



Reading > Lesson 4: Purpose/Method/Opinion Questions > Exercise 4.2

FOCUS: Answering multiple-choice purpose, method, and opinion questions about longer passages.

Continue



Reading > Lesson 4: Purpose/Method/Opinion Questions > Exercise 4.2

DIRECTIONS: Read the passage. Then click on the answer choice that best answers the question.

Continue

The Permanent Campaign



Reading > Lesson 4: Purpose/Method/Opinion Questions > Exercise 4.2

DIRECTIONS: Read the passage. Then click on the answer choice that best answers the question.

Hide Time 00:19:35

Continue

The *permanent campaign* is a term invented by American political scientists to describe the current presidential electoral process in the United States. During each presidential election cycle, the time between the completion of one election and the beginning of the next has become shorter. The presidential election campaign no longer begins in the election year; instead, it is now nearly a four-year process.

No single factor created the permanent campaign. Instead, several political and technological factors are responsible for this transformation. The political process has changed a great deal since the 1980s. The main way that presidential candidates are nominated currently is through the **primary election**; political parties are no longer as important in the nominating process. Now, candidates must win primaries in different regions of the country. This means that candidates must start early to become known to key political figures, and finally, to the voting public in these states. In the "old days," candidates had to attract only party leaders. The old process was not easy but was much less public and much less expensive than campaigning for primary victories.

Technology has also contributed to the invention of the permanent campaign. At the turn of the twentieth century, presidential candidates did not move freely and quickly around the country; travel was by rail, ship, or horse-drawn carriage. Also, telephone communication was primitive, and there were no radios or televisions. The candidates spoke to smaller crowds of people for a shorter length of time and, by necessity, a presidential campaign only lasted for a few weeks or months. Today, the idea of potential candidates campaigning for office under these conditions would be ridiculous.

Media and information technology have also helped to modernize campaigning through **polling**. These changes are factors in the permanent campaign. Modern computer and telephone technology allow the media and private organizations to take the pulse of the public through opinion polls almost continually. As polls have become more common, they have become a source of fascination to the media. Pollsters have discovered that the media's appetite for polls is nearly insatiable; as a result, the number of polls has increased. In the 1950s polls were rarely taken and poll results were rarely discussed in media coverage of elections. However, by the 1980s hundreds of stories about each election campaign focused on poll results. Indeed, much of the media coverage of the campaign focuses on exactly that. Thus, candidates must pay attention to how well they do in the polls. They must begin campaigning early for the public to recognize their names; and in addition, because campaigns are now media events, they must begin early to establish themselves as worthy of media attention. Finally, candidates must have organizations, fundraisers, and pollsters in order to be taken seriously by the media. Simply put, it would be very irrational to do otherwise because a modern campaign cannot succeed without these things.

In sum, key changes in the political process, coupled with technological innovations and the increasing influence of the media, have contributed to the **perpetual** motion that modern presidential elections have become. Are these trends irreversible? This seems to be the case. Only a return to the old primary system would seem to make much difference, but such a change is highly unlikely.



Hide Time 00:17:39

Back

1 of 6

Next

Review

Continue

1 Why does the author discuss primaries in paragraph 2?

- ☐ To explain how primaries are conducted in various regions of the U.S.
- ☐ To show that primaries are not significant to the political process
- ☐ To point out how the nominating process has changed
- ☐ To focus on the main reason for failure in the nominating process

The *permanent campaign* is a term invented by American political scientists to describe the current presidential electoral process in the United States. During each presidential election cycle, the time between the completion of one election and the beginning of the next has become shorter. The presidential election campaign no longer begins in the election year; instead, it is now nearly a four-year process.

No single factor created the permanent campaign. Instead, several political and technological factors are responsible for this transformation. The political process has changed a great deal since the 1980s. The main way that presidential candidates are nominated currently is through the **primary election**; political parties are no longer as important in the nominating process. Now, candidates must win primaries in different regions of the country. This means that candidates must start early to become known to key political figures, and finally, to the voting public in these states. In the "old days," candidates had to attract only party leaders. The old process was not easy but was much less public and much less expensive than campaigning for primary victories.

Technology has also contributed to the invention of the permanent campaign. At the turn of the twentieth century, presidential candidates did not move freely and quickly around the country; travel was by rail, ship, or horse-drawn carriage. Also, telephone communication was primitive, and there were no radios or televisions. The candidates spoke to smaller crowds of people for a shorter length of time and, by necessity, a presidential campaign only lasted for a few weeks or months. Today, the idea of potential candidates campaigning for office under these conditions would be ridiculous.

Media and information technology have also helped to modernize campaigning through **polling**. These changes are factors in the permanent campaign. Modern computer and telephone technology allow the media and private organizations to take the pulse of the public through opinion polls almost continually. As polls have become more common, they have become a source of fascination to the media. Pollsters have discovered that the media's appetite for polls is nearly insatiable; as a result, the number of polls has increased. In the 1950s polls were rarely taken and poll results were rarely discussed in media coverage of elections. However, by the 1980s hundreds of stories about each election campaign focused on poll results. Indeed, much of the media coverage of the campaign focuses on exactly that. Thus, candidates must pay attention to how well they do in the polls. They must begin campaigning early for the public to recognize their names; and in addition, because campaigns are now media events, they must begin early to establish themselves as worthy of media attention. Finally, candidates must have organizations, fundraisers, and pollsters in order to be taken seriously by the media. Simply put, it would be very irrational to do otherwise because a modern campaign cannot succeed without these things.

In sum, key changes in the political process, coupled with technological innovations and the increasing influence of the media, have contributed to the **perpetual** motion that modern presidential elections have become. Are these trends irreversible? This seems to be the case. Only a return to the old primary system would seem to make much difference, but such a change is highly unlikely.



Hide Time 00:17:39

Back

1 of 6

Next

Review

Continue

- 2 The author believes that the "old days" of presidential campaigning
- ☐ were not attractive to all party leaders
 - ☐ were not taken seriously by the media
 - ☐ were easier for party leaders and the public
 - ☐ were simpler but less advantageous for the public

The *permanent campaign* is a term invented by American political scientists to describe the current presidential electoral process in the United States. During each presidential election cycle, the time between the completion of one election and the beginning of the next has become shorter. The presidential election campaign no longer begins in the election year; instead, it is now nearly a four-year process.

No single factor created the permanent campaign. Instead, several political and technological factors are responsible for this transformation. The political process has changed a great deal since the 1980s. The main way that presidential candidates are nominated currently is through the primary election; political parties are no longer as important in the nominating process. Now, candidates must win primaries in different regions of the country. This means that candidates must start early to become known to key political figures, and finally, to the voting public in these states. In the "old days," candidates had to attract only party leaders. The old process was not easy but was much less public and much less expensive than campaigning for primary victories.

Technology has also contributed to the invention of the permanent campaign. At the turn of the twentieth century, presidential candidates did not move freely and quickly around the country; travel was by rail, ship, or horse-drawn carriage. Also, telephone communication was primitive, and there were no radios or televisions. The candidates spoke to smaller crowds of people for a shorter length of time and, by necessity, a presidential campaign only lasted for a few weeks or months. Today, the idea of potential candidates campaigning for office under these conditions would be ridiculous.

Media and information technology have also helped to modernize campaigning through polling. These changes are factors in the permanent campaign. Modern computer and telephone technology allow the media and private organizations to take the pulse of the public through opinion polls almost continually. As polls have become more common, they have become a source of fascination to the media. Pollsters have discovered that the media's appetite for polls is nearly insatiable; as a result, the number of polls has increased. In the 1950s polls were rarely taken and poll results were rarely discussed in media coverage of elections. However, by the 1980s hundreds of stories about each election campaign focused on poll results. Indeed, much of the media coverage of the campaign focuses on exactly that. Thus, candidates must pay attention to how well they do in the polls. They must begin campaigning early for the public to recognize their names; and in addition, because campaigns are now media events, they must begin early to establish themselves as worthy of media attention. Finally, candidates must have organizations, fundraisers, and pollsters in order to be taken seriously by the media. Simply put, it would be very irrational to do otherwise because a modern campaign cannot succeed without these things.

In sum, key changes in the political process, coupled with technological innovations and the increasing influence of the media, have contributed to the perpetual motion that modern presidential elections have become. Are these trends irreversible? This seems to be the case. Only a return to the old primary system would seem to make much difference, but such a change is highly unlikely.



Hide Time 00:17:39

Back

1 of 6

Next

Review

Continue

- 3 How does the author show that technological innovations have quickened the pace of modern campaigning?
- ☐ By mentioning how past candidates had to journey by train, boat, or horse
 - ☐ By stating that the presidential campaign is now a "four-year process"
 - ☐ By explaining the consequences of frequent polling to the political process
 - ☐ By discussing the influence of the media on a presidential campaign

The *permanent campaign* is a term invented by American political scientists to describe the current presidential electoral process in the United States. During each presidential election cycle, the time between the completion of one election and the beginning of the next has become shorter. The presidential election campaign no longer begins in the election year; instead, it is now nearly a four-year process.

No single factor created the permanent campaign. Instead, several political and technological factors are responsible for this transformation. The political process has changed a great deal since the 1980s. The main way that presidential candidates are nominated currently is through the **primary election**; political parties are no longer as important in the nominating process. Now, candidates must win primaries in different regions of the country. This means that candidates must start early to become known to key political figures, and finally, to the voting public in these states. In the "old days," candidates had to attract only party leaders. The old process was not easy but was much less public and much less expensive than campaigning for primary victories.

Technology has also contributed to the invention of the permanent campaign. At the turn of the twentieth century, presidential candidates did not move freely and quickly around the country; travel was by rail, ship, or horse-drawn carriage. Also, telephone communication was primitive, and there were no radios or televisions. The candidates spoke to smaller crowds of people for a shorter length of time and, by necessity, a presidential campaign only lasted for a few weeks or months. Today, the idea of potential candidates campaigning for office under these conditions would be ridiculous.

Media and information technology have also helped to modernize campaigning through **polling**. These changes are factors in the permanent campaign. Modern computer and telephone technology allow the media and private organizations to take the pulse of the public through opinion polls almost continually. As polls have become more common, they have become a source of fascination to the media. Pollsters have discovered that the media's appetite for polls is nearly insatiable; as a result, the number of polls has increased. In the 1950s polls were rarely taken and poll results were rarely discussed in media coverage of elections. However, by the 1980s hundreds of stories about each election campaign focused on poll results. Indeed, much of the media coverage of the campaign focuses on exactly that. Thus, candidates must pay attention to how well they do in the polls. They must begin campaigning early for the public to recognize their names; and in addition, because campaigns are now media events, they must begin early to establish themselves as worthy of media attention. Finally, candidates must have organizations, fundraisers, and pollsters in order to be taken seriously by the media. Simply put, it would be very irrational to do otherwise because a modern campaign cannot succeed without these things.

In sum, key changes in the political process, coupled with technological innovations and the increasing influence of the media, have contributed to the **perpetual** motion that modern presidential elections have become. Are these trends irreversible? This seems to be the case. Only a return to the old primary system would seem to make much difference, but such a change is highly unlikely.



Hide Time 00:17:39

Back

1 of 6

Next

Review

Continue

4 The author uses the word *ridiculous* in paragraph 3

- ☐ to emphasize that former ways of campaigning no longer work
- ☐ to prove that presidential candidates are sometimes ridiculous
- ☐ to show that technology makes unreasonable demands on a candidate's time and resources
- ☐ to illustrate the ineffectiveness of telecommunications in the early twentieth century

The *permanent campaign* is a term invented by American political scientists to describe the current presidential electoral process in the United States. During each presidential election cycle, the time between the completion of one election and the beginning of the next has become shorter. The presidential election campaign no longer begins in the election year; instead, it is now nearly a four-year process.

No single factor created the permanent campaign. Instead, several political and technological factors are responsible for this transformation. The political process has changed a great deal since the 1980s. The main way that presidential candidates are nominated currently is through the [primary election](#); political parties are no longer as important in the nominating process. Now, candidates must win primaries in different regions of the country. This means that candidates must start early to become known to key political figures, and finally, to the voting public in these states. In the "old days," candidates had to attract only party leaders. The old process was not easy but was much less public and much less expensive than campaigning for primary victories.

Technology has also contributed to the invention of the permanent campaign. At the turn of the twentieth century, presidential candidates did not move freely and quickly around the country; travel was by rail, ship, or horse-drawn carriage. Also, telephone communication was primitive, and there were no radios or televisions. The candidates spoke to smaller crowds of people for a shorter length of time and, by necessity, a presidential campaign only lasted for a few weeks or months. Today, the idea of potential candidates campaigning for office under these conditions would be ridiculous.

Media and information technology have also helped to modernize campaigning through [polling](#). These changes are factors in the permanent campaign. Modern computer and telephone technology allow the media and private organizations to take the pulse of the public through opinion polls almost continually. As polls have become more common, they have become a source of fascination to the media. Pollsters have discovered that the media's appetite for polls is nearly insatiable; as a result, the number of polls has increased. In the 1950s polls were rarely taken and poll results were rarely discussed in media coverage of elections. However, by the 1980s hundreds of stories about each election campaign focused on poll results. Indeed, much of the media coverage of the campaign focuses on exactly that. Thus, candidates must pay attention to how well they do in the polls. They must begin campaigning early for the public to recognize their names; and in addition, because campaigns are now media events, they must begin early to establish themselves as worthy of media attention. Finally, candidates must have organizations, fundraisers, and pollsters in order to be taken seriously by the media. Simply put, it would be very irrational to do otherwise because a modern campaign cannot succeed without these things.

In sum, key changes in the political process, coupled with technological innovations and the increasing influence of the media, have contributed to the [perpetual](#) motion that modern presidential elections have become. Are these trends irreversible? This seems to be the case. Only a return to the old primary system would seem to make much difference, but such a change is highly unlikely.



Hide Time 00:17:39

Back

1 of 6

Next

Review

Continue

5 How does the author show the current wide use of polling in paragraph 4?

- ☐ By listing the dates when polls were taken in important elections
- ☐ By defining the term and giving examples of polls that were taken
- ☐ By telling how often polls were conducted and covered by the media in a recent election
- ☐ By describing the steps in the development of polling in elections.

The *permanent campaign* is a term invented by American political scientists to describe the current presidential electoral process in the United States. During each presidential election cycle, the time between the completion of one election and the beginning of the next has become shorter. The presidential election campaign no longer begins in the election year; instead, it is now nearly a four-year process.

No single factor created the permanent campaign. Instead, several political and technological factors are responsible for this transformation. The political process has changed a great deal since the 1980s. The main way that presidential candidates are nominated currently is through the **primary election**; political parties are no longer as important in the nominating process. Now, candidates must win primaries in different regions of the country. This means that candidates must start early to become known to key political figures, and finally, to the voting public in these states. In the "old days," candidates had to attract only party leaders. The old process was not easy but was much less public and much less expensive than campaigning for primary victories.

Technology has also contributed to the invention of the permanent campaign. At the turn of the twentieth century, presidential candidates did not move freely and quickly around the country; travel was by rail, ship, or horse-drawn carriage. Also, telephone communication was primitive, and there were no radios or televisions. The candidates spoke to smaller crowds of people for a shorter length of time and, by necessity, a presidential campaign only lasted for a few weeks or months. Today, the idea of potential candidates campaigning for office under these conditions would be ridiculous.

Media and information technology have also helped to modernize campaigning through **polling**. These changes are factors in the permanent campaign. Modern computer and telephone technology allow the media and private organizations to take the pulse of the public through opinion polls almost continually. As polls have become more common, they have become a source of fascination to the media. Pollsters have discovered that the media's appetite for polls is nearly insatiable; as a result, the number of polls has increased. In the 1950s polls were rarely taken and poll results were rarely discussed in media coverage of elections. However, by the 1980s hundreds of stories about each election campaign focused on poll results. Indeed, much of the media coverage of the campaign focuses on exactly that. Thus, candidates must pay attention to how well they do in the polls. They must begin campaigning early for the public to recognize their names; and in addition, because campaigns are now media events, they must begin early to establish themselves as worthy of media attention. Finally, candidates must have organizations, fundraisers, and pollsters in order to be taken seriously by the media. Simply put, it would be very irrational to do otherwise because a modern campaign cannot succeed without these things.

In sum, key changes in the political process, coupled with technological innovations and the increasing influence of the media, have contributed to the **perpetual** motion that modern presidential elections have become. Are these trends irreversible? This seems to be the case. Only a return to the old primary system would seem to make much difference, but such a change is highly unlikely.



Hide Time 00:17:39

Back

1 of 6

Next

Review

Continue

6 Which of the following statements gives the author's opinion of the effects of the permanent campaign?

- ☐ It is a temporary change to the presidential electoral process.
- ☐ It has forever altered the way that presidential candidates campaign.
- ☐ It is responsible for important innovations in communications technology.
- ☐ It has improved campaigning by making the electoral process longer.

The *permanent campaign* is a term invented by American political scientists to describe the current presidential electoral process in the United States. During each presidential election cycle, the time between the completion of one election and the beginning of the next has become shorter. The presidential election campaign no longer begins in the election year; instead, it is now nearly a four-year process.

No single factor created the permanent campaign. Instead, several political and technological factors are responsible for this transformation. The political process has changed a great deal since the 1980s. The main way that presidential candidates are nominated currently is through the **primary election**; political parties are no longer as important in the nominating process. Now, candidates must win primaries in different regions of the country. This means that candidates must start early to become known to key political figures, and finally, to the voting public in these states. In the "old days," candidates had to attract only party leaders. The old process was not easy but was much less public and much less expensive than campaigning for primary victories.

Technology has also contributed to the invention of the permanent campaign. At the turn of the twentieth century, presidential candidates did not move freely and quickly around the country; travel was by rail, ship, or horse-drawn carriage. Also, telephone communication was primitive, and there were no radios or televisions. The candidates spoke to smaller crowds of people for a shorter length of time and, by necessity, a presidential campaign only lasted for a few weeks or months. Today, the idea of potential candidates campaigning for office under these conditions would be ridiculous.

Media and information technology have also helped to modernize campaigning through **polling**. These changes are factors in the permanent campaign. Modern computer and telephone technology allow the media and private organizations to take the pulse of the public through opinion polls almost continually. As polls have become more common, they have become a source of fascination to the media. Pollsters have discovered that the media's appetite for polls is nearly insatiable; as a result, the number of polls has increased. In the 1950s polls were rarely taken and poll results were rarely discussed in media coverage of elections. However, by the 1980s hundreds of stories about each election campaign focused on poll results. Indeed, much of the media coverage of the campaign focuses on exactly that. Thus, candidates must pay attention to how well they do in the polls. They must begin campaigning early for the public to recognize their names; and in addition, because campaigns are now media events, they must begin early to establish themselves as worthy of media attention. Finally, candidates must have organizations, fundraisers, and pollsters in order to be taken seriously by the media. Simply put, it would be very irrational to do otherwise because a modern campaign cannot succeed without these things.

In sum, key changes in the political process, coupled with technological innovations and the increasing influence of the media, have contributed to the **perpetual** motion that modern presidential elections have become. Are these trends irreversible? This seems to be the case. Only a return to the old primary system would seem to make much difference, but such a change is highly unlikely.