THEME – CAMPAIGN POLITICS

The Campaign Assessment and Candidate Outreach Project
Paul S. Herronson, University of Maryland • Ronald A. Faucheux, Campaigns & Elections

Can good politics be winning politics? Can candidates who take the “high road” get elected? If so, how do they do it, and how can other candidates learn from their practical real-life experiences? And, why am I receiving Campaigns & Elections magazine for free? The Campaign Assessment and Candidate Outreach Project, which is funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts, addresses the first two questions, as well as some related issues. You are receiving free copies of Campaigns & Elections because one of the goals of the project is to inform candidates, political practitioners, academics, and other students of politics of our findings.

Year in, year out, a variety of so-called experts and pundits tell us what is wrong with the political system, particularly election campaigns, and what needs to be done to fix it. Rarely, however, does anyone ever ask the candidates themselves—the men and women who put their careers on the line—as to what they think is wrong with the system and what should be done about it. The Campaign Assessment and Candidate Outreach Project does precisely this. It presents a candidate’s eye view of campaigning and an assessment of the impact that various campaign techniques have on election outcomes. The project also explores what candidates believe to be the major factors in their electoral fortunes as well as their ideas on how to make the system work better.

Our goals are to collect some baseline data that will paint an accurate portrait of how candidates perceive the electoral process, and present some case studies of candidates who adhered to the highest ethical and moral standards when running for office and won. We believe that presenting this information could have a positive impact on the way contemporary campaigns are waged.

We assess the candidates’ views of the campaign process using a telephone survey of 502 recent state legislative and local candidates, a mail survey of approximately 20,000 candidates, and several focus groups compromised of candidates for the U.S. Senate, Congress, and state and local offices. The participants in these assessment efforts include incumbents, challengers, and candidates for open- seats; winners and losers; and Democrats, Republicans, minor-party candidates, and independents. The case studies were chosen to illustrate the tough strategic and ethical choices candidates often have to make in the heat of a hard-fought election.

The outreach part of the study involves presenting the results of our surveys, focus groups, and case studies to candidates, party officials, political consultants, and academics—who we would like to share the results with their
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students. We hope to do a follow-up study to learn whether our study has had any impact on campaign conduct.

Thus far you have had the opportunity to read about several parts of our study. The results of the telephone survey were reported in a series of articles that appeared in the August 1999 issue of Campaigns & Elections magazine. One article gave an overview of the project, another focused on the results for state legislative candidates, a third discussed the views of third-party and independent candidates, and a fourth article used the focus group results to highlight how campaigns change candidates.

The September issue included three case studies from our project. The first case study featured Audrie Bock, a Green Party candidate whose victory over Democrat Elihu Harris in a race for the California Assembly demonstrates that candidates who run strong, positive grassroots campaigns can defeat opponents who outspend them by 15 to 1. Bock’s victory was made all the more impressive by the fact that she was a minor-party candidate in a district that had provided Democratic candidates victory margins that were in excess of 55 percent in recent elections.

The second case study also involved campaign finance issues. Democratic Senator Russ Feingold—a champion of campaign reform—financed his campaign under the same rules that would take effect should his reform package be enacted. Despite limiting himself to spending $1 per voter and discouraging supporters for making independent and issue advocacy expenditures on his behalf, Feingold managed to defeat Republican challenger Congressman Mark Neumann in a very close race.

The lesson gleaned from the third case study is that a political reformer can beat a highly visible politician who has lined up endorsements from all of the state’s major political powerhouses. Republican state legislator David Vitter’s victory over former GOP Governor David Treen in the special election to replace retiring Rep. Bob Livingston showed that popularity and connections are not enough to defeat a shrewd candidate who wages a positive, issue-oriented campaign.

The results of additional case studies, the mail survey, and other reports commissioned for the Campaign Assessment and Candidate Outreach Project will appear in later issues of Campaigns & Elections. We hope that you find these publications interesting and invite you to use them in your classes. Should you know of victorious candidates whose campaigns disseminated issue-oriented messages, relied on large numbers of volunteers to conduct grassroots activities, refused to unfairly attack their opponents, or limited their campaign spending, please let us know. We are interested in learning more about good campaigns that are also winning campaigns.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Dear POP Members:

I am delighted to have been elected as the new chair of Political Organizations and Parties and I look forward to serving for the next two years. POP is one of the larger and more successful of the APSA sections and my predecessor, Ruth Jones, deserves our warm thanks for her hard work to keep it so.

Thanks also go to our outgoing board members, Barbara Burrell, Debra Dodson, Robin Kodolny, and John Shockley, who have served us well these past two years. Candy Nelson of American University did a terrific job with the POP program at the APSA conference in Atlanta.

At this year’s business meeting we approved a new award: the Political Organizations and Parties/Party Politics award for the best paper presented on a POP sponsored panel at the APSA conference. We have no formal affiliation with the journal Party Politics, but we were happy to approve the proposal made by editor (and POP board member) David Farrell. A POP committee is considering this year’s papers and will soon choose a winner. The individual selected will be encouraged to submit his or her paper to Party Politics, and although publication is not assured, the journal promises to expedite the peer reviewing process. (Despite the journal’s name, papers on any subject on a POP panel are eligible.)

Another decision made at this year’s business meeting was to approve a proposal to change the Epstein and Walker awards. Traditionally we have given these awards to a book and article of lasting importance “classics” if you will. As one critic of this practice put it at our last meeting, “Why do we want to be recognizing Duverger’s Political Parties at this point? It’s not like it’s going to help his career.” This may be a bit caustic, but this was the sentiment that prevailed. We can bring added recognition to contemporary work and the new Epstein and Walker committees will consider those works published during the last two calendar years. This change brings POP in line with most other APSA sections.

The centerpiece of our POP program next year will be our workshop commemorating the 50th anniversary of “Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System.” John Green and Paul Herrnson have already lined up top party scholars for this event and the papers will later be published in an edited volume. Thanks to John and Paul for the already extensive effort they have put forth on this.

If you have some ideas as to what POP should be working on, I hope you’ll contact me. I’m easily reached at Tufts at jberry01@emerald.tufts.edu.

—Jeffrey M. Berry, Chair
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FROM HEADQUARTERS

Political Organizations and Parties Organized Section of the American Political Science Association Annual Business Meeting
Atlanta, GA, Friday, September 3, 1999

This section meeting was called to order by POP Chairman Ruth Jones. The following business transpired:

1. Chair’s Report
Ruth Jones reported several items:
APSA membership is down considerably. The concern is that younger scholars are not joining the association. A survey will be sent to political scientists to ask why they are not APSA members.

Membership Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>POP Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submissions for APSA panels for the 2000 Annual Meeting will only be online this year. Responses to paper submissions will only be online as well.

APSA is requesting biographical updates for its next membership directory. Please be sure to note your membership in POP on this form (available online).

Ruth Jones then called for the approval of the minutes of last year’s business meeting. The minutes were accepted unanimously.

Ruth Jones informed POP that the section sent flowers to Diana Dwyre in honor of her new baby offering POP’s good wishes to her.

Ruth Jones then pointed out the current membership of POP was indicated on the back of the agenda. She reminded POP members that the size of the section will be linked to the number of POP panels offered next year. APSA has already informed us that there will be fewer panel slots next year due to hotel space.

Ruth Jones acknowledged David Magleby for his work on organizing the 1999 POP Workshop on Issue Advocacy and Interest Group spending in campaigns.

2. Treasurer’s Report (July 1, 1998 to June 30, 1999)
Ruth Jones distributed the Treasurer’s report. The report was accepted as distributed unanimously.

Funds on hand July 1, 1998 $8,610.43
Revenue for Period
APSA section dues $1,100.00
Interest Incomes 48.62
Other revenue:
Mailing labels 100.60
TOTAL REVENUE $1,249.22 $1,249.22
Expenditures:* 1998 Awards (219.59)
TOTAL EXPENDITURES: (219.59)
Net Activity for the Period $1,029.63
Funds on hand June 30, 1999** $9,640.06

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

** NationsBank funds on deposit divided between nonprofit checking ($6,547.40) and nonprofit savings ($3,092.66).

3. 2000 POP Workshop
Ruth Jones asked Paul Herrson to report on his efforts for the 2000 POP Workshop and panels commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Responsible Parties report. Herrson reported that the POP Workshop will have two special panels. Also, there will be four special panels in the regular program: two additional POP panels, one shared with the Comparative Politics section and one shared with the History and Politics section. Plans are also in the works for a special reception at the Annual Meeting. Also, there will be a web site and edited book produced for the occasion. APSA also has plans to videotape the special panels. John Green announced a meeting to be held the next day (September 4, 1999) to plan next year’s events. See Fiftieth Anniversary of the APSA Committee Report on page 5.

4 POP/Party Politics Award:
Ruth Jones informed the section that the Executive Committee met via conference call prior to the APSA meeting and at 11:30 a.m. on September 3, 1999. Based on these meetings, the Executive Committee recommends to the section that a best paper prize for papers presented at POP panels sponsored by the journal Party Politics be adopted.
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FROM HEADQUARTERS

Ruth Jones then moved to adopt a best paper award and to adopt the selection procedure recommended by the POP Executive Council:

PROPOSED:
The first Party Politics Prize for the best paper presented at a POP panel at the American Political Science Association’s Annual Meeting shall be awarded at the POP Business Meeting for papers given at the previous Annual Meeting.

Nominations for the prize shall be solicited from the chairs and discussants on POP panels at the previous Annual Meeting. Chairs and discussants will be asked to nominate only one paper. Solicitations for the nominations shall commence within two weeks of the conclusion of the Annual Meeting and should be initiated with the assistance of the POP panel organizer.

Copies of the nominated papers shall be obtained from the nominees and shall be sent to the chair of the Party Politics Prize committee. The prize committee shall consist of three people and shall be selected by the chair of POP in the same manner as the other POP prize committees.

Either party, POP or Party Politics, can withdraw from this arrangement with two years’ notice.

The motion was approved unanimously.

5. Review of POP Awards:
Ruth Jones initiated a discussion about POP’s book and article awards which originated in the Executive Council. John Coleman was asked to offer the language adopted by the Executive Council: Reword both awards with “a book/article published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties.”

Discussion followed. Some members opposed the change entirely. Others opposed the two year language, in favor of a longer time horizon. Others were in favor of the change because of the presence of the Eldersveld award for lifetime achievement. John Coleman added that the award language needs to be explicit in order for the award committees to work effectively.

Ruth Jones called for a vote on the motion by a show of hands: 19 were in favor; 11 opposed. Ruth Jones declared the motion carried.

6. Presentation of Awards: Awards reported on page 5.

7. Election of Officers:
Ruth Jones asked POP to accept the slate offered by the Nominations Committee chaired by Debra Dobson.

Chair: Jeffrey Berry, Tufts University
Executive Council:
   Mary DeLorise Coleman, Jackson State University
   Beth Leech, Rutgers University
   Marian Lief Palley, University of Delaware
   Laura Woliver, University of South Carolina

The slate was accepted.

Ruth Jones thanked Candy Nelson for organizing the 1999 POP program and thanked outgoing council members for their service. She then turned the meeting over to incoming chair Jeff Berry.

Jeff Berry invited applause for Ruth Jones and asked for any additional items.

Charles Hadley announced that the American Review of Politics published selections from last year’s workshop. Paul Herrmon announced that he has sent copies of Campaigns & Elections magazine to all members of POP as part of a study he is conducting about the conduct of campaigns.

Jeff Berry adjourned the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Diana Dwyre, Secretary Treasurer

Many thanks to Robin Kolodny for taking these minutes at the meeting.

NOTICE
Cornelius P. Cotter, a founding member of POP, the recipient of POP’s best article award, and leader of the team of political scientists who conducted the study of state parties organizations that led to the publication of Party Organizations in American Politics, died at age 75 in July at his retirement home in Atascadero, California. He had been in ill health for a prolonged period following an auto accident.

In recognition of Neil’s professional contributions and his friendship, his colleagues in the department of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee have created an APSA Centennial Campaign memorial in his name. Professional colleagues and friends of Neil Cotter may be a part of this memorial by sending their contributions to the APSA Centennial Fund, c/o APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20036.


**FROM THE FIELD**

Fiftieth Anniversary of the APSA Report
"Toward A More Responsible Two-Party System"
Committee Report

Co-Chairs: Paul Herrnson and John Green

Committee Members:

1. Events at the 2000 APSA
   a. POP Workshop. As is traditional, POP will sponsor a workshop on the Wednesday afternoon before the official meeting. The workshop will have two sessions, with a coffee break in-between and a reception at the conclusion.

   ** In the first session, Leon Epstein will offer reflection on American political parties since the publication of the responsible party report in 1950. We have asked Paul Beck, Donald Fowler (former DNC chair), and David Broder to respond to Epstein’s presentation. (Broder has committed in principle, but may not be able to attend due to the 2000 campaign).

   b. The official APSA Program. The Committee will propose four events as part of the official APSA program. These proposals are subject to approval by the program chair.

   ** A Roundtable on the Responsible Party Report. Organizer: David Mayhew. This roundtable will feature some of the authors of Responsible Parties report, their students, contemporaries, and others. The participants will discuss the origins, writing, and impact of the report.

   ** A Roundtable on Contemporary American Parties. Organizers: Paul Herrnson and John Green. This roundtable will feature presentations by John Bibby and Sandy Maisel; David Magleby, Kelly Patterson, and James Thurber; Herbert Weisberg; and Frank Sorauf (with one person speaking for each grouping of scholars).

   ** Panel on responsible parties in comparative context. Organizers: John Green and Patrick Seyd. This panel will include papers by Herbert Kitschelt, Matthew Shugart, Patrick Seyd, and Eric Uslaner. We will propose that this panel be co-sponsored by the Comparative Parties section.

2. Educational Materials.
   The program events will be video taped and there are plans for the APSA to distribute the tapes at cost. John Coleman will establish a web site in conjunction to the program.

3. The Edited Volume.
   We have made progress on an edited volume of essays growing out of the POP program at the APSA. Our expectation is that the book will be published in 2001.

4. Fundraising:
   We have raised or have commitments for $15,500 to finance the POP program, including: $1,500 from the APSA (to video tape panels and roundtables); $4,500 from the Committee for Party Renewal; $1,000 donation from Jerry Mileur; and $7,500 from the Bliss Institute.

---

1999 POP AWARDS

Malcolm Jewell, winner of the Samuel Eldersveld Award for a lifetime of distinguished scholarly and professional contributions to the field.


James Q. Wilson, winner of the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field for Political Organizations, published in 1973.

Committee: Kristi Andersen, Anna Harvey, Ken Kollman, and John Coleman, chair.

Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, winner of the Jack Walker Award for an article of unusual importance and significance to the field for two articles in the American Political Science Review: "Two Faces of Power" (vol. 56, no. 4, December 1962) and "Decisions and Nondecisions: An Analytical Framework" (vol. 57, no. 3, September 1963).

Committee: Scott Ainsworth, John Gerrity, and John Coleman, chair.

Robin Kolodny, winner of the Emerging Scholars Award.

Committee: Ruth Jones, Diana Dwyre, and Sandy Maisel, chair.

---
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Call for Papers 2000 APSA
Political Organizations and Parties
Paul Allen Beck, Ohio State University

Three different types of proposals for individual papers and whole panels on political organizations, especially political parties and interest groups, are welcomed. First, APSA panels should serve, above all, as forums for presentations of the best current research in the field. Therefore, proposals involving “cutting edge” original research on any aspect of political organizations, utilizing any approach, and focusing on any country or countries are strongly encouraged.

Second, we will look favorably upon proposals that explicitly address the annual meeting theme of Political Science as Discipline? Reconsidering Power, Choice, and the State of Century’s End.

Third, 2000 marks the 50th anniversary of the Report of the Committee on Political Parties of the American Political Science Association, “Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System.” We are especially interested in receiving proposals for papers or panels on it and its various themes. They can be based on contemporary, historical, crosstime, crossnational, or purely theoretical (formal or normative) perspectives and can involve such topics as party responsibility, party organizations, candidate selections, party campaigning, electoral mobilization and turnout, party development (in new or established democracies), congressional parties, divided government, party conventions, party platforms or manifestos, campaign finance, and the competition between parties and interest groups.

All proposals must contain a clear statement of both the theoretical question(s) to be addressed and the research design and, where relevant, how they will address any of the themes outlined above. In choosing among proposals, a premium will be placed on how well the projects are developed in the proposals and either their “cutting edge” quality or their relationship to the meeting themes.

Two Post-Doctoral Fellowships
 (£16,286 to £18,185) in the Department of Politics and International Relations
University of Aberdeen

1. A Research Fellow will be required to work on a project entitled: ‘Beliefs and Actions: Why Predisposition Differs From Mobilization’ as part of the ESRC’s Democracy and Participation Research Programme with Professor Grant Jordan and Dr. William Maloney. The fellowship is for two years and the main aim of this project is a systematic and robust test of both the free-rider thesis in relation to group membership, and the effects of group marketing. This research seeks to explain why some citizens who possess specific attitudinal traits suggesting predisposition to sympathize with specific cause or issues become mobilized to participate in politics, via group membership/support, while others, possessing similar attitudinal characteristics, remain inactive. The Research Fellowship will commence around October 2000 s/he will spend 100% of their time working on the project. Under the direction of Jordan and Maloney s/he will be responsible for the design of research instruments (i.e. postal questionnaires); fieldwork including in-depth interviews, observation, documentary analysis, and questionnaire surveys; data preparation and analysis, including both quantitative and qualitative data analysis using appropriate computer software; dealing with the day-to-day administrative elements of the project; and play a major role in the writing-up and dissemination stages of the research. Candidates should have completed (or be near completion of) a Ph.D. and should possess statistical skills to create and analyze databases.

2. A second Research Fellowship will be available from January 2000 and is open to applicants with a strong interest/background in interest groups studies and/or public policy. While some replacement teaching is required, the applicant will be involved in a range of projects with Professor Grant Jordan and Dr. William Maloney, as well as having the opportunity to carry out research on their own. Candidates should have completed (or be near completion of) a Ph.D. and the possession of statistical skills would be an advantage, but is not essential.

For More Information Contact:

Professor Grant Jordan
Department of Politics and International Relations,
University of Aberdeen,
Kings College,
Aberdeen, AB24 3QY.
Scotland, UK.
E-Mail: pol039@abdn.ac.uk
Telephone: 0044 1224 272722
Fax: 0044 1224 272181

Dr. William Maloney
Department of Politics and International Relations,
University of Aberdeen,
Kings College,
Aberdeen, AB24 3QY.
Scotland, UK.
E-Mail: pol037@abdn.ac.uk
Telephone: 0044 1224 273404
Fax: 0044 1224 272181
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Reference books are a mainstay of teaching and research, and they are especially valuable with regard to American parties and elections because of the steady pace of change. William Binning and his colleagues Larry Esterly and Paul Sracic have produced a valuable addition to this genre with their Encyclopedia of American Parties, Campaigns, and Elections. This book combines a command of the scholarly literature with brevity; the Encyclopedia is in a single volume with less than 500 pages. The entries vary in length, but tend to be succinct, pointing the reader to the one or two best sources of information on the subject. Organized alphabetically, cross-reference and well indexed, the book is easy to use, especially for undergraduates.

The Encyclopedia presents three kinds of information. First and foremost it grapples with the special vocabulary of American parties and elections, from 1790s to the 1990s. In this regard the book is excellent. Few reference books bother to define “soft” and “hard” money, “yellow dog Democrats,” “exit polls,” “push poll,” “jungle primary,” “pool reporter,” and “targeting.” For the more scholarly inclined, it includes terms such as “approval voting,” “cumulative voting,” “limited voting,” “prospective” and “retrospective” voting, as well.

Second, the book offers brief accounts of American presidential elections from 1789 to 1996, describing the major figures, issues, and outcomes. Extensive cross-references put the reader in touch with most important actors and events, weaving a rich tapestry. For example, the cross-references for the 1996 campaign include not just “Clinton,” “Dole,” and “Perot,” but also “issue ads” and “soft money;” similarly, the entry for 1832 includes “patronage” and “Anti-Masonic Party” as well as “Jackson.”

Third, the book contains a large number of biographical entries on a wide range of political figures, past and present. Here is the one place where the brevity of the book is sometimes put to the test, especially with regard to presidents. However, these entries are written with an eye toward the political issues and practices of the time, and dovetail nicely with the other kinds of definitions.

In sum, the Encyclopedia of American Parties, Campaigns, and Elections is an excellent, short reference work. It belongs in libraries of all sorts and on the desks of political scientists concerned with American parties and elections. After all, one may need to know if a “hack” can be found on the “hustings,” who the heck was “Schuyler Colfax,” or the relationship, if any among “GOP,” “GOPAC,” and “GOTV.”

---

Papers of Interest
1999 American Political Science Association Annual Meeting


“How to Win a Landslide By Really Trying – Party Electoral Mobilization in Britain.” Paul F. Whiteley and Patrick Seyd, University of Sheffield.


“European Integration and Determinants of Voter Choice in Democratizing States: Greece and the Czech Republic.” Thomas W. Høy and D. Christopher Brooks, Indiana University.

“Learning and Voting in Britain: Insights from the Deliberative Poll.” Robert C. Luskin and James S. Fishkin, University of Texas, Austin, and Roger Iowell, National Centre for Social Research.

“How Do You Lead an Elephant or Donkey? Campaign Activities of Republican and Democratic State Legislative Leaders.” Thomas H. Littel, University of Texas, Arlington.

“When Black Legislators Defect: Roll Call Voting in Four State Legislatures.” Tyson D. King Meadows, East Carolina University and Thomas F. Schaller, II, University of Maryland, Baltimore County.


“Campaign Finance Reform in New York City: A Decade of Experience.” Jeffrey Kraus, Wagner College.

“Representation and Citizen Participation in Neighborhood Organizations.” David Swindell, Clemson University.


“South Africa: A New Institutional Order Takes Shape.” Christopher Thornhill, University of Pretoria.

“Like the ‘New Politics’ Never Happened: The German Left at the Turn of the Century.” Charles Lees, University of Sussex.


“Friends and Neighbors Donate How Social Networks Finance and Affect Legislative Campaigns.” Craig Williams and Ronald Keith Gaddie, University of Oklahoma.

“The Influence of Political Action Committees on the Selection of Congressional Candidates.” Dore Annapolis, University of California, Berkeley.


“The Undemocratic Democracy, or Why the People of California Voted to Disenfranchise Themselves.” Stephen D. Ansolabehere and James M. Snyder, Jr., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.


“The Stealth Campaign-Experimental Studies of Slate Mail in California.” Shanto Iyengar, Stanford University.


“Stealing the Show: Organized Interests and Independent Campaigns in Congressional Elections.” Alison Kelcher, University of California, Santa Barbara.

“Partisanship and the President’s Quest for Votes on the Floor of Congress.” Richard Fleisher, Fordham University and Jon R. Bond, Texas A&M University.

“Significant Partisan Effects and Roll Call Voting on Executive Branch Authority.” Timothy P. Nokken, University of Houston.
"The Impact of Soft Money on State Party Behavior." Raymond La Raja, University of California, Berkeley.

"The Absence of Competitive Party Politics in the Muslim Middle East: Turkish Exceptionalism in Comparative Perspective." Michele Penner Angrist, Princeton University.

"Formulas for Inclusion: Civic Pacts and the Political Incorporation of Islamist Parties." Carrie Rosefsky Wickham, Emory University.

"The Emergence of Competitive Party Politics in Mexico." Kathleen Bruhn, University of California, San Diego.

"Political Parties and Democracy in Peru." Charles D. Kenney, Ohio University.


"Parties, Party System Development and Democratic Consolidation: Turkey in Comparative Perspective." Birol Akgun, Case Western Reserve University.


"Organizing for Europe: European Regional Parties at the Millennium." Joel Herndon, Emory University.

"The Role of Political Parties in Late Third Wave Democratizers." Carrie Manning, Georgia State University.


"The Electoral Concentration and Legislative Discipline." Johnathan N. Katz, University of Chicago.

"Party Switching Legislators: A Signaling Game." Juan C. Copa, Florida State University.


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