



UNC  
COLLEGE OF ARTS &  
SCIENCES

*Carolina* POLITICAL SCIENCE  
HAMILTON HALL  
CAMPUS BOX 3265  
CHAPEL HILL, NC 27599-3265

T 919.962.3041  
F 919.962.0432

*July 21, 2013*

PROFESSOR TERRY SULLIVAN

T 919.962.0413  
E [sullivan@ibiblio.org](mailto:sullivan@ibiblio.org)

## OVERVIEW

Since beginning a tenure appointment, my research has focused on four research areas, all elements of the political tradecraft of leadership: bargaining, persuasion, operational routines, and managing subordinates. In each area, I have created new theory and brought these analytics closer to the actual practices of those who govern. I have also created innovative data resources on these core processes. This research moves the discipline closer to understanding political decision-making, innovates new theory, generates new data from “behind the scenes,” and focuses on the nature of politics. Because these activities reflect much more closely the actual practices of political leaders, contemporary leaders, both in the national government and abroad, find my scholarship useful and informative.

Teaching plays an important part of my professional agenda. Following developments in brain-based research and in educational psychology, I have created a number of pedagogical improvements to the political science curriculum, among them the first writing intensive courses and the first first year seminars. These innovative approaches have earned me repeated recognition both by national foundations and by internal institutions interested in advancing teaching in R1 universities. My most recent national fellowships in teaching demonstrate my continued involvement in recognized, innovative teaching.

In service, I have taken the opportunity provided by tenure to combine scholarship with first hand exposure to my subject, political tradecraft in national governance. Useful scholarship combines theoretical and analytical sophistication and an interaction with the subject matter. In my service both inside and outside the confines of the university and department, I have always created new avenues for meeting scholarly and community obligations. My research and its applications in national governance has afforded me several opportunities for affecting an agenda important to scholarship and national affairs. My most recent stints as Campbell Fellow in National Affairs at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, as scholar member of the President’s Transition Coordinating Council (for the 2009 transition), and as Commissioner of the National Commission on Reform of the Federal Appointments Process attest to the usefulness of my scholarship in affecting national governance and bringing national recognition to the University’s mission as a public university.



*In my mind, I'm gone to Carolina*

## RESEARCH INNOVATIONS

Since ancient times, social sciences have concentrated on understanding leadership (e.g., Aristotle, Plato, Socrates, Plutarch, Erasmus, Locke, Hobbes, Harvard School of Business). Much of that focus, however, has lacked any firsthand observation of actual leaders interacting with their peers competing for leadership, the essence of political tradecraft.<sup>1</sup> Since Woodrow Wilson, modern political science has focused leadership studies on the correlates of the most obvious of outputs and the most obvious of initial conditions – e.g., vetoes, roll call votes, executive orders and public approval, macro economic conditions.

My scholarship takes a different approach, focusing almost entirely on leadership anchored in the observation of contemporary, confidential interactions among national politicians. This work has concentrated not only on developing a theory of *what presidents do*, but also on creating systematic data documenting those activities. These scholarly activities focus on five primary elements: bargaining, persuasion, organizational routine, the management of derivative authority, and the creation of policy proposals.

### ***On Influence***

If, as modern politicians would say, the “first rule of politics is, ‘you can tell a man to go to hell, but you can’t make him go...’<sup>2</sup>”, then the study of political influence should concentrate on how peer national leaders manage their relationships so that others do what they would not otherwise do. Conceived in this way, this first rule involves causing others to change their course of action, diverging from their predispositions and towards an advocated alternative. This general phenomenon includes the study of bargaining and persuasion. The standard theory of bargaining published in all major journals (due to Baron/Ferejohn and Romer/Rosenthal in political science and Rubenstein in economics) employs mathematical approaches that, while elegant, simply devolve to gross forms of “agenda control.” This approach produces results not anchored in the tradecraft of politicians and the theoretical results produced (e.g., minimum winning coalitions favoring leaders only) reflect none of the empirical patterns observed by real politicians.

My research has focused on the actual conduct of bargaining by presidents and other leaders aimed at those among their peers whom they want to convert. This topic presents two primary challenges. First, no research conducted or published develops a theory of the give and take involved in actual bargains between successful and influential political leaders. Give and take, inherently, involves a number of strategic considerations — including bluffing — which complicates theory and which makes observations of public activities less useful. In addition, no research makes use of observations of these private, highly confidential exchanges. My research has developed unique data detailing the position-taking between members of Congress and the President during bargaining on the most controversial presidential policies between 1953 and 1976. These data represent about 40,000 observations of bargaining exchanges. To these data I have deployed a new theoretical approach to bargaining which resembles the actual practices of professional political leaders bargaining with each other. The first exploration of these data appeared in a series of articles (in the *APSR*, *JOP*, and *AJPS*) exploring the behavior patterns associated with conversion and strategic behavior in bargaining. My most recent addition to this series appearing in a top three journal (*JOP*, July 2011) focuses on a new bargaining theory, called “reciprocal” theory. The new theory also extends beyond give and take to encompass a heretofore unexplained set of US Constitutional amendments (the 20<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>) as well as identifies an important time dependent (called “horizon”) effect associated with bargaining. This research occupies the core of my book project, *Making A Difference*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Even Plutarch’s accounts rely entirely on secondary and tertiary sources. Some of Machiavelli’s later works rely on some practical knowledge.

<sup>2</sup> Lyndon Johnson, quoted in Terry Sullivan, 2013, *Making a Difference: LBJ and Presidential Persuasion, Routine, and Reach*. Princeton University Press (manuscript under contract).

While the standard study of influence actually focuses on success (e.g., Bond and Fleisher; Edwards) my research on influence concentrates on modeling persuasion: what leaders say to other leaders to get them to do what they would not otherwise do. This approach to influence (as conversion) presents one basic challenge, finding opportunities to observe systematically real persuasion at work. Again, my research in this area begins by developing and exploiting data on precisely the subject matter: secretly recorded exchanges between master politicians attempting to persuade each other to give in on major policy issues. It creates a new measure of influence, called “sway,” which, for the first time, operationalizes the standard definition of influence (due to Dahl). This research agenda began with a group of graduate students and continues with my latest publication in the journal *Congress and the Presidency*. This agenda also plays a significant role in *Making a Difference*.

### ***On Routine and Operations***

While the American president represents the world’s most watched and the most discussed decision-maker, the discipline knows virtually nothing about what presidents do, how the office and office-holder interact, what dynamics distinguish an executive institution from others.<sup>3</sup> Making progress in understanding the executive institution requires surmounting two basic challenges. First, theoretically, little of the presidency matches up with the formal models used. The mainstream of political science research tends to model the executive institution with the same mechanics as it models the legislative. Theoretical treatment of delegation, for example, revolves around modeling a legislative game rather than an executive one. Theories of agency, in economics and public administration rely on mathematics implying a strict hierarchy of authority, including non-substitutability of efforts and a private goods nature to returns, when executive political authority typically remains the subject of struggle, subordinate and presidential efforts easily substitute for each other, and real compensation more closely resembles public goods. Hence, theories of delegation do not model executive “unity of purpose.”<sup>4</sup>

In addition to these theoretical problems, no data exists to observe directly how the president engages or delegates. Instead, the discipline focuses on modeling easily observed public activities (typically outputs), such as presidential speeches or executive orders without any useful theory of the presidential decision-making process behind them or as a whole. The result of these efforts leads political science to recommend organizational principles at odds with how practitioners see their work, rendering these research results irrelevant to the practice of governing and hence to understanding government.

My research in this area addresses both these issues. Again, it develops a new theory that does not begin with principal/agency mathematics and instead offers a constrained maximization approach generating a model of simultaneous decision-making involving a range of theoretically relevant variables. The initial results of this new theory correctly match the experiences of practitioners heretofore treated by political science as mere anecdotes. The new theory also develops a straightforward measure of an important constitutional concept — “unity of purpose” or the ability to resist the legislative power — and a new theoretical concept (affinity) which unifies formal theory across legislative and executive institutions. This theory identifies what practitioners recognize as important dynamics in governing the presidency and applying its operations and routines to governing. The precursors of this theory appear in the two books from the White House Transition Project emphasizing the importance of practitioner lessons on governing. The introduction and conclusion of my book on the experience of White House chiefs of staff highlights further some important elements of this theory. The full mathematical statement of the theory appears in a paper currently under review. This model also plays an important role in the manuscript *Making a Difference*.

---

<sup>3</sup> This ignorance extends to the business world as well, where academics know a great deal of what middle managers do but virtually nothing of the detailed activities of high corporate management.

<sup>4</sup> This phrase derives from James Wilson’s appeal to the constitutional convention to reject both the New Jersey and Virginia plans calling for a committee to govern the executive branch in the new constitution. Wilson argues for a presidential “singularity,” in which primary and derivative authorities combine.

Again, I have developed new and unique data on presidential engagement and management of the complex executive process. These data currently cover some 70,000 observations. This data provides the first glimpse into the nature of an “executive” institution and its fundamental differences with a legislative institution, operationalizing for the first time James Madison famous missive to match institutional structure with the motives of its office-holders and Alexander Hamilton’s insistence that the pursuit of “fame” must drive institutional behavior.

The application of the data from this agenda appears first in a monograph published in 2009 for the Obama presidential transition by the White House Transition Project and highlighted in a conference at the Center for American Progress during the Bush-Obama transfer. Two separate elements of this data, along with a new theory of presidential decision-making appear in two articles under consideration at the *APSR* and the *AJPS*, respectively. The first models two traditional theories of presidential motivation and institutional operation with data on presidential engagement, while the second proposes a new theory of delegation and its application to traditional public administration analysis of presidential staffing.

Future empirical models will explore the impact of unexpected events on presidential engagement. After establishing a standard routine, do presidencies react to crises by altering what they do or by treating the crisis within their standard operation? A more extensive dataset on what the president does currently nearing completion will triple the size of the current dataset.

### ***On Agenda Control and Compromise***

Political science considers leadership as transforming predispositions into alternative, advocated positions. This process models the reciprocal theory of bargaining as give and take (see above). But leadership also controls the formation of policy specifics and their transformation over time in reaction to altering circumstances. Agenda control, therefore, represents an extension of bargaining and persuasion. Some persuasion alters the interpretation of a proposal (its “frame”) while some persuasion alters the proposal itself. The study of agenda relies heavily on easily observed outputs rather than on observing the more confidential processes leading to decisions about those outputs.

A final element of a theory of presidential leadership will explore the ways in which presidents shape and make decisions about the content of policy decisions, both in the legislative branch and in the autonomous regulatory agencies.

### ***On Standing Up Government***

Institutional scholarship has an epistemological obligation to produce knowledge resembling the actual operation of government. The tenured faculty of public universities has a special obligation to produce scholarship that pointedly addresses the improvement of governing. In a separation of powers constitutional system, a key function in effectively transforming electoral decisions into governing involves the ability of the elected government to “stand up” the administrative state under a new political management. Over the past two decades, the American executive has become less and less capable of doing so and political science has made little effort to produce scholarship to provide useful advice on how to rectify the situation. In this area, again, research has focused on publicly observable events (i.e., Senate confirmations) without understanding any of the details of the executive vetting process or the potential burdens ameliorated by altering operational elements of the appointments process. I have developed two databases which allow for assessing the nature of the presidential “appointments problem.” These data more closely track the process of appointments and confirmation and develop the first complete data on the vetting process that nominees must go through. The analysis of the data from this research agenda appears first in a series of reports published by the White House Transition Project for the Brookings Institution and for the American Enterprise Institute. More recently, the results of this agenda appear in the *Public Administration Review* and forthcoming from the Aspen Institute and Rockefeller Foundation. They will eventually make up the bulk of a small book on the appointments process at the conclusion of my participation as commissioner on the National Commission on Reforming the Presidential Appointments Process.

## TEACHING INNOVATIONS

My teaching employs the latest brain research on learning strategies and “active learning” techniques to train students to develop a sophisticated understanding of the topics of leadership, influence, strategy, and power. Using behind the scenes archival records, students take on traditionally difficult topics, like bargaining and persuasion, by comparing traditional theories of the subject with direct observation of politicians at work. These resources include secretly recorded conversations between national politicians trying to get each to do what they would not otherwise do. Typically in teams, student use prior theories to develop research questions, identify potential and competing conjectures to answer these questions, develop from those conjectures potential research expectations, develop original data to apply to these expectations and evaluate the impact of these data on the conjectures.

In addition to exploring explanation and its uses in understanding politics, all of my classes teach the “triage method” of writing developed at UCLA by linguist Richard Lanham and now recommended nationwide by the Lilly Endowment and other foundations emphasizing improvements in teaching in R1 universities. Students take their model of analysis, described above, and then employ Lanham’s system of writing to develop a series of small papers leading up to completing a large (typically 25 pages single-spaced) paper on their topic.

The application of advanced pedagogical techniques and training in writing have made it possible for me to easily innovate new courses for the department curriculum when required by changes in the university’s demands. These include the first wave of “writing intensive” courses taught in the department and the first set of First Year Seminars established in the department. I continue to teach both these “service courses.”

Since tenure in July of 1991, I have taught all levels of students. These classes regularly receive University administration support and national recognition from institutions, like the Lilly Endowment, the Spenser Foundation and the Teagle Foundation, which promote innovations in R1 university education. Student evaluations typically register satisfaction with these courses, even though they also acknowledge the demanding nature of the material and assignments.

Students also regularly recognize, especially later in life, the positive effects of these courses on their professional careers. I am happy to say that I regularly get email from my students from many years ago, like this one from a former student now age 41, class of ’89:

As a note, I still talk about your class a great deal. My wife has heard the stories many times about how much fun I had researching my paper. I still pull it out every couple of years or so. And, I still use the advice and skills you and I discussed. I am noted for my writing in my professional life, something I owe, in large part, to your class. (Shadwick).

### **Graduate Teaching**

*Core Course in American Institutions.* Taught on a rotating basis for several years with William Keech, this course established the standard for student performance in American institutional studies and set the foundation for students in advanced courses.

*American Legislative Processes.* Focused on the US Congressional process, this course surveyed modern theories of the legislative process, agenda formation, etc. I gave up this course up to allow new recruited faculty an opportunity.

*American Presidency.* This course concentrated on the role of the president in leadership and the policy process. Early on, it brought in graduate students like Scott De Marchi and Luke Keele and resulted in published joint projects. Recent changes in the methodology requirements and recruitment of behavioral students resulted in less political science interest forcing me to alter the content to appeal to the students who did take the course, primarily from the Public Health School and the Law School. At the department’s request, I abandoned teaching the course four years ago for lack of interest from political science graduate students.

*The Politics of Political Tradecraft.* This course will appear in 2014 and encourages graduate students to move beyond standard models and topics, especially those associated with institutional outputs and common independent variables, and consider how politicians interact with one another

in common tradecraft. Topics will include models of bargaining, persuasion, agenda development, routine and organizational operations, use of authority, etc.

### ***Undergraduate Writing Intensive***

For two decades, I have taught a mainstay writing intensive course for the department, now called a level “400” course. This course concentrates on the role of the American presidency in policy making. It highlights leadership and the use of original primary research materials. Students prepare original 25 page single spaced papers employing original evidence to ascertain the status of conjectures they develop about passage of a major policy innovation.

### ***Undergraduate “Service”***

For two decades, I have regularly taught an introductory large course on congress and the presidency in policy making. At the department’s request I suspended teaching this course so that newly recruited junior faculty could cover it. On the loss of that faculty, I have recently restarted teaching this class.

### ***First Year Seminars***

Since the inception of the program, I have taught a first year seminar on the theory and practice of leadership among high-level national politicians. Students develop data resources and write a 10 page, single spaced paper comparing theories of leadership and their application to what high level political leaders do. Recently the First Year Seminar program announced plans to highlight this course as one of two to celebrate the anniversary of the FYS program.

## **ON USEFUL SCHOLARSHIP**

I have always tried to repay the University’s confidence in me with innovative contributions to the life of both the department and the university. I have also made a successful career demonstrating to the national and international policy making communities that public university scholarship can play in a useful role in governing. For many of my colleagues and certainly for me, these contributions to national and international governing have opened opportunities for access to the kind of experience and data that drive my unique approach to scholarship about governing and tradecraft.

### ***Department Service***

Since tenure in July 1991, I have served many terms on the Graduate Admissions Committee, one of the key responsibilities and most arduous tasks in the department. For four years, I took on the problems in Graduate Student Placement. In that service, I created an entire range of services for our students including the checklists we still use, a program of contacting our alumnae at Universities whenever one of our students applied for a job, the series of student practice presentation we still use, and a placement manual students still ask for. I have served for two years as Development Director, again, creating institutional structures to further our efforts, e.g., a liaison system with University and College Development officers to identify important donors that we had not reached, a system to keep our graduate alumnae better informed, and creating a contact system for our undergraduate alumnae which included starting the newsletter we still circulate.

I have served on a range of recruitment committees, mostly in American politics and International Relations. While these have not always been successful, I have attended meetings, did my homework, pursued candidates, sponsored them in their visits, and carried through on them in the post-visit stages leading to their decisions. I took the lead and organized the visits of James Snyder, James Sidanius, Mike Munger, and a number of other senior appointments.

In the most recent past, I have served on the Committee on Undergraduate Studies and as the department’s library liaison. In the latter job, I often manage a budget for political science materials.

With this budget, we may purchase journals and electronic databases that our faculty need for their research and to which the library might not otherwise commit. This budget also allows us to pay a kind of “ransom” to the library for any resource that the Library by its own determination wishes to do away with but which someone on our faculty finds nevertheless useful. In the past few years, that budget responsibility has meant that I have overseen the identification of and then selection of journals and resources that the library could eliminate with our blessing. This task involved identifying and querying the faculty about some 300 to 1,000 journals. In this task I worked with the departmental chair to make sure that all of our faculty’s interests were served well or protected.

In managing this budget, I have leveraged other resources for the department’s use. For example, in past semesters, I negotiated with the library a deal to use some of its endowment to purchase research materials for graduate students needed for their dissertation but they could not actually afford.

As a member of Undergraduate Studies, I volunteered to develop a report to the Dean documenting the department’s contribution to effective learning outcomes. As a member of the three-person committee, I helped develop a strategy for approaching this subject without overburdening colleagues with a seemingly impossible task. I helped develop a questionnaire, administered the questionnaire and generated data which allowed the committee to demonstrate that the department contributed significant learning outcomes.

### **University Service**

In addition to serving as liaison with the University Library System, since tenure in July 1991, I have served on the governing board of the University’s public/private consortium called over the years by various names, but currently called “Ibiblio.org.” Begun with my help in 1991, and in its original form, this consortium included most of the major computer companies sponsoring the development and deployment of the world wide web. As “Sunsite,” its original name, the consortium anchored a worldwide system of servers providing content, innovation in presentation, and software to the web community. Over the two decades of its service, Ibiblio.org remains a mainstay of the world wide web and in particular a hub for the Linux community.

As a member of the board in two different eras, I helped develop private support that eventually assisted in two developments. First, corporate partnerships helped improve the university’s then very deficient research computing capacity. Sunsite demonstrated to partners like Sun Microsystems that they could work well with the University and that led to a number of corporate contributions of equipment and infrastructure, like the university’s second T1 line and eventually broadband pipeline. More than half the university’s traffic flowed through the sunsite array and through its dedicated resources. Second, participation on the board allowed the university to claim academic expertise in combining technical expertise with substantive holdings. As a member of the board and as a representative of the university, I participated in advising the US Department of Commerce on development of the Information Infrastructure Assistance Program which sponsored public funding of networking throughout the country, especially in rural states like North Carolina. I managed UNC grant efforts to the Department of Commerce coordinating efforts in three UNC professional schools, several academic departments, and several research institutes. Moreover, this expertise allowed the university to offer technical support to many of its most influential alumnae at Bell South and Turner Broadcasting (creating CNN.com and exploiting its Turner Classic Movies collections) in particular and with the 1996 Atlanta Olympics Organizing Committee. These efforts made it possible for the University to claim that it stood behind its alumnae with valuable resources.

I also managed for the University a multi-institutional and private effort to digitize the Jimmy Carter Presidential Library, again supporting efforts for the 1996 Atlanta Olympics. This effort built scholarly resources with the assistance of our core alumnae and their companies in Atlanta.

I also served for three years on the advisory board for the University Center for Teaching and Learning.

### **National Service**

Helping the national governing institution manage its affairs constitutes a genuinely scholarly service — applying knowledge of the subject to the subject — one that anyone acquainted with the mission of a public university could appreciate. In each of these projects, my work has applied scholarly knowledge to real world problems of governing, making it clear to practitioners that scholarship has value (not their presumption), and leading then to improved opportunities for scholarship itself.

*The White House Transition Project.* Since tenure in July 1991, I have served for 15 years as cofounder and Executive Director of the White House Transition Project, a scholarly consortium of private and public university faculties, policy schools, and research institutions. Through that project, I have participated in improving decision-making at the United Nations Agency on Development (in Colombia), the George W. Bush White House (in several areas of process), two presidential administrations in Mexico, two in Argentina, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Operations (on presidential appointments), The Barrack Obama White House (appointments), the George HW Bush Presidential Library (on scholarly access), and the George W. Bush Presidential Center (on early scholarly access).

The work I have done in this area has four major effects:

1. It has improved governing itself.
2. It provides an exemplar to the international community.
3. Affording decision-makers access to this scholarship so that they can find value in opening up their institution to further scholarly examination and releasing vitally necessary internal data.
4. It improves the basis of scholarship.

The WHTP research base<sup>5</sup> has prepared four national campaigns and two president-elects for managing the challenges of their first experiences as the president's team actually begins to govern. We have helped define what new administration's should care about first and what distractions they should avoid. These experiences have led to admitting scholars to the proceedings of the President's Transition Coordinating Council, which combines the highest officers in the national security and cabinet agencies, the White House, and the president-elect's organization to smooth the way for the incoming administration. Scholars provide their non-partisan expertise in research to questions the Council has about how to proceed. In turn, scholars get the opportunity to observe high level decision-making in action.

Because much of the rest of the world looks to the American presidency for a model of governance, my research and interactions with these governing institutions over the past 15 years has led the leaders of many of the emerging democracies in the world to rely on my research. These countries include several in Latin America and Eastern Europe, two areas to which our department has a special focus.

In several areas, e.g., executive privilege, the White House has turned to members of the WHTP, including me, to counsel their position of issues affecting scholars. In addition to executive privilege, these topics have included reduction in secrecy, improved access to diplomatic documentation, and reduced barriers to accessing archival materials from presidential libraries. These activities have led to the issuance of three executive orders reducing the presumption of secrecy in the government and increasing accession of, and improved processing times for, presidential library materials, in turn improving scholarly access.

In several areas of research, including one of my own, the usefulness of the WHTP project for practitioners has led to access to data on important governing processes. For example, scholars have considerably more access to the media and communications parts of the White House. This improved

---

<sup>5</sup> The project has two research elements. The first, its Institutional Memory Series, documents the best practices and experiences of previous White House officials (those either as principal assistants to the President or their deputies) managing the primary offices in an administration and former presidents. The second, its Institutional Anatomy Series, provides research on elements of the presidential operation highlighted as problems by former White House officials during interviews conducted during compiling the Institutional Memory briefing books. See the application of this series to improving research in political science (3, below).



access has led to publication of at least three new books on communications, including two Neustadt award winners. In my research area, White House experience with WHTP has smoothed the way for access to information on the executive vetting process of potential nominees leading to presidential appointments. This area again involves going into the process rather than simply observing its most obvious outputs, the final nominations itself. This access has led to at least one research publication to date (in the *Public Administration Review*) with others to come.

*Access to Data through PRESIDENeT.* In addition to these efforts, after tenure in 1991, I worked extensively with the National Archives and its presidential libraries system to improve scholarly access to archival materials through the then nascent worldwide web. This project (PRESIDENeT.org) began in 1992 with a collaboration between myself, Sunsite UNC, Sun Microsystems, the Archivist of the United States, and the National Archives Office of Presidential Libraries. Through this collaboration, the partners built the first ever email system for the archival staffs and the first websites for each of the presidential libraries, greatly improving scholarly access to presidential libraries and their archival holdings.

*National Commission on Reform of the Federal Appointments Process.* As a result of scholarship on the appointments process, the Aspen Institute and Rockefeller Foundation asked me to join a national commission to improve the appointments process as its only scholar. The Commission included former members of the Senate, Senate Majority Leaders, senior White House officials, directors or presidents of national organizations (e. g., NOW, Common Cause, Women's League of Voters, Center for American Progress). Eventually, the bulk of the Commission's agenda came from my research, then most recently published in the *Public Administration Review*. The Commission's work has led to passage of a reform package, including several recommendations from my research agenda, and the development of a new program for sharing information between the White House and the Senate on nominees, a program which I pioneered for the WHTP from 1999 through 2002 and which a quarter of the George W. Bush nominees used in preparing their nominations.<sup>6</sup>

### ***Professional Service***

Since tenure in July 1991, I have regularly served on the governing board of the Presidency Research Group of the American Political Science Association.

I also served two years as the PRG's president, two years as its Vice-President, and one year as its Secretary Treasurer.

Since tenure in July 1991, I have served on the editorial boards of the following journals:

*The Journal of Politics*

*The American Journal of Political Science*

*Political Research Quarterly*

*Presidential Studies Quarterly*

*Congress and the Presidency*

I have served as Features Editor for the *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 1999-2002.

---

<sup>6</sup> The statistics on use derive from a study by the Pew Charitable Trusts subsequent to their funding of the WHTP program in 1999 through 2002.