

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

“Southern Grassroots Party Activists, 2001”

Charles L. Prysby and John A. Clark

The American South, long distinctive for its Democratic Party dominance, has been notable in recent years for undergoing dramatic change. A major shift occurred following the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. African Americans across the region entered the electorate in support of a new Democratic Party, while many conservative whites found the Republicans more to their liking. Realignment in the electorate gradually created a competitive - and in some places dominant - Republican Party. The region once known for its solid support for Democratic candidates has seen an increase in GOP officeholders up and down the ticket. For observers of political parties, this change has made the South a region of great interest.

Not that long ago, few political scientists were interested in studying political party organizations in the South, largely because there was little to study. Neither party possessed much of an organization. Republicans were too feeble to support a viable party organization; Democrats were so dominant that they did not need one. Moreover, divisions among Democrats sometimes discouraged the development of strong party organizations that might take sides in factional disputes. Fortunately for political party scholars, this situation too has changed greatly in the past few decades. Electoral realignment in the South has not only produced a far more competitive two-party system but also stronger party organizations. In most states, both parties have established permanent and fairly significant state party headquarters. Efforts have been made to improve county party organizations as well, but these developments have received less attention from scholars than the emergence of party competition and the creation of state party organizations.

A recent effort to examine local party organizations is the 2001 Southern Grassroots Party Activist (SGPA) project, which surveyed over 7,000 grassroots party activists in the eleven southern states. This study was directed by John Clark and Charles Prysby and was funded by a National Science Foundation grant. It was inspired by the original SGPA study, directed by Charles Hadley and Lewis Bowman, that surveyed over 10,000 southern grassroots activists in 1991. The questionnaires used in the two studies overlapped considerably, allowing for an analysis of change in the attitudes and behavior of local party activists over this ten-year period. Thus, our analysis of the 2001 data usually involved analysis of the 1991 data as well in order to determine trends and shifts over time.

The target population for the 2001 study was the county party chairs and other members of the county party executive committees (the 1991 study has a similar target population). These individuals were selected because they represented the leaders of the party organization at the county level. The precise nature of the sample and target population varied from state to state, and even from party to party within some states, owing to differences in the nature of local party organizations across the states and parties. The data were collected in the spring and summer of 2001 through a mail survey, which achieved a 51 percent response rate overall.

The project was a highly collaborative effort. Political scientists in each state were responsible for administering the survey, and the full data set was compiled by the project directors. The individuals responsible for collecting the data also participated in analyzing the data and in writing up the results. The primary publications of the project are a special double edition of the *American Review of Politics* and an edited book, recently published by the University Press of Kentucky.¹ The first edited work employs a state-by-state approach, while the second contains chapters that are substantive or thematic in nature and that are based on an analysis of the full eleven-state data set.

What can studies of local party activists tell us that studies of elections or election outcomes cannot? Quite simply, local party activists are on the front lines of political activity. They provide a necessary link between the public at large and elites at higher levels of party or elected office. Their attitudes help shape their party's positions, and their activities can mean the difference

(continued on page 5)

From Headquarters 2, 3, 4, 6, 7
Scholarly Precincts 3, 4, 5, 8

Chair: Frank Baumgartner, Penn State University

Secretary-Treasurer: John Bruce, University of Mississippi

VOX POP Editor: John Green, The University of Akron

Program Chair: Kevin M. Esterling, University of California, Riverside

Website Coordinator: Kyle Saunders, Northern Illinois University

Executive Council: Larry Bartels, Princeton University; Holly Brasher, George Washington University; Thomas Ferguson, University of Massachusetts, Boston; Mark Smith, University of Washington; Barbara Norrander, University of Arizona; Byron Shafer, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Dan Tichenor, Rutgers University; Christina Wolbrecht, University of Notre Dame.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Letter from the Chair October 2004

I am pleased to write this note to recognize the activities that we engaged in during the 2004 meetings in Chicago and to give you an advance look at what will be happening in 2005. During our business meeting at the APSA meetings in Chicago, we were pleased to recognize the award winners listed below. Our business meeting, in contrast to many, is dominated not by problems and issues of governance but rather by a celebration of the best work being done by our members. Congratulations to each of those who won an award this year. And thanks to those who served on the many committees that we establish each year to choose these award winners.

I am pleased to announce the program organizer for the 2006 annual meetings. Kevin Esterling, the 2005 program organizer, has already begun his work as you can see by his call for papers in this issue of VOX-POP. Barry Burden will follow Kevin in that position the following year. (No one can blame us for a lack of advance planning!)

Besides celebrating our best work, another tradition at recent business meetings has been to bemoan the small numbers of panels that our section controls at the APSA meetings. Indeed, statistics show that our section has one of the lowest acceptance rates of all APSA sections. Unfortunately, we cannot claim that APSA plays favorites with the allocation of panels; it is done by a clear formula in which attendance at the panels of the previous year plays a large part. So let me encourage you to attend our panels for next year. Kevin Esterling has paid particular attention to this question in his call for papers and is considering various ways of encouraging attendance next year. I hope you will cooperate!

Thanks to each of those who have agreed to serve on one of the committees (see page 7), and congratulations to those who were selected to join the POP Executive Council. A nominations committee consisting of myself as well as three members of the current executive committee selected this group of nominees and I am glad to say that the full executive council agreed with their selection, and each person selected agreed to serve. Congratulations to each of them. And, just as importantly, let me express my thanks to the four members of the Executive Council who completed their terms in 2004: Jonathan Bernstein, University of Texas; Pradeep Chhibber, UC Berkeley; Marie Hojnacki, Penn State University; David Lowery, UNC-Chapel Hill and University of Leiden, Netherlands. Your work is really appreciated.

As many of you may know, the APSA is making a concerted effort to encourage mentoring of our younger colleagues both through the organized sections and centrally. My experience with this, both as Section Chair and more broadly, is that it cannot be a top-down process. Let me just say that if there are people in the Section, or thinking of joining the Section, who would like some advice, feedback, confidential listening and talking, or professional advice, they should get in touch with me and if it is not something I can personally handle, then I will attempt to find the right person from among our ranks who can be helpful. This invitation applies particularly to graduate students and the younger members of the profession among us, but it is not limited to them. Many people may have a variety of questions ranging from publication strategies, where to find syllabi, how to deal with colleagues in a university setting, or other issues. Often there is someone locally at your university or department with whom to discuss these things. If not, and you think some one from the Section might be helpful, then contact me. Senior members of our Section, both male and female, have consistently been happy to spend some time on such issues. On a similar note, let me also encourage people to send manuscripts, even preliminary ones, to

those whom you cite, or to others who might be able to give some feedback. Many people, especially younger members of the profession, may have article manuscripts, or maybe just article ideas, that could benefit from some feedback from someone more senior in the area. Sometimes it is nice to get this feedback before sending the manuscript to a journal, when it can be too late. If you have such an idea or a full manuscript, please feel free to send it to me as an attachment; I'll find people in the Section who can give you some feedback. And if it's an attack on punctuated equilibrium or on the ideas laid out in Basic Interests, I'll respond myself! All in all, our Section is large, but not so large that members should feel intimidated or inhibited in being in touch. There are many resources here but people have to ask and communicate before those can be useful. As Section Chair, I'm certainly willing to play the role of putting people in touch with those who might be able to help, no matter what the professional issue may be.

Finally, let me remind you that we typically have a Short Course at the APSA meetings; these usually take place on the Wednesday before the meetings, and last 5-8 hours. In 2004 we did not offer such a course. We have not yet finalized our plans for a Short Course for the 2005 meetings. Please be in touch with me if you have suggestions or ideas. I think that offering the Short Course has been one of the most visible and effective activities that the Section has engaged in in recent years.

I'll be in touch again with further section news in the Spring. Please note, if you believe a paper presented on one of our POP panels at the 2004 annual meetings merits consideration for our Best Paper award, please be in touch with the chair of that panel, who should nominate any appropriate papers as soon as possible to the committee. Thanks to all of the officers of the Association, to those who have agreed to serve on our committees this year and last, and to you our members for your support. I believe our 2004 meetings were quite successful and I'm expecting the 2005 meetings to be even more energized.

With best wishes, Frank R. Baumgartner
Professor, Penn State University and Chair, POP

FROM HEADQUARTERS

APSA Task Force on Mentoring

Designed as an umbrella program, the Mentoring Program is intended to encourage professional development and open opportunities for all APSA members, with special focus on the needs of women and minorities within the profession. We would like to invite your members to check out the Task Force material on our mentoring program, both in PS: Political Science and Politics and on-line at our APSA website, listed at <http://www.apsanet.org/about/mentoring>.

If you have questions, please feel free to contact Karen Renwick Monroe, Chair APSA Task Force on Mentoring, at Kmonroe@uci.edu. If you or any of your members are willing to serve as a mentor, please download the mentor information form from this webpage and email it to our general email at mentoring@apsanet.org. If you're interested in finding a mentor, simply send an email to mentoring@apsanet.org requesting a report on the available mentors in the APSA Mentor Database. You will need to note the type of mentorship you'd prefer, as well as any topic areas (listed on the webpage) in which you might require specialized knowledge. Once you receive the report listing mentors who correspond to the criteria you provide, we will ask you to select and contact a mentor who meets your needs. If you have any problems, please let me know, or contact mwoodruff@apsanet.org.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Minutes of Political Organization and Parties (POP) Organized Section Business Meeting APSA Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL September 3, 2004

Frank Baumgartner called the meeting to order at 12:33 pm.

1. Minutes and Treasurer's Report

Minutes from the 2003 meeting were unanimously approved. Secretary-Treasurer, John Bruce, presented the Treasurer's Report.

Treasurer's Report (July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004)

FUNDS ON HAND JULY 1, 2003 \$ 11,026.74

REVENUE FOR PERIOD

APSA section dues \$1,332.00
Interest Income 12.67
Section List Rebate 218.85

TOTAL REVENUE \$ 1,563.52

EXPENDITURES *

2003 Awards (581.43)
Grad Travel Awards to
2003 Meeting (1,200.00)
Bank Fees (76.00)

TOTAL EXPENDITURES \$ (1,857.43)

NET ACTIVITY FOR THE PERIOD .. (293.91)

FUNDS ON HAND JUNE 30, 2004 \$ 10,732.83

* Copying, printing, postage, telephone, travel and staff provided gratis by Penn State University, Bliss Institute at the University of Akron, and the University of Mississippi.

** Bank of America funds on deposit divided between nonprofit checking (\$7,613.23) and savings (\$3,119.60).

2. Chair's Report

The Chair made the following announcements:

- The APSA is working on the development of a mentoring program. Members of POP were encouraged to participate.
- Membership in the section is holding relatively steady across the last few years. POP is presently the 12th largest of 34 sections. Student members in the section is 22%, which is about the average across sections.
- The small number (7) of panels at this year's APSA was noted. The section does relatively well in terms of submissions and membership, so the thinking is that it is panel attendance that hurts the panel allocation. Some discussion focused on the possibility of a door-prize type drawing to encourage attendance.

3. 2005 APSA Program

Kevin Esterling read the call for papers as published by APSA. He also expressed his desire to see alternative panel formats. One idea would be to have the discussant present the papers, greatly reducing the role of the authors on the panel. Discussion focused on the need for high-quality discussants, as well as on the need to make sure all panelists are clear on the panel format at the time of acceptance. There was a consensus in favor of trying something new.

4. Awards

- The *Party Politics* Award for the best presented at a POP panel at the APSA meeting was presented to Eric S. Heberlig, Marc

J. Hetherington, and Bruce A. Larson, for their paper entitled "The Redistribution of Campaign Funds and Institutional Advancement in the U.S. House."

- The Jack L. Walker, Jr. Outstanding Article Award for an outstanding article on political organizations or parties published in the last two years was given to Gary J. Miller and Norman J. Schofield for their article entitled "Activists and Partisan Realignment in the United States" (*American Political Science Review*).
 - The Leon D. Epstein Award for an outstanding book on political organizations and parties was given to Jeffrey M. Berry and David F. Arons for their book entitled "A Voice for the Nonprofits".
 - The Samuel J. Eldersveld Award for a lifetime contribution to the field of political organizations and parties was given to David Mayhew.
 - The Emerging Scholar Award, recognizing unusual promise within 7 years of receiving a Ph.D., was given to David Kimball and Eric Schickler.
- #### 5. Upcoming POP-related events
- Nominations for the council will be announced by email shortly.
 - The Chair will be appointing members of the various awards committees. Volunteers and nominations welcome.
 - POP would like to sponsor a short course at the 2005 meeting. Those with ideas should contact the chair or the secretary/treasurer as soon as possible.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
John M. Bruce
POP Secretary - Treasurer

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

Call for Papers, 2005 APSA "Mobilizing Democracy"

Deadline: November 15, 2004

Submit your proposal electronically at www.apsanet.org/mtgs/

POP Contact: Kevin Esterling, University of California, Riverside,
kevine@citrus.ucr.edu

This year's conference theme, "mobilizing democracy," touches many of the research interests of the political organizations and parties division. The freedom to form associations is one of the core principles of democracy, enabling some degree of mass participation, public debate, and accountability. At the same time, the warnings of Madison and Washington are still relevant in this day of seemingly unimpeded access and bitter partisanship. Under what conditions do political organizations and parties foster or impair democratic politics?

As always, the POP division invites all submissions that advance the systematic understanding of parties, social movements, and political organizations broadly understood. The division welcomes single country and comparative research, as well as all theoretical and methodological orientations. Papers exploring the role of political organizations and parties in mobilizing democracy are especially encouraged. Are there effects on social capital and trust, positive or negative, which come from embeddedness in various types of organizational social networks? Do elite debates help to mobilize expertise and improve the informedness of public policy? What role do groups and parties play in building new institutions of accountability and governance in emerging democracies?

This year, the POP division will strongly encourage panels to adopt a discursive structure, where presenters and discussants will give brief presentations and leave time for audience members to participate in the discussion. Because of this, the division particularly seeks interested people to serve as activist panel chairs who are willing to set firm time limits and to cajole panel-audience interaction.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

A Message from the 2005 Section Organizer Kevin M. Esterling, University of California, Riverside

A low acceptance rate is perhaps the best indicator of the quality of any outlet for communicating research. So it is of note to members of this section that POP is tied (with Race, Ethnicity, and Politics) for the lowest acceptance rate for paper acceptance among all of the organized sections of APSA. By the 2004 meeting data, we had an acceptance rate of 36%; the average for all sections combined was 53%; and the high is a whopping 78% for the section on Formal Political Theory.

The acceptance rate statistic has two meanings for the section. First, assuming that the section organizer selects papers based on merit and interest, and assuming the average quality of POP research is the same as other sections, strong competition for slots suggests that our panels should be of relatively high quality. But second, given the formula APSA uses to mete out panels among the sections, which heavily weights attendance, the statistic shows that our panels are poorly attended. These two points seem to be in contradiction: if the research presented at our panels is so good, why is our attendance so bad?

This question consumed much of the discussion at this year's POP business meeting, and we knocked around ideas for how to improve attendance at our panels. My suggestion of serving cocktails at each panel session made little headway. Instead, the discussion quickly turned to the idea that perhaps attendance would improve if POP panels were more interesting to the audience. The business meeting group speculated that, which the research that underlies the presentations at POP panels may be of high quality, perhaps the presentations themselves in current practice are not of similar quality. And given this belief, and assuming the idea of an open bar at each panel is off the table, what should the section do?

The answer turned out to be fairly obvious to a room full of institutionalists: the business meeting attendees quickly settled on the idea of improving the institutional design of the panels. The flaw in the current design of panels is that they are often not very interactive. It is all too common for panelists to present their research design and findings in intimate detail ("The analysis shows the estimated coefficient for the fourth variable in table 6 was about twice the size of the estimated standard error . . ."), and often discussants give referee-report style comments to each of the papers in sequence ("the organization of the first paper needs to be improved; the second paper needs to integrate the results more coherently into the argument . . ."), comments that are at best only of interest to the paper authors themselves. And by the time the panelists and discussants finish their presentations, time has expired and the audience members are left wondering how they can regain the hour and forty-five minutes of their lives that they have just lost.

This year the POP section would like to try a different format for the panels, and we will experiment with two new institutional designs. Most of the panels will be formally organized in the usual way with paper presenters and discussants, but with new time limits and expectations: paper authors will be asked to give very short presentations of the main arguments and findings, the discussant to make perhaps one provocative comment per paper, and the chair to play an activist role in enforcing time limits and soliciting discussion from the audience. In this format, the paper presentation ideally will be a sales pitch to the audience about why the research is interesting and important, an activity that is very different from merely summarizing a paper as it is written. In turn, the discussant will offer concise comments that might usefully provoke discussion, and the chair will be encouraged to play a more dynamic role of cajoling audience members and panelists to interact and to help draw out major themes.

In addition, this year the section will experiment with a radical new design for two "blockbuster" panels, one of which will be for research on political parties and the other for research on political organizations. These panels may have as many as six papers, with the provisos that the discussant will present integrated summaries of and commentary on the papers and each panelist only gets a brief opportunity to rebut the discussant's characterization of their paper. This format is inspired by Rick Hall's successful experiment with discussant-presenters a few years back in the Legislative Studies section; the idea is that discussants are more likely to extract the core meaning of the research and less likely to feel the need to articulate and defend the minutia and the full variety of findings reported in the paper itself.

With both of these proposed designs, the intent is to create more discursive panels that will be of interest to audience members. The ideal is to create the atmosphere of a seminar or workshop, that enables all participants, panelists, chairs, discussants, and especially audience members to be involved in the construction of the meaning of findings for the profession, in exploring counter explanations, in finding previously unexpected connections to other lines of research, and in arguments about the practical, theoretical, and normative implications of the research. Of course, the current POP leadership has no power to enforce these new expectations that go beyond the formal organization of the panels; they are merely proposed norms. We do believe, however, that if POP can develop a reputation as the section with forums for discussion and rich intellectual experience, our overall panel attendance will improve. This in turn would provide the public good for our section of more panels and slots.

Watch this space in the next newsletter for the section's new, innovative poster session format!

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

Assistant / Associate Professor
Department of Political Science,
American Politics / Political Behavior

The University of Connecticut's Department of Political Science seeks candidates for a position in American politics at the level of Assistant or Associate Professor to begin Fall 2005. We are interested in a candidate who has an active research agenda and publishing record in the area of political behavior. Research interests may include, but are not limited to, public opinion, voting behavior, participation, socialization, and effects of mass media. The successful candidate will teach undergraduate and graduate courses in American politics and work closely with graduate students in the sub-field. The successful candidate will also have the opportunity to use the resources of, and developing a working relationship with, the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research located at the University.

Candidates should send their curriculum vitae, three references, a writing sample of article length, student evaluations if any, and a statement of current research interests to: Chair, American Politics Search Committee, Department of Political Science, University of Connecticut, 341 Mansfield Road, U-1024, Storrs, CT 06269-1024. Review of applications will begin on October 1, but will continue until we fill the position. We encourage applications from under-represented groups, including minorities, women and persons with disabilities. (Search #05A040)

(continued from page 1)

between winning and losing close elections. In a region in transition, they can help flesh out a larger picture of political change.

One major focus of the study was to examine inter and intra-party conflict. Our analysis found that the party activists were more clearly divided in their ideological orientations in 2001 than they were in 1991. Table 1 presents the breakdown of Democratic and Republican grassroots party activists according to their ideological self-placement. Republican activists already were quite conservative in 1991. Hardly any called themselves even somewhat liberal, and only 13 percent identified as a moderate. Even so, they managed to move to the right ten years later. Now only a very small number even call themselves moderates, and over one-half say that they are very conservative. Democratic activists are not as liberal as Republicans are conservative, but they are considerably more liberal than they were in 1991. Now a majority claim to be liberal, and the combination of liberals and moderates now comprises over 80 percent of Democratic activists.

TABLE 1.
Ideological identification of grassroots party activists (in percents)

	Democrats		Republicans	
	1991	2001	1991	2001
Very liberal	10	18	0	0
Somewhat liberal	26	35	2	1
Middle of the road/moderate	35	29	13	6
Somewhat conservative	22	14	48	38
Very conservative	6	4	37	54
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: adapted from Patrick R. Cotter and Samuel H. Fisher III, "A Growing Divide: Issue Opinions of Southern Party Activists," in *Southern Political Party Activists*, ed. John A. Clark and Charles L. Prysby (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2004), p. 62.

These differences in ideological orientations are reflected in the attitudes that activists have on specific policy issues. On each of 14 issues, Democratic activist were more liberal than their Republican peers, often by considerable margins. On virtually every issue where direct comparisons could be made, the parties were more polarized in 2001 than they had been a decade earlier. For example, on the issue of abortion, Republican activists were quite divided in 1991, but they coalesced around the pro-life position in 2001. Most Democrats were pro-choice in 1991, but even more favored abortion rights ten years later.

Despite the agreement on issues, there remain substantial cleavages in each of the parties. For Democrats, a racial gap persists on many policy issues. The gap is especially large on issues that have an explicit racial dimension like government aid and hiring preferences for minority group members. Religion seems to be a potent cleavage within the Republican Party, where almost half of the activists surveyed identify themselves as supporters of conservative religious groups. Their differences with fellow Republicans are most noticeable on moral issue like abortion.

An earlier generation of scholarship suggested that party organizations might soon become obsolete, especially at the local level. Our data show that, to the contrary, local party officials are more active in campaigns than ten years before. This change is especially noteworthy in the South, where few areas saw active local parties only a generation ago. Republican activists in particular view their party as growing significantly stronger over the past five to ten years.

For many years, the subfield of political parties was characterized by rich theory and sparse data. Studies like ours have helped to rectify this imbalance, for us and for others who may wish to work in this area. The 2001 SGPA data set will be available to researchers through the ICPSR data archive. The 1991 SGPA study already is archived with the ICPSR. Each data set contains more than 100 variables regarding the activists, their attitudes and activities, and their organizations. We hope that they will provide baselines for scholars collecting new data on individual states or the region as a whole.

NOTES

1. John A. Clark and Charles Prysby, eds., "Grassroots Party Activists in Southern Politics, 1991-2001," *American Review of Politics* 24 (Spring and Summer 2003); John A. Clark and Charles L. Prysby, eds., *Southern Political Party Activists: Patterns of Conflict and Change, 1991-2001* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2004). For order information, link to <http://plsc.uark.edu/arp> or <http://www.kentuckypress.com>.

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

Democracy Fellowships at the National Endowment for Democracy

The National Endowment for Democracy (NED) invites applications to its Regan-Fascell Democracy Fellow Program. Established in 2001 to enable democracy activists, scholars, and journalists from around the world to deepen their understanding of democracy and enhance their ability to promote democratic change, the fellowship program is based at NED's International Forum for Democratic Studies, in Washington, D.C.

Program: The program offers two tracks: a *practitioner track* (typically three to five months in duration) to improve strategies and techniques for building democracy abroad and to exchange ideas and experiences with counterparts in the United States; and a *scholarly track* (typically five to ten months in length) to conduct original research for publication.

Eligibility: The fellowship program is intended primarily to support practitioners and scholars from new and aspiring democracies. Distinguished scholars from the United States and other established democracies are also eligible to apply. Practitioners are expected to have substantial experience working to promote democracy. Scholars are expected to have a doctorate, or academic equivalent, at the time of application. The program is not designed to pay for professional training or to support students working toward a degree. *A working knowledge of English is an important prerequisite for participation in the program.*

Support: The fellowship year begins October 1 and runs through July 31, with major entry dates in October and March. All fellows receive a monthly stipend, health insurance, travel assistance, and research support through the Forum's Democracy Resource Center and Internship Program.

Application: For further details and instructions on how to apply, please download our "Information and Application Forms" booklet, available on our website at www.ned.org/forum/R-FApplication.pdf or visit us on-line at www.ned.org and follow the link to "Fellowship Programs." *Please note that all application materials must be typewritten and in English.*

Deadline: Applications for fellowships in 2005-2006 must be received no later than November 1, 2004. Notification of the competition outcome is in April 2005.

For questions, please contact: Program Assistant, Fellowship Programs, National Endowment for Democracy, 1101-15th Street, NW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005, Tel: 202-293-0300, Fax: 202-293-0258, Email: fellowships@ned.org, Internet: www.ned.org.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Award Citations

Samuel Eldersveld Award, honoring a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field.

The award committee is delighted to present this year's Eldersveld Award to David R. Mayhew of Yale University.

In a career spanning 40 years - so far - David Mayhew has established himself as our most perceptive, productive, and influential scholar of American party politics. From his first book, *Party Loyalty Among Congressmen*, to his most recent work, *Electoral Realignments: A Critique of American Genre*, he has repeatedly illuminated our understanding of the role of political parties in the broader political system. Indeed, no decade has passed without a major work from Mayhew recasting the way we think about some important aspects of the organization and impact of parties. In the 1970s, *Congress: The Electoral Connection* taught us to see the significance of parties in reverse image, as it were, by reasoning carefully and acutely about the behavior of reelection-seeking members of Congress in an environment where parties are weak. In the 1980s, *Placing Parties in American Politics* provided a rich historical survey of the status of traditional party organizations in American states and cities through the first half of the twentieth century. In the 1990s, *Divided We Govern: Party Control, Lawmaking, and Investigations, 1946-1990* powerfully challenged the common-sense assumption of decades of political science that unified partisan control of government facilitates effective policy-making. In his most recent work, Mayhew gave the same contrarian scrutiny to realignment theory, with similarly stimulating results. All of this work demonstrates the unmatched historical knowledge, analytical creativity, and instinct for the right questions that make Mayhew such a worthy successor to his own mentor, V.O. Key, Jr., among scholars of American Party Politics. We are very pleased to honor his scholarly achievements by presenting him with the Samuel J. Eldersveld Award.

Jack Walker Award, honoring an article published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties.

The Walker prize for 2004 is awarded to Gary Miller and Norman Schofield for their 2003 APSR article entitled, "Activist and Partisan Realignment in the United States."

In this article, Miller and Schofield challenge conventional understandings of partisan realignments by explaining these realignments as a consequence of the coalition building strategies of vote-maximizing candidates seeking to attract the optimal set of policy-motivated party activists in a two-dimensional political space.

More specifically, the authors describe a process of "dynamic equilibrium" in which candidates consider the aggregate positions of current party activists in terms of how those positions are likely to affect their prospects for winning an election. Under some circumstances, candidates may realize that winning is more likely if they trade off some of the support of current activists for the support of those who may be disaffected by the present partisan alignment because the political dimension of most concern to them is not one that is currently salient. By adopting a position that attracts some "disaffected" support, a candidate may disrupt the existing "activist equilibrium" and shift the salient dimension in politics. This "flanking maneuver," then, may redefine or realign the public image of the parties. Evidence for this process is provided by historical examples from the period 1896 through 2000,

during which a sequence of shifts occurred that could not be accounted for by conventional notions of realignment. (Specifically, the social cleavage that distinguished the parties in 1896 was replaced by an economic cleavage for much of the early to mid-20th century; in turn, this was displaced by a social cleavage, but with party positions that were mirror images of those occupied by the parties in 1896.)

That the reconceptualization of realignment that Miller and Schofield present draws attention away from forces in the political environment that might affect transformations of party support and focuses instead on how changes in partisan alignments are affected by intra-party dynamics, is indeed an important contribution of this study. But Miller and Schofield's model also requires scholars to consider the positions taken by parties as resulting from a much more complex (and realistic) process than is typically recognized. The model presented in the article characterizes party positions as a combined function of activists' support of parties' current positions, the efforts of candidates to maximize their vote shares in light of the levels of activists' party support, and the reactions of activists to the candidates' efforts to build winning coalitions. This view is in sharp contrast to the traditional emphasis on either party candidates or party activists as during or defining parties' positions. Moreover, the mapping of this more complex process onto a two-dimensional space, in which the dimensions have differing salience, allows for the author's unique portrayal of realignment as long run manifestation of the short-term efforts of candidates to disrupt the equilibrium that exists among activists in an effort to maximize votes.

Leon Epstein Award, honoring a book published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties.

Jeffrey M. Berry (with David F. Arons). 2003. *A Voice for the Nonprofits*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

A Voice for Nonprofits addresses a class of political institutions - nonprofit organizations - that are providing ever more basic public services at all levels of government. Political scientists typically have little trouble with so labeling nonprofits as political institutes. Indeed, nonprofits often combine the roles traditionally played by public bureaucracies in directly providing goods and services to citizens and by interest organizations in advocating in support or opposition of public policies. Yet, nonprofits are surprisingly handicapped in acting as political institutions. With their arms length relationship with elected officials, they cannot use internal channels of communication in the manner of traditional public bureaucracies. And federal law discourages nonprofits from engaging in direct lobbying of public officials. The key term here is "discourages." Based on the interviews from a sample of more than 1,700 tax-deductible nonprofit organizations. *A Voice for Nonprofits* find that executives sharply limit their lobbying activity. Yet, discourages is not the same as prohibits. Professor Berry makes a very strong case that this lack of lobbying is both detrimental to linking the decisions of elected officials to the real experiences of service providers and recipients and, just as importantly, largely unnecessary. That is, nonprofits have far more leeway in engaging in advocacy behaviors than they imagine. In a detailed analysis of IRS regulations, Professor Berry demonstrates that the lack of lobbying activity by nonprofit organizations is largely due to self-censuring behavior on their part based on a fundamental misunderstanding of federal tax law. Combining insightful empirical and legal analysis, *A Voice for Nonprofits* is a work that will greatly interest scholars working near the increasingly fuzzy

(continued on page 7)

FROM HEADQUARTERS

(continued from page 6)

border between public bureaucracy and organized interests. Just as importantly, the book is likely to have far more reaching and immediate impacts on applied public policy than is common for a scholarly work by unleashing policy advocacy activities on the part of nonprofit organizations.

Emerging Scholar Award, honoring a scholar who has received his or her Ph.D. within the last seven years and whose career to date demonstrates unusual promise.

I'm Mark Smith from the University of Washington, and I'd like to begin by thanking my colleagues on the award committee: Ken Kollman of the University of Michigan and Dan Tichenor from Rutgers University. We are pleased to present the emerging scholar award to David Kimball from the University of Missouri-St. Louis and Eric Schickler of Harvard University.

Let me start with what the committee wanted to recognize in David Kimball's work. If anyone were to define what it means to study Political Organizations and Parties, Kimball would be it. He has made strong contributions to both of the usual sides of the section, political parties and interest groups. His work on parties has focused upon the party in the electorate, where he teamed with Barry Burden for an important article and related book called *Why Americans Split their Tickets: Campaigns, Competition, and Divided Government*. Kimball and Burden undermine the notion, popular during the 1980s and 1990s, that voters intentionally split their tickets to create moderate policies through divided government. Instead, what matters in creating ticket-splitting are the dynamics of individual races that structure at the elite level what voters are reacting to at the mass level.

On the interest group side of our section, Kimball's contributions have been equally impressive. He has worked with Marie Hojnacki on a pair of articles exploring interest groups' choices of whom to lobby on congressional committees. Among the findings to emerge from the research are that groups' choices of whom to lobby depend upon the configurations of such factors as whether the group is cause-oriented, the prior position of each legislator, and the amount of perceived support for the group in the legislative districts. More recently, Kimball has been part of the ongoing research collaboration with Frank Baumgartner, Jeff Berry, Beth Leech, and Marie Hojnacki on interest group lobbying of Congress and executive agencies. As the first large-scale attempt to study lobbying through a random sample of issues, the project's findings will generalize to the population of cases better than anything the field has produced up to now.

The second recipient of the emerging scholar award is Eric Schickler. Schickler's first major project culminated in articles and his book *Disjointed Pluralism: Institutional Innovation and the Development of the U.S. Congress*. The scope of Schickler's research is broad-reaching, and he overturns simple theories that posit a single motivation for institutional change in Congress. Instead, he subsumes within a more complex and nuanced theoretical portrait such motivations as building party power, winning reelection, promoting policy goals, and strengthening the chamber's institutional capacity. Of special relevance for POP scholars is Schickler's finding that the theory of conditional party government theory, operationalized through measures of party polarization and party capacity, has but limited effects upon the institutional changes by comparison to the ideological position of the median voter in the chamber.

Schickler's other work that the committee wants to recognize is his recent articles and his book with Don Green and Brad Palmquist title *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and*

the Social Identities of Voters. Schickler, Green, and Palmquist present a theory of partisan identification that rejects a strong basis in individual evaluations of parties' policies or performance. Instead, people choose which party to affiliate with by first considering which social groups to which they belong and then determine which party those groups support. In finding that party identification is stable at both the aggregate level and the individual level once measurement error is corrected, the project significantly advances research and theory on party identification.

It felt a little odd for the committee to be giving the award to someone who has already advanced to the rank of Full Professor, first at Berkeley and then at Harvard. If Eric Schickler hasn't moved from emerging to emerged by now, then it's not clear who has. However, the only formal requirement for the award is that the candidate received a Ph.D. in the last seven years, and it didn't feel right to exclude someone for having achieved too much. In the case of both Schickler and Kimball, they meet the letter and also the spirit of the award's requirements, because we felt confident in both recognizing their previous work and in anticipating more contributions in the future. With both of them still in their thirties, we expect to see Eric Schickler and David Kimball writing seminal studies in the coming years.

POP/Party Politics Award, honoring the best paper presented at a POP-sponsored panel at the previous APSA meeting.

The award committee received a number of excellent papers. We were particularly impressed with the strong theoretical content and contributions made by the papers. They covered a wide range of topics, including both European and U.S. parties and interests. The paper we chose, "The Redistribution of Campaign Funds and Institutional Advancement in the U.S. House," by Erick Heberlig, Marc Hetherington, and Bruce Larson was our choice because it was extremely well conceived and well executed and theoretically innovative. We congratulate the authors on their accomplishments. The paper will be invited for publication in *Party Politics*.

Committee Assignments for 2004-05

Samuel Eldersveld Award

Byron Shafer (Chair), University of Wisconsin
Susan Scarrow, University of Houston
Nicol C. Rae, Florida International University

Jack Walker Award

Thomas Ferguson (Chair),
University of Massachusetts, Boston
Andrea Campbell-Francis, University of Illinois
Anne Costain, University of Colorado

Leon Epstein Award

Dan Tichenor (Chair), Rutgers University
Mark Smith, University of Washington
Robin Kolodny, Temple University

Emerging Scholar Award

Barbara Norrander (Chair), University of Arizona
David Kimball, University of Missouri, St. Louis
Scott Ainsworth, University of Georgia

POP / Party Politics Award

Christina Wolbrecht (Chair), University of Notre Dame
Andrew McFarland, University of Illinois, Chicago
Jennifer Victor, University of Pittsburgh

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

Call for Papers Democracy and Political Parties

The focus of this European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) workshop is on the empirical and theoretical relationship between political parties and democracy. The workshop invites applicants seriously to consider both empirically and theoretically the relationship between models of democracy on the one hand and the nature of political parties on the other.

Outline of the workshop: Behind the apparent consensus concerning the desirability of democracy and the centrality of the political parties to actual functioning of democratic systems, there lies considerable disagreement. In particular the perceived inability of parties to serve as adequate channels of representation has given rise to debates on the 'decline' or 'failure' of parties, and to lamentations that parties are no longer what they once were. Underlying these debates about the contemporary performance of existing parties and party systems, however, there are deeper disagreements about the meaning of democracy and the actual role of political parties within it. Even when normative assumptions about what is valuable about democracy and about how democracy should work are made explicit, they generally are simply stated as self-evident truths, rather than being recognized as contentious choices. Indeed, notwithstanding their importance to one another, the literatures on parties and democratic theory have developed in a surprising degree of mutual isolation. This failure to take questions of democratic theory to heart, and to identify the relationship

between normative and institutional prescriptions, is particularly worrisome given both the important challenges of consolidating recently established democracies and the problems of adapting to changes in the established democracies.

Application: Interested participants are invited to send a paper proposal to the workshop directors: Richard S. Katz (richard.katz@jhu.edu) and Ingrid van Biezen (i.d.vanbiezen@bham.ac.uk). The deadline for applications is December 1, 2004. The dates of the conference, which will take place at the University of Granada in Spain, are April 14-19, 2005. For more information, see www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

CALL FOR PAPERS

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

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

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

The
University
of Akron

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

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