2013 APSA Awards

Recognizing excellence in the profession is one of the most important activities of APSA. The following awards were announced in August 2013 and presented to these awardees during the APSA Annual Meeting at the Awards Ceremony August 29, 2013, in Chicago, Illinois.

CAREER AWARDS

Frank J. Goodnow Award

The Goodnow Award recognizes distinguished service to the profession and the association, not necessarily a career of scholarship. This service may be by individuals, groups, and public and private organizations who have played a role in the development of the political science profession and the building of American Political Science Association.

Award Committee: Erik S. Herron, National Science Foundation; Michael B. Preston, University of Southern California; Elizabeth Theiss-Morse, University of Nebraska, Lincoln (Chair)

Recipient: **Michael A. Brintnall**, American Political Science Association

Citation: Michael Brintnall's service as executive director of the American Political Science Association for over 10 years exemplifies the high level of dedication and commitment to the profession the Frank J. Goodnow Award is intended to honor. Michael received his PhD in political science from MIT in 1976, was on the faculty at Brown University and Mount Vernon College, served as the executive director of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, and worked in the national office of the APSA from 1990 to 1996 and became executive director in 2002. He has worked tirelessly on behalf of the profession, has exhibited true leadership, and, to quote one of his nominators, "has been indefatigable in the cause of the APSA." His efforts to professionalize the national office, to make the organization financially solvent, and to defend the organization and the profession from detractors have significantly strengthened the APSA and the profession.

Michael's first Executive Director's Report in 2002 highlighted three areas he wanted to develop within the APSA: (1) improving support for teaching; (2) doing more to support and engage academic departments in APSA procedures; and (3) doing more in the international arena. Michael has done an incredible job in all three areas. His emphasis on teaching and learning and the related programs he instituted truly stand out as major accomplishments. One such program is the Teaching and Learning Conference (TLC) held each year to bring teachers of political science together to discuss issues related to pedagogy and curriculum and to share research on teaching. To quote the TLC's web page, the APSA "strives to promote greater understanding of cutting-edge approaches, techniques, and methodologies for the political science classroom" and brings scholars together "to share effective and innovative teaching and learning models." The first TLC had about 40 participants. The most recent TLC, celebrating its 10th anniversary, had over 300 participants from all over the world addressing such topics as assessment, graduate education, teaching in a community college, and internationalizing the curriculum. The APSA under Michael has also stepped up its recognition of excellence in teaching, made available resources for teachers (including publications on civic engagement and assessment), and supported the publication from the Political Science Education section of a journal, the *Journal of Political Science Education*. This emphasis on teaching and learning, as one nominator wrote, "has brought back to the association hundreds of members who felt left out by the APSA and has reached out to new constituencies and new members from primarily undergraduate institutions." As another nominator wrote, "a more diverse group of faculty … have found a home in the APSA and we are better for it." The emphasis on teaching and learning and the broadening of the association's base are extremely important for the future of the APSA and Michael's efforts on their behalf cannot be understated.

Michael has also been devoted to increasing the resources available to departments, including supporting the annual workshop for department chairs and the publications that help chairs better perform their duties. About 700 departments participate in the Departmental Services Program and Michael has been unstinting in his efforts to reach out to departments. He has also been unstinting in his efforts to make the APSA a truly international organization, gaining a name for itself not just in the United States but around the world. The APSA has more international members than ever before and is widely regarded as a top academic organization.

Michael's service to the APSA has been exemplary. He has strengthened the organization during his directorship through his good judgment, his willingness to consult with a wide range

Recipient: **Howard J. Silver**, Consortium of Social Science Associations

Citation: Howard Silver has advocated tirelessly for the social sciences over the past 25 years in his position as executive director of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA). His work on behalf of the social sciences in general and political science in particular makes him highly deserving of winning the Frank J. Goodnow Award. Howard received his PhD in political science in 1975 from The Ohio State University and worked as a consultant, a campaign manager, and a legislative analyst. Howard has been the chair of the Coalition for National Science Funding, a member of the 2010 Census Advisory Committee, a co-founder of the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Systems, the president of the National Capital Area Political Science Association, and a council member for the American Political Science Association. His work at COSSA, however, that truly

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

© American Political Science Association, 2013

exemplifies his commitment to building our profession. Howard began working for COSSA in 1983 as its Associate Director for Government Relations prior to becoming its Executive Director in 1988.

Howard has been central to COSSA's success in two major areas: (1) advocating for and trying to protect government funding for the social sciences; and (2) promoting the value of social science research to those both in and outside of government. COSSA has been at the forefront lobbying for social science funding within the federal government, including working to sustain funding for the social sciences at the National Science Foundation and creating an office of behavioral science at the National Institutes of Health. Along these lines, Howard was instrumental in helping retain funding for the American National Election Studies. He has also worked through COSSA to inform people in Congress and in the federal bureaucracy about the value of political and social science research for understanding key issues facing the nation and the world. As one nominator wrote, Howard has "been our loudest voice in Washington in advocating governmental support for the social sciences and for acknowledging its important role in advancing the health of our society and our democracy."

Much of Howard's success comes from his ability to build networks. One network involves the members of COSSA, which is made up of 18 governing members (including the APSA), 23 membership organization, 57 universities, and 12 centers and institutes. This highly interdisciplinary network covers economics, history, communication studies, criminal justice, psychology, sociology, and many other disciplines. Bringing together these disparate organizations to work on behalf of the social sciences as a whole (and thereby overcoming the collective action problem) is a daunting task, but Howard has done so in a way that is an enormous benefit to the social sciences. The second network involves people in government, specifically members of Congress, congressional staff, and people working in the bureaucracy. Howard has been able to develop strong allies within the government and a reputation for thoughtfulness and fair-mindedness, both of which give him much needed access in Washington.

Howard's work has made COSSA "an indispensable Washington player" and he "has been its workaholic, deft, and inspired on-the-scenes leader." He has done all of this work on behalf of the profession while drawing little attention to himself. The Goodnow Award allows us to recognize in a very public way all he has done and to show our deep appreciation for his accomplishments on our behalf.

John Gaus Award and Lectureship

The John Gaus Lecture honors the recipient's lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration and to recognize achievement and encourage scholarship in public administration.

Award Committee: Jerrell D. Coggburn, North Carolina State University (Chair); Andrew Sancton, University of Western Ontario; Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, University of Utah

Recipient: **Robert F. Durant**, American University

Citation: The American Political Science Association (APSA) is proud to confer the 2013 John Gaus Award upon Professor Robert F. Durant to honor his "lifetime of exemplary scholarship in the joint tradition of political science and public administration." Professor Durant, of the Department of Public Administration and Policy in American University's School of Public Affairs, has made important contributions to multiple streams of public administration and political science literature, but his work on the administrative presidency and environmental governance are particularly noteworthy. As stated in his nomination letter, Professor Durant's "work on the administrative presidency integrates research on political behavior, organization theory, and social psychology to produce a truly interdisciplinary approach to understanding how presidents act as administrators. His work on environmental governance draws from seemingly disparate literatures to shape our understanding of a policy area that sits at the nexus of the natural and social sciences." Professor Durant has authored or co-authored seven books and more than 100 articles and book chapters. His scholarship has appeared in leading public administration and political science outlets and has been recognized with best article awards from *Public Administration Review, American Review of Public Administration*, and *Policy Studies Journal* as well as outstanding book awards from the American Political Science Association, American Society for Public Administration, and the Academy of Management. An elected fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration, Professor Durant has also received the American Society for Public Administration's Dwight Waldo Award (2012) for distinguished scholarly contributions over an extended career and the ASPA/NASPAA Charles H. Levine Memorial Award (2003) for Excellence in Public Administration Research, Teaching, and Service. Professor Durant's prolific record of scholarly achievement, sustained for over 30 years in academia, epitomizes the lifetime of exemplary scholarship envisaged by APSA for the John Gaus Distinguished Lecturer Award.

Hubert H. Humphrey Award

The Hubert H. Humphrey Award is in recognition of notable public service by a political scientist.

Award Committee: Danielle Allen, Institute for Advanced Study; Mary Hawkesworth, Rutgers University, New Brunswick (Chair); Darrell M. West, The Brookings Institution

Recipient: **Susan E. Rice**, Executive Office of the President

Citation: Susan Rice is currently serving as national security advisor to the President. She was formerly the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations and a member of President Obama's Cabinet. Susan E. Rice has earned a reputation for constructive negotiation in the midst of intractable conflict. She has played key peacebuilding roles in post-genocide Rwanda, Uganda, Ethiopia, Sudan, Sierra Leone, Libya, and Cote D'Ivoire. As a member of the National Security Council staff, she served as the Director for International Organizations and Peacekeeping from 1993 to01995. She subsequently served as Special Assistant to President William J. Clinton and Senior Director for African Affairs at the National Security Council at the White House, 1995–1997. As the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs from 1997–2001, Ambassador Rice developed and implemented U.S. policy for 48 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and oversaw the management of 43 U.S. Embassies and more than 5,000 U.S. and Foreign Service national employees. In 2000, Ambassador Rice was

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001273 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013

co-recipient of the White House's 2000 Samuel Nelson Drew Memorial Award for distinguished contributions to the formation of peaceful, cooperative relationships between states. From 2002 to 2009, Susan Rice served as Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, where she specialized in foreign policy pertaining to weak and failing states. She was particularly concerned with growing global poverty as a threat to security. Attuned to the messiness and complexity of "borderless problems" such as terrorism, climate change, and poverty, Dr. Rice has sought multilateral strategies among antagonistic factions. In an interview with *New Republic* (December 31, 2012), she noted, "You have to deal with those countries as you find them. We don't get, in every instance, to have the governments of our choosing." Under Ambassador Rice's leadership, the U.S. Mission to the United Nations has secured the stiffest UN sanctions ever against Iran and North Korea, unprecedented action to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and materials, support for life-saving interventions in Libya and Cote d'Ivoire, cooperation on the referendum for independence in Southern Sudan, vital UN assistance in Afghanistan and Iraq, and initial progress on reform of the UN Human Rights Council. Elected to Phi Beta Kappa at Stanford University, Ambassador Rice has been a Truman Scholar and a Rhodes Scholar. She completed her M. Phil and D. Phil at New College, Oxford University. Her dissertation, Commonwealth Initiative in Zimbabwe, 1979–1980: Implication for International Peacekeeping, won the Chatham House-British International Studies Association Award for most distinguished dissertation in international relations.

Benjamin E. Lippincott Award

The Benjamin E. Lippincott Award recognizes a work of exceptional quality by a living political theorist that is considered significant after a time of at least 15 years since the original date of publication. Supported by the University of Minnesota. The award is biennial.

Award Committee: Jeffrey Abramson, University of Texas, Austin (Chair); Jill Frank, University of South Carolina; Michael Neblo, Ohio State University

Recipient: **Charles Taylor**, McGill University

Title: Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity

Citation: Published originally in 1989, *Sources of the Self* remains a widely read, deeply influential, and probing examination of what is by any judgment an issue at the center of political theory—what does it mean to be a self? Taylor set out to show that selfhood has a history, that it is possible to trace the modern evolution of our sense of self, and its moral and political consequences. Taylor argued in large part that modern identity, by divorcing or disengaging selfhood from the question of what it means to have a concept of the good, is sometimes impoverished and unanchored from the search for meaning in the world. By subjecting the question of identity to historical analysis, but also by engaging in an exercise of philosophical anthropology—trying to unearth and reconstruct prior and competing conceptions of selfhood—*Sources of the Self* succeeded in illumining pervasive features of modern political cultures and of our attempts to understand those cultures. *Sources of the Self* is part of an overall body of work that has made Charles Taylor a widely acclaimed political theorist who has contributed to the study of political science beyond the usual field subdivisions. In addition to *Sources of the Self*, the Taylor oeuvre includes *Hegel* (1975), *Hegel and Modern Society* (1979), *Philosophy and the Human Sciences* (2 vols., 1985), *The Ethics of Authenticity* (1992), *Varieties of Religion Today: William James Revisited* (2002), *Modern Social Imaginaries* (2004), *A Secular Age* (2007), as well as numerous edited volumes, published lectures, and articles on political directions for Canada, religious identity and political community, multiculturalism, and the politics of recognition. The study of political thought aims to connect the political present to its historical past and its moral future. Professor Taylor's writings are enduring and fresh examples of political theory at its finest. It is a distinct pleasure for the members of the 2013 Lippincott Prize committee to present Charles Taylor with this long overdue award.

Carey McWilliams Award

The Carey McWilliams Award honors a major journalistic contribution to our understanding of politics.

Award Committee: Victoria Maria DeFrancesco Soto, University of Texas, Austin; Forrest Maltzman, George Washington University; Susan McWilliams, Pomona College (Chair)

Recipient: **Ezra Klein**, *The Washington Post*

Citation: In 2003, Ezra Klein started his first blog, and in only a decade he has become one of the most important and independent-minded journalists on the American political scene. His Wonkblog is generally regarded as the most successful feature of *The Washington Post's* online edition, and he writes frequent columns for the print edition of that newspaper. His work regularly appears in *The American Prospect*, *Bloomberg View*, *The New Yorker*. A commentator and occasional host on MSNBC, Klein has also appeared on shows such as *Charlie Rose*, *The Colbert Report*, *The McLaughlin Group*, and R*eal Time with Bill Maher*. For his thoughtful, provocative, and wide-ranging contributions to the national political discourse, we are pleased to name him as the winner of the 2013 Carey McWilliams Award.

Like McWilliams, the longtime *Nation* editor who wrote about a wide range of social and policy subjects, Klein writes ably about a wide range of political issues, attentive both to the small-scale details of particular policies and the large-scale dynamics of American society. Also like McWilliams, Klein insists on teaching his readers how government actually works, focusing on system- and institutional-level analyses rather than on episodic coverage of individual personalities and interpersonal dramas.

As many have testified, Klein has a particular talent for writing about complex and arcane policy debates in ways that are both accessible to laypeople and interesting to political scholars. This talent served him particularly well in illuminating the debates surrounding the Affordable Care Act, and in 2010, Klein was named Blogger of the Year by both *The Week* magazine and the Sidney Hillman Foundation for his writing about health-care politics in the United States. Klein brings a distinct personality and voice to all of his writing, and he often says things that other journalists are loath to say. In so doing, he evinces the independence (and often the irreverence) that make for good political journalism—and journalism that is very much in the tradition of Carey McWilliams and this award.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001273 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013

Charles E. Merriam Award

The Charles E. Merriam Award is given to a person whose published work and career represents a significant contribution to the art of government through application of social science research. The award is biennial.

Award Committee: Linda L. Fowler, Dartmouth College; Amy Gutmann, University of Pennsylvania (Chair); John Mark Hansen, University of Chicago

Recipient: **Kathryn Sikkink**, University of Minnesota

Citation: Kathryn Sikkink is a scholar of international human rights and an award-winning writer and teacher with a deep knowledge of the work of activists in promoting justice in Latin America, Europe, and Africa, and a lifetime of involvement in international networks that hold despotic leaders accountable. Translations of her work into Spanish, Chinese, and Arabic have extended the reach of her ideas around the globe. Sikkink's most influential works include *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (1998), co-authored with Margaret Keck, and *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions are Changing World Politics* (2011). Both convey a powerful message about the potential for citizens to hold leaders accountable, even under the worst circumstances. In Sikkink's analyses, efforts to promote human rights are not merely "feel-good" exercises but have significant impact on the behavior of international actors. Alliances among advocates, for example, have reached across frontiers to promote women's suffrage, advocate environmental justice, and combat slavery. Similarly, they have diffused norms of bodily integrity across the globe to establish a basic standard against which to evaluate the conduct of autocratic leaders. Over time, then, the activities of networks of activists have strengthened the rule of law in emerging democracies and created the conditions for prosecutions that have increased the probability of punishment for despots. Noted one reviewer of *The Justice Cascade*, as prosecutions of former leaders with abysmal records on human rights become the norm, "violators are left with few places to run." Throughout her career, Sikkink has built bridges between academic scholarship and human rights practitioners, and as a teacher, she has mentored her students to lead impactful lives and do research that makes a positive difference in the world. Sikkink's research not only has brought the influence of new types of international actors and values into the mainstream of scholarship, it has also highlighted successful strategies for targeting NGOs and nation states to bring about greater respect for human rights. In this regard, Sikkink brings a shadowy world of torture and violence into the light and shows its victims two things: that they are not alone and that others have succeeded in obtaining justice.

Ithiel deSola Pool Award and Lectureship

The Ithiel deSola Pool Lecture is given by a scholar selected to explore the implications of research on issues of politics in a global society, evoking the broad range of scholarship pursued by Ithiel deSola Pool.

Award Committee: James N. Druckman, Northwestern University (Chair); Stephen J. Farnsworth, University of Mary Washington; Melissa Nobles, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Recipient: **Arthur Lupia**, University of Michigan

Citation: Professor Lupia truly captures a range of scholarship, nearly unparalleled in the discipline. While he may be best known for his widely cited and influential work on information and public opinion formation, he also has made fundamental contributions to the study of institutions (e.g., referenda, legislatures), comparative politics (e.g., coalition formation, duration), international relations (EU relations), and methodology (e.g., the use of experiments and surveys). Indeed, these contributions have led to a near unprecedented amount of recognition including (for example) the National Academy of Sciences Award for Initiatives in Research (he is the only political scientist to have ever won the award), election to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the receipt of the Warren Mitofsky Innovators' Award, and the receipt of a Guggenheim fellowship. His work also stands out insofar as he combines the logical rigor of formal models with the empirical realism of psychologically oriented work. By so doing, he has made substantial progress towards combining the long discussed divide between economic and psychological approaches in political science. Perhaps of equal, if not greater, importance is the collective benefits that Professor Lupia has provided to the social sciences. This includes being the co-founder of Time-sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS), being the co-PI of the American National Election Studies (ANES) (where he helped to implement fundamental changes such as the on-line commons), acting as an initial and continuing contributor to the Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models summer program, and playing an active role in the APSA (e.g., serving on the Governing Council and as Treasurer). Moreover, he has served as the political science liaison to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, as well as other organizations. In sum, Professor Lupia's scholarship and service wonderfully captures that which was inspired by the remarkable contributions of Professor de Sola Pool.

Distinguished Teaching Award

The Distinguished Teaching Award honors outstanding contributions to undergraduate and graduate teaching of political science at two- and four-year, and graduate level, institutions. It may recognize a series of contributions spanning several years or an entire career, or a single project of exceptional impact.

Award Committee: Jay Barth, Hendrix College; Mary Fainsod Katzenstein, Cornell University (Chair); Richard G. Niemi, University of Rochester

Recipient: **John E. Seery**, Pomona College

Citation: This is the second year in which the American Political Science Association has conferred an association-wide award for distinguished teaching. It is an honor for this year's committee to recognize John Evan Seery, Professor of Politics at Pomona College, as the 2013 APSA Distinguished Teaching Awardee. Even among this exceptional group of nominees, John Seery's teaching career stands out as monumental. Professor Seery is the consummate teacher no less in his writing than in the classroom. In his book, *America Goes to College*, he advocates for the liberal arts in general and for political theory in particular as fundamental to the exploration of ideas, the discovery of community, and the sustenance of intellectual conversation. In the classroom, his students and colleagues testify, he reconnoiters among the most challenging thinkers of both

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001273 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013

ancient and modern times, he exemplifies the listening required of true intellectual community, and he leaves students voracious for more.

At Pomona College, Professor Seery's courses are in unrelenting demand. His students, many of whom are now recognized political scientists or political theorists in their own right, speak of the transformative impact his teaching has had on their intellectual careers. Even as he has exemplifies what it means to be a brilliant teacher and conscientious citizen in a liberal arts setting, he has also been a prolific author and editor of numerous and widely acclaimed books. It is of little wonder that an abundance of awards have already been bestowed on Professor Seery: Twice the Wig Distinguished Teaching Award at Pomona, the Phi Beta Kappa Sidney Hook Memorial Award and many other student-conferred honors.

BOOK AWARDS

Ralph J. Bunche Award

The Ralph J. Bunche Award is for the best scholarly work in political science published in the previous calendar year which explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Award Committee: Stefanie Chambers, Trinity College; Kim Geron, California State University, East Bay; Mark Q. Sawyer, University of California, Los Angeles (Chair)

Recipients: **Lisa Garcia Bedolla**, University of California, Berkeley, and **Melissa R. Michelson**, Menlo College

Title: Mobilizing Inclusion: Transforming the Electorate through Get-Out-the Vote Campaigns, Yale University Press

Recipient: **Otto Santa Ana**, University of California, Los Angeles

Title: Juan in a Hundred: Representations of Latinos on the Network News, University of Texas Press

Citation: In *Mobilizing Inclusion* Garcia Bedolla and Michelson explore which get-out-the-vote efforts are successful in organizing electoral turnout in ethnoracial communities. Through the study of hundreds of get-out-the-vote (GOTV) efforts in California in 2006–2008 they analyzed the approaches and tactics employed by several nonpartisan community based voter mobilization organizations to turn out ethnic and racial communities using both indirect methods and direct contact with potential voters. In this book, they develop a theoretical frame, the Sociocultural Cognition Model of voting behavior, to more deeply understand and explain the effectiveness of these targeted GOTV efforts. Using this model, they analyzed GOTV efforts by the method utilized and the election type. Combining both a large number of field experiments and qualitative field observations they found efforts to personally contact potential voters in native languages increased turnout. They explain the results with their model of voting behavior that describes the cognitive and sociocultural processes involved and explains under what circumstances these sociocultural interactions impact on the behavior of the electorate, many of whom are new to voting or are not high propensity voters. Their analysis shows that once voters are moved to vote, they are likely to continue to vote. This increase in political engagement by ethnoracial communities will lead to an expansion of the American electorate. *Mobilizing Inclusion* is groundbreaking in demonstrating that sociocultural context matters to understand political behavior, particularly in low-income ethnoracial communities. Garcia Bedolla and Michelson are to be commended for working closely with many communities of color to extract the data and lessons from these important voter mobilization efforts that will be critical as voting rights are coming under increasing attack. This work is an outstanding example of combining theory and practical politics and is worthy of recognition for the Ralph J. Bunche Award in 2013.

Citation: In *Juan in a Hundred* Santa Ana explores the coverage of Latinos in the news and finds while they were 15% of the nation's population, only 1% of network news coverage during 2004 dealt with Latinos as the focus of a story. More disturbing is only that of the few stories that were aired about Latinos, most were negative and perpetuated stereotypes of Latinos in the content or tone. Santa Ana completed a comprehensive study by using quantitative research combined with semiotic readings and applied cognitive science and humanist theory to explain the implications of this peripheral and negative coverage of Latinos in the news. The choice of network evening news was the foundation for this research study. This medium is the most authoritative and influential source of opinion generating content in the news industry, but, unfortunately, Santa Ana's comprehensive review of a year of network news stories demonstrated reporting about Latinos was also non-existent and that nothing has changed in the past 15 years. The limited number of stories and the skewing and topic limitation lead to viewers maintaining racial stereotypes. *Juan in a Hundred* is a sophisticated and detailed study of television news program and the myths that are created through distorted mass communication. This book is an important work and is highly deserving of the Ralph J. Bunche Award for scholarship that explores the phenomenon of ethnic and cultural pluralism. Latinos constitute the fastest-growing and largest ethnic minority in the United States, yet less than one percent of network news coverage deals with Latinos as the focus of a story. Out of that one percent, even fewer stories are positive in either content or tone. Author of the acclaimed *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse*, Otto Santa Ana has completed a comprehensive analysis of this situation, blending quantitative research with semiotic readings and ultimately applying cognitive science and humanist theory to explain the repercussions of this peripheral, negative coverage.

Santa Ana's choice of network evening news as the foundation for *Juan in a Hundred* is significant because that medium is currently the single most authoritative and influential source of opinion-generating content. In his 2004 research, Santa Ana calculated that among approximately 12,000 stories airing across four networks (ABC, CBS, CNN, NBC), only 118 dealt with Latinos, a ratio that has remained stagnant over the past fifteen years. Examining the content of the stories, from briefs to features, reveals that Latino-tagged events are apparently only broadcast when national politics or human calamity are involved, and even then, the Latino issue is often tangential to a news story as a whole. On global events involving Latin America, U.S. networks often remain silent while BBC correspondents prepare fully developed, humanizing coverage. The book concludes by demonstrating how this obscurity and misinformation perpetuate maligned perceptions about Latinos. Santa Ana's inspiring calls for reform are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001273 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013

poised to change the face of network news in America.

Gladys M. Kammerer Award

The Gladys M. Kammerer Award is for the best political science publication in the previous calendar year in the field of US national policy.

Award Committee: Lonna Rae Atkeson, University of New Mexico; Elisabeth R. Gerber, University of Michigan (Chair); Kent E. Portney, Tufts University

Recipient: **Betsy Sinclair**, University of Chicago

Title: The Social Citizen: *Peer Networks and Political Behavior*, University of Chicago Press

Citation: In *The Social Citizen*, Betsy Sinclair develops and carefully investigates the theory that social pressures influence individual choice in profound yet complex ways. Previous studies have posited various contextual effects, but the committee sees this work as the very best treatment of the question to date: it employs a wide range of methods, data, contexts, and behaviors to rigorously and systematically isolate the mechanisms whereby an individual's political network affects his/her behavior. The key substantive point is that social pressure, not information, is the mechanism by which social context, in the form of political networks, affects behavior. The study makes an important theoretical contribution, forcing a focus away from the individual voter/citizen to explicitly consider this interconnectedness. This is important for informing both modeling and estimation strategies. To develop and test her models, Sinclair has also made several valuable methodological contributions, using randomized field and survey experiments, as well as network analyses, to identify causal mechanisms. This work literally turns the field of political behavior on its head: it powerfully demonstrates that the assumption of autonomous choice, so central to our theoretical/modeling approaches and explanations, misses a vitally important element of the process. The committee expects this work to be very well cited and to generate numerous studies that build on Sinclair's insights.

Victoria Schuck Award

The Victoria Schuck Award is for the best book published in the previous calendar year on women and politics.

Award Committee: Sharon Denise Austin, University of Florida; Lisa J. Disch, University of Michigan; S. Laurel Weldon, Purdue University (Chair)

Recipient: **Myra Marx Ferree**, University of Wisconsin

Title: Varieties of Feminism: German Gender Politics in Global Perspective, Stanford University Press

Citation: In *Varieties of Feminism,* Myra Marx Ferree investigates the development of German feminism in relationship to the distinctive form and situation of the German state. The book is distinctive for presenting the German case as an example of what feminism looks like when it does not develop in the context of political and economic liberalism, as it did in the United States. Ferree focuses on feminists' self-definition as "autonomous," a term that took on a unique meaning in the contexts of both patriarchal West Germany and Communist East Germany. Charting the changes in German feminism that occurred, first, with German unification and then with the emergence of the European Union, Ferree tells the story of how gender, which German feminists understood structurally like class, ultimately morphed into an individualized difference. Theoretically, her work is a model for how to do intersectional analysis in a European context. Methodologically, it is an exemplar of comparative analysis that does not center United States feminism as an implicit norm. Ferree's book deserves a wide readership not only because it contributes new knowledge about 20th-century feminist movements but also for its path breaking theoretical and methodological innovations. This is an innovative and important study that is well worthy of the Victoria Schuck Award.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award

The Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award is for the best book published in the United States during the previous calendar year on government, politics, or international affairs. The award is supported by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation.

Award Committee: Evelyne Huber, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Gary C. Jacobson, University of California, San Diego (Chair); Ronald J. Schmidt, Sr., California State University, Long Beach

Recipient: **Martin Gilens**, Princeton University

Title: Affluence and Influence: Economic Inequality and Political Power in America, Princeton University Press, copublished with Russell Sage Foundation

Citation: It is no secret that economic inequality has been growing in the United States for several decades, and the idea that vast differences in wealth threaten the fundamental democratic principle of political equality is commonplace. It has not, however, been subject to much rigorous empirical examination. *Affluence and Influence* takes on this task, providing a detailed and sophisticated analysis of the levels of support offered by poor, middle-class, and affluent citizens for 1,779 policy initiatives proposed between 1981 and 2002 and determining whose preferences prevailed. Its central finding is that policies are more responsive to the preferences of the affluent (defined as the top income decile) than to middle- and lower-income groups. Most importantly, when income groups differ in their preferences, the rich usual prevail: outcomes are strongly related to the preferences of the affluent but not to those of other groups, especially the poor. Policy changes generally match the preferences of lower income groups only when their preferences are shared by the affluent. One major consequence is that economic policies are more conservative—less regulation, a flatter tax structure, a lower minimum wage, less protectionism—than they would be if they reflected the preferences of all Americans. But on social issues—abortion and gay rights, for example—greater responsiveness to the affluent leads to more liberal policies than would otherwise be expected. Gilens also shows that institutions matter: influence is less unequal when poor and middle-class Americans have major interest group champions such as AARP or the teachers' unions, for example. Moreover and counterintuitively, when divided government and polarized politics create conditions for gridlock, overall policy responsiveness is enhanced. The reason is that under such circumstances, only policies that enjoy very broad support can be enacted. This is only one of a number of findings that compose a carefully nuanced picture of how variable conditions shape policy responsiveness to different income groups. But the main implication of the Gilens's analysis clear: economic and political inequality tend to be mutually reinforcing, so the growing income gap between the wealthy and everyone else is

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001273 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013

likely to exacerbate the political inequalities he has so carefully documented.

DISSERTATION AWARDS

Gabriel A. Almond Award

The Gabriel A. Almond Award is for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of comparative politics.

Award Committee: Liesbet Hooghe, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and VU University Amsterdam (Chair); Dan Slater, University of Chicago; Erik M. Wibbels, Duke University

Recipient: **Evgeny Finkel**, George Washington University

Title: Victims' Politics: Jewish Behavior during the Holocaust

*Recipien*t: **Gwyneth McClendon**, Harvard University

Title: The Politics of Envy and Esteem in Two Democracies

The Almond Award Committee for the best dissertation in comparative politics has selected two winners for the 2013 prize: Evgeny Finkel of the University of Wisconsin, for his dissertation titled "Victims' Politics: Jewish Behavior during the Holocaust," and Gwyneth McClendon of Princeton University for "The Politics of Envy and Esteem in Two Democracies."

Citation: Finkel's "Victims' Politics" is an unusually mature dissertation. We were impressed with the way Finkel brings to bear a broad array of comparative politics literature to the study of the Holocaust. The study debunks the notion of Jews as passive recipients of Nazi perpetration and seeks to systematically understand variation in responses under virtually uniform life-threatening constraints. Finkel finds that the victims' pre-war political and social experiences were decisive. Moreover, the dissertation is beautifully written, in direct—even blunt—language, yet with an admirable detachment and evenhandedness, particularly on the delicate question of occasional Jewish collaboration with the Nazis. The study employs primary data on uprisings and pre-war political activity, and draws richly from hundreds of interviews with survivors. The author brings out variation through the voices of the victims. This is a dissertation that transcends the disciplinary boundaries of political science.

Citation: McClendon's "The Politics of Envy and Esteem in Two Democracies" is a theoretically ambitious thesis that advances the idea that within-group envy motivates citizen preferences on policy (under-)provision. The research design is first class. The author combines comparative case study with survey data and experiments situated in two highly different contexts: South Africa and the United States. McClendon employs a range of methodologies and triangulates with diverse data streams to examine the robustness of her argument—envy rooted in social status differences—against alternative arguments. Her dissertation is a model of how political scientists can employ sophisticated methodology to serve theory building.

That Finkel and McClendon should share this award is appropriate for several reasons. First and most obviously, the dissertations are both of the very highest quality, and of strikingly similar quality. Yet the differences are as important as the similarities, because they say so much about the eclectic and exciting state of comparative politics. These dissertations truly represent bookends on high quality comparative politics. Finkel's is clearly written as a book and with careful attention to people, times and places. McClendon's is written in the article tradition and with particular attention to causal identification.

William Anderson Award

The William Anderson Award is for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of state and local government, federalism, or intergovernmental relations.

Award Committee: Barbara Allen, Carleton College (Chair); Tulia G. Falleti, University of Pennsylvania; Paul L. Posner, George Mason University

Recipient: **Clayton M. Nall**, Harvard University

Title: The Road to Conflict: How the American Highway System Divides Communities and Polarizes Politics

Citation: Professor Nall demonstrates that the Interstate Highway System, the largest public works program in US history, dramatically changed the American social and political landscape as it opened new vistas to travelers, commerce, and above all migration and settlement. Professor Nall's scholarship is based on original data sets, which use archival sources to document the many local, state, and federal petitioners and decision-makers' choices for routing as well as carefully constructed measures of suburbanization and geographic polarization of the electorate. In this well-crafted presentation, Professor Nall shows how the US Interstate Highway System increased white flight, the polarization of the American electorate, and fostered localized publics favoring policies oriented to suburban development. In demonstrating these profound consequences, Professor Nall reveals how policies that change the spatial distribution of populations can have powerful effects on politics, the built environment, economic and social class development.

Edward S. Corwin Award

The Edward S. Corwin Award is for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of public law.

Award Committee: Robert F. Castro, California State University, Fullerton; Paul Frymer, Princeton University (Chair); Susan Haire, University of Georgia

Recipient: **Ezequiel Alejo Gonzalez Ocantos**, University of Notre Dame

Title: The Collapse of Impunity in Latin America: Legal Cultures, Strategic Litigation, and Judicial Behavior

Citation: Ezequiel González Ocantos' dissertation, "The Collapse of Impunity Regimes in Latin America: Legal Cultures, Strategic Litigation and Judicial Behavior," is a fascinating, theoretically innovated, and richly documented study about the development of human rights institutions and norms in Argentina and Peru. Drawing from an exhaustive amount of fieldwork, interviews, and archival analysis, Ocantos breaks new ground by illuminating the inner-workings of judicial actors in crafting innovative and often controversial legal response in the absence of political and procedural hurdles. In contrast to accounts that see judges simply acting within politically strategic or hierarchical environments, he argues: "judicial behavior is processed within a complex organizational environment yielding judicial outcomes that are necessarily influenced by the institutionalization of 'sticky' ideas about the law in courts' routine practices. These informal behavioral norms shape the way judicial actors understand the law, the limits it imposes and the possibilities it affords; the way they relate to other branches of government; the way they adjudicate rights claims between parties; and the reach of their involvement and influence in policy disputes." By

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001273 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013

emphasizing ideas, refracted through historical and organizational development, Ocantos powerfully balances obstacles to reform with the profound ways in which foundational changes in legal norms can occur through the role of individual activism. As such, the dissertation alerts us to the critical work of litigators and movements in being able to push even institutionally bounded judicial actors to make dramatic advancements in human rights.

Harold D. Lasswell Award

The Harold D. Lasswell Award is for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of policy studies. The award is supported by the Policy Studies Organization and the APSA Organized Section on Public Policy.

Award Committee: David E. Campbell, University of Notre Dame; Sheldon Kamieniecki, University of California, Santa Cruz (Chair); Mara Sidney, Rutgers University, Newark

Recipient: **Nicholas Carnes**, Duke University

Title: By the Upper Class, For the Upper Class? Representational Inequality and Economic Policy Making in the United States

Citation: Professor Carnes, who is assistant professor at Duke University, wrote the dissertation at Princeton University under the direction of Christopher H. Achen. In this extraordinary, well-written dissertation, whose research is already appearing in leading journals and a new book with the University of Chicago Press, Carnes addresses a deceptively straightforward question: Does it matter that most politicians in the United States are considerably better off than the people they represent? Using data on the class backgrounds of federal, state, and local legislators—including original biographical data on the legislators who served in the U.S. Congress from 1999 to 2008—this study illustrates how imbalances in the class composition of our legislative institutions influence economic policy outcomes. Employing rigorous empirical analysis, he finds that legislators from different classes tend to think, vote, and advocate differently on economic issues. In the aggregate, the numerical underrepresentation of the working class skews the policymaking process towards outcomes that tend to reflect the upper class's economic preferences. Carnes is persuasive in arguing that more attention should be paid to the important goal of increasing class diversity, alongside other dimensions of diversity (race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc.), in our government institutions, and he gestures toward the difficulty of doing so—not just that these candidates need to run for office and be elected, but also that there are barriers to effectiveness once in office. These findings broaden our understanding of how personal traits influence legislative behavior, contribute to the literature on representation, and highlight an important and often-overlooked source of inequalities in political influence in the United States. Decades ago, E.E. Schattschneider famously wrote that "the flaw in the pluralist heaven is that the heavenly chorus sings with a strong upper class accent." With his dissertation, Carnes shows that America's legislators sing with that same accent—more than ever.

Helen Dwight Reid Award

The Helen Dwight Reid Award is for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of international relations, law, and politics.

Award Committee: Virginia Haufler, University of Maryland, College Park; Shaheen Mozaffar, Bridgewater State University; Beth A. Simmons, Harvard University (Chair)

Recipient: **Aila Michela Matanock,** Stanford University

Title: "International Insurance: Why Militant Groups and Governments Compete with Ballots Instead of Bullets"

Citation: Out of an extremely competitive field of candidates, the committee is pleased to select Aila Matanock for the award. Her dissertation, titled "International Insurance: Why Militant Groups and Governments Compete with Ballots Instead of Bullets." asks an interesting and timely question: What are the conditions under which militant groups will participate in post-conflict elections, forming political parties instead of returning to violence? The question helps to identify a crucial missing piece of the puzzle about the role of post-conflict elections in securing peace. Matanock argues persuasively that both governments and militant groups can use elections to bring in outsiders to guarantee outcomes, providing "insurance" for the commitments both parties make. She carefully tests commitment theory against alternatives using an original dataset of different types of militant groups—terrorist, insurgent and guerrilla—worldwide between 1980 and 2010. Her results are bolstered by extensive interviews with representatives of all sides, including militants themselves, in Colombia and elsewhere. The committee found this dissertation to be ambitious both theoretically and empirically, and the results have obvious policy implications.

E. E. Schattschneider Award

The E. E. Schattschneider Award is for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of American government.

Award Committee: Brandice Canes-Wrone, Princeton University (Chair); Donald P. Green, Columbia University; Jose Angel Gutierrez, University of Texas, Arlington

Recipient: **Jon C. Rogowski**, University of Chicago

Title: Representation and the Electoral Connection

Citation: This dissertation, through three outstanding papers, pushes forward our understanding of the causes and consequences of legislative polarization. Each of the chapters entails innovative empirical analysis of this important and timely topic. In the first paper, Rogowski develops a database of the campaign platforms of over 2,500 congressional candidates and 6,500 state legislative candidates to assess whether the primary system affects the ideological extremism of the platforms, and finds that it does not. In the second paper, Rogowski examines the relationship between turnout and candidate polarization, and shows that candidate divergence reduces turnout. The third paper then links candidate platforms to legislators' behavior in office. In particular, Rogowski examines whether legislators' roll call voting is more ideologically extreme than their campaign platforms, and finding that it is, proceeds to analyze the extent to which voters punish them for this behavior.

Leo Strauss Award

The Leo Strauss Award is for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of political philosophy.

Award Committee: Jason Frank, Cornell University; Stephen G. Salkever, Bryn Mawr College (Chair); Mark E. Warren, University of British Columbia

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001273 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013

Recipient: **Alin Fumurescu**, Tulane University

Title: Compromise and Representation: A Split History of Early Modernity

Citation: Alin Fumurescu's treatment of the development of the concept of compromise in modern Western political thought is both obviously timely and strikingly original. The dissertation is a remarkably well-organized and well-written work that draws on a truly impressive command of obscure original sources as well as insightful recontextualizations of canonical works of early modern political theory. Fumurescu's originality comes without deflating, stretching, or distorting the existing literature—indeed, his interpretations are generous and productive. Based on historical and textual scholarship that is both deep and broad, Fumurescu gives us a theoretically sophisticated history of this oddly under-theorized concept, and relates that history to contemporary democratic politics with clarity and elegance. The dissertation reads like a mature work from a major scholar, and should become a strong contribution to the ongoing project of understanding modern democratic politics.

Leonard D. White Award

The Leonard D. White Award is for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of public administration. *Award Committee:* Barbara C. Burrell, Northern Illinois University; Stefanie A. Lindquist, University of Texas, Austin (Chair); Steven Maynard-Moody, University of Kansas

Recipient: **Deondra Rose**, Cornell University

Title: The Development of U.S. Higher Education Policy and its Impact on the Gender Dynamics of American Citizenship

Citation: In her dissertation, Dr. Rose engages in analysis of both policy formation and policy impact by assessing the determinants of federal higher education policy at mid-twentieth century, as well as the impact of those policies on women's educational achievement and political participation. Using historical data, survey research techniques, and quantitative analysis of existing datasets, Dr. Rose presents a nuanced and multifaceted approach to assessing the origins and consequences of progressive educational reform on women's educational attainment and political engagement in the United States. The dissertation is impressive in its scope and depth; it sheds new light on the dynamics of gender policies and their impact; and the committee expects that it will have substantial and lasting influence on scholarship in the field.

PAPER AND ARTICLE AWARDS

Franklin L. Burdette Pi Sigma Alpha Award

The Franklin L. Burdette Pi Sigma Alpha Award is for the best paper presented at the previous annual meeting.

Award Committee: Sheri Berman, Barnard College-Columbia University; Alan Gerber, Yale University (Chair); Bernard N. Grofman, University of California, Irvine

Recipients: **Toby Bolsen**, Georgia State University; **Fay Lomax Cook**, Northwestern University; **James N. Druckman**, Northwestern University

Title: When and How Partisan Identification Works

Citation: This article provides important insights into the nature of partisanship-one of the most important theoretical topics in political behavior. Bolsen, et al. note that although partisanship is widely assumed to influence citizens' political behavior we do not know exactly how its influence is felt on informational and affective aspects of cognition. Through a series of survey experiments, Bolsen et al. show how the importance of partisanship as a cuing/biasing factor is affected by political context. Among other things, they show that priming subjects to concern themselves with factual information reduces the effect of partisan cues and that the effect of partisanship is smaller when there is cross-party endorsement of a policy. Taking advantage of computerized data that includes how quickly particular questions were completed, they are also able to study response speeds and use that information to judge among competing explanations for how partisan cues affect judgment. The authors help us to understand when and how partisanship influences political behavior at the individual level. Their work also has important implications for how we understand voting in elections and how citizens evaluate policy proposals. For their ability to produce fresh insights on a topic of central concern, we are pleased to award the Burdette prize to these scholars.

Heinz Eulau Award

The Heinz Eulau Award is for the best article published in the *APSR* and *Perspectives on Politics* during the previous calendar year. Two Eulau Awards are made, one for each journal. Committee members are asked to help make the selection from one journal or the other, and the chair is asked to participate in both decisions.

Award Committee: Jonathan Bendor, Stanford University; Jose Antonio Cheibub, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; John S. Dryzek, Australian National University; Suzanne Mettler, Cornell University (Chair); Valeria Sinclair-Chapman, University of Rochester

Recipient: **Regina A. Bateson**, Yale University

Title: "Crime Victimization and Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 106 (3): 570–87.

Citation: This is a striking paper in several significant respects. First, the topic is novel: though studies of political participation abound, never before have scholars even considered whether crime victimization might influence it. Second, the finding is fascinating and counterintuitive: most of what we know about determinants of political participation suggests that those who have been disadvantaged in life participate less, but remarkably, Bateson finds that the life crisis engendered by crime victimization actually contributes to greater involvement. Third, the *magnitude* of the finding is striking: the effect on political participation is approximately equal to an increase of 5–10 years of education. Thus, the author has apparently discovered a *major* cause of political participation. Fourth, the *scope* of the finding is very wide: it holds in all regions around the world—indeed, for all nationalities—all types of crime, and all kinds of political participation.

Bateson's study offers a model of fine social science research. She makes inventive use of several datasets in order to examine her topic around the world. While the study is limited by being based solely on observational data, she astutely recognizes the inferential problems associated with this kind of empirical design and carefully addresses the leading threats to causal inference. She also offers nuanced consideration of results in different regions, finding that in some,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001273 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013

crime victimization is strongly associated with "rejection of democracy, support for authoritarianism, and approval of repressive policing and vigilantism." Her findings offer provocative evidence of the role that personal experiences, such as pain and loss, may bear on the political realm.

Recipients: **Kathleen Bawn**, University of California, Los Angeles; **Martin Cohen**, James Madison University; **David Karol**, University of Maryland; **Seth E. Masket**, University of Denver; **Hans Noel**, Georgetown University; **John R. Zaller**, University of California, Los Angeles

Title: "A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands and Nominations in American Politics." *Perspectives on Politics* 10(3): 571–97.

Citation: This article presents a fundamental challenge to the reigning view of political parties as teams of politicians seeking to win election. Instead, it argues that U.S. parties are "best understood as coalitions of interest groups and activists seeking to capture and use government for their particular goals." Unlike the dominant view that portrays voters as rewarding parties based on their records in office, this article acknowledges that a portion of the electorate exhibits limited attention, interest, or comprehension of candidates' issue positions and party performance. These conditions create an "electoral blind spot," one that parties exploit in order to disguise their records, which often involve catering to the priorities of powerful groups rather than to voters generally. Interest groups and activists, rather than being friendly supporters of parties, exist in competition with politicians for control of the party agendas. Those groups that can credibly threaten replacement of elected officials at the nomination stage wield considerable power over policy relative to voters and even activists who present no credible threat of replacement. Viewed in this light, political parties are not necessarily conducive to a "well-functioning" democracy; to the contrary, their existence raises critical normative issues. This article is a "must-read" for scholars of American politics, and the theory it offers is broader in application, reaching beyond the United States, as well. ■



The APSA Awards Ceremony and Luncheon was held in the Empire Ballroom at the Palmer House Hotel in Chicago, August 29, 2013, to acknowledge more than 30 recipients this year, as well as those who received awards in 2012.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001273 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013