The Center Page

News from the Centennial Center

As a result of generous contributions by Association members and friends to the Centennial Campaign, APSA created nine endowments to support a diverse range of grant programs to encourage individual research and writing in all fields of political science and to facilitate collaboration among scholars working within the discipline and across the social and behavioral sciences and humanities. More details on the Centennial Center, these endowments, and application requirements visit center@apsanet.org.

Fund for Latino Scholarship provides support to individuals or programs that promote the recruitment, retention, and promotion of Latino and Latina political scientists.

Warren E. Miller Fellowship in Electoral Politics provides supplemental support for research residencies in national and comparative electoral politics at the Centennial Center.

Special Fund for the Study of Women and Politics provides supplemental support for the study of women and politics to both resident and non-resident scholars.

The Presidency Research Fund provides supplemental support for the examination of the presidency for both resident and non-resident scholars.

Marguerite Ross Barnett Fund supports research on issues of diversity, cultural nationalism, African-American voting behavior, educational policy, and urban and minority politics for resident or non-resident scholars.

Rita Mae Kelly Fund supports research on the intersection of gender, race, ethnicity, and political power.

Paul Volcker Endowment provides support in research and theory building on public administration issues affecting governance in the U.S. and abroad for resident or non-resident scholars.

Huang Hsing Foundation Chun-tu Hsueh Fellowship for International Scholars provides supplemental support for Centennial Center residencies by international scholars, especially those from the People's Republic of China.

In 2011, the Centennial Center hosted 22 political scientists of whom five provided their own external funding, and three were nonresident. The draw on individual endowments was uneven. The Warren E. Miller Fellowship in Electoral Politics that provides supplemental support for research in national and comparative electoral politics at the center was the most popular, followed by the Rita Mae Kelly Fund that supports research on the intersection of gender, race, ethnicity, and political power, and the Special Fund for the Study of Women and Politics.

Funds are used in several ways. Two recent examples follow.

PROFILES

Thomas T. Holyoke



A veteran of two previous residencies at the APSA Centennial Center for Political Science and Public Policy, associate professor Thomas T. Holyoke of the department of political science at California State University, Fresno, spent October 2012 interviewing lobbyists and congressional staff to learn more about how electronic participation influences advocacy. His research is for an undergraduate textbook on interest groups and lobbying, including the degree to which they use the Internet and social media to lobby Congress. He has already carved out an in-depth expertise on the subject of interest groups and lobbying. His most recent publication is *Competitive Interests: Competition and Compromise in American Interest Group Politics* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press 2011).

Borrowing liberally from the proposal he submitted to the Centennial Center, Tom asks: Has lobbying by organized interest groups for political influence changed over the last decade and a half as new technology has made it easier to directly connect group members to their elected and appointed officials? Or, how does a group's organizational structure and degree of member participation shape the strategies its lobbyists use in the twenty-first century? Interest groups have been increasing in number and ideological diversity since the 1960s and are playing more important roles in elections, lawmaking, and administration. Indeed, membership in interest groups appears to be the one form of political participation that is steadily growing, even as political party membership and voter turnout stagnates. A 2008 survey by Zogby found that approximately 68% of all Americans are members of at least one organization engaged in some form of political advocacy, and through these organizations they are brought into contact with their congressional representatives. Many are using the Internet and social media to revolutionize lobbying, connecting members to their elected officials more frequently than ever before.

How technology, and the increase in group member participation it appears to have helped stimulate, has shaped twenty-first century advocacy strategy has been noted in various think-tank reports. These reports, however, simply document the increase rather than explain why it is occurring, how it has

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096512001692 Published online by Cambridge University Press

changed interest group lobbying (if it has), and how it may even have changed the sometimes strained relationship between lobbyists and the members they represent. Are group leaders using the Internet and social media to keep members better informed and push them more frequently for political advocacy? Does it increase informed contact with elected officials because group members are more informed, or is it just a new way to send more identical messages (more Astroturf advocacy) to the already cluttered electronic inboxes of lawmakers? And why are many organizations *not* using online technology?

As Holyoke notes, these are not trivial questions. Not only does the Internet make grassroots advocacy easier, it may also make it easier for members to independently track issues important to them and keep tabs on their representative interest groups. In the past, members were heavily dependent on their organization for information on Washington, DC, and this gave group leaders a tool by which they could exert control over their members. Today, the tables *may* be reversed and the ease of acquiring information, for those who bother to do so, may force lobbyists to spend more time justifying their actions to members. Scholars have repeatedly shown that how a group is organized, and how actively its members participate, can constrain how their lobbyists engage in the business of advocacy and the extent to which they can make political compromises. Does more information and visibility lead to better representation and more informed citizens (at least those in interest groups)?

The best way to understand what all of the new survey and think-tank research on Internet lobbying means for interest group advocacy is to get first-hand accounts from those on both the delivering and receiving ends. During his stay at the Center in October 2012, Holyoke conducted a number of semi-structured elite interviews with lobbyists where the primary topic discussed was how lobbyists are using the Internet to inform and motivate their members and how they have used it successfully in their advocacy. He followed this up by asking congressional legislative staff about whether they feel it has significantly increased the quantity of contacts as well as their quality (personalized arguments rather than duplicative statements).

Last year we discovered an important synergy between the APSA Centennial Center scholars and the 2011–12 class of APSA Congressional Fellows. We organized four separate lunch discussions in which the scholars presented their research to date and the fellows interacted with questions and benefitted from the substance. Unfortunately, Tom Holyoke left the Center at the end of October but, drawing on fellowship alumni in the area, the current class of foreign affairs fellows and their graduate school colleagues in the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies two-month foreign affairs seminar, APSA staff and other invited guests, the center and the congressional fellowship program co-sponsored an October 23, 2012 research discussion with Tom at the newly renovated APSA conference facility. The opportunity also gave APSA a chance to film Tom's talk for online posting and to post a note on the association's social sites as well (APSA twitter account, Facebook, and LinkedIn). ■

Caitlin Harrington Lee

Caitlin Lee's early educational background was similar to many other APSA Centennial Center scholars with a BA summa cum laude in political science and an MA in Security Studies, with honors, from Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. From there she took a less-traditional path. As Ms. Lee wrote in her application letter, "I have chosen to undertake my doctoral research as a distance-learning student in the MPhil/PhD program in the War Studies Department at King's College in London. I chose this nontraditional route because of my deep interest in the preparation for and conduct of war based on my work [ten years] as a journalist at *Jane's Defence Weekly* [and Senior Reporter, Homeland Security for *Congressional Quarterly*], and because the War Studies Department's new distance learning program has allowed me to complete my dissertation while meeting my traveling responsibilities as a military spouse (her husband is Major Jarrett S. Lee, USAF, currently deployed in Afghanistan)…. I am eager to learn from colleagues immersed in political science research methods and international relations theory, which are the fundamental building blocks for my dissertation research. In return, I would hope to contribute what I am learning about military culture, technology, and the realities of the battlefield as I research and write my dissertation on the US Air Force's R/MQ-1 Predator unmanned aircraft program."



As Lee noted in her research proposal for the center, observers often cite the role of technology in fomenting military innovation, a crucial variable in explaining states' victory or defeat in war. But few studies have explored the role of organizational culture in mediating what states decide to do with new technology. Her dissertation examines the role of organizational culture in military innovation through a qualitative study of the United

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096512001692 Published online by Cambridge University Press

States Air Force's (USAF's) development, adoption, and employment of unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) technology during 1995 to 2011. Drawing on primary documents and interviews, she plans to test competing explanations of military innovation to expand our understanding of technology, organizational politics and culture, and the external threat environment in this process.

Her research focuses on the Air Force's R/MQ-1 Predator UAV to explore how the USAF has responded to the challenges and opportunities presented by unmanned aircraft technology. With the delivery of the last MQ-1 Predator aircraft to the USAF in March 2011, the UAV has become the first UAV in history to complete all three stages of weapon system innovation, including development, adoption, and operational use. A new research opportunity has emerged to examine a UAV program as a complete analytical unit with a beginning, middle, and end. At the same time, the history of the R/MQ-1 Predator is still fresh enough to allow the possibility of conducting a variety of interviews with individuals who were directly involved in the program. Lee intends to seize on this data-rich opportunity to explore why and how the USAF pursued the widespread deployment and weaponization of the R/MQ-1 Predator, and whether the USAF's approach to the Predator UAV offers any policy lessons for UAV innovation in the future.

Her hypothesis is that the organizational culture of the USAF acted as a powerful shaping force in USAF decision-making about the Predator program that rivaled the influence of other internal and external influences. Her research will explore the possibility that several conflicting cultural traits within the USAF acted at times to both enable and constrain the USAF's capacity to integrate the R/MQ-1 Predator. For example, it is possible that USAF culture may have held back the Predator program because of a legacy built around manned flight and traditional pilots who see unmanned technology as a threat to their way of doing business. Conversely, it is also possible that USAF culture may have facilitated R/MQ-1 Predator innovation due to a culturally engrained affinity for technological innovation, regardless of the type, that stems from the idea that technology provides a way to make airpower more efficient and effective versus other means of military power.

During her time at the Centennial Center, Lee will pursue two research activities. First, she plans to capitalize on Washington-based archival and library resources at the National Air and Space Museum, Office of Air Force History at Bolling Air Force Base, the Office of the USAF Chief Historian at the Pentagon, and the Pentagon library. She also will use her time at the APSA Centennial Center to conduct interviews for a series of case studies.

As a Pentagon recommender, and one of her professors at Georgetown noted, Lee's dissertation topic is highly relevant to the continued development of US military capabilities. UAVs are playing increasingly important roles in joint military operations and the technology supporting them is evolving rapidly, so that decision makers will face complex decisions about how much autonomy to build into future UAV systems. And the broader question of how to foster innovation within large institutions is one of enduring interest.

Lee is currently scheduled to present her Centennial Center research findings to date over a brown-bag lunch with this year's 2012–2013 APSA Congressional Fellows during their orientation and other guests at the newly renovated APSA conference center. ■

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096512001692 Published online by Cambridge University Press