

## House Journal Votes: An Individual Analysis of Obstruction and Leadership Assistance

**Brian Webb**  
**Georgia State University**

### **Abstract**

This paper examines the why individual members of the House request votes on the daily Journal. The literature is divided over how requests for Journal votes are used in the House. Journal vote request are believe to be either obstruction tactics used by the minority party or tools to assist party leaders. Neither theory of Journal votes test their claims using individual level data of House members. Yet, these individual members are who actually request Journal votes. I arrive at several hypotheses that predict why different members of the House request Journal votes and test these hypotheses using individual level data. The findings indicate that majority members use Journal votes strictly as tools to assist leaders, while minority members use Journal requests as both obstruction and leadership assistance. Journal requests data from the 103<sup>rd</sup> to 106<sup>th</sup> Congress are used in logit and zero-inflated poisson regressions to arrive at these conclusions.

## Introduction

Why do members of the House of Representatives force votes on the Journal? At the outset of each legislative day in the House of Representatives, the Journal of the previous day's activity must be accepted by the chamber. Typically, the Journal is accepted by the Speaker with no objection from the floor. Occasionally, however, the Speaker's acceptance of the Journal is challenged and put to a vote. According to the rules of the House, any House member can challenge the Speaker's acceptance of the Journal and request a vote. Once a vote is requested, the Speaker usually takes a voice vote and presents the results; however, after the voice vote, any member can request a recorded vote. House rules allow the Speaker to either take the recorded vote at the time of the request or postpone it for later in the day.

Journal votes are believed to show us two important aspects of behaviour in the House. First, Journal votes are traditionally viewed as obstructionist behaviour by the minority party (Rohde 1991). Second, Patty (2009) argues that Journal votes are requested in order to help party leaders organise and negotiate with members prior to important votes. Patty's argument suggests that Journal vote requests are one of the many tools available to party leaders to set the agenda and influence members (see Cox & McCubbins 1993; Cox & McCubbins 2005; Sinclair 1995; Aldrich & Rohde 2000; Aldrich & Rohde 2001). As Patty (2009) notes, the use of Journal requests by leader may have critical implications for how we view and study the influence of parties in the House. No matter if Journal vote requests are obstruction or tools of the leadership, they can potentially reveal a great deal about the behaviour of both the majority and minority party in the House. Minority party behaviour is alarmingly understudied in the literature (Krehbiel & Wiseman 2005), so any examination of minority behaviour

expands the breadth of knowledge about congressional behaviour. Journal votes can reveal important information about how the minority party and its members act in House, an area not extensively covered in the literature.

The paper expands on the previous literature by examining the individual requests made by House members. Specifically, I argue that majority and minority members of the House attempt to accomplish different goals. Therefore, Journal requests by majority and minority members must be considered separately. Journal vote requests made by majority members should be primarily used to assist majority party leaders. Journal requests made by the minority could be used to both benefit leaders and as obstruction of the majority. I find that both predominate theories of Journal votes are correct to some extent. Majority Journal requests appear to be driven solely by party leadership, while minority Journal requests contain a hint of obstruction that appears to be motivated by re-election.

This paper serves multiple purposes. First, it tests competing theories on the use of Journal vote requests in the House. Second, it is the first individual level analysis of Journal vote requests. Previous studies on Journal votes focus on aggregate level data or on acceptance of the Journal. I go a step beyond by assessing what causes individual members of the House to request a Journal vote. This individual level analysis is important because it provides a glimpse into the motivations of Members of Congress, lends insight to the inner workings of Congressional procedures and rules, and reveals the level of control party leaders have over their rank-and-file. Furthermore, this paper brings to light the different motivations of majority and minority party members and how these differences alter the implementation of Congressional

procedure.

### Literature Review

Traditionally, the literature views Journal votes as ‘pure protest’ of the minority against the majority (Rohde 1991). Rohde is not examining Journal vote requests but whether or not House members vote to accept the Journal. Rohde argues that votes against the Journal have no substantive policy purpose and are therefore only used by minority members to protest the actions of the majority. In examining Republicans in 1980s, Rhode finds that the frequency of voting against the Journal differentiates ‘confrontational’ and ‘traditional’ minority members. Rohde finds that minority members with higher levels of party loyalty and less tenure were more likely to be confrontational to the majority party and vote to reject the Journal more frequently. Rohde’s characterisations of confrontational minority members are supported by Connelly and Pitney (1994), who also examine Republicans in the 1980s and early 1990s. Overall, Rohde suggests that more loyal and less tenured minority members are more likely to attempt to protest or obstruct the majority and that one of the primary ways of doing so is through voting to reject the Journal.

Patty (2009) argues that Journal votes are not simply protest votes used by the minority. Patty notes that the majority requests votes on the Journal as frequently, if not more so, than the minority. Nevertheless, Patty (2009) notes that the Speaker possesses the authority to delay challenges to the Journal to later in the day. The Speaker typically uses this authority and places the actual vote on the Journal directly before a string of more important votes. These facts do not match the traditional view of Journal votes. Patty (2009) explains that Journal votes may be used by the party

leaders to anticipate and control contentious votes. Patty (2009) reveals that Journal votes are more likely to occur on days where party unity is high and the margin between those voting for and against are small. Thus, Patty (2009) concludes that Journal votes are used, not as a mechanism for protest, but as a tool of party leaders.

Specifically, Patty (2009) argues that Journal votes help reduce the organisational cost of party leaders. He notes that party leaders have limited resources and must expend those resources to discover the intentions of their members and persuade their votes. Party leaders, by using Journal votes, can collect all party members in one place and inform them on more important upcoming votes (also see Sinclair 1995). For example, Journal votes are likely to coincide with important procedural votes. Procedures are one of the main sources of majority party power (Cox & McCubbins 1993), so if leaders can make procedural votes more efficient, it gives them a way to more effectively govern the chamber and their party. Patty (2009) finds that days with Journal votes are more likely to also have more contentious and partisan votes. Patty's findings not only reveal the strategic nature of Journal votes, they also have strong implications for broader literature on the effects of parties in the House (Cox & McCubbins 1993; Cox & McCubbins 2005; Sinclair 1995; Aldrich & Rohde 2000; Aldrich & Rohde 2001; Rohde 1991). Patty (2009), however, does not look at the individual requesting the Journal votes and, thus, does not examine the reasons individual members actually make requests. This reveals a slight gap in his findings as it is individual members who make request for Journal votes. Furthermore, Patty does not separate Journal days into whether the requests were made by the minority or the majority. I show that there are reasons to believe that requests from the majority and

the minority will differ systematically.

The existing literature on Journal votes reveals that House members are motivated to use votes to either obstruct or assist majority leadership. The literature, however, does not actually test the reasons individual members request Journal votes. This is a significant oversight because the process is triggered by individual House members. Thus, to fully understand Journal requests, it is vital to understand the reasons make requests. Therefore, even though both Patty (2009) and Rohde (1991) provide compelling theoretical investigations, they conduct incomplete empirical tests. Furthermore, majority and minority party members are motivated by different factors. For example, majority party members are concerned with making their party's brand name look as good as possible, while the minority party wishes to tarnish the majority party as much as possible. Majority party members wish to keep the majority status, while minority party members wish to displace the majority (Cox & McCubbins 1993; Jones 1970). Thus, Journal request may be used for different purposes by members depending on their party's status in the chamber. To completely examine the use of Journal requests, individual requests must be studied using individual level data and, furthermore, must be divided by party. In addition, the motivations behind requesting a Journal vote must be established.

### Theory

The literature presents two competing theories of Journal vote in the United States House of Representatives. The first argues that Journal votes are simply dilatory tactics employed to slow down the majority party's agenda. The second argues that Journal vote request are tools of party leaders designed to decrease the cost of

organisation and increase the effectiveness of party whips.

These two theories make very different prediction regarding what type of House member should request Journal votes. First, the dilatory theory predicts that the minority party members should be making Journal vote requests, specifically those discontent with the majority party. Patty (2009) shows that, for the most part, this is not the case, as the majority party requests a sizable portion of Journal votes. However, Patty does not reveal what type of minority members are requesting Journal votes, leaving parts of the dilatory theory untested. Second, the leadership assistance theory predicts that party leaders, or those representing party leaders, are those making Journal vote requests.<sup>1</sup>

<<Insert Table 1 here>>

Table 1 presents a cursory test of the predictions of these two theories.<sup>2</sup> Table 1, obviously, confirms the finding of Patty (2009) that the majority party requests Journal votes and, more specifically, that party leaders themselves are making Journal vote requests. Table 1 also shows that party leaders and their representatives, on both sides of the aisle, make a large portion of Journal vote requests, accounting for well over half of all requests.<sup>3</sup> This basic evidence provides a great deal of support for the leadership assistance theory and makes intuitive sense as both parties can equally benefit from the organisational benefits of Journal votes.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is important to note that leaders may be using representatives to actually implement Journal votes, instead of doing it themselves. Leaders may be too busy to actually request the vote so they send rank-and-file members to do it. Furthermore, requesting a Journal vote at the behest of party leaders could be a way for rank-and-file members to garner favor with leaders. The design of this paper and the data available prevent further exploration of these questions, however, future research will attempt to address these shortcomings.

<sup>2</sup> Descriptions of the data used in Table 1 can be found in the Data and Methods section.

<sup>3</sup> Leaders are defined by *Politics in America*. In addition members with a close ideological distance or a loyalty score of .95 or higher are defined as leader representatives. This is used as a proxy for leader representatives in order to more accurately test the leadership assistance theory.

While Patty (2009) primarily focuses on the majority leadership and their use, minority leaders request a great deal of Journal votes. Minority party leaders obviously want to reduce their organisational cost, thus they may request votes for the same reasons as majority leaders. Furthermore, the situations in which Journal votes benefit the majority should also benefit the minority. Basically, both sets of leaders can potentially benefit from Journal votes regardless of who actually request the votes. Thus, the majority may allow the minority to request Journal votes in order to reap their own benefit. Therefore, it is not overly surprising that leaders, for both parties, make up a large majority of Journal vote requests.

Table 1, however, reveals that party leaders and their representatives do not make all Journal requests. According to the leadership assistance theory this is a somewhat unexpected finding and begs to the following questions: what type of House members, for both the majority and minority, are making Journal request without leadership approval, and what motivates these members? In the following paragraphs, I use the existing literature to make predictions about what type of non-leader House members are requesting Journal votes and why they are doing so.

Rank-and-file members from either party may request Journal votes to accomplish various goals or appease various constituencies (Fenno 1973; Mayhew 1974; Dodd 1977). For example, members of Congress may act to achieve re-election (Mayhew 1974; Cox & McCubbins 1993; Cox & McCubbins 2005) or policy (Fenno 1973; Aldrich & Rohde 2000; Aldrich & Rohde 2001). Furthermore, members of Congress may act to appease numerous constituencies such as their own personal preferences, their electoral constituency, or their geographic constituency (Fenno 1978).



Thus, if rank-and-file members are not acting on the behalf of leaders with their Journal vote requests, they should be acting to achieve one of these goals.

Members of Congress of either party who are seeking re-election should be influenced to request Journal votes based on the ideology of their district. Members seeking re-election need to follow their districts lead, so if the district favors obstruction, so to should the member. While district ideology influences both majority and minority members, it does so in the opposite direction. For majority members, moderate district ideology should influence Journal vote requests. Of the majority party districts, moderate ones are more likely to be farther from the majority position than extreme districts. Thus, moderate majority districts are more likely to oppose the position of the majority party, leading their representatives more likely to protest or attempt to delay the majority.

The opposite applies for minority party members seeking re-election. Minority members seeking re-election choose to request Journal votes based on the preferences of their respective districts. Specifically, minority members coming from more extreme districts are should be more likely to request Journal votes. Moderate districts are inherently more sympathetic to the majority than extreme districts. Thus, minority members from moderate districts will not want to possibly forsake middle-of-the-road voters by openly obstructing the majority. Members from extreme districts, however, do not need to appeal to moderate voters and can pander to the extreme voter by protesting, thus voicing their disapproval with the majority party.

Theoretically, it may be difficult to buy Journal requests as tools used to aide re-election. Arnold (1990) argues that for any action of members to aide re-election, it

must be traceable to the member. Simply put, Journal votes are not likely to be noticed by the general public and thus, are not traceable. However, if the member is trying to build up a reputation of obstructing or badgering the majority they may be able to add to their reputation by doing seemingly unnoticeable acts such as requesting Journal votes. Thus, Journal votes may help a member present an overall impression of contempt towards the majority that is then conveyed by the media or interest groups.

Furthermore, the re-election argument may not hold for the majority party. According to the Procedural Cartel Theory (Cox & McCubbins 1993; Cox & McCubbins 2005), the majority party is granted an allotment of tools that allow them to set the agenda and discipline party members. Cartel Theory claims that the end result of these powers is increased electoral security for majority members. Thus, majority members should be able to rely on their party to bolster re-election, instead of taking re-election into their own hands. The traceability, or lack thereof, of Journal votes and the conclusions of Cartel Theory suggest that re-election may not be the primary influence of non-leadership Journal vote requests.

Members who request Journal votes, not designed to aide leaders, may also be doing so to accomplish their own policy objectives. If this is the case, Journal vote requests should be influenced by the members' own ideology. Members seeking policy use their ideology as a guide for determining what bills to delay and protest. They do not delay in order to gain recognition or electoral gains but because they personally disagree with the policy implications. Thus, they use their own personal ideology to determine when to request Journal votes. As with district ideology, personal ideology should have a different influence on Journal vote requests, depending on party. More

moderate majority members are more likely to protest the policies of the majority party, while more extreme minority members are more likely to do so. Furthermore, it is not just member's basic ideology that leads them to obstruct for policy gains, but their ideological distance from the majority party median as well. The farther any member's ideology (majority or minority) is from the majority party median ideology, the more likely they are to disagree with the policy positions of the majority and seek to obstruct (Dion 1997). Overall, if members of Congress are seeking policy gains by requesting Journal votes then personal ideology should influence Journal request.

In addition to re-election and ideology, the existing literature shows that party loyalty and tenure influence the usage of roll call votes (Rohde 1991; Connelly, Jr. & Pitney 1994). Thus, we can expect that more loyal party members, particularly of the minority party, are more likely to request Journal votes. Furthermore, we can expect more junior members of Congress are more likely to make Journal vote requests. The several theories regarding Journal vote requests in the U.S. House reveal several reasons why individual members of the House might request a Journal vote. Below, I compile the reasons into hypotheses regarding the individual implementation of Journal votes. I explicitly describe these hypotheses and discuss ways to accurately test them.

### Hypotheses

The two overarching theories of Journal votes presented in this paper lead to rather different hypotheses. The Dilatory hypothesis states that Journal votes are used to protest the majority. Thus, we should see members of the House who are discontent with the majority party making Journal requests. As Patty (2009) has shown, this is simply not the case. Therefore, I forego a direct test of the overall Dilatory hypothesis.

The Leadership Assistance theory (Patty 2009) predicts that leaders use Journal votes to aide with party organisation and negotiations. This leads to the following hypothesis regarding the individual decision to request Journal votes:

*Leadership Assistance Hypothesis:* Party leaders are more likely to request Journal votes and do so more often. Because leaders of both parties can receive organisational benefits from Journal votes, the Leadership Assistance Hypothesis should apply to both parties.

Table 1 revealed that not all Journal requests are made by party leaders and their representatives. Thus, the following hypotheses are used to determine what motivates non-leader members to request Journal votes.

*Re-election Hypothesis:* Minority members with more extreme district ideologies are more likely to request Journal votes. Majority members with more moderate district ideologies are more likely to request Journal votes. Support for the Re-election Hypothesis will indicate that re-election is a motivation influencing Journal vote requests.

*Policy Hypothesis:* Minority members with more extreme ideologies are more likely to request Journal votes. Majority members with more moderate ideologies are more likely to request Journal votes. Support for the Policy Hypothesis will indicate that policy preferences are a motivating influence on Journal vote requests.

*Distance Hypothesis:* The further any member is from the ideological median of the majority party the more likely they are to request Journal votes. This hypothesis assumes that Journal votes are being used as obstruction and that the motivation driving the obstruction is based on policy concerns. Members ideologically distant from

the majority would not seek to benefit leaders by requesting Journal votes, thus, we can assume that if this hypothesis holds, some Journal votes are being used as obstruction. Alternatively, finding that members closer to the majority median are more likely to request Journal votes would supply support for the Leadership Assistance Hypothesis. If this is the case, we could assume that members closer to the majority median are acting as representatives of the leadership and try to reduce leaders' organisational costs.

*Party Loyalty/Seniority Hypothesis:* Members more loyal to their party are more likely to request Journal votes. More junior members of the House are more likely to request Journal votes. This hypothesis stems from the findings of Rohde (1991) and Connelly and Pitney (1994) who find more junior and loyal minority members are more likely to prefer a strategy of obstruction when dealing with the majority party. Furthermore, junior members may be more likely to request Journal votes because they are running errands for party leaders. Basically, party leaders use more junior members to do their Journal vote bidding.

### Methods and Data

Using roll call data provided by Rohde (2004), I was able to determine the Roll Call number of each vote on the Journal in the House from the 103<sup>rd</sup> to 106<sup>th</sup> Congress. I then looked up each Journal vote in the Congressional Record and recorded the House members requesting the Journal vote. Using this information I created two variables which serve as the two dependent variables of this paper. The first is a dichotomous variable indicating whether a member of the House requested a Journal vote. The second is a count variable which measures the number of times each

member requested a Journal vote. This allows us to test not only what causes House members to request Journal votes but what causes some members to do it more than others.

I use the following independent variables to test the prediction of the paper. Party loyalty is measured as the percentage of times a member supports their party divided by the number of opportunities available to support their party on partisan votes. Partisan votes exist when a majority of one party votes against the majority of the other party. Tenure is measured as the number of consecutive years served in the House. Both party unity and tenure are included in the model to control for the findings of Rohde (1991), who found that more loyal and junior minority members are more likely to vote against accepting the Journal (thus, more likely to delay). If loyal and newer members are more likely to vote against the Journal, they may very well be more likely to request votes on the Journal as well. Party leaders are coded by using a dichotomous variable. Lists of party leaders were obtained through *Politics in America* (1994-2000).<sup>4</sup> District Ideology is measured as the percent of the vote that the presidential candidate of the member's party received in the previous presidential election. According to the theory, this variable should be significant and negative for minority members, indicating that minority House members from moderate districts are less likely to obstruct using Journal votes. Ideology is the folded DW-Nominate score. In essence, this score is not measuring the pure ideology of House members, but how extreme they are. Distance from the Party is measured as the absolute value of the difference between the member's party's ideological median (DW-Nominate) and the

---

<sup>4</sup> Assistant Whips for Republicans and At-Large Whips for Democrats were excluded because of the large number of members in these two groups.

member's ideology. Lastly, Electoral Security is measured as the percent of the vote that each member received in their last election.

I use two different statistical models to test the hypotheses of this paper. I use logit models for the dichotomous dependent variable and zero-inflated poisson models for the count dependent variable. Zero-inflated poisson models are used because a large majority of House members request no Journal votes, thus the assumption of normality needed to conduct a regular poisson regression does not hold. I run individual models for both majority and minority members. This allows us to not only test why members request Journal votes but also what causes members to request them more frequently.

## Results

<<Insert Table 2 here>>

Table 2 presents the results of the logit models. In the Majority Model, only two variables significant impact the likelihood of requesting a Journal vote: party leaders and seniority. Being a party leader in the majority party significantly increases the likelihood of requesting a Journal vote. In addition, more junior majority members are also significantly more likely to request Journal votes. I argue in the discussion below that these results strongly support the Leadership Assistance theory and the claims of Patty (2009). The Majority Model also shows that ideology, district ideology, security, loyalty, and distance from the majority are all insignificant. These results show that no matter what electoral situation majority members are in, how loyal they are, or how much the ideologically disagree with the party, they are no more likely to request Journal votes. These results suggest that all of the hypotheses presented above, besides the

Leadership Assistance Hypothesis, do not apply to the majority party. This becomes clearer in the discussion where I argue that the seniority result is a function of serving party leaders.

Table 2 also indicates which variables influence minority party members to request Journal votes. In the Minority Model, there are also only two variables that influence the implementation of Journal votes. As with the majority, being a minority party leaders are significantly more likely to request a Journal vote. Again, this provides support to the Leadership Assistance Hypothesis. In addition to party leaders, district ideology significantly impacts minority Journal vote requests. Table 2 indicates that as minority member's district become more moderate they are less likely to request a Journal vote. This also means that minority members from more extreme districts are more likely to make Journal requests. I argue that these results support both the Leadership Assistantship and the Seniority Hypothesis.

<<Insert Table 3 here>>

Table 3 reports the results of the zero-inflated poisson models.<sup>5</sup> In the Majority Model the only variable that significantly increases the number of Journal vote requests is party leaders. This means that being a majority party leader significantly increases the number of Journal requests made. No other variable impacts the frequency of requests for the majority party. As with the logit models loyalty, district ideology, security and distance from the party do not increase the frequency of majority party Journal

---

<sup>5</sup> Each of the models in Table 4 excludes outliers. One outlier was dropped from each model. Traficant from the 103<sup>rd</sup> Congress was dropped from the Majority Model and McNulty from the 106<sup>th</sup> was dropped from the Minority Model. These members were excluded because they requested Journal votes at a much higher frequency than the normal House member. Including these members provided increased difficulty for the statistical analysis. Furthermore, analysis of these members showed that their behaviour may have been personal quirks as opposed to the systematic characteristics examined in this paper.



requests. Furthermore, seniority loses significance between the logit and poisson models. Thus, even the only other variable that impacts the likelihood of requests does not affect frequency. The poisson models are clear, only being a party leader increases the frequency of Journal requests for the majority, supporting the notions behind the Leadership Assistance Hypothesis.

The Minority Model in the poisson table indicates that two variables significantly impact the decision of minority members to requests Journal votes: district ideology and party leaders. The results of the Minority Model in the poisson tables mirror those of the logit models. Minority party leaders request significantly more Journal votes than their non-leader counterparts. Again, supplying support to the Leadership Assistance Hypothesis. District ideology is once again significant and suggests that minority members from more extreme districts request Journal votes more frequently. I argue below that this suggest some minority Journal votes are used as obstruction and that this obstruction is used for electoral purposes.

### Discussion

I now discuss what the results presented above reveal about the different hypotheses of this paper. Overall, the Leadership Assistance Hypothesis gains the most support from the statistical analysis of this paper. In all four models presented (Majority and Minority Models in both the logit and poisson tables) party leaders significantly increase the usage of Journal votes. Party leaders are more likely to request Journal votes and request them more often. If party leaders, particularly majority leaders, are requesting Journal votes at a high rate it is safe to assume that Journal votes are not 'pure protest' votes against the majority. Thus, it appears that the

primary function of Journal votes in the modern House is to assist leaders in their task of organising and whipping party members. The findings of Patty (2009), for the most part, are confirmed by the analysis of individual Journal vote requests presented in this paper. This is especially true for the majority party and appears to explain most of the minority's party usage of Journal requests.

The Re-election Hypothesis for the majority party is not supported by this analysis. The variables used to gauge members concern over re-election are completely insignificant for the majority party. As just mentioned, this is due to the fact that Patty (2009) almost completely explains the use of majority party Journal requests. It is a slightly different story for the minority party. District ideology is significant in both the logit and poisson regressions for the minority party in the expected direction. These findings indicate that minority party members from more extreme ideological districts are more likely to use Journal requests. Based on the theories of congressional motivations I argue that some minority members are using Journal requests to increase their re-election chances by trying to appease the extreme nature of their districts.<sup>6</sup> It appears that these minority members are using Journal requests as obstruction to create an image of challenging the majority, in order to pander to their more extreme districts. Since Journal vote requests are traditionally viewed as protest, the minority member can seem like they are challenging the majority. These members are allowed to get away with protesting or delaying the majority because the majority inherently benefits Journal votes. Thus, minority party members from extreme districts can work on their

---

<sup>6</sup> A second explanation could be that these findings are the result of selection bias, meaning that more extreme districts elect more extreme representatives who are acting on their policy preferences when they obstruct. I have attempted to control for this situation by using independent variable that measure the policy preferences of members, however, some bias could still remain.

own re-election while majority party leaders simultaneously reap organisational benefits.

The hypotheses regarding policy (Policy and Distance) find no support for either the majority or the minority. Neither ideology nor the ideological distance from the majority median are significant in any of the models. This indicates that policy is not a determining factor for Journal requests usage. This makes intuitive since Journal requests actually aide leaders in the passage of legislation. Furthermore, if a member intends on using a Journal vote as a means of protest, it is not effective at stopping the legislation. Thus, if a member truly wanted to prevent a piece of legislation from passing, they would most likely attempt a more effective means of obstruction or protest.

Two more hypotheses remain to discuss. First, party loyalty is never significant. This is somewhat surprising since the Leadership Assistance Hypothesis was given so much support. Theoretically, more loyal members should be more supportive of leaders and thus more willing to aide leaders with Journal requests. However, this does not appear to be the case. The null results for loyalty might be due to the fact that the effect of leaders is absorbed by the party leader dummy variable. Seniority is significant only for the majority party and only in the logit model. This indicates that more junior members are more likely to requests Journal vote but that individual junior members do not frequently request Journal votes. This indicates that majority leaders are using junior members to request Journal votes on their behalf, but seem to be spreading the responsibility around to several junior members instead of making a select few make all requests.

### Conclusion

This article provides an individual level analysis of Journal vote requests in the U.S. House of Representatives. Previous studies of Journal votes had only analysed Journal votes on the aggregate level. I used these studies to test competing hypotheses regarding the implementation of Journal votes. Overall, Patty's (2009) notion that Journal votes serve the interest of party leaders by reducing their organisational cost is the prevailing finding of this analysis. Party leaders are more likely to and more frequently request Journal votes, giving a great deal of credence to the Leadership Assistance Hypothesis. Thus, I share Patty's sentiments that Congressional procedures, no matter how mundane, should be examined to determine the true nature of party influence in Congress. Furthermore, if procedures viewed as useless or simply protest, such as Journal votes, can be shown to have intricate and significant effects on the legislative process, we must review our understanding of Congressional procedure and analyse how the parties truly influence the actions of Congress.

While this research answers questions regarding the individual implementation of Journal votes, further research is needed to fully satisfy this question and other related topics. First, this research is limited to quantitative data regarding the implementation of Journal requests. I make several assumptions regarding the motivation of House members in their use of Journal requests. These assumptions, however, cannot be proven with the data provided in this paper. More in depth interviews of House members and case studies of important legislation is needed to accurately test these assumptions about members' motivations. Second, the time frame of this particular study is rather small. An expanded dataset will provide an opportunity to make broader

generalisations about Journal votes throughout the history of the House. In addition, an in depth analysis of other Congressional procedures is needed to determine exactly how different procedures effect the legislative process and how these procedures can be altered to make Congress more effective at legislating.

## Bibliography

- Aldrich, J.H. & Rohde, D.W., 2000. "The Consequences of Party organization in the House: The Role of the Majority and Minority Parties in Conditional Party Government," in *Polarized Politics: Congress and the President in a Partisan Era*. Washington D.C.: CQ Press.
- Aldrich, J.H. & Rohde, D.W., 2001. "The Logic of Conditional Party Government: Revisiting the Electoral Connection," in *Congress Reconsidered*. Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc.
- Arnold, R.D., 1990. *The Logic of Congressional Action*, Yale University Press.
- Connelly, Jr., W.F. & Pitney, J.J., 1994. *Congress' Permanent Minority?*, Littlefield Adams Quality Paperbacks.
- Cox, G.W. & McCubbins, M.D., 1993. *Legislative leviathan: Party Government in the House*, University of California Press.
- Cox, G.W. & McCubbins, M.D., 2005. *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives*, Cambridge University Press.
- Dion, D., 1997. *Turning the Legislative Thumbscrew: Minority Rights and Procedural Change in Legislative Politics*, University of Michigan Press.
- Dodd, L.C., 1977. "Congress and the Quest for Power," In *Congress Reconsidered*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Fenno, R., 1978. *Home style: House Members in Their Districts*, Boston: Little Brown.
- Fenno, R.F., 1973. *Congressmen in Committees*, Little, Brown and Co.
- Jones, C.O., 1970. *The Minority Party in Congress*, Little, Brown and Co.
- Krehbiel, K. & Wiseman, A., 2005. "Joe Cannon and the Minority Party: Tyranny or Bipartisanship?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 30(4), 479-505.
- Mayhew, D.R., 1974. *Congress: The Electoral Connection*, Yale University Press.
- Patty, J.W., 2009. "Dilatory or anticipatory? Voting on the Journal in the House of Representatives," *Public Choice*, 143(1-2), 121-133.
- Rohde, D.W., 1991. *Parties and Leaders in the Postreform House*, University of Chicago Press.

Rohde, D.W., 2004. *Roll Call Voting Data for the United States House of Representatives, 1953-2004. Compiled by the Political Institutions and Public Choice Program*, East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Sinclair, B., 1995. *Legislators, Leaders, and Lawmaking: The U.S. House of Representatives in the Postreform Era*, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Table 1

Journal Vote Requests 103<sup>rd</sup> – 106<sup>th</sup> Congress

---

	Majority Requests	Minority Requests	Total
Leader or Representative	90	83	173
	78%	92%	84%
Non-Leaders	25	7	32
	22%	8%	16%
Total	115	90	205
	100%	100%	100%

---



Table 2

Likelihood of Making a Journal Vote Request 103<sup>rd</sup> – 106<sup>th</sup> House

	<u>Majority Model</u>	<u>Minority Model</u>
Party Loyalty	.75 (3.17)	6.31 (4.24)
District Ideology	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.04 (0.015)***
Party Leader	0.79 (0.33)**	0.71 (0.35)**
Seniority	-0.04 (0.02)**	0.02 (0.016)
Ideology	0.89 (1.32)	.89 (2.6)
Electoral Security	0.02 (1.07)	1.9 (1.34)
Distance from Party Median	-1.17 (1.78)	-2.00 (2.50)
Constant	-2.7 (2.65)	-7.83 (3.15)***
N	943	795
Log Likelihood	-257.17	-189.43
Chi <sup>2</sup>	14.13**	31.37***

*Note: Standard Errors in Parentheses. \*\*\*p<.01 \*\*p<.05.*

Table 3

Frequency of Journal Votes 103<sup>rd</sup> – 106<sup>th</sup> House

	<u>Majority Model</u>	<u>Minority Model</u>
Party Loyalty	2.90 (3.25)	7.22 (4.12)
District Ideology	-0.017 (.016)	-0.04 (0.014) <sup>***</sup>
Party Leader	.72 (.319) <sup>**</sup>	1.05 (.314) <sup>***</sup>
Seniority	-.03 (.018)	.02 (.017)
Ideology	.709 (1.41)	.56 (2.5)
Electoral Security	.05 (1.05)	1.60 (1.32)
Distance from Party Median	-2.16 (1.74)	-0.70 (2.5)
Constant	-0.084 (2.67)	-7.19 (3.1) <sup>**</sup>
N	942	794
Log Likelihood	-316.65	-226.25
Chi <sup>2</sup>	12.28	44.16 <sup>***</sup>

*Note: Standard Errors in Parentheses. \*\*\*p<.01 \*\*p<.05.*