



April 2016

Conceptualizing Congressional Organization: The Legacy of Keith Krehbiel's Informational Theory

Madalyn Browning-Perry
Illinois Wesleyan University, mbrowni1@iwu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/respublica>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Browning-Perry, Madalyn (2016) "Conceptualizing Congressional Organization: The Legacy of Keith Krehbiel's Informational Theory," *Res Publica - Journal of Undergraduate Research*: Vol. 21

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/respublica/vol21/iss1/11>

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Commons @ IWU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this material in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This material has been accepted for inclusion by editorial board of Res Publica and the Political Science Department at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@iwu.edu.

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Conceptualizing Congressional Organization: The Legacy of Keith Krehbiel's Informational Theory

Abstract

A small-scale replication of Keith Krehbiel's original test on the 99th Congress is carried out in this paper. This replication consists of four committees in the 112th Congress selected because of their symptomatic distributive tendency. The aim in this paper is to characterize committees as diverse in composition with heterogeneous high demanding members who possess different bits of information. Furthermore, this heterogeneity of membership is associated with a higher percentage of closed rules assigned to the committee by the House Committee on Rules. Though evidence supports Krehbiel's assessment of committee composition, there does not appear to be a relationship between membership heterogeneity on committees and the number of closed rules it is granted.

CONCEPTUALIZING CONGRESSIONAL ORGANIZATION: THE LEGACY OF KEITH KREHBIEL'S INFORMATIONAL THEORY

Madalyn Browning-Perry

***Abstract:** A small-scale replication of Keith Krehbiel's original test on the 99th Congress is carried out in this paper. This replication consists of four committees in the 112th Congress selected because of their symptomatic distributive tendency. The aim in this paper is to characterize committees as diverse in composition with heterogeneous high-demanding members who possess different bits of information. Furthermore, this heterogeneity of membership is associated with a higher percentage of closed rules assigned to the committee by the House Committee on Rules. Though evidence supports Krehbiel's assessment of committee composition, there does not appear to be a relationship between membership heterogeneity on committees and the number of closed rules it is granted.*

INTRODUCTION

For many years, theorists have attempted to rationalize and explain congressional organization. Though many competing ideas have taken shape over time, research and experimentation have developed two prevailing schools of thought: the distributive theory and the informational theory. These theories ultimately aim to understand the dynamic of power within Congress, and the manifestations of this power on congressional rules and norms within the chambers themselves. As to the former, working within the framework of the informational theory, this research argues that committees in the 112th Congress are diverse with heterogeneous high-demanding members who possess different bits of information. As to the latter, this paper argues that greater heterogeneity of membership on a committee is associated with a higher percentage of closed rulings given to that committee by the House Committee on Rules.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Distributive Theory

David Mayhew's distributive theory of legislative organization dominates the literature on Congress. Mayhew posits that committees are stacked with homogenous high-demanding members who can work collectively to bring home legislative goods that benefit their constituencies equally. This theory assumes that legislators are ultimately concerned with reelection. Therefore, every action of members is in pursuit of this goal. As Mayhew describes, legislators are "single-minded seekers of reelection" (Mayhew, 2004, 17). It is a rational presumption that members, as human beings, will generally act

in their own best interest. It logically follows that in order to reach the other two goals of achieving power within the chamber and producing “good” public policy, that all members must be elected. Reelection is universal and as distributive theorists explain, reelection leads to membership on committee. Membership in general is necessary, but continuing membership on specific committees that are relevant to a member’s constituency is crucial. Evidence shows that incumbents are reelected at high rates. This decreases the stress of election and is inherently valuable and thus drives all members of congress to seek reelection. However, the value of incumbency has risen in recent years: “seats are not as safe as they seem... many congressmen have won by less than 55 percent” (Mayhew, 2004, 32). Furthermore, vote variation fluctuates depending on the “mood” of the electorate, which makes the electoral outcome uncertain. This high uncertainty of reelection affects members’ behavior. In pursuit of reelection and placement on a committee of interest, it is essential that members are successful in distinguishing themselves from others. In order to successfully accomplish this, Mayhew explains members engage in advertising, credit-claiming, and position-taking.

Mayhew describes advertising as the practice of creating a positive image of oneself. Demonstrating personal qualities such as experience, knowledge, and responsiveness is largely done through direct mailings to voters at the public’s expense. The main goal of the member is to present himself or herself in a positive light that will encourage voters to reelect him. Members also engage in credit-claiming, or actively taking credit for bringing home legislative goods. The membership is tasked with a challenge, to convince constituents that he or she as a member is responsible for securing certain “particularized benefits” for the constituency. Credit-claiming allows members to build a resume to showcase the tangible benefits they secured for voters; there is “a tendency for winners to take personal credit for victories” (Mayhew, 2004, 38). The third way by which members distinguish themselves is through position-taking, or the “public enunciation of judgmental statements” (Mayhew, 2004, 61). These declaratory judgments emphasize a member’s opinion and implicitly or explicitly connect a member to a specific issue. The goal is that the constituents acknowledge the member’s position in an electorally positive way.

Using these three activities, members must collectively work together to pass legislation and secure benefits to make themselves appealing, each to their own constituency. Insofar as the member's interests do not conflict this may be possible. Mayhew goes on to explain that each member is "entitled to his share of the benefits" (Mayhew, 2004, 88). Neither party nor seniority matters in distributive theory because Congressmen are all American and according to the rules of Congress that are precise enough to "admit judgment of benefits..." yet "ambiguous enough to allow members to claim personal credit" in the end, all members manage to obtain individual goods for their constituencies (Mayhew, 2004, 88).

Rejection of Distributive Theory

Mayhew describes the concept of collective action in accordance with collective agreement to benefit all. Mayhew, while in keeping with what could be argued as the ethical tradition of American democracy, intended by the Framers, to "form a more perfect union [by all and for all]," and also to collectively "...promote the general welfare [equally]," is idealistic and, furthermore, it is unrealistic. In "conjuring up a vision of the United States congressmen as single-minded seekers of reelection," Mayhew assumes that legislators are primarily focused on their personal reelection to office. Secondly, he assumes United States congressmen, who are focused on the interest of their competing constituencies, can work together in order to capture gains from trade to benefit everyone (Mayhew, 2004). Working together, or logrolling, a this-for-that agreement between members to vote for policy unravels exceedingly quickly during floor discussion. Krehbiel argues this is because of the heterogeneity of membership on committees. Heterogeneity of membership introduces difficulty for two reasons. The first difficulty is that the competing interests of constituencies cause members to have competing interests. Thus arises the struggle of members to collectively come to an agreement. The second is that information across these committees is asymmetric. This ensues because, "Asymmetries in incoming legislator's talents [or expertise] give rise to asymmetries [in knowledge] in a policy area" (Krehbiel, 1991, 248). Members do not have equal access to policy information in all areas. This creates a prisoner's dilemma within the chamber, because there is uncertainty of how each member will act.

In the effort to obtain pork for their constituency, members have an incentive to cheat the agreement because each distrusts the other. Though members are high demanding, the fact that committee membership is heterogeneous undermines a member's ability to demand effectively. The linchpin of distributive theory is collective action to secure tangible benefits. In the event members fail to act collectively, which is common in the modern congress, distributive framework becomes limited in its applicability. It is then unsuccessful in rationalizing the modern Congress.

Informational Theory

Keith Krehbiel offers instead an alternative to the distributive theory, the informational theory of legislative organization. Krehbiel argues that committees are diverse with heterogeneous high-demanding members and that every member holds different pieces of information. Krehbiel argues each member has a personal agenda, similar to the reasoning proposed by distributive theorists, however, he argues committee membership is heterogeneous. Krehbiel addresses uncertainty by acknowledging that uncertainty is caused by asymmetric information across committees. Krehbiel's concept of heterogeneity in combination with asymmetric information across committees offers an answer to the problem of collective action. He reasons that during floor debates, asymmetric information that is indicative of a member's strategy to procure tangible benefits is exposed. Exposing information uncovers the "hidden agenda" of members, and it instigates debate over pieces of legislation that are suspect to favor one member's constituency over that of another member's. Krehbiel sought to prove this theory using the 99th Congress as the test subject. He measured heterogeneity of membership by utilizing policy specific interest group scores assigned to members of every committee. He found that all but one committee, the Armed Services Committee, was in fact heterogeneous in the 99th Congress. Furthermore, that this heterogeneity promoted competition between members expose the hidden agenda of other members and allowed legislation to be discussed thoroughly. Thorough debate is an answer to why logrolling is not always successful. Krehbiel, like Mayhew, believes that members have a goal of reelection, however, unlike Mayhew, Krehbiel believes reelection is one of three overarching goals. The other two goals are to achieve power within the chamber and to produce good public policy, that is policy that supports what is in the constituents' best

interest. Krehbiel reasons that reelection derives its worth from achieving power within the chamber and producing “good” public policy. Another component to Krehbiel’s design is the idea that the House Committee on Rules recognizes committee heterogeneity. Furthermore, rewards heterogeneity by granting a “restrictive” rule on legislation. A “restrictive” rule symbolizes trust that diversity in committee membership has thoroughly checked legislation through meticulous examination and rigorous debate. Thereby producing a “better,” more moderate piece of policy legislation because of this competitive debate. Krehbiel inferred that in the 99th Congress the percentage of closed rules and rules that were restrictive in their terms of debate had increased. Though the original intent of the heterogeneous committee members was to use power to expose the agenda of the opposite side, it ultimately led members to create “good” public policy overall and led to the development of more legitimate committees trusted by the House Committee on Rules. This paper uses the logic of the informational theory framework to challenge the dominant merit of the distributive theory in assessing congressional organization.

Selection of the Informational Theory

Analysis in this paper is focused on the committee: the committee is an institutional piece of Congress and if “the primary empirical focus [of this paper] is on committees” then it seems “the most promising empirical approach, is an institutional approach” (Krehbiel, 1991, 14). Krehbiel also mentions that “...the predictions of distributive and informational theories of legislative organization are least ambiguous and most direct in terms of institutions” (Krehbiel, 1991, 14). Each theory, because of its focus on committees as the central form of organization and power in Congress, has a certain degree of testing stability. Furthermore, there is an element of testing reliability in the easily measurable variables because the informational theory experiment can be duplicated with relative ease. Secondly is the informational theory offers a polar opposite conceptualization of the dynamic of power within committees compared to the distributive theory.

It is the aim of this paper to duplicate Krehbiel’s design by testing the informational theory of legislative organization on the 112th Congress. In constructing a smaller-scale design of Krehbiel’s work, the research seeks that committees in the 112th

Congress are indeed diverse with heterogeneous high-demanding members and that this heterogeneity is associated with a higher percentage of “closed” rules granted by the House Committee on Rules.

There are three reasons to duplicate Krehbiel’s design. ; The first is Krehbiel’s design has not been replicated since the 99th Congress. The academic integrity of the informational theory would benefit from a more recent test of its merits. The second reason is that though legislators want to secure particularized benefits, like distributive theorists suggest, it cannot be the sole reason for member’s actions; the distributive theory is too simplistic. Article I of the Constitution, explicitly authorizes the duties and powers to the legislature. It could be gathered that the Framers of the Constitution intended Congress to be microcosmic of the American public, in that members in the House could be average citizens, while membership in the Senate was reserved for a smaller, more enlightened group. It could be reasoned that because the legislature is the first branch drafted in the Constitution and is textually the longest, that the Framers intended it to be the most powerful branch; and with this power comes the honorable responsibility of preserving the founding values of this country. The explicit and implicit expectations of legislature make it multidimensional. The “predictions of the informational theory received considerable support,” on multidimensional tasks such as, “pork barrel politics, capturing gains from trade, and solving chaos problems” ideas only one-dimensionally analyzed in the context of the distributive theory (Krehbiel, 1991, 258). This corresponds to the third reason for replicating Krehbiel’s design, to understand how hyperpolarization affects committee selection. Today when there is so little party overlap, members who are unsuccessful in securing the three main goals of committee membership stand more to lose today than in the past. In this way, losses intensify for a member with a low success rate. It would seem logical that the legislature would want to stop committees from being particularistic. In other words, polarization should incentivize the leadership, responsible for preserving the honor of the legislature, to create heterogeneous committees with the hope that those committees moderate policies that would balance the two party extremes. This incentive is evidenced by a simple comparison of the percentage of “closed” rules granted to the 99th Congress to the percentage of “closed” rules in the 112th Congress. The nature of “closed” rules has

changed over time. In a progression from the 103rd Congress to the 113th Congress, the percentage of “closed” rules granted at the aggregate level has increased from nine percent to 48 percent (Davidson, 1994, 221). Considering this increase, one observes a higher percentage of “closed” rules granted to each committee in the 112th Congress, being in a time of hyperpolarization.

METHODOLOGY

Congress and Committee Selection

After choosing to duplicate the informational theory of legislative organization, the 112th Congress is selected for analysis and as a comparison to the 99th Congress. The reason being that the 112th Congress was the most recent congressional record available.

This partial replication of Krehbiel’s design presented several challenges, one being the large number of committee members in the chamber. The research conducted found it necessary to focus on specific committees. The four committees chosen to test are the Agriculture Committee, Armed Services Committee, Education and the Workforce Committee, and Financial Services Committee. These committees have a tendency toward distributive theory, seem to be issue specific and may have particularistic policy-based membership. Selecting committees that have a symptomatic distributive tendency would strengthen Krehbiel’s counter conceptualization of congressional organization in the event the results support the hypothesis posed by the informational theory. In any case, if the results are not supported by the informational theory the selection shows academic fairness.

Bivariate Test Selection

Running the bivariate test is to assess if there is a strong relationship between the interest group scores, an approval rating of a member in a specific committee compared to the Poole and Rosenthal nomination scores, ideological scores dependent on voting pattern by committee. A strong relationship between the two would indicate each score could be used in place of the other. The use of the Poole and Rosenthal scores of the chamber should produce the same test results as the interest group scores. Krehbiel favored the interest group scores and chose to use those for his original design because the interest group scores take into consideration a member’s voting pattern. The Poole and Rosenthal scores would only characterize a member’s ideology, not paying attention

to individual action. For instance, say a member is conservative on the Agriculture Committee; having grown up on a farm, the member may lean towards conservatism on social issues, preferring low government involvement. However on issues pertaining to the land, the member would lean towards liberalism because he favors land subsidies and crop insurance, which require high government involvement. This situation touches on Krehbiel's larger idea that the interest group scores expose abnormalities in a member's voting pattern, such as voting with the opposite party, an occurrence the ideological scores neglect.

Similar to Krehbiel's study, this research gathers interest group scores for all available members in the four committees selected. It was necessary to use the readily available ideological scores assigned by Poole and Rosenthal when evaluating the entire chamber's heterogeneity and dispersion. The bivariate test is an attempt to not stray too far from Krehbiel's model. The assumption is that there will be a strong correlation between the Poole and Rosenthal scores and the interest group scores. It would support the hypotheses if the scores showed a strong correlation because this would indicate little difference between the two scores.

Independent Samples T- Test Selection

The two-tailed test of central tendency is an attempt to capture Krehbiel's idea of outlyingness. The first part of this process is to identify the distribution of membership on committees and examine whether the membership is centered within the committee or if membership is spread out on committees. The second task is to identify committees that present the same type of organization as the greater chamber for instance a committee that displays the same type of distribution, as the larger chamber is microcosmic of the entire chamber. If it is found that committees are indeed diverse and microcosms of the whole, then Krehbiel's claim that "committees are diverse with...outlying members" is correct.

Descriptive Statistics Test Selection

The purpose of the descriptive test is to characterize the committees as either "heterogeneous" or "homogeneous" in respect to membership. The standard deviations and the means gathered are based on the Poole and Rosenthal scores assigned to each member. This test acts as the central evidence of Krehbiel's assertion of membership as it

pertains to committee composition. If it is found that these committees are heterogeneous, then this paired with the test of central tendency proves that committee composition consists of "...diverse...heterogeneous high-demanding members," Krehbiel will have secured a success in his assumption of committee composition.

Committee Success Correspondence

The Rules Committee's designation of a committee as "legitimate," or as being trustworthy in producing moderate legislation is, according to Krehbiel's claim, predicated on its heterogeneity. A substantial part of Krehbiel's theory in its conceptualization of the committees is that heterogeneous membership will be symptomatic of a higher percentage of "closed" rules. This framework includes the standard deviations of the Poole and Rosenthal nominate scores of the selected committees and the standard deviations of the interest group scores of the selected committees. It is the intention of this study to organize the four committees in order of their percentage of "closed" rules and then rank them by the standard deviation for both the nominate scores and the interest group scores. If Krehbiel is correct in his assumption that heterogeneity influences the percentage of "closed" rules, then the order of committees assigned by percent "closed" rule should match the order of the standard deviation of nominate scores and the standard deviation of the interests groups. According to the bivariate test, the difference between the nominate scores and the interest group scores may inspire a different match with the committees. The order of one of these standard deviations may match better with the order of the committees ranked by percentage "closed" rule. The weak relationship between the nominate scores and interest group scores for the Agriculture Committee and the Financial Services Committee identified in Table 1 should not be problematic to the experiment because though there's a weak correlation between two committees, there is a strong correlation between two other committees. In the end the pairing balances out. If there is a correlation between a committee's success rate in obtaining a "closed" rule on a piece of introduced legislation and the rank of the standard deviation, then all of Krehbiel's theory will be proved true as it pertains to the 112th Congress.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Table 1: Bivariate Test: Between Poole + Rosenthal scores and Interest Group Scores

Committee	Correlation	Relevance	2-Tailed Significance
Agriculture	-0.37	WEAK**	0.012
Armed Services	0.933	STRONG	0.000
Ed + Workforce	-0.745	STRONG	0.000
Financial Services	0.346	WEAK**	0.006

The bivariate correlation, shown in Table 1, shows a weak relationship between the issue-specific interest group score and the Poole and Rosenthal score for each member on the Agriculture Committee and the Financial Services Committee. The correlation between the Poole and Rosenthal scores and the interest group scores is only marginally significant. This means there will be some difference in Krehbiel's test using interest group scores compared to the study's test using the Poole and Rosenthal scores. The magnitude of the weak negative correlation in the Agriculture Committee represents the idea that just because a member is on the Agriculture Committee does not mean that the individual member is necessarily liberal. Similarly, a member of the Financial Services Committee is not necessarily always conservative.

There is a partial correlation in the two-tailed significance of the bivariate test for both committees that possess a weak correlation. In the Committee on Agriculture, this measurement of .012 is not statistically significant and the measurement .006 in the Financial Services Committee is only marginally significant. This idea is exemplified in Krehbiel's preferred use of the interest group scores as opposed to using the Poole and Rosenthal scores. He believed the interest group scores, depending on member voting patterns, were a better way to characterize the membership on committees, more so than a simple ideological score. This choice introduces the idea of party. In fact a member may be a Republican on the Armed Services Committee, however, he might not always vote with the Republican Party in all situations. The interest group scores take this factor into account. The Poole and Rosenthal scores are one-dimensional; a member is either liberal or conservative to a degree. Scores assigned to members from an issue-specific group, which correlate to the member's committee, offer a multidimensional measure of a

member's supportiveness while working with the committee to obtain legislative goods for the specific interest group. The interest groups that assign a member's score are policy experts in their specified area, so Krehbiel ultimately trusts that their assessment of a member is accurate based on the member's character, work ethic, and success in obtaining legislative goods for the interest group.

Conversely, there is a strong relationship between the Poole and Rosenthal score and the issue-specific interest group score for the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The magnitude of the positive correlation for the Armed Services Committee .933 ($p > .05$) leads one to conclude that members on this particular committee tend to be conservative. Similarly, the score of the Education and Workforce Committee -.745 ($p > .05$) is a strong negative ideological correlation. Members on the Education and Workforce Committee lean toward liberal ideologies. Though there might be a tendency of liberalism or conservatism on a committee that does not mean the committee is homogeneously dominated by a singular political party. Rather, it is appealing to ideological variance, not a specific party. A committee that appeals to a specific ideological variance does attract ideologically homogenous interest groups, which can create a discrepancy in the interest group scores of members. If Republicans are evaluated from a liberal interest group, their scores will most likely be lower, not because of their work ethic, or their supportiveness, but because the member is Republican.

Table 2: Independent Samples T-Test: Poole and Rosenthal Scores

Committee	GOP		Democrats	
	Mean	Sig. (compared to .05)	Mean	Sig. (compared to .05)
Agriculture	0.003	Different	0	Different
Armed Services	0.713	Same	0.241	Same
Ed + Workforce	0.855	Same	0.968	Same
Financial Services	0.53	Same	0.652	Same

This test of central tendency, organized and assessed in terms of political party in all four committees, identified the difference in mean for each committee by utilizing the Poole and Rosenthal membership scores. Based on the information discovered, three of the four

committees show a distribution in mean for both parties that mimic the distribution of the party caucus in the greater chamber. According to Table 2, the Agriculture Committee is the only committee of the four that is not a microcosm of the entire chamber, meaning that the distribution of the mean for both Republicans and Democrats on the committee does not match the distribution of mean of Republicans and Democrats in the greater chamber. Furthermore, the Agriculture Committee is an outlier compared to the other three committees. This test is successful because the data is in cadence with Krehbiel's theory; that membership within committees mirrors membership in the greater chamber

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics

**Based on Poole and Rosenthal NOMINATE Scores*

Committee	GOP		Democrats	
	STDV	MEAN	STDV	MEAN
Party Caucus	0.256513	0.67058	0.276522	-0.32284
**Agriculture	0.421967	0.5078	0.525884	0.03667
Armed Services	0.166371	0.66917	0.10479	-0.31281
Ed + Workforce	0.148266	0.67574	0.302142	-0.36225
Financial Services	0.21917	0.71488	0.114038	-0.3843

[Agriculture committee is the outlier]

This data summary employing the nomination scores substantiates Krehbiel's claim show that the membership on committees, like membership within the party caucus, is generally heterogeneous. The table above is a comparison of the means and standard deviations of the each of the four committees compared to that of the party caucus. It was found that the scores of members on the Agriculture Committee have a standard deviation of .4219 ($p > .05$), which was substantially wider than the party caucus of .2565 ($p > .05$). This indicates that the Agriculture Committee is stacked with diverse members, more so than the three other committees. This is in line with Krehbiel's reasoning that leadership would be inclined to stack committees with diverse heterogeneous members in the effort to cast a wide expertise in committees and ultimately insight more debate over legislation. In light of the findings in Table 3, it is not surprising to discover that a committee, which is not microcosmic in relation to the entire chamber, is in fact a "membership-outlier." Aside from Krehbiel's idea, there might be a

reason for this outlyingness, which could be the geographical presence of agriculture is across the country. Thus it attracts many different types of members across states purely because of its prevalence around the country.

Though the Agriculture Committee is a manifestation of the informational theory that is not to say the others tend toward distributive theory. The standard deviation of the nominate scores is a measure of heterogeneity, but the mean is arguably the more important indicator of a committee's heterogeneity in relation to the greater chamber. The three committees, Armed Services, Education and the Workforce, and Financial Services, possess a mean that is very close to the mean of the party caucus. Because of this similarity, there is confidence in characterizing them as heterogeneous as well.

Table 4: Committee Success Correspondence*

Committee	% Closed or Structured Rule	STDV (PR Score %)	STDV (IG Score %)	Rank (1-4)	
				STDV (PR Score %)	STDV (IG Score %)
Ed +Workforce	0.5	0.562	0.47	2	1
Agriculture	0.45	0.527	0.262	3	3
Financial Services	0.294	0.578	0.14	1	4
Armed Services	0.2	0.509	0.39	4	2

* Ordered by % "Closed" + "Restrictive" Rule

Table 4 summarizes what could be called the committee success rate in securing "closed" and "restrictive" rules. Originally, the intent was to use only rules that were "closed" to measure the Rules Committee as either having complete trust or no trust at all in the committee granted the rule. However, the Armed Services Committee was not granted any "closed" rules on introduced legislation, which led the thought closed rule was too a qualification of trust. Out of the four rulings a committee can be granted; closed, restrictive, modified open, and open. The "restrictive" rules would be regarded as the second highest indication of trust.

This qualification was of substance and deserved to be recognized. Thus, the committees are now ordered by the percentage of "closed" and "restrictive" rules each was granted on introduced legislation. The columns following "closed" and "structured" rules are the standard deviations for both the nominate scores and the interest group scores. These indicate the heterogeneity in each of the committees. The standard

deviations were then ranked from high to low. Table 4 shows that there is only a correct match of the deviations for the Agriculture Committee and the Committee on Education and the Workforce. That is, Krehbiel's prediction that heterogeneity drives "closed" rules was only correct for two of the four committees.

CONCLUSION - NEED TO ADD IN THE CHAMBERS TENDENCY TOWARD RESTRICTIVE RULES

It was discovered that in fact a committee's heterogeneity is not necessarily indicative of its reward of a "closed" rule by the House Rules Committee. Though this was the case, the experiment was a partial success and there is room to improve its accuracy. Krehbiel was correct in his conceptualization of committee composition, however the trust the House Rules Committee has in the composition of committee membership may not be represented in the measurable form of a "closed" rule. Trust may be shown in other areas, such as the speed by which a committee's bill is scheduled on the calendar for debate. There may be "legislative perks" a trusted committee receives that are not measurable, such compensation and access to legislative resources.

A successful committee may not be characterized as a committee that attains a "closed" rule. Instead, "successful committee members influence others not by wielding formal authority by engaging in command-and-control tactics, but rather they persuade" (Krehbiel, 1991, 256). One interpretation of this is that "successful" committees are thought achieve more "closed" rules on bills introduced. This might seem intriguing, but the logic is flawed because there are committees, like the Armed Services Committee, that managed to successfully pass legislation into law, without a "closed" rule. A more compelling answer to why heterogeneity is not necessarily rewarded a "closed" rule and furthermore why a closed rule is not necessarily indicative of trust is because persuasion within the chamber is assumed. Rather than using "command-and-control tactics" in the form of a "closed" rule, heterogeneous committee membership would be trusted to persuade other internal members. In the presence of hyperpolarization, it is logical to assume the House Committee on Rules has a plan to combat the problems introduced by hyperpolarization. If "successful committee members [can] influence others...by persuasion" then it could be reasoned the most successful committees are those that manage to pass legislation with the weight of a "modified" or "open" rule. In these instances committees awarded a "modified" or "open" rule require the members to use

the “essence of committee power,” persuasion, in order to be successful (Krehbiel, 1991, 256).

In the effort to understand legislative organization “one must understand legislative institutions, that is the rules and binding constraints on legislator’s behavior” (Krehbiel, 1991, 14). Krehbiel’s informational theory of legislative organization offers the best conceptualization of congressional organization. Replicating his design, though on a smaller-scale and for the 112th Congress, has added academic merit to the informational theory. It was found that in the 112th Congress, committees are diverse with heterogeneous high-demanding members possessing asymmetric information. Furthermore, it could be argued this diversity in membership is indicative of a multi-dimensional virtuousness of the legislature because the leadership intentionally creates these diverse heterogeneous committees in the effort to limit the effects of hyperpolarization on committee operation. Membership of committees is intentionally diverse in the hope of producing the “best,” type of legislation through meticulous examination and rigorous debate. The “best” type of legislation, meaning the debate between members has exposed the “hidden evils,” of the opposite side and produced a more pure, more virtuous piece of legislation. The content of the legislation may not necessarily be virtuous, but the method of debate and examination in the diverse heterogeneous committees is what is virtuous, in that it produces a more dignified piece of legislation.

REFERENCES

- Rhodes Cook Letter*. 2011. "The Changing Composition of the 112th Congress" vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 12-14.
- Agriculture Committee. 2012. *Agriculture Committee in the 112th Congress*. Available: <https://www.congress.gov/search?q=%7B%22source%22%3A%22legislation%22%2C%22search%22%3A%22112th+congress+%22%2C%22congress%22%3A%22112%22%2C%22house-committee%22%3A%22Agriculture%22%7D> [2015, 10/06].
- Armed Services Committee. 2012. *Armed Services Committee in the 112th Congress*. Available: <https://www.congress.gov/search?q=%7B%22source%22%3A%22legislation%22%2C%22congress%22%3A%22112%22%2C%22senate-committee%22%3A%22Armed+Services%22%7D> [2015, 10/06].
- Davidson, R.H. & Oleszek, W.J. 1994, *Congress and its members*, Washington, D.C. : CQ Press, c1994; 4th ed.
- Education and Labor Committee. 2012. *Education and Labor Committee in the 112th Congress*. Available: <https://www.congress.gov/search?q=%7B%22congress%22%3A%5B%22112%22%5D%2C%22source%22%3A%22legislation%22%2C%22search%22%3A%22112th+congress%22%2C%22house-committee%22%3A%22Education+and+the+Workforce%22%7D> [2015, 10/06/2015].
- Financial Services Committee. 2012. *Financial Services Committee in the 112th Congress*. Available: <https://www.congress.gov/search?q=%7B%22source%22%3A%22legislation%22%2C%22search%22%3A%22112th+congress+%22%2C%22congress%22%3A%22112%22%2C%22housecommittee%22%3A%5B%22Financial+Services%22%5D%7D> [2015, 10/06].
- Forgette, R.G. 1997. *Reed's Rules and the Partisan Theory of Legislative Organization*, Northeastern Political Science Association.
- Gary Cox and Matthew Mccubins. 1993. "Introduction & "Self Selection"" in *Legislative Leviathon*, Revised edn. California: University of California Press pp. 1-24.

Krehbiel, K. 1991, *Information and Legislative Organization*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Library of Congress: Thomas 2012, *Bill Summary & Status in 112th Congress*.

Available: <http://thomas.loc.gov/home/LegislativeData.php?&n=BSS&c=112> [2015, 10/06].

Mayhew, D.R. 2004, *Congress: the electoral connection*, New Haven, Conn. : Yale University Press, 2004; 2nd ed. / foreword by R. Douglas Arnold.

Robinson, J.A. 1961, *The Role of the Rules Committee in Regulating Debate in the U.S. House of Representatives*, Wayne State University Press.

Thorson, G.R., Nitzschke, T. & Maxwell, N. 2007. "Rule Assignment in the Postreform House: A Test of Three Competing Theories of Legislative Organization". *Congress & the Presidency*. vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 23-34. 2015.

RES PUBLICA XXI

ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

2016



Knowledge and Wisdom