

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

Where Have All the POP Panels Gone?

Robin Kolodny, Temple University

In October, 2005, John Aldrich wrote "Letter From the Chair" in *VOX POP*, with good and bad news. The good news was that paid membership in POP was high, attendance at annual business meetings was good, and the organization's finances solid. The bad news was that submissions for panel slots far outstripped the number allotted to the section. Aldrich noted that POP's situation was due to a "critical bottleneck [that] arises from lower attendance at panels relative to willingness to participate on them, in comparison with other sections." (POP:2) Aldrich encourages increased attendance at panels to remedy this state of affairs and increase POP's future panel allocations. Kevin Esterling organized 9 panels at the 2005 meetings and Barry Burden organized 10 in 2006 (and these numbers were higher than the original allotment due to co-sponsorship).

Why does this disjuncture exist? Surely, scholars of political parties and organizations are no more likely to "ditch" panels than scholars of other subfields. The question arises that if, as the APSA head tally implies, the 600 dues paying members of POP are not attending POP panels, just where are they? One possible answer, I submit, is that they *are* going to panels on the study of political parties, and that increasingly those panels are found in other organized sections. The reason for this is that the study of political parties has become so fragmented, that party scholars have too many homes. I present the findings of two quick analyses: my own experiences as chair of the Political Parties section for the Southern Political Science Association Meeting in 2006, and a survey of the 2006 APSA program.

As organizer of the Political Parties section of the 2006 Southern Meeting, I received 60 proposals: 56 for papers and four for discussant/chair positions. Authors indicated whether the parties section was their first or second choice for paper placement. Twenty-seven authors listed Political Parties as their first choice section, while 33 listed it as their second choice. I lost 32 of the 33 "second choicers" to other sections and managed to retain 26 of the "first choicers" in the parties section. Thirteen other sections took 32 of the 60 party proposals. That means that the majority of proposals to the parties section were presented in other sections. The political parties' section's big competitors were Legislative Politics, Elections and Voting and Money and Politics followed closely by Executive and Presidential Politics and the Comparative Politics of Industrial Nations.

TABLE ONE:
First Choice Sections of Party Paper Proposers (Political Parties was the Second Choice), 2006 APSA.

Section Name	Number of Proposals Listing Other	Number of Proposals Lost	Number of Proposals Retained
Legislative Politics	7	-7	0
Elections & Voting	6	-6	0
Money & Politics	4	-4	0
Executive and Presidential Politics	3	-3	0
Comparative Politics of Industrial Nations	3	-3	0
Public Opinion	2	-2	0
Judicial Politics & Public Law	2	-2	0
Comparative Politics of Developing Nations	1	0	1
Political Methodology	1	-1	0
Race and Ethnicity	1	-1	0
Religion and Politics	1	-1	0
State Politics	1	-1	0
Women and Politics	1	-1	0

I then looked at offerings at the most recent APSA meetings. Barry Burden, the POP panel organizer for this year's meetings, reported in the Summer 2006 edition of this newsletter that he was only able to accept 23% of papers submitted to this section because of the limited number of panel slots and that he and Kevin Esterling (who organized last year's panels)

(Continued on page 4)

From Headquarters 2, 5, 6,
From The Field 3, 7, 8
Scholarly Precincts 8

Chair: John Aldrich, Duke University

Secretary-Treasurer: Holly Brasher, University of Alabama at Birmingham

VOX POP Editor: John Green, The University of Akron

Program Chair: Phil Paolino, University of North Texas

Website Coordinator: Michael Brady, Duke University

Executive Council: Barry Burden, Harvard University; Marjorie Hershey, Indiana University; Ken Kollman, University of Michigan; Beth Leech, Rutgers University; Scott Ainsworth, University of Georgia; Lonna Rae Atkeson, University of New Mexico; Tom Carsey, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill; and Kira Sanbonmatsu, Ohio State University.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Minutes of the Political Organizations and Parties (POP) Business Meeting APSA Annual Meeting September 1, 2006

John Aldrich called the meeting to order at 12:10 pm.

I. Welcome and Announcements

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, and introduced the Section Chair for the 2007 APSA meeting, Phil Paolino. Also introduced was the new webmaster for the section's site, Mike Brady.

II. Minutes and Treasurer's Report

Minutes from the 2005 meeting were unanimously approved.

John Bruce presented the Secretary/Treasurer's Report, including a discussion of section membership relative to other sections in APSA.

TREASURER'S REPORT (July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006)
FUNDS ON HAND JULY 1, 2005 **\$11,532.72**

REVENUE FOR PERIOD

APSA Section Dues	\$1,232.00
Interest Income	\$ 1.41
Section List Rebate	\$ 102.25
Bank fees - credit	\$ 13.00

TOTAL REVENUE **\$ 1,348.66**

EXPENDITURES *

2005 Awards	(541.60)
Shipping of Awards	(31.18)
Bank Fees	0.00

TOTAL EXPENDITURES **(\$572.78)**

NET ACTIVITY FOR THE PERIOD **\$775.88**

FUNDS ON HAND JUNE 30, 2006 **\$12,308.60**

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

III. Section Officers

The Chair thanked outgoing Council members and the outgoing Secretary/Treasurer for their work:

Council: Barbara Norrander, Christina Wolbrecht,
Byron Schafer, Dan Tichenor

Secretary/Treasurer: John Bruce

Continuing members of the Council were acknowledged:

Barry Burden, Marjorie Hershey, Ken Kollman, and
Beth Leech

The new slate of Council members and Secretary/ Treasurer were elected by unanimous consent:

Council: Scott Ainsworth, Lonna Rae Atkeson,
Tom Carsey, Kira Sanbonmatsu

Secretary/Treasurer: Holly Brasher

IV. New Business

There was discussion of how the section may best use the funds that have accumulated in the account. Options discussed included travel awards for graduate students, endowing a section award, and offering assistance to short course production. The topic was resolved with the recommendation that the Chair appoint a special committee to recommend action at the 2007 business meeting.

The possibility of an affiliation between the *Party Politics* journal and the section was raised again. Issues of input in selection of the editor and impact on section dues were discussed. No proposal is currently under consideration.

The short course options for 2007 were discussed, including a "how to" course on how to study networks.

V. In Memoriam

The section took a moment to honor the passing of two scholars of great significance to the field. John Aldrich spoke of Austin Ranney's work, while Paul Herrnson offered a tribute to the life of Leon Epstein.

VI. Presentation of the POP Section Awards

Jack L. Walker, Jr. Outstanding Article Award

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

Michael Laver, NYU, for "Policy and the Dynamics of Political Competition," APSR, May 2005.

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."

Gary W. Cox and Mathew D. McCubbins (both of UCSD), for *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Samuel J. Eldersveld Award

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

Herbert Kitschelt, Duke University

Emerging Scholar Award

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

Andrea Campbell, MIT

Party Politics Award

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

Hans Noel, UCLA, for "Ideology, Party, and the Creation of the Anti-Slavery Coalition."

There was a motion to adjourn, and a second.
The meeting was closed at 12:55 pm.

FROM THE FIELD

IN MEMORIAM

Leon D. Epstein, 1919 - 2006

Leon D. Epstein died on August 1, 2006, as the result of injuries suffered from a fall. He was born in Milwaukee, raised in Beaver Dam, and lived in the Madison area for most of his life. He received his BA and MA at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and he spent most of his professional career there. He was proud of his university and state, and he took great pleasure in contributing to both.

Leon had a splendid career. After one year as an assistant professor at the University of Oregon, he returned to the University of Wisconsin where he rose through the ranks from Assistant Professor to Professor in just six years. He chaired the Political Science Department from 1960 to 1963, helping to build its numbers and standing considerably. He served as the Dean of the university's College of Letters and Science from 1965 to 1969, striving to maintain and improve upon the college's reputation for excellence during a period of great social and political unrest. Leon also served as president of the Midwest Political Science Association in 1971-1972 and as the American Political Science Association's president in 1978, exhibiting impressive leadership of both of those organizations.

Leon's contributions to the discipline have been recognized in many ways. He was the recipient of the Samuel J. Eldersveld Career Achievement Award in 1992, given by the APSA's organized section on Political Organizations and Parties. A few years later, the "POP" section honored him by creating an award for the best book on political organizations or parties in his name.

A scholar with broad-ranging interests, Leon published books and articles in a variety of fields. His scholarship was theoretically and empirically rich, and relevant to the events he observed happening around him. While being stationed in Great Britain by the military, he developed an interest in the nation's politics, leading to the publication of *Britain: Uneasy Ally* (1954), *British Politics in the Suez Crisis* (1964), and his APSA presidential address, "What Happened to the British Party Model" (1979). His observations about his state, university, and its public philosophy—"The Wisconsin Idea"—led to the publication of *Politics in Wisconsin* (1958) and *Governing the University: The Campus and the Public Interest* (1974). Of course, two of Leon's most well-known works were broader in scope, *Political Parties in Western Democracies* (1967) and *Political Parties in the American Mold* (1986) are seminal works that continue to influence political science scholarship.

Scholars at research universities are best known for contributions they make through their research; however, Leon's friends, colleagues, and especially his students often pay tribute to another set of contributions. Leon was a role model for us in many ways. His intellectual curiosity and openness to the ideas of others were remarkable. In his class lectures, for example, he would first present his point of view, next introduce differing points of views, then make criticisms of his own arguments and those of others, and then give the likely responses of those whose work was under discussion.

Leon's dedication to his students was unrivaled and exemplified by one practice in particular: his habit of reading dissertation chapters almost immediately—within hours of receiving them. I vividly remember his calling me at home at 7 p.m. to discuss my first dissertation chapter; it was only about 5 hours after I gave it to him. He offered praise, words of encouragement, and suggestions and then went on to say "Let's meet first thing tomorrow morning to go over my typewritten comments." And at 8 a.m. on a dark and very cold Wisconsin winter morning, we were alone in North Hall doing just that.

My experience was typical for Leon's students. By prioritizing our work, he made us feel that it was important, and this encouraged us to work diligently. Of course, if we didn't, and several weeks had gone by before we turned in another chapter, we felt somewhat awkward when we ran into him in the hallway. Leon's penchant for fast feedback has had a ripple effect, as has his research. Many of his students have continued the tradition of

providing their students with swift feedback. Many of our students have developed a coping mechanism that we occasionally used when we were behind in our work—they avoid running into us in the hall!

Leon Epstein, was a great scholar, teacher, and friend to many. His colleagues, students, and friends mourn his passing, but we also celebrate his life, and feel thankful for having had the opportunity to know him. Those wishing to contribute to the graduate fellowship created in his name can send a check made out to the University of Wisconsin Foundation and marked in "Memoriam Leon Epstein" to Professor Graham Wilson, Chairman, Department of Political Science, 110 North Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706-1389.

IN MEMORIAM

Austin Ranney, 1920 - 2006

I write these comments with sadness and affection. Over the summer, *POP*, indeed, the discipline and the academy, lost two of its leading lights. Elsewhere in this issue, Paul Herrnson offers his thoughts on Leon Epstein, his (and many others') mentor and, of course, the person we so justly honored by naming our best book award after.

Austin Ranney (1920-2006) was one of the greatest scholars of political parties and their role in democratic politics. He, like Leon Epstein, spent many of his most important years at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, although he was most recently at Berkeley (which has a very nice, formal obituary at <http://www.polisci.berkeley.edu/faculty/bio/emeriti/Ranney,A/>, if you'd like to read a more regular account). He began as something of a critic of the responsible parties as a doctrine relevant for American and of course that mean (even in his doctoral dissertation) confronting the work of E.E. Schattschneider. He also made a powerful historically rooted, normatively grounded but contemporary, relevant exploration of political parties in a book I still often require in graduate and undergraduate courses, *Curing the Mischiefs of Faction* (1975). I often have wondered (often aloud, in class) about how his experiences as a member of the McGovern-Fraser Committee affected his thinking in the latter book.

He edited the APSR and was instrumental in helping transform the discipline and its journal through the behavioral revolution and up to the coming of more technical formal theory and methodology. He was so successful in this regard because, it seemed to me, he valued the advance of knowledge however derived and could therefore negotiate nicely among formal and informal, historical and contemporary, philosophical/ethical and empirical (during the height of the so-called "fact-value dichotomy period") in seeking a better understanding of matters political.

I first met him as an undergraduate. He came to Allegheny College to speak when I was in the midst of applying to graduate school. My advisor, John Kessel, arranged a meeting. This was shortly after the Wisconsin legislator had responded to anti-war activities by eliminating funding for the first year of graduate school. I remember that we talked, and after a few minutes he waxed eloquent about the graduate program but said words to the effect that I should value admittance to Wisconsin but I should go elsewhere and perhaps they would try to hire me on the faculty after I finished - "we pay faculty even in the first year" I recall him saying.

It was that unflinching look at the world as best he could understand it, regardless of what that told him or how it helped him make his case, that made - and continues to make - his scholarship so valuable. Along with my mentors at Rochester, and two colleagues while I was still a young scholar, Joe Schlesinger at Michigan State and Frank Sorauf at Minnesota, I was fortunate to have been shaped by John Kessel and these two scholars whose life we celebrate in this issue.

(Continued from page 1)

approached APSA about the problem of inadequate panel space. However, Burden does not report (nor would he be expected to know) what happened to the 121 paper proposals he rejected. Did they end up in other sections, or did these party scholars not present at all at the Meeting?

While I have no way of knowing the disposition of those papers, I looked for the presence of political party scholarship elsewhere in the 2006 APSA program. I used the search engine on the APSANET website for PROceedings to find panels on the program containing the words “party,” “parties” or “partisan” in their titles. After the initial panel title search, I used the same search terms for a paper title search, yielding additional panels containing parties scholarship.¹ Table two lists the sections or related groups hosting such panels, the total number of panels offered followed by the number with the search terms in the panel title, the percentage of party panels, the total number of panels containing both panel titles with party keywords and panels with *papers* with party topics (adding panels without party keywords in the title) and finally the percentage of total panels in the “party” category. I counted panels as they were listed by section, so I did not subtract any panels that were co-sponsored. I found 40 panels with party keywords in the title and an additional 70 (for a total of 110) panels with papers on party topics. The panels and papers were offered in 32 sections or related groups offering a total of 524 panels. Party panels constituted 21% of their offerings (110/524).

Twenty of the 32 sections focus on American politics or political methodology. Twelve are comparative or international in scope. Of the 199 non-American panels, 48 contained “party” subjects, accounting for 24% of the total, greater than the proportion among Americanist sections of 19%. This is a fascinating finding with many implications for POP.

**TABLE TWO:
Panels and Papers with Party Topics, 2006 APSA Meeting**

Section Name	Total Panels / Number with “Party” Panels	Percent Party Panels	Total Panels / Number Party Panels & Party Papers	Percent Party Panels
Related Group: Campaign Finance Research Group	1/1	100%	1/1	100%
Related Group: Cato Institute	1/1	100%	1/1	100%
Related Group: British Politics Group	3/1	33%	3/2	66%
Political Organizations & Parties	10/6	60%	10/6	60%
Representation & Electoral Systems	10/1	10%	10/5	50%
Legislative Studies	25/5	20%	25/12	48%
Comparative Democratization	34/4	12%	34/11	32%
Comparative Politics of Advanced Industrial Societies	16/1	6%	16/5	31%
European Politics and Society	17/2	12%	17/5	29%
Public Opinion	26/1	4%	26/7	27%
Formal Political Theory	11/0	0%	11/3	27%
Urban Politics	12/1	8%	12/3	25%
Related Group: Taiwan Studies	4/0	0%	4/1	25%
Elections and Voting Behavior	35/2	6%	35/8	23%
Politics of Communist & Former Communist States	13/1	8%	13/3	23%
Political Economy	9/0	0%	9/2	22%
Political Communication	18/0	0%	18/4	22%
Political Methodology	14/0	0%	14/3	21%
Related Group: Policy Studies Organization	5/0	0%	5/1	20%
Comparative Politics	48/4	8%	48/9	19%
Presidency Research	22/1	5%	22/4	18%
Law and Courts	19/0	0%	19/3	16%
Politics and History	21/1	5%	21/3	14%
State Politics & Policy	7/1	14%	7/1	14%
Women & Politics	15/1	6%	15/2	13%
Religion & Politics	15/0	0%	15/2	13%
Race, Ethnicity, & Politics	18/1	5%	18/2	11%

Comparative Politics of Developing Areas	27/1	4%	27/3	11%
Related Group: Claremont Institute	12/1	8%	12/1	8%
Political Psychology	12/0	0%	12/1	8%
“Theme” Panels	27/1	4%	27/2	7%
International Political Economy	17/1	6%	17/1	6%

Among Americanists, Legislative Studies offered twice the number of party panels as POP (but a lower proportion), followed by Public Opinion, Formal Political Theory, Urban Politics and Elections and Voting Behavior each with about a quarter of their panels concerning parties. The overlap with Legislative Studies and Elections and Voting was also seen at the Southern meeting.

Intellectual Reasons for the Decline

According to the APSA website, organized sections were first established in 1983. The six original sections were:

- Federalism
- Law and the Courts
- Legislative Studies
- Public Policy
- Political Organizations and Parties
- Public Administration

Twenty-three years later, APSA is up to 37 organized sections, about 9 additional divisions, and 60 related groups. About 106 entities invite paper proposals and organize panels at the Annual Meeting.

Given the sections that compete for party scholarship, we can see some of what has happened to the study of political parties. I offer the following explanations for the lack of interest in political scientists sending research proposals to parties sections: increasing specialization of the discipline, a plurality of definitions regarding political parties, and methodological biases toward formal and quantitative methods.

Specialization of the Discipline

In the past several decades, the discipline has become far more specialized. From the origin of the original sections, we can easily see how the sub-field bias moved from institutional forms to distinctive frameworks such as international relations, comparative politics, and political theory. This means that studies of legislatures, federalism and policy can be found in a large number of sections in the profession. This corresponds to a similar explosion in the number of new journals that have emerged to showcase scholarly work. The upside to specialization is that it helps scholars who are most likely to benefit from each other’s work find each other in a timely and efficient manner. The downside is that it prevents scholars from finding common ground with others whose work seems dissimilar on its face, but is really artificially segregated (i.e. area studies, subnational, or international arenas). The Association encourages this atomization by emphasizing membership counts for sections and providing mechanisms for the creation of new sections and organized groups (that while highly democratic, promote the idea that old “forms” cannot include new approaches). Since APSA members who pay section dues are most likely to look at the panels organized by their “home” sections, it is unlikely that they would be aware of the larger number of panels I discovered doing my word search of panel and paper titles.

The finding that a significant number of party panels are found in comparative or international panels is fairly significant. In a Southern roundtable on the topic of parties’ research (where an earlier version of this article was circulated), John Ishiyama underscored the inexplicable “firewall” between American and non-American parties scholars. Both communities have similar questions and theories, yet few are familiar with the work of the others. Within comparative politics, Ishiyama finds a further division between those who study Western Europe and the rest of the world. If POP could encourage better ties between our section and several of the comparative sections, we might see welcome results.

Plurality of Definitions of Parties

There is a problem unique to the study of parties that contributes to atomization - the increased contestation of its definition. While contesting definitions is what most academia (and social sciences in particular) is about, it is a larger problem for political parties than for other institutions such as

legislatures, executives, the courts, even federalism. When Goldman and Key came up with the tripartite structure for political parties in the American context, the three major aspects (or “faces”) of party were theorized to belong together. But with major scholars like Schlesinger developing a theory of parties that privileged the organization, post-Michigan study behavioralists developing sophisticated measures of party identification in the electorate, and Aldrich arguing that parties came out of the legislative context and do not include the voters, parties became embedded in the study of other institutions and processes. If parties come out of the legislature, then they should be included with legislative studies. If parties are embedded in the electorate, then they should be included with studies of political behavior. If parties are “teams” designed for winning elections, then they should be viewed as autonomous organizations, with an emphasis on the resources they acquire and the strategies they use to wage campaigns. We see that today, the first two conceptions of parties have been subsumed under different sections (in the case of the electorate, several sections). The last conception of parties has been left under the “POP” rubric. My argument suggests a couple of issues. First, if Legislative Studies, Public Opinion, and Elections, Public Opinion and Voting have a natural attachment to some aspect of the study of parties, shouldn’t there be more co-sponsorship (there is some) or open acknowledgment that some parties scholars have migrated there? Second, why has the POP section been left with the image as the “home” of organizational studies of parties and why is that in itself less popular?

Methodological Biases

My explanation for why POP and institutional studies of parties have fallen out of favor has to do with methodological biases in the profession. Studies of party in government, especially in the legislative area, have been dominated recently by rational choice models. It is a useful and popular methodology that attempts to explain behavior within a consistent and relatively stable institutional setting. Studies of partisan attachment in the electorate are heavily skewed toward survey-based research and experimental methods, both with well-established guidelines and research protocols for instrument design, implementation and interpretation. Studies of party as organization tend to be more qualitative in nature, with some attempts to quantify or describe organizational dimensions existent, but due to the sheer number and variety of party organizational types, are necessarily problematic. Scholars of party organizations normally use case study comparisons, requiring a team of academics to apply some standards of classification and observation to their immediate environment. Many of these studies have been successful while they lasted, but the methodology is so labor-intensive, cumbersome, time-consuming and expensive that they cannot be sustained over a long period of time or even at consistently spaced intervals. We cannot replicate Cotter, Huckshorn, Bibby and Spencer’s work for example as easily as we can use NES data or modify a mathematical model. Therefore, party organizational work is not well integrated into most related organized sections (except for some of the comparative sections) and remains in POP. I believe this explains why the selection of divisions for paper placement has lagged in POP and the SPSA Political Parties section - many scholars who are interested in some aspect of parties see the stand-alone study of party organizations as a residual category.

Finally, APSA has launched a new initiative to remedy this fragmentation in other areas - “Working Groups.” Academics interested in a common theme that is covered in a number of divisions agree to visit panels of interest and meet several times throughout the conference to discuss them. Two such topics in 2006 were “Campaigns & Elections” and “Social Networks.” Participants in the working groups wore a ribbon underneath their name tags denoting the name of their working group so they could coordinate with others during the conference. Given the 110 panels I identified, shall we find the need to convene one for “Political Parties” next time?

¹ I looked for the use of the term “party” as applied to political parties, deleting several international relations panels where the term “party” referred to actors in civil or military affairs.

FROM HEADQUARTERS AWARD CITATIONS

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

Recipient: Herbert Kitschelt

Award Committee: Chair, Ken Kollman, University of Michigan; Jeffrey Berry, Tufts University; David Rohde, Duke University

I want to thank the other two committee members, Jeffrey Berry and David Rohde. There were many excellent people nominated for the award, and we had a good, ongoing conversation about these people’s work. We were enthusiastic in making our final decision.

Herbert Kitschelt, the George Allan Professor of International Relations at Duke University, is this year’s winner of the Samuel Eldersveld Award, given by the Political Organizations and Parties Section of the American Political Science Association. The Eldersveld Award is given annually to a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field of political organizations and parties. To people studying political parties, party systems, comparative politics, and European politics, it goes without saying that Professor Kitschelt deserves this award.

Professor Kitschelt got his Ph.D. at the University of Bielefeld in Germany, and has worked at Bielefeld, at Humbolt University in Germany, at the University of Notre Dame, and at Duke University. He has published eight books, plus four edited volumes. At last count, he has authored or co-authored 73 published articles, either in refereed journals or edited volumes. He is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

His research in comparative political parties and party systems has been very influential. Starting in the late 1980s and early 1990s, he published numerous articles and four books on European parties, including *The Radical Right in Western Europe* in 1995, which won the 1996 Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award for best book on government, politics or international relations, given by the American Political Science Association. His four books during this period, starting with the *Logics of Party Formation* in 1989, established a theoretical framework for studying interactions between the internal politics of parties and the external environment those parties face. In the *Logics* book, for instance, Professor Kitschelt compares different types of party activists and how they are motivated to respond differently to electoral pressures, and shows how the internal balance of power within parties among these different types of activists shapes party strategies. The four books over this time period built on one another and lay out a coherent intellectual legacy, rich with theoretical content and empirical implication.

His work since the 1990s has focused on political parties and party systems in Central and Eastern Europe and in Latin America. Several of his papers linking party strategies, electoral competition, and economic reform in Central and Eastern Europe have been the basis of a large literature on these party systems. Many other scholars have taken his ideas and applied them to compare party systems cross-nationally, compare parties within and across countries, and compare the development of parties and party systems over time in these parts of the world. A hallmark of Professor Kitschelt’s work is his attention to what motivates people to seek power within parties and within government, and to note that there is diversity among people’s motivations. This diversity explains a lot, and helps us solve a lot of puzzles about how parties change over time, how they can change course, and backtrack, and even cease to exist. He pays careful attention to the resulting internal politics within parties borne out of this diversity, and the way that diversity gets aggregated into more or less unified party strategies.

I am honored to present the Eldersveld award to Professor Kitschelt.

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.

This year, the award committee was comprised of Larry Evans of the College of William and Mary, John Ishiyama of Truman State University,

FROM HEADQUARTERS

(Continued from page 5)

and Matthew Wilson of Southern Methodist University. Many superb articles about political organizations and parties were published during 2004 and 2005, but the sense of the committee is that one piece especially stands out: **“Policy and the Dynamics of Political Competition,”** by **Michael Laver of New York University**, which appeared in the May 2005 issue of the *American Political Science Review*.

Professor Laver’s article is an outstanding scholarly contribution for a number of reasons. For one, it reaches beyond the static nature of most existing theories of party competition to consider the dynamic relationships through which voters continually reevaluate their support for political parties and parties make adjustments in their policy platforms to build electoral support. At the core of the article is a rigorous, highly imaginative, agent-based model that captures essential features of party competition. Professor Laver’s simulations demonstrate that a simple “Hunter” decision rule (parties repeat policy moves that previously were successful; otherwise they act randomly) performs particularly well relative to other strategies. He also marshals impressive empirical support for the Hunter algorithm via a case study of five-party competition in Ireland from 1986 to 1997. Professor Laver’s article sheds important new light on the dynamics of multiparty competition and, the selection committee believes, provides a valuable platform for further research about the emergence of new parties, the evolution of party strategies over time, and other key aspects of party competition. For these reasons, “Policy and the Dynamics of Political Competition” is a worthy recipient of this year’s Walker Award.

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.

Award Committee: Marjorie Hershey, Indiana University, Chair; Scott C. James, UCLA; and Beth L. Leech, Rutgers University.

Recipient: Gary Cox and Mathew McCubbins

Book: *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives* (Cambridge, 2005).

In the past quarter of a century or more, the study of the role of parties in legislatures has been a remarkably fecund area of political science scholarship. It has drawn some of the discipline’s best and brightest into its fold, and generated a large, lively, and sophisticated debate regarding the manner in which Congress organizes itself for work and for the electoral benefit of its membership. In a subfield with a long and distinguished pedigree, Gary Cox and Mathew McCubbins have written an instant classic, a must-read book that will be the starting point for subsequent scholarship seeking to prove or refute the proposition that party matters to the operations of the U.S. Congress. Published in 2005, *Setting the Agenda* represents a major advance in our understanding of legislative parties. It is a work of mature scholarship that advances Cox and McCubbins’ procedural cartel theory and develops a series of focused and well-conceived tests to arbitrate competing claims. With its adept use of both quantitative and qualitative evidence, *Setting the Agenda* presents a forceful and persuasive case for understanding the centrality of party organization to policymaking in the U.S. House. To be sure, it is not likely to end the debate over the role of parties in legislatures; but it has pushed that debate substantially forward. It is, in our opinion, a model of high-powered, social scientific research and a genuine *tour de force*.

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.

The winner of the 2006 Emerging Scholar Award is Andrea Campbell of MIT. Campbell’s work to date crosses subfields, methodologies, and national boundaries.

Her book, *How Policies Make Citizens: Senior Citizen Political Activism and the Welfare State*, published by Princeton University Press, examines how the structure of Social Security and Medicare policy

energized political participation by senior citizens. Group involvement in the policy process then changed the policies, and the cycle began anew. This process raised the profile of senior citizen issues in the political parties, in interest groups, and in government bureaucracy. The study combines careful quantitative and archival analysis and informs our understanding of first, how policy can, either intentionally or inadvertently, structure participation by different interests, and second, how interest groups learn to leverage the policy process for mobilization purposes. Of particular interest is how programs like Social Security and Medicare decrease the typical mobilization bias in which the better off members of an interest group participate more than those less well off. This bias is now much less present among the elderly than other age groups. This also means, however, that policy structure can lead to heightened participatory inequality within the other groups. Campbell has explored all these themes in the book as well as in a series of published articles and work in progress.

Campbell’s other work explores how federalism intersects with tax and fiscal policy and the kinds of mobilization opportunities available to interest groups and political parties across countries. She also examined how parties and political context shape voting on racially-charged ballot referenda. And she has studied the contrasting impact of organizational modernization on the Republican and Democratic parties. Her work has appeared in leading journals including the *American Political Science Review*, *Comparative Political Studies*, *Political Behavior*, and *Studies in American Political Development*. She has recently been a co-recipient of a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation for a study of “Ideologies, Interest, and Policy Feedback in the Contemporary Politics of Medicare.”

This impressive early track record is a sign of great promise, and the committee has no doubt that Andrea Campbell will continue to be a productive, innovative scholar whose work bridges the study of political organizations, policy making, and political behavior. She is richly deserving of the 2006 Emerging Scholar Award.

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

“Ideology, Party and the Creation of the Anti-Slavery Coalition,” by **Hans Noel**.

Award Committee: Kevin Esterling, UC Riverside, Chair; Josephine T. Andrews, UC Davis; Robert Lowry, UT Dallas

In this paper, Hans Noel provides a compelling explanation for the origins and dynamics of ideology in the public sphere. Noel provides a novel depiction of how ideology emerges among public intellectuals through an interesting and compelling measurement model. Noel combines the results of this measurement model with historical evidence to show that ideology is not a mere rationalization for parties to justify preferences embodied in platforms. Instead, Noel demonstrates that parties find they must respond to the intellectual logic of ideology, and the internal coherence of ideas contained in public discourse, in order to remain politically relevant. Noel shows that in the 1850s, newspaper opinion writers incorporated positions on the issue of slavery into their writings in a manner that cohered with positions on other salient issues of the day. In particular, pro-business pundits who favored tariff protections opposed slavery while those who opposed the tariff favored slavery. At the same time, the Whigs and Democrats were both internally divided on slavery, and the issue was largely orthogonal to party politics. Throughout the decade, the Whigs proved unwilling to incorporate this ideological division, and eventually the party succumbed to the Republican Party that made slavery a central tenet of its party platform. A great strength of this paper is in its efforts at multimethod evaluation, making use of statistical results and careful historical research. Noel pieces together an interesting original dataset, and incorporates Bayesian item response theory models that are underutilized in political science (imported largely from psychology). This paper is part of a much larger project that eventually will yield a set of spatial scores for pundits measured every 20 years throughout U.S. History. Overall, this is an interesting paper and an ambitious project, and well deserves the award for the best paper presented in the section in 2005.

FROM THE FIELD
APSA WOMEN AND POLITICS
RESEARCH SECTION
CALL FOR EDITORIAL TEAM
PROPOSALS FOR *POLITICS & GENDER*
AUGUST 2006

Overview

On July 1, 2007, Karen Beckwith and Lisa Baldez will complete their term as editors of *Politics & Gender*. The Women and Politics Research Section of the American Political Science Association's peer-reviewed journal, *Politics & Gender* is published by Cambridge University Press and currently in its second year of publication. The journal has already established a reputation as an agenda-setting journal that publishes the highest quality scholarship on gender and/or women and politics. The Section actively seeks applications for a new *Politics & Gender* editorial team, to be composed of three to five faculty members in this research area, most preferably holding a tenured or tenure-stream position at a college or university anywhere in the world. The term of the editorial team will be three years, with a possible extension by the Section for one additional three-year term.

Editorial Team

The editorial team for *Politics & Gender* will need to continue the tradition of rigorous standards in publishing and of attracting top quality research of interest to all the subfields intersecting with research in gender and women and politics. All proposals must identify a managing editor, responsible for ongoing journal administration, working in cooperation with Cambridge University Press. Proposals should also identify an editorial team of three to five members. The editorial team will be responsible for managing and administering the day-to-day operations of the journal, selecting and appointing the *Politics & Gender* editorial board of 20 to 35 members (which exercises general oversight), and presenting an editorial report to the annual business meeting of the Women and Politics Research Section.

Criteria

The Editorial Selection Committee empowered by the research section will adjudicate proposals based on **four key criteria**:

- **Comprehensive vision of the journal.**
- **Demonstrated breadth and balance in the sub-field.**
- **Editorial and Administrative experience.**
- **Effective organizational plans and financial/institutional support.**

Further details of proposal criteria are available at the *Politics & Gender* webpage at <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=PAG>.

Selection Process

The Women and Politics Research Section of the American Political Science Association has constituted a search committee chaired by Lee Ann Banaszak, former president of the Section. The other members of the search committee are Timothy Kaufman-Osborn, Whitman College; Karen O'Connor, American University and current President of the Section; Elizabeth Prugl, Florida International University; and Virginia Sapiro, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Michael Brintnall, Executive Director of APSA serves on the search committee in an advisory capacity. Potential candidates should feel free to consult with the current editors about the journal and its editorship. All editorial team proposals and other inquiries should be directed to the chair via email at lab14@psu.edu, or via regular mail at Department of Political Science, 219 Pond Lab, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

Deadline for Submissions

All editorial team proposals should reach Lee Ann Banaszak, Chair of the Search Committee by January 15, 2007. The Editorial Selection Committee expects to appoint the editorial team by April 1, 2007.

PAPERS OF INTEREST
2006 American Political Science Association
Annual Meeting

- "Europe Made Me Do It: Explaining Defection in European Parliament Elections in 1999 and 2004." Sara Binzer Hobolt, Oxford University and Jae-Jae Spon, University of Iowa.
- "A Survey of MEPs in the 2004-09 European Parliament." Roger M. Scully, University of Wales and Simon Hix, London School of Economics and Political Science, David M. Farrell, University of Manchester.
- "Campaigns and European Parliamentary Elections: Support for Eurosceptic Parties." Susan A. Banducci, Texas Tech University and Catia Chierici, University of Twente.
- "European Integration and National Elections Introducing a Model of EU Issue Voting." Catherine Eunice De Vries, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- "Unorthodox Lawmaking Republican Style." Barbara Sinclair, University of California, Los Angeles.
- "Agenda Setting in a Multi-Institutional Environment: Restrictive Rules in the House." Nathan W. Monroe, Michigan State University and Thomas H. Hammond, Michigan State University.
- "Party Government and the Expansion of House Whip Networks." Scott R. Meinke, Bucknell University.
- "Mechanisms of Majority Party Control of the Legislative Process in the House of Representatives, 1953-1996." Cary R. Covington, University of Iowa and Matthew O'Hollearn, University of Iowa.
- "Forms of Evidence Used in Testimony on Statewide Smoking Restrictions." Dorie Apollonio, University of California, San Francisco and Lisa A. Bero, University of California, San Francisco.
- "Presenting a United Front: Similarities and Differences Between Interest Group and Congressional Issue Framing." Jessica C. Gerrity, Indiana University.
- "Goals, Salience, and the Nature of Advocacy." Marie Hojnacki, Pennsylvania State University, Frank R. Baumgartner, Pennsylvania State University, Jeffrey M. Berry, Tufts University, David C. Kimball, University of Missouri, St. Louis and Beth L. Leech, Rutgers University.
- "Winning the Abortion Wars: A Comparative Study of Interest Group Tactics." Dana J. Patton, Eastern Kentucky University and Sara L. Ziegler, Eastern Kentucky University.
- "Strategic Lobbying: The How and Why of Congressional Lobbying." Jennifer Nicoll Victor, University of Pittsburgh.
- "Search for Cures: Assessing Interest Group Influence in the Federal Grantmaking Process." Michelle L. Chin, Arizona State University and Eric Lindquist, Texas A&M University System.
- "Where do the 'Radical Parties' Stand? A Spatial Review of Radical Parties in Multiparty Competitions." Sultan Tepe, University of Illinois, Chicago and Melvin J. Hinich, University of Texas, Austin.
- "Effects of Third Party Threat in U.S. Elections." Daniel J. Lee, Duke University.
- "Move to the Center or Mobilize the Base? Effects of Political Competition, Voter Turnout, and Partisan Loyalties on the Ideological Convergence of Vote-Maximizing Candidates in Two-Party Competition." Thomas L. Brunell, University of Texas at Dallas, Bernard N. Grofman, University of California, Irvine, James Adams, University of California, Davis, Samuel Merrill, III.
- "Progressive Ambition as a Process of Adaptation and Expatriation." Michael Tofias, Duke University.
- "Why Experience Makes a Difference: Candidate Record as a Source of Candidate Credibility." Brian K. Arbour, University of Texas.
- "Military Vets in Wartime Elections: Asymmetric Partisan Advantage of Candidates' Past Military Service in Congressional Elections." Jeremy Michael Teigan, Ramapo University.
- "May the Best Man Win: Perceptions of Candidate Personal Characteristics and the Presidential Vote in 2004." Charles L. Prysby, University of North Carolina-Greensboro.

FROM THE FIELD

(Continued from page 7)

- “The Primary Reason for Women’s Underrepresentation: Challenging the Conventional Wisdom.” Kathryn Pearson, University of Minnesota and Jennifer L. Lawless, Brown University.
- “Prospective Presidents: Opinions on Black and Women Candidates in the 2008 Presidential Election.” David C. Wilson, University of Delaware.
- “Changing the Electoral System: What About Systematic and Strategic Effects? A Focus on the New French European Electoral System and Its Outcomes.” Annie Laurent, CERAPS.
- “Why do Big Parties Oppose Majority Systems? Satisfaction and Electoral Reforms in Belgium.” Jean-Benoit Pilet, Université Libre de Bruxelles (Belgium).
- “Explaining Electoral Reform in a System with Mixed-Member Parliament: Electoral Reforms in Russia since 1994.” Marat R. Akopian, Rutgers University.
- “Irrational Actors: Small Party Support for Single-Member District Electoral Reform in Japan and Taiwan.” Ashley Esarey, Middlebury College.
- “Forming Left Wing Coalition Governments? Sweden and Germany in the early 21st Century.” Christopher S. Allen, University of Georgia.
- “Policy or Votes? How Electoral Rules Influence Party Strategy: Evidence From the UK.” Jae-Jae Spoon, University of Iowa.
- “Campaign Outsourcing and the Transformation of Party Organization In Britain and Germany.” Jennifer K. Smith, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.
- “Party Polarization, Convergence, or Decline in the German Elections of 2005? Revisiting Kirchheimer’s Prediction.” Michelle Hale Williams, University of West Florida.
- “Ballot Design and Voting in the 2004 Elections.” David C. Kimball, University of Missouri, St. Louis and Martha E. Krpf, University of Missouri, Kansas City.

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

State of the Parties: The Changing Role of Contemporary American Parties Fifth Edition Edited by John C. Green and Daniel J. Coffey

Every four years, *The State of the Parties* brings readers up to date on party action in election years and in between. With the dual themes of polarization and innovation characterizing the new edition, this essential party primer includes: four new chapters on party resources, a greatly expanded section on public opinion, coverage of party efforts to mobilize the youth vote, thirteen new chapters covering topics ranging from the *Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act* to *Deaniacs and Democrats* to *The Rise of the Right*, and as always, a distinguished roster of contributors.

Contributors: Alan I. Abramowitz, Nathan S. Bigelow, William C. Binning, Melanie J. Blumberg, R. Lawrence Butler, Daniel J. Coffey, Christian Collet, David A. Dulio, Diana Dwyre, John P. Frendreis, Cary Funk, R. Sam Garrett, Alan R. Gitelson, John C. Green, Cassie A. Gross, Jerrold Hansen, Eric Heberlig, John S. Jackson III, Shannon Jenkins, Scott Keeter, Courtney Kennedy, David C. Kimball, Robin Kolodny, Raymond J. La Raja, Bruce Larson, David B. Maleby, J. Quin Monson, Susan E. Orr, Kelly D. Patterson, John R. Petrocik, Ronald B. Rapoport, A. James Reichley, Howard L. Reiter, Douglas D. Roscoe, David K. Ryden, Kyle L. Saunders, Daniel M. Shea, Richard M. Skinner, Daniel A. Smith, Walter J. Stone, Jeffrey M. Stonecash, and Peter Ubertaccio.

To order, contact Rowman & Littlefield at 1-800-462-6420 or visit www.rowmanlittlefield.com and save 15% when you order online.

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
