VOLUME 8
ISSUE 2

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

*ISSUE THEME: INTEREST GROUP RESEARCH

INTEREST GROUPS: A SUBFIELD IN SEARCH OF AN IDENTITY

Allan J. Cigler, University of Kansas

The nature and role of organized political interests have long been core concerns of observers of the American policy. Yet as a subfield within the discipline of political science, interest group politics is often considered "undertilled," with a perceived gap between the presumed importance of the subject and the quantity and quality of research upon which firm generations can be based.

There are a number of explanations for the paucity of interest group research. Like the public at large, political scientists have often viewed interest groups with ambivalence, recognizing their inevitability, but uncomfortable with their impact, and have preferred to study political parties. The difficulty and expense of doing systematic empirical field research on interest groups has also discouraged scholarly inquiry. The "hard" data that do exist in the interest group area are often nominal or ordinal in scale, and hold little attraction to a generation of scholars looking to apply advanced statistical analysis. Nevertheless, research in the interest group area has increased markedly in recent years.

For review purposes, the subfield literature can be separated into concerns of demand aggregation and group impact. The demand aggregation literature focuses upon questions of the scope and representativeness of the group universe, how political groups organize, attract and retain members, and the internal workings of interest groups. The group impact literature is concerned with the role and tactics of groups in the political process, both in terms of elections and formulating public policy.

DEMAND AGGREGATION RESEARCH

The Contemporary Interest Group Universe

It was not until early in the 1980s that a number of empirically based studies provided a detailed picture of the interest group universe and how it had changed in the postwar period. Researchers found a tremendous expansion of the group universe, both in numbers and scope, at the federal and state levels, especially since 1960. Particularly

(continued on page 3)

ISSUE THEME: INTEREST GROUP RESEARCH

*FROM HEADQUARTERS

Dear Colleagues:

The section is solvent and flourishing, with 492 members, including 50 members residing outside the United States.

An issue which is very important to the section is the relationship of the sections to the formal structure of the APSA. As Jim Gibson described in the last issue of *Vox Pop*, one unresolved issue is the role of sections in program sponsorship at the APSA's annual meeting. A second is the services provided to the sections by the APSA and at what cost. A third problem is the proliferation of sections within the APSA. The APSA has appointed a committee, chaired by L. Sandy Maisel of Colby College, to consider the role of the sections in the APSA.

The incongruence between the content of the POP's By-laws and the way we have operated in the past needs to be addressed. A committee to revise the By-laws has been appointed and will report at the section's business meeting in San Francisco next September. The members of the By-laws Revision Committee are Anne Costain, University of Colorado, Chair; James Guth, Furman University; and Sarah McCally Morehouse, University of Connecticut.

The committee to select the 1990 POP Award recipients has been selected and welcomes your nominations of candidates for the Awards. The three awards are the Samuel Eldersveld Award for a lifetime of distinguished scholarly and professional contributions to the field, the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field, and the award for an article of unusual significance to the field. The members of the Awards Committee are Frank B. Feigert, Chair, University of North Texas; Robert Harmel, Texas A&M; and William Keefe, University of Pittsburgh.

Consideration is being given to conducting a survey of section members. The survey would examine the range of scholarly interests of POP members, evaluations of the current activities of POP, and suggestions for new activities which might be sponsored by the section. We are currently exploring the costs of conducting such a survey.

M. Margaret Conway, Chair

MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
Atlanta, August 31, 1989

The chair of the section, Frank Sorauf, called the business meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. There being no objections to the minutes of the 1988 meeting, they were approved as printed.

The chair reported first on the financial condition of the section. The section dues produced $2,400 in fiscal year of 1989, of which 60 percent ($1,440) went to the APSA (by APSA policy) in return for general administration, membership lists, mailing lists, and printing of the newsletter. The remaining 40 percent ($960) covered other newsletter expenses and the expenses entailed in making the three annual awards. (The chair noted that his university and those of the program and newsletter editor subsidized the section by paying postage, phone bills, secretarial costs, some materials, etc.) After paying a few bills from the 1989 convention the section will have a surplus of about $2,600.

The chair also reported on the status of sections within the APSA. He noted the reduced role for sections in the 1990 program and said it was indicative of the ambivalence of some officers and members of the Council about the sections and their growth. There still is no direct representation for the sections in the decision making of the Association, but the Council committee in the sections will at least have the leadership experienced in and sympathetic to the sections. The sections themselves are not only growing but becoming more and more diverse in size, goals, and interests; as they grow, however, they still cover the terrain of the discipline very imperfectly. In sum, the chair predicted continued volatility in relationships with the APSA and among the sections, but increasing growth and influence for the sections.

John Green reported briefly on the new Newsletter, asking for the help and suggestions of the members. Jim Gibson followed with a report on planning for the section's contributions to the 1990 program, describing the sharing of authority with representatives of the Program Committee that will obtain.

After hearing a report from Robert Huckshorn, chair of the nominating committee, proposing the following officers for election for two-year terms (with the exceptions noted), the meeting elected all of them by acclamation.

1. Chair: Margaret Conway, University of Florida
2. Secretary-Treasurer: Charles Hadley, University of New Orleans
3. Program Chair: Ruth Jones, Arizona State University
4. Members of the Council: Richard Boyd, Wesleyan University; William Keefe, University of Pittsburgh; Michael Malbin, U.S. Department of Defense; Marian Palley, University of Delaware.
5. Members of the Council (one-year terms): Ann Costain, University of Colorado; Diane Pinderhughes, University of Illinois; Gerald Pomper, Rutgers University; Jack Walker, University of Michigan.

John Green, The University of Akron, will continue as newsletter editor.

There was no old or new business to consider. Alan Gitelson thanked the chair for his two years of service to the section, and the meeting was adjourned.

Frank Sorauf, Secretary Pro Temp

CALL FOR PAPERS

1990 Annual Meeting of the
American Political Science Association
San Francisco

Official Deadline: December 1, 1989

Political Parties and Organizations (ORGANIZED SECTION)

I would like the 1990 Political Parties and Organizations panels to reflect a balance between conventional and innovative research. On the conventional side, papers dealing with party organizations, parties and electoral politics, parties and money, PACs and other interest groups, party elites, and such process concerns as linkage, integration, realignment, governance, etc., are certainly welcomed. I also especially encourage papers that might not ordinarily seem to fit within the traditional conception of political organizations and parties. For instance, papers that are cross-national in focus are encouraged, as are papers that combine a concern with political organizations and parties with other institutional and process concerns (e.g., interest group activity in the courts; the role of parties in the legislative process). Diachronic analyses are also especially encouraged. It should also be stressed that the section invites papers on political organizations other than political parties. Note that no methodological orthodoxy is being imposed on the papers—research based on eclectic methods, so long as they are rigorous, is welcomed. Formal analyses are especially encouraged. I also solicit your suggestions for additional topics for the meeting, and especially ideas for innovative roundtables. Finally, please make a special effort to encourage graduate students to consider participating in the meeting.

James Gibson, Department of Political Science, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204; [Office: (713) 749-4322; Home: (713) 660-8813; FAX: (713) 747-8638; BITNET: POLSBR@UHUPVM1]

Section 8. Political Organizations. (APSA PROGRAM)

We are interested in investigating—even collecting—substantively innovative approaches to political organizations. To the end, a special focus of the panels in our section will be political parties, interest groups, and social movements in comparative perspective. This implies comparisons across countries, of course, where the American case is frequently marginalized or overlooked. But it also encourages comparisons across historical periods or across organizational types. In the same fashion, we are particularly interested in proposals for panels which integrate topics often considered separately, such as parties and interest groups, or parties and social movements—topics which have added virtue of almost requiring comparisons across organizational types or historical periods.

As the preceding implies, we hope to be responsive to proposals for *panels* and not only for papers. One of us for example, is interested in the *mechanisms* for intragenerational transmission of partisan identification, in looking inside the black box; the other is interested in the utility of the old-fashioned notion of party factions and their evolution, in looking at parties as 'covers' for factional activity—though these are offered as examples, not requests. Finally in line with the overall theme of democratization, we hope to offer several panels on aspects of that theme especially relevant to the section, as perhaps with "Michel's Iron Law of Oligarchy—Contemporary Evidence" or "Structural Democratization in American Politics—Movement and Impact."

Byron Shafer, Nuffield College, Oxford University, Oxford OX1 1NF, United Kingdom (Office: 011-44-86527-8500; Home: 011-44-86564-705).

Bernard Grofman, Department of Political Science, University of California at Irvine, Irvine, CA 92717 [Office: (714) 856-6394 and 5143; Home (714) 733-1094].

IN SEARCH OF AN IDENTITY

(continued from page 1)

impressive has been the growth in the number of nonoccupational groups, such as citizens organizations, and the expanded political role of institutions, such as corporations, churches, state and local governments, hospitals, foundations, think tanks, public interest law firms, and universities. Most scholars now agree that "organized interests" is a better descriptive term for the subfield than "interest groups," since many of the main actors no longer are membership groups, funded by membership contributions and characterized by face-to-face interaction among members.

We have just begun to comprehend the nature and meaning of changes in the complexity of the group universe. Representation, for example, is more than merely recognizing the number and diversity of active interests: it should involve the comparative assessment of resources, including intangible assets such as experience, skills, and tenacity. How well the newly active "organized interests" can represent citizen interests is a particularly challenging research question. At this stage, we understand "scope" far more than "bias" in the group universe.

(continued on page 6)

INTEREST GROUP RESEARCH

Here are brief descriptions of two extensive, innovative, and continuing research projects on interest groups.

THE NATIONAL INTEREST GROUP SYSTEM

Jack L. Walker
University of Michigan

Theoretical dispute and speculation about interest groups began in the United States with James Madison's concerns about the dangers of faction and has attracted numerous highly respected contemporary scholars. Yet feelings persist among observers of the discipline that the subfield lacks intellectual consensus and rigor.

One reason for the subfield's cloudy reputation has been the lack of any empirically based scheme of classification that would allow national systems of interest groups to be compared in a comprehensive, yet parsimonious way. Hundreds of excellent case studies of interest groups have been published during the past 30 years, yet it is hard to create generalizations about the entire interest group system based upon this research because one cannot be certain what any given case study is a case of.

One of the central purposes of my study of interest groups at the national level in the United States is to provide a kind of intellectual road map that might eventually allow for rigorous comparisons of the interest group systems in many different countries. I am concerned only with voluntary associations that operate primarily in the nation's capitol and have members. I have excluded from this phase of my study the public affairs of business corporations, the activities of the Washington legal community, and nonprofit think-tanks like the Heritage Foundation.

Rather than studying a small number of groups in depth, which is the normal approach employed by students of this subject, I have collected information through mail surveys sent to the executive secretaries of all groups operating in Washington. My aim was to obtain data on a small number of variables from a large number of groups. A total of 892 responses were obtained, producing a data set that allows for elaborate statistical analysis of the data.

The first step in the analysis of my data was the creation of a typology of interest groups based upon whether their membership emerges from pre-existing occupational or professional societies, or whether those who join are united mainly by a common dedication to a cause or a broad collective goal. In the United States, at least, the occupational based associations, about 80 percent of the total, can be divided further between those whose members work in the profit-making sector of the economy and those that emerge from the nonprofit sector. This simple three-part typology (profit, nonprofit, and cause or citizen groups) is solidly based in the historical development of voluntary associations in the United States, and I have found that interest group leaders regard the scheme an obvious feature of their world when questioned about it during interviews.

Beyond creating a classification scheme, the principal questions being addressed in the study are: (1) how do groups come into being in the first place? (2) what tactics do groups follow in pursuit of their goals? I made a conscious decision, however, to ignore for now the difficult problem of measuring the effectiveness or power of interest groups. My current research is directed toward the political and legal environment in which interest groups operate, their financing, the methods of governance they employ, and their functioning as political organizations, not the ultimate impact of their efforts on the development of public policy. I am studying the ecology of interest groups, and asking why some constituencies are represented in Washington while others are not.

The single most important findings from my study so far is the crucial role played by outside patrons in the creation, maintenance, and daily functioning of interest groups. Most of the theory in this subfield concerns itself with the relationships between the leaders of groups and their members. My findings show, however, that most groups do not rely completely on their members for financial or political support. Group leaders often pay as much attention to securing the support of foundations, government agencies, wealthy individuals, and large business firms as they do in trying to mobilize their members for collective action.

The discovery of the crucial role of outside support in the maintenance of interest groups calls for a systematic explanation of the relationships between group leaders and their patrons. My study is meant to shift our attention away from the motives and behavior of individuals considering whether to join interest groups, toward questions about the crucial role played in American politics by huge business firms, and by government agencies that often are responsible for bringing into existence interest groups that subsequently make efforts to influence these same agencies. Questions arise from my findings about whether the interest group system accurately represents the broad range of public opinion, how interest groups relate to political parties, and how the interest group system reacts to changes in partisan control over governmental institutions resulting from national elections. The book I am preparing based upon this study will offer answers to these questions, and will attempt to sketch out the central role of the burgeoning interest group system in the continuing process of political mobilization in America.

*(**Some results from this project are described in Jack L. Walker, "The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America" APSR 77(2): 390-406.)*

THE WASHINGTON INTEREST REPRESENTATIVES PROJECT

Robert H. Salisbury
Washington University

At the Law and Society Association meetings in the late spring of 1980, Jack Heinz, Professor of Law at Northwestern; Ed Laumann, Sociology Chair at Chicago; Bob Nelson, LL.B. and nearly a Ph.D. in Sociology; and I met to consider a research fantasy. Heinz and Laumann had just completed their landmark study of *Chicago Lawyers* (Russell Sage and American Bar Foundation, 1982). Nelson was finishing his thesis, later published as *Partners with Power* (University of California Press, 1988). I had been investigating the role of congressional staff (with Shepsle, "Congressmen as Enterprise," *LSQ*, 1981). Heinz and I were old friends and sometimes collaborators, and we all were compatible personally and intellectually.

As we contemplated the future, an enticing vision began to take shape. Heinz, Laumann and Nelson could extend their work as lawyers and I could expand my empirical research on Washington staffers and my theoretical interest in interest groups by combing forces. And so we began.

Initially our focus was the role of Washington lawyers, but we soon came to realize that in order to understand that role we would need to compare lawyers with nonlawyers. We also came quickly to the conclusion that if we were to say anything much about the substance of interest group politics—and we were strongly of the view that policy interests are the core of group action—we would have to limit our investigation to a few specific areas of public policy and explore those in considerable depth and detail.

Heinz and Laumann had achieved an impressive track record in research supported by the American Bar Foundation, and ABF, later joined by NSF, was therefore willing to invest in our efforts. Our first concern was to pick the brains of knowledgeable participants in the interest representation process. Accordingly, we "interviewed" more than 100 lobbyists, lawyers and public officials in order to develop a sense of what issues to pursue and how best to frame the design of questions and sampling procedures.

Following this rich experience we constructed interview protocols that were highly structured, far more so than would have been possible without the extensive preliminary interviewing. We also developed a fairly elaborate sampling frame of private organizations known to have been actively respecting policy issues in the four domains we had selected: agriculture, energy, health, and labor. In the end we interviewed 311 organizations, asked them who represented their interests in Washington, interviewed 774 of those named to which were added 32 "notables" to fill out a list of 72 (66 actually interviewed) that had been nominated as particularly prominent interest representatives in the four policy areas, and then, having asked the representatives what government officials they most often interacted with, we interviewed 301 officials.

The result was an immensely rich, immensely complex set of data, the mining of which could certainly consume several professional lives. The analytic tasks were complicated by the fact that Heinz soon began a three-year term as executive director of ABF, Laumann became Dean of Social Sciences at Chicago, and I took on the chair of my Department. Moreover, though we remained close personally and in intellectual perspective, the fact that we were 300 miles apart burdened our progress. Nevertheless, we have managed to generate more than a dozen papers, and we hope to complete a book manuscript by the spring of 1990. Assuming publications by 1991 the project will have taken just over a full decade from inception to completion. We will all be much relieved when it is finally done, even though we will be fully aware of the many possibilities still lurking unexplored in our data. And we are also happy to report that the collaboration, with its many difficulties, has never suffered from loss of enthusiasm, of civility, or above all, of great mutual respect and admiration. Given that the project involved collaboration across disciplines, universities, and even generations, it is a special pleasure to report that throughout it has been high and powerful fun.

*(**Some results from this project are described in Robert Salisbury, John P. Heinz, Edward D. Laumann, and Robert L. Nelson "Who Works with Whom? Interest Group Alliances and Opposition" APSR 81(4): 1217-1234.)*

IN SEARCH OF AN IDENTITY

(continued from page 3)

The Collective Action Problem

Explaining why people join groups and clarifying the reasons for the recent proliferation of groups have drawn the most attention from interest group scholars. For many political scientists, the evolving body of theory and research on the collective action problem gives the interest group subfield its main identity—and its reputation as "theory rich and data poor."

While we are far from an empirically grounded theory of organizational formation and maintenance, our understanding is far greater than even a short time ago. Many of the important elements of a theory and their conditional effects have been identified, and both theoretical and empirical work continues at a fast pace. In general, the literature suggests that while there are substantial barriers to collective action, there are a number of "solutions" to the collective action problem that enable even large constituencies to pursue collective political goals. Group entrepreneurs and outside patrons play crucial roles in group formation and development, and individual motivations for collective action are broader and less tied to selective benefits than some of the earlier literature would suggest.

(continued on page 6)

IN SEARCH OF AN IDENTITY

(continued from page 5)

The research task in the collective action area remains substantial, however. While some argue that empirical work should not proceed until theory is more developed, most would agree that more empirical research on a broader set of organized interests is needed. Studies surveying non-members as well as members would lend additional insight into the collective action problem. Just about any well-crafted study of an organized political interest would make a valuable contribution to the collective action data base.

GROUP ACTIVITIES AND IMPACT

Groups in the Electoral Process

Groups play a prominent role in American elections, their activities ranging from endorsements of candidates to participation in the nomination and platform writing processes, to mobilizing voters and supplying money and other campaign resources. One effect of the 1971 and 1974 campaign finance reform laws has been to make the role of groups in electoral process more visible. The result has been a "bull market" in research on group activities in elections, especially the activities of political action committees.

But the availability of good data on PACs did not automatically produce good research or clear results. PAC money, for example, is analytically difficult to separate from other sources of money in terms of its impact on elections, and money itself is only one of many political resources in a campaign. Much of the literature on PACs is descriptive, focusing upon their fund-raising and spending patterns, internal operations, and their effect upon political parties. Research on the linkage between PAC contributions and legislative behavior suggests that PAC contributions are less important than constituency, partisan and ideological factors on roll call votes, but may be particularly important under certain circumstances, such as when legislators have no strong preferences, on less visible issues, and perhaps at other stages of the legislative process (e.g. subcommittee decisions).

Studies of group activities other than campaign finance are particularly needed. For example, the role played by activist farmers, teachers and members of organized labor in presidential nomination campaigns has not been systematically studied from the perspective of interest group strategy, nor has the role of organized interests in the writing of party platforms. "In-kind" contributions, such as conducting registration drives and lending group staff to campaign organizations suggest a different relationship between candidates and interest groups, where groups are actively involved in the campaign decision making.

Washington Representatives in the Policy Process

Many public policy studies have potential relevance to interest group scholars, including much of the literature on congressional, bureaucratic, and judicial decision making. The findings from policy literature, though often narrowly derived and policy area specific, tend to confirm and challenge much of the conventional wisdom about groups and lobbyists in the policy process.

The small body of literature on Washington lobbyists and representatives is illustrative. While there has been a tremendous growth in the number of group actors in the policy process, systematic research presents a picture of Washington representatives somewhat different than the journalistic accounts of "upper-tier," "top-echelon" lobbyists and consultants. Most are not "guns-for-hire," moving between employment in government and the private sector nor are they "specialists." Most are long-time employees of the organization which they represent, often performing a myriad of tasks, from securing funds for the organization to contacting and monitoring policy makers. There is some indication that Washington representatives engage in the same kinds of activities they have always engaged in, but that the level of activity is much elevated.

Still, our knowledge about the vast number of individuals associated with organized interests remains at the rudimentary level. We know little about what motivates Washington representatives and their perception of their jobs, and the linkages between the various background characteristics of the lobbyists and their effectiveness. And while there is some research on actual lobbying techniques and their effectiveness, this area has been largely neglected by political scientists.

Organization Interests in the Policy Process

The expanding presence of the federal government in the lives of citizens, the proliferation of organized interests represented in Washington, and the expansion of access points in the policy arena, has increased the number of participants in the policy process and changed the process itself in fundamental ways. By the late 1970s, the context that permitted "iron triangles" to operate in American politics no longer was present, replaced by a much less stable environment characterized by large numbers of groups, inter-group competitiveness within policy sectors, fewer hegemonic interests, more openness in the decision-making process, and a willingness among elected officials, including the president, to intervene even in narrow policy arenas.

A relatively large body of literature has documented the trend toward more open and competitive policy arenas, less dominated by one or two organized interests. Interest

(continued on page 7)

IN SEARCH OF AN IDENTITY

(continued from page 6)

group domination in the policy process has tended to occur most often in distributive and self-regulatory sectors, typified by concentrated benefits and widely distributed costs. As more and more policies are seen as redistributive, even "sacred cow" policies like the Social Security system now face at least token opposition from groups of younger taxpayers, and a reexamination of the disabled rights policy arena in the late 1980s might find that those who found compliance with laws costly (like universities and public transportation systems) have become more willing to confront rights advocates than in the past, especially during a period of budgetary constraints.

The contemporary policy process poses and analytical challenge to academic researchers. One reason the "iron triangle" metaphor survived so long was its simplicity, especially for pedagogical purposes. In its place has been offered the "issue network" concept, a somewhat vague and fluid notion, and a relatively small number of researchers have attempted to operationalize the concept.

The task of understanding the role of organized interest in the policy process is complex and vast, and a number of research questions have yet to be explored in any detail, including the linkage between interest demand aggregation factors such as organizational characteristics and the degree of policy success. While some policy domains are comparatively well studied from an interest group perspective (like agriculture), others have received virtually no attention. Perhaps the most pressing research need in this area is more analytically descriptive work on a broader range of policy domains.

CONCLUSIONS

A number of conclusions can be drawn from this overview of the interest group subfield. First, if the ultimate test of a subfield's progress lies in the advancement of knowledge about the subject matter, those who study organized interests should feel good about the enterprise. We now know much more about the group universe, its complexity, scope and biases than even a decade ago. The vastness of the task ahead should not detract from the real progress that has been made.

Second, the interest group subfield lacks the internal unity and distinctiveness that characterizes many other subfields in the profession. Many of the most influential researchers probably view themselves more as public choice theorists, policy and legislative specialists, or students of campaigns, elections and political participation than as students of interest groups per se. Methodological and theoretical diversity is hence the hallmark of the subfield. While some see the lack of an agreed upon paradigm or commonality of methodology as a weakness, others see it as a strength.

In the future, it is likely that diversity of both subject matter and approaches will continue. Interest group politics is a "catch all" subfield, attracting scholars with many substantive interests. No doubt the scope of the subfield will continue to broaden, and the elusive dependent variables "organized interest" and "group impact" will remain so.

***This essay was abstracted from a detailed review of the interest group literature scheduled to appear in William Crotty, ed., Political Science: Looking to the Future (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, forthcoming Fall/Winter 1989-1990). Copies of the full essay are available from the author.*

The 1989 POP Awards

Allan Kornberg, Duke University, winner of the Samuel Eldersveld award for a lifetime of distinguished scholarly and professional contributions to the field.

Anthony Downs, Brookings Institution, winner of the Leon Epstein award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field (for his *An Economic Theory of Democracy*).

Robert Salisbury, Washington University, winner of the award for an article of unusual importance and significance to the field (for his article, "An Exchange Theory of Interest Groups," in the February 1969 *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 12(1: 1-32).

NEW CAMPAIGN FINANCE DIRECTORY

The Price of Admission:
An Illustrated Atlas of Campaign Spending
in the 1988 Congressional Elections

Larry Makinson
The Center for Responsive Politics

Through nearly 200 maps and 140 graphs, this atlas provides a tool for interested voters, students, researchers, journalists, and would-be candidates to examine in detail the finances and other dynamics of modern American elections, and compare the nationwide trends with individual races with all 50 state and 435 congressional districts.

Available from The Center for Responsive Politics, 1320 19th Street, NW, Suite M-1, Washington, DC 20036. $16.95.

*SPECIAL INTERESTS

PICKING THE PRESIDENT: IS THERE A BETTER WAY

Public Policy Program and Department of Government
The College of William and Mary

November 9-11, 1989 • Williamsburg, Virginia

Every four years there is a call for alteration in the process of electing the President, and since 1968 not a single election has passed without at least some major adjustments. This conference will emphasize the ways in which the process itself shapes and is in turn influenced by the political parties, the media, and the political activists and the broader electorate, and ultimately how it influences the type of person elected to and untrusted with the Presidency. The sessions will include papers and talks on the following: (1) The role of the political party system in the election process; (2) The role of the media as manipulative and manipulated institution; (3) How turnout is affected by, and affects the process of electing the President; and (4) Prospects for change from the elite and mass perspectives.

Participants include: Kenneth Bode, NBC News; David Broder, *Washington Post*; Frank Fahrenkopf, Former Chair, Republican National Committee; David Gergen, *U.S. News and World Report*; Kathleen Hall Jamieson, University of Texas; Charles Jones, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Elaine Kamarck, former campaign manager for Governor Bruce Babbitt; Paul Kirk, former Chair, Democratic National Committee; Thomas Mann, The Brookings Institute; John J. McGlennon, College of William and Mary; Gary Orren, Harvard University; Kevin Phillips, National Public Radio; Frances Fox Piven, CUNY Graduate School; Ronald B. Rapoport, College of William and Mary; Senator Charles S. Robb (D-Virginia); John P. Sears, political commentator and former campaign manager for Ronald Reagan; Mark Shield, *Washington Post*; Walter J. Stone, University of Colorado at Boulder; Eddie N. Williams, Joint Center for Political Studies; Raymond Wolfinger, University of California-Berkeley.

For further information contact David H. Finifter, Director, Public Policy Program, or Karen S. Dolan, Conference Administrator, the College of William and Mary, Morton Hall—Room 116, Williamsburg, VA 23185, (804) 253-7084. The conference registration fee is $85 if received by October 19 and $95 after October 19.

THE INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

The Comparative Representation and Electoral Systems Research Committee of the IPSA includes some 150 individuals from 23 different countries who seek to facilitate research on the comparative forms and effects of representation and electoral systems.

YOU ARE INVITED TO JOIN this international network of scholars. Membership in the Electoral Systems Research Committee covers the period running through the 1991 IPSA World Congress in Buenos Aires, and entitles international scholars to information concerning the professional activities of the Research Committee (including program plans for ESRC panel sessions at the 1991 IPSA World Congress), receipt of the *International Newsletter*, and listing in the ESRC *International Membership Directory and Research Register*. Membership dues through 1991 are only $15 U.S. or L10 sterling, may be paid in either currency.

The University of Akron

Ray C. Bliss Institute
of Applied Politics
Akron, OH 44325-1904

Nonprofit Organization
BULK RATE
U.S. Postage Paid
Akron, Ohio
Permit Number 222