

# 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

## **Coalition Portfolios in Interest Group Politics**

*Michael T. Heaney, University of Michigan*

Collaborating in coalitions is one of the principal ways that interest groups work to advance their policy agendas. Coalitions allow interest groups to pool resources, gain access to sensitive and timely information, and signal support for their positions to policymakers. Some interest groups avoid joining coalitions because of the ways that coalitions constrain groups' autonomy and expose groups to risks from political mistakes made by other actors. Nevertheless, most interest groups chose to participate in one or more coalitions.

Political scientists have developed a variety of theories for why and how interest groups work in a single coalition. They have paid less attention to the fact that interest groups usually participate simultaneously in multiple coalitions. Because interest groups devote considerable resources to working in coalitions, it is important to examine how interest groups select and juggle multiple memberships. Do coalition memberships interact with each other in significant ways? Do the conflicting imperatives of multiple coalitions impose costs on interest groups? Or do interest groups find ways to synergize their overlapping affiliations?

### **The Concept of the Coalition Portfolio**

In an article to appear in the October 2013 issue of the journal *Interest Groups & Advocacy* (open access at <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/iga/journal/v2/n3/index.html>), Geoffrey M. Lorenz and I use the concept of the "coalition portfolio" in an effort to understand interest groups' participation in multiple coalitions. We define a coalition portfolio as "the set of all coalitions within a given area of public policy in which an interest group participates at a particular point in time." The portfolio concept allows for the possibility that interest groups relate to coalitions differently depending on the area of public policy in question, as well the possibility that portfolios change over time.

We can assess interest groups' overall coalition strategies by looking inside their coalition portfolios, which have several dimensions. (1) *Breadth*: In how many areas of public policy does a group construct a portfolio? (2) *Number of Coalitions*: Within a particular policy area, how many coalitions does a group belong to? (3) *Coalition Size*: Are the coalitions large or small? (4) *Tactics*: What tactics do the coalitions use? (5) *Transparency*: Are the coalitions public and visible, or are they private and secretive? (6) *Ideology*: What are the ideologies of the members of the coalitions? (7) *Issues*: What are the widths of the issue niches of the members of the coalitions? (8) *Overlap*: To what extent do the coalition memberships overlap with one another? These dimensions suggest that groups may construct vastly different portfolios of coalitions. For example, one group may choose to join coalitions only within a single area of policy and focus entirely on participating in grassroots coalitions with their ideological

<b>From Headquarters.....</b>	<b>1,2,3</b>
<b>Scholarly Precincts.....</b>	<b>4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15</b>
<b>Chair:</b> Marc Hetherington, Vanderbilt University	
<b>Secretary-Treasurer:</b> Holly Brasher, University of Alabama at Birmingham	
<b>VOX POP Editor:</b> John Green, The University of Akron	
<b>Program Co-Chair:</b> Miki Kittilson, Arizona State University and Richard Herrera, Arizona State University	
<b>Website Coordinator:</b> Amy Alexander, University of California, Irvine	
<b>Executive Council:</b> David Dulio, Oakland University; Paul Frymer, Princeton University; Michael McDonald, Binghamton University; Dara Strolovitch, Princeton University	

allies. Another group may diversify its portfolio with respect to tactics, joining one coalition with a grassroots emphasis, one coalition that lobbies Congress, and one coalition that follows a long-term legal strategy in the appellate courts. In fact, there are thousands of possible ways for a group to constitute its portfolios, depending on the choices it makes across these eight dimensions.

Invoking the concept of a coalition portfolio implies that there is the potential for consequential interactions between the different coalitions of which an interest group is a member. If there were no such interactions, then the portfolio concept would be of little value; it would be sufficient instead to look at each coalition separately. However, if there are consequential interactions between coalitions, then these interactions should affect the choices that groups make about which coalitions to join and how much effort to devote to them, as well as the ability of an interest group to influence the policy process.

Interactions between different coalitions in the same portfolio may occur for a number of reasons. First, interest groups have limited staff and other resources to use when participating in coalitions. If a group joins one coalition, that may reduce the time and energy that it devotes to other coalitional endeavors. Second, different coalitions may take conflicting positions on the same issue, which may make it problematic for a group to participate within both coalitions. Third, intersecting memberships of groups and coalitions may create either positive or negative network externalities. If an interest group is a member of two coalitions, it may share information obtained through its work in one coalition with members of the other coalition. If two groups share membership in two or more coalitions, then they may coordinate their strategies across the coalitions. Any conflicts between the groups within one coalition could also spill over into the work of the other coalition. For these reasons, the way that an interest group works in any one coalition in its portfolio is likely to affect the way that it works in other coalitions in its portfolio.

### **Coalition Portfolios and the Medicare Modernization Act**

In order to assess whether or not interactions between coalitions make a difference for groups, Lorenz and I examined the participation of 115 interest groups in the debate over the enactment of the Medicare Modernization Act (MMA) in 2003 and its implementation in 2004-2006. Drawing on personal interviews with representatives of 102 interest groups, we collected information on groups' influence reputations and coalition memberships, as well as control variables for communication networks, lobbying capacity, partisanship, organizational age, and organizational type. We focused on how overlapping memberships of groups in coalitions affect how central a group is in the overall organizational network. High levels of network centrality mean that the group has constructed a portfolio in which it tends to be in coalitions with groups that are not otherwise in coalition with one another. Central groups are well positioned to act as brokers in the network since they are situated between groups that would otherwise have difficulty connecting with one another. A position of brokerage is valuable both because it provides advantages in obtaining timely, sensitive information, and because it signals to key observers that the group has been able to find common ground in a complex network environment.

The results of our analysis show that the ability of groups to obtain central positions in the overall network of coalitions is a positive, significant predictor of the group's reputation for exerting influence over the policy process. Centrality in coalition networks predicts a group's reputed influence level, other things equal. Changes in centrality predict changes in that reputation from enactment to implementation, holding other variables constant. We find that groups' influence reputations do not vary with the number or size of the coalitions of which they are a member.

The ability of interest groups to obtain central positions in the network of coalitions does not depend only on the coalitions that are in their own portfolios. Rather, it also depends on the portfolios of all other groups in the network. We find, for example, that as the policy debate over Medicare moved from enactment to implementation, the coalition network became denser and less factionalized. Among other things, this change meant that groups that benefitted from being able to broker across factions during the enactment period (such as Families USA) were less able to leverage this advantage during the implementation period.

The findings of our research constitute strong evidence that there are consequential interactions between coalitions in an interest group's portfolio. Analyses of interest group coalitions that look at how groups work within a single coalition – but that do not consider interactions with other coalitions – are potentially neglecting important forces that shape coalition politics. At the same time, our study only scratches the surface in exposing the nature of interactions among coalitions. We examine interaction on one dimension (overlapping coalition memberships) and consider the effects of one interest group outcome (influence reputation), but leave a large number of other questions unexplored.

### **Directions for Future Research**

Future research on coalition portfolios might fruitfully explore three sets of questions. First, what are the factors that influence how interest groups construct their coalition portfolios? Second, what explains variations in how interest groups allocate effort across the coalitions in their portfolios? Third, which dimensions of coalition portfolios matter the most for interest group outcomes in the policy process.

A first direction for research would be to investigate how interest groups think about and construct their coalition portfolios. The potential for conflicting issue positions is perhaps the most obvious type of interaction which may affect groups' decisions. It may be easy for groups to avoid joining coalitions that are on opposite sides of a major issue, but other situations may be less clear cut. Imagine that a group is interested in joining two different coalitions that work on a mostly separate set of environmental issues, but which take somewhat different positions on the topic of climate change. Does the interest group choose between the two coalitions based on the conflict over the one issue? If it takes this approach, then it loses out on the opportunity to work with the other coalition on a series of other environmental issues. Instead, the interest group could join both coalitions and try to persuade one or both of the coalitions to modify their positions on the climate change debate. Doing so, however, may create tension with its coalition partners, which may not be very flexible in their positions on this issue. Or, the

group could join both coalitions and simply ignore the conflict over this one issue. How interest groups deal with these conflicts almost certainly varies from group to group and from coalition to coalition. Yet, this conflict illustrates the precarious situation that groups may find themselves in when participating in multiple coalitions.

A second direction for research would be to probe how interest groups manage and allocate effort across their coalition portfolios. Within any particular coalition, a group may be a key player, a specialist, or a member in name only. These roles involve different amounts of time and energy on the part of the group's staff members. If a group plays a key leadership role in one coalition, it may have less time available for involvement in other coalitions. A group may choose to balance its involvement in smaller, action-oriented coalitions that require intensive participation with involvement in larger, information-oriented coalitions that require less of the group's attention. How do groups decide which coalitions should receive more of their involvement? Does this decision depend mostly on the issue in question? Do partisan considerations weigh in? If groups believe that involvement in some types of coalitions pay off more than others, how do they make these determinations?

A third direction for research would be to consider variations in how the dimensions of coalition portfolios influence the ability of groups to get what they want from the policy process. Lorenz and I show that the overlapping membership of coalitions creates a politically relevant network structure. What are the effects of other kinds of variation in coalition portfolios? For example, are coalition portfolios more valuable to groups when they are ideologically diverse or ideologically homogenous? Are there observable benefits to having a portfolio with tactically diverse coalitions? Or, do variations in the types of coalition memberships create confusion about the group's identity for its attentive audiences.

The study of coalition portfolios is likely to follow many fruitful directions, in addition to the ones that are suggested in this essay. Further research in this area promises to offer insight into how the participation of interest groups in multiple coalitions shapes the nature of coalition politics.

## SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

### 2013 POP AWARD RECIPIENTS

#### **Samuel J. Eldersveld Career Achievement Award**

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

Chair: Walter J. Stone, University of California, Davis  
Barbara Sinclair, University of California, Los Angeles  
Russell J. Dalton, University of California, Irvine

**Winner: Gary W. Cox, Stanford University**

This year's Eldersveld Award committee composed of Russ Dalton, Barbara Sinclair and Walt Stone (chair) is pleased to award the Samuel Eldersveld Career Achievement Award for 2013 to Gary W. Cox, William Bennett Munro Professor of Political Science at Stanford University. Gary Cox is an outstanding scholar known for his clear and incisive thought and

his remarkable ability to make significant headway in our understanding of the biggest questions motivating the discipline. He has pioneered the theoretical and empirical understanding of the nexus between governmental institutions and political parties in representative democracies. His work has redefined the study of parties in American and Comparative politics by opening new theoretical frontiers and by bringing to bear systematic empirical analysis on questions fundamental to our understanding of party politics. Like Sam Eldersveld himself, his interests span traditional subfields to frame new questions and advance our understanding of enduring issues in representative governance.

In two seminal books on Congress coauthored with Mathew D. McCubbins, Professor Cox developed and extended his cartel theory of congressional parties. In the *Legislative Leviathan* (1993) followed by *Setting the Agenda* (2005), he and McCubbins confronted the scholarly conventional wisdom of the day that parties lurked in the background of Congressional politics, playing a distinctly secondary role. Their theory and evidence forced scholars to recognize the importance of the majority party in the House, and to re-think how the committee system was organized to promote majority-party interests. In addition to literatures on parties and the institutional makeup of Congress, their work stimulated a wave of research on party branding and the electoral effects of parties in legislative elections, anticipating the polarization in American party politics and the scholarship that arose to comprehend it.

Gary Cox is among the most significant political scientists ever to work in the area of comparative institutions. He has published scores of articles on comparative legislative and electoral politics, but his most significant comparative work appears in the seminal *Making Votes Count: Strategic Coordination in the World's Electoral Systems* (1997). The book broke new ground in the areas of comparative institutions and strategic electoral behavior by combining micro-level analysis of the effects of electoral rules on the motivations and consequences of individual choices with a focus on the relationship between institutions and aggregate outcomes such as the number of parties. In his first book, *The Efficient Secret: The Cabinet and the Development of Political Parties in Victorian England* (1987), Cox demonstrated how 19th century British parliamentarians overcame collective-action problems whereby individual politicians emphasized their own personal electoral needs to develop party-centered cabinet government.

Professor Cox has a long list of awards recognizing his accomplishments, including memberships in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences, Guggenheim Fellow, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award, the Fenno Prize, the Epstein Book Award, and many others. To this impressive list, we are proud to add the Samuel Eldersveld Career Achievement Award for his contributions to the study of parties and organizations.

#### **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.

Chair: Lynda Powell, University of Rochester  
Sona Golder, Pennsylvania State University  
Martin Cohen, James Mason University

**Winner: Vineeta Yadav, Pennsylvania State University**  
*Political Parties, Business Groups and Corruption in Developing Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Yadav asks why some developing democratic countries have more legislative corruption than others. There is broad agreement on the negative consequences of corruption and on the critical importance of reducing it. Yadav's work examines the institutional roots of corruption. She argues that, "legislative institutions, which shape the policy process, play a crucial and neglected role in the corruption drama by shaping the lobbying strategies employed by money-rich business interests."

She posits that legislative rules that give parties strong control over agenda setting, the amendment process and member sanctions create incentives for interest groups, primarily business interests in these developing countries, to lobby and fund parties rather than individual legislators. She argues, against conventional wisdom, that strong legislative parties engender more corruption than weak ones.

She tests the hypotheses she develops with both large-country level analysis and detailed case studies in India (a strong party legislature) and Brazil (a weak party legislature). She created a data set on legislative rules for 64 developing democracies over twenty years and combined these data with cross-country corruption data gathered by others. That allowed her to test her macro-level hypotheses linking the legislative rules related to strong and weak party systems to corruption for a large sample of countries. She used the case studies, which are particularly impressive, to test the micro-level mechanisms responsible for these linkages. She surveyed business interest groups in both countries, conducted a large number of open-ended interviews with elite actors and described legislative bill histories. Her analyses of all these data support both her micro and macro level hypotheses and affirm her argument that strong legislative parties promote higher levels of legislative corruption.

Altogether, Yadav's book is theoretically rich and analytically strong. It provides a wealth of new insights. It is a worthy recipient of the Leon Epstein Award, and will influence how scholars study the effects of institution on corruption in the future. It is a book that will have longstanding value to scholars, and will be of great interest to the non-academic community that cares about these issues as well.

### **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.

Chair: David Kimball, University of Missouri, St. Louis  
Lawrence Ezro, University of Essex  
Marco Steenbergen, University of Zurich

**Winner: Kathleen Bawn, UCLA and Zeynep Somer-Topcu, Vanderbilt University.**

**Kathleen Bawn and Zeynep Somer-Topcu. 2012. "Government versus Opposition at the Polls: How**

**Governing Status Changes the Impact of Policy Positions."**  
*American Journal of Political Science* 56(2):433-446.

The committee's choice for the Jack Walker Outstanding Article Award is "Government Versus Opposition at the Polls: How Governing Status Changes the Impact of Policy Positions," by Kathleen Bawn and Zeynep Somer-Topcu. The theory of this study is that voters witness governing parties moderating or compromising on their pre-election policy goals once in office. Thus, voters are more likely to discount extreme policy positions advocated by the government during campaigns. While opposition parties should attract more votes by offering moderate positions, the governing party should attract more votes by taking more extreme positions. For governing parties, this theory turns the Downsian model of party competition on its head. Nevertheless, the authors provide evidence from five countries to support their theory. The article provides an original and nuanced theory that challenges conventional wisdom; it subjects the theory to careful empirical testing, and the ideas are likely to be tested in other settings. Finally, the findings in this study have implications for parties' election strategies, for policy representation, and for victorious parties' election mandates.

### **Emerging Scholar Award**

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

Chair: Barry Burden, University of Wisconsin, Madison  
Beth L. Leech, Rutgers University  
Howard G. Lavine, University of Minnesota

**Winner: Zeynep Somer-Topcu, Vanderbilt University**

**Winner: Timothy Werner, University of Texas**

### **Zeynep Somer-Topcu**

Zeynep Somer-Topcu earned her Ph.D. in 2009 at the University of California-Davis. She is an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Vanderbilt University.

Somer-Topcu is one of the leading young scholars of comparative political parties. Her work – which has already appeared in top journals including the *American Journal of Political Science*, *Journal of Politics*, *British Journal of Political Science* – illuminates essential questions about the policy positions that parties adopt. Focusing on multiparty systems in Western Europe, she inventively combines data on party platforms with surveys of voters to study how voters respond to party messages.

This research produces findings that both confirm and challenge conventional wisdom. In line with standard spatial models, she and her coauthors find that losing parties do in fact moderate their positions by moving in the direction of the winning parties. Moreover, parties update their platforms more when their vote shares decline. And these shifts pay off, but not until the next election when their vote shares increase in response to their updated positions.

At the same time, party positioning appears not to have much impact on the public. European voters do not shift their positions or their party preferences in response to changes in

parties' policy statements. Voters do, however, shift their positions in response to perceptions of where parties stand. In pointing to both the sensible and surprising dynamics between parties and voters, Somer-Topcu makes valuable contributions to our understanding of electoral democracy in multiparty systems.

### **Timothy Werner**

Timothy Werner earned his Ph.D. in 2009 at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He is an assistant professor in the McCombs School of Business at the University of Texas.

Werner is an expert in the interaction between business and politics as well as party politics, campaign finance, and other topics. He has published in the *Journal of Politics*, *American Politics Research*, and elsewhere on these topics. Some of his most intriguing recent work examines how business interests and markets responded (or rather, decided not to respond) to the Supreme Court's 2010 *Citizens United* decision. This work is indicative of the creative approach Werner takes to examining the interaction of the private and public sectors.

Werner's most significant contribution is his book, *Public Forces and Private Politics in American Big Business*, which was published by Cambridge University Press in 2012. The book is utterly original and important. It demonstrates that political change in large corporations often has private rather than public origins. Werner examines three cases – the environment, gay rights, and executive compensation – using interviews and statistical analysis to show how a firm's employees are frequently responsible for changes in private politics and corporate social responsibility. These internal forces may work independently of government, in conjunction with government action, or to prevent government intervention. Werner's work demonstrates that firms are indeed political actors who seek to minimize uncertainty and pursue self-interest. Werner's book is sure to become an important milestone in the study of business interests in politics.

## **FROM THE FIELD**

### **PAPERS OF INTEREST**

#### **2013 American Political Science Association Annual Meeting**

- 'Political Parties and Election Fraud.' Fredrik M. Sjoberg, Columbia University.
- 'Why Do Voters Support Ethnic Parties? The Determinants of the Ethnic Vote in Ecuador.' Karleen West, West Virginia University.
- 'An Interest Groups and Partisan Politics Model for Renewable Energies.' Xun Cao.
- 'Armed Group Competition and Civilian Abuse in Multiparty Civil Wars: Evidence from Columbia.' Michael Weintraub, Georgetown University.
- 'Room to Maneuver? Party Strategies in the European Political Space.' Guido Tiemann, Institute for Advanced Studies.
- 'Linking Candidate Divergence in the District to Party Polarization in the Legislature: A Three-Factor Model, With Evidence from the U.S. House of Representatives, 1956-2008.' Samuel Merrill, III, Wilkes University, Thomas L.

- Brunell, University of Texas, Dallas and Bernard N. Grofman, University of California, Irvine.
- 'Dynamic Motivated Reasoning: How Changing Elite Partisan Cues Alter Citizens' Interpretation of Economic Reality.' Rune Slothuus, Aarhus University and Michael Bang Petersen, University of Aarhus.
- 'When and How Partisan Identification Works.' Toby Bolsen, Georgia State University, James N. Druckman, Northwestern University and Fay Lomax Cook, Northwestern University.
- 'Party Members vs. Party Supporters in a Period of Declining Membership.' Aldo Fernando Ponce, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE) and Susan Scarrow, University of Houston.
- 'Being Activists in Atypical Parties. The Italian Case of Lega Nord and Movimento 5 stelle.' Gianluca Passarelli, University of Roma – La Sapienza.
- 'New Adventures in Party Membership: Primary Elections and the Italian Case.' Luca Bernardi, University of Leicester and Antonella Seddone, University of Turin.
- 'Why People Get Involved in Political Parties: Comparing Attitudes and Incentives for Party Activism between American and Spanish Party Delegates.' Montserrat Baras, UAB and Patricia Correa Vila, UAB.
- 'Taiwanese Views of China and the World: Party Identification, Ethnicity, and Cross-Strait Relations.' Peter Hays Gries, University of Oklahoma.
- 'Partisan Politics and Fiscal Policy in Times of Boosts and Busts (1970-2011).' Damian Raess, University of Geneva.
- 'Global Imbalances, Housing Prices, and Partisan Fiscal Policies.' Ben William Ansell, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities and J. Lawrence Broz, University of California, San Diego.
- 'Time as Age: Measuring the Durability of European Party Systems.' Marcus Dreuzer, Villanova University and Vello Pettai, Leuphana Universität Lueneburg.
- 'Anarchist Conspiracies! The Discrediting of Street Politics and the Parliamentarization of Power in the Discourse of the Freedom and Justice Party.' Neil Ketchley, London School of Economics.
- 'Parties and Post-election Disputes: Who Rejects Electoral Results.' Svitlana Chenykh, University of Oxford.
- 'Political Parties and the State in Post-Collapse Venezuela and Bolivia.' Jennifer Marie Cyr, Northwestern University.
- 'Why Parties? Ruling Parties and Authoritarian Regimes Revisited.' Anne Meng, University of California, Berkeley.
- 'Partisan Voices on the African Airwaves: An Experiment on the Political Effects of Exposure to Talk Radio.' Devra Coren Moehler, University of Pennsylvania and Jeffrey K. Conroy-Krutz, Michigan State University.
- 'Political Parties and the State in Post-Collapse Venezuela and Bolivia.' Carlos Melendez, University of Notre Dame.
- 'National Partisanship and State Policy Diffusion: The Impact of Federalism, Gridlock, and Polarized Parties.' Joseph Wantz, University of Maryland.
- 'America's Invisi-burbs: The Role of Socio-Demographics, Neighborhood Social Context, and Partisanship on Suburban Political Participation.' Lorrie Frasure-Yokley, University of California, Los Angeles.

- ‘Party Organizational Structures and Intraparty Bargaining: The Non-Triviality of Party Activists’ Cooperation.’ Maoz Rosenthal, SUNY, Binghamton University.
- ‘Democratization of Candidate Selection Processes and its Effect on a Party’s Electoral Fortune: Evidence from a Cross-National Analysis.’ Yael Shomer, Tel Aviv University.
- ‘Intra-Party Linkages and Electoral Performance in Brazil, 1996-2010.’ George F. Avelino, Ciro Biderman, FGV, and Leonardo S. Barone, Fundação Getulio Vargas.
- ‘With Friends Like These: Party Organization and Intra Party Watchdogs in Parliamentary Government.’ Christian B. Jensen, University of Nevada, Las Vegas and Zachary David Greene, University of Mannheim.
- ‘Party Democratization and Fiscal Redistribution.’ Kenneth Mori McElwain, University of Michigan and Erin. R. McGovern, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- ‘Party Cues, Voter Ignorance and Referendum Voting.’ Roger Scully, Cardiff University.
- ‘What Information do European Voters Consider when Estimating Party Policy Positions?’ James Adams, University of California, Davis.
- ‘How Government Policy Influences the Shifting Sands of Party Support.’ Guy D. Whitten, Texas A&M University, Christine S. Lipsmeyer, Texas A&M University and Andrew Philips, Texas A&M University.
- ‘Presidents, Partisanship and Policy Entrepreneurs: Reconceptualizing Institutional Change through the Freedom of Information Act.’ Kevin M. Baron, University of Florida.
- ‘Multipartism and Beneficial Cycling: A Defense of Consensual Democracy.’ Yuhui Li, University of California, San Diego.
- ‘Senators Created American Mass Parties.’ Darin DeWitt, University of California, Los Angeles.
- ‘Class and Inclusivity: How Public Opinion Translates into Party Preferences in the European Union.’ Pete Mohanty, University of Texas, Austin.
- ‘Divide and Conquer? Dictators, Democrats, and Authoritarian Party Divides in the Rise of Democracy in Africa.’ Kimberly L. Shella, University of California, Irvine.
- ‘Mainstream Parties’ Strategic Approaches to the Far Right in Western Europe.’ Kimberly Twist, University of California, Berkeley.
- ‘The Determinants of Radical Left Parties Electoral Support in Western Europe.’ Luis Ramiro, Universidad de Murcia.
- ‘Local Attachments and Radical Right Party Support.’ Jennifer Fitzgerald, University of Colorado, Boulder.
- ‘Separating Ideology from Party in Roll Call Data,’ Hans Noel, Georgetown University.
- ‘Winning on the Other Party’s Turf: Voters and Candidates in Congressional Elections.’ Jon R. Bond, Texas A&M University, College Station and Richard Fleisher, Fordham University.
- ‘Bipartisan Signaling: A Comparison of Bill Co-sponsorship to Party Unity Vote Scores.’ Jennifer Bachner, Johns Hopkins University.
- ‘“Building Blocks”—The Group Origins of Cultural Conservatism in the Republican Party.’ Christopher Baylor, University of California, Los Angeles.
- ‘Comparing Islamic Political Parties and the Christian Right.’ Esen Kirdis, Rhodes College.
- ‘Creating Brands: Political Representation and Party System Consolidation.’ Nasos Roussias, University of Sheffield and Elias Dinas, University of Nottingham.
- ‘When Proportional Representation Is Disproportional: Representational Inequality across Parties and Districts under Districted PR.’ Orit Kedar, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- ‘Party Systems and Political Change in Europe.’ Larry M. Bartels, Vanderbilt University.
- ‘The End of Catch-all Parties: Information and Political Polarization.’ Torben Iversen, Harvard University and David Soskice, Oxford University.
- ‘Party Alignments, Partisan Sorting, and Polarization. America in Comparative Perspective.’ Herbert Kitschelt, Duke University and Philipp Rehm, Ohio State University.
- ‘Party Affiliation and Social Networking in the 2012 Presidential Election.’ William D. Adler, Johns Hopkins University and Rachel F. Adler, Northeastern Illinois University.
- ‘Relocation and Realignment: How the Great Migration changed the face of the Democratic Party.’ Keneshia N. Grant, Syracuse University.
- ‘Senators Created American Mass Parties’ Darin DeWitt, University of California, Los Angeles.
- ‘The Solid South? Intra-Party Organization and the Development of the Southern Caucus, 1937-1964.’ Ruth Bloch Rubin, University of California, Berkeley.
- ‘Party Building and Federal Fund Distribution in the American Deep South, 1960-2012.’ Ayako F. Hiramatsu, Johns Hopkins University.
- ‘And Then There Were None: Explaining the Decline of Catholic Political Parties.’ Luis F. Mantilla, Georgetown University.
- ‘Local Governance and Party-Voter Linkages in India.’ Mark A. Schneider, Columbia University.
- ‘When is Cultural Diversity a Threat? The Determinants of Mainstream Political Parties’ Use of Exclusionary Appeals.’ Jennifer Miller-Gonzalez, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- ‘Parties’ Responses to Women’s Organized Pressure: The Impact of Gender Quotas on Mexican Parties.’ Esperanza Palma, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.
- ‘Can Social Movements Resolve the Crisis of the U.S. Party System?’ John C. Berg, Suffolk University.
- ‘The Moral Institutions of the Tea Party Movement: Liberty or Proportionality, or both?’ Emily McClintock Ekins, University of California, Los Angeles and Jonathan Haidt, New York University.
- ‘Promises, promises: Political budget cycles, parties and vote-buying.’ Philip Keefer, The World Bank and Marek Hanusch, Ministry of Finance and Development Planning.
- ‘Persisting against the Odds: Political Parties and their Roots in Unstable Party Systems.’ Jennifer Marie Cyr, Northwestern University.
- ‘The Politics of Public Investments in Albania. New Parties, Old Strategies.’ Carlos E. Costa, Rhodes College.
- ‘The logic of party collusion in a democracy: Evidence from Mali.’ Jessica Gottlieb, Stanford University.
- ‘Why is there Party Proliferation within Senegal and across Africa?’ Catherine Lena Kelly, Harvard University.

- 'Clientelism and the Organizational Foundations of Regional Parties.' Adam W. Ziegfield, University of Chicago.
- 'Timing and Sources of Competition in Hegemonic Party Regimes: A Comparative Study of Taiwan and Singapore.' Netina Tan, University of Toronto.
- 'Rejuvenating the Party Leadership as a Survival Strategy: Mainland China and Taiwan in Comparative Perspective.' Dong Zhang, Northwestern University, Victor C. Shih, Northwestern University, Mingxing Liu, Peking University and Mengchang Zhu, Peking University.
- 'Is There an Economic Vote in Dominant Party Systems?' Kharis Ali Templeman, University of Michigan.
- 'New Parties in Power: Evidence on Government Formation from Central and Eastern Europe.' Till Weber, Humboldt University of Berlin and Florian Grotz, Leuphana University Lüneburg.
- 'Partisan Control of Ministries and the Allocation of EU Regional Aid.' Stephen Bloom, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and Vladislava Petrova, Southern Illinois University.
- 'Interests, Special Relations, and the Future of the US-Israel Alliance.' Ziv Rubinovitz, London School of Economics and Political Science.
- 'Scaling the Progressive Ladder: Partisanship, Ambition and Roll-Call Behavior in the Argentine House and Senate.' Juan Pablo Micozzi, University of New Mexico and Hirokazu Kikuchi, University of Pittsburgh.
- 'A District at a Time: The Role of Electoral College Allocation Schemes in the Growth of Partisan Polarization.' Irwin L. Morris, University of Maryland and Anne Cizmar, University of Maryland.
- 'Parties' Strategic Behavior as a Source of Incumbency Advantage: An Analysis of Spanish Senatorial Elections from 1977 to 2008.' Elena Llaudet, Harvard University.
- 'The Market for "Hard" Money: Funding Flows through Political Parties Post-BCRA.' Susanna Supalla, University of Rochester.
- 'Canadian Party Allocation Strategies at the Federal and Provincial Level.' Keith E. Hamm, Rice University and Jaclyn J. Kettler, Rice University.
- 'The Rhetoric of Emergency Powers: How Partisan Crises Illuminate National Security Crises.' Ross J. Corbett.
- 'Party Politics and Black Disfranchisement: Coalitions, Legislator Behavior, and Exclusion in the Antebellum United States.' David Alexander Bateman, University of Pennsylvania.
- 'Twisting the Donkey's Tail: Transforming the Democratic Party on Race.' Christopher Baylor, University of California, Los Angeles.
- 'How do Ethnic Parties Win Elections? Social Coalitions, Political Alliances, and the Success of the Bahujan Samaj Party in India.' Rahul Verma, University of California, Berkeley.
- 'The Political Economy of Ethnic Mobilization: Comparing the Emergence, Consolidation and Radicalization of Ethnic Parties in Post-Colonial Sri Lanka and Malaysia.' Nikolaos Bizziouras, US Naval Academy.
- 'Populist Persuasion in Turkey: Reproduction of Power in Turkey through the Justice and Development Party.' Esin Kivrak Koroglu.
- 'The Gingrich Senators, the Tea Party Senators, and Their Effect on the U.S. Senate.' Sean M. Theriault, University of Texas, Austin.
- 'Joining the Tea Party Caucus: A Survival Strategy.' Gisela Sin, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign and David J. Hendry, Yale University.
- 'Competitive Primaries and General Election Success: The Role of the Tea Party in 2010.' Sarah A. Treul, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and Caitlin E. Jewitt, IUPUI.
- 'Political Party Activity in the 2012 Elections: Sophisticated Orchestration or Diminished Influence? Robin A. Kolodny, Temple University and Diana Dwyre, California State University, Chico.
- 'Primaries, Partisanship, and Polarization in the Senate.' Carly Schmitt, Indiana State University, Chera A. LaForge, Indiana University East and Hanna Brant, Indiana State University.
- 'Covering the Cost of Toeing the Party Line.' Henry A. Kim, University of Arizona and Andrew Scott Waugh, University of California, San Diego.
- 'Going Partisan: Presidential Leadership in a Polarized Political Environment.' Brandon Rottinghaus, University of Houston and Matthew Lang, University of Houston.
- 'Exploring What Individuals Know About Judicial Philosophies and What it Means for Nonpartisan Judicial Elections.' Lydia Brashear Tiede, University of Houston and Craig M. Burnett, University of North Carolina, Wilmington.
- 'When Does a Party Faction Break Off to Form Its Own Party?' Marcos Menchaca, University of California, Los Angeles.
- 'Parties between Thresholds: State Subsidies and Party Behavior in post-Communist Democracies.' Maria Spirova, Leiden University and Fernando Casal Bértoa, Leiden University.
- 'Latino Migration and Partisan Bias: Results from Redistricting Simulations.' Ian McDonald, Lewis & Clark College.
- 'Why Hispanics Vote Incorrectly More Often for Republican Candidates: The Influence of the Macro-Environment on Immigrant Voting.' Junyan Zhu, Georgia State University and Sean Richey, Georgia State University.
- 'The Health Sector and Campaign Contributions in the States' General Trends, Shifting Tides, and Partisan Mobilization.' Karl Kronebusch, CUNY-Baruch College.
- 'Beyond Money: How Special Interest Groups Influence Policy Choices.' Stephanie Wolton, University of Chicago.
- 'Firms, Partisanship, and the Global Organization of Production: Evidence from U.S. Imports.' Pablo Martin Pinto, Columbia University and Stephen J. Weymouth, Georgetown University.
- 'Exploring Interest Group Influence in the U.S. House of Representatives.' L. Martin Overby, University of Missouri and Mathias Tromborg, University of Missouri.
- 'Parties and Pork in American State Legislatures.' Gerald Gamm, University of Rochester and Thad Kousser, University of California, San Diego.
- 'Leading the Party: Presidential Rhetoric, Party Reputations, and Party Attachments.' Amnon Cavari, Interdisciplinary Center.
- 'Regional Income Inequality and Party Representation.' Melissa Ziegler Rogers, Claremont Graduate University.
- 'Does the Tea Party Still Matter?: Measuring Tea Party Influence in the 2012 Presidential and Congressional Elections.' Leigh A. Bradberry, California State University,

- Northridge and Gary C. Jacobson, University of California, San Diego.
- ‘Disentangling Party and Candidate: An Experimental Test of Trait Ownership.’ Alexander George Theodoridis, University of California, Merced and Stephen Goggin, University of California, Berkeley.
- ‘The Competitive Authoritarian Trap: Opposition Parties in Sub-Saharan Africa.’ Jean-Francois Gagné, University of Montreal.
- ‘The Rise and Impact of the Tea Party.’ Theda Skocpol, Harvard University.
- ‘Houston and the Communist Party: Beyond Civil Rights “Monuments”.’ Anna Marie Smith, Cornell University.
- ‘The Rise of Independents: How News Coverage of Partisan Politics Contributes to the Decline of Partisanship.’ Samara Klar, University of Arizona and Yanna Krupnikov, Northwestern University.
- ‘Implicit Partisan Identity: A New Measure of Affective Polarization.’ Shanto Iyengar, Stanford University and Sean Westwood, Stanford University.
- ‘The Polarizing Effects of Partisan Sorting.’ Lilliana Hall Mason, SUNY, Stony Brook.
- ‘Interest Group Lobbying in Financial Regulation: An Analysis of Rulemaking by the Securities and Exchange Commission.’ Kevin L. Young, Princeton University and Christopher Gandrud, Yonsei University.
- ‘Interest Group Influence on the Federal Reserve’s Merger Approval Decisions.’ Lucas Puente, Stanford University.
- ‘Interest Group Lobbying in Financial Regulation: An Analysis of Rulemaking by the Securities and Exchange Commission.’ Kevin L. Young, Princeton University and Irene Spagna, University of Waterloo.
- ‘The President, Political Parties, and Legislative Behavior in Brazil: An Application of Bayesian Item Response Modeling.’ Tsung-han Tsai, Washington University in St. Louis.
- ‘Political Party Programming and Taxation in Latin America’s Emerging Markets.’ Christina Wagner Faegri, University of Southern California.
- ‘The Effect of Local Party Activity on Registration, Turnout and Vote Share.’ Douglas D. Roscoe, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth and Shannon Jenkins, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth.
- ‘Party Power and the Causal Effect of Endorsements.’ Seth E. Masket, University of Denver, Eric McGhee, Public Policy Institute of California, George A. Krause, University of Pittsburgh and Daniel Berkowitz, University of Pittsburgh.
- ‘Uncertainty or Ambiguity? Sources of Variation in Ideological Placements of Political Parties.’ John H. Aldrich, Duke University, Marco Fernandez, Duke University, Sandra Jessica Ley Gutierrez, Duke University and Gregory Schober, Duke University.
- ‘Policy Drivers of Citizens’ Perceptions of Political Parties.’ Cees van der Eijk, University of Nottingham and Hermann F.J. Schmitt, University of Manchester.
- ‘Party Unity and Voter Perceptions: How Does Unity Mediate Party Message?’ Zeynep Somer-Topcu, Vanderbilt University.
- ‘Cooperation, Conflict, and Voter Perceptions of Party Policy Positions.’ Randolph T. Stevenson, Rice University.
- ‘Elite Polarization and Voter Partisanship: A Comparative Perspective.’ Noam Lupu, Juan March Institute.
- ‘Are Campaign Elites the Source of Partisan Polarization.’ Ryan D. Enos, Harvard University and Eitan D. Hersh, Yale University.
- ‘Strong Connections: Partisan and Revolving Door Ties in Lobbying Networks.’ Richard L. Hall, University of Michigan and Geoffrey M. Lorenz, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- ‘Understanding Interactions Between Parties: A Latent Network Approach Using “Big Data”.’ Simon Weschle, Duke University and Michael D. Ward, Duke University.
- ‘Reaching Beyond the Core Base: Can Political Parties Win Policy Support by Framing Issues?’ Rune Slothuus, Aarhus University.
- ‘Shifts in Corporate Support for the Parties: Disentangling National and Local Factors.’ James Edward Monogan, III, University of Georgia and Christopher M. Witko, Saint Louis University.
- ‘Capital Preferences: International Capital and Government Partisanship.’ Andrey Tomashevskiy, University of California, Davis.
- ‘Deterring Defection and Third Party Guarantees in Negotiated Settlements.’ Deniz Cil, University of Maryland.
- ‘The Sequencing of Elections and Party Competition.’ Bernard Dolez, CERAPS, Robert Elgie, Dublin City University and Annie Laurent, CERAPS.
- ‘Strong Parties, Weak Parties: An Analysis of Democratization in Sub-Saharan Africa.’ Rachel Beatty Riedl, Northwestern University.
- ‘Party Systems and Political Cleavages in Third Wave Democracies: A Latin American Perspective.’ Kenneth M. Roberts, Cornell University.
- ‘Southeast Asia’s Party-Democracy Paradox.’ Erik Martinez Kuhonta, McGill University.
- ‘Institutionalizing Inclusion: Nationalist Parties and Democratic Stability in South and Southeast Asia.’ Maya Jessica Tudor, University of Oxford and Dan Slater, University of Chicago.
- ‘Dynastic Politics and Party Organizations: Why Family Ties Improve Electoral Performance in India.’ Kanchan Chandra, New York University and Anjali Thomas Bohlken, University of British Columbia.
- ‘Ethnic Politics and Urban Voting Behavior in India: Explaining Variation in Electoral Support for the Bharatiya Janata Party (1999-2009).’ Allison Berland Kaul, University of Maryland.
- ‘Outrageous Politics: How Populist Outrage Drives Anti-Political Sentiment and Party System Volatility in East Central Europe.’ Paul DeBell, Ohio State University.
- ‘Brokerage Party Systems in Central Europe: The Evolution of Parties as Firms.’ Abby Jane Innes, London School of Economics.
- ‘Departures, Diversions and Destinations: The EU and the Development of Party Politics in Central and Eastern Europe.’ Tim Haughton, University of Birmingham and Karin A. Bottom, University of Manchester.
- ‘Party and Committee Leadership Behavior, 1949-2009.’ Marija Anna Bekafigo, University of Southern Mississippi.
- ‘Party Voting in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century House.’ Chris Den Hartog, California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo.

- ‘Assessing Party Organizational Change: Participation, Representation and Power.’ Susan Scarrow, University of Houston and Paul D. Webb, University of Sussex.
- ‘The Building of a New Party: the New Flemish Alliance in Belgium.’ Kris Deschouwer, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Emilie van Haute, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Tom Verthe, Vrije Universiteit Brussel and Stefanie Beyens, Vrije Universiteit Brussel.
- ‘Members, Friends and Supporters: Patterns of Engagement with Contemporary Party Organizations.’ Anika Gauja, University of Sydney.
- ‘Helping Women Succeed: Parties and the Voters under Poland’s Open-list Electoral System.’ Anna Mikulska, Rice University.
- ‘Preadult Orientations, Political Periods, and Partisan Realignment: Paul Allen Beck’s Political Socialization Scholarship.’ Zoe M. Oxley, Union College.
- ‘Gender, Party Leaders, and Electoral Outcomes.’ Jeffrey A. Karp, Australian National University and Ian McAllister, Australian National University.
- ‘President Obama and the Renewed Racialization of White Youth Partisanship.’ Michael Tesler, Brown University.
- ‘Fact Checking the Fact Checkers: Verification Web sites, Partisanship and Sourcing.’ Kenneth S. Rogerson, Duke University.
- ‘The Policy Ties of Factionalized Parties.’ Eduardo Aleman, University of Houston and Daniel Chasquetti, Universidad de la Republica.
- ‘Addressing Congressional Partisan Polarization one Caucus at a Time.’ Nils Ringe, University of Wisconsin, Madison and Jennifer Nicoll Victor, George Mason University.
- ‘Hybrid Federalism, Partisan Politics, and Early Implementation of State Health Insurance Exchanges.’ Elizabeth Rigby, George Washington University and Jake Haselswerdt, George Washington University.
- ‘Positioning the Party to Get Out the Vote: Policy Choice with Endogenous Voter Turnout.’ David P. Myatt, London Business School.
- ‘Distinguishing Partisanship from Inattention in Aggregate Opinion.’ Gregory McAvoy, University of North Carolina, Greensboro.
- ‘Partisan Typecasting: Morality and the Differential Framing of Political Issues by Democrats and Republicans.’ Bradley Jones, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- ‘Delay of Microlevel Decisions and the Dynamics of Party Support.’ Etsuhiro Nakamura, Ehime University.
- ‘Rebuilding Party Rule: The Limits of China’s Post Sichuan-Earthquake Development Strategy.’ Christian Phillip Sorace, University of Texas, Austin.
- ‘State and Labor in Post-Communist Europe: Pathways of Regime Transition, the Character of Party Systems, and the Organizational Inheritance of Trade Union Federations.’ Rudra Sil, University of Pennsylvania.
- ‘The Politics of Brinkmanship: Empowering Presidents and Party Leaders in the Policy Process.’ James M. Curry, University of Utah.
- ‘Open vs. Closed Rules and Conditional Party Government: A Computational Model.’ Damon M. Cann, Utah State University and Jeremy Clayne Pope, Brigham Young University.
- ‘Friend or Foe: Muslim Immigrants and Center-left Political Parties in Western Europe.’ Janna Bray, University of Michigan.
- ‘Institutional Design, Ethnic Heterogeneity, and Party System Fragmentation.’ David I. Lublin, American University.
- ‘Party Mobilization and the Income Gap in Voting in the 2012 Presidential Election.’ Elizabeth Rigby, George Washington University and Melanie Jean Springer, Washington University, Saint Louis.
- ‘Individual and Institutional Incentives for Party Development in the French Third Republic.’ Alexandra Cirone, Columbia University.
- ‘Cultural Economics: Personality, Party, and Ideology in American Politics.’ Christopher David Johnston, Duke University, Howard Lavine, University of Minnesota and Christopher M. Federico, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.
- ‘Double Jeopardy: How the Left Loses from Asymmetric Partisan Accountability.’ Mark Andreas Kayser, Hertie School of Governance and Cassandra Grafstrom, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- ‘Personal Patronage and Party Pork: Clientelism and Budgetary Politics in Thailand.’ Praewpailin Soihonprai, University of Michigan and Allen D. Hicken, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- ‘Payoffs, Parties, or Policies: Understanding Voting in Malaysia.’ Meredith L. Weiss, University at Albany, SUNY.
- ‘Patronage Politics and Party Nationalization in Young Democracies.’ Helen H. Lee, Michigan State University.
- ‘Why Parties (of Power)? Institutional Choice and Elite Strategies in Post-Soviet Eurasia.’ Eli Feiman, University of Michigan.
- ‘Elite Cohesion, Sequencing, and External Support in Third-Party Nation-Building.’ Keith A. Darden, Yale University and Harris Mylonas, George Washington University.
- ‘Party System Institutionalization and Cohesion in Post-Communist Legislatures.’ Frank C. Thames, Texas Tech University.
- ‘Citizen Ideology, Electoral Institutions, and Party Cohesion in State Legislatures.’ Justin Kirkland, University of Houston.
- ‘Party Cohesion in European Legislatures: Cross-Country and Cross-Party Comparisons.’ Caroline Close, Université Libre de Bruxelles and Lidia Nunez Lopez, Université Libre de Bruxelles.
- ‘Polarizing Picks: the Conditional Effect of Partisan Fragmentation on Judicial Appointments.’ Abby Blass, University of Texas, Austin and Sean M. Theriault, University of Texas, Austin.
- ‘Party System Polarization and Ideological Congruence: New Data, Causal Mechanisms.’ G. Bingham Powell, Jr., University of Rochester.
- ‘Exploring the Effects of Congruence: Party-Voter Agreement and Citizens’ Evaluation of Representation.’ Mirjam Dageförde, University of Stuttgart.
- ‘Why Parties Change – Or Do They?: Citizen Perceptions of the Partisan Landscape.’ Russell J. Dalton, University of California, Irvine and Ian McAllister, Australian National University.
- ‘Beyond Class, Beyond Europe: Examining How Political Parties Adapt Policy Positions in the Face of Changing

- Cleavage Structures in Western Europe and the United States.' Onawa Pronise Lacewell, Social Science Research Center, Berlin.
- 'Exploring the Effects of Democratic Decentralization on Dominant Party Systems in Eastern and Southern Africa: With In-Depth Analysis of Zambia and South Africa.' Ragnhild Louise Muriaas, University of Bergen and Lars Svasand, University of Bergen.
- 'Are Political Parties Failing? An Investigation into the Quality of Representation in Western Europe.' Annika Werner, Social Science Research Center WZB.
- 'Party Matters: Heterogeneity in Party Characteristics When Explaining Electoral Support in Europe.' Mark Franklin and Lorenzo De Sio, LUISS Guido Carli.
- 'Electoral Competition and Issue Voting: The Effects of Institutions and Party Characteristics on the Voting Decision Process.' Romain Lachat, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- 'Walking the Partisan Line: Mitt Romney in the 2012 Campaign.' Roderick P. Hart, University of Texas, Austin.
- 'Campaign Tweets: Cognitive Mobilization or Partisan Mobilization.' Michael J. Jensen, University of Canberra.
- 'Winners Take All: Institutions, the Predominant Party System and Democratic Consolidation.' Sebnem Gumuscu, Sabanci University.
- 'Multi-Party Elections in Africa: Attribute of Authoritarianism and Driver of Democracy.' Matthijs Bogaards, Jacobs University Bremen.
- 'Partisanship in a Social Setting.' Samara Klar, University of Arizona.
- 'Agreeing to Lose: Why and How Parties Choose to Accept Defeat in War.' Christopher Chiego, University of California, San Diego.
- 'Dominant Parties in Lebanon's Post-War Political System.' Amanda Rizkallah Chown, University of California, Los Angeles.
- 'Is Aliran still Available?: A Study on the Relationship between Party Support and Socioeconomic Backgrounds in Indonesia.' Jung Hoon Park, University of Florida.
- 'The Conservatives and European Integration: Electoral Strategy, Party Competition and Modernization.' Philip Lynch, University of Leicester and Richard Whitaker, University of Leicester.
- 'Partisan Politics After the Financial Crisis.' Lucy Barnes, University of Oxford and Timothy Hicks, Trinity College, Dublin.
- 'The Modern Presidency, Social Movements, and the New Party System.' Sidney M. Milkis, University of Virginia.
- 'Depolarization? Party Coalitions and the Politics of Gun Control, 2000-2012.' David Karol, University of Maryland, College Park.
- 'Parties and Movements in American Political Development: Towards a Framework.' Daniel Schlozman, PhD, Johns Hopkins University.
- 'The Efficiencies and Pathologies of Special Interest Partisanship.' Katherine Krimmel, Columbia University.
- 'Making Commitment Visible: Identification and Visibility at Party Rallies.' Mariela Szwarcberg, Reed College.
- 'Third-Party Actors and the Success of Democracy: How Electoral Commissions, Courts, and Observers Shape Incentives for Election Manipulation and Post-Election Protest.' Milan Svulik, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign and Svitlana Chernykh, University of Oxford.
- 'Electoral Reform and Party Personnel in Italy (1987-2008): Does Recruitment Still Follow Internal Lines?' Luciano Bardi, University of Pisa, Gianluca Passarelli, University of Roma-La Sapienza, and Piero Ignazi, University of Bologna.
- 'Cooptation Tools or Regime Agents: Legislatures in Single-Party Regimes in Non-African Countries.' Yu Xiao, University of Pittsburgh.
- 'Fighting for the Life of the Party: Making Anticorruption Campaigns Work in China.' Jiangnan Zhu, University of Hong Kong, Yiping Wu, Zhejiang University of Finance and Economics and Dong Zhang, Northwestern University.
- 'Governors, Hyper-Partisanship, and Shifting Alignments in the Federal System.' Jennifer M. Jensen, SUNY, Binghamton University.
- 'Examining the Development of the Partisan Gender Gap, 1954-2010.' Jonathan M. Ladd, Georgetown University, Daniel Q. Gillion, Harvard University and Marc Meredith, University of Pennsylvania.
- 'Secularism and the Justice and Development Party in Turkey: Relations with the Non-Religious Other.' Meltem Ersoy, George Mason University.
- 'The JDP and the New Turkish Party System: Myth or Reality?' Tristan Vellinga, University of Florida.
- 'Party Nationalization and Representational Consequences.' Scott Morgenstern, University of Pittsburgh.
- 'Bureaucrats as Gatekeepers: Interest Group Participation in Regulatory Policymaking.' Madeline Barch, Indiana University.
- 'Conditioning Partisan Judgment: Uncertainty, Partisanship, and Political Judgment.' Hyeonho Hahm, University of Michigan.
- 'Campaign Support of Parties and Electoral Performance of Candidates.' Suhjin Lee, London School of Economics and Political Science.
- 'Exploring the Bare Necessities: Unemployment, Redistribution and Party-System Fragmentation.' Konstantinos Matakos, University of Rochester and Dimitrios Xeferis, University of Cyprus.
- 'The Rise of Socialist Parties and the Extension of Franchise: Quasi-Experimental Evidence from Norway.' Mona Morgan-Collins, London School of Economics.
- 'Negotiating Unity and Difference: The Dynamics of Rhetorical Conflict within Multi-Party Governments.' Judi Atkins, University of Leeds.
- 'Partisan Politics and Privatization in OECD Countries.' Reimut Zohlnhoefer, Heidelberg University, Herbert Obinger, University of Bremen and Carina Schmitt, Bremen University.
- 'Picking Winners by Saving Losers: Partisanship and the Political Economy of Corporate Bailouts.' Michael Graham Smith, Columbia University.
- 'Politicizing Inequality: Investigating Left Parties' Agenda Setting Behavior Since 1980.' Jason D. Hecht, Cornell University.
- 'Alternatives to Repression? Understanding Conservative Party Survival in Germany, 1871-1928.' Daniel F. Ziblatt, Harvard University.

- ‘Ethnic Politics and Partisan Violence: Exploiting Cross-National Variation in the Caribbean.’ Emily Ann Beaulieu, University of Kentucky.
- ‘Don’t Lose Control: How Partisanship and the Political Landscape Shape Religious Beliefs.’ Michele Margolis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- ‘The Care and Feeding of Partisanship: The Role of Religious Context.’ Alicia Diana Forster, University of Florida.
- ‘A Political Agency Model of Leaders, Parties, and Voters.’ Benjamin Nyblade, University of British Columbia.
- ‘Dynamic Political Rhetoric: Electoral, Economic, and Partisan Determinants of Speech-Making in the UK Parliament.’ Sven-Oliver Proksch, University of Mannheim and Kira Killermann, University of Twente.
- ‘Electoral Competition in the Face of Dissent: How Parties Manage Internal Divisions over Unforeseen Issues.’ Jonathan B. Slapin, University of Houston and Ling Zhu, University of Houston.
- ‘Did They Jump or Were They Pushed? How Parliamentary Candidate Selection May Drive Opposition Parties towards Electorally Irrational Policies.’ Florence So, University of Aarhus, Nicholas Aylott, Umea University and Tim Bale, Queen Mary, University of London.
- ‘The Effect of Party Experience and Consistency on Partisanship and Vote Choice.’ Georgia Kernell, Northwestern University.
- ‘Inferring Partisanship for Housing and Neighborhood Characteristics: Experimental Evidence on Geographic Sorting.’ James G. Gimpel, University of Maryland, College Park, Iris Hui, University of California, Los Angeles and Wendy K. Tam Cho, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- ‘Calling It Wrong: Partisan Media Effects on Electoral Expectations and Institutional Trust.’ Laura Silver, University of Pennsylvania, Felicity Duncan, University of Pennsylvania, Devra Coren Moehler, University of Pennsylvania and Andrew M. Daniller, University of Pennsylvania.
- ‘Partisan News Before Fox: Newspaper Partisanship and Partisan Polarization, 1881-1972.’ Tim Groeling, University of California, Los Angeles and Matthew A. Baum, Harvard University.
- ‘Encountering Incivility On-Line: The Effects of Uncivil Partisan Attacks on Blog Reader Opinion.’ Elizabeth Suhay, Lafayette College, Cameron Roche and Lucien Bruggeman, Lafayette College.
- ‘Passion, Persuasion, and Patriotism: The Intersectional Politics of Anger in the Tea Party Movement.’ Holloway Sparks, Emory University.
- ‘The Military as a Neutral Third Party.’ Jose Antonio Cheibub, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Milan Svoblik, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- ‘Cue-Taking in Congress: Interest Group Signals from Dear Colleague Letters.’ Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Ohio State University, Dino P. Christenson, Boston University and Alison Craig, Ohio State University.
- ‘Assessing the (Changing) Structure of Organised Interest Networks: Evidence from UK Public Policy Consultations.’ Darren R. Halpin, Australian National University and Robert Ackland, Australian National University.
- ‘Devaluing the Party: Assessing the Trade-off between Loyalty and Competence through an Audit Experiment.’ David Szakonyi, Columbia University.
- ‘Under Pressure: The Polarizing Effect of Expected Social Interaction with a Fellow Partisan.’ Eric William Groenendyk, University of Memphis.
- ‘The Importance of Local Ties in Parties’ Recruitment Strategies in a Closed-list Proportional Representation Electoral System: The Case of Portugal.’ Ana Espirito-Santo, Social Sciences Institute (ICS) and Edalina Sanches, University of Lisbon.
- ‘Party Personnel Strategy and List Construction: Evidence from Lithuania.’ Erik S. Herron, National Science Foundation, Michael S. Lynch, University of Kansas and Monika Aleknaviciute, Independent Scholar.
- ‘Preference Votes and Parties’ Nomination Strategies in Flexible-List Systems.’ Audrey André, University of Antwerp and Sam Depauw, Free University of Brussels.
- ‘Legislative Accountability in a Mixed-Member System: Turnover, Dual Candidacy, and “Party-Hopping” in New Zealand.’ Jack Vowles, Victoria University of Wellington.
- ‘Post-rebel Party Transitions to Electoral Politics: Results from a Cross-Regional Dataset, 1990-2009.’ Carrie Manning, Georgia State University and Ian O. Smith, Georgia State University.
- ‘Rebel Legacies and Party Identity Change.’ John Ishiyama, University of North Texas and Michael Christopher Marshall, University of North Texas.
- ‘Parties, Votes and Health Insurance: Policy and Voting Behavior in Mexico.’ Elizabeth Kaknes, University of Virginia and Heidi Schramm, University of Virginia.
- ‘When Are Interest Group Ads More Effective?’ Travis N. Ridout, Washington State University, Michael M. Franz, Bowdoin College and Erika Franklin Fowler, Wesleyan University.
- ‘Partisan Trading in a Presidential Election Prediction Market Experiment.’ T.K. Ahn, Seoul National University, Won-Ho Park, Seoul National University and Kyu S. Hahn, Stanford University.
- ‘Do Parties Matter? Party Affiliation and Fiscal Spending in Brazilian Municipalities.’ Ricardo Ceneviva, Universidade de Sao Paulo and Thomas Brambor, Lund University.
- ‘Explaining Variations in the Institutionalization of Party Systems: a Cross-regional Approach.’ Eduardo Olivares C., University of Manchester.
- ‘Bipartisanship: Modeling Cross-Party Coalition Building Activity in the 99 State Legislature Chambers.’ Lynda W. Powell, University of Rochester.
- ‘Runoff Rules, Political Parties, and Democracy in Latin America.’ Cynthia McClintock, George Washington University.