

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

Lobbying Firms as a Topic of Inquiry

Michael T. Heaney

University of Glasgow and University of Michigan
michaeltheaney@gmail.com

Scholars of political organizations and parties have long investigated lobbyists and the clients that they represent. They have examined the differences between *in-house* lobbyists – who represent a client organization as employees of that organization – and *contract* lobbyists – who are hired on an ad hoc basis to represent a client for a specific project or projects, but are not formal employees of the client. Contract lobbyists are often (but not always) employees of lobbying firms. These firms play an important role in selecting and training thousands of lobbyists, while guiding their work with clients. In doing so, they may influence the decisions of political parties, the development of issues, and the outcomes of policy debates. However, scholars have devoted only minimal attention to these firms and how they are situated in the political landscape.

Partisanship and Lobbying Firms

In a recent article in the journal *Research & Politics* (July-September 2019: 1-9), titled “The Partisan Ties of Lobbying Firms,” Alexander C. Furnas, Timothy M. Lapira, and I focus on how lobbying firms are connected with political parties and how those ties may be related to firms’ lobbying revenues. We examined the revenue streams of 1603 lobbying firms that reported federal lobbying receipts in the United States between 2008 and 2016. Our regression models controlled for numerous firm-level co-variates, including firm alignment with House and Senate leadership, number of lobbying clients, diversity in clientele, firm type, whether the firm has international offices, number of domestic offices, and firm age.

Our analysis yielded three notable findings. First, lobbying firms have clear and relatively stable partisan identities. A strict definition of a “partisan” firm (i.e., it gave 95 percent or more of its campaign contributions to only one party) led us to estimate

that 42 percent of lobbying firms were “partisan” in nature. A weaker definition of a “partisan” firm (i.e., it gave 85 percent or more of its campaign contributions to only one party) would indicate that 60 percent of lobbying firms were “partisan” in nature.

Second, lobbying firms benefit financially when they are aligned with the party that controls the House of Representatives. This alignment corresponded with approximately \$5000 to \$6000 in additional revenue per lobbyist per quarter. We did not find convincing evidence that similar benefits accrued from alignment with the partisan leadership of the Senate.

Third, changing control of the House of Representatives had clear financial implications for lobbying firms in 2011 when the Republicans reclaimed the leadership of the chamber. Republican-aligned firms gained roughly \$10,000 in additional revenue per lobbyist that year as a result of the change, while firms aligned with the Democrats lost approximately \$40,000 in revenue per lobbyist that year as a result of the change. However, we did not find statistically significant differences between the changing fortunes of Democrats and Republicans in 2015, when Republicans regained control of the Senate.

From Headquarters.....1,2,3,4,5
Scholarly Precincts.....5,6,7,8,9,10
President: Beth Leech, Rutgers University
Secretary: Hans Noel, Georgetown University
Treasurer: Katie Marchetti, Dickinson College
VOX POP Editor: John Green, The University of Akron
Executive Council: Bruce Larson, Gettysburg College; Ann-Kristin Kölln, Aarhus University; Michael J. Malbin, University of Albany, SUNY; Robin Kolodny, Temple University; Noam Lupu, Vanderbilt University; Michael Heaney, University of Michigan; Heath Brown, CUNY John Jay College; and Diana Dwyre, California State University – Chico

Our results demonstrate that many lobbying firms have partisan commitments and that their revenues depend, both positively and negatively, on those commitments. For these firms, electoral outcomes are not only about policy preferences, they are also about profits. Thus, it is a mistake to assume – as is done routinely in the prevailing literature on lobbying – that lobbying firms are merely disinterested aggregators of lobbying talent. They have skin in the game. This fact provides good cause to take a closer look at these political institutions.

The Functions of Lobbying Firms

Lobbying firms perform a variety of functions that make working for a lobbying firm different from working as an independent lobbying contractor. First, lobbying firms organize the work of their lobbyists. Second, lobbying firms market the work of their lobbyists to potential clients. Third, lobbying firms are a stop on the career paths of their lobbyists. What is the political relevance of these functions?

First, lobbying firms have a critical organizing function. The possible ways of organizing a lobbying team are innumerable. A firm may have more than a hundred lobbyists or be composed of only a handful of associates. Firms may focus entirely on lobbying or may combine lobbying with other professional services, such as legal advice and representation. Firms may cover a wide range of issues or may specialize in particular areas, such as health, defense, or appropriations. They may balance their contacts in a bipartisan fashion or may lean heavily on allies in a single political party. Some firms may choose to emphasize lobbying representation by women while other firms give little attention to the gender balance of their lobbyists.

How firms organize their lobbying enterprises matters because it affects what tasks lobbyists perform and, thus, what effects they have on policy debates. Lobbyists at a boutique health care firm are likely to work on a narrower set of issues than are lobbyists at a general-purpose lobbying firm. Boutique lobbyists, however, may have access to more specialized contacts and resources on a topic, thus shaping the approach they take to an issue.

Second, lobbying firms are a marketing mechanism. Firms provide their imprimatur on individual lobbyists, who otherwise might be unknown to potential clients. Firms assure clients not only that a lobbyist can be trusted but also about what their strengths are. How a firm chooses to market itself matters to what kind of clients a lobbyist serves. Of course, this perspective does not deny that lobbyists arrive at their positions with their own expertise and networks, which they would have regardless of which lobbying firm they joined. Yet, for many lobbyists, the reputation of their firm is more reliable and better known than their own reputation – or it at least complements that reputation.

Third, lobbying firms are a stop along a career path for lobbyists. Many lobbyists come to a firm directly from employment in government. Others come from an association or another lobbying firm. After their time at the lobbying firm, they may go back through the revolving door into government work. Or

they may move on to another advocacy organization. The interests and contacts that lobbyists bring with them are relevant to the ways that their current lobbying firms are able to influence the political process. Likewise, the experience that lobbyists have at their current firms will likely matter to how they act in their subsequent positions.

Directions for Future Research

The organizational, marketing, and career-shaping functions of lobbying firms suggest directions for future political science research on this topic. Since very little is known about lobbying firms as political institutions, the field is wide open for new projects. These studies could be conducted on an international, national, and/or subnational basis.

A place to start is to investigate the policy niches formed by firms. Broad groupings – such as health, defense, and environment – are easy to imagine. But more complex, multidimensional niches are also likely. For example, a niche focused on health appropriations lobbying in the House of Representatives brings together three distinct dimensions of specialization. It would be valuable to know more about how firms select their niches, as well as how niche structures evolve over time. When and how do new specializations emerge? Which specializations tend to be connected with one another? Which niches are especially disconnected from one another? How do bipartisan firms differ from Democratic and Republican firms in their issue specializations? Research on firm specialization could shed light on how the lobbying community reacts to new policy trends or, potentially, helps to shape those trends.

Lobbying firms may be influential not only because of what topics they are involved in, but also for the ways that they work with other organizations on these topics. Studies on lobbying coalitions, for instance, have sometimes noted that lobbying firms may play a role in managing coalitions. The organizational members of a coalition may combine their resources to finance payments to a lobbying firm that acts as an “honest broker” in coordinating the activities of the coalition. Further, it is not uncommon for lobbying firms to *create* lobbying coalitions; they point to an issue and then try to attract interested groups who will make recurring payments to the firm in exchange for coalition management. These types of actions not only *represent* interests, but are catalysts to *transforming* interests. Systematic research is needed to know how common these practices are and whose agendas they serve.

Another set of questions pertains to the effects of marketing by lobbying firms. How do the ways that lobbying firms present themselves correspond with the kinds of clients that they work for? What kinds of lobbying firms attract large, wealthy clients, and which kinds attract smaller, less-affluent clients? How does the nature of a firm affect the market value of lobbyists’ services? Do lobbyists who have similar qualifications command different revenues when working for different firms? If so, what explains these variations? Addressing these questions would speak directly to how lobbyists working for firms have experiences that depart from the experiences of lobbyists operating independently.

Marketing may not only influence lobbying clients but may lead to reactions from competing lobbying firms. Firms may attempt to infiltrate the niches constructed by their competitors. Or they may propose to offer an alternative range of services. Some of these efforts may become trends. If they do, then the nature of lobbying representation could be driven, in part, by the desire of lobbying firms to compete with one another, rather than by clients' representational needs. These strategies are typically present in any market but are generally not incorporated into models of the lobbying profession.

The social networks generated through the unfolding of lobbyists' careers prompt a variety of questions about the consequences of lobbyists' mobility. Observing the flow of people from government perches to particular lobbying firms could be revealing of lobbyist-legislator power dynamics. Which lobbying firms draw disproportionately from the most auspicious seats of power? Are these high-demand lobbyists distributed widely across the system or are they concentrated in a small number of elite firms? Likewise, political scientists would be keen to know more about the journey of lobbyists back to government. Are lobbyists from certain firms advantaged in obtaining new posts? Do they bring with them ideological or policy positions that were developed during their time at the firm?

These questions could be investigated with respect to any national, subnational, or supranational government that requires lobbying registration and reporting of lobbying activities. Examples of such entities include the European Union, Ireland, Canada, the United States, Peru, Wisconsin, and Arizona. It would be valuable to explore how these systems differ in terms of their tendencies toward having revolving-door lobbyists, inequalities in firm revenues, polarization based on partisanship, or other features that may be pertinent. Scholars might situate such investigations in the context of variations in the strength and features of lobbying laws. Do the fortunes of lobbying firms depend on political culture, the strength and structure of legal institutions, or something else? Research in this vein would deepen what is known about the comparative politics of interest group systems.

Why to Pay Attention to Lobbying Firms

Political scientists have been attentive to how political organizations attempt to influence policy processes since the early years of the political science profession. Most of their focus has been placed on political parties, interest groups, and social movements. While this focus has not been misplaced, it nonetheless has been incomplete. Lobbying firms are not new. But it is wise to inquire if they have taken on new roles, and/or become more consequential, in the aftermath of an era that witnessed sustained growth in the incomes and numbers of professional lobbyists.

The tightening of lobbying laws and enhanced requirements for transparency have made lobbying firms more amenable to political research in many places around the world. The task of political scientists is to situate these firms within the institutional and cultural frameworks of their corresponding governmental institutions. Doing so would help to better understand how

lobbying firms interact with lobbyists and other political organizations to ultimately influence political processes. Ideally, new research would help to clarify the role of lobbying firms in democratic politics.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

AWARD CITATIONS

Emerging Scholar Award

The Emerging Scholar Award is given to a scholar who has received his or her Ph.D. within the last five years (2014-2018) and whose career to date demonstrates unusual promise. This year's award goes to Danielle Thomsen of the University of California-Irvine. The committee consisted of Stephen Medvic (chair), Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Ann-Kristin Koelln. The committee explained their decision:

Professor Thomsen is a prolific scholar whose research explores some of the most pressing concerns in contemporary American politics. To date, she has published a book with Cambridge University Press, eight articles, and several book chapters and book reviews. Her book, *Opting Out of Congress: Partisan Polarization and the Decline of Moderate Candidates*, establishes a theory of candidate emergence based on party fit. In it, Professor Thomsen argues convincingly that moderates, who are out of step with the prevailing ideologies of their parties' leadership, have increasingly chosen not to run for Congress because they find the rewards of serving in Congress to be less appealing than do ideologues. The book is a significant contribution to the literature on political parties, congressional elections, and polarization.

Professor Thomsen's work also contributes to our understanding of gender and politics and of campaign finance. In particular, she has studied patterns of women's representation, partisan differences in the emergence and success of women candidates, and the gender composition of candidates' donor networks.

The Committee found Professor Thomsen's research questions to be important, the data sets she employs to be rich and varied, and the quality and number of her publications to be impressive. In addition, we commend her for disseminating her work in public venues like the Monkey Cage and for her considerable service to the discipline. For these, and other, reasons, we are happy to honor her with POP's Emerging Scholar Award.

Jack Walker Award

The Jack Walker Award recognizes an article published in the last two calendar years (2017, 2018) that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties. This year's award goes to Alexander Hertel-Fernandez of Columbia University, Matto Mildemberger, and Leah S. Stokes, both of the University of California, Santa Barbara, for their article "Legislative Staff and Representation in Congress," published in the *American Political Science Review* (2018, 113(1): 1-18 doi:10.1017/S0003055418000606). The

selection committee, Jennifer Victor (chair), Matt Grossman, and David Hopkins, said of the article:

One of the most important and enduring political questions is whether the views of citizens are represented by the actions of public officials—and, if they are not, why not. Political science has sometimes struggled to answer this question, in part because of a traditional division between scholars who study public opinion and scholars who study elites or institutions. This paper is an outstanding example of a new kind of scholarship that uses innovative methods to bridge this traditional divide. It effectively identifies the critical role of political parties and interest groups as key institutions that intermediate between the preferences of the mass public and the behavior of political leaders.

The authors of this article show that legislative staff rely on information from interest groups to help the staff learn about constituents' needs and preferences, but that this information tends to overstate concerns that favor the groups that communicate them. Thus, the most important source of legislative staffers' advice to policymakers is misperceived, due to reliance on interest groups. Their innovative experiments in elite surveys further show that staffers may respond more to campaign contributors but not to citizens groups. This is an important step forward in understanding how parties and interest groups distort policymakers' views of their constituents.

Leon Epstein Outstanding Book Award

The Leon Epstein Outstanding Book Award recognizes a book published in the last two calendar years (2017, 2018) that made an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties. This year's award goes to Devin Caughey of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for his book *The Unsolid South: Mass Politics and National Representation in a One-Party Enclave* (Princeton University Press, 2018). The committee, Michael Franz (chair), Scott Ainsworth, and Bruce Larson had this to say about the book:

How should we understand politics in the South during Jim Crow? Devin Caughey lays out three models—elite dominance (i.e., authoritarianism by economic elites), ruptured linkages (democracy in name and in limited practice, but wholly inadequate), and white polyarchy (functional democracy for whites only). Professor Caughey investigates how well each explains political representation in the one-party South during and following the New Deal period (roughly 1932-52). While Professor Caughey says no account fits perfectly, he finds the strongest evidence for white polyarchy, with competitive primaries providing a forum for non-elite white voters to have political voice and enforce political accountability. Importantly, he finds that white polyarchy does not translate to the state and local level. He concludes that the national two-party system helped structure the responsiveness primarily of congressional delegates.

Professor Caughey deploys a remarkable array of data, including hundreds of public opinion polls to demonstrate the rightward shift of Southern whites between the 1930s and 1950s. He

convincingly shows that Southern white voters (and Members of Congress) were very much in favor of the economic policies of the early New Deal period and that that support frayed (especially on some issues) as those policies came to be seen as threats to the “region’s system of racial hierarchy” (p. 64).

The book will appeal to APD scholars and those focused on authoritarian regimes, but we support this book for the Epstein Award because of its application to the study of parties. Professor Caughey asks us to re-consider how strongly we should affirm the dictum that “modern democracy is unthinkable save in terms of parties.” A lot of democracy is possible within a party, he posits. Professor Caughey’s work is a fresh and elegant treatment of politics and representation in the one-party South that will shape research in this area for years to come.

POP Best APSA Paper Award (2018)

The POP Award recognizes the best paper delivered on a Political Organizations and Parties-sponsored panel at the preceding APSA annual meeting. The 2018 prize for the 2017 meeting was awarded at the 2019 meeting to Alexander Furnas of the University of Michigan, Michael Heaney of the University of Glasgow, and Timothy LaPira of James Madison University for their paper entitled “The Partisan Ties of Lobbying Firms.” The committee, consisting of Thomas Holyoke, Diana Dwyre, and Jesse Crosson, had this to say about the paper:

This is a very strong and innovative paper addressing, among other things, the principal-agent problem in lobbying, which usually is conceived of as addressing the question of how interest groups and their members can constrain the actions of their lobbyists. This paper makes a major contribution by refocusing the problem on the activities of lobbying firms, recognizing that lobbying is not a singular activity. The authors use data from reports filed under the Lobbying Disclosure Act to determine the income of these firms and data on campaign contributions of the lobbyists to determine their partisan ties.

Their results show that lobbying firms depend for their professional and financial success, to a large degree, on these partisan ties, though the results are qualified. Partisan ties with the House majority party bring more revenue to a lobbying firm, but the same is not true for ties to the Senate majority party. Nonetheless, such dependence on connections to majority party legislators calls into question a lobbying firm’s loyalties. As long as revenue is a motivating factor, lobbying firms will need to do all they can to cultivate and maintain their relations with House majority party lawmakers, perhaps at the expense of the people or organizations they are supposed to represent.

This paper has recently been published in *Research & Politics* (<https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168019877039>).

POP Best APSA Paper Award (2019)

The POP Award recognizes the best paper delivered on a Political Organizations and Parties-sponsored panel at the preceding APSA annual meeting. The award for a paper presented at the 2018 meeting goes to Matt Lacombe of

Northwestern University for his paper “The Political Weaponization of Gun Owners: The NRA’s Group Social Identity.” The committee, consisting of Heath Brown (chair), Marie Hojnacki, and Robin Kolodny, had this to say about the paper:

This paper centers on an important question for scholars of interest groups and political parties, namely: why are gun owners so devoted to the National Rifle Association, and why is the NRA so effective at mobilizing them? To answer this question, Matt Lacombe (now an assistant professor of political science at Barnard College) analyzes a range of data spanning nearly a century, including content analysis of hundreds of editorials from the *Rifleman*, the NRA’s member magazine, and op-eds from daily newspapers. As opposed to conventional approaches to the study of influential groups, which focus on inside lobbying and campaign activities, this paper focuses entirely on outside lobbying.

The paper demonstrates that a critical cause of the political activity of gun owners is the NRA’s historic cultivation of a distinct, politicized gun owner identity. For example, NRA editorials do not center solely on detailed debates about gun policy, in fact, 80 percent of editorials in the *Rifleman* use “identify-forming” language, including allusions to patriotism, honesty, and bravery. Professor Lacombe shows that, as opposed to anti-gun op-eds which infrequently address identity, pro-gun op-eds in newspapers are much likely to vilify so-called “out-group” opponents of guns and lionize “in-group” gun owners.

The article also demonstrates evidence of a causal relationship between the NRA editorials and subsequent pro-gun op-eds in daily newspapers. By connecting the editorials to the op-eds, Professor Lacombe reveals a key link in the chain of interest group influence. Overall, these findings help explain the ability of interest groups to use resources to shape public policy by influencing the political behavior of members of the mass public.

This paper has recently been published in *The Journal of Politics* (81(4): 1342-1356. <https://doi.org/10.1086/704329>).

Samuel Eldersveld Career Achievement Award

The Samuel Eldersveld Career Achievement Award recognizes a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field. The award winners this year were Virginia Gray of University of North Carolina and David Lowery of Penn State University for their joint – and individual – work on organized interests. The award committee, consisting of Frank Baumgartner, Patrick Bernhagen, and Gregory Koger, described the work of Professors Gray and Lowery:

Together, Professors Gray and Lowery have pioneered the population ecology approach to the study of organized interests. Among the hundreds (literally) of articles each has published, they have produced several key publications, including their book, *The Population Ecology of Interest Representation: Lobbying Communities in the American States* (University of Michigan Press, 1993). This approach, at the time, challenged

existing group-level accounts of organized interest formation and longevity. Whereas scholars in the Olsonian tradition had looked only at internal factors to ascertain the odds of group creation, maintenance, and longevity, Professors Gray and Lowery promoted the view that we must also look at the surrounding environment. Taking their cue from studies of biology, they noted that studying the internal dynamics of organisms without considering the fit between the organism and its environment would never create a complete theory. They applied this reasoning to the study of group maintenance and had a big impact on the field. This impact is immediately apparent when one looks at the contemporary study of interest groups – not only in North America, but also in Europe and Australia. Citations to their classic contributions continue to accumulate, largely because a new generation of scholars – some their students, others simply attracted by the conceptual framework and its robustness across national contexts – are actively testing, refining, and reformulating their initial insights.

It is worth noting that, in addition to this work, Professors Gray and Lowery have also made substantial contributions in other fields: Professor Gray in US State Politics and Professor Lowery in US State Politics and Public Administration and the study of Bureaucracy and Local Politics.

The research of Professors Gray and Lowery has had an impact in the United States and well beyond. Professor Lowery has held a senior and influential post at the University of Leiden (the Netherlands). Professor Gray has been a welcome – and active – participant at many European workshops, conferences and meetings. Jointly, their presence has been energizing to the field in the US and Europe. Both have published more than 20 articles with graduate student coauthors, introducing an enormous group of young scholars to the study of interest group politics, and ensuring both the population ecology perspective, and the study of organized interests have strong foundations in future generations of scholars.

The Samuel Eldersveld Career Achievement Award recognizes scholars whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field. Professors Gray and Lowery most certainly qualify, in terms of research impact, mentorship and development of the field.

The nomination for this award was forwarded by Prof. Darren Halpin of Australian National University and included supporting statements from more than a dozen nominators from three continents and many generations.

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

APSA 2019 Annual Meeting

Papers of Interest

“From Competition to Polarization: How Populists Change Party Systems and the EU.” Milada Anna Vachudova, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

- “Contests, Factions, and Party Organization.” Giovanna Invernizzi, Columbia University and Carlo Prato, Columbia University.
- “Single-Member Districts and One-Party Authoritarianism: Case of Jim Crow South.” Joseph W. Robbins, Valdosta State University and Bernard Tamas, Valdosta State University.
- “Who Talks to the Chief, Who Builds the Party?” Anja Osei, University of Konstanz.
- “When are Parties Ethnic, National, Religious, or Populist?” Sherrill Stroschein, University College London.
- “Coalition Inclusion Probabilities. A Dynamic Measure of Party Competitiveness.” Mark A. Kayser, Hertie School of Governance, Berlin and Jochen Rehmert, Hertie School of Governance.
- “Party System De-institutionalization and its Consequences on Democracy.” Vincenzo Emanuele, LUISS Guido Carli, Rome and Alessandro Chiaramonte, University of Florence.
- “Expectation of Coalition Formation in Multi-Party Settings.” Shaun Bowler, University of California, Riverside; Gail McElroy, Trinity College, Dublin; and Stefan Müller, Trinity College Dublin.
- “Before Reagan: The Early Anti-Abortion Movement and the Republican Party.” Neil O’Brian, University of California, Berkeley.
- “Heaven on Earth: Explaining Religious Party Formation and Strength.” Mario Rebelo, University of Oxford.
- “What’s in a Cue? A Reputational Model of Party Cue Effects on Public Opinion.” Martin Bisgaard, Aarhus University and Rune Slothuus, Aarhus University.
- “The Effect of Far Right Success on Mainstream Party Positions on Equality.” Peter Allen, University of Bath and Ana Catalano Weeks, University of Bath.
- “Using Gender Quotas to Fight Intraparty Battles.” Sergio Jesus Ascencio Bonfil, NYU Abu Dhabi.
- “Voters’ Perceptions of Women’s Representation Within Political Parties.” Jens Wäckerle, University of Cologne.
- “Electoral Incentives and Electoral Systems: Five Advantages of Two Party Systems.” Ian Shapiro, Yale University and Frances McCall Rosenbluth, Yale University.
- “Populism and the Decline of Party Democracy.” Nadia Urbinati, Columbia University.
- “Parties, Politics, and the Provision of Security.” Kelly Stedem, Brandeis University.
- “Interest Group Influence on Subordinate Policies.” Richard L. Hall, University of Michigan.
- “On Whose Door to Knock? Lobbyists’ Strategic Targeting of Members of Congress.” David Ryan Miller, Washington University in St. Louis.
- “Hiring Revolvers as a Route to Influence?” Benjamin Egerod, University of Copenhagen; Jens Adriaan Van der Ploeg, University of Copenhagen; and Anne Rasmussen, University of Copenhagen.
- “You Win, I Lose: On the Spatial Interdependence of Lobbying Outcomes.” Benjamin Egerod, University of Copenhagen and Wiebke Marie Junk, University of Copenhagen (KU).
- “For the People or for the Party? State Building in China’s Anti-Poverty Campaign.” Jing Vivian Zhan, The Chinese University of Hong Kong and Haoyue Zhou, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- “Old Party, New Tricks: The Emergence of Party Power in Japan.” Jordan Hamzawi, University of California Davis.
- “Who Gets in the News?: A Case Study of Populist Party’s Campaigns in Japan.” Fumie Mitani, College of Law Nihon University.
- “Law and Order, the Coercive State and Pakistan’s Party Systems.” Adnan Naseemullah, King’s College London and Pradeep Chhibber, University of California, Berkeley.
- “Cursed Inheritance? Vote Secrecy and Official Party Decline in Brazil.” Daniel W. Gingerich, University of Virginia.
- “Ruling Party Defectors and Opposition Success in Authoritarian Regimes.” Sebastian Dettman, Singapore Management University.
- “Armed & In Office: Why Violent Parties Succeed in Democratic Elections.” Mary Beth E. Altier, New York University.
- “Political Parties and the Constitution.” Wayne Batchis, University of Delaware.
- “The End of Federal Patronage and Its Effect on Southern GOP Organizations.” Boris Heersink, Fordham University; Jeffery A. Jenkins, University of Southern California; and Nicholas G. Napolio, University of Southern California.
- “Social Welfare, Social Class, and the U.S. Party System, 1945-2016.” Regina Wagner, University of Alabama and Byron E. Shafer, University of Wisconsin.
- “LGBT Incorporation: Party Delegates and the Politics of Sexuality, 1980-2012.” Andrew Thomas Proctor, Princeton University.
- “The Suburbanization of the Democratic Party, 1992–2018.” David A. Hopkins, Boston College.
- “Patronage Guaranteed? Policy Reform, Parties and Partisanship in Rural India.” Thibaud Marcesse, King’s College.
- “Party Strategy and Turnout Decline: Evidence from Chile.” Eli Gavin Rau, Yale University.
- “Dynamic Party System Fragmentation.” Jose Antonio Cheibub, Texas A&M University; Thiago de Miranda Queiroz Moreira, Texas A&M University; Gisela Sin, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign; and Keigo Tanabe, Texas A&M University.
- “Examining the Influence of Eurosceptic Populist Parties in National Parliaments.” Thomas Persson, Uppsala University and Christer Karlsson.
- “Party Factions, Legislative Procedures, and Amending Activity in the US House.” Chris Den Hartog, California Polytechnic State University; San Luis Obispo; and Timothy P. Nokken, Texas Tech University.
- “Are All Coalition Parties Treated the Same?” Andrea Junqueira, Texas A&M University; Thiago Nascimento da Silva, Universität Mannheim; and Guy D. Whitten, Texas A&M University.
- “Leader or Party? Evaluating the Personalization Thesis and Vote Choice 1996-2016.” Ian McAllister, Australian National University and Stephen Patrick Quinlan, GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences.
- “Political Parties & New Modes of Mobilization in Comparative Perspective.” John H. Aldrich, Duke University; Rachel K. Gibson, University of Manchester; and Pedro C. Magalhaes, University of Lisbon.
- “Learning by Cue-ing? How Parties and Voter Guides Affect Candidate Perceptions.” Cheryl Boudreau, University of

- California, Davis; Christopher S. Elmendorf, UC Davis; and Scott A. MacKenzie, University of California, Davis.
- “Who Donates to Congressional Campaigns, Parties, and PACs?” Jay Goodliffe, Brigham Young University and David B. Magleby, Brigham Young University.
- “Conversion and Replacement: Interest Group Strategies and Polarization.” Elizabeth Baisley, Princeton University.
- “The Emergence and Evolution of Interest Groups during the Trump Era.” Darren R. Halpin, Australian National University and Michael T. Heaney, University of Glasgow.
- “Exploring Changes in State Interest Group Systems from 2005 to 2015.” Thomas T. Holyoke, California State University, Fresno.
- “Majority Party Control & Legislator Behavior: Causal Estimates of Party Effects.” Christian R. Grose, University of Southern California and Nicholas G. Napolio, University of Southern California.
- “Party Pressure in Roll Call Votes.” Simon Hug, University of Geneva and Reto Wuest, University of Geneva.
- “The Role of Political Parties in the Information-Based Model of Committees.” Breanna Wright, Stony Brook University and Michael Peress, SUNY - Stony Brook.
- “Cutting Both Ways: Party System Stability and Democracy in Europe.” Fernando Casal Bertoa, University of Nottingham; Zsolt Enyedi, Central European University; and Martin Mölder.
- “Multiple Affiliations and Party Choice in the French Third Republic.” Alexandra Cirone, Cornell University and Brenda Van Copenolle, Leiden University.
- “Globalization, Inequality, and the Fate of Extreme Right- and Left-wing Parties.” Misa Nishikawa, Ball State University and Wonjae Hwang, University of Tennessee.
- “The Tea Party, Donald Trump and the Cooptation of the White Nationalist Movement.” Richard C. Fording, University of Alabama and Sanford F. Schram, Hunter College, CUNY.
- “The Subprime Mortgage Crisis and the Tea Party Movement.” Zhao Li, Princeton University.
- “Shoestring Diplomacy: Lobbying and Litigation by Self-Determination Groups.” R. Joseph Huddleston, Seton Hall University.
- “Electoral Clientelism Under Autocracy: Parties Versus Firms.” Timothy Frye; Ora John Reuter, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; and David Szakonyi, Higher School of Economics.
- “Who’s at the Party? Group Sentiments and the Social Bases of Partisanship.” John V. Kane, New York University; Lilliana Hall Mason, University of Maryland, College Park; and Julie Wronski, University of Mississippi.
- “Access and Lobbying in Legislatures.” Gleason Judd, Princeton University.
- “Interest Group Competition over Campaign Spending and Lobbying.” Gregory Sasso, Università Bocconi and Dan Alexander, University of Rochester.
- “Change of Electoral Magnitude: Impacts on Parties, Voters and Party System.” Annie Laurent, Université de Lille and Bernard Dolez, Université Paris 1.
- “Diplomacy and Foreign Lobbying.” Matt Malis, New York University and Hye Young You, New York University.
- “Chinese-Style Lobbying: Internet Oligarchs and the Politics of Wealth Defense.” Yixue Shao, Northwestern University.
- “Party-Movement Separation and Islamist Party Evolution: The Case of Ennahdha.” A. Kadir Yildirim, Rice University.
- “Radical Islamists, Civil Society, and Party System Transformation.” Tahmina Rahman.
- “Do Radical Rightwing Populist Parties Make a Difference?” Duane H. Swank, Marquette University and Hans-Georg Betz, Johns Hopkins University.
- “Polarization in Multiparty Systems.” William T. Bianco, Indiana University; Gyung-Ho Jeong, University of British Columbia; Indridi Haukur Indridason, University of California, Riverside; Christopher J. Kam, University of British Columbia; and Regina A. Smyth, Indiana University.
- “What Explains Inter-Party Cooperation and Conflict?” James Adams, University of California, Davis; Simon Weschle, Syracuse University; and Christopher Wlezien, University of Texas at Austin.
- “Negative Partisan Identity in Multi-Party Systems.” Alexa Bankert, University of Georgia.
- “Reconsidering Gender Gaps in State Legislatures: The Effects of Women’s Lobbying.” Elizabeth Wiener, Emory University.
- “The Party or the Program: Individual Differences in Affective Polarization.” Lori Bougher, Princeton University.
- “Parties, Pivots and Roll-Call Votes in Congress, 1887-2016.” John H. Aldrich, Duke University and Michelle Whyman, Duke University.
- “Are American Political Parties Resilient? Campaign Finance Party Networks.” Jennifer Nicoll Victor, George Mason University.
- “Corruption Scandals and Electoral Accountability: A Party Differentiation Theory.” German Petersen, University of Texas at Austin.
- “Economic Hardship, Political Corruption and the Emergence of Challenger Parties.” Albert Solé-Ollé, University of Barcelona.
- “Lobbying Beyond the Legislature: Women’s Organizations’ and Rulemaking.” Ashley English, University of North Texas.
- “Interest Group Coalitions and Minority Representation in Rulemaking.” Maraam Dwidar, University of Texas, Austin.
- “Parties and Interest Groups Explain Why the Rich Rule Most in Foreign Policy.” Matt Grossmann, Michigan State University and Zuhair Sheikh Mahmood, Michigan State University.
- “Candidate Over Party: Split-Ticket Voting in State Supreme Court Elections.” Chris “Boom Boom” Bonneau, University of Pittsburgh and Damon M. Cann.
- “Analyzing the Effect of Catholic Parties on Abortion and Same-Sex Marriage Laws.” Luis Felipe Mantilla, University of South Florida, St. Petersburg.
- “Female Leaders and Foreign Aid: The Role of Party Preferences.” Ulkar Imamverdiyeva, University of Houston.
- “Do Interest Groups Contributions Have a Gender Bias?” Ruoxi Li, California State University, San Marcos and Regina Wagner, University of Alabama.
- “Policy-Balancing Voting in a One-Party Dominant System.” Ko Maeda, University of North Texas.
- “How Do Voters Condition Their Votes on Party Leadership?” Hikaru Yamagishi, Yale University.

- “The Economics of European Populism: Growth Regimes and Party System Change.” Jonathan Hopkin, London School of Economics and Mark Blyth, Brown University.
- “Party-Group Alignment of the Republican Party and the National Rifle Association.” Matthew Lacombe, Barnard College, Columbia University.
- “Local Democratic Parties in Rust Belt and Rural SW Pennsylvania, 1970s-Present.” Lara Putnam, University of Pittsburgh.
- “Citizen Activism and Party Politics from the Tea Party to the Anti-Trump Resistance.” Theda Skocpol, Harvard University; Vanessa Williamson, Brookings Institution; and Caroline Tervo, Harvard University.
- “Civic Feedbacks: Organizing Strategy and Groups’ Influence over Public Policy.” Hahrie C. Han, Johns Hopkins University and Andrea Louise Campbell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- “When Badge Trumps Party: Partisanship at the ‘Thin Blue Line.’” Michael James Zoorob, Harvard University.
- “Are Radical-Right Populist Parties Only Bad for Some Democracies?” Marlene Mauk, GESIS - Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences.
- “Exposure to the Other Side(s): Affective Polarization in Multi-Party System.” Lars Erik Berntzen, University of Bergen.
- “Party, Democracy, and the Ideal of Non-Factionalism.” Emilee Chapman, Stanford University.
- “Populists and Realignment: Party Transformation Strategies Past and Future.” Elizabeth Sanders, Cornell University.
- “How Parties Organize from the Grounds: The Genesis of the Movimento 5 Stelle.” Thomas Kurer, Harvard University and Daniel Bischof, University of Zurich.
- “Populism, Personalization and Party Politics.” Bill Cross, Carleton University.
- “What Do Donors Want? Heterogeneity by Party and Policy Domain.” David Broockman, Stanford University and Neil Malhotra, Stanford University.
- “Campaign Contributions and the Case of Competing Interest Groups.” Leslie K. Finger, Harvard University and Sarah E. Reckhow, Michigan State University.
- “The Room Where It Happens: Party Activists and the 2016 Presidential Election.” Rosalyn Cooperman, University of Mary Washington; Gregory D. Shufeldt, Butler University; and Kimberly H. Conger, University of Cincinnati.
- “Power Sharing, Mobilization, and Party Organization.” Giovanna Invernizzi, Columbia University and Carlo Prato, Columbia University.
- “Social Media Networks of Candidates and Intra-Party Competition in Finland.” Iulia Cioroianu, University of Bath and Hilde Roza Coffe, Victoria University of Wellington.
- “Intra-Party Competition and Authoritarian Party Durability in Ethiopia.” Terrence Lyons, George Mason University; Leonardo R. Arriola, University of California, Berkeley; and Josef Woldense, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities.
- “Party Differences in Women Electoral Success in Open Ballot PR Elections.” Georg Lutz, University of Lausanne.
- “Party Quotas and Gender Differences in Pathways to Run for Office in Australia.” Katrine Beauregard, Australian National University and Marija Taflaga, The Australian National University.
- “Parties, Candidates, and Gender in the 2016 Irish Elections.” Mack Mariani, Xavier University; Fiona May Buckley, University College Cork; Austin Wright, Xavier University; and Claire McGing, Maynooth University.
- “Changing the Republican Mind: Partisan Opinion Leaders and Climate Change.” Juliet Carlisle, University of Utah and Sara K Yeo, University of Utah.
- “Party System Fragmentation and the Demand for Electoral Reform.” Christopher Prosser, University of Manchester.
- “Coalition Partners and Policy Preferences: Party Type and Government Policies.” Kathryn Wainfan, University of California, Merced.
- “Election Campaigns, Party Communication and Coalition Governments.” Heike Klüver, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin and Anthea Jeanne Alberto.
- “Cueing and Backlash Effects of Party Press Releases on Public Opinion in Germany.” James Adams, University of California, Davis; Dominic Duval, Université du Québec à Montréal; and Alexandra Feddersen, University of Fribourg, Switzerland.
- “Changing Positions without Losing Face. How Parties Shift their Issue Positions.” Alexandra Feddersen, University of Fribourg, Switzerland.
- “Populist Appeals and Party Support in Bihar.” Taberez A. Neyazi, National University of Singapore; Kazuya Nakamizo, Kyoto University; Anup Kumar, Cleveland State University; and Holli A. Semetko, Emory University.
- “Young or New? A Temporal Approach to the Institutionalization of Party Systems.” Fernando Casal Bertoa, University of Nottingham and Zsolt Enyedi, Central European University.
- “How Issue Salience Explains the Decline of Social Democrats in Europe.” James Dennison, European University Institute.
- “Interest Group Networks and Economic Shocks.” Joan C. Timoneda, Duke University and Sebastian Vallejo, University of Maryland, College Park.
- “The Dynamic Networks of Immigration Interest Groups.” Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Ohio State University; Seulah Choi, Boston University; and Dino Pinterpe Christenson, Boston University.
- “Sources of Radical Right Party Support Among Economically Leftist Citizens.” Pascal König, University of Kaiserslautern and Georg Wenzelburger, Seminar für Wissenschaftliche Politik.
- “Contesting Autocracy: Explaining the Origins of Opposition Parties in Africa.” Leonardo R. Arriola, University of California, Berkeley; David Dow, Duke University; and Natalie Wenzell Letsa, University of Oklahoma.
- “Left Behind: Emigration, Political Brain Drain, and Support for Radical Parties.” Paula Daniela Ganga, Columbia University; Filip Savatic, Georgetown University; and Abraham Newman, Georgetown University.
- “Shaping Competition: Allies’ Party Licensing and the Extreme Right in Germany.” Giovanni Capoccia, University of Oxford and Grigore Pop-Eleches, Princeton University.
- “The Reaction of German Christian Democrats to the Rise of the AfD.” Sarah Elise Wiliarty, Wesleyan University.
- “Party Norms and Partisan ‘Apostates.’” James Lucien Martherus, Vanderbilt University.

- “Party Control and Gender Representation.” Quinn Albaugh, Princeton University.
- “The Effect of Party Networks on Congressional Primaries.” Shawn Thomas Patterson.
- “United in Diversity? Explaining Left-Right Diversity among Regionalist Parties.” Jelle Koedam, University of Zurich.
- “Party v. Policy? Who Chooses Policy Position over Party Loyalty?” Michael Barber, Brigham Young University and Jeremy C. Pope, Brigham Young University.
- “Race, Party, and Representation in the Politics of Policing.” Laurel Eckhouse, University of Denver.
- “Back to Government: The Career Paths of Revolving Door Lobbyists.” Maria Silfa.
- “Political Parties and Local Elections: Consequences for Voters.” Laura Stephenson, University of Western Ontario and Michael McGregor.
- “Where You Least Expect It: Authoritarianism and the Democratic Party.” Alexa Bankert, University of Georgia and David Stack, Cleveland State University.
- “Super-Predator Effect: How Claims of Party Racism Demobilize Blacks and Latinos.” Christopher T. Stout, Oregon State University and Keith Baker, The College at Brockport.
- “Affective Polarization in Multiparty Systems.” Markus Wagner, University of Vienna.
- “Unfit to Serve: Perceptions of Party System Incompetence & its Undermining Effect.” Robert Rohrschneider, University of Kansas and Rudiger Schmitt-Beck, University of Mannheim.
- “Measuring Democratic and Republican National Committee Activity Quantitatively.” Boris Heersink, Fordham University.
- “Rethinking the Party: Theory and History in Recent American Party Scholarship.” Jessica Hejny, Middle Tennessee State University and Adam Hilton, Mount Holyoke College.
- “Post-New Deal: The Democrats’ Dilemmas since 1980.” Daniel Schlozman and Sam Rosenfeld, Colgate University.
- “From the Ground Up: Local Council Electoral Systems and Party Emergence.” Sherrill Stroschein, University College London.
- “The Election of Minority Women: Ethnic Parties, Ethnic Seats, and Gender Quotas.” Stephanie S. Holmsten, University of Texas, Austin; Melanie M. Hughes, University of Pittsburgh; and Robert G. Moser, University of Texas at Austin.
- “Party Competition and Election Violence in Constituencies Across the World.” Ursula E. Daxecker, University of Amsterdam and Mike Medeiros, University of Amsterdam.
- “Political Parties, Violent Youth and Electoral Insecurity.” Ghadafi Saibu, University of Bayreuth.
- “Do Rebel Parties Change their Voting Constituencies? A Cross National Study.” John Ishiyama, University of North Texas.
- “Populist Opportunity Structures in Multi-Party Competition.” Tarik Abou-Chadi, University of Zurich; Pablo Barbera, University of Southern California; and Hauke Licht, University of Zurich, Political Science Department.
- “Affective Polarization in Western Multi-party Systems.” Noam Gidron, Hebrew University; James Adams, University of California, Davis; and Will Horne, Princeton University.
- “To Moderate or Not: When New Politics Parties Take on Old Politics Issues.” Jae-Jae Spoon, University of Pittsburgh and Christopher J. Williams, University of Arkansas at Little Rock.
- “Black Women: Keepers of Democracy, Democratic Process & the Democratic Party.” Christina M. Greer, Fordham University; Christine Marie Slaughter, University of California, Los Angeles; and Chaya Crowder, Princeton University.
- “Party Footprints in Africa: Measuring Party Presence with Public Opinion Surveys.” Robert Britt Mattes, University of Strathclyde; Matthias Werner Krönke, University of Cape Town; and Sarah Jane Lockwood, Columbia University.
- “Opposition Party Practices in a Shrinking Civic Space.” Aikande Clement Kwayu, Bumaco Ltd.
- “Revisiting the Origins of the British Labour Party.” Chitrallekha Basu, University of Barcelona; Carles Boix, Princeton University; Jordi Munoz, University of Barcelona; and Sonia Gabriela Giurumescu, University of Barcelona.
- “Building a Party Top-Down and Bottom-Up: The Case of MORENA in Mexico.” Mathias Poertner, Texas A&M University.
- “From Social Network Structures to Political Parties: The Case of Bolivia.” Mariana Giusti-Rodriguez, Naval Postgraduate School.
- “Party-Building Inside-Out: Youth and Women’s Wings in African Opposition Parties.” Keith Weghorst, Vanderbilt University.
- “Building from Scratch? Supply-side Factors in the Success of the AfD.” Marcel Lewandowsky, University of Florida.
- “Far-right Parties in Government.” Kimberly Twist, San Diego State University.
- “Interest Groups and the Legitimacy of Governance.” Anne Rasmussen, University of Copenhagen and Stefanie Reher, University of Strathclyde.
- “Can Political Parties Still Set the Agenda?” Daniel Stevens, University of Exeter; Susan A. Banducci, University of Exeter; Gabriel Katz, IMT Institute for Advanced Studies Lucca; Travis Coan; and Iulia Cioroianu, University of Bath.
- “Club Goods Provision: The Effect of Weak Political Parties on Allocation.” Katherine Marie McKiernan, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- “Minority Party Status and the Decision to Run for Congress.” Jacob Forrest Harrison Smith, Duke University.
- “Economic Shocks, Party Competition and Turnout.” Francesc Amat, IPERG - University of Barcelona and Pablo Beramendi, Duke University.
- “Rethinking the Linkage Between Party Politics and Welfare State Under Populism.” Silvia Fuselli, Johns Hopkins University (SAIS).
- “Quebec Women and the Decline of the Liberal Party.” Evelyne Brie, University of Pennsylvania and Dawn L. Teele, University of Pennsylvania.
- “Rejection of Patriarchalism, Distrust in Government’s Commitment, and Preference for Multiparty Competition in China.” Lianjiang Li, Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- “Crashing the Party? Elites, Outsiders, and Elections.” Peter Buisseret, University of Chicago and Richard Van Weelden, University of Pittsburgh.

- “Boxholm Tea Party: Taxation and Voter Turnout in an Unlikely Setting.” Rasmus Broms, University of Gothenburg.
- “Talking in Slogans: Elite Contention in Communist Public Media.” Yin Yuan.
- “The Selection of Communist Party Membership: Evidence from Identical Twins.” Lin Lin; Junjian Yi, National University of Singapore; and Congyi Zhou, New York University.
- “The Impact of Leaders’ Military Experience on Third Party Military Interventions.” Phoebe Woorim Moon, University of California, Irvine.
- “Like Voters, Like Politicians: Descriptive Representation and Populist Parties.” Emily Anne West, University of Pittsburgh and Maria Carreri, Northwestern University.
- “Competitor Lobbying and Regulatory Oversight.” Benjamin Barber, IE Business School.
- “The Effects of Firms’ Lobbying on Resource Misallocation.” In Song Kim, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- “Market Structure and Conflict of Interests: Inter-Governmental Lobbying.” Yue Hou, University of Pennsylvania and Peichun Wang, Microsoft Research.
- “The Republican Roots of Christian Nationalism.” Paul A. Djupe, Denison University; Andrew R. Lewis, University of Cincinnati; and Anand Edward Sokhey, University of Colorado, Boulder.
- “Interest Group Lobbying and Negative Agenda Setting.” Alex Garlick, The College of New Jersey.
- “A Tale of Asymmetry? Explaining Coalitions between Parties and Interest Groups.” Elin Haugsgjerd Allern, University of Oslo; Vibeke Wøien Hansen, University of Oslo; and David Marshall, University of Reading.
- “Who Gets Heard in Plenary Debates? Median Voter Versus Median Party Supporter.” Pola Lehmann, Berlin Social Science Center.
- “Life, Literacy, and the Pursuit of Prosperity: Party & Policy in the 50 States.” Gerald Gamm, University of Rochester and Thad Kousser, University of California, San Diego.
- “Positive Partisanship: Partisans are Primarily Motivated by In-party Favoritism.” Hye-Yon Lee, University of Pennsylvania and Yphtach Lelkes, University of Pennsylvania.
- “Parliamentarians’ Appeal to Interest Groups: Patterns of Signalling Interest.” Stefanie Bailer, University of Basel.
- “Refoundational Change? Populism against Authoritarian Successor Parties.” Dilara Hekimci, Florida International University.
- “Municipal Populism in Moscow: Local Challenges to Single-Party Dominant Regimes.” Otto Kienitz, University of California, Berkeley and Matthew Stenberg, University of California, Berkeley.
- “Immigration and Party-Line Voting in State Legislatures.” Gary M. Reich, University of Kansas.
- “When do Secularizing Parties Succeed? Cross-national and Historical Analysis.” H. Zeynep Bulutgil, University College London.
- “Fitting Odd Parties In—Parties’ Representational Claims in Coalition Formation.” Alona Dolinsky, Johns Hopkins University.
- “When Do Political Parties Respond to their Fringe Voters?” Werner Krause, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.
- “Candidate Turnover and Party Policy Change in Central and Eastern Europe.” Allan Sikk, University College London and Philipp Koeker, Leibniz University Hannover.
- “Firm Lobbying by Political Regime Type.” David H. Bearce, University of Colorado, Boulder and Megan Roosevelt, Montana State University, Bozeman.
- “Voting, Lobbying, and Trade Policy: A Structural Estimation Framework.” Kishore Gawande, University of Texas at Austin; Pablo Martin Pinto, University Houston; and Santiago Miguel Pinto, Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.
- “Banking for the Public Interest.” Anahí Elisabeth Wiedenbrüg, University of Oxford.
- “Party Movements, Environmental Pollution, and Electoral Systems.” Sven Kosanke, Detlef Jahn, University of Greifswald.
- “Party Positions, Voter Discontent, and Support for Non-Viable Parties.” Robin E. Best, Binghamton University (SUNY).
- “The Contours of Divisions Within Political Parties: Hierarchy or Factions?” Ann-Kristin Koelln, Aarhus University and Jonathan Polk, University of Gothenburg.
- “Keeping it in the Family? Party Cohesion, Disagreement and Voter Perception.” Zachary David Greene, University of Strathclyde.
- “Party Policy Diffusion and Intra-Party Politics.” Mariken van der Velden, Free University Amsterdam.