

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

THEME – POLITICAL ACTIVISTS

Interview Methods of Political Science: POP's Workshop for 2001

Beth L. Leech
Rutgers University

When I was a graduate student working on my dissertation, one of the first interviews I conducted was with the lead lobbyist for a large accounting firm. After being kept waiting for about 45 minutes, I was ushered into the lobbyist's office, where he began firing questions at me about my education and experience. It's not uncommon for interview subjects to be wary, and so I assumed that he wanted to check my credentials before beginning our discussion. The questions continued, and I tried my best to be open and calming until finally he asked: "Why do you want this job?"

Although I had sent a letter of introduction and identified myself and my research project when I scheduled the meeting, I had failed to follow the sage advice of political scientist Lewis Dexter: "It can never be assumed that the interviewee remembers who you are or what your project is." I did manage to extricate myself from the job interview and move on to the research interview that day, but I'm reminded of this story whenever I think about the many things researchers need to know to be effective interviewers.

Interview data have provided the backbone of many of the most important works in political science, but few graduate programs provide any formal training or guidance about how to conduct interviews, especially with elite subjects. The lucky ones (myself included) had a mentor who could guide them. But although graduate students typically receive several years of training in all manner of statistical analyses, very little time is spent learning about how best to collect the information that they later will analyze. For those who would like the

chance to learn more, the POP council has agreed to sponsor a short course on elite interviewing in connection with this year's APSA meeting. The short course will feature an afternoon of advice and pointers from some of the most experienced and adept interviewers in the discipline, and is open to any member of APSA who is interested in elite interviewing. The list of those who are scheduled to give a presentation during the short course (see the end of this article for details) includes scholars from many fields and subfields, including those who study the presidency, the courts, and the bureaucracy, as well as parties and interest groups.

What is elite interviewing?

The term elite interviewing generates some confusion and disagreement, as some researchers use "elite" to refer to the socioeconomic position of the interviewee, whereas for others it has more to do with how the interviewee is treated by the interviewer. There is an interac-

THEME: PARTY STRENGTH

From Headquarters	4
From the Field	5
Scholarly Precincts	5, 6, 7

Chair: Jeffrey M. Berry, Tufts University
Secretary-Treasurer: Diana Dwyre, California State University, Chico
Program Chair: Anne Costain, University of Colorado, Boulder
VOX POP Editor: John Green, The University of Akron

Executive Council: Mary DeLorse Coleman, Jackson State University; Beth Leech, Rutgers University; Marian Lief Palley, University of Delaware; Laura Woliver, University of South Carolina; Richard Hall, University of Michigan; Burdett Loomis, University of Kansas; William Mayer, Northeastern University; Thomas Poguntke, University of Mannheim; Susan Scarrow, University of Houston.

(Continued from page 1)

tion between these two situations, as Dexter points out in his book, *Elite and Specialized Interviewing*:

“In standardized interviewing . . . the investigator defines the question and the problem, he is only looking for answers within the bounds set by his presuppositions. In elite interviewing, as here defined, however, the investigator is willing, and often eager to let the interviewee teach him what the problem, the question, the situation, is. . . . Partly out of necessity . . . this approach has been adopted much more often with the influential, the prominent and the well-informed than with the rank-and-file of a population. For one thing, a good many well-informed or influential people are unwilling to accept the assumptions with which the investigator starts; they insist on explaining to him how they see the situation, what the real problems are as they view the matter” (pp. 6-7).

The focus of POP’s planned short course is on interviewing broadly, but with a focus on interviews of people in decision-making or leadership roles. Our panelists have experience in both standardized interviewing as well as more open-ended, exploratory interviews, and several of them also specialize in survey methodology. The crossover is hardly an accident. Methodological concerns that are important with survey design, such as question wording, interviewer effects, response rate, and question order, also are relevant to conducting interviews. But interviews pose special concerns as well. Some of them are practical or technical: to tape or not to tape, how to gain access, or how to write up interview notes. Other concerns are less straightforward. Confidentiality issues may be more pronounced with an elite interview, where the subjects may have been chosen in part because of their position or because of specialized knowledge they have. And the open-ended nature of even a well-structured interview can make attempts to systematically code and analyze the responses excruciatingly difficult.

The panelist for the short course will share their approaches to many of these sorts of issues, as well as address how to follow general ideas about research design — reliability, validity, sample selection, replicability — when conducting elite interviews. Most of the panelists have conducted interviews with typical government elites — members of Congress, members of parliaments, top-level bureaucrats, party leaders, and interest group leaders. Some have conducted interviews with activists, who while note “elites” in the socioeconomic sense of the word, are experts in their field and treated as such by the interviewer.

Interviewing traditions

The distinctions that Dexter made between standardized and elite interviewing parallel the differences between two interviewing traditions — the journalistic and the ethnographic — that have helped shape interviews in many social science fields, including political science. In many ways the interviewing traditions of anthropology and journalism lie at opposite ends of the continuum. The ethnographic interview begins with the interviewer assuming she knows nothing. The goal of the interview is to encourage the informant to teach and define, and to provide a structure that allows the informant to do so. The journalistic interview begins with the assumption that the reporter knows (or must act as if she knows) everything and the job is simply to get the subject to admit to it. Having worked both as a journalist and an anthropological fieldworker before becoming a political scientist, I can say that interviews conducted by political scientists typically lie somewhere between these two camps. It’s worth adding that I have used each of these interview styles in the other discipline. Interview methods should cross disciplines, because each is appropriate in a different type of situation, and these situations are not discipline-specific.

As a journalist, for instance, I sometimes used ethnographic interviewing techniques when interviewing a cooperative subject for a feature story. If the purpose of the interview is simply to understand, as deeply as possible, the point of view and activities of the interviewee, then open-ended ethnographic techniques are appropriate, whether one is an anthropologist, a journalist, or a political scientist. On the other hand, the experienced interviewer knows that when there is something that people would rather not speak about, such general questions will fail to elicit the needed information. Asking a politician about past indiscretions, the journalist does not say, “So, what can you tell me about your youth?” She says, “Police reports in Maine show that you were arrested for drunk driving on Sept. 4, 1976. Why did you not reveal this before?”

Likewise, as an anthropological researcher I sometimes found that the more direct questioning more often associated with journalists was needed. While in Kenya I interviewed more than 100 women about their reproductive histories. Although nearly every woman over the age of 20 had experienced a miscarriage, stillbirth, or death of a child, an open-ended question such as “Tell me about all of your pregnancies” would fail to elicit such information. Such sad issues are usually not talked about. So I asked each women, “Aja inkera netala?” How many children are the lost ones? Not “Have you lost any children?” but rather assuming that for all these women, child mortality was a too-common event. And indeed, most

(Continued from page 2)

women answered sadly with a number, and if asked would offer details. Only the rare women could say happily, "Maata" — I don't have any (lost children).

All of which is a perhaps too-roundabout way of suggesting that there is not one single vision of political science interviewing that we will advocate during this short course. Rather, our goal is to expose participants to a variety of different approaches and to encourage all participants to think about the methodological challenges that each entails. I hope members of POP will encourage their graduate students and colleagues who have an interest in using interview data in their work to attend this course and participate in the discussions.

Short course participants

The short course will feature:

- **Joel D. Aberbach and Bert Rockman.** Professors Aberbach and Rockman each have more than three decades of experience conducting structured and open-ended interviews with political appointees and senior civil servants in the U.S. federal government. They also have conducted interviews with members of Congress and collaborated in a nine-country study of political elites. Aberbach is professor of political science and policy studies director at the Center for American Politics and Public Policy at UCLA. Rockman is university professor of political science and research professor in the Center for International Studies at the University of Pittsburgh; this summer he moves to Ohio State University, where he will be director of the School of Public Policy and Management.
- **Jeffrey Berry.** Professor Berry's major research projects have depended heavily on elite interviews. He has conducted more than 300 elite interviews, including work for books on Washington politics and on grassroots politics. His two current projects are a study of national policymaking (with Frank Baumgartner, Marie Hojnacki, David Kimball, and Beth Leech), which is built around elite interviews, and a study of nonprofits, which uses both elite interviews and a mail survey of 1,750 organizations from around the country. Berry is professor of Political Science at Tufts University, as well as president of POP.
- **David Farrell.** Over the past 20 years, Professor Farrell has carried out elite interviews with politicians, party staffers, and civil servants as far afield as Ireland, Britain, Belgium, the United States, Israel, India and South Africa. He is currently engaged in research on modes of representation by members of the European Parliament. Farrell is a Jean Monnet professor of European politics at the University of Manchester, where his areas of specialty include parties, electoral systems, and the European Parliament.
- **Kenneth Goldstein.** In his book, *Interest Groups, Lobbying, and Participation in America* (Cambridge University Press 1999) Professor Goldstein uses interviews with interest group leaders to learn how and why they made strategic

lobbying decisions. His current work on political advertising combines interviews with fund-raisers, ad makers, and ad buyers with quantitative data on ad buys. Goldstein is an associate professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin, where his research interests include political advertising, political participation, interest groups, and survey research methodology.

- **John Kessell.** Professor Kessell's research has focused in recent years on the presidency and political parties. He has conducted structured interviews with members of the Nixon, Carter, and Reagan White House staffs, as well as unstructured interviews with leaders of various political campaigns. He also designed surveys of activists in the presidential campaigns of 1972 and 1988. Kessell is professor emeritus at Ohio State University.
- **Beth Leech.** Professor Leech has conducted interviews as a newspaper journalist, an anthropological fieldworker, and a political scientist. As a political scientist she has interviewed lobbyists, bureaucrats, and congressional staff members for studies of interest group lobbying strategies and influence on policymaking. Leech is an assistant professor at Rutgers University and is the organizer of this short course.
- **H.W. Perry.** For his book *Deciding to Decide: Agenda Setting in the United States Supreme Court* (Harvard 1991), Professor Perry did what many had thought was impossible: He interviewed Supreme Court justices and clerks to learn about how the court decides which cases to hear. Perry, who is a specialist in constitutional and public law, is associate professor of government and law at the University of Texas.
- **Laura Woliver.** Professor Woliver's first book, *From Outrage to Action: The Politics of Grass-Roots Dissent* (University of Illinois Press 1993), is based on elite interviews with individuals who had protested injustices in their communities. For the last several years she has conducted elite interviews with politicians, interest group leaders, amicus writers, and activists involved in abortion politics in South Carolina and at the national level. Woliver is an associate professor in the Department of Government and International Studies and associate director of Women's Studies at the University of South Carolina.

POP WORKSHOP DETAILS

The POP short course on elite interviewing will be held from 1-5 p.m. on Wednesday, August 29, 2001, at the American Political Science Association annual meeting in San Francisco.

The Course is open to any member of APSA, and there is no charge. A limited number of \$100 stipends will be available to help graduate students defray the costs of attending the course. Information about how to apply will appear in the next VOXPOP, as well as in the summer issue of PS.

**Call for Submission of Syllabi
APSA Political Organizations and Parties
(POP)
Syllabi Project**

The American Political Science Association (APSA) is updating and expanding collections of political science course syllabi. Faculty are invited to submit syllabi to be considered for a new syllabus collection for members of the Political Organizations and Parties section. We are interested in submissions from all people teaching the subject from all ranks and all institutional types from community college to research university. Robin Kolodny, Temple University, will be the editor. Among the courses we would like to include are American Political Parties, Interest Groups, Comparative Political Parties and Interest Groups, and Campaigns and Elections.

For courses focusing on American parties and interest groups, we are particularly interested in syllabi that incorporate party and group activities at the state and local levels. We are also interested in syllabi that are either centered on experiential learning or an internship or contain other (or more limited) real-world experiences.

To Submit Syllabi or Course Units

To be considered for the collection, each syllabus should include an explicit statement of the course objectives, instructional methods and how students are evaluated, in addition to the books, reading topics and assignments that constitute the core of any syllabus.

Send two (2) hard copies of your submission and a diskette -- or send an attachment to an E-mail in WordPerfect or RTF format -- to: Sue Davis, Ph.D., Director of International Programs APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20036, sdavis@apsanet.org, 202/483-2512.

DEADLINE: May 15, 2001

Direct any questions about the project to Sue Davis (sdavis@apsanet.org) or Robin Kolodny (rkolodny@temple.edu) or by regular mail to: APSA, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

**Emerging Scholar Award Committee
Seeks Nominations**

The selection committee for POP's Emerging Scholar Award seeks nominations for the 2001 award. The award is given for outstanding contributions to scholarship in the field within the first five years of receiving the Ph.D. In the past, the five-year criteria has been interpreted variously, so the committee has decided to invite nominations from individuals who have received the Ph.D. between 1993 and 1995.

Any member in the section may make nominations and self-nominations are permitted. We ask for a brief paragraph explaining the importance of the nominee's contributions in the nomination statement. Nominees will be asked to forward a CV and a sample of their best professional writing as e-mail attachments to the committee chair. Nominations and supporting materials should be sent to Robin Kolodny, Temple University, (rkolodny@temple.edu), before April 15, 2001.

**Samuel J. Eldersveld Award
Committee Seeks Nominations**

Piggybacking on Robin Kolodny's request for nominations, Burdette Loomis is also soliciting nominations for the Eldersveld Award - POP's career achievement award. Please e-mail him with any suggestions, b-loomis@ukans.edu.

Past recipients of the Samuel J. Eldersveld Award are: 1986 - Samuel J. Eldersveld; 1987 - Austin Ranney; 1988 - David Truman; 1989 - Allan Kornberg; 1990 - Frank Sorauf; 1991 - William J. Crotty; 1992 - Leon Epstein; 1993 - Joseph Schlesinger; 1994 - James L. Sundquist; 1995 - Gerald Pomper; 1996 - Herbert Alexander; 1997 - Robert Salisbury; 1998 - Nelson W. Polsby; and Louise Overacker; 1999 - Malcolm Jewell; 2000 - Ken Janda.

APSA Short Course

The Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies' (CCPS) Campaign Management Institute at American University is offering a short course at the APSA convention on the topic "Teaching About Campaigns and Elections II." This short course builds on the success of last year's offering and will also include materials assembled by CCPS as part of the "Improving Campaign Conduct" project we are conducting funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts.

Part of the workshop will involve small group discussions with workshop participants, leading academics in the study of campaigns and elections, and prominent practitioners who are members of the American Association of Political Consultants (AAPC) (see list below). Participants will engage in discussions of normative behavior in campaigns with professionals and will receive information about AAPC's mentoring program designed to get undergraduates and recent graduates matched with internship or job opportunities with these campaign professionals.

The workshop will also include a lunch time panel discussion with a number of scholars and practitioners engaged in reform efforts in the conduct of campaigns. Topics include normative issues for campaign professionals, coverage of campaigns by journalists, issue advocacy campaigns by interest groups and political parties, and the implications emerging technologies have on campaign practices.

We will host a lunch for all participants at the conclusion of the workshop. There are no registration fees for the workshop or luncheon. For more information or to reserve a place at the short course, please mail us at ccps@american.edu or call 202-885-3970.

Short Course Participants:

James A. Thurber, American University
 Paul S. Herrnson, University of Maryland
 Kathleen Hall Jamieson, University of Pennsylvania
 L. Sandy Maisel, Colby College
 Diana Dwyre, California State University, Chico
 David Magleby, Brigham Young University (invited)
 Michael Cornfield, George Washington University
 Robin Kolodny, Temple University
 David A. Dulio, American University
 Stephen K. Medvic, Old Dominion University
 Paul Taylor, Alliance for Better Campaigns (invited)
 Brad Rourke, Institute for Global Ethics
 Dan Schnur, University of California,
 Berkeley and Technology Network
 Tony Fazio, Campaign Data Center
 Cathy Allen, Campaign Connection (invited)

The Politics of Women's Rights: Parties, Positions, and Change

Christina Wolbrecht
 (Princeton University Press, 2000)

Laura R. Woliver, University of South Carolina

The Republican party used to be the champion of equal opportunity for women, while the Democratic party, at best, remained silent on the issue. Today as we all know, those positions are reversed. Amazingly, such a transformation of agendas on issues which impact the majority of the population have gone relatively unstudied in political science. Christina Wolbrecht helps alleviate that gap in the literature with her systematic, cogent, and compelling study, *The Politics of Women's Rights: Parties, Positions, and Change*.

Wolbrecht's analysis displays how the elections, issues, and parties changed with the introduction of women to the electorate. On women's issues she shows the importance of political parties and the contrasting stances parties have made concerning gender politics. She uses Sue Carroll's definition of women's rights issues: issues where policy impact will likely have a direct impact on large numbers of women than of men (p. 19). The parties, Wolbrecht shows, are "gendered" in their alignments. On women's issues, the two major parties are now polarized, with consistent and unified positions within each party either pro or against women's rights policy making.

Considering how the alignment of the two major American parties in regards to women's rights is not axiomatic, Wolbrecht tells a succinct tale of how the Republican party changed from support for gender equity, the Equal Rights Amendment (E.R.A.), and other proposals to one consistently and often adamantly against. At the same time, the Democratic party moved from being opposed to the E.R.A., cold or hostile to women's equity issues, to pro-E.R.A., staunch defense of women's reproductive agency and freedom, and support for many other programs to improve the lives of women and girls. The two party's transformations were dynamic and interactive.

The study covers 1952-1992, decades where political elites and the voting public were confronted with compelling questions on American race relations, foreign policy, and domestic socioeconomic conditions, as well as gender politics. The civil rights movement, environmentalism, the anti-war movement, welfare rights efforts, and the countermovements they triggered also reshaped the two major American political parties. While Wolbrecht gracefully incorporates the twofold forces of civil rights and women's rights as reshaping the parties, she pays relatively little attention to the anti-war passions which also buffeted the parties. Indeed, the anti-war, women's rights, and civil rights movements (and countermovements) sometimes overlapped.

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS:

(Continued from page 5)

Wolbrecht analyzes political party platforms, national party organizations, elite party behavior, the words and actions of party presidential candidates, positions of presidential administrations, and party Congressional positions on women's issues. The original analysis contained in the study is extensive. For instance, to measure Congressional party positions on women's rights, she coded all of the women's rights bills introduced into the House and Senate and all of their cosponsors from 1952 to 1992. She supplements this with interest group ratings and roll call data when available. The study also benefits from data Anne Costain shared from her 1992 pathbreaking study of the American women's movement. Wolbrecht also folds in recognition that the way issues are framed and defined over time helps shape their partisan support and political fortunes. The combined picture shows, indeed, the dramatic reconfigurations of the parties concerning women's rights. The Republicans were slightly more favorable towards women's rights in the 1950s and 1960s. By 1980, the party positions are reversed. In party platform positions, for instance, "After 1980, the level of dissension within both parties [regarding women's rights issues] declines as one view came to dominate each party" (p.72).

The gendered realignment of the parties was encouraged by the desire of party elites to win elections. From their quest for block of loyal voters, they began to either repel or attract the women's vote. As they are either successful in appealing to women voters (the Democrats) or alienate women voters either to become Independent identifiers, or Democrats (the Grand Ole Party), they in turn, become havens for social movements either part of the antifeminist, anti-civil rights backlash (the G.O.P.). At the same time, by keeping the faith on socially liberal causes which impact gender, race, class, and recently, sexual preferences (Democrats), the Democratic party coalition of activists and interests changes, too. Party leaders react to these activists within their party coalitions and, in turn, increase those adherents' voices and strength within the party, thus necessitating strengthening of party allegiance to issues highly salient to coalitional groups. The tightening, refining, and restricting of Republican party positions on abortion is an example of this.

The book provides important political and historical context necessary to understand the extent and significance of this party polarization through gendered transformation. Wolbrecht's emphasis throughout on the themes surrounding the E.R.A. and abortion politics deftly display the nature of her argument and theory. She also weaves in recognition of the importance of movement leaders (Phyllis Schlafly's organized opposition to the E.R.A., for example) and group and movement tactics and events (rallies and protests which impact political agendas).

The salience of women's rights within the Democratic party and the strength of the family and tradition-

ally gendered values coalition within the Grand Old Party is aptly explained and explored in this book. The book argues that "The case of women's rights demonstrates the extraordinary power of the American parties to mediate conflict" (p. 230). The book is an important contribution to the study of political parties in America. When read with Jo Freeman's *A Room At a Time* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), Anne N. Costain's *Inviting Women's Rebellion* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), and Kristi Andersen's *After Suffrage* (University of Chicago Press, 1996), *The politics of women's Rights* makes it clear that women's issues have forcefully reshaped, along with civil rights, the anti-war mobilization, and environmentalism, the elite behavior, party agendas, candidate styles, Congressional policymaking, and the fortunes of the two major political parties. Her model of equilibrium disruption, coalitional changes, and party elite positioning make a compelling explanation for partisan positioning on women's rights issues and can be replicated with other large social issues (like environmentalism) by future scholars. Wolbrecht's study is an important contribution to party, group, and movement scholarship.

APSA Media Directory

In the wake of the heavy press demand for political scientists who could explain some of the issues relating to the contested outcome of the 2000 presidential election, the American Political Science Association has decided to create a media directory. It has turned the job of compiling appropriate names over to the organized sections. Political Organizations and Parties has told APSA that we will provide names and we are going to compile our list by soliciting volunteers.

If you would like to be included in this directory, please give us your complete contact information (including e-mail) and identify areas you are comfortable talking to journalists about. You should offer specific areas of expertise, for example, campaign finance, party organizations, or national elections. Please send this information to Pop's Secretary-Treasurer, Diana Dwyer at ddwyre@csuchico.edu. Please specify that your e-mail is for the "APSA Press Contact List." Professor Dwyer will pass the information on to the American Political Science Association in Washington.

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS:

Papers of Interest

2000 American Political Science Association Annual Meeting (First Installment)

- "A Model of Downsian Voting in Different Institutional Settings." Dean P. Lacy, Ohio State University and Phillip Paolina, University of Texas, Austin.
- "Going for Broke: Network Effects and Dynamics of Presidential Campaign Contributions." Alan Wiseman and Adam Meiorowitz, Stanford University.
- "Why Iowa Matters: Information Transmission and Momentum in Presidential Elections." Justin Fox and Indridi Haukur Indridason, University of Rochester.
- "An Electoral Information Based Theory of Political Parties." Joshua Clinton, Stanford University.
- "New Opposition Parties and Centralization: The Case of Japan in the 1990s." Ethan Scheiner, Duke University.
- "Challenging the Hegemon: Opposition Party Entry and Strategic Positioning in Mexico." Kenneth F. Greene, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Strategic Dilemmas of Successful Opposition Parties: The Case of the German Party of Democratic Socialism." Louise Davidson-Schmich, Duke University.
- "Origins of the American Party System: A Formal Theoretic Account." Jeffrey D. Grynawski, Duke University.
- "Clinton as a Presidential Politician." Peri E. Arnold, University of Notre Dame.
- "The Politicized White House." John F. Harris, Washington Post.
- "Clinton and the Party System in Historical Perspective." John J. Coleman, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- "Clinton and the Democratic Party." Nicol C. Rae, Florida International University.
- "Clinton and the Republican Party." John J. Pitney, Claremont McKenna College.
- "Elites and Party System Change in Japan: The Institutional Roots of Elite-Based Change." Ray Christensen, Brigham Young University.
- "Challenges to Establish Party Systems: The Effects of Party." Amir Abedi, University of British Columbia.
- "Federalism and the Case of the Capricious Canadian Voter." Brian J. Gaines, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- "From Dominance to Multipartism: The Transformation of the Indian Party System." Csaba Nikolenyi, University of British Columbia.
- "Struggling to Reform: The Decline of the Anti-Evolution Movement and the Transformation of American Politics, 1925-1930." Michael Lienesch, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- "How Political Parties and Voluntary Associations Interact in Shaping Civil Society." Kristi Andersen and McGee W. Young, Syracuse University.
- "The Rush to Organize: Explaining Associational Formation Across the United States from 1860 to 1929." Jocelyn Elise Crowley, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, Theda Skocpol, Harvard University.
- "Economic Activity as Political Action." Virginia Sapiro, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- "The Nationalism of State Legislative Elections: Out-of-State Contributions in the 1996 Legislative Elections." Owen G. Abbe, University of Maryland, College Park.
- "Legislating Frugality: Comparative Campaign Finance in Races for Governor." Kedron Bardwell, University of Iowa.
- "Candidate Quality and Electioneering in the Expanded Party." Jonathan H. Bernstein, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Disentangling Constituency." Benjamin Bishin, University of California, Los Angeles.
- "Political Participation: Voter Turnout and Protest Activity." Zulema Blair, Binghamton University, SUNY.
- "Press Routines and Political Contexts in News Coverage of Maroral Elections." Julio Borquez, University of Michigan, Dearborn.
- "The Paradoxical Consequences of Split-Ticket Voting." Avraham Brichta and Ami Pedahzur, University of Haifa.
- "Party Competition." John M. Bruce and Robert D. Brown, University of Mississippi.
- "Regional Realignment Revisited." Charles S. Bullock, University of Georgia, Ronald Keith Gaddie and Donna Hoffman, University of Oklahoma.
- "Momentum in Presidential Nomination Races, 1936-2000." Andrew E. Busch, University of Denver.
- "Electoral Systems, Presidential Party Systems, and Term Limits: A Comparative Analysis of the Philippines from 1946 to 1998." Jungug Choi, University of Texas, Austin.
- "The Persistence of Presidential Campaigns in Presidential Evaluations." Michele P. Claibourn, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- "Gender Differences in Partisan Change in the South." Rosalind Blanco Cook, University of New Orleans and Jonathan Knuckey, University of Central Florida.
- "The Dynamics of Turnout: Parties, Voters, and Participation Trends in the U.S., 1828-1996." David Darmofal, University of Illinois, Urban-Champaign.
- "EMILY'S Men: Investing in Equality." Christine L. Day and Charles D. Hadley, University of New Orleans.
- "Choice and Power in American Politics: Rethinking Downs' Economic Theory." Elizabeth M. DeSouza.
- "Has the Time Come for Alternative Voting Systems: Reframing the Scope and Factors." John A. Garcia and Regina P. Branton, University of Arizona.
- "Family Stability and the Transmission of Partisanship in One and Two-Parent Families." Richard J. Hardy and James W. Endersby, University of Missouri, Columbia and Joseph Carrier, Columbia College.
- "Competitive Elections, Mobilizations, and Class Bias in State Electorates, 1972-1996." David Hill, Bridgewater State College.
- "Party System Change: Toward a New Century of Competition." Neal G. Jesse, Bowling Green State University.
- "Explaining GOP Gains in Southern State Houses." Aubrey W. Jewett, University of Central Florida.
- "The Salience of Women's Issues in the Media and Women's Parliamentary Participation." Pia S. Kaiser, University of California, Los Angeles.
- "Individual Preferences of Institutional Structures? Party Cohesion in Great Britain, Canada, and Australia." Christopher Kam, University of Rochester.
- "The Political Impact of Globalization: Evidence from Survey Research in Contemporary China." Pierre Landry, University of Mississippi.
- "Partisan Polarization, Candidate Elections, and Representative Behavior: Who Moved First, the Voters or Their Representatives?" Dewayne L. Lucas, Binghamton University, SUNY.
- "The Institutional and Social Contexts of Participation." Melissa J. Marschall, University of Illinois, Chicago.
- "Paying More for Less: The Declining Impact of Party Contact on Voter Turnout." Paul S. Martin, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- "Simulating Moderation: Representation in Open and Closed Primaries." Jennifer Merolla, Duke University.
- "A Model of Black Giving: Assessing the Impact of the Black Church on Current Elections." Keesha M. Middlemass and Nancy Winemiller Basinger, University of Georgia.
- "How Courts and Lawyers Mediate Direct Democracy." Kenneth P. Miller, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Social Capital, Civic Literacy, and Political Participation: Explaining Differences in Turnout in National and Local Elections." Henry Milner, Lava University.
- "Electoral Arrangements and Multipartism: Evidence from Columbia and Venezuela." Erika Moreno, University of Arizona.

The State of the Parties:
**2000 &
BEYOND**



The Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics at The University of Akron will sponsor a conference on American political parties **October 17-19, 2001** in Akron, Ohio. The purpose of the conference is to assess changes in political parties resulting from the 2000 election. The conference will bring together scholars and practitioners for this purpose, and the best papers will be included in the 4th edition of *The State of the Parties*, scheduled to be published by Rowman & Littlefield in 2002.

For further information and conference registration contact the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44325-1914, (330) 972-5182, E-mail: Bliss@uakron.edu.

The
University
of Akron

The University of Akron is an Equal Education and Employment

The
University
of Akron

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

First Class
U.S. Postage Paid
Akron, Ohio
Permit Number 222