

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

Party Politics and POP: A Beautiful New Friendship

Paul Webb, Sussex University and David Farrell, Manchester University

The editors of *Party Politics* are happy to reciprocate Russ Dalton's expectation of a "beautiful friendship" with POP, as reported by Ken Janda in the latest issue of the journal.

This marks our new status as POP's official journal, a development about which we are genuinely delighted. While *Party Politics* has always been international in scope, it has long been the reality that around half of our submissions and published articles emanate from scholars based in the U.S., so it feels entirely appropriate to be now formalizing this long-standing connection with the American political science community. This article constitutes a brief reflection on the history and development of the journal and its relationship with POP.

As Ken Janda notes in his editorial, the founders of POP had in mind the idea of launching a specialist journal from the outset (in the 1970s), but found the project beset by too many obstacles to be realized at that time. This left an outlet gap for specialist work on parties and related political organizations that was eventually filled by *Party Politics*. The journal was the brainchild of Ian Holliday and David Farrell in the early 1990s, then both based at the University of Manchester. Ken Janda was invited to fulfill the brief of the new journal's North American editor, while Paul Webb, then at Brunel University in London, became the Reviews Editor. The idea was pitched to Sage Publications, an innovative American academic publisher with offices around the world including London, and from the outset the relationship between the academics and the publisher was constructive and smooth. The editors deliberately adopted a broad church approach, wanting to reflect the diversity of work that they saw in this major field of political science scholarship. Over the years around two-thirds of articles appearing in the journal have focused on the established democracies of Europe, North America, Australia, Asia and Japan, while the remainder have mainly taken in the newer and transitional democracies, especially those of post-communist Eastern Europe. Only a few have been about parties in non-democracies. We have also embraced a wide array of theoretical and methodological approaches, and will continue to do so.

The first issue was published at the beginning of 1995, following a spectacular launch conference in Manchester; that issue included contributions by eminent figures in the discipline like Ronald Inglehart, Pippa Norris, Wolfgang C. Muller, Ian McAllister and Stephen White, but the article in that issue which went on to attract most attention over the years was Katz and Mair's seminal piece on the Cartel Party. It is perhaps fitting that 15 years on, we plan to dedicate a special issue to a critical retrospective on the Cartel model. That article and others played an important role in enabling the journal to make an immediate impact, and over the years it has maintained a healthy position in the ISI Impact Factor index; recently compiled figures reveal that its average Impact Factor for the five years 2004-2008 inclusive was 1.337, placing it 24th out of 99 ranked political science journals. Meanwhile, the submission rate to the journal has climbed, enabling us to shift from

four to six issues a year, while maintaining a tradition of publishing at least one (and often two) guest-edited special issue(s) in each volume. The number and quality of submissions is such that we are currently only able to find room in our pages for about 20% of papers sent to us for consideration. While this sometimes means having to disappoint authors, we can at least provide them with a great deal of constructive feedback, thanks to the willing and often very detailed scrutiny of our reviewers. And while the pressure on the journal has inevitably generated longer delays between acceptance and eventual publication, Sage has reacted by introducing "on-line first" publication, which means that subscribers will be able to access electronic versions of accepted papers as soon as they have been edited and proofread. This innovation will take effect this year and will greatly enhance the process of intellectual dissemination in our field.

Indeed, innovation and development have been prominent features of *Party Politics* over the years. Ken Janda has been responsible for developing and maintaining an extremely useful website at www.party-politics.org, which among other things provides an index of everything ever published in the journal, a search engine, and - as an alternative to standard abstracts - the first and last paragraphs of each article. In 2003, Ian Holliday, having relocated from Manchester to Hong Kong, decided to relinquish his editorship of the journal, and the baton was passed to Paul Webb (who in turn handed on the Reviews Editorship to Sussex colleague Aleks Szezerbiak). In 2007, *Party Politics* adopted a new online submission and review system hosted by Scholar One's 'Manuscript Central' framework. It was in that year too that John Aldrich as incumbent POP Chair, floated the proposal that *Party Politics* might become the official journal of this APSA section. Over the next year or more this suggestion was made concrete as Aldrich's successor, Russ Dalton, worked with the journal's editors and Sage in order to realize the objective. The

(Continued on page 2)

A Beautiful New Friendship	1, 2
From Headquarters	2, 3, 4, 7, 8
Scholarly Precincts	4, 5, 6, 7
From the Field	8

Chair: Russell Dalton, University of California, Irvine
Secretary-Treasurer: Holly Brasher, University of Alabama at Birmingham
VOX POP Editor: John Green, The University of Akron
Program Co-Chair: Christina Wolbrecht, University of Notre Dame
and Marie Hojnacki, The Pennsylvania State University
Website Coordinator: Amy Alexander, University of California, Irvine
Executive Council: Barbara Sinclair, University of California, Los Angeles; Paul Goren, University of Minnesota; Marc Hetherington, Vanderbilt University; Frederick J. Boehmke, University of Iowa

FRIENDSHIP

(Continued from page 1)

terms of the new arrangement that emerged from this process include the following key points: the remit and masthead of the journal has broadened to reflect POP's intellectual scope ("The International Journal for the Study of Political Parties and Political Organizations"); the Chair of POP has been added to the Journal's editorial advisory board; notices of POP events and activities will be published for free in the Journal; *Party Politics* will mark the new relationship by publishing a guest-edited special issue; and POP members will get the journal for a new combined section membership and journal subscription fee of \$29 a year (\$21 for graduate students), a considerable discount on the standard individual rate.

The cementing of relations between POP and *Party Politics* represents an important new chapter in the life of the Journal. We look forward to working closely with the POP Executive in ensuring that this association reaps full dividends to the benefit of the section and the Journal.

Paul Webb

Co-editor, *Party Politics*

SAVE THE DATE

The State of the Parties: 2008 & Beyond October 15-16, 2009

The 2008 presidential election was extraordinary in many respects, including a massive increase in voter turnout, new records in campaign spending, and innovations in grassroots politics.

What role did political parties play in these events? How did the party organizations fare? What are the implications for the future? The sixth 'State of the Parties' conference on October 15-16, 2009, will seek to answer these questions.

Conference sessions will cover the 2008 Presidential nomination contests, the party system, partisan publics, party organizations, party activists, party resources and party in government. Papers will be presented by leading political scientists, including Rick Farmer, John Jackson, David Magleby, John Petrocik, Ron Rapoport, Daniel Shea, Walter Stone, and Jeff Stonecash.

For more information and conference registration, contact the Bliss Institute (330) 972-5182 or visit our website at:

www.uakron.edu/bliss

POP EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, September 3, 2009 at
12:15 p.m.

POP BUSINESS MEETING

Friday, September 4, 2009 at
12:15 p.m.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Letter from the Chair

July 2009

As my two-year term as chair of the POP section approaches its end, I want to share a brief reflection on what we have accomplished recently and the challenges facing the section in the future.

We have made two major steps forward in the past couple of years. First, this spring we finalized our long-planned association with *Party Politics* as the official journal of the section. This began under John Aldrich's tenure as chair, and we finalized the arrangement. This will increase the costs of section membership, but it provides a printed copy of the journal at a substantial discount over the individual subscription rate. In addition, this association should benefit the section and the journal as we move forward. So as your APSA membership renewal arrives, we hope you will continue your POP membership under this new arrangement. Second, we successfully created an endowment to accompany the Leon Epstein Award for the best book in the POP field. The main recognition of scholarship is the award itself, and we hope a modest check from the endowment will be the icing on the cake for future winners.

One of the pleasures of POP is working with a group of committed colleagues who devote their time to benefit scholarship and teaching on political organizations and parties. I want to especially thank Marie Hojnacki and Christina Woldbrecht, for assembling a great lineup of POP panels for the 2009 APSA meetings in Toronto. We encourage you all to attend POP panels. APSA uses counts of attendance to allocate the number of panels we receive in future years: a big turnout means more opportunities for members to present at the next APSA. If you are looking ahead, Miki Kittilson (Miki.Kittilson@asu.edu) and Richard Herrera (Richard.Herrera@asu.edu) of Arizona State University will organize POP panels for the 2010 APSA meetings.

I also want to thank John Green, Holly Brasher, and all the current and recent members of the POP executive committee for their contributions to the section. In a world where there are often too many demands on our time, all these individuals found time to discuss the issues facing the section, serve on award selection committees, or other administrative duties. And VoxPop has been our voice to our members with the support of the Bliss Institute at the University of Akron. My thanks in the name of all the POP faculty and students who benefitted from these efforts.

If I look toward POP's future, it should be very positive. Our total membership size should increase with the affiliation with *Party Politics*. We span two of the more dynamic fields in contemporary political science, that are central to the intellectual questions of politics. In fact, our major challenge is probably to accommodate the expanding breadth of the POP field. POP was formed as a merger of the subfields of political organizations and parties, which sometimes leads to different research priorities. The association with *Party Politics* will likely expand the number of members who study these topics in comparative perspective. As democracy has expanded around the world, the relevance of POP scholarship has also expanded. Thus, we face the challenge of being equally responsive to these different research communities, and continuing to engage them in dialogues that highlight our shared interests. This also means expanding our activities in ways that support scholarship and teaching in these areas.

A close colleague once advised me that university administration is like a relay race. You run as hard as you can until your leg of the race is done, and then you pass the baton to the next person. It has been a pleasure to run my part of this race for POP and its members. Now I'm going to sit on the bench and rest.

Russell Dalton
University of California, Irvine

-2- rdalton@uci.edu

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Foundations and Future Directions:

An Exploration of Competitive Interest Group Politics

Thomas T. Holyoke, California State University, Fresno

Perhaps the most interesting part of researching competitive interest group politics has been studying the changes in the literature over the last couple of decades. It was not quite an article of faith that institutional structures were keeping the growing community of organized interests from trampling on each other's toes, but it was pretty close. A complicated web of rules allowed members of Congress to claim and hold seats on committees and subcommittees with exclusive jurisdictions over issues important to the constituents who put them in office, with norms of reciprocity ensuring that the policies they crafted to benefit these voters were protected from meddling by other legislators. These key constituents also tended to be mobilized into interest groups, so their lobbyists were often invited to help committee lawmakers tweak these policies when necessary to maintain the mutually beneficial status quo. With the agencies responsible for implementing these policies carefully watched by these legislators and their entourage of interest group lobbyists, it is little wonder that scholars felt comfortable using terms such as 'subgovernments' and 'iron triangles' to describe the policy making process. American political science might focus on intense competition between parties and candidates in elections, but all appeared peaceful in the world of interest group politics.

Rather than crumble under a direct, theoretically driven assault, belief in subgovernments seems to have been quietly undermined by the work of a few scholars studying the internal structures and policy goals of a particular type of advocacy organization that started to appear in greater numbers in the 1960s at the onset of the American interest group 'explosion' (see Walker 1983; Scholzman and Tierney 1986). Books by Berry (1977) and McFarland (1984) on public interest groups shed an intellectual spotlight on organizations whose stated purpose was to deliberately compete with those interests enjoying cozy relationships with lawmakers by introducing new issues, redefining old issues, and pushing for new and likely unwelcome (at least to those benefitting from the status quo) policies addressing them. Although hardly invincible, follow-up work by Rothenberg (1992) and, again, Berry (1999) highlighted the success these groups sometimes enjoyed in disrupting subgovernments, enough so that by the 1990s it began to feel strange to still think of interest group politics as noncompetitive.

So claiming that American interest group politics is competitive is hardly novel, but framing and designing research on the topic still requires some care. Austen-Smith and Wright's (1994) effort to create a stark formal model of the circumstances under which two lobbyists compete over a legislator's vote resulted in an outpouring of criticism (e.g., Baumgartner and Leech 1996; Kollman 1997), so I decided to try to fit my work into the new research on coalition formation emerging in the 1990s (e.g., Hojnacki 1997; Hula 1999). Although this work was not framed in a competitive context, the very idea that group lobbyists choose to work together suggests that some type of differences are being overcome. Presumably these differences are grounded in how issues of concern to the members of groups are potentially resolved with policy. This means the positions lobbyists may take are at least partially constrained by what their members will accept, although it may sometimes be a tenuous constraint since members are attracted to many groups for reasons other than advocacy. Coalitions thus only form when lobbyists find common positions acceptable to at least a majority of all of their members, even if nobody is getting everything they want; each lobbyist's freedom to engage in give-and-take depends as much on the intensity and unity of their members' preferences as it does on pressures they may be under from the lawmakers on whom they depend for access.

My recent *AJPS* article (Holyoke 2009a) therefore synthesizes the literature on collective action and public interest groups (or group type based on incentive structures generally), legislative lobbying, coalition formation, and bargaining. Gathering data from personal interviews with 83 lobbyists in Washington, D.C. on six issues, I was able to create a rough measure of the degree of competition among groups on each issue. My analysis also provided empirical support for the circumstances under which lobbyists are likely to form coalitions. They are more likely to do so when they are under pressure from lawmakers; when members are not overly united in their preferences, or simply do not feel all that strongly about an issue; and when lobbyists believe their competitors have the flexibility to agree to support compromise positions in a coalition. Conversely, when members of two or more groups feel very strongly about an issue, even minor differences in their preferred policy outcomes can prevent lobbyists from finding the common ground necessary for coalition formation. In other published work, I explore how

congressional committees can use hearings to pressure competing groups into making compromises (Holyoke 2008), and how institutional rules can force competing groups to jointly support the agendas of party leaders (Holyoke 2009b). In other, as yet unpublished work, I take a different approach, examining the effect of group compromise or unresolved conflict on the ability of Congress to enact legislation or even move it out of committee.

Assuming my work stands the test of time, what should come next? My work has been fortunate enough to appear at a time of inspired scholarship on interest group politics, too much to comprehensively address here. How group competition is shaped by members certainly needs to be further explored, especially along the lines of Gray and Lowery's (1997) work on how groups compete to dominate issue niches and the members and resources they contain. Can lobbyists for groups advocating similar positions on an issue, but competing to dominate the same issue niche, easily overcome these seemingly minor differences to work together in a coalition? If there is a socio-economic stratification to a group's membership, as Strolovitch (2007) finds to be the case in many groups, does disagreement among members over policy positions allow wealthier members to exercise disproportionately greater power over lobbyist bargaining than other members, perhaps perpetuating the accent of the heavenly chorus? Part of Susan Yackee's extensive work on group influence over agency rule making finds that competition often results in the larger, arguably stronger, side disproportionately influencing the final rule (see 2007 with Amy McKay), but can agency officials and legislators pressure competing lobbyists into agreeing to a compromise position before filing comments?

Some future work perhaps requires looking more closely into my assumptions. One example is issue dimensionality, which Baumgartner et al. (2004) argues is one of the most crucial aspects of interest group politics. I assume that while interest groups define the same issue in a variety of different ways, making it multidimensional, potential policy outcomes can be arranged along a single dimension and competition thought of as the difference between the collective member preferences of groups for these outcomes. Heaney (2004), however, argues that group leaders define issues in ways that promote their organizations to potential members. This suggests that their need to distinguish their organization from other groups in order to attract members may lock them into supporting competing positions on an issue. In other words, group leaders may actually be creating competition by the way they define themselves. Unsurprisingly, this harkens right back to the issue niche work of Gray and Lowery! Whether my work fades or endures, interest group competition, conflict, and bargaining in American politics will likely be the norm in the near future. Hopefully these questions will provide scholars rich research agendas for years to come.

REFERENCES

- Austen-Smith, David, and John R. Wright. 1994. 'Counteractive Lobbying.' *American Journal of Political Science* 38 (February): 25-44.
- Baumgartner, Frank R., Jeffrey M. Berry, Marie Hojnacki, David C. Kimball, and Beth L. Leech. 2004. 'The Structure of Policy Conflict.' Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Baumgartner, Frank R. and Beth L. Leech. 1996. 'The Multiple Ambiguities of "Counteractive Lobbying".' *American Journal of Political Science* 40 (May): 521-542.
- Berry, Jeffrey M. 1977. *Lobbying for the People: The Political Behavior of Public Interest Groups*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Berry, Jeffrey M. 1999. *The New Liberalism: The Rising Power of Citizen Groups*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution Press.
- Gray, Virginia and David Lowery. 1997. 'Life in a Niche: Mortality Anxiety among Organized Interests in the American States.' *Political Research Quarterly* 50 (March): 25 - 47.
- Heaney, Michael T. 2004. 'Outside the Issue Niche: The Multidimensionality of Interest Group Identity.' *American Politics Research* 32 (November): 611-651.
- Hojnacki, Marie. 1997. 'Interest Groups' Decisions to Join Alliances or Work Alone.' *American Journal of Political Science* 41 (January): 61-87.
- Holyoke, Thomas T. 2008. 'Interest Group Competition and Cooperation at Legislative Hearings.' *Congress and the Presidency* 35 (Autumn): 17-38.
- Holyoke, Thomas T. 2009a. 'Interest Group Competition and Coalition Formation.' *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (April): 360-375.
- Holyoke, Thomas T. 2009b. 'Institutional Constraints on Legislative Lobbying: Lobbying for Indian Casinos in New York State.' *Social Science Journal* Forthcoming.
- Hula, Kevin W. 1999. *Lobbying Together: Interest Group Coalitions in Legislative Politics*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Kollman, Ken. 1997. 'Inviting Friends to Lobby: Interest Groups, Ideological Bias, and Congressional Committees.' *American Journal of Political Science* 41 (April): 519-544.
- McFarland, Andrew S. 1984. *Common Cause*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers.
- McKay, Amy and Susan Webb Yackee. 2007. 'Interest Group Competition on Federal Agency Rules.' *American Politics Research* 35 (May): 336-357.

(Continued on page 4)

FROM HEADQUARTERS

REFERENCES (Continued from page 3)

- Rothenberg, Lawrence S. 1992. *Linking Citizens to Government: Politics at Common Cause*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlozman, Kay Lehman and John T. Tierney. 1986. *Organized Interests and the American Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Strolovitch, Dara Z. 2007. *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Walker, Jack L. Jr. 1983. 'The Origins and Maintenance of Interest Groups in America.' *American Political Science Review* 77 (June): 390-406.

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

Division 35

Political Organizations and Parties

May 1, 2009

TITLE: 2008 AND THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN PARTY COALITIONS APSA THEME PANEL

Chair: Christina Wolbrecht, University of Notre Dame (wolbrecht.1@nd.edu)

Participants:

- Paul R. Abramson, Michigan State University (abramson@msu.edu)
Paul A. Beck, Ohio State University (beck.9@osu.edu)
Geoffrey C. Layman, University of Maryland (glayman@gvpt.umd.edu)
Tasha S. Philpot, University of Texas, Austin (tphilpot@austin.utexas.edu)
Gary M. Segura, Stanford University (segura@stanford.edu)

TITLE: AUTHOR MEETS READERS: LARRY BARTELS' UNEQUAL DEMOCRACY

Chair: Benjamin I. Page, Northwestern University, (b-page@northwestern.edu)

Participants:

- Larry M. Bartels, Princeton University (bartels@princeton.edu)
Robert S. Erickson, Columbia University (rse14@columbia.edu)
Kay Lehman Schlozman, Boston College (kschloz@bc.edu)
Taeku Lee, University of California, Berkeley (taekulee@berkeley.edu)
John R. Zaller, University of California, Los Angeles (zaller@ucla.edu)

TITLE: ADVOCACY AND LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

Chair: Kristina Miler, University of Illinois (kmiler@illinois.edu)

Papers: **'How a Bill Becomes a Law: The Effect of Interest Groups.'**

- Matt Grossmann, Michigan State University (matthewg9@gmail.com)
and Kurt Pyle, Michigan State University (pylekurt@msu.edu)

'Lobbying the State Legislature: Who Dominates and When Does It Matter.'

Dave Nelson, University of Wisconsin, Madison (denelson3@wisc.edu)

'Congressional Responses to Lobbying: Observations of an APSA Congressional Fellow.'

Amy Melissa McKay (amckay@gsu.edu)

'Organized Interests Campaign Advertisements and Legislative Behavior.'

Mary C. Deason, University of Mississippi (mcdeason@olemiss.edu)

Discussant:

Scott H. Ainsworth, University of Georgia (sainswor@uga.edu)

TITLE: PARTY POLITICS AND LEGISLATIVE ELECTIONS

Chair: Stephen K. Medvic, Franklin and Marshall College

(stephen.medvic@fandm.edu)

Papers: **'Candidate Ideology or Candidate Quality: Explaining Democratic House Victories in 2006 and 2008.'**

- Gregory Huber, Yale University (gregory.huber@yale.edu) and
Conor Dowling, Yale University (conor.dowling@yale.edu)

'Realignment, Open Seats, the Retirement Slump, and the Appearance of an Increasing Incumbency Effect.'

Jeffrey M. Stonecash, Syracuse University (jstoneca@syr.edu)

'Risk Taking and Redistricting: How a Party's Willingness to Accept Risk Leads to Seat Gains and Losses.'

Aaron Dusso, George Washington University (aaron444@gwu.edu)

'Changing the Playing Field: Redistricting and Party Competition in the States.'

John M. Bruce, University of Mississippi (jbruce@olemiss.edu);
Jonathan Winburn, University of Mississippi (jwinburn@olemiss.edu) and
Robert Brown, University of Mississippi (psrbrown@olemiss.edu)

Discussant:

Jamie L. Carson, University of Georgia (Carson@uga.edu)

TITLE: THE SCHOLARLY LEGACY OF NELSON W. POLSBY Cosponsored by Politics and History

Chair: Raymond J. La Raja, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
(laraja@polsci.umass.edu)

Papers: **'The Divided Democrats Revisited: Ideological Cohesion in the American Party System, 1996-2008'**

William G. Mayer, Northeastern University (w.mayer@neu.edu)

'Presidential Cabinet Formation and Party-Building.'

Harold F. Bass, Ouachita Baptist University (bassh@obu.edu)

'Continuity and Change in the Study of Congress.'

David W. Brady, Stanford University (dbrady@stanford.edu)

'Title TBD.'

Stephen Ansolabehere, Harvard University (sda@gov.harvard.edu)

'The Problem of Ideology.'

John R. Zaller, University of California, Los Angeles
(zaller@ucla.edu)

TITLE: NETWORKS OF ADVOCATES AND ACTIVISTS Cosponsored by Political Methodology

Chair: Timothy M. LaPira, College of Charleston (LaPiraT@cofc.edu)

Papers: **'Network Determinants of Interest Groups' Participation in Coalitions over Time.'**

John C. Scott, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
(jscott@email.unc.edu)

'It's Not Personal; It's Strictly Business: A Social Networks Analysis of Internal Party Cleavages, 1972-2008.'

Hans Noel, University of Michigan (hansnoel@umich.edu)

'527 Committees as Central Actors in the Political Party Network, 2006 and 2008.'

David A. Dulio, Oakland University (ddulio@oakland.edu);
Richard Skinner, Bowdoin College (rskinner@bowdoin.edu) and
Seth Masket, University of Denver (smasket@du.edu)

'Parties and the Congressional Lobbying Network.'

Gregory Koger, University of Miami (gregory.koger@gmail.com) and
Jennifer Victor, University of Pittsburgh (jnvictor@pitt.edu)

'Social Networks, Political Heterogeneity, and Interpersonal Influence: Test of a Formal Model with Empirical Evidence from Italy and the U.S.'

Delia Baldassarri, Princeton University (dbalda@princeton.edu)

Discussant:

Suzanne M. Robbins, George Mason University (srobbin1@gmu.edu)

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS (Continued from page 4)

TITLE: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF PARTY POSITIONS IN EUROPEAN DEMOCRACIES

Cosponsored by European Politics and Society

Chair: Markus M. L. Crepaz, University of Georgia (mcrepaz@uga.edu)

Papers: **'When Parties Position Themselves. Political Parties in Policy Space across Europe.'**

Alexander H. Trechsel, European University Institute
(Alexander.Trechsel@eui.eu) and

Peter Mair, European University Institute (Peter.Mair@eui.eu)

'Cross-Cutting Issues and Party Strategy in the European Union.'

Craig A. Parsons, University of Oregon (cap@uoregon.edu) and
Till Weber, European University Institute (till.weber@eui.eu)

'Voter Engagement and Responses to Party Polarization and Depolarization: An Analysis of Party Positioning and Voter Partisanship in Britain, 1970-2005.'

James Adams, University of California, Davis (jfadams@ucdavis);
Jane Green, University of Manchester (jane.green@manchester.ac.uk) and
Caitlin Milazzo, University of California, Davis (ccmilazzo@ucdavis.edu)

'Who is Left Behind? Comparing European Party and Voter Positions Along Two Dimensions.'

Jan Rovny, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (rovny@unc.edu)

Discussant:

Michael D. McDonald, SUNY, Binghamton
(mdmcd@binghamton.edu)

TITLE: EXPLAINING PARTY POLARIZATION IN THE U.S. CONGRESS **Cosponsored by Legislative Studies**

Chair: Jon R. Bond, Texas A&M (jonbond@polisci.tamu.edu)

Papers: **'Whatever Happened to Moderate Republicans? Party Asymmetry in the U.S. Congress, 1972-2008.'**

David A. Hopkins, University of California, Berkeley
(dhopkins@berkeley.edu)

'Income Inequality and Party Polarization in the U.S. House.'

Jeffrey W. Ladewig, University of Connecticut
(Jeffrey.ladewig@uconn.edu);

Samuel Best, University of Connecticut (sam.best@uconn.edu) and
Robert O'Brien, University of Connecticut (Robert.o'brien@uconn.edu)

'What about Institutions? The Polarizing Effect of Reforms on the House of Representatives' Amendment Process.'

Barry Pump, University of Washington (bpump@u.washington.edu)

'Procedural Polarization in the U.S. Congress.'

Sean M. Theriault, University of Texas, Austin (seant@mail.utexas.edu)

Discussant:

Jeffrey D. Grynawski, University of Chicago (grynav@uchicago.edu)

TITLE: POLITICAL PARTIES AND POLICY MAKING IN THE U.S. CONGRESS **Cosponsored by Legislative Studies**

Chair: Gerald Gamm, University of Rochester (gerald.gamm@rochester.edu)

Papers: **'A Computational Model of Party Committee Influence on Legislative Behavior.'**

Andrew Waugh, University of California, San Diego
(aswaugh@ucsd.edu)

'Taming the Filibuster: Vote Skipping and Omnibus Spending Bills in the U.S. Senate.'

Peter Hanson, University of California, Berkeley (phanson@berkeley.edu)

'Party Power in the U.S. House: Discharge Petitions, Agenda Control, and Committees.'

Susan Miller, University of Missouri, Columbia (smmwbc@mizzou.edu)
and L. Overby, University of Missouri, Columbia (overby@missouri.edu)

'House Appropriations After the Republican Revolution.'

David W. Rohde, Duke University (rohde@duke.edu);
John Aldrich, Duke University (aldrich@duke.edu) and
Brittany Perry, Duke University (bnp2@duke.edu)

Discussants:

Gerald Gamm, University of Rochester (gerald.gamm@rochester.edu)
and Steven S. Smith, Washington University, St. Louis (smith@wustl.edu)

TITLE: TACTICAL CHOICE AND ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS **Cosponsored by Public Policy**

Chair: Virginia H. Gray, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
(vgray@email.unc.edu)

Papers: **'The Structure of Lobbying and Representation across Policymaking Venues.'**

Frederick J. Boehmke, University of Iowa
(frederick-boehmke@uiowa.edu);

John Patty, Harvard University (jpatty@gov.harvard.edu);
Sean Gailmard, University of California, Berkeley
(gailmard@berkeley.edu) and

Andrew Pettine, University of Iowa (andrew-pettine@uiowa.edu)

'Organizational Strategies in Breast Cancer Research.'

Patricia Strach, Harvard University (pstrach@rwj.harvard.edu)

'Signals through the Fog: Bureaucratic Signaling and Attention in Financial Regulation.'

Samuel Workman, University of Texas, Austin
(sworkman@austin.utexas.edu) and

JoBeth Shafran, University of Texas, Austin (surfaceshafran@gmail.com)

'Interest Group Competition and Legislative Success in the U.S. Congress.'

Holly Brasher, University of Alabama, Birmingham
(hbrasher@uab.edu)

Discussants:

Marie Hojnacki, Penn State University (marieh@psu.edu) and
Beth L. Leech, Rutgers University (BethL@rci.rutgers.edu)

TITLE: PARTY LINKAGE AND PARTY GOVERNMENT IN CONTEMPORARY DEMOCRACIES **Cosponsored by Representation and Electoral Systems**

Chair: Richard S. Katz, Johns Hopkins University (richard.katz@jhu.edu)

Papers: **'Comparing Voter Participation: Individual Resources, Orientations, and the Context of Party Politics.'**

Miki Caul Kittilson, Arizona State University (miki.kittilson@asu.edu)

'Parties and Participation: The Linkage between Parties and Voters.'

Ian McAllister, Australian National University
(ian.mcallister@anu.edu.au)

'Forming a Government: Do Expectations Match Reality?'

Russell J. Dalton, University of California, Irvine (rdalton@uci.edu)

'Democratic Representation: The Congruence between Citizens and Government.'

David M. Farrell, University of Manchester
(david.farrell@manchester.ac.uk)

'Voter Diversity, Ideological Trends and Changing Party System Polarization: Implications for Ideological Congruence.'

Bingham G. Powell, Jr., University of Rochester
(gb.powell@rochester.edu)

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS (Continued from page 5)

Discussant:

André Blais, University of Montreal (andre.blais@u.montreal.ca)

**TITLE: THE POLITICS OF PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATIONS
Cosponsored by Elections and Voting Behavior**

Chair: Barbara Norrander, University of Arizona (norrande@u.arizona.edu)

Papers: **'Early State Primary Momentum: Media Hype or Reliable Cue?'**

Dino Christenson, The Ohio State University

(christenson.24@polisci.osu.edu) and

Corwin Smidt, Michigan State University (smidtc@msu.edu)

'The Consequences of Open Presidential Primaries.'

Michael G. Hagen, Temple University (michael.hagen@temple.edu) and

Richard Johnson, University of Pennsylvania (rgcj@sas.upenn.edu)

**'Healing the Rifts: Intraparty Factionalism at the
2008 Presidential Nominating Conventions.'**

Michael T. Heaney, University of Florida (mtheaney@ufl.edu);

Dara Strolovitch, University of Minnesota (dzs@umn.edu) and

Seth E. Masket, University of Denver (smasket@du.edu)

**'Politics in Motion: Dynamics of Presidential Primaries,
1972-2008.'**

Martin Cohen, James Madison University (cohenmg@jmu.edu);

David Karol, University of California, Berkeley (dkarol@berkeley.edu)

and Hans Noel, University of Michigan (hansnoel@umich.edu)

Discussants:

Seth E. Masket, University of Denver (smasket@du.edu) and

Barbara Norrander, University of Arizona (norrande@u.arizona.edu)

TITLE: STABILITY AND CHANGE IN AMERICAN PARTISANSHIP

Chair: Charles Franklin, University of Wisconsin, Madison

(chfrankl@wisc.edu)

Paper: **'The Next American Voter: The Political Demography of American
Partisanship.'**

Eric P. Kaufmann, Harvard University/University of London

(e.kaufmannbbk.ac.uk) and

Vegard Skirbekk, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis

(skirbekk@iiasa.ac.at)

'The Geography of Political Independence.'

Brian J. Brox, Tulane University (bbrox@tulane.edu)

**'The New Democratic Majority: Who Voted in the 2008
Presidential Election?'**

Seth C. McKee, University of South Florida, St. Petersburg

(scmckee@stpt.usf.edu) and

David Hill, (dhill@stetson.edu)

**'A Reversal of Trends? Voter Turnout in the 2008 Presidential
Elections.'**

Priscilla L. Southwell, University of Oregon (psouth@uoregon.edu)

Discussant:

Charles Franklin, University of Wisconsin, Madison

(chfrankl@wisc.edu)

**TITLE: GENDERING POLITICAL ORGANIZING: WOMEN, MEN, AND
ACTIVISM IN THE U.S.**

Cosponsored by Women in Politics Research

Chair: Jennifer Leigh Disney, Winthrop University (disneyj@winthrop.edu)

Papers: **'National Coalition Work in the American Women's Movement.'** Laura
R. Woliver, University of South Carolina (woliver@sc.edu)

**'Pro-Women, Antifeminist? Understanding Sarah Palin Through
Conservative Women Activists.'**

Ronnee Schreiber, San Diego State University

(rschreib@mail.sdsu.edu)

**'Advocacy in Hard Times: Representing Marginalized Groups in the
Twenty-First Century.'**

Dara Strolovitch, University of Minnesota (dzs@umn.edu)

'Governance and the Political Activity of Women's Associations.'

Maryann Barakso, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

(barakso@polsci.umass.edu)

**'The Electoral Success of Women's Organizations:
Do the Media Matter?'**

Danielle Thomsen, Cornell University (dt324@cornell.edu)

Discussant:

Kristen Goss, Duke University (kgoss@duke.edu)

**TITLE: POLITICAL PARTIES IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE:
TWENTY YEARS AFTER THE FALL OF COMMUNISM**

Cosponsored by

The Politics of Communist and Post-Communist Countries

Chair: Mary Stegmaier, University of Virginia (ms2bu@virginia.edu)

Papers: **'Party Divisions in Europe: Theory and Evidence from an Expert
Survey in 27 European Democracies.'**

Robert Rohrschneider, University of Kansas (roro@ku.edu) and

Stephen Whitefield, University of Oxford

**'Are Mixed Electoral Systems the Best Choice for Central and
Eastern Europe or the Reason for Defective Party Systems.'**

Daniel Bochsler, University of Zurich, Center for Comparative

and International Studies (bochsler@ipz.uzh.ch)

'Populist Appeals in Postcommunist Europe.'

Kevin Deegan-Krause, Wayne State University (kdk@wayne.edu) and

Tim Haughton, University of Birmingham

(T.J.Haughton@bham.ac.uk)

'The Endurance of the Czech Communist Party.'

Mary Stegmaier, University of Virginia (ms2bu@virginia.edu) and

Klara Plecita-Vlachova, Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of

Sciences (Klara.Plecita@soc.cas.cz)

Discussant:

Andrew Roberts, Northwestern University (aroberts@northwestern.edu)

**TITLE: RELIGIOUS POLITICAL PARTIES IN COMPARATIVE
PERSPECTIVE**

Cosponsored by Religion and Politics

Chair: Ramazan Kilinc, Michigan State University (kilinc@msu.edu)

Papers: **'Understanding Moderation and Extremism: The Strategies and
Goals of Religious Parties.'**

P. Pushkar, McGill University (p.pushkar@mcgill.ca) and

Madhvi Gupta, Concordia University (madhvi_gupta@excite.com)

**'Religion Between Movement and Party: A Comparative Analysis of
Religious Party Formation in Middle East and Latin America.'**

Luis Mantilla, Georgetown University (lfm5@georgetown.edu)

**'Negotiating Islam, Civil Society, and Secularism: The Justice and
Development Party in Turkey.'**

Ani Sarkissian, Michigan State University (asarkiss@msu.edu) and Serife

Osler, SUNY New Paltz

**'What Accounts for the Success of Islamist Parties in the Arab World?
Evidence from Jordan.'**

Michael D.H. Robbins, University of Michigan

(robbinmd@umich.edu)

Discussant:

Robert A. Dowd, University of Notre Dame (Robert.A.Dowd.9@nd.edu)

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS (Continued from page 6)

TITLE: PARTY ORGANIZATIONS IN THE STATES

Cosponsored by State Politics and Policy

Chair: Rachael Vanessa Cobb, Suffolk University (rcobb@suffolk.edu)

Papers: **'The Dynamic Relationship Between State Party Organizational Strength and Electoral Success.'**
Robert C. Lowry, University of Texas, Dallas (robert.lowry@utdallas.edu)

'When Do Party Elites Democratize? The Direct Primary in Pennsylvania, 1842-1906.'

Kaori Shoji, Gakushuin University (kaori.shoji@gakushuin.ac.jp)

'A Network Analysis of State Party Committee Strength.'

Andrew Waugh, University of California, San Diego (aswaugh@ucsd.edu)

'Party Strength and Activity and Women's Political Representation at the Local Level.'

Melody Crowder-Meyer, Princeton University (mcrowder@princeton.edu)

Discussants:

John Clark, Western Michigan University (john.clark@umich.edu) and Rachael Vanessa Cobb, Suffolk University (rcobb@suffolk.edu)

POSTERS

TITLE: POSTER SESSION: NEW FRONTIERS IN AMERICAN PARTY RESEARCH

Posters: **'Vying for the Plank: Discovering the Conditions under which Interest Groups Influence Party Platforms.'**

Jennifer Nicoll Victor, University of Pittsburgh (jnvictor@pitt.edu) and Gina Reinhardt, Texas A&M University (greinhardt@bushschool.tamu.edu)

'Parties and Movements in American Politics: Patterns of Alliance from Free Soil to the Christian Right.'

Daniel Schlozman, Harvard University (schlozm@fas.harvard.edu)

'From Images to Votes: Understanding the Dynamics of Issue Evolution.'

Amnon Cavari, University of Wisconsin, Madison (cavari@wisc.edu)

'The Cultural Basis of Party Identification.'

Joel A. Lieske, Cleveland State University (j.lieske@csuohio.edu)

Discussant:

David Karol, University of California, Berkeley (dkarol@berkeley.edu)

TITLE: POSTER SESSION: INTRA-PARTY DEMOCRACY IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Posters: **'Intra-Party Dynamics and Party Splits.'**

Hande Mutlu, New York University (hande.mutlu@nyu.edu)

'Do Parties Become More Democratic and Does it Pay? Assessing the Reciprocal Relationship Between Intraparty Democracy and Party Membership.'

Ingo Rohlfing, University of Cologne (rohlfling@wiso.uni-koeln.de)

'Do Primaries Matter? How Internal Democracy Affects Party Performance in the General Election.'

Kathleen M. Bruhn, University of California, Santa Barbara (bruhn@polsci.ucsb.edu)

'Formal Models of Machine Politics.'

Ugur Ozdemir (uozdemir@artsci.wustl.edu)

Discussants:

Marisa Kellam, Texas A&M University (mkellam@polisci.tamu.edu) and Simone Bohn, York University (sbohn@yorku.ca)

TITLE: POSTER SESSION: EXPLAINING ORGANIZED POLITICAL ACTION

Posters: **'Examining Endogeneity in Social Movement Protest and Public Opinion: The Case of the U.S. Women's Movement.'**

Lee Ann Banaszak, Penn State University (lab14@psu.edu) and Heather L. Ondercin, Louisiana State University (ondercin@lsu.edu)

'Baptists and Church-State Advocacy: An Analysis of the Effects of Membership Opinion on Lobbying the Supreme Court.'

Andrew R. Lewis, American University (al3978a@student.american.edu)

'Should We Go Steady? Patterns of Cooperative Lobbying Behavior among Forestry Advocacy Groups in France and Sweden.'

Emily Olivia Matthews, University of California, San Diego (eomathews@ucsd.edu)

'Advocacy Coalitions: Beyond Influence, an Organizational Survival Perspective.'

Stephanie Yates, Laval University (stephanie.yates.1@ulaval.ca) and Raymond Hudon, Laval University (hudon@pol.ulaval.ca)

'Soliciting Participation: Understanding the Role of Membership Groups in Promoting Political Engagement.'

Maryann Barakso, University of Massachusetts, Amherst (barakso@polsci.umass.edu)

Discussant:

Michael T. Heaney, University of Michigan (mheaney@umich.edu)

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Organized Section on Political Organizations and Parties (POP) List of Award Recipients and Committees for 2009

JACK J. 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: Michael Laver, New York University, michael.laver@nyu.edu
Bonnie Meguid, Rochester University
Kevin Easterling, UC Riverside

WINNER: Michael Tomz and Robert Van Houweling, 'Candidate Positioning and Voter Choice,' *American Political Science Review*, (2008), 102:3, 303-18.

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: Marc Hetherington, Vanderbilt University, marc.j.hetherington@vanderbilt.edu
Dara Strolovitch, University of Minnesota
Bruce Larson, Gettysburg College

WINNER: Larry M. Bartels. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton University Press.

SAMUEL J. ELDERSVELD AWARD

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

Chair: Kay Schlozman, Boston College, kschloz@bc.edu
John Aldrich, Duke University
Clyde Wilcox, Georgetown University

WINNER: Jeff Berry, Tufts University

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: Miki Kittilson, Arizona State University, Miki.Kittilson@asu.edu
Scott Desposato, UC San Diego
Michele Swers, Georgetown University

WINNER: Hans Noel, Georgetown University

FROM HEADQUARTERS (Continued from page 7)

BEST POP PAPER AWARD

This award honors the best paper presented on a POP panel at the preceding APSA annual meeting.

Chair: Frederick J. Boehmke, frederick-boehmke@uiowa.edu
Sona Golder, Florida State University
Eric Schickler, UC Berkeley

WINNER: Richard Skinner, Seth Masket, and David Dulio, '527 Committees and the Political Party Network.'

FROM THE FIELD

Papers of Interest

2009 Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting

- 'Party Organizations and Electoral Performance in Central and Eastern Europe.' Margit Tavits, Washington University, St. Louis.
- 'The Dynamics of Voter Preferences and Party Leader Positions.' Sara Binzer Hobolt, University of Oxford and Robert Klemmensen, University of Southern Denmark.
- 'Rethinking the Impacts of Party Policy Shifts.' Jane Green, University of Manchester.
- 'The 'Third Way' at a Dead End? An Empirical Study of Germany's Left.' Andrea Haupt, DePaul University.
- 'Which Voting Subconstituencies React to Party-Centered Media Reports and to Economic Conditions? A Cross-National Analysis of Eight Western Europe Politics, 1973-2003.' James Adams, University of California, Davis; Michael Clark, Northern Illinois University; Malcolm Easton, University of California, Davis; Lawrence Ezrow, University of Essex; Spyros Kosmidis, University of Essex and Anja Neundorf, University of Essex.
- 'The Origins of Dominant Parties: Regional Legislators and United Russia, 2001-2008.' Ora John Reuter, Emory University.
- 'Measuring Political Party Relevance in Post-Communism States.' Regina Smyth, Indiana University and Christopher Kam, University of British Columbia.
- 'Parties of Power and their Success: Explaining Regime Divergence in Russia and Ukraine.' Brandon Marcus Wilkening, Indiana University.
- 'Uncertain Partners of Democracy: Political Parties in Ukraine.' Andrey A. Meleshevich, National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.

- 'Too Much Democracy? How the Selection Rules You Use Affect the Candidates You Get.' Kathleen Marie Bruhn, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- 'Risk Taking and Redistricting: How a Party's Willingness to Accept Risk Leads to Seat Gains and Losses.' Aaron Dusso, George Washington University.
- 'Running Nowhere: Third Party Presidential Campaigns in 2008.' Brian Brox, Tulane University.
- 'Does EMILY's List Predict Electoral Success?' Rebeca J. Hannagan, Northern Illinois University and Jamie Pamela Pimlott, Niagara University.
- 'Political Parties, Interest Groups, Money, Elections and Health Care Policy: The 2008 Iowa State Legislative Elections.' Arthur Sanders, Drake University.
- 'Has McCain-Feingold Reduced the Influence of Money in Politics? Evidence From Stock Price Changes for Firms of Different Sizes.' Andrew Healy, Loyola Marymount University and Gena Gammie, Loyola Marymount University.
- 'Give and Take: An Analysis of Congressional Leadership PAC Networks.' Andrea McAtee, University of South Carolina.
- 'Are Family Politicians Better Fund-raisers? An Analysis of Fund-raising Totals in Congressional Elections: 1978-2008.' Kimberly L. Casey, University of Missouri, St. Louis.
- 'Apocalypse Not Now? The Argentine Party System After the 2001-2002 Crisis.' Luis F. Clemente, University of Albany, SUNY.
- 'Institutional Reform and Political Parties in Post-Fujimori Peru.' Alberto Vergara, University of Montreal.
- 'Growing Apart or Staying Together? Multilevel Politics and Party Cohesiveness in Mexico.' Imke Harbers, Leiden University.
- '21st Century Democracy in the Two Mexicos' The Poor' South and the Rich' North: Political Factionalism or Political Cohesion? Economic Structures, Rules and Opportunities in Oaxaca and Nuevo Leon.' Guadalupe Correa-Cabrera, New School for Social Research.
- 'How Democracy Truly Works in the Dominican Republic: A Qualitative Analysis.' Edward Gonzalez-Acosta, New School for Social Research.
- 'Sequential and Spatial Voting: The Case of the 2008 Democratic Primary.' Baodong Liu, University of Utah.
- 'The Obama Effect: Racial Attitudes and Their Effects on Candidate Appraisal.' David B. Sparks, Duke University and Candis S. Watts, Duke University.
- 'The Firewall: Latino Voters in the 2008 Primaries and General Election.' Sylvia Manzano, Texas A&M University; Matt A. Barreto, University of Washington and Gabriel R. Sanchez, University of New Mexico.

The
University
of Akron

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

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