far Isn't Killing Off Earmarks.
4-16-08. Congress Zeroes in on In-Flight Cell Calls Lawmakers Want to Stop a Nuisance Before it Can Start.
10-21-08. Terms of Endearment.
8-1-09. Digest.
12-16-09. The Bucks Will Stop Here Expansion at John Cochran VA Medical Center Tops List of Area Earmarks in Spending Bill.
1-18-10. Metro East Officials Want Feds to Tell What's Wrong With Levees Agencies Are Seeking Repairs That Will Cost Hundreds of Millions.
2-25-10. Digest.
10-19-10. For Congress: the Usual Suspects.
10-20-10. Earmarks Are Again at Issue in Campaign Carnahan Is Hoping Her Strong Opposition Puts Her a Step Ahead of Blunt.
11-3-10. Can't Beat 'Em? Eat 'Em Metro East Entrepreneurs Believe an Image Makeover of the Asian Carp Along With a Processing Plant Could Produce a 'Gold Mine.'
12-6-10. What's Up/Heads Up.

Rep. Paul Ryan Newspaper Citations

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel
11-6-02. Incumbents in State Delegation All Win.
7-24-02. House Moves to Lift Travel Ban, Other Restrictions on Cuba.
3-2-03. Feingold's Job-Performance Ratings Almost Match Kohl's.
11-5-03. U.S. Congressman from Wisconsin Urges Action to Save Manufacturing Jobs.
8-24-03. Ryan Session to Address Hispanics' Concerns.
7-16-03. Ryan a Leading Voice in Medicare Debate He's Demanding Reforms As Part of Prescription Drug Package.
6-20-04. Will Jobs Tell the Tale of Election? As State's Outlook Brightens, Both Sides Find Ammo.
8-7-04. Ryan, Kind Clash on State's Economic Health.
10-31-04. 1st District.
12-20-04. Tenacious Fighter Goes Out Quietly Kleczka Bypasses Pomp As Political Career Ends.
2-10-05. GOP Lawmakers Differ on Social Security Overhaul.
4-4-05. Young Man in a Hurry at 34, Paul Ryan Has Made His Mark in Congress.
2-21-05. Selling Social Security GOP, Democrats Are Pitching Their Points of View.
5-8-05. Ryan Team to Listen in Both English and Spanish.
4-16-06. Residents Get Chance to Talk About Health Care Costs.
6-22-06. Line-Item Veto Aims to Trim Pork Spending Critics Worry Bill Gives Bush Too Much Power; House to Vote Today.
8-20-06. Forum to Tackle Issues Facing Black Community.
6-25-07. Kind, Ryan Offer Farm Plan Amendment Seeks Reforms in '07 Bill.
1-20-08. Senators Never Missed a Vote.
3-28-08. Rate Cuts Must Stop, Ryan Says Fed Actions Will Boost Inflation, Hurt Dollar, Congressman Thinks
6-1-08. Lawmakers Spend Break on the Go. Some Visit Local Voters Others Take State Issues Overseas.
4-28-08. Few Reforms Find a Home in Farm Bill. Early Promise of Change in Subsidy Programs Derailed
8-10-08. Washington Notebook.
3-29-09. Budget Difficult for All Sides GOP, Democratic Factions Must Consider Wants, Needs, Shortfalls.
4-26-09. Ryan Shines As GOP Seeks Vision His Youth, Talent, Conservative Politics Excite Party Leaders.
8-19-09. Four Challenge Ryan for Congressional Sea Democrats Face Off in September Primary; Other Two Run Unopposed.
1-17-10. Legislators Travel Over Break Feingold Wants Series of Deals Removed from Health Care Bill.
6-27-10. U.S. Agency Puts up to 1, 000 Jobs at Risk: Bucyrus May Lose Contract Over Denial of Loan Guarantees.
10-15-10. Two Try to Block 1st District Incumbent.
4-8-11. Ryan Gets Support, Suggestions at Budget Listening Session.

Janesville Gazette
8-1-06. Pension Bill Likely to Be Approved.
12-12-06. Ryan Positioned to Help Restore Fiscal Reality.
4-6-08. Budget Boondoggle Award to Ag Dept.
3-4-09. Line-Item Veto for Obama? Janesville-Based Proposal Says Yes.
4-1-09. Local Congressman Chosen to Answer Obama's Challenge.
7-7-10. Democrats Split Over How to Defeat Ryan.

Chapter 9
Rep. Larry Kissell Newspaper Citations

Fayetteville Observer
9-28-08. 8th District Congressional Race Has Familiar Foes.
12-14-08. Mr. Kissell Goes to Washington.
4-29-09. Bragg Gets More Stimulus Money.
4-25-10. The Fayetteville Observer, N.C., Henry Cuningham Column: Buzz on BRAC: Kissell to Discuss BRAC Challenge.
8-30-10. Kissell to Tour Raeford Ethanol Plant.
9-6-10. Internal Polls Shows Kissell Leading GOP Rival.
10-21-10. Outsiders Aim to Influence 8th Congressional District Race With Cash.
11-3-10. 8th Congressional District: Kissell Wins Second Term.
1-20-11. Lawmakers' Seating Arrangement a Nod Toward Civility.
2-7-11. Taxes, Annexation Top Fayetteville, Cumberland Agendas.
2-4-11. Congressman Kissell's Staff to Hold Office Hours in Raeford.

Independent Tribune
10-23-08. Hayes, Kissell Debate in Kannapolis.
4-21-09. More Stimulus Money Slated for Cabarrus.
1-17-09. Chamber's Motto for New Year: 'Shine in 2009.'
7-16-10. Concord Awarded $1.6 Million in HUD Grants.
1-23-11. Local Officials Share Priorities at Legislative Breakfast.

Stanly News and Press
3-9-09. Grants to Fund Law Enforcement, Crime Prevention Programs.
4-21-10. Locust Receives $2 Million Loan to Construct Municipal Building.
9-8-10. Kissell Teaches Civics Lesson to Oakboro Students.

Rep. David Reichert Newspaper Citations

Seattle Times
5-9-04. Head to Head, Moderates Win in Seattle's Ring Cities.
7-8-04. Vance's 'Domination' Prediction May Come Back to Haunt Him.
8-25-04. Top Cop Seeks Congress Beat.
8-28-04. Ads Provoke Sharp Responses 8th District Race Heats up Reichert's GOP Record Questioned in Mailing.
10-1-04. Parties Turn up the Heat in Race for 8th District Negative TV Ads Ross, Reichert Distance Themselves from Attacks on Their Behalf.
10-4-04. Prominent Pair Try to Put Accent on a Positive Image.
3-22-05. Two from State Voted Across Party Lines.
3-29-05. Reichert Will Host a Forum on Social Security.
3-31-05. The Sheriff Goes to Congress.
5-23-05. State Effects Seen in Stem-Cell Fight.
6-7-05 Cheney's Visit Gives Early Boost to Reichert's Re-Election Coffers.
10-31-05. In a "Green" Pickle, Edges Away from Arctic Drilling.
11-3-05. Arctic Refuge Drilling Rides on Budget Vote Environmental Decision Placed in Filibuster-Proof Spending Package.
3-25-06. Reichert Wants the Heat on Exxon for Spill Valdez Anniversary. Lawmaker Asks Congress to Pressure Company to Pay Up.
4-5-06. Dems' Hopes Rise in 8th, Along With Rookie's Fortunes.
4-6-06. Delay's Departure Not a Moment Too Soon.
7-20-06. Reichert Has Heart-To-Heart Talk With Women on Staff Before Vote.
9-24-06. 8th District Race Awash in Ads.
10-15-06. Reichert in the 8th.
8-1-07. Insurance Bill Puts Reichert on Spot Child Health Care Vote to Boost Program Could Play Well in District but Anger GOP.
9-25-07. Reichert Backs Child-Health-Care Bill.
10-1-07. Burner Among 7 Dems to Benefit from Fundraiser.
11-9-07. Reichert Bill Would Add to Alpine Lakes 22,000 More Acres in Protected Wilderness Area Environmentalists Praise Measure.
3-19-08. Joint 911 Center Gets $2.5 Million 14 Eastside Cities, Agencies Taking Part Money
from Federal, State Governments.
8-20-08. One More Round for Reichert, Burner U.S. Congress McDermott Will Face Beren in 7th; Larsen, Bart to Square Off in 2nd.
8-31-08. Republicans? Just Don't Call Them That Rossi: "We Do Our Own Thing" Politicians Here Seek Distance from McCain, National Party.
9-8-08. Radio Ad Distorts Burner's Position 8th District Race She and Reichert Both Back Lower Taxes on Families With Kids.
3-21-10. Free to Have Health Care for All.
6-28-10. For Reichert Challenger, it’s All About the Economy.
8-6-10. DelBene and Dillon in the 8th District.
8-11-10. Pierce County May Hold Key in 8th.
10-30-10. DelBene, Reichert Seek Support of Women Voters in 8th District Race.
11-3-10. GOP's Reichert, Herrera Win House Seats.
3-20-11. NPR Issue Is Politics, Not Savings.

**Franked Material Collections:**
Franked documents for the following members were collected in October of 2011 from the Clerk of the House of Representatives from May 2002 through May 2011:
Biggert, Judy
Calvert, Ken
Capuano, Mike
Cleaver, Emanuel
Costello, Jerry
Kissell, Larry
Michaud, Mike
McCaul, Mike
Reichert, Dave
Ryan, Paul
Scalise, Steve
Schmidt, Jean
Young, Bill
Young Don