

**HOW DEPUTY ROLES EFFECT LEGISLATIVE AND CONSTITUENCY SERVICE  
BEHAVIOR IN NASCENT DEMOCRACIES:  
the Case of the Honduran Congress**

by

Michelle M. Taylor-Robinson  
Associate Professor  
Department of Political Science  
Texas A&M University  
TAMU-4348  
College Station, TX 77843-4348  
(409) 845-2674  
fax (409) 847-8924  
E339MT@polisci.tamu.edu

For the conference on "Re-Thinking Democracy in the New Millennium", Houston, TX,  
February 17-19, 2000

This research was funded by grants from the Texas A&M University Program to Enhance  
Scholarly and Creative Activities and NSF Grant #Y460895. The author would like to thank  
Rachel Gibson, Robert Harmel, Kim Hill, Wendy Hunter, Donley Studlar, John Robertson,

Forest Robinson, Guy Whitten, and Bruce Wilson for their helpful comments on this project.  
Any errors, of course, are my own.

**HOW DEPUTY ROLES EFFECT LEGISLATIVE AND CONSTITUENCY SERVICE  
BEHAVIOR IN NASCENT DEMOCRACIES:  
the Case of the Honduran Congress**

**ABSTRACT**

This article reports on a motivational analysis of deputy roles in the Honduran Congress to assess how roles effect deputy behavior and compare the roles found in a nascent third wave democracy with those found in institutionalized democracies. This work is patterned after Searing's (1985, 1987, 1991, 1994) work on the British Parliament and Studlar and McAllister's (1996) study of Australian MPs. Four deputy roles are found in Honduras: Socially Concerned Rangers, Strengthen the Legislature, Patron Rangers, and Good Party Deputies. Legislative work and constituency service are compared for behavioral differences across roles. The number and type of bills proposed by deputies and the level and type of speech-making are found to vary with role type. While deputy definitions of whom they represent do not vary systematically with role type, the services and activities deputies say they perform for their constituents, as well as their motives do vary with role.

**HOW DEPUTY ROLES EFFECT LEGISLATIVE AND CONSTITUENCY SERVICE  
BEHAVIOR IN NASCENT DEMOCRACIES:  
The Case of the Honduran Congress**

Since Burke's proposal of the trustee-delegate dichotomy, representational roles have been a subject of interest in the study of legislative institutions (see for example Wahlke, Eulau, Buchanan and Ferguson 1962; Woshinsky 1973; Alpert 1979; Converse and Pierce 1979; McCrone and Kuklinski 1979; Kim, Barkan, Turan and Jewell 1983). This research was hampered, however, by an inability to show a relationship between role type and behavior (Jewell 1983; Hedlund 1985). Still, the question is an intriguing one -- does the way that deputies view their job influence whom they represent and how? Does it influence their behavior in other ways?

Donald Searing (1985, 1987, 1991, 1994), in his landmark work on the British House of Commons, addresses this question using motivational analysis, asking MPs how they view their job. The virtue of this approach is that while it takes into account the institutional constraints that influence deputy behavior, it acknowledges that within these parameters deputies have latitude to determine how they will do their job. The role deputies chose is influenced by what motivates them and what they want to accomplish. Searing (1991) also argues that the delegate/trustee dichotomy (or the trichotomy of delegate/trustee/politico), while philosophically interesting, is not how deputies view their job. Because it does not tap the motivations that drive people to run for office, it does not produce a consistent or strong correlation with behavior. If, however, we ask deputies what they view their job to be and what motivates them, we should uncover deputy roles that correlate with important deputy behaviors.

This article extends Searing's work by applying motivation-based role analysis to third wave democracies. Most motivation-based role analysis has focused on institutionalized legislatures.<sup>1</sup> Here the Honduran Congress is used as a case study to explore the role orientations of deputies in a nascent democracy where historically the Congress was a "marginal legislature"

(Mezey 1979). Does this undemocratic history and legacy of a weak legislature affect the roles deputies perceive for themselves? What types of deputy roles are uncovered in this quite different setting? Do they resemble the deputy roles found by Searing (1994) in Britain or Studlar and McAllister (1996) in Australia? Some similarities could be expected due to the intended function of the legislature in all democracies as the representative branch of government. But do deputies perceive representation as (part of) their role? If so, then representation of whom, and how? Does representation mean defending the district's policy interests, delivering pork, attending to individual's needs, or something else? Another function of the legislature, especially in presidential systems, is to check the executive. Traditionally in Latin America this has not happened when deputies are indebted to the president for their position and have little incentive to constrain the power of their patron. Thus, an important question for third wave democracies is whether any deputies perceive their role as checking the executive. Finally, what do deputy roles and the behaviors they produce tell us about the chances of democratic consolidation?

Building on Searing's methodology I uncovered four different deputy roles in the Honduran Congress. As shown below, these roles produce different legislative and constituency service behavior, and they have implications for democratic consolidation.

### **WHY THE HONDURAN CONGRESS?**

The Honduran Congress was chosen for this first motivational role analysis of a third wave democracy because it is representative of many young legislatures in Latin America. Honduras installed democracy in 1982 when presidential, congressional, and local elections were held after 10 years of military rule. For much of the 1970s the Congress was closed, or vastly restructured into a corporatist body made up of representatives of business and labor organizations (Morris 1984: 50; Posas 1992; Salomón 1992: II). Since 1982 four elections have

been held, and power has twice changed hands between the two traditional parties. The 1994-97 Congress is thus a good choice for studying deputy roles in a new democracy because by the fourth Congress the deputies had time to develop concepts of roles as well as norms of behavior within the Congress and between the Congress and the Executive.<sup>2</sup>

Honduras' political history and parties makes it an interesting case for study. During the twentieth century it has experienced outwardly democratic regimes, the dictatorship of Tiburcio Carías from 1932-1948, and military governments (Rosenberg 1995). But despite this checkered past, party institutions were more strongly developed than in many Latin American countries. The Liberal Party (PLH) was founded in the 1890s, and the National Party (PNH) in the 1910s, and both parties have elected deputies to the Congress during every democratic or pseudo-democratic regime in this century. Politics in Honduras has always been party politics, at least when it has not been military politics, and the Liberal and National Parties still dominate the political scene. A deputy with political ambitions must work through one of these established parties, and party switching is unheard of (though faction switching within one's party is common). Thus, we would expect parties to be a major factor in how at least some deputies define their role.

Finally, a brief outline of the electoral system and the organization of the Congress is necessary before moving on to deputy roles and their impact on politicians' behaviors. The Honduran Congress is unicameral and its members are elected via closed-list proportional representation from 18 departments. Until 1997 deputy elections were fused with presidential elections, and voters cast one vote for president, three vice-presidents, a slate of deputies for their department, and a deputy slate for the Central American Parliament. In the 1997 elections voters cast a separate vote for a slate of deputies, and the prospect of this change may have influenced the behavior of some of the members of the 1994-97 Congress. However, it is doubtful that this change affected behavior much because the deputy ballot was still on the same page as the

presidential ballot, and deputy names were not printed on the ballot; only the party name and banner were listed. Also, deputy lists continue to be chosen largely through back-room bargaining between faction leaders and the party's presidential candidate. Though both major parties now hold primaries, the order of deputy candidates on each party's list is still greatly influenced by deal-making between factions. Thus, even though deputy elections are no longer fused, Congress aspirants are still largely dependent on the good will of their party or faction leader to obtain an electable place on the list (Taylor 1996).

One hundred twenty-eight deputies (*propietarios*) are elected to a four year term in the Congress, as are 128 substitutes (*suplentes*). Both *propietarios* and *suplentes* are considered representatives of their departments, and both can propose bills. *Suplentes*, however, can only participate in Congress debates and vote when they are called to fill in for a *propietario*, and they are not appointed to Congress commissions unless they are appointed to fill in permanently for a *propietario* who dies or leaves the Congress to take another government position. Most *suplentes*, thus, participate little in Congress proceedings. Some *suplentes*, however, attend sessions, propose bills, and take part in debates as frequently as active *propietarios*.<sup>3</sup> For this reason *suplentes* were included along with *propietarios* in this study.

The Congress is led by a Directorate, the *Junta Directiva*, composed of a President, four Vice-Presidents, two Secretaries, and two Pro-Secretaries, elected by the Congress membership. During the 1994-97 Congress it was made up entirely of members of the governing Liberal Party, which held 71 of the 128 seats in the Congress. Each party caucus has a leader (*jefe de fracción*) who acts as the group's spokesperson when necessary and serves as a link to the party leadership.

Lastly, this Congress can be described as "unprofessional" (Squire 1992: 1027-9) in the sense that the reelection rate is low, deputies have little opportunity to gain policy expertise, and are provided with virtually no resources for research or attending to the needs of their constituency.<sup>4</sup> Only the members of the Congress Directorate have their own offices, assistants,

and secretaries. The party *jefes* have an office and secretaries, but these offices tend to be used by many members of the party and are a focal point for party activity. Commission presidents get a small office, though most do not have even a secretary. The Congress has a small staff of advisors who work primarily for the Directorate, and there is also a secretarial pool, though most of its time is occupied with Congress business (i.e., typing the day's agenda, transcribing plenary session minutes, archiving Congress records, preparing the final version of bills to be sent to the president).

For approximately eight months a year the Congress meets two consecutive afternoons/evenings a week followed by one morning session (Tuesday through Thursday). This compressed schedule accommodates the transportation difficulties of deputies from departments far from the capital, and suggests an acknowledgment of the duty of deputies to represent the people of their district. However, deputies are not given a budget to hire staff who can help attend to constituent demands, or a budget for travel around their departments.

## **THE DATA**

The data about role orientations and constituency service were obtained from interviews or surveys with 72 members of the 1994-97 class of the Honduran Congress. The set of deputies who participated in the study includes 56 *propietarios* and 16 *suplentes*, with 39 from the ruling Liberal Party (7 *suplentes*), 31 from the National Party (9 *suplentes*), and the two *propietarios* from the minority Innovation and National Unity Party (PINU). The deputies represent 15 of the country's 18 departments. Twelve of the deputies in the study are women (5 PLH, 7 PNH), which includes all the women *propietarios* in the Congress. Most of the deputies are the Honduran equivalent of backbenchers, though some Congress and party leaders are also included. Twenty-five of the deputies responded to a questionnaire administered in July 1996,

and 47 took part in semi-structured interviews based on the questionnaire during July and August 1997.<sup>5</sup>

Questions were designed to tap the motivation to be a deputy, as well as each deputy's definition of their constituency, and constituency service. Deputies were also asked about committee work, their background, and their future political goals. To facilitate comparison with other works, questions were developed from Searing's (1985, 1987) work on Britain, Studlar and McAllister's (1996) work on Australia, and from various works about roles and constituency service behavior in the U.S. Congress (Parker 1980; Johannes 1983; Bond 1985).<sup>6</sup>

Role orientation measures were constructed from responses to three questions taken directly from Searing's study of the British Parliament and from responses to a question that asked deputies to rank the importance of 11 activities.<sup>7</sup> Based on my past research in Honduras, I considered Searing's questions interesting in their own right for study in a new democracy, and saw no reason why the questions would not translate well into the Honduran context. The three questions were the following: (1) Thinking broadly about your role as a deputy, what are the most important duties and responsibilities involved? (2) Thinking for a moment very broadly about Honduran society, how important is your work as a deputy to the functioning of society as a whole? and (3) Thinking about your political activity, what do you personally find most satisfying about it? What would you miss most if you left politics? According to Searing these questions do several things. The first question taps a purposive role by asking the deputies "to characterize the broadest and most significant aspects of their work." The second question evaluates the importance of the role. The third question allows a fuller exploration of a role's motivational basis through "comments that highlighted motivations through discussions of those aspects of backbench roles that respondents liked best and, sometimes, least" (Searing 1985: 352-3).

## **IDENTIFYING ROLE ORIENTATIONS**

Determining the role orientations of Honduran deputies began with expectations based on my interviewing experience. Three or four dominant roles were expected. One role was a deputy concerned with strengthening the Congress as an institution. The second was what Honduran deputies call the "ranger" role, that appeared similar to Searing's "good constituency member" (1994, 1985). The third was an overwhelmingly political deputy whose political life is tied up with his/her party, rather than the district, constituents, or policy. It also appeared that not all rangers were the same, so I anticipated that the factor analysis might reveal two ranger roles, one an old-style politician based in the tradition of executive controlled government and elite dominated politics, and the other a new-style politician interested in establishing a more broadly participatory democratic system that is responsive to majority needs.

For the formal data analysis an extensive list of categories was compiled from a review of all responses to the role questions for coding deputy responses to the three open-ended role questions (see Appendix). The activities a deputy listed as the four most important in the rank-ordering question were also included. All interviews and surveys were coded independently by the author and a graduate student, after which we met to resolve the cases where our coding differed.

These data were then reduced via factor analysis.<sup>8</sup> Oblique and varimax rotations were conducted, producing virtually identical results (responses grouped together into the same factors, and all deputies loaded onto the same categories). By keeping factors with an eigenvalue above 1.7, four factors emerged, which collectively explained 37.6% of the variance. Only the top four factors were retained for several reasons. First, those four factors depicted theoretically distinct roles. Second, the loading of the deputy responses onto those roles largely confirmed my expectations based on knowledge of Honduras and of the findings of other role analysis studies. Third, the fifth factor appeared to be a political variant on the strengthen legislature role. While

such a role is plausible, very few deputies loaded on that role, so it appeared better to deal with this as a potential sub-type within another role. This decision was based in part on Searing's findings of several sub-types within the dominant roles in the British Parliament. Lastly, review of the factors with lower eigenvalues indicated that they represented small clusters of the original variables that were not substantively interpretable or otherwise of theoretical interest.

### **DEPUTY ROLES IN THE HONDURAN CONGRESS**

The factor analysis uncovered four deputy roles, two "old-style roles" that are legacies of the Congress's and the country's past, and two "new-style roles" that are signs of the changes that may be an encouraging part of the third wave of democracy in Latin America. The two new-style roles are Socially Concerned Rangers and Strengthen the Legislature. The two old-style roles are Patron Rangers and Good Party Deputies. Forty-six of the 72 deputies (64%) received scores that showed them to fit into one of these role orientation categories. Ten deputies' also received a relatively high ranking on a second role orientation, though all but two scored much higher on the first factor than on the other. Searing also found such role overlaps in Britain, and he explained that, "most backbenchers change roles several times" during their careers. Also, deputies "may play more than one [role] at the same time, but usually one predominates over the others and provides the major focus of motivation and activity" (Searing 1985: 354).

That deputies would exhibit some of the features of more than one role orientation is expected given the history of the Honduran Congress as a rubber stamp to the executive where the primary task of deputies was to act as a local patron for their community and individuals. Though the function of the Congress is changing and expanding in the new democracy (Taylor-Robinson and Diaz 1999), the role of deputy has not changed in the eyes of all the people elected to the position. Even new-style deputies still feel compelled to attend to the traditional patron-client aspects of the job, because the people expect it and it is considered essential for getting

reelected (from interviews with deputies). Thus for example, 52 of the 72 deputies mentioned providing services and projects to their departments or communities as part of their job. But these overlaps do not detract from the differences among the role orientations, and the behavioral analysis shows that legislative behavior and perceptions of constituency service differ across the roles.

It was not possible to categorize the role orientations of 26 of the deputies (36%). Some deputies view the job quite differently from their colleagues, and thus do not fit well into any of the four role categories that were dominant in this analysis. For example, at least two of the uncategorized deputies are primarily motivated by policy concerns about a particular policy area (e.g., the needs of the elderly). If a role orientation such as Searing's (1987) "policy advocate" had appeared in this analysis, these deputies would have fit that role well. However, due to the small part that the Honduran Congress has traditionally played in policy-making, and the lack of resources available to deputies for policy research, it is understandable that policy advocacy did not emerge as a dominant role. Some deputies were unclassifiable because they gave ambiguous brief answers to the role questions. This was particularly a problem with some deputies who filled out the survey, though others took the exercise very seriously (some even returned the survey typed and with attachments).<sup>9</sup>

Socially Concerned Ranger Role. Fourteen deputies (19.4% of the 72 deputies in the study) were classified as Socially Concerned Rangers. Eight of these deputies were from the governing Liberal Party and six from the National Party. Five are women, five were *suplentes*, and nine departments are represented.

Several of these deputies identified themselves as rangers. They explained that rangers are different from their colleagues because they are primarily interested in bringing projects to their district rather than legislating, even though the Constitution says a deputy's duty is to legislate. Other responses that characterized this role type were that a deputy represented humble

people, and that part of a deputy's job is to help his/her party get reelected. They said a deputy should not distance him/herself from the people, and many complained about deputies who moved to the capital after being elected, never returning to the district. Many said that a deputy should deliver deeds, not just words, and that the people do not respect deputies who make hollow promises. The "socially concerned" label for this role came from the concern with helping people to help themselves, and helping their communities develop, without an emphasis on personally being known for delivering the pork. Socially Concerned Rangers explained that people need sustainable development and to not be so dependent on government. Deputies in this role type did not view the deputy's help as essential for getting things done. They also said their job is to help people and groups resolve their problems, and to maintain the local party organization.

The "help my party get reelected" and "maintain the local party organization" characteristics were initially perplexing because they seemed more appropriate as part of the "Good Party Deputy" role. However, the constituency service analysis (presented below) highlighted that the Socially Concerned Rangers see their work (i.e., helping groups help themselves, providing pork barrel projects that develop their districts) as reflecting on their party and helping it win votes in the next election. They see their work as a contribution to their party and it is an acknowledgment that politics is party based. It is not a politicization of social services, which is a constant complaint in Honduran politics. In essence, this is an extension of the "credit claiming" concept from U.S. politics (Mayhew 1974; Fenno 1978; Fiorina 1989) to a party-list electoral system.

Strengthen the Legislature Role. Ten deputies (13.9%) fit the dimensions of a Strengthen the Legislature role orientation. Five were from the Liberal Party, and five were Nationals. Two of these deputies are women, one was a *suplicante*, and they were elected from seven departments.

These deputies saw their job as making better laws and building the Congress as an institution. They also wanted to end the partisan attitude of the government and increase the independence of Congress from the executive. In contrast to the Socially Concerned Rangers, these deputies saw their job as legislating. Though many explained that they still attend to the needs of constituents because the people expected it, they did not see that as their real job. Most mentioned studying bills and working on commissions as part of a deputy's job. These deputies also were distinguished by their interest in building or strengthening democracy, and they considered strengthening the Congress and making better laws as central to this goal.

As will be seen below, these deputies were legislative leaders in the Congress, but few held formal leadership positions. Only two held leadership positions during the 1994-97 Congress, and two had in previous Congresses.

Patron Ranger Role. Six deputies (8.3%) were classified as Patron Rangers. Four were from the Liberal Party, while two were Nationals. Two members of this group are women, two were *suplentes*, and they represent four different departments.

As with Searing's (1994: 161-95) Parliament Men role, this "old-style role" is a window on Honduras' past. These deputies are traditional patrons who provide for their clients, and view the patron's assistance as essential to getting the client's need addressed. This important aspect of the role can be seen in the common response that "people know I'm working to help them with their problems," and also that the duty of a deputy is to look for solutions to people's problems. Other responses that loaded on this role type are that it is a deputy's job to help people and groups resolve problems and to provide services and pork barrel projects for their department or community, and it is a deputy's job to meet with constituents and maintain contact with the people.

That this group is small, and the Parliament Men role was also the smallest role category in Searing's study, may be a sign in Honduras, as in Britain, that this old-style patron deputy is a

thing of the past that will disappear as this new democracy matures. However, to predict their disappearance would be premature in Honduras, since the tradition of caudillo politics is still strong. Also four of these deputies were reelected to the 1998-2001 Congress, so their role orientation, though old fashioned, does not appear to have adversely affected their careers.

Good Party Deputy Role. Sixteen deputies (22.2%) fit the role type "Good Party Deputies." Seven were from the Liberal Party, eight Nationals, and one from the PINU. None of these deputies are women, three were *suplentes*, and they were elected from 11 departments.

This is an old-style role because of its connection to parties, and party factions, which are key actors in Honduran politics. Party leaders exercise much control over the political futures of deputies because they organize the departmental lists for elections (see Taylor 1996). Due to the nature of the party institution, a party-oriented role where the job of deputy is conceived primarily in partisan terms rather than in terms of constituency service or policy-making was expected.

When asked about their job and what they would miss most if they left politics these deputies spoke of politics and campaigns, and meeting with other activists in their party. They also mentioned oversight as part of their job, though this is oversight in the sense of criticizing the other party, not oversight to make sure laws are implemented as intended. Another response that loaded on this role category was "do not distance yourself from the people." However, in contrast to the Socially Concerned Ranger role, here "people" should be interpreted to mean militants in the deputy's party, rather than all people. Responsibilities to party supporters were also mentioned.

Several responses which loaded negatively on this role also point to its partisan nature. Many of the deputies in the study mentioned their duty to legislate to benefit all of the people, but this response was conspicuously absent in this role category. Many deputies in the study also mentioned that they were frustrated in their job because they were not able to do enough for the

people (i.e., pork projects, passing legislation), but again this response was noticeable for its absence among this group. Lastly, these deputies did not mention a desire to end the partisan attitude of government -- a problem that rankled many of the other types of deputies.

## HOW DEPUTY ROLES EFFECT BEHAVIOR

Role analysis is most compelling if the roles can be demonstrated to have a behavioral impact. In terms of both legislative behavior and constituency service, roles do appear to shape deputy behavior in the Honduran Congress.

Legislative behavior. One way to compare deputies is participation in the legislative process. Fortunately, two objective indicators of legislative work are available: how many bills a deputy initiates,<sup>10</sup> and how often a deputy speaks in Congress plenary sessions.

Table 1 shows that the average number of bills initiated by deputies differs across the four role types, and so does the percentage of deputies in a role category who initiated legislation. The pattern is similar when the 1990-93 legislative record is included for the deputies who also served in that term.<sup>11</sup> During the 1994-97 Congress the average number of bills initiated per deputy is 4.1, (this number takes into account that 51 of the 128 *propietarios* [40%] did not initiate any bills).<sup>12</sup> In a comparison across role types of the average number of bills initiated, the Strengthen the Legislature Role stands out. The average number of bills initiated by the members of this group was almost twice the Congress average, and it was much larger than the average for the other roles. Also, all of the deputies in this group initiated at least one piece of legislation during their careers, while none of the other role types came close to this level of participation. Their behavior is consistent with their professional desire to legislate. However, the behavior of Good Party deputies is unpredicted. Two-thirds of these deputies initiated bills, and that high level of participation is not consistent with the marginal legislature tradition in Honduras, or the interpretation of this as an "old-style" deputy role whose members accept the established system of control by party leaders and the executive. A possible explanation is presented below.

(insert Table 1 about here)

Because the number of bills initiated by deputies varies from 0 to 93, Table 2 breaks deputy bill initiation into low, medium low, medium high, and high levels. Deputies who initiated no bills were placed in a separate category. The bill initiation levels were determined by dividing the 77 *propietarios* who initiated legislation into groups that are as equal in size as possible.<sup>13</sup> Each cell in Table 2 shows the percentage of deputies in a role type who are in a quartile. The average number of bills per cell is also provided, since the range for some quartiles is large.

(insert Table 2 about here)

Again the deputies in the Strengthen the Legislature role stand out as the legislators. Seventy percent initiated a medium high or high number of bills, and this role type also had the smallest percentage of deputies in the no bills or low cells. Consistent with the Rangers' preference to deliver pork rather than legislate, the deputies in these two roles cluster in the no bills or low cells. Only one Patron Ranger initiated any bills, and that deputy is an outlier for the role type with a high level of bill initiation. Though more Socially Concerned Rangers initiated legislation, bill initiation was not a major part of their work since 85.7% of these deputies were in the medium low quartile of bill initiation, or lower. Still, for some Socially Concerned Rangers bills appear to be a tool for achieving their community development goals. Finally, the bill initiation rates of Good Party Deputies varied widely. An explanation may be that seven of these deputies are current or past party or Congress leaders, ex-ministers, or presidents of important Congress commissions. That they would adopt the Good Party Deputy role is consistent with the traditional means of succeeding in Honduran politics. The average number of bills initiated by these deputies is 5.3, and all but one initiated a medium high or high number of bills. The other nine Good Party Deputies are true backbenchers (four are *suplentes*). While some may harbor ambitions of moving up the political ladder, the legislative behavior of most fits the stereotype of the do-nothing politico who works for their party rather than their district.

The average number of bills initiated by these backbenchers is 1.9 and only two were in the medium high quartile.

Legislative records can also be compared by the types of bills deputies initiate, in particular which type of deputy initiates national-level legislation (see Table 3). Bills were coded according to level of impact (individual, local, sectoral, regional, or national) (see Taylor-Robinson and Diaz 1999). Strengthen the Legislature deputies are expected to propose the most national-level bills, and Socially Concerned Rangers and Patron Rangers should initiate bills targeted at the local and individual-levels, though Socially Concerned Rangers may also propose sectoral-level bills.

(insert Table 3 about here)

Table 3 supports these expectations. The majority of bills initiated by Strengthen the Legislature deputies is national, while Rangers initiated a much lower percentage of national-level legislation. Also 65.3% of legislation initiated by Socially Concerned Rangers has a local, sectoral, or individual target, while 39.6% of the bills initiated by Strengthen the Legislature deputies has these types of targets. This is consistent with their views of their job. Socially Concerned Rangers are more interested in projects than legislating, so it follows that when they do propose bills, they focus on the sub-national-level. Since Strengthen the Legislature deputies want to make better laws, they focus on national-level legislation. However, as shown below, they are aware of their constituency service responsibilities, so it is understandable that some of their bills are local, sectoral, and individual.

The one role that again differs somewhat from expectations is the Good Party Deputy Role. These deputies initiate an above average amount of individual-level bills, as do the Patron Rangers, which is consistent with the traditional nature of these roles. However, more than half of their bills are national in impact. As good party supporters, both on the front and back benches, these are the deputies the executive is likely to turn to when it wants a deputy to initiate

a bill, though it is not possible to systematically track such connections.<sup>14</sup> Still, overall there is an observable difference in legislative behavior across role types, and it differs from the average for all *propietarios* as well.

Another way to compare deputies' legislative behavior is by their speaking activity in Congress plenary sessions. As an indicator of debate participation, data was collected on the number of times all deputies spoke in the 1994-97 Congress.

The number of deputy speeches was divided into low, medium low, medium high, and high levels of speech making,<sup>15</sup> because the number of times deputies took part in debates during the 4-year period ranged from zero to 1,978. Table 4 shows the percentage of deputies in each role category in each quartile, and the percentage who never spoke. The average number of speeches per cell is also given since the range for some quartiles is large, and the averages help support hypotheses about speech-making behavior. For example, Socially Concerned Rangers would be expected to speak less than Strengthen the Legislature deputies, and the average for Socially Concerned Rangers in the medium high quartile is 43.5 speeches (rather low in the range), while the average for the Strengthen the Legislature role in the same quartile was 93 speeches (just shy of the high range). The total number of speeches given was 11,485 (10,920 by *propietarios*).

(insert Table 4 about here)

Speech giving clearly varies by deputy role. The average number of speeches made by Socially Concerned Rangers falls in the medium low category, which is consistent with their preference for working on projects rather than legislating. The average for Strengthen the Legislature deputies is a high number of speeches, which is consistent with their interest in improving the quality of laws and increasing the Congress's independence from the executive, since an independent Congress cannot just rubber-stamp bills proposed by the president.

The speech giving behavior of Patron Rangers is more difficult to explain because this they appear to be divided into two sub-groups. Half gave almost no speeches, while three deputies gave a medium high or high number of speeches. Because this is a traditional role, lacking interest in legislating, these deputies were expected to make few speeches. However, 98 of their 451 speeches were not "debate" but rather motions to dispense with debate, which is understandable participation by Patron Rangers.<sup>16</sup> Finally, the average participation rate for Good Party Deputies was in the high category, though their average was much lower than that of the Strengthen the Legislature deputies. Half of the Good Party Deputies gave a medium high or high number of speeches. All but two of these frequent speakers currently hold leadership positions in their party or the Congress, or held them in the past, so their high level of speech making may be explained by the duties of their formal roles, or having become accustomed to speaking due to past leadership positions. The rest of the Good Party Deputies were rarely heard from in the Congress.<sup>17</sup>

Participation can also be compared based on oversight-oriented speeches (see Table 5).<sup>18</sup> During the 1994-97 Congress, deputies made 529 speeches for oversight purposes (480 were made by *propietarios*). Strengthen the Legislature and Good Party Deputies are much more likely to engage in oversight than are Socially Concerned Rangers and Patron Rangers. That 70% of the Strengthen the Legislature deputies made a medium high or high number of oversight speeches is consistent with this role's interest in building the Congress as an institution, increasing the independence of the Congress from the executive, and building or strengthening democracy. Fifty percent of the Good Party deputies also made medium high or high numbers of oversight speeches, which is consistent with their view of oversight as part of their duty. Opposition deputies in this group see it as their job to draw attention to problems in the government and in society, and since Honduran parties are highly factionalized, deputies within

the governing party can make oversight speeches to attack the currently dominant faction within their own party.<sup>19</sup>

(insert Table 5 about here)

Deputies in both of the Ranger roles are much less likely to make oversight speeches. This is to be expected for the Patron Rangers, whose role is a legacy of the past when the legislative branch was completely subservient to the executive. Over half of the Socially Concerned Rangers did not make oversight speeches, and only two of the deputies in this group were in the high oversight-speeches category, and even then they were at the low end of that category. This is somewhat surprising given their interest in helping communities. However, they know that deputies from the governing party who cause problems will not get access to government resources to provide projects for their districts (from interviews with deputies), so they may see making oversight speeches as counter-productive.

Constituency service attitudes. As deputies explained, legislating is only part of their job. Constituents also expect deputies to attend to their needs. Thus, another way to compare the behavioral impact of deputy roles is constituency service. Do deputies who adopt different roles have different views of who their constituents are? Do concepts of constituency service vary? Is their motive for constituency service different? As shown below, definitions of constituents do not vary systematically across role types in the Honduran Congress, but concepts of constituency service do vary with role type, as do the motivations for performing these services.

All participants in this study were asked, "Who are the people you represent?" As Table 6 shows, how deputies define their constituents does not differ strongly by role type.<sup>20</sup> In all four role categories a large percentage of the deputies offered a geographic definition of their constituency.<sup>21</sup> For some this encompassed their entire department, while for others it was limited to specific municipalities. This difference is largely driven by practical considerations and party campaign tactics. Particularly in Francisco Morazan and Cortes, the departments with

the largest populations, the deputies of each of the major parties divide up the department for efficiency. In the middle-sized departments the parties charge each of their deputy candidates with directing campaign efforts in particular municipalities, but the deputies still consider themselves representatives of the entire department. In the smallest departments the norm is to represent the entire territory of the department, especially if only one deputy is elected from a party. Thus geographic definitions of constituency do not vary due to role type.

(insert Table 6 about here)

More than half of the deputies in both the Strengthen the Legislature and Patron Ranger roles offered a "people-based definition" of who they represent, in particular that they see themselves as representing humble people. While this may simply be a politically correct answer in a poor country, it is interesting that a much smaller percentage of Socially Concerned Rangers and Good Party Deputies gave this type of definition of constituency. Though the low incidence of this type of definition from the Socially Concerned Rangers was unexpected, the higher incidence of this response among Patron Rangers is consistent with that role's image, particularly when it is linked to the type of constituency service they perform (see Table 7 below), which emphasizes particularistic service (e.g., helping a poor person buy medicines, transporting a person to the capital), rather than working with popular organizations to address community needs.

Finally, Patron Rangers were most likely to say they represent people from their party, which agrees with the old-style patron-client nature of that role, and the strong political component of the patron-client network in Honduras. The low incidence of this type of constituent definition for Good Party Deputies was surprising. My explanation is that these deputies were the most likely to provide what they perceived to be a politically acceptable answer to the question, and they perceived it wiser to say they represent their department, or humble people, than fellow party members because such favoritism and exclusion from the public trough

are common popular complaints in Honduras. Lastly, that no Strengthen the Legislature deputies gave a partisan definition of their constituents is consistent with the role's characteristic of wanting to end the partisan attitude of government.

When deputies were asked, "What types of activities do you engage in for your constituents?" responses varied with role type and many fit the classical particularistic services,<sup>22</sup> pork projects,<sup>23</sup> and legislative work categories.<sup>24</sup> (see Table 7) Additional types of responses were: political activities, participating in organizations, spending time with constituents,<sup>25</sup> and making an effort to find solutions to problems.<sup>26</sup> Most deputies gave multiple responses to this question (the average number of response categories per deputy was 2.5, with the range from one to five). In essence, deputies have a "constituency activity profile" so we can look for commonalties in this activity profile within a role category, and distinctions across role types.

(insert Table 7 about here)

As would be expected given the traits of their role, Socially Concerned Rangers were the most likely to list delivering pork projects as part of their constituency service activities. They were also the most likely to mention working with international aid organizations to get projects for their district, and to explain that participation in organizations is part of their constituency work. Only one Socially Concerned Ranger gave a response coded in the "make an effort" category, which underscores the trait of these deputies that they do not just want to talk about the need for projects. Also consistent with the traits of their role, Strengthen the Legislature deputies were the most likely to list legislative work as part of their constituency service. They recognize that constituency service is part of their job (and many listed delivering pork projects as one of their constituency service activities), though several said it is not the part they enjoy or that it is a distraction from their real job which is to legislate. Thus, it stands to reason that they would try to address constituent needs via legislation, rather than lobbying ministries and agencies.

For Patron Rangers constituency service activities include pork projects and making an effort to find solutions to problems. This is consistent with the old-style patron-client aspect of how they view their job, and with the role trait that "people know I am working to help them with their problems." Their ability to provide help due to their connections in the political network is a key aspect of this role, which makes the low percentage of Patron Rangers to list particularistic service surprising. For Good Party Deputies the most common answers to the constituency service activities question were "making an effort to solve problems," spending time with constituents, and pork projects (though they were less likely than the average for all deputies in the study to list pork projects as a constituency service activity). The emphasis on visiting the district and attending meetings compliments this role's traits, since these are common campaign activities.

Overall, Patron Rangers and Good Party Deputies focused more on contact with the people, and talking with them about what they and their community need, than on actually delivering the goods. In contrast, Socially Concerned Rangers and Strengthen the Legislature deputies want to produce concrete accomplishments.

This emphasis on concrete accomplishments may explain the political activities aspect of constituency service mentioned by a few Socially Concerned Rangers. This type of response was expected from Good Party Deputies because of their role's interest in campaigns and politics, and two Good Party Deputies did mention political activities as part of their constituency service. But a higher percentage of the Socially Concerned Rangers mentioned political activities, which was not expected.<sup>27</sup> However, rereading the transcripts of their interviews showed that these political activities (i.e., getting people registered to vote, organizing the party at the local level) were another type of concrete project for the Socially Concerned Rangers. Voter registration is a big task in Honduras since the rules for registration and voting procedures change often. Historically, vote fraud has been perpetrated through the electoral rules as well, so Socially

Concerned Rangers were concerned with making sure their constituents could exercise their legal right to vote. Since power and government services in Honduras are channeled through political parties, Socially Concerned Rangers considered building and maintaining the local party organization to be part of constituency service because it would increase the community's chances of obtaining government aid.

Lastly, deputies were asked, "What motivates you to perform these activities and services?" Responses were grouped into three types: personal satisfaction;<sup>28</sup> it is part of the job of a deputy;<sup>29</sup> and election motives.<sup>30</sup> (Table 8)

(insert Table 8 about here)

Responses reflect the role types where constituency service would be expected to be a desirable part of the job, versus those roles where it could better be described as something to be endured. Many Socially Concerned Rangers said they are more interested in delivering projects than in legislating, so it is consistent with their role orientation that they would view performing constituency service, particularly delivering pork barrel projects, as something which gives them satisfaction, and not just as "part of the job." For Patron Rangers, while the motive is described in the same terms, the meaning appears to be somewhat different. These deputies emphasized in interviews that people know they are working to help them with their problems, and "making an effort" to address needs was often listed as constituency service. Thus, serving as a patron for people would be expected to give them satisfaction. This is also consistent with their election motive, because these are old-style politicians who saw patronage as an electoral key.

On the other hand, Strengthen the Legislature deputies made it clear in interviews that performing constituency service is essential, but it is not what they think their job should be. Several said the people do not understand that the real job of deputies is to legislate. Thus, it is consistent with their role that we find a lower percentage of deputies who said they do constituency service for the satisfaction it provides.

Lastly, the lower than average percentage of Good Party Deputies who give personal satisfaction explanations for why they perform constituency service is consistent with the traits of the role, and with the general image of politicians in Honduras. Good Party Deputies viewed constituency service as a show -- making an effort to find solutions to problems, and not distancing themselves from the people -- and they do not view delivering projects to the district as necessary for political advancement. Thus, it is consistent with the role type that they see constituency service as part of the job.

## CONCLUSIONS

This article began with two questions: does how deputies view their job influence who they represent and how, and does it influence their behavior in other ways? The findings show that roles do matter. In the Honduran Congress legislative activity varies across roles, and so do views of constituency service. Since Searing's work on the British House of Commons, and Studlar and McAllister's work on the Australian Parliament also show that deputy roles are related to behavior, we can conclude with a reasonable degree of confidence that deputy roles determined through motivational analysis can help explain and predict deputy behavior.

In Honduras new-style Strengthen the Legislature deputies take legislating seriously. They propose many national-level bills, and take an active part in Congressional debates. By contrast, new-style Socially Concerned Rangers initiate few bills, and typically are not heard in the Congress chamber. Instead they are interested in working to develop their communities. Old-style Patron Rangers are not active legislators, and they have a traditional, patron-client view of their relations with constituents. They want to build a name for themselves which enhances their status as a *patron*, while Socially Concerned Rangers are more interested in getting concrete projects built any way they can to help their communities to help themselves. Finally, old-style Good Party Deputies take a highly partisan view of politics, and they are not trying to reshape the

political system to increase the power and independence of the Congress. Backbenchers in this role group are typically silent in Congress, and they tend to view constituency service as maintaining contact with the people, rather than delivering pork barrel projects. Good Party Deputies who are or have been party or Congress leaders are active proposing bills and speaking in the Congress, but their goal is not to expand the power of the Congress.

Another question set out at the beginning of this article was whether any of the deputy roles found in Honduras resemble roles found in established democracies with institutionalized legislatures? The Socially Concerned Ranger role has much in common with the Good Constituency Member role Searing found in Britain, especially the role's local promoter variant. While Rangers do not define their job as "redress of grievances" as Searing describes the Good Constituency Member role, the desire to develop their community, and the greater interest in projects than legislating bare a strong resemblance to the Good Constituency Member role in Britain (see Searing 1994: 123). It is interesting to note that Searing describes this as the oldest MP role in Britain, in fact "redress of grievances was Parliament's original function" (Searing 1994: 122). Thus, we might expect a similar role in Honduras to be one of the old-style roles. However, the new-style Socially Concerned Ranger role more closely resembles the British Good Constituency Member because of the deputies' interest in actually delivering services (deeds not just words) and their conviction that their work brings their party electoral pay-offs.

There is no Policy Advocate role in Honduras, which is likely a legacy of the country's authoritarian past and of the control the president had over policy until very recently. Traditionally the president made policy which the Congress rubber-stamped, so the Congress was more likely to attract people who aspired to be local caudillos than those with a policy agenda. While some deputies are working on a policy agenda, they are a minority, so a Policy Advocate role was not uncovered by the factor analysis. However, both the British Policy Advocate MPs and Honduran deputies in the Strengthen the Legislature role category are working to increase the

power of the legislature. If the main goal of the Strengthen the Legislature deputies is accomplished, i.e., the Congress becomes an autonomous institution which can check the executive and develop its own policies, then the Strengthen the Legislature role may be replaced by a Policy Advocate role.

The most obvious legacy of Honduras' past is the Good Party Deputy role. Adopting the Good Party Deputy role is rational for advancing one's political career because the major parties and their faction leaders control access to electable positions on the deputy lists and appointments to positions in the executive and judicial branches (Taylor 1996). In this way Honduran politics resembles politics in Australia, and Studlar and McAllister (1996) also found a "party role" that is the rational role for a deputy to adopt to maximize their future electoral chances.

The final question was what do the deputy roles found in Honduras and the behaviors they produce tell us about the chances of democratic consolidation? This relates to theories of representation because a democracy is unlikely to consolidate that does not represent the interests of the majority of its population. For democracy to deepen people must have access to government and opportunities to participate beyond voting, and they must feel that at least some government officials represent their interests. The legislature is intended to be the representative branch of government, but do the roles deputies adopt cause them to see their job as representing the people?

If the number of deputies who adopt new-style roles increases there is reason to think that this democracy will make progress toward consolidating. Socially Concerned Rangers are interested in finding out what the people of their district need and then deliver those projects. While this is neither trustee nor delegate-style representation, and it does not explain how deputies should vote on bills, it does mean that common people's needs will be heard by government, and that elected representatives are working to address those needs. Political

science has focused on trustee versus delegate forms of representation on policy issues. However, in a poor developing country "pork barrel representation" is probably most important for creating citizens who think that government is listening to them. "Bricks and mortar" representation will allow voters to give a positive answer to the question, "what has government done for me lately?" instead of concluding that politicians just make hollow promises and government does not represent their interests.

Persistence of old-style roles, particularly the Good Party Deputy role, calls into question whether most deputies see their job as representing and working for the needs of the common people. These deputies think of constituency service as keeping in contact with the people, not delivering projects to communities, and unfulfilled promises breed discontent that can cause people to turn against established parties and even democracy. Thus, it will be important to monitor whether new-style deputy roles become more common, or if deputies who adopted those roles are unable to get reelected so that deputies who adopt old-style roles once again become the norm.

Another function of the legislature in presidential systems is to check the executive, but do the role orientations of Honduran deputies lead them to perform this function? This can effect chances of democratic consolidation because an uncontrolled executive helps special interests gain extensive influence over government policy, which can lead to popular frustration with democracy. The Strengthen the Legislature role type is encouraging here because these deputies want to build the Congress as an institution, and increase its independence from the executive. If they are successful, then interest groups and the people in general will have a second branch of government to appeal to if the executive's policies do not represent their interests. If Strengthen the Legislature deputies succeed in increasing the power of the Congress, popular groups should find receptive advocates in Socially Concerned Rangers who think their duty is to represent humble people and to legislate to benefit all the people, not just elite interests. However, Patron

Rangers and Good Party Deputies continue to play the game of politics in the old way. Patron Rangers need the executive's support to obtain the government resources they need to build their reputation as local caudillos, so they have no incentive to check the executive.<sup>31</sup> Good Party Deputies got their seats in the Congress by being loyal to their party faction leader, or by making large campaign contributions, thus they do not have their own electoral base nor do they want to have to cultivate a personal vote because that would involve too much personal work and risk, so they too have little incentive to check the executive if their party is in power.

In sum, deputies who adopt new-style roles are a force for change. If their numbers increase the Congress should become a more representative institution and more willing to check the executive, which would help deepen the democracy. However, new-style deputies must win elections in a system dominated by old-style parties, so they may be less likely to be reelected than Patron Rangers and Good Party Deputies.<sup>32</sup> If that is the case then the Congress is likely to remain subservient to the executive and to play party-based patronage politics thereby causing popular frustration with democracy to grow, which will not help democracy consolidate.

# **APPENDIX** **Deputy Responses to Role Questions by Deputy Role Type**

	Socially Concerned Rangers (14)	Strengthen Legislature Deputies (10)	Patron Rangers (6)	Good Party Deputies (16)	Deputies Not Categorized (26)
Responses:					
More interested in projects than legislation	7	0	0	0	0
Represent humble people	9	1	0	1	1
Help people & my party get reelected	4	0	0	0	0
Don't distance yourself from the people	5	1	1	3	0
Deeds not just words	6	1	0	0	1
Help people to help themselves	4	0	2	1	1
Help people & groups resolve problems	12	5	6	8	11
Maintain the local party organization	2	1	0	0	0
Make better laws	1	7	0	2	0
Build the Congress as an institution	0	7	0	0	1
End the partisan attitude of government	4	5	1	0	1
Increase the independence of Congress from the executive	0	6	0	1	1
Legislate - specific issues and topics	0	5	3	2	4
Build & strengthen democracy	0	2	0	1	0
Study bills	2	9	3	13	11
Commission work	3	7	3	6	15
People know I am working to help them with their problems	2	0	5	0	1
Look for solutions to problems	0	0	4	2	0
Provide services & projects to the district	11	7	6	7	21
Meet with constituents & maintain contact with the people	12	8	4	12	18
Politics & campaigns	1	0	0	6	0
Oversight	2	2	0	8	1
Responsibilities to party supporters	1	0	0	3	2
Frustrated-cannot accomplish enough	6	5	1	0	6
Legislate to benefit <u>all</u> the people	9	3	0	1	12

## REFERENCES

- Alpert, Eugene J. (1979). A Reconceptualization of Representational Role Theory. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* , 4, 587-603.
- Bond, Jon R. (1985). Dimensions of District Attention Over Time. *American Journal of Political Science* , 29, 330-47.
- Converse, Philip and Roy Pierce. (1979). Representative Roles and Legislative Behavior in France. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 4, 525-62.
- Fenno, Richard F. (1978). *Home Style*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Fiorina, Morris P. (1989). *Congress: Keystone of the Washington Establishment*. (2nd.ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hedlund, Ronald D. (1985). Organizational Attributes of Legislative Institutions: Structure, Rules, Norms, Resources. In *Handbook of Legislative Research*.. Gerhard Loewenberg, Samuel C. Patterson, and Malcolm E. Jewell (eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jacobson, Gary C. (1997). *The Politics of Congressional Elections*. (4th.ed.). New York: Longman.
- Jewell, Malcolm E. (1983). Legislator-Constituency Relations and the Representative Process. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 3, 303-337.
- Johannes, John R. (1980). The Distribution of Casework in the U.S. Congress: An Uneven Burden. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 5, 517-44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1983). Explaining Congressional Casework Styles. *American Journal of Political Science*, 27, 530-547.
- Kim, Chong Lim, Joel D. Barkan, Ilter Turan, and Malcolm E. Jewell. (1983). *The Legislative Connection: The Representative and the Represented in Kenya, Korea, and Turkey*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mayhew, David R. (1974). *Congress: The Electoral Connection*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- McCrone, Donald J. and James H. Kuklinski. (1979). The Delegate Theory of Representation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 23, 278-300.
- Mezey, Michael. (1979). *Comparative Legislatures*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Morris, James A. (1984). *Honduras: Caudillo Politics and Military Rulers*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Parker, Glenn R. (1980). Cycles in Congressional District Attention. *Journal of Politics*, 42, 540-48.
- Payne, James L. (1972). *Incentive Theory and Political Process: Motivation and Leadership in the Dominican Republic*. Lexington, MA: D.C.Heath and Co.
- Pearson, Neale J. (1987). Honduras. In Gerald Michael Greenfield and Sheldon L. Maram (eds.) *Latin American Labor Organizations* (pp.463-494). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Polsby, Nelson W. (1968). The Institutionalization of the U.S. House of Representatives. *American Political Science Review*, 62, 144-68.
- Posas, Mario. (1992). *El Proceso de Democratización en Honduras*. In Puntos de Vista: Temas Políticos. Tegucigalpa, Honduras: Centro de Documentación de Honduras.
- Rosenberg, Mark B. (1995). Democracy in Honduras: The Electoral and the Political Reality. In *Elections and Democracy in Central America, Revisited*. Mitchell A. Seligson and John A. Booth (eds.). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Salomón, Leticia. (1992). Política y Militares en Honduras. Tegucigalpa, Honduras: Centro de Documentación de Honduras.
- Schulz, Donald E. and Deborah Sundloff Schulz. (1994). *The United States, Honduras, and the Crisis in Central America*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Searing, Donald D. (1994). *Westminster's World: Understanding Political Roles*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1991). Roles, Rules, and Rationality in the New Institutionalism. *American Political Science Review*, 85, 1239-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1987). New Roles for Postwar British Politics: Ideologues, Generalists, Specialists, and the Progress of Professionalization in Parliament. *Comparative Politics*, 19, 431-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1985). The Role of the Good Constituency Member and the Practice of Representation in Great Britain. *Journal of Politics*, 47, 348-81.
- Squire, Peverill. (1992). The Theory of Legislative Institutionalization and the California Assembly. *Journal of Politics*, 54, 1026-54.

- Studlar, Donley T. and Ian McAllister. (1996). Constituency Activity and Representational Roles Among Australian Legislators. *Journal of Politics*, 58, 69-90.
- Taylor, Michelle M. (1996). When Electoral and Party Institutions Interact to Produce Caudillo Politics: The Case of Honduras. *Electoral Studies*, 15, 327-37.
- Taylor-Robinson, Michelle M. and Christopher Diaz. (1999). Who Gets Legislation Passed in a Marginal Legislature and is the Label Marginal Legislature Still Appropriate? A Study of the Honduran Congress. *Comparative Political Studies*, 32, 590-626.
- Whalke, John C., Heinz Eulau, William Buchanan, and LeRoy C. Ferguson. (1962). *The Legislative System*. New York: Wiley.
- Woshinsky, Oliver. (1973). *The French Deputy: Incentives and Behavior in the National Assembly*. Lexington, MA: D.C.Heath and Co.

**Table 1**  
**Actual Law Making Behavior -- Number of Bills Initiated by Deputies**

Role Types:

	Socially Concerned Rangers (n = 14)	Strengthen the Legislature Deputies (n = 10)	Patron Rangers (n = 6)	Good Party Deputies (n = 16)	All <i>Propietarios</i> (n = 128)
Total No. (1990-97)	26	91	18	116	905
Average No. (1990-97) *	1.4 (n = 18)	6.1 (n = 15)	2.6 (n = 7)	5.5 (n = 21)	3.5
Total No. (1994-97)	24	81	18	54	522
Average No. (1994-97)	1.7	8.1	3	3.4	4.1
% who initiated at least one bill (1990-97)	57	100	16.7	68.8	60**

\* The number of cases in this row is larger than the N for the role type because a deputy who was a member of both the 1990-93 and 1994-97 Congresses is counted as two cases.

\*\* This number is the percentage of all *propietarios* in the 1994-97 Congress who initiated a bill during the 1994-97 period.

**Table 2**  
**Comparison of Total Number of Bills Initiated by Deputies**  
**of Different Role Types (1994-97)**

	Role Types:									
	Socially Concerned Rangers (n = 14)		Strengthen the Legislature Deputies (n = 10)		Patron Rangers (n = 6)		Good Party Deputies (n = 16)		All <i>Propietarios</i> (n = 128)	
	%	Ave.	%	Ave.	%	Ave.	%	Ave.	%	Ave.
No bills	50	0	20	0	83.3	0	31.3	0	39.8	0
Low (1)	7.1	1	10	1	--	--	6.3	1	13.3	1
Medium Low (2-3)	28.6	2	--	--	--	--	12.5	3	17.8	2.4
Medium High (4-6)	7.1	6	30	5	--	--	31.3	4.8	13.3	5
High (7-93)	7.1	9	40	16.3	16.7	18	18.8	7.7	15.6	18.2
Overall average # of bills initiated:*	1.7		8.1		3.0		3.4		4.1	
	Med. Low		High		Med. Low		Med. Low		Med. High	

\* A one way ANOVA on the number of bills initiated by deputies of the four different role types suggests that role type has a significant effect [ $F(3,42)=2.75$   $P<.06$ ]. Moreover, using Duncan New Multiple Range a posteriori test of specific contrasts, Socially Concerned Rangers and Strengthen the Legislature deputies are significantly different at the .05 level.

Number of bills broken down into approximate quartiles based on the total number of bills initiated by each *propietario* who actually initiated legislation.

no bills -- 51 deputies  
Low -- 17 deputies  
Medium Low -- 23 deputies  
Medium High -- 17 deputies  
High -- 20 deputies

**Table 3**  
**Comparison of Types of Bills Initiated by Deputies of Different Role Types**  
 (% of total number of bills initiated in the 1990-93 and 1994-97 Congresses)

	Role Types:				
	Socially Concerned Rangers (n = 14)	Strengthen the Legislature Deputies (n = 10)	Patron Rangers (n = 6)	Good Party Deputies (n = 16)	All <i>Proprietarios</i> (n = 128)
Total # of bills:	26	91	18*	116	522
<i>Type of bill :</i>					
individual	19.2	11	27.8	21.6	15.3
local	19.2	15.4	27.8	11.2	24.7
sectoral	26.9	13.2	5.6	9.5	15.9
regional	7.7	0	5.6	2.6	4.8
national**	23.1	56	33.3	55.2	34.3

\* All bills initiated by a single deputy

\*\* Comparison of the number of national-level bills initiated by deputies in each role type versus the number of all other types of bills yields a  $\chi^2$  of 12.35 with 7 degrees of freedom,  $P=.1$ .

NOTE - columns may not total to 100% because it was not possible to classify some bills.

**Table 4**  
**Comparison of Total Number of Speeches Made by Deputies**  
**of Different Role Types (1994-97)**

Role Types:											
		Socially Concerned Rangers (n = 14)		Strengthen the Legislature Deputies (n = 10)		Patron Rangers (n = 6)		Good Party Deputies (n = 16)		All <i>Propietarios</i> (n = 128)	
Total # of speeches:		241		1,859		451		1,656		10,920	
		%	Ave.	%	Ave.	%	Ave.	%	Ave.	%	Ave.
No speeches		14.3	0	--	--	--	--	6.25	0	9.4	0
Low (1-7)		28.6	4.3	10	3	50.0	2.3	12.5	1.5	21.9	3.8
Medium Low (8-27)		28.6	12.5	10	11	--	--	25.0	16.7	22.7	14.6
Medium High (28-94)		28.6	43.5	10	93	16.7	39	25.0	55.5	23.4	56.7
High (101-1,978)		--	--	70	250	33.3	203	31.3	273	22.7	299.6
Overall average # of speeches:*		17.2 Medium Low		186.0 High		75.2 Medium High		103.5 High		85.3 Medium High	

\* A one way ANOVA on the number of speeches made by deputies of the four different role types suggests that role type has a significant effect [F(3,42)=2.63 P<.07]. Moreover, using Duncan New Multiple Range a posteriori test of specific contrasts, Socially Concerned Rangers and Strengthen the Legislature deputies are significantly different at the .05 level.

Number of speeches broken into approximate quartiles based on the total number of speeches given by each *propietario* who spoke in the Congress plenary sessions

no speeches -- 12 deputies  
Low -- 28 deputies  
Medium Low -- 29 deputies  
Medium High -- 30 deputies  
High -- 29 deputies

**Table 5**  
**Comparison of Total Number of Oversight-Oriented Speeches Made by Deputies**  
**of Different Role Types (1994-97)**

	Role Types:									
	Socially Concerned Rangers (n = 14)		Strengthen the Legislature Deputies (n = 10)		Patron Rangers (n = 6)		Good Party Deputies (n = 16)		All <i>Propietarios</i> (n = 128)	
Total # of oversight speeches:	29		113		8		94		480	
No oversight speeches	% 57	Ave. 0	% 30	Ave. 0	% 33	Ave. 0	% 25	Ave. 0	% 37.5	Ave. 0
Low (1)	14.3	1	--	--	33	1	25	1	13.3	1
Medium Low (2-3)	14.3	2	--	--	16.7	2	--	--	19.5	2.4
Medium High (4-8)	--	--	30	7.3	16.7	4	18.8	5	16.4	5.6
High (9-46)	14.3	11.5	40	22.8	--	--	31.3	15	13.3	16.9
Overall average # of oversight speeches:*	2.1 Med. Low		11.3 High		1.3 Low		5.9 Med. High		3.8 Med. High	

\* A one way ANOVA on the number of oversight-oriented speeches by deputies of the four different role types suggests that role type has a significant effect [ $F(3,42)=3.13$   $P<.04$ ]. Moreover, using Duncan New Multiple Range a posteriori test of specific contrasts, Socially Concerned Rangers and Strengthen the Legislature deputies are significantly different at the .05 level, and Patron Rangers and Strengthen the Legislature deputies are also significantly different at the .05 level.

Number of oversight-oriented speeches broken into approximate quartiles based on the total number of oversight-oriented speeches given by each *propietario* who gave this type of speech

no oversight speeches -- 48 deputies

Low -- 17 deputies

Medium Low -- 25 deputies

Medium High -- 21 deputies

High -- 17 deputies

**Table 6**  
**Comparison of Responses to the Question "Who Are the People You Represent?"**  
(percent and number of deputies per role type giving a response)

Role Types:										
	Socially Concerned Rangers (n = 14)		Strengthen the Legislature Deputies (n = 10)		Patron Rangers (n = 6)		Good Party Deputies (n = 16)		All Deputies in Study (n = 72)	
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
<i>Geographic definitions:</i>										
(1) my department	71.4	(10)	80	(8)	33.3	(2)	50	(8)	56.9	(41)
(2) specific municipalities	57.1	(8)	50	(5)	50	(3)	31.3	(5)	38.9	(28)
(3) 1 and/or 2	85.7	(12)	90	(9)	66.7	(4)	62.5	(10)	69.4	(50)
(4) all people	14.3	(2)	40	(4)	16.7	(1)	31.3	(5)	26.4	(19)
<i>Political definition:</i>										
(5) people from my party	28.6	(4)	--	--	33.3	(2)	18.8	(3)	20.8	(15)
<i>People-based definitions:</i>										
(6) humble people*	28.6	(4)	60	(6)	66.7	(4)	37.5	(6)	40.3	(29)
(7) middle class	21.4	(3)	10	(1)	--	--	18.8	(3)	12.5	(9)
(8) 6 and/or 7	28.6	(4)	60	(6)	66.7	(4)	43.4	(7)	41.7	(30)

\* includes the following responses: humble people, campesinos, workers, lower class, "majority populations"

**Table 7**  
**Comparison of Responses to the Question**  
**"What Types of Activities Do You Engage In For Your Constituents?"**  
(percent and number of deputies per role type giving a response)

	Role Types:									
	Socially Concerned Rangers (n = 14)		Strengthen the Legislature Deputies (n = 10)		Patron Rangers (n = 6)		Good Party Deputies (n = 16)		All Deputies in Study (n = 72)	
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Particularistic services	42.9	(6)	10	(1)	16.7	(1)	31.3	(5)	27.8	(20)
Pork projects	71.4	(10)	60	(6)	50	(3)	43.8	(7)	54.2	(39)
Legislative work	28.6	(4)	60	(6)	33.3	(2)	37.5	(6)	38.9	(28)
Political activities	21.4	(3)	--	--	--	--	12.5	(2)	12.5	(9)
Participating in organizations	28.6	(4)	20	(2)	16.7	(1)	12.5	(2)	18.1	(13)
Time with constituents	21.4	(3)	30	(3)	33.3	(2)	43.8	(7)	25	(18)
"Making an effort to find solutions to problems"	7.1	(1)	40	(4)	50	(3)	43.8	(7)	33.3	(24)

**Table 8**  
**Comparison of Responses to the Question**  
**"What Motivates You to Perform These Activities & Services?"**  
(percent and number of deputies per role type giving a response)

	Role Types:									
	Socially Concerned Rangers (n = 13)*		Strengthen the Legislature Deputies (n = 9)*		Patron Rangers (n = 6)		Good Party Deputies (n = 16)		All Deputies in Study (n = 70)*	
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
Personal satisfaction	84.6	(11)	66.7	(5)	100	(6)	56.3	(9)	75.7	(53)
Part of the job	23.1	(3)	44.4	(4)	66.7	(4)	56.3	(9)	40	(28)
Election motive	23.1	(3)	33.3	(3)	33.3	(2)	12.5	(2)	15.7	(11)

\* The numbers of deputies in the Socially Concerned Ranger and Strengthen the Legislature role categories are lower than in the other tables because 1 deputy in each category was not asked this question. Hence the N for this table is 70 instead of 72.

---

<sup>1</sup> The major exception is Payne's (1972) work on the Dominican Republic.

<sup>2</sup> A similar argument could be made for studying the Ecuadorian Congress, since Ecuador's third wave democracy was installed in 1978, and the country has a similarly undemocratic history. Another case would be the Argentine Congress, where democracy was reestablished in 1983.

<sup>3</sup> To place the active sub-set of *suplentes* in a context for comparison with the *propietarios*, 51 *propietarios* initiated no legislation, while 23 *suplentes* initiated at least one bill, with the number of bills they initiated ranging as high as 9 and averaging 2. By comparison, 80 *propietarios* initiated 2 or fewer bills. Also 12 *propietarios* never once spoke in four years of Congress sessions, while 42 *suplentes* spoke at least once, with their number of speeches ranging as high as 93 and averaging 13.5. By comparison, 56 *propietarios* gave 13 or fewer speeches. Attendance cannot be systematically gauged for *propietarios* or *suplentes* since attendance records were not available.

<sup>4</sup> For Squire (1992: 1028) "Legislatures deemed professional are those which meet in unlimited session, pay their members well and provide superior staff resources and facilities." Professionalization differs from institutionalization (Polsby 1968: 145) in that a legislature can be institutionalized and still not exhibit the characteristics of professionalization.

Turn-over is high in Honduras, but not because most deputies do not desire to serve more than one term. It is partly due to fluctuations in the size of the Congress, from 82 to 134 to 128 deputies. Also in the 1985 election party factions ran their own lists as part of a compromise to resolve a constitutional crises (Schulz and Schulz 1994; Pearson 1987: 465). Then in 1989 the National Party won a 71 to 57 seat majority, while in 1993 the Liberals won a 71 seat majority.

<sup>5</sup> Three deputies answered the questionnaire and also were interviewed, and are counted in the interview group.

<sup>6</sup> Initially I attempted to conduct a survey to replicate as closely as possible Studlar and McAllister's (1996) study of the Australian Parliament. However, only 30 deputies returned the survey, and of these, several could not be identified, so it would not be possible to pair their responses to the questions with the deputy's legislative history and commission assignments. The low response rate was surprising because the PLH and PNH faction leaders distributed the surveys from their offices and personally asked the deputies to cooperate with the research project. In 1997 elite interviews were conducted as an alternative method to collect the role motivation data. The survey questions were asked in the interviews, though it was usually not possible to ask all the questions due to time constraints and the conversational nature of elite interviews. The interviews did afford the advantages of allowing for probing into the motives behind the answers, and allowing deputies time to expound upon their answers to the questions. The interviews were not taped, as Searing (1985: 351-2) advocates, but rather notes were taken during the interview and written up in detail immediately afterward. Though taping interviews

---

allows the use of direct quotes in the analysis, for deputies in nascent democracies with a history of authoritarian government, it is my experience that being taped makes them uncomfortable and thus less likely to give true and complete responses to questions.

<sup>7</sup> In the interviews the deputy was given the list of activities to rank according to their importance. The activities were: meeting with constituents, helping people in the district who have personal problems with the government, staying in touch with local government officials in the district, taking time to explain to citizens what their government is doing, making sure the district gets its fair share of government funds, giving speeches and personal appearances to interested groups about Congress, studying and doing basic research on proposed legislation, working in Congressional committees, debating and voting on legislation on the floor of the Congress, oversight of the executive branch, and working informally with other deputies to build support for legislation about which you are personally concerned. This list is adapted from the constituency and policy orientation indexes used by the Obey Commission found in Johannes (1980: 541-2).

<sup>8</sup> As with the role questions, factor analysis was used to make this work as comparable as possible with Searing's (1985, 1987, 1991, 1994) and Studlar and McAllister's (1996) work.

<sup>9</sup> Searing dropped 11.5% of the cases from his analysis because the MPs roles were unclassifiable (Searing 1985: 353, note 10). The percentage of uncategorizable deputies was higher in Honduras for the reasons discussed in the text. In addition, my interviews in Honduras were often shorter than Searing's interviews with MPs and a follow-up survey was not conducted because of the failure of the initial survey attempt, hence less information was available for the factor analysis. Nine deputies received negative scores on all four factors, which means that they did not give many, or any responses that were associated with a role. The others received negative scores on some of the factors, and very low scores on the other factors, and thus were still not categorizable.

<sup>10</sup> Another way to compare deputies' legislative behavior would be their level of legislative success. However, given the highly partisan nature of Honduran politics this would not be a fair comparison of deputies' intent, or willingness to work to get their bills passed into laws, since deputies from the major opposition party are less likely to get their bills reported out of commission than deputies from the governing party. Opposition deputies also complained of this bias in interviews, as did deputies from the less powerful factions of the governing party. Another concern is that bill initiation by opposition deputies may be artificially depressed, despite their role orientation, because they realize their likelihood of success is low. However, since PLH and PNH deputies are relatively equally represented in all role types but the Patron Ranger Role, any effect party has on a deputy's legislative record is assumed to be similar across all three roles. Finally, informal rules may control who can initiate bills (e.g., needing party approval to propose a bill), which would also skew this indicator of legislative behavior since some deputies were not from the dominant faction of their party. However, no such obstacle was mentioned in interviews.

<sup>11</sup> Including deputies' legislative records from the 1990-93 Congress is a possible way to address the partisan bias because the National Party was in control during that period, but only 24 of the

---

72 deputies in this study were deputies from 1990-93 (7 as *suplentes*). However, as a control legislative records are reported in Table 1 for both the 1990-93 and the 1994-97 Congresses.

<sup>12</sup> During the 1990-93 Congress 383 bills were initiated by *propietarios*, for an average of 3 per *propietario*, with 46 *propietarios* (36%) not initiating any bills.

<sup>13</sup> Exactly equivalent quartiles of 19.25 deputies each were not possible because 17 *propietarios* initiated one bill, and 13 initiated two bills each, thus the "low" category had to either be much larger than a quarter of the bill initiating *propietarios*, or smaller.

<sup>14</sup> 41.2%, 7 of 17 bills initiated by Good Party Deputy backbenchers were national-level, and 51.4%, 19 of 37 bills initiated by the deputies in this group who currently or in the past held party or Congress leadership positions were national-level.

<sup>15</sup> A speech refers to any time a deputy speaks during a plenary session. It includes making motions for changes in a bill, long and short speeches that are part of bill debates, procedural motions, speeches that point out problems in the government or society that the Congress should investigate, taking part in discussions of such suggestions, and motions to dispense with the first and second debates on a bill and to go directly to the third debate.

<sup>16</sup> A deputy can move to dispense with the first and second of the three debates on a bill if the matter is urgent. In practice urgent is defined liberally, and only one debate is held for many bills. Of the 660 dispense motions during the 1994-97 Congress, 72% were made for "consensus" bills (e.g., to build a monument, create a new municipality, give the title of "city" to a community, allow the government to donate land to an organization, infrastructure bills to build a road, etc, allow an organization to import supplies without paying tax, to allow a citizen to serve as an honorary consul, change the dates of a Congress recess, bills to extend the period for paying a tax, promotions for military officers, international cooperation agreements). The rest of the dispense motions were made for bills concerning major legislation, such as the reform of a major legal code (e.g., the penal code, electoral law), constitutional amendments (e.g., ending mandatory military service), and budget bills (e.g., the national budget, budgets for autonomous agencies).

<sup>17</sup> The average number of speeches made by the 9 backbench Good Party Deputies was 28.7, while the average for the 7 front benchers was 199.7.

<sup>18</sup> Deputies can make *manifestaciones* and *denuncias*, and motions to form a commission to investigate a problem in the government or society.

The Honduran Congress still lacks strong tools for oversight of the executive branch because it does not have many resources with which to investigate problems. Special commissions can be formed, but they often do not produce a report, and their work is hampered by a lack of investigative resources and staff. The executive branch is known for stonewalling deputies when they ask it for information, even if they are from the governing party. The Comptroller, who is appointed by the Congress and is supposed to answer to it, frequently does not produce reports when the Congress asks, and deputies often complain that the reports it does produce are not well done. Still, deputies can at least register complaints about problems, and deputy role is a good cue to whether a deputy will be likely to use this tool.

<sup>19</sup> The average number of *manifestaciones* made by opposition deputies in this role was 7.7, while it was 3.6 for Good Party Deputies from the governing party.

---

<sup>20</sup> Tables 6, 7, and 8 are based on deputy responses to open-ended questions. The author and a graduate student independently coded the responses into a list of categories devised by the author. We then met to resolve cases where we disagreed on the coding. Numbers listed in parentheses in the "all deputies in study" columns show total incidences of a particular category of response.

<sup>21</sup> The response "all people" is listed under the geographic definitions since many deputies explained that they took the needs of all Hondurans into consideration when legislating, but that for constituency service and pork their work was mainly limited to their department or specific municipalities they represent.

<sup>22</sup> In Honduras examples of particularistic services were transport to the capital, buying medicines, a scholarship, getting a person out of jail, getting a job for a constituent.

<sup>23</sup> Common examples of pork projects include, telephone and electricity service, paving a road, building a school or clinic, sewers, and flood protection systems. The response "coordinating with international aid groups to get projects built in my district" is also included in this category.

<sup>24</sup> Legislative work includes responses of "make policies" and "propose bills."

<sup>25</sup> Includes "visits to the department" and "attending meetings." "Participating in organizations" is not included here because it implies engaging in actual work, which distinguishes some deputies' constituency service activities from other deputies who emphasized "face time" rather than actually working to get things done.

<sup>26</sup> Many deputies explained that their job is to find solutions to problems and they make suggestions to appropriate ministries and government agencies. However, these deputies were unlikely to mention other methods of getting community needs addressed, such as pursuing the option of working with international aid organizations. Nor did they emphasize actually delivering the product, rather than just talking about it and making a promise. Action versus talk was important for how Socially Concerned Rangers distinguished themselves from their colleagues, so "making an effort to find solutions to problems" is kept as a separate type of constituency service, because its vagueness is revealing.

<sup>27</sup> Studlar and McAllister (1996: 82) also found that deputies who adopt the "party role" in Australia are no more likely than other types of deputies to engage in local party work. Their explanation is that party deputies spend their time on national party activities, not local-level work, and a similar explanation might apply in Honduras as well.

<sup>28</sup> Includes: it gives me satisfaction, I want to help my community, it is my home, I was raised to help people, I come from a humble background, I want to be remembered as a deputy who did something for my community.

<sup>29</sup> Includes: it is a deputy's duty, and it is an obligation of being elected.

<sup>30</sup> Includes: I do these things for the benefit of my party, and to develop my political career.

<sup>31</sup> Because votes in the Honduran Congress are taken by a show of hands, it is not possible to determine which deputies vote with the executive and which break party ranks.

<sup>32</sup> Studlar and McAllister's (1996: 82-84) found in Australia that spending time on local party work increases a deputy's vote, while local constituency work reduces the number of votes they receive in the next election. Their explanation for this negative impact of constituency service is that working on local constituency needs leaves less time to spend on other activities (i.e.,

---

national party work, developing policy expertise, gaining national visibility) that have larger electoral benefits. In Honduras party faction leaders may not want to promote independent deputies so they may not be placed in electable positions on the party list in the next election.