

# VOX POP Newsletter

## *of Political Organizations and Parties*

An official section of the American Political Science Association  
Produced by the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, The University of Akron

### **Bringing the Outside in: The Study of Outside Money in Congressional Campaigns**

David B. Magleby, Quin Monson, Kelly D. Patterson, and Jeffrey R. Makin  
*Brigham Young University*

This is a very exciting time for the study of congressional and presidential elections. The 2004 election cycle will be the first time candidates and noncandidate groups operate under the new campaign finance regulations, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA) as interpreted by the Supreme Court in *McConnell v. FEC*. As it did in 1998, 2000, and 2002, the Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy (CSED) at Brigham Young University is organizing and implementing a national study of the most competitive contests, where outside group spending is most probable, during the 2004 cycle.<sup>1</sup> Using a case-study methodology, the research aims to document the largely undocumented aspects of candidate and noncandidate campaigns. The CSED methodology relies on academic field researchers and would be wholly impossible without the collaboration of highly skilled and qualified individuals across the nation. By the end of the 2004 cycle, the CSED research will have monitored 105 contests with the help of 110 academics at 69 colleges and universities across the nation. The participation of these academics has helped CSED obtain unparalleled data on the involvement of outside groups in competitive electoral contests.

The CSED research design is based on three assumptions. First, noncandidate campaign activity is most likely to occur in competitive races. In 2002, CSED studied seventeen noncompetitive races as a control group, in part, to test this assumption. We found overwhelming evidence that the vast majority of outside money is spent in competitive races.<sup>2</sup> Second, because much of noncandidate campaign activity is not disclosed, it is best uncovered and understood by someone with knowledge of the local context. To understand the full impact and reach of noncandidate activity, academics knowledgeable about the competitive race are recruited to systematically monitor each campaign. The academics in each competitive race oversee the collection of campaign communications, including the extent of mail, telephone, and personal contact; they also collect as much information as possible on broadcast advertising. They monitor voter mobilization efforts conducted by candidates, parties, and interest groups. Data on campaign communications in the contests are enhanced by a network of informants organized by the local academics. The informants agree to collect their political

mail and keep a record of other campaign communications they view or receive.<sup>3</sup> The third, assumption is that political professionals would be willing to be interviewed and discuss their decision making and funding allocation strategies. Elite interviewing helps “connect the dots” of our data collection efforts—both by validating what is discovered in the data collection efforts of the academics as well as by providing new information. All interviews for the study are conducted on the record and with few exceptions the information from those interviews is fully attributed.

As mentioned, the CSED methodology relies on academic fieldwork and reconnaissance networks. The academics in each sample race observe the contest and retrieve data on noncandidate campaign communications with voters. They also monitor television and radio advertising buys, direct mail, and telephone contacts, print advertising, and internet communications where possible. The academics supplement these efforts with the standard Federal Election Commission data on the candidate campaigns, party, and PAC expenditures. They also conduct post-election interviews with campaign managers, consultants, and political reporters involved with the interest groups or parties invested in these races. Using a set of case studies that employ multiple methods of data collection, the CSED methodology seeks to systematically investigate the causes and consequences of campaign spending “within its

*(continued on page 2)*

<b>From Headquarters</b> .....	<b>3, 4, 5</b>
<b>From The Field</b> .....	<b>3, 5, 6,</b>
<b>Scholarly Precincts</b> .....	<b>7, 8</b>

**Chair:** Frank Baumgartner, Penn State University  
**Secretary-Treasurer:** John Bruce, University of Mississippi  
**VOX POP Editor:** John Green, The University of Akron  
**Program Chair:** Scott James, University of California, LA  
**Website Coordinator:** Kyle Saunders, Northern Illinois University

**Executive Council:** Jonathan Bernstein, University of Texas at San Antonio; Pradeep Chhibber, University of California at Berkeley; Marie Hojnacki, Pennsylvania State University; David Lowery, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Larry Bartels, Princeton University; Holly Brasher, George Washington University; Thomas Ferguson, University of Massachusetts, Boston; Mark Smith, University of Washington.

(continued from page 1)

real-life context.<sup>4</sup> This provides the richest, most feasible, and most accurate method of understanding the phenomenon of campaign spending by noncandidate entities in congressional elections.<sup>5</sup>

### Case Selection

The sampling pool of competitive races CSED monitors is developed based on a combination of lists of competitive races published in early spring by the *Cook Political Report*, the *Rothenberg Political Report*, and *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*. This list is enhanced by interviews with current and former party and interest group professionals, reporters, and other political experts who help identify contests in which outside money is most likely to be present.<sup>6</sup> In the final stages of sample selection, we quantify the input from the contacts and published sources by computing an additive score for each race. Each score is comprised of a combination of the ratings in the published reports together with the likely competitive races named by the Republicans and key allied groups as well as those named by the Democrats and key allied groups. Once scored, the list is sorted in rank order and we select the races according to their ranking.

While largely based on the potential for a competitive race, the case selections took other considerations into account as well in order to assure a broad range in the number and type of noncandidate groups observed. We make an effort to stratify the sample in terms of incumbent and open-seat races and for contests which would permit us to capture a wide variety of interest group and party communications and strategies. We are able to select cases so that we have variation in geographic location, level of minority population, and the number and type of interest groups likely to become involved. The last step of the case selection involves finding academics willing to participate in the project. The academics recruited to monitor the contests are selected based on their scholarly reputations and knowledge of state electoral politics.

In 2002, we added seventeen noncompetitive control races to test some of the assumptions about where noncandidate money is spent, thus establishing a baseline against which to compare the competitive races.<sup>7</sup> Many of the control races were selected because they were adjacent to the competitive races already sampled, as it would be difficult to convince academics to study a race where we expect little if any serious campaign activity. The most cost effective way to add some control races was to ask the academics studying our competitive races to identify an adjacent district to cover in addition to the competitive race. These control races are in the same media markets as the competitive races and thus do not require additional trips to television and radio stations to obtain ad buy data. They also involve elite interviews with many of the same people at the state level. We also selected some control races in states that had competitive races in the 2000 election in order to contrast the role of outside money in the same state or district over time.

In sum, the procedures followed to select the cases for this study achieve an appropriate balance between maximizing the observable variance and minimizing bias while at the same time keeping the research costs at an acceptable level. In addition, non-random case selection in a small-n study helps to ensure that one does not exclude an import case.<sup>8</sup>

### Voter Reaction to the Campaigns

The project also seeks to connect the activities of the candidate and noncandidate groups to the voters targeted by those activities. In both the 2002 and 2004 election cycles, CSED, in cooperation with Washington State University and the University of Wisconsin, developed

and executed surveys that seek to measure the reaction of voters to federal campaigns.

The public opinion research in 2002 consisted of a three-wave panel survey that sought to measure the impact of the immense ground and air war activities that occurred in several key senate races. The survey results showed that voters felt overwhelmed by the deluge of information received from candidate and noncandidate groups in an attempt to persuade them to vote a particular way.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, the 2004 survey places an emphasis on media markets that will be linked to ad buy information such as the CMAG data gathered by Professor Ken Goldstein and his colleagues at the University of Wisconsin. The ad buy data and the ground war data can then be linked with the voter data to assess the different effects of the campaigns on the choices and attitudes of voters.

The project also asked a sample of voters in different states to fill out a log survey documenting the various forms of contact that they received from the candidate and noncandidate campaigns in the three weeks leading up to Election Day. The project then surveyed these voters to register their opinions on the nature of the campaign and the information they were able to glean from the different activities that they observed. We found that the average voter received nearly 19 pieces of political mail during this period in South Dakota and Minnesota—two of the most competitive senate races. One Minnesota voter received 80 pieces of mail in three weeks. This extraordinary volume of information had a numbing effect on voters in those areas. The project will produce and administer similar surveys for the 2004 election cycle.

Together, the public opinion and log surveys make it possible to connect what the academics learn in the field with what the voters experience in the campaigns. In this manner, researchers can more fully grapple with the issue of campaign effects.

This research design tries to address several of the obstacles currently encountered by student of political campaigns and these obstacles' effects. It cannot overcome all of these obstacles—no research project reasonably can. However, it is helpful to elaborate on these obstacles in order to develop strategies to overcome them.

The first obstacle is the increasing difficulty of surveying congressional candidates. Some scholars, such as Professor Paul Herrnsen at the University of Maryland, can speak more to this task, but as a student of congressional elections, it is getting more and more difficult to survey those individuals who can describe, compare, and contrast specific campaigns. Some congressional candidates, mostly members of Congress, now routinely refuse to answer any surveys. Academics situated in those particular races, however, can provide much of the data that surveys used to provide.

Second, there is an increasingly high financial cost of gathering enough information on important institutional variables from the different actors in congressional campaigns. Researchers from different projects should explore ways to pool resources to create large, rich data sets. These data sets could include variables from the campaigns, such as the tone, strategies, and electoral procedures in the various races. It is often too difficult or too costly for one research project to perform all of these data gathering tasks, but collaborating scholars can create very useful data by monitoring particular races, interviewing elites, and sharing their results.

Finally, it will also be difficult to assemble these large data sets over time. The Pew grants that have funded many of the studies discussed today are unique in that they have funded projects over multiple cycles. However, if we theorize that time is an important dynamic and that many of the factors may shift over time, congressional scholars will need to come to terms with the question of

(continued on page 3)

(continued from page 2)

what is an acceptable time horizon. Collaboration across institutions could clearly help alleviate some of the burdens discussed above. But what types of institutions, research and otherwise, would the field need to create in order to facilitate collaboration and the construction of the larger, more useful data sets? We firmly believe that this can be an important innovation in the field and that ways should be constructed to facilitate more cross-institutional collaboration, particularly between the excellent research centers at different universities and colleges. The eventual placement of these research efforts in the ICPSR should always be a goal.

### Conclusion

We hope that this research encourages innovations in gathering data about the factors that affect the dynamics and outcomes of congressional and presidential elections and in constructing data sets sufficient for the types of questions the field would really like to examine. The research design discussed about has specific weaknesses but also holds out the hope of gathering data that can help scholars more fully understand campaigns and their effects. With further data gathering and more collaboration, efforts like those outlined above should result in more complete data sets and more refined knowledge about the dynamics of congressional and presidential elections.

<sup>1</sup> The Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy at Brigham Young University would like to acknowledge the generous support of the Pew Charitable Trusts in funding the 1988, 2000, 2002, and 2004 projects discussed in this article.

<sup>2</sup> David B. Magleby, ed., *The Last Hurrah? Soft Money and Issue Advocacy in the 2002 Congressional Elections* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2004), p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> We gratefully acknowledge the participation in this data collection effort of local members of the League of Women Voters and Common Cause as well as many others recruited by the local academics.

<sup>4</sup> Robert K. Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2003). Using multiple methods of data collection helps to enhance the validity of our conclusions. See Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton University Press, 1994).

<sup>5</sup> Our methodology is similar to that followed by other research in congressional elections that uses case studies. See James A. Thurber, "Case Study Framework and Methodology," in James A. Thurber, ed., *The Battle for Congress: Consultants, Candidates, and Voters* (Brookings Institution Press, 2001), pp. 239-246.

<sup>6</sup> Among others, we acknowledge the assistance in this effort of Karen Ackerman, Matt Angle, Damon Ansell, Bob Bennenson, Ed Brookover, Bernadette Budde, Martin Burns, Charlie Cook, Chuck Cunningham, Mike McElwain, Greg Giroux, Andy Grossman, John Guzik, Tom Hofeller, Chris LaCivita, Mike Matthews, Bill Miller, Stuart Rothenberg, Scott Stoermer, Deanna White, Derrick Willis, and Sharon Wolff.

<sup>7</sup> On this point we are especially indebted to Janet Box-Steffensmeier, Richard Fenno, and other panel participants who provided feedback on our methodology as part of a panel titled, "Getting Inside the Outside Campaign: Using Collaborative Fieldwork to Study Soft Money and Issue Advocacy" at the 2002 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association.

<sup>8</sup> See Gary King, Robert Keohane, Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton University Press, 1994), especially chapter 4, for a comprehensive discussion of the issues involved in qualitative case selection. They provide an especially good discussion of why a random sample is not always an acceptable method of case selection in small-n case study research. Our non-random case selection method uses a key explanatory variable (competitiveness) to drive our case selection of our focus and control races while also using other available prior information to increase the range of values across our dependent variable (noncandidate campaign activity).

<sup>9</sup> David B. Magleby and J. Quinn Monson, "Campaign 2002: 'The Perfect Storm'" (Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy, Brigham Young University, November 13, 2003.)

## FROM HEADQUARTERS

### POP EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING

Friday, September 3, 2004

11:30 a.m.

### POP BUSINESS MEETING

Friday, September 3, 2004

12:30 p.m.

### CALL FOR NOMINATIONS TO POP EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

One-half of the officers on the Executive Council are renewed each year. Council members serve a two-year term. Anyone with nominations should e-mail Frank Baumgartner ([frankb@psu.edu](mailto:frankb@psu.edu)) by August 2, 2004.

### APSA MEETING PREREGISTRATION DEADLINE

The deadline to preregister for the Annual Meeting is August 12, 2004. After this date, meeting attendees must register on-site in Chicago at the higher registration rate.

To preregister, log in to MyAPSA at [www.apsanet.org](http://www.apsanet.org) and click on the link for 2004 Pre-Registration.

## FROM THE FIELD

### CALL FOR PAPERS

The State of the Parties: 2004 & Beyond  
October 2005 — Akron, Ohio

The University of Akron's Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics will sponsor a conference on American political parties in October 2005, in Akron, Ohio. The purpose of the conference is to assess changes in political parties resulting from the 2004 election. The conference will bring together scholars and practitioners for the purpose, and the best papers will be included in the 5th edition of the *State of the Parties*, scheduled to be published by Rowman & Littlefield in 2006.

Scholars interested in presenting a paper on any aspect of contemporary American Party politics should submit a one-page proposal by February 1, 2005, to: John Green, Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44325-1914, telephone: (330) 972-5182, fax: (330) 972-5479, e-mail: [bliss@uakron.edu](mailto:bliss@uakron.edu), website: [www.WinningPolitics.com](http://www.WinningPolitics.com)

**POP Panels for APSA, 2004****THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2:**

- 8:00 am 35-1 Ideas, Institutions & Civic Engagement: Changing Forms of Political Organization, 1950 to Present**  
**Chair:** Lee Ann Banaszak, Penn State University  
**Authors:** "The 1950s, Women, Civic Engagement, and Political Change." Lanethea Mathews-Gardner, Muhlenberg College  
 "Diminished Democracy? Comparing the Opportunities for Participation in Voluntary Associations Over Time." Maryann Barakso, American University  
 "American State Development and Interest Group Liberalism." McGee W. Young, Marquette University.  
 "Reconceiving the Development of Organized Interests in American Politics." Richard A. Harris, Rutgers University, Camden and Daniel J. Tichenor, Rutgers University, New Brunswick  
 "A New Balance of Power: Interest Groups and Parties in MA, 1970-2000." Rachael Vanessa Cobb, Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
**Discussant:** Elisabeth S. Clemens, University of Chicago

- 10:15 am 35-3 Electoral Coalitions: French, Japanese, and Comparative Perspectives**  
**Chair:** Kenneth R. Benoit, Trinity College, University of Dublin  
**Authors:** "Electoral Coalitions in a Personal-Vote-Oriented Electoral System: Recent Evidence from Japan." Ray Christensen, Brigham Young University  
 "Pre-Electoral Coalitions and Government Stability in Comparative Perspective." Sona Nadenichek Golder, New York University  
 "Getting in the Game: Pre-Electoral Coalition Formation as a New Party Strategy, with Evidence from the French Greens." Jae-Jae Spoon, University of Michigan  
 "Oversized Electoral Coalitions and the Logic of Party Collusion." Robert J. Weiner, Cornell University  
**Discussant:** Kenneth W. Kollman, University of Michigan

- 4:15 pm 35-6 Explorations in the Determinants of Group Influence**  
**Chair:** Marie Hojnacki, Pennsylvania State University  
**Authors:** "Still an Upper-Class Accent?: Organized Interest Politics and Equality of Political Voice." Kay Lehman Scholzman, Boston College; Traci Burch, Harvard University; and Sam Lampert, Harvard University  
 "The Political Participation of Business Interest Groups in the United States." Jeffrey Drope, University of New Mexico; and Wendy L. Hansen, University of New Mexico  
 "Constraining Interest Group Power: The Effect of Term Limits on the Tobacco Industry." Dorie Apollonio, University of California, San Francisco  
 "What Makes Sierra Club Groups Effective: The Influence of Internal Organizational Practices on Political Outcomes." Hahrie C. Han, Stanford University; Matthew Baggetta, Harvard University; Marshall Ganz, Harvard University; and Chaeyoon Lim, Harvard University  
**Discussants:** Anne Binderkrantz, University of Aarhus, and Kenneth Goldstein, University of Wisconsin, Madison

**FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3:**

- 10:15 am 35-7 Author Meets Critics: A Roundtable on David Mayhew's "Electoral Realignments: A Critique of an American Genre"**  
**Chair:** Theodore J. Lowi, Cornell University  
**Participants:** Walter Dean Burnham, University of Texas, Austin  
 Richard F. Benschel, Cornell University  
 J. Morgan Kousser, California Institute of Technology

- Jeffrey M. Stonecash, Syracuse University  
**Discussant:** David R. Mayhew, Yale University

**SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4:**

- 10:15 am 35-5 Contemporary Transformations in American Party Politics**  
**Chair:** John H. Aldrich, Duke University  
**Authors:** "Playing Favorites: An Examination of Party-Loyal Donors to Presidential Nomination Campaigns, 1996-2004." Terri L. Bimes, Harvard University and Casey Byrne Dominguez, University of California-Berkeley  
 "From Universalism to Hyper-Partisanship: Tracking Party Discipline in the California Assembly, 1901-2001." Seth E. Masker, University of Denver  
 "Campaign Specialists, Party Receptivity, and the Professionalization of Election Campaigns." Jennifer K. Smith, Yale University  
 "The Demise of the Blanket Primary: The Impact of Voter Turnout, Partisanship, and Candidate Fortunes." Priscilla L. Southwell, University of Oregon  
**Discussants:** John H. Aldrich, Duke University and John J. Coleman, University of Wisconsin, Madison

- 4:15 pm 35-2 The Interest Group Politics of Health Care Policy**  
**Chair:** Jacob S. Hacker, Yale University  
**Authors:** "The Politics of Health: The Changing Community of Organized Interests." Mark A. Peterson, University of California, Los Angeles  
 "Lobbying the Clinton and Bush Administrations on Health Policy: Any Meaningful Differences?" Rogan Kersh, Syracuse University  
 "The Effects of Evidence-Based Debate Among Lobbyists on the Legislative Product, with Evidence from Medicare Hearings." Kevin M. Esterling, University of California-Riverside  
 "Interest Group Coalitions as Policy Making Institutions: An Analysis of Health Care Politics During the 108th Congress." Michael T. Heaney, University of Chicago  
 "Behind the Veil: How Interest Groups Quietly Win Even on Highly Salient Issues." William G. Weissert, Florida State University and Carol S. Weissert, Florida State University  
**Discussant:** Marie Hojnacki, Pennsylvania State University

**SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 5:**

- 10:15 am 35-4 New Research in Coalition Formation**  
**Chair:** Michael T. Heaney, University of Chicago  
**Authors:** "The Determinants and Effects of Interest-Group Coalition Behaviors." Frank R. Baumgartner, Pennsylvania State University  
 "The New Polarization in American Politics: Interest Groups, Mass Media and Contestation of the Abortion Issue." Jessica C. Gerrity, Indiana University; Edward G. Carmines, Indiana University, Bloomington; and Michael W. Wagner, Indiana University, Bloomington  
 "Giving a Little to Get a Little: A Bargaining Model of Interest Group Coalition Formation." Thomas T. Holyoke, Hastings College  
 "Coalition Merchants: The Spatial Structure of American Political Discourse, A Hierarchical Model for Estimating Ideal Points with Paucity of Data." Hans Noel, University of California, Los Angeles  
**Discussants:** Michael T. Heaney, University of Chicago and Hahrie C. Han, Stanford University

---

---

## FROM HEADQUARTERS

### American Political Science Association Organized Section on Political Organizations and Parties (POP)

#### List of Awards to be Presented at APSA, 2004

##### Jack L. Walker, Jr. Outstanding Article Award

This award "honors an article published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties."

Marie Hojnacki, Penn State University (Chair)  
Tony Nownes, University of Tennessee  
John A. Clark, Western Michigan University

WINNER: Gary J. Miller (Washington University, St. Louis; [gjmiller@wustl.edu](mailto:gjmiller@wustl.edu)) and Norman J. Schofield (Washington University, St. Louis; [schofld@wustl.edu](mailto:schofld@wustl.edu)) for their article "Activists and Partisan Realignment in the United States" published in *American Political Science Review*, 2003.

##### Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award

This award "honors a book published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties."

David Lowery, University of North Carolina (Chair)  
Christina Wolbrecht, University of Notre Dame  
Fred Boehmke, University of Iowa

WINNER: Jeffrey M. Berry (Tufts University; [jeffrey.berry@tufts.edu](mailto:jeffrey.berry@tufts.edu)) with David F. Arons (formerly Co-Director of Charity Lobbying in the Public Interest; [dfarons@yahoo.com](mailto:dfarons@yahoo.com)). 2003. *A Voice for the Nonprofits*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

##### Samuel J. Eldersveld Award

This award is "to honor a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field."

Larry Bartels, Princeton University (Chair)  
Beth Leech, Rutgers University  
Richard Johnston, University of British Columbia

WINNER: David Mayhew, Yale University  
([david.mayhew@yale.edu](mailto:david.mayhew@yale.edu))

##### Emerging Scholar Award

This honor is awarded to a scholar who has received his or her Ph.D. within the last seven years and whose career to date demonstrates unusual promise.

Mark Smith, University of Washington (Chair)  
Dan Tichenor, Rutgers University  
Ken Kollman, University of Michigan

##### CO-WINNERS:

David Kimball, University of Missouri-St. Louis,  
Department of Political Science  
([kimballd@msx.umsi.edu](mailto:kimballd@msx.umsi.edu))  
Eric Schickler, Harvard University, Department of  
Government, ([eschickler@latte.harvard.edu](mailto:eschickler@latte.harvard.edu))

##### Party Politics Award

This award honors the best paper presented on a POP panel at the preceding APSA annual meeting. The award recipient is offered the opportunity to publish the paper in *Party Politics*.

Holly Brasher, University of Alabama (Chair)  
John Geer, Vanderbilt University  
Tom Ferguson, University of Massachusetts, Boston

WINNER: "The Redistribution of Campaign Funds and Institutional Advancement in the U.S. House," by Eric S. Heberlig (UNC Charlotte; [esherl@email.unc.edu](mailto:esherl@email.unc.edu)), Marc J. Hetherington (Bowdoin College; [mhetheri@bowdoin.edu](mailto:mhetheri@bowdoin.edu)), and Bruce A. Larson (Farleigh Dickenson University; [BruceLarson@fd.edu](mailto:BruceLarson@fd.edu)).

---

## FROM THE FIELD

### Decade of Behavior Research Award

The APSA has been invited to submit nominations for the Decade of Behavior Research Award, which recognizes excellence in the behavioral and social sciences for research that has impacted policy or has made other concrete contributions to solving social problems. Up to five awards will be given each year and this year's theme is Promoting Democracy. Awardees will be invited to Washington, D.C. to present their research at a congressional briefing on Capitol Hill and may also be invited to contribute to a written compilation of research examples.

If you would like to be considered or know someone to recommend as an APSA nominee, please submit curriculum vitae, three letters of recommendation, a short narrative which addresses the nominee's qualifications and explains the work in context emphasizing its importance, and any written or other materials illustrating the work's impact to Rebecca Myers ([rmymers@apsanet.org](mailto:rmymers@apsanet.org)) by August 1, 2004. For more information on this award, please visit [www.decadeofbehavior.org/award](http://www.decadeofbehavior.org/award).

## FROM THE FIELD

Director  
Institute for Social Inquiry and  
The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, Inc.  
University of Connecticut

The University of Connecticut is seeking a distinguished quantitative social scientist to serve as the Director of the *Institute for Social Inquiry* (ISI) and the *Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, Inc.* (<http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu>). The Institute for Social Inquiry is a center designed to facilitate quantitative research in social sciences, particularly in regard to public opinion. The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, Inc. (Roper Center) functions as a unit within ISI. It is a non-profit corporation, based on the University of Connecticut campus and dedicated to public opinion scholarship. The Roper Center, in existence since the 1940's, maintains the oldest and largest archive of public opinion information in the world.

The Director of ISI/Roper will report to the Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education and will conduct original research and lead interdepartmental, interdisciplinary research/scholarship in the social sciences, particularly in regard to public opinion; (s)he will direct ISI and the Roper Center staff as they facilitate interdisciplinary survey research on campus, nationally, and internationally. Our interest in public opinion surveys is broad and includes surveys of political, social, business, public health and other issues of interest to the director and faculty. We are interested in an active survey operation as well as an archival function. The director is expected to provide strategic leadership and leverage the university's investment in staff in the Roper Center, a budgeted new building, and social science faculty across campus in at least four schools to facilitate multidisciplinary initiatives designed to generate external revenue sources for the center as well as for collaborative research. The director will also serve as the president of the Roper corporation and will be an ex officio member of the Roper Board of Directors.

Candidates for the position of Director should have a Ph.D. (or terminal degree) in the social sciences that will qualify for a tenured professional position in appropriate schools and departments (e.g., Political Science, Sociology, Psychology, Economics, Statistics, Business, Family Studies) and a successful research career in the social sciences, with a focus on public opinion and survey research with a quantitative emphasis, and a record of success with past and current external grant support.

Candidates should submit a cover letter and curriculum vitae and have three letters of reference sent to Lois Timms-Ferrara ([lois@ropercenter.uconn.edu](mailto:lois@ropercenter.uconn.edu)), The University of Connecticut Institute for Social Inquiry/Roper Center, 341 Mansfield Road, Unit 1164, Storrs, CT 06269. For full consideration, applications should be received by September 15, 2004. Applications will be accepted, however, until the position is filled.

In keeping with our commitment to build a culturally diverse community, the University of Connecticut invites applications from women, people with disabilities, and members of minority groups.

## Research Committee of Legislative Specialists International Political Science Association

### Conference Call Sub-State / Sub-National Legislatures: Representation; Policy-Making, and Governance

National School of Public Administration  
Quebec City, Canada  
October 20-24, 2004

The Research Committee of Legislative Specialists (RCLS) of the International Political Science Association invites researchers in sub-state / sub-national legislatures around the world to propose papers for the forthcoming international conference "Sub-State / Sub-National Legislatures: Representation, Policy-Making, and Governance."

The conference in Quebec City is an opportunity to explore topics in the study of sub-state and sub-national legislatures in both unitary and federal systems, and also to examine the place and functions of these legislatures in democratic polities. Proposals have been received for panels on:

1. Sub-National Parliaments in Unitary States. This panel is expected to have papers on Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, and Hong Kong.
2. Structural Incentives for Insuring Accountability in Sub-National Legislatures.
3. Campaign Finance Regulation by Sub-National Legislatures.
4. Policy Initiatives by Sub-National Legislatures.

Proposals for other panels are also welcome. The conference is sponsored by the Research Committee of Legislative Specialists of IPSA with the International Political Science Association Secretariat and the National School of Public Administration.

Papers accepted for the conference should contain an abstract, and a bibliography in standard format used in the IPSA Review. Participants should bring copies for distribution. For purposes of broad dissemination, papers should be written in English or French, the two working languages of IPSA. We will post the abstracts on the conference website which is currently under development.

Plans are underway to bring the papers together in an edited collection on Sub-National Legislatures. Thus, conference organizers are expecting that the papers written and presented will be in almost final form by the date of the conference.

Conference registration fee is US \$37.50 or CA \$50.00, and for couples, US \$55.00 or CA \$75.00. Conference registration fees will be accepted by Professor Ned Schneier the RCLS Secretary-Treasurer in August.

To indicate your interest in giving a paper or in organizing a panel, please contact Professor Ronald E. Weber ([rweber@uwm.edu](mailto:rweber@uwm.edu)) or Professor Stephane Paquin ([paquin.stephane@uqam.ca](mailto:paquin.stephane@uqam.ca)). If you have any questions about conference participation, please also e-mail either or both organizers.

For local information, please contact Professor Paquin ([paquin.stephane@uqam.ca](mailto:paquin.stephane@uqam.ca)). The conference site will be the National School of Public Administration in the center of Quebec City. The conference hotel is expected to be the Royal William Hotel which is immediately nearby the National School of Public Administration.

# SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

## PAPERS OF INTEREST

### Midwest Political Science Association Meeting, 2004

- "Political Parties, Partisanship, and Support for Democratic Institutions." Aida Paskeviciute, Binghamton University, SUNY, Christopher J. Anderson, Syracuse University.
- "Determinants of Social Movement Mobilization: A Pooled Cross-Section Time-Series Analysis for a Comparative Study in Four Western European Countries in 1975-89." Jai Kwan Jung, Cornell University.
- "Social Movements, Social Capital and Popular Participation in Latin America: A Theoretical Critique." Paul W. Posner, Clark University.
- "Same Rules, Different Game: A General Model of Presidential Primaries, 1972-2000." Marty Cohen, Hans C. Noel, and John R. Zaller, University of California at Los Angeles.
- "Causes and Consequences of Crossover Voting in Presidential Primaries." Michael G. Hagen, Rutgers University, Richard Johnston, University of British Columbia.
- "Theory and Practice in Testing Models of the Iowa Caucus." C. Clayton Hull, Georgetown University.
- "Choosing How to Choose: State Delegate Selection Rules for Presidential Nominations, 1972-2000." Scott R. Meinke, Bucknell University, Jeffrey Staton, Florida State University, Steven T. Wuhs, University of Redlands.
- "Modeling the Presidential Primary Vote: 1976-2000." Wayne P. Steger, DePaul University.
- "Tainted Money? Contribution Limits and the Effectiveness of Campaign Spending." Thomas Stratmann, University of Chicago.
- "Estimating the Electoral Effects of Party Contribution Limits." Daniel E. Bergan, Northwestern University.
- "Contribution Limits and Disparity in Contribution between Gubernatorial Candidates." Kihong Eom, University of Kentucky, Donald A. Gross, University of Kentucky.
- "Interest Groups and the Electoral Control of Politicians." James Snyder, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Michael Ting, Columbia University.
- "The Structure of Interest Group Competition: Explaining the Variable Nature of the Business Advantage." William G. Jacoby, Michigan State University, Timothy La Pira, Rutgers University, Beth L. Leech, Rutgers University.
- "Precinct Quality and Voter Turnout: Race, Income, and Civic Participation." Mara A. Marks, Loyola Marymount University, Matt A. Barreto, University of California, Irvine, Nathan D. Woods, Claremont Graduate University.
- "Party Switching among Incumbent Southern Legislators, 1980-2003." Antoine Yoshinaka, University of Rochester.
- "Decentralization of the Party System." Dawn Brancati, Princeton University.
- "Divided Government, Parties, and U.S. Trade Policy: How Domestic Institutions and Partisan Control Effect Trade Policy, 1974-2002." Nicole M. Simonelli, New York University.
- "The 2002 Election: A Study in African American Candidates for High-Profile Statewide Offices." Kristofer A. Frederick, University of Albany, SUNY.
- "Blacks and High Profile Statewide Elections in the South: 1988-2002." Matthew A. Wavro, Purdue University, Judson L. Jeffries, Purdue University.
- "Urban Black Voters v. Black Middle Class Voters: Is a Second Realignment Possible to the Republican Party." Steven D. Day, University of Houston.
- "Surfing for Incentives in Collective Action Organizations." Cheryl L. Thomas, American University.
- "The Impact of Election Day Registration on Voter Mobilization Activities." Mary K. Fitzgerald, James Madison University.
- "Patterns of Roll Call Voting in America's Legislatures." Gerald C. Wright, Indiana University, Tracy Osborn, Indiana University, John Winburn, Indiana University.
- "Political Party Competition and Redistribution in the American States." Andrew Karch, University of Texas at Austin, Benjamin Deufel, Harvard University.
- "Supranational Membership and Voter Turnout: A Test of the European Union." Geoffrey D. Peterson, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Mark W. Rasmuson, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire.
- "Ideology, Economics, and Voter Abstention: Evidence from the European Democracies, Erik R. Tillman, Emory University.
- "Party System Configuration and Its Effect on Economic Voting: Reexamination of 'Clarity of Alternative' Thesis." Jim Seok Bae, The University of Texas at Austin.
- "Democratic Norms and Governance: Ideological Congruence and Winners/Losers." Myunghee Kim, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville.
- "Context and the Consequences of Concurrent Campaigns on Learning." Jennifer Wolak, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- "The Electoral Consequences of Ambivalence: Ambivalence, Abstention and Third Party Candidate Support." Gregory W. Gwiasda, Ohio State University.
- "The Dynamics of Negativity in the 2000 Presidential Campaign." Lee Sigelman and Erik Voeten, George Washington University and Emmett H. Buell, Denison University.
- "The Accuracy of Stereotypical Judgments: The Surprising Role of Education." Mark R. Joslyn, University of Kansas.
- "Split Ticket Voting and Issue Elections." Stephen C. Brooks, University of Akron, Rick Farmer, University of Akron.
- "Split Ticket Voting and the Realignment of the South." Justin M. Buchler, University of California, Berkeley, Matthew G. Jarvis, University of California, Berkeley.
- "The Sophisticated Voter and Split Ticket Voting." William T. Horner, University of Missouri-Columbia.
- "The Changing Catholic Voter: Trends in the Political Behavior of American Catholics." Stephen T. Mockabee, University of Cincinnati.
- "Social Networks and the Gender Gap in Vote Choice: The Case of the 2000 Canadian Election." Elisabeth L. Gidengil, McGill University, Bonnie H. Erickson, University of Toronto, Allison Harell, McGill University.
- "Interest Group Coalitions and the Spatial Theory of Choice: A Spatial Model of Group Participation on Amicus Curiae Briefs." Richard A. Almeida, Southeast Missouri State University.
- "Advocacy Groups, Think Tanks and the Economic Programs of Liberals and Conservatives." Mark A. Smith, University of Washington.
- "Partisan Change and Consequences for Lobbying." Charles S. Bullock, University of Georgia, Karen Padgett, University of Georgia.
- "The Structure of Opposition in Public Policy Debate." Marie Hojnacki, Pennsylvania State University.
- "Macedonian Post-Communist Elite." Ivica Bocevski, University of Pittsburgh.
- "Explaining Moderation in Post-Communist Ethnic Party Systems: A Cross-National Investigation in the Balkans." Paula M. Pickering, College of William and Mary.
- "Incentives for Coalition-Making in Post-Communist Democracies." Mikhail Filippov, Washington University.
- "An Explanation of Electoral Popularity for Far Right Reactionary Parties in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union." Scott T. Nissen, Indiana University.
- "Competition or Corruption?: Restrictive Voting Laws in the Northern and Southern United States." David Darmofal, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- "Registration and Voter Turnout." Daniel Stevens, University of Miami, John Transue, Duke University.

(continued on page 8)

## **SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS** *(continued from page 8)*

- "Examining the Participation of Habits of Early and Late Registrants." Daron R. Shaw, University of Texas, James G. Gimpel, University of Maryland, Joshua J. Dyck, University of Maryland, Ann M. Leonetti, University of Maryland.
- "Can We Reform Our Way to Higher Turnout? Analyzing Registration Reform and Electoral Participation in the American States." Melanie J. Springer, Columbia University.
- "Who Registered? Who Voted? Michigan and Minnesota in 2000 Presidential Election." Uisoon Kwon, Western Michigan University, Gang-Hoon Kim, Western Michigan University.
- "Does Low Turnout Matter? Evidence From the 2000 Canadian Federal Election." Daniel Rubenson, University de Montreal, Andre Blais, University of Montreal, Elizabeth Gidengil, McGill University, Neil Nevitte, University of Toronto, Patrick Fournier, University of Montreal.
- "Motivation, Turnout, and Midterm Elections." John W. Patty, Carnegie Mellon University.
- "Electoral Participation and the Character of Elections." Mark New Haven Franklin, Trinity College Connecticut.
- "The Deactivated Voter and Attitudinal Ambivalence." Jangsu Kim, SUNY at Stony Brook, Hye-Jin Oh, SUNY at Stony Brook.
- "The Origins of Presidential Conditional Agenda Setting." Eduardo Aleman, University of California, Los Angeles, George Tsebelis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- "Provincial Machine Politics and Party Government in the Argentine Chamber of Deputies." Mark P. Jones, Michigan State University, Wonjae Hwang, Michigan State University.
- "Legislative Parties in Chile." John B. Londregan, Princeton University, Cristobal Aninat, Universidad de Aldolfo Ibanez.
- "Party Brokers and Legislative Discipline in the Ecuadorian Congress." Andres Mejia Acosta, University of Notre Dame.

- "Party Power in the U.S. Senate: Shaping the Ideological Content of the Legislative Agenda." Andrew A. Bargen, University of Iowa.
- "The Timing of Cabinet Reshuffles in Comparative Perspective: An Event History Approach." Christopher Kam, University of South Carolina, Indridi H. Indridason, University of Iceland.
- "Size, Party Systems and Stability." Lauri A. Karvonen, Abo Akademi, Carsten G.E. Ankar, Mid Sweden University.
- "When a Better Deal Comes Along: How Opportunity Costs Effect the Decision to 'Exit' Party Organizations." Tracy Long, Texas Tech University, Dennis Patterson, Texas Tech University.
- "The British Greens at 30." Debra Holzhauser, Coe College.
- "Negative Party Identification: The Case of Mexico." Estranda M. Luis, University of California, San Diego.
- "What Counts as Priors in Electoral Strategizing?" Frederico Estevez, ITAM, Rafael Gimenez, ARCOP, Rafael Vergara, University of California, San Diego.
- "Form or Substance? The Candidate Appraisal Vote in the Newly Democratic Context." Elizabeth Zechmeister, University of California, Davis.
- "Looking at Left and Right the Right Way: Multiple Dimensions and Electoral Outcomes." Florin N. Fesnic, University of Illinois.
- "Between Moderation and Extremism: Religious Parties in Chile, India, and Turkey." P. Pushkar, Concordia University, Madhvi Gupta, McGill University.
- "Intraparty Politics and Nomination Rules in the PRI." Dwight Dyer, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Islamist Democrats or Islamist Pragmatists? An Assessment of the Justice and Development Party in Turkey's Democracy." Sultan Tepe, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- "The Effects of Political Party Systems on Democratic Development: Findings from Africa and Asia." Michelle T. Kuenzi, University of Kansas, Gina M. Lambright, Indiana University, Misa Nishikawa, Ball State University.

**The  
University  
of Akron**

Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics  
Akron, OH 44325-1914

---

FIRST CLASS  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

---