

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-01903-4 - Ideology in America
Christopher Ellis and James A. Stimson
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Ideology in America

Public opinion in the United States contains a paradox. The American public is symbolically conservative: it cherishes the symbols of conservatism and is more likely to identify as conservative than as liberal. Yet at the same time, it is operationally liberal, wanting government to do and spend more to solve a variety of social problems. This book focuses on understanding this contradiction. It argues that both facets of public opinion are real and lasting, not artifacts of the survey context or isolated to particular points in time. By exploring the ideological attitudes of the American public as a whole, and the seemingly conflicted choices of individual citizens, it explains the foundations of this paradox. The keys to understanding this large-scale contradiction, and to thinking about its consequences, are found in Americans' attitudes toward religion and culture and in the frames in which elite actors describe policy issues.

Christopher Ellis is assistant professor of Political Science at Bucknell University. He received his Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and has previously taught at North Carolina State University. His work has been published in the *Journal of Politics*, *Political Research Quarterly*, *Political Science and Politics*, *Electoral Studies*, and *Journal of Public Opinion and Parties*.

James A. Stimson earned his B.A. from the University of Minnesota and his Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina. Stimson is former President of the Midwest Political Science Association and Treasurer of the American Political Science Association. He has authored or coauthored six books: *Yeas and Nays* (with Donald R. Matthews), *Issue Evolution* (with Edward G. Carmines), *Public Opinion in America*, *The Macro Polity* (with Robert S. Erikson and Michael B. MacKuen), *Tides of Consent*, and *Mandate Politics* (with Larry Grossback and David A. M. Peterson). A Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, he has won the Heinz Eulau and Gladys Kammerer awards of the American Political Science Association. He is founding editor of *Political Analysis* and has authored articles in all the major journals of political science.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-01903-4 - Ideology in America
Christopher Ellis and James A. Stimson
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Advance Praise for *Ideology in America*

“In this excellent book, Ellis and Stimson use a sophisticated methodological approach to trace the ebb and flow of ideology in American public opinion over the past 75 years. Their insights are relevant to a variety of audiences. For journalists, commentators, and pundits, Ellis and Stimson show that the public’s liberal-conservative orientations cannot be extracted readily either from election results or from public opinion survey questions. For academics, they elaborate on the scholarly consensus that the mass public is largely ‘innocent of ideology.’ Instead, they demonstrate systematic patterns in the ways that citizens ‘misuse’ liberal-conservative terminology to describe their own political orientations. This book represents a major step forward in understanding how ordinary citizens think about the political world.”

– William G. Jacoby, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University; ICPSR, University of Michigan

“In this extended treatment of the paradox of symbolic conservatism and operational liberalism Ellis and Stimson present important evidence for the continuation of the phenomenon first uncovered by Free and Cantril in 1967. They demonstrate that these ‘conflicted conservatives’ remain numerous despite the apparent polarization of the electorate in the recent past, that they differ from the general electorate, and that they are a force sufficient to change close presidential election outcomes. This is accomplished against the background of a fascinating account of the decline in the symbolic resonance of liberal identification since the 1930s, and of the nonpolitical meanings of conservatism.”

– Kathleen Knight, Columbia University

“This is a compelling book on an interesting and important topic. Ellis and Stimson provide a driving analysis of seemingly every facet of the match and mismatch between people’s policy preferences and ideological identification in America. Predictably strong on social science, the book also is accessible, readable, and engaging. *Ideology in America* is as good as it gets.”

– Christopher Wlezien, Temple University

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-01903-4 - Ideology in America
Christopher Ellis and James A. Stimson
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Ideology in America

CHRISTOPHER ELLIS

Bucknell University

JAMES A. STIMSON

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-107-01903-4 - Ideology in America
 Christopher Ellis and James A. Stimson
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
 Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107687417

© Christopher Ellis and James A. Stimson 2012

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
 and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
 no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
 permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2012

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data

Ellis, Christopher, 1978–

Ideology in America / Christopher Ellis, James A. Stimson.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-01903-4 (hardback) – ISBN 978-1-107-68741-7 (paperback)

1. Ideology – United States. 2. Conservatism – United States.

3. Liberalism – United States. 4. Social conflict – United States.

5. Divided government – United States. 6. United States – Politics and

government – Public opinion. 7. Public opinion – United States.

8. Americans – Attitudes. I. Stimson, James A. II. Title.

JC573.2.U6E55 2012

320.50973–dc23 2011035572

ISBN 978-1-107-01903-4 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-107-68741-7 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs
 for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not
 guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-01903-4 - Ideology in America
Christopher Ellis and James A. Stimson
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> vii
<i>List of Tables</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xvii
1 The Meaning of Ideology in America	1
1.1 <i>The Conflict Between Liberalism and Conservatism</i>	2
1.2 <i>The Two Faces of Ideology in American Politics</i>	10
1.3 <i>Plan of the Book</i>	12
2 Operational Ideology: Preferences Data	14
2.1 <i>Public Policy Preferences</i>	15
2.2 <i>Preferences: Concept and Data</i>	17
2.3 <i>Why Operational Liberalism?</i>	24
2.4 <i>Question Formats</i>	31
2.5 <i>The Dimensions of Policy Preference</i>	34
3 Operational Ideology: The Estimates	37
3.1 <i>The Dimensions of Operational Ideology</i>	37
3.2 <i>A Second Dimension of Preferences</i>	49
3.3 <i>Are the Two Dimensions Independent?</i>	52
3.4 <i>Appendix: Criterion Variables Used for Dimensional Interpretation</i>	56
4 Ideological Self-Identification	57
4.1 <i>Ideology as Self-Identification</i>	58
4.2 <i>Building a Historical Portrait of Symbolic Ideology</i>	59
4.3 <i>Explanations for Growing Conservative Identification</i>	72
4.4 <i>A Statistical Model</i>	86
4.5 <i>Conclusions: Building the Conservative Symbolic Majority</i>	88
	v

vi		Contents
5	The Operational-Symbolic Disconnect	90
5.1	<i>Operational and Symbolic Ideology at the Individual Level</i>	92
5.2	<i>The Operational-Symbolic Disconnect: Some Individual-Level Evidence</i>	95
5.3	<i>Who Are the “Operationally Liberal Symbolic Conservatives”?</i>	99
5.4	<i>Ideology and Policy Preferences: A Multidimensional View</i>	106
5.5	<i>The Operational-Symbolic Paradox Revisited</i>	112
5.6	<i>Appendix: Questions and Coding Used in Creation of GSS Preference Measures</i>	113
6	Conservatism as Social and Religious Identity	115
6.1	<i>Cultural Issues and American Politics</i>	116
6.2	<i>Another Explanation: “Conservatism” as Religious Identity</i>	127
6.3	<i>Another Explanation, Part 2: “Conservatism” as Social Identity</i>	131
6.4	<i>Extrapolitical Identity and Political Self-Identification</i>	133
6.5	<i>Conservative Lifestyles and Conservative Ideology: Some Correlational Evidence</i>	135
6.6	<i>Modeling Social Identity and Ideological Self-Identification</i>	138
6.7	<i>“Populist” Preferences and Conservative Identification</i>	142
6.8	<i>Conclusions</i>	144
6.9	<i>Appendix: ANES Questions and Coding for Preference Measures</i>	145
7	Conflicted Conservatism	149
7.1	<i>Are “Conflicted Conservatives” Really Conservative?</i>	150
7.2	<i>Conflicted Conservatism as Default Ideology</i>	153
7.3	<i>Framing and Mass Opinion</i>	155
7.4	<i>Symbolic Conservatism, Operational Liberalism, and Conflicted Elite Frames</i>	156
7.5	<i>Ideological Language in the Mass Media</i>	161
7.6	<i>News Exposure, Knowledge, and Operational-Symbolic Conflict</i>	167
7.7	<i>“Conflicted Conservatism” and American Political Dynamics</i>	173
8	Ideology and American Political Outcomes	175
8.1	<i>Making Sense of Ideology in American Politics</i>	175
8.2	<i>The Electoral Impact of Conflicted Conservatives</i>	177
8.3	<i>Operational-Symbolic Dynamics</i>	185
8.4	<i>On the Measurement and Conceptualization of Ideology</i>	189
8.5	<i>On Public Rationality</i>	191
	<i>Bibliography</i>	195
	<i>Index</i>	203

List of Figures

2.1	Average Liberal Percentage of the Response over Time	<i>page</i> 23
3.1	Public Policy Mood First Dimension, 1952–2009	45
3.2	A Simple Conception of Party and Voter Spaces in Left and Right	47
3.3	Cumulative Loss of Support for the President’s Ideological Position	49
3.4	Public Policy Mood First and Second Dimensions, 1952–2009	50
3.5	Locating Issue Series in Two-Dimensional Space	54
3.6	Locating Issue Series in Two-Dimensional Space: Rotated	55
4.1	The Administration Series, 1936–1964	63
4.2	The Go Left Series, 1945–1979	64
4.3	The Identification Series, 1937–1970	65
4.4	The Party to Join Series, 1936–1978	66
4.5	The Preference Series, 1944–1970	66
4.6	The Estimated Series, 1936–1970	68
4.7	Ideological Self-Identification, 1937–2006	70
4.8	Correlations Between Liberals Thermometer and Blacks Thermometer	79
4.9	Correlations Between Liberals Thermometer and Labor Unions Thermometer	80
4.10	Correlations Between Liberals Thermometer and Urban Unrest	81
4.11	Correlations Between Liberals Thermometer and Thermometers for Black Militants and Civil Rights Leaders	82
5.1	Operational and Symbolic Ideology, 1952–2008	91
5.2	Comparison of Operational Ideology Measure and GSS Spending Preference Measure	94

viii	<i>List of Figures</i>
5.3	Net Preferences on Spending Issues, 1973–2006 95
5.4	Distribution of Operational and Ideological Preferences 96
5.5	Operational and Symbolic Ideologies by Classification, 1973–2008 98
5.6	Net Preferences on “Cultural” Issues, 1973–2006 108
5.7	Operational Preferences of Self-Identified “Liberals” 109
5.8	Operational Preferences of Self-Identified “Conservatives” 110
6.1	Expected Impact of Issue Preferences on Ideological Identification, 1986–2006 Pooled 120
6.2	Expected Impact of Issue Preferences on Partisan Identification, 1986–2006 Pooled 121
6.3	Association of Issues with Republican Identification 123
6.4	Association of Issues with Conservative Identification 123
6.5	Biblical Views of the American Electorate, 1984–2006 130
7.1	Operational and Symbolic Ideologies of Respondents Probed to Choose an Identification 155
7.2	Media Use of Ideological Language 163
8.1	The Accuracy of GSS Presidential Vote Recall 179
8.2	Operational and Symbolic Ideology 186
8.3	Squared Correlations Between Operational and Symbolic Ideology Series for Three Periods 187
8.4	The Size of the Operational-Symbolic Gap over Time 188

List of Tables

2.1 An Example Question	<i>page</i> 19
2.2 The Recoded Example	20
2.3 A Simple Aggregate of Survey Responses	22
2.4 Relative Percentage Supporting Expanded Government Spending in Various Categories	27
3.1 Decomposing the Valid Variation of Surveyed Preferences into Dimensions	41
3.2 Defining Variables for the First Dimension of Political Preferences, 1952–2009	44
3.3 Defining Variables for the Second Dimension of Political Preferences, 1952–2009	50
3.4 Criterion Variables for Interpreting the Economic Dimension	56
3.5 Criterion Variables for Interpreting the Cultural Dimension	56
4.1 Which Party Would You Join?	61
4.2 The Dimensional Solution for Four Items, 1936–1970	67
4.3 Items and Loadings for the Estimate of Liberal-Conservative Self-Identification	70
4.4 Explaining the Movement in Liberal Self-Identification	87
5.1 A Comparison of Various Measures of Political Engagement for Four Ideological Groups	100
5.2 Educational Attainment of Ideological Groups	102
5.3 Operational Preferences of Symbolic Conservatives, by Strength of Identification	103
5.4 Symbolic Preferences of Operational Liberals	104
5.5 Political Preferences of Four Ideological Groups	105
6.1 Ideological and Partisan Identification as a Function of Issue Preferences, 1986–2006	119
	ix

x	<i>List of Tables</i>
6.2	Abortion Attitudes and Knowledge Among Self-Identified Conservatives 125
6.3	Indicators of Doctrinal Conservatism Among American Citizens 131
6.4	Lifestyle Choices and Political Attitudes 137
6.5	The Impact of Issues and Lifestyle Choices on Political Identification 139
6.6	Predicting Self-Identified Conservatism Among Citizens with “Populist” Attitudes 143
7.1	Political and Social Values of Ideological Groups 151
7.2	Media Mentions of Ideological Terms, by Section 164
7.3	Media Mentions of Ideological Terms, by Valence 166
7.4	Predicting “Conflicted Conservatism” Among the Population at Large 170
7.5	Predicting “Conflicted Conservatism” Among Operational Liberals 172
8.1	Voting Tendencies of Conflicted Conservatives 180
8.2	Presidential Election Outcomes for Three Elections, Actual and Estimated with the Effect of Conflicted Conservative Votes Removed 182

Preface

The Ohio ballot of 2004 featured a vote on an amendment banning gay marriage. It passed by a large margin. And the same was true in Arkansas, in Georgia, in Mississippi, in Montana, in North Dakota, in Oklahoma, and in Utah. All of these states, most conservative leaning, had ballot measures, and all were lopsided victories for the anti side of the gay marriage debate. The average vote was about 70% for the ban, 30% against.

There was never a large prospect that legal gay marriage was imminent in these states. The bigger story was the possible impact on the election for the president of the United States. The theory was that the ballot measures would mobilize large numbers of culturally conservative usual nonvoters to make a rare trip to the polls and then incidentally vote for George W. Bush, whose campaign was tightly linked to the opposition to gay marriage.

The ballot measures did coincide with increased turnout, particularly in more culturally conservative areas. And in Ohio, critical to Bush's Electoral College victory and won with a margin of just over a hundred thousand votes, the increased conservative turnout might have been enough to put Bush over the edge. Whether or not decisive, the popular narrative of the election in the weeks-long postmortem left an indelible impression that appeal to cultural conservatism in the United States was, as it had been many times before, a formula for Republican electoral success.

Bush wasted no time translating his victory into a proposal for governing. "Let me put it to you this way," he said; "I earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it. It is my style."

And then the president set about turning his campaign promise for private accounts in the Social Security system into legislation. The Bush proposal would direct some proportion of the payroll tax contributions of younger workers into private, self-managed accounts, with the presumption that much of the investment would be in stocks with a higher return than the government bond investments of the Social Security system. The new program would dismantle, or at least greatly change, the system of government-financed income security for the elderly in place since the New Deal.

The complication of the proposal was that the Social Security system, as designed, was a system of intergenerational transfer. The current contributions of younger workers, that is, were already dedicated to the retirement support of the generation of their parents and grandparents. Thus the issue was not merely whether to replace a government-held account with a private one but also how to finance the current and future generations of recipients when the money they would require would be redirected into private accounts.

The proposal contemplated borrowing the additional money, a matter of trillions of dollars, when the federal deficit was already growing out of control. Since the demography of the baby boom already had the Social Security system in a deficit in 20 years or so, when the amounts paid out would exceed the amounts coming in, that additional financing was widely seen as a threat to the existing system. Supporters of the current Social Security system worried, and not without reason, that when the debt came due and younger workers were well started with private accounts, the reckoning would involve major cuts to traditional Social Security benefits to balance the books.¹

As the proposal wound its way to Capitol Hill, the public weighed in. In polls, but perhaps more importantly in personal comments to members of Congress, very large numbers of actual and potential recipients voiced concern that the Bush proposal was a threat to the future of Social Security. The public, it was clear, was in no mood for experimentation. It had been living with the existing system for almost 70 years, liked it, and wanted it to continue unchanged in the future. In an uncertain world, Social Security was a rock, something that could be counted upon.

¹ Bush offered the assurance that the promises of Social Security would always be kept. But since the financial crisis to the system loomed a good decade at least after he would have left office, that was a promise that he was powerless to keep.

As members heard that outpouring, doubts began to arise. “Political capital” or not, Republicans began to become nervous that establishing private accounts would be seen as opposed to the continuation of Social Security, long famous as the “third rail of American politics.” It became clear that such a proposal would likely have Republicans going it alone, with no Democratic support. And although the votes of Democrats were not needed, the political cover of bipartisanship was.

Thus the messages going back to the White House from Capitol Hill began to replace enthusiasm with reserve, reserve with caution, and, eventually, caution with fear. Republicans had heard approving responses when they characterized the Social Security system as “bankrupt.” But now, as they proposed to change it, the message of public opinion became starkly supportive of the status quo.

Congressional Republicans were looking for a way out. It was provided to them by Senator Charles Grassley of Iowa, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. Grassley read the tea leaves of public sentiment and declared that he found so little support for the Bush proposal that he declined even to schedule hearings on the bill. It was going to die anyhow, but that was the final whimper of Bush’s most important policy proposal.

But the failure of Bush’s plan to overhaul Social Security was more than about a simple misreading of how much “capital” Bush had indeed earned by appealing to a culturally conservative electorate. As it turns out, the role that gay marriage played in shaping the 2004 results was probably misread, too. Although the public was clearly uneasy about homosexual relations and was willing (particularly in culturally conservative states) to express its support for “traditional marriage” at the ballot box, it was uneasy – and was growing more so – about the possibility of providing government a means to regulate gay and lesbian unions out of existence entirely.

And despite the fact that “moral values” famously topped the list as the most important problem facing the nation in 2004 exit polls, “values” turned out to be only a small part of what voters, particularly swing voters, were thinking about in the election.² There is also precious little evidence that “values” voters turned out in higher rates in 2004 than in elections prior. Bush’s victory was in all likelihood much more a result of a fairly good economy – and some residual “rally around the flag” enthusiasm following September 11 and the invasion of Iraq – than it was about these sorts of cultural concerns.

² See Hillygus and Shields 2005 for a thorough discussion of this point.

So, which nation are we? Are we the one that holds dear cherished symbols of marriage, family, and tradition and resists real or perceived efforts to encroach on these symbols? Or the one that so strongly supports Social Security as a government benefit for retirement that it would not hear of any conservative experiments in lessening the government role, even by a relatively popular newly reelected president?

The theme of this book is that we are both Americas, the one that reveres the symbols of tradition and the one that fervently supports a redistributive pension system for seniors. We are one and the same, a symbolically conservative nation that honors tradition, distrusts novelty, and embraces the conservative label – and an operationally liberal nation that has made Social Security one of the most popular government programs ever created.

Our story here of gay marriage and a failed proposal to change the retirement system is just an illustration. Symbolic conservatism is much more than marriage. And it is much more than – fundamentally different from – culturally conservative politics as defined by the religious right. It is respect for basic values: hard work, striving, caution, prudence, family, tradition, God, citizenship, and the American flag. And the ranks of Americans who cherish these values is no fringe activist minority; it is the mainstream of American culture. It is also not explicitly political, except in the sense that strategic political elites have tried to make it so. It is woven into the fabric of how ordinary citizens live their lives.

And for the other side, operational liberalism, Social Security is also no exception. Most Americans like most government programs. Most of the time, on average, we want government to do more and spend more. It is no accident that we have created the programs of the welfare state. They were created – and are sustained – by massive public support.

Our plan of attack is to tell both stories, of why Americans predominantly identify as conservatives, when at the same time supporting a liberal government role in a wide range of particular circumstances. We will not try to resolve the conflict between them. We will embrace it as the right story of what America is: both liberal and conservative.

Clearly many Americans, authors and most potential readers included, are not both liberal and conservative. The political class, of which we are jointly members with our readers, lines up symbols to match policy, or the reverse. That fact can make us forget that many citizens do not do so. This group is a very large proportion of the electorate and, so far as we can tell, always has been. We will give these people sustained attention, trying to understand why the default ideological identification of America

Preface

xv

seems to be “conservative,” while the default attitude toward government programs is support for more.

BACKGROUND

The research of which this book is the product originated when we were both at the University of North Carolina. The discovery of conservative symbolic dominance is as easy as looking at the most recent question on liberal and conservative self-identification. The appreciation of operational liberalism was a more subtle and gradual process. It began with initial work on the study of public policy mood (Stimson 1991). One cannot compile all of the survey questions on domestic policy issues without eventually noticing that liberal responses to such queries consistently outnumber conservative ones.

The conflict between symbolic conservatism and operational liberalism is developed more fully in *Tides of Consent* (Stimson 2004). There the group to be called “conflicted conservatives” was first observed in a treatment of a small section of one chapter. But that chapter ends more in a question mark than a conclusion. It left us both struck by the idea that contradiction was more normal in American politics than it was aberrant. We determined somehow to get to the bottom of that. This book is the product of about six years of joint effort toward that end.

Our first conception is that the problem for our research was to explain why so many people could simultaneously embrace conservative symbols and liberal policy preferences. And we have done that, particularly in Chapters 6 and 7. But along the way we decided that it was not as simple as one large, but nonetheless deviant, group – that understanding American ideology more generally would be a necessary step along the way. That is what we have endeavored to do.

We are ourselves a bit conflicted. The two authors are on opposite sides of political debates as often as not. When we write about liberals and conservatives, it is not like a cowboy movie in which the good guys wear white hats and the bad guys black. We are likely to disagree over who should wear which hat. But we share a scientific commitment to getting the theory and facts right, which makes working together easy, fun, and profitable.

And if one of us is right and the other one wrong, it is probably not going to be decided who is which in the pages of this book.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-01903-4 - Ideology in America
Christopher Ellis and James A. Stimson
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Acknowledgments

This project began at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, which brought the two authors together and provided a wonderfully stimulating environment. We thank the Department of Political Science; the American Politics Research Group; and a large number of colleagues, faculty and graduate students, who contributed to our work in myriad ways.

Most of the data used in this book were collected from the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut, Storrs. This book could not have been written without the richness of the Roper archive. As it developed, the project also benefited from the support of Bucknell University, North Carolina State University, and the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation. Le Centre d'Études Européennes of Sciences-po, Paris, provided a home away from home for Stimson during most of the research and writing of this book.

Completion of this project was supported by National Science Foundation grant 1024291 for "Developing Policy Specific Measures of Public Opinion," Frank R. Baumgartner, co-Principal Investigator.

Mo Fiorina, Paul Sniderman, and Ben Highton provided criticism and encouragement along the way. Sarah Binzer Hobolt and Mark Pickup provided useful critiques of Chapter 2. Bill Jacoby, Tom Rudolph, Steven Greene, Chris Wlezien, and Scott Meinke have also read or commented on various parts of this project. Their insights are greatly appreciated. Ellis particularly wishes to thank Mike MacKuen. Much of what became the final chapters of this book originated in a seminar paper written for his Media and Politics seminar some time ago. His helpful criticism and encouragement contributed to setting this project off in the right direction.

We owe a special debt to Elizabeth Coggins, a coauthor on related work on ideological self-identification, for the content analyses of Chapter 6 and for database management. We thank the former UNC undergraduate Peter Herman for assistance in the substantial task of updating the public opinion database.

We thank coauthors on other projects, John Bartle, Sebastian Dellepiani, Vincent Tiberj, Cyrille Thiébaud, Elizabeth Coggins, Mel Atkinson, Frank Baumgartner, Joe Ura, Chris Faricy, and Patrick Wohlfarth, for contributions they do not even know that they have made.

We are grateful to Lew Bateman at Cambridge University Press for providing an editorial process that brings out the best of our work.

Stimson thanks Dianne, as always.

Ellis thanks Carrie for her support, understanding, and love throughout the course of this project. Thank you for being understanding as I tried to figure out what to do with the rest of my life and for giving me the direction that I needed to see this through. To Connor and Charlotte, you are the best things that could have happened to me. You grow more amazing every day. To Maureen and Gary, thanks for all that you have done. You now finally get to see what I'm doing when I'm not getting ready for class.