

Rachel Porter

Ph.D. Candidate

Email: rachs@live.unc.edu

URL: rachelporter.org

Research Statement

My research employs advanced quantitative methods and original data sources to offer new perspectives on established theories about American politics. In single-authored and collaborative work, I investigate how electoral dynamics affect elite behavior, specifically, and legislative outcomes, more broadly. My dissertation extends this research agenda by demonstrating that candidates still run on locally oriented issues in today’s “nationalized” campaign environment. I go on to show that politicians follow-through on these local campaign promises once they reach Congress. This research is supported by the Social Science Research Council’s Social Data Dissertation Fellowship, which funds projects that employ cutting-edge methods and novel data to investigate democracy.

Nationalized and Locally Oriented Campaigns for Congress (Dissertation)

The conception of elections as a critical link between legislators and the interests of constituents dates back to *Federalist No. 10*. In his essay, James Madison argues for a model of government where representatives advocate for district needs and communicate local preferences. Fast forward to the mid-20th century; seminal works in political science like Mayhew’s *The Electoral Connection* (1974) and Fenno’s *Homestyle* (1977) also note the significance of local issues. Modern candidates for the House of Representatives, however, appear to employ an altogether different approach to elections. These politicians are perceived to run on partisan, “nationalized” platforms rather than projects and problems important to their district. It would seem that, in today’s campaigns, the adage “all politics is local” no longer rings true.

In my dissertation, I assert that this understanding of campaigns misses the mark. I demonstrate that—even though House elections attend more to national issues than before—candidates still often “go local.” Rather than considering campaigns as either national or local, I conceptualize these tactics as part of a spectrum of choices. My theoretical framework allows for the possibility that candidates adopt national party positions while *also* highlighting local concerns. For some candidates, this may mean discussing district-specific policies alongside national party positions. For others, “going local” may not involve taking up district-specific issues but, rather, using local considerations to craft party-driven messages.

To assess campaign strategy in modern elections, I employ an original data set of text scraped from campaign websites for *all* candidates in 2018 and 2020 who had an official campaign site. Campaign websites are well-suited for testing my theory because they (1) provide a near complete inventory of the issues important to a candidate’s campaign, and (2) are largely representative of the population of campaigns. To compile these data, I developed a flexible web scraper capable of crawling through websites to find and collect candidates’ campaign platforms. This text was next cleaned of extraneous code, parsed into individual platform points, and labeled for major topic-area by a team of over twenty undergraduate research assistants, whom I have managed since 2018. This collection is the *first* comprehensive data set of text on campaign position taking.

In my first dissertation chapter, I investigate how increasingly safe congressional districts impact elite behavior. In 1970, over 40 percent of districts were considered competitive; in 2018, a paltry 10 percent fell into this category. Today, for those many politicians who run in districts safe for their own party, winning the primary may be the only obstacle to attaining office. Pleasing ideologically-extreme primary voters, then, becomes of the highest importance. Consequently, I posit that increasingly safe districts are partially to blame for our state of polarized politics. To test this

theory, I couple a technique for small-area estimation called multilevel regression with synthetic poststratification (MrsP) with the validated voter information for 2.7 million primary election voters to create a direct measure for partisan primary constituency ideology at the congressional district-level. Using my new measure, I show that incumbents are less representative of same-party primary voter preferences when the general election is competitive for both parties. These results emphasize the important role that electoral institutions play in motivating legislative behavior. An earlier draft of this chapter was presented at several conferences, including the Society for Political Methodology’s annual meeting, and is currently under review.

Drawing on these results, I argue that districts with fierce two-party competition have unique electoral conditions that motivate candidates to play down their partisanship. Moderate voters—who are vital to winning competitive races—can be put off by candidates who place the party they belong to ahead of the people they want to represent. A platform that incorporates locally driven issues, conversely, may help demonstrate a commitment to the district. Accordingly, I suspect that candidates who run in competitive districts will be more likely to take up *local* issues—policies that address needs unique to a specific constituency. Employing a random effects model where the share of a candidate’s platform as “locally oriented” is expressed as a function of individual candidate characteristics and electoral factors, I find support for my theory.

Departing from traditional conceptions of local issues, I also suggest that candidates may “go local” through the rhetoric they use to discuss nationally important issues. In one test of this theory, I pair campaign platform text with a keyword assisted topic model (keyATM) by Eshima, Imai, and Sasaki (2020) to investigate Republican candidates’ position taking on policies related to illicit drugs and narcotics. Unlike other topic models, the keyATM allows for user-specified keywords to aide in the estimation of topics before model fitting. I assess how much candidates cover topics in their platforms defined by terms such as “enforce,” “law,” and “treatment” to determine if local conditions can motivate Republican candidates to stray from their party’s national position on drugs. I find that Republicans tended to be *less* “tough on crime” and *friendlier* towards addiction treatment if their district had a greater-than-average rate of opioid-related deaths.

Finally, I assess whether candidates make good on the locally oriented policy positions they took up in their campaigns once in Congress. This chapter offers an innovative extension to existing scholarship on legislative follow-through by diving deeper into the content of incumbents’ behavior rather than simply assessing whether or not they legislated on a particular issue. To conduct this analysis, I employ a new method that builds off the framework for keyword assisted topic models (keyATM) discussed above. This extension allows for the estimation of common topics across multiple corpora—a noteworthy methodological advancement. Existing methods for topic discovery that rely on latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) rest on the assumption that documents come from a single collection, or—in other words—documents are all the same type (e.g. newspaper articles, floor speeches, or television transcripts). This new approach, conversely, allows for the estimation of common topics across different sources simultaneously. This method allows me to more directly compare elites’ position taking in campaigns with their subsequent legislative activity in Congress (e.g. speeches on the floor or discussions in committees). I am currently developing this multi-corpora keyATM software alongside Kosuke Imai and Santiago Olivella.

Candidate Experience in Congressional Elections

My interest in primaries originates from a coauthored project with Sarah Treul. Primary elections for the U.S. House of Representatives have traditionally been thought to be low-stakes affairs. However, the dynamics of congressional primaries have changed dramatically over the past decade. These trends led us to question whether traditional theories of candidate success translate to today’s primary electoral landscape. Using newly compiled data on the political and professional

background of primary candidates, we show that political novices are fairing better than ever before in congressional elections. We employ a regression discontinuity design to assess if these successful amateurs are at a disadvantage in the general election. Surprisingly, we find that the nomination of a political amateur in the primary has no bearing on the party’s subsequent vote share in the general election. In our data collection, we successfully located information on 28,010 primary candidates or 90% of individuals who ran between 1980 and 2020. To our knowledge, this is the first data set that comprehensively codes the most recent and relevant political experience a primary election candidate had before running for office.

Using these data on candidate political and professional experience, Sarah Treul and I are producing a book manuscript that investigates trends towards political amateurism in the U.S. House of Representatives. In the past, about 75% of candidates newly elected to Congress had a history of holding elected office. Today, over half of all new House members have *no elected experience whatsoever*. Moreover, our initial findings demonstrate that this growing cohort of inexperienced representatives is less effective at lawmaking than their experienced counterparts. In our book manuscript, we go on to examine how these amateur legislators communicate their legislative productivity (or lack thereof) to constituents. We then discuss the implications of our findings on congressional capacity and suggest that trends towards amateurism may help to explain our current state of congressional dysfunction. This project is expected to be completed by Summer 2021.

Descriptive Representation & Congressional Campaigns

In collaborative work with Maura McDonald and Sarah Treul, we take advantage of the large number of women who ran for Congress in 2018 to investigate if men and women differ in their campaign “presentation of self.” Employing an unsupervised form of content analysis called structural topic modeling (Roberts et al. 2013), we examine text data on biographical narratives from candidate websites. Like other LDA-based models, STMs uncover textual topics or “themes” based on word co-occurrences. We find that women choose to emphasize their electoral experience and diversity above all else in their campaigns for Congress. We also show that prior political experience, more so than gender, is the key cleavage defining how candidates (both men and women) present themselves. Finally, we present evidence that female candidates are strategic in their self-presentation choices, emphasizing their gender in friendly Democratic districts and playing it down in Republican safe seats. This article, “Running as a Woman?,” has been accepted for publication by *Political Research Quarterly* and is available online.

In “Changing the Dialogue,” (under review) these same coauthors and I further evaluate the ways in which electoral conditions impact political outcomes. We employ non-parametric entropy covariate balancing to assess the causal impact of candidate diversity on their election’s issue dialogue. We find a strong relationship between the emergence of candidates from underrepresented populations (i.e. female and Black candidates) and their same-party primary opponents’ issue adoption. For example, we show that the emergence of a Black Democrat is associated with a *twenty-five percentage-point* increase in the probability that their white primary election opponents take up issues that disproportionately affect Black Americans into their campaign platforms. Comparing primary and general election platform text, we demonstrate that this website content remains unchanged over the course of elections. In other words, male and white candidates’ coverage of issues that affect women and Black Americans does not begin and end with the primary. How candidates campaign is important because the positions they take during the election inform how they govern. Politicians tend to follow through on their campaign platforms, making good on the promises they made to voters. Accordingly, if more candidates cover issues in their campaigns related to groups traditionally underrepresented in lawmaking, there should be a greater probability that these policy priorities will reach the halls of Congress.