



PROJECT MUSE®

Campaign Finance and Political Polarization

La Raja, Raymond J., Schaffner, Brian F.


Published by University of Michigan Press

La Raja, J. & Schaffner, F..

Campaign Finance and Political Polarization: When Purists Prevail.

Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015.

Project MUSE., <https://muse.jhu.edu/>.



➔ For additional information about this book

<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/42636>

List of Figures and Tables

Figures

- Figure 1.1 Limits on Contributions to Parties from Various Sources 27
- Figure 1.2 Limits on Contributions to Candidates from Various Sources 29
- Figure 1.3 Per Capita Fundraising by State Parties, 2012 Elections 30
- Figure 2.1 Ideology of Registered Voters, State Donors, Federal Donors 46
- Figure 2.2 Issue Positions of Donors and Other Adults 47
- Figure 2.3 Donor Ideology Based on Giving to Candidates versus Parties 49
- Figure 2.4 Proportion of Donors Who Give to Parties, Candidates, or Groups, Based on Their Ideology 50
- Figure 2.5 Donor Perceptions of Party and Candidates, Based on Donor Ideological Self-Placement 53
- Figure 2.6 Contributions to Parties Based on State Contribution Laws (2010) 56
- Figure 2.7 Limits on Candidate Donations and Polarization among Party Donors (2010) 58
- Figure 3.1 Source of State Legislative Candidate Funds for 2005–2006 Elections 64

- Figure 3.2 Expected Contribution Patterns among Four Types of Donors 68
- Figure 3.3 How Parties and Groups Distribute Their Funds across the Ideological Spectrum (1996–2010) 71
- Figure 3.4 Proportion of All Funds Received by Different Types of Candidates (2005–2006) 73
- Figure 3.5 Fundraising Sources for Incumbents (2005–2006) 74
- Figure 3.6 Fundraising Sources for Challengers (2005–2006) 75
- Figure 3.7 Fundraising Sources for Open-Seat Candidates (2005–2006) 76
- Figure 3.8 Relationship between Incumbent Ideology and Proportion of Funds Coming from Different Sources (1996–2010) 78
- Figure 3.9 Effects of Party Contribution Limits on Candidates' Fundraising Portfolios 80
- Figure 3.10 Relationship between Ideology and Candidate Reliance on Party Funds (2006–2010) 82
- Figure 4.1 State Legislator and District Ideologies 94
- Figure 4.2 Ideological Distribution of Legislators in States With and Without Limits on Party Fundraising/Contributions 98
- Figure 4.3 Ideological Distribution of Legislators in Professional State Legislatures With and Without Limits on Party Fundraising/Contributions 99
- Figure 4.4 Partisan Ideological Overlap in States With and Without Party-Centered Campaign Finance Laws (1996–2008) 101
- Figure 4.5 Projected Levels of Polarization Based on Party Finance Limits 105
- Figure 4.6 Average Increase in Polarization in Professional Legislatures Based on Laws Limiting Party Contributions/Fundraising (1997–2007) 106
- Figure 5.1 Independent Expenditures Relative to Total Contributions in States Depending on Party Contribution Laws (2010–2012) 123

Figure 5.2 Independent Spending by Groups in States With and Without Party Limits (2006–2012) 127

Figure 6.1 What Goal Is Most Important for Campaign Finance Reform? Average Rank Ordering of Preferences among Respondents (Scale: a high of 1 to a low of 5) 156

Figure 6.2 Support for Contribution Limits to Candidates for Different Types of Contributors 158

Tables

Table 1.1 Comparing Per Capita Contributions to Parties (2011–2012 Election Cycle) 32

Table 1.2 Comparing States With and Without Limits on Political Parties 33

Table 2.1 Campaign Donors versus American Adults 44

Table 2.2 Characteristics of Donors in States with Low Contribution Limits versus No Limits 55

Table 3.1 Differing Priorities of Political Donor Groups 66

Table 3.2 How Parties and Groups Distribute Contributions 72

Table 3.3 Factors Affecting Where Incumbent Senators Receive Campaign Funding 83

Table 4.1 Average Legislative Polarization and Change (1997–2010) 93

Table 4.2 Models Estimating Effects of Campaign Finance Limits on Polarization in State Legislative Chambers (1993–2013) 104

