

The Electorate, the Campaign, and the Office

The Electorate, the Campaign, and the Office

A Unified Approach to Senate and
House Elections

Paul Gronke

The University of Michigan Press

Copyright © by the University of Michigan 2000
All rights reserved
Published in the United States of America by
The University of Michigan Press
Manufactured in the United States of America
∞ Printed on acid-free paper

2004 2003 2002 2001 4 3 2 1

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, or otherwise, without the written permission of the publisher.

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gronke, Paul, 1961–

The electorate, the campaign, and the office. A unified approach
to Senate and House elections. / Paul Gronke.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-000-0000-0 (acid-free paper)

1. United States. Congress—Elections. 2. Voting—United States
 3. United States. Congress—Campaigns. 4. Congress—United States.
- I. Gronke, Paul. II. Title.

JK999.G99 2000

353.001'02—dc20

96-43487

CIP

*To Matthew, Benjamin, Katherine, and Samuel,
who don't care about that "typing" thing I do:
take me, I'm yours!*

Contents

List of Figures	ix
List of Tables	xi
Acknowledgments	xiii
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
2. In Search of a Unified Model of House and Senate Elections	13
3. The Setting: Political “Districts” in the U.S. House and Senate	37
4. The Campaign: Quality Candidates and Campaign Funding	61
5. From Setting to Candidates to Campaigns: Tracing the Causal Chain	87
6. Voters in U.S. Legislative Elections	109
7. Two Institutions, One Choice?	151
Appendixes	
A. Media and Demographic Measures from Chapter 3	165
B. Variable and Model Information for Chapter 5	175
C. Variable Information for Chapter 6	179
References	185
Index	199

Figures

1.1	Ideal type House and Senate differences	7
2.1	Institutions, political settings, campaigns, and the vote	16
3.1	Diversity in racial makeup, states and congressional districts	48
3.2	Variance in education levels, states and congressional districts	49
3.3	Variance in income levels, states and congressional districts	49
3.4	Diversity in occupation, states and congressional districts	50
3.5	Diversity in nationalities, states and congressional districts	50
3.6	Media market dominance of electoral districts	52
3.7	Contiguity of media markets and electoral districts	53
3.8	Per capita advertising costs in electoral districts	54
3.9	Population density in states and congressional districts	54
3.10	Partisan competitiveness in electoral districts, 1982–88	56
3.11	Normal Republican vote in electoral districts, 1982–88	57
4.1	Senate campaign expenditures, 1982–96	74
4.2	House campaign expenditures, 1982–96	74
4.3	Per capita campaign expenditures, 1982–96	77
4.4	Campaign spending for challengers, 1982–96, per capita	78
4.5	Campaign spending for incumbents, 1982–96, per capita	78
6.1	Recall rates across institution and type of race, 1988 and 1990	113
6.2	Likes and dislikes across institution and type of race, 1988	117

Tables

3.1	Demographic characteristics of election districts	46
4.1	Comparison of intensity codings: three sample years	68
4.2	Challenger quality in the Senate and House, 1982–96	70
4.3	Candidate quality in open seat contests, 1982–96	72
4.4	Campaign spending in the Senate and House	76
4.5	Per capita campaign spending in the House and Senate	77
4.6	Open seat spending	80
4.7	Predicting campaign intensity	82
4.8	Spending ratios in the Senate and House	84
5.1	Challengers and diverse districts	96
5.2	Challengers and incumbents	98
5.3	District diversity, incumbents, and challenger quality	99
5.4	Campaign spending, incumbents, and political settings	103
5.5	Changes in incumbent spending: two examples	105
6.1	Recognizing the candidates, 1988–90	115
6.2	Information, district diversity, and district size	118
6.3	Ability to recall candidate names	125
6.4	High-intensity campaigns and candidate recall	127
6.5	Job evaluations of senators and House members	132
6.6	Content of likes and dislikes in the Senate and House	134
6.7	Incumbent vote, pooled and disaggregated models	140
6.8	Likes and dislikes in low- and high-intensity contests	147
A.1	Arbitron TV households and census person counts	169

Tables	xii
A.2 Sample calculations for media market measures	170
A.3 Demographic diversity in election districts: updating Bond	173
C.1 Isolating high-flow campaign environments	181
C.2 Voter choice: defection toward and away from the incumbent	182
C.3 Incumbent vote, no likes and dislikes	183

Acknowledgments

The intellectual background of this work came almost directly out of my year as one of a long line of “data drones” working for the National Elections Studies at the University of Michigan. During those years, I coded the incoming correspondence regarding proposed changes to the survey. The dogged loyalty that scholars had to particular survey items, most often tied to their specific research agendas, was a source of frustration to me then. I am a lot more understanding now! Still, the dichotomy between scholarly training that preached breadth and generalizability and a job that emphasized narrowness and specificity encouraged me think about broader theories of electoral behavior.

Near the end of my time at the NES, these ideas crystallized as I worked closely with Steven Rosenstone, now Dean of the Social Sciences at the University of Minnesota but then one of the co-directors of the National Election Study, and Santa Traugott, then study director of the NES, on the the National Science Foundation proposal for funding the complete Senate Election Study (the 1988 cycle had ended successfully). The writing, rewriting, fact-checking, endless bibliography reviews, and many conversations with Steve and Santa helped me focus on Senate/House comparisons as one route to a general theory. Both Steve and Santa were tremendously helpful during this final period of my graduate career.

Since then, I have been lucky enough to meet many colleagues who have thought about these issues and influenced my research. The most direct influence would be the person I replaced at Duke University and only know as a distant colleague, David Canon. David’s book on candidate emergence and his willingness to share ideas and data were invaluable. I also need to thank my colleagues at Duke, the University of Michigan, and around the country. They listened to my rambling thoughts and reacted to my written work. These friends and colleagues include John Aldrich, Mike Alvarez, Bill Bianco, John Brehm, David Canon, Richard Fenno, Jim Garand, Dave King, Phil Paolino, Pat Sellers, Santa and Mike Traugott, Matt Wilson, and Gerald Wright. Sooner or later, the National Science Foundation will assist the Legislative Studies Section of the American Political Science Association to establish a data archive and web server for the exchange of information. I am indebted for the gracious assistance from Tom Brunell, Gary Jacobson, John Krasno, Tom Palfrey, and especially David Canon. I’ve tried to reciprocate

by sharing my own data when the inevitable and seemingly unending requests have flowed in. Ross Baker, Bill Bianco, Paul Herrnson, Charles Stewart, and two anonymous reviewers commented on earlier drafts of this book. Special thanks go out to Steven Rosenstone, Donald Kinder, Vincent Price, and John Kingdon for guidance and to my friends for all their understanding and confidence.

I don't think I could have completed graduate school without the friendship and of my two longtime drinking buddies, John Brehm, my compatriot as a graduate student at the University of Michigan, coworker and Scrabble maven at the National Election Studies, and now a colleague at Duke University, and Alex Grist, wherever you are. They helped me through a difficult period of my life, and I'll be forever grateful.

This book would not have been possible without financial support from the Duke University Arts and Science Research Council, the Gerald R. Ford Dissertation Fellowship, the Horace H. Rackham Dissertation Fellowship, and the continued patience of the faculty of the Department of Political Science and the administration at Duke University.

Chuck Myers, past editor at the University of Michigan Press, was a godsend. I wish him luck at Princeton. The staff at Michigan has been helpful. Brad Gomez provided research assistance near the end of the project. Carrie Liken and John Rattliff assisted me in the tedious task of responding to the copy editor at Michigan.

Some of the data utilized in this research were made available (in part) by the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research. Neither the collector of the original data nor the consortium bear any responsibility for the analysis or interpretations presented here.

Finally, my academic career would never have continued without the unflagging support, patience, and love given unselfishly by Karin Purdy. Let's make our dreams come true, together.