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Abstract

Today, there is much evidence to suggest that the party fundraising ‘machine’ is not what it was in US Senate Elections. Some speculate that with the tremendous growth of PAC contributions and the *Citizens United v Federal Election Commission* decision, party money is inconsequential in the overall scheme of a candidate’s fundraising operation. What role, then, does the party play in the fundraising activities of its candidates? Does it play a role at all?

My research focuses on those on the receiving end of party expenditure, and will attempt to show that current scholars underestimate the importance that party loyalty and influence may still have in the 'money-ball' game of US Senate elections. Further, my research focuses on the personal in politics, studying the relationships of Senators to one another and how that affects fundraising behavior. Data were drawn from Federal Election Commission filings to determine the amount of party money received by campaigns, and the correlation of party coordinated funds with measures of interpersonal interaction between Senators. While my hypothesis was not supported by the data, some minor findings in the data sets are noteworthy, and worthy of further study.
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Chapter I. Overview

Objective

My research aims to quantify the personal interaction between the two major political parties and candidates seeking election or re-election to the United States Senate. Specifically, I wish to study the link between cultivating relationships and garnering financial support. Does a candidate who interacts with the party members get preferential treatment over others who do not actively seek out approval by the party? Is there a way to establish a connection between personal loyalty and funds received?

In order to establish that linkage, I evaluated the financial statements of candidates from the two major parties for the United States Senate, looking specifically at income received from party sources in the election year 2012. I excluded minor-party and independent candidates, elections won by independents, and elections in which short-term appointed, previously unelected Senators were running. This was to ensure two things. Firstly, that only the two major parties were studied, and that independent and minor candidates would not skew the research’s focus away from the parties. And secondly, so that I could be assured that I only studied those candidates who who had a vested interest in party relationships in and out of the chamber. Thus I excluded appointed Senators, who may not have been active beforehand, and those not involved with the major parties I would study. By looking at all candidates, I was able to study whether previous membership in the Senate, and therefore presumed relationships with other Senators, influenced intra-party financing. Alternative explanations for why some candidates are favored over others may include their voting records, their importance or
rank in the chamber, etc. I had initially planned to analyze three election cycles, but in the interest of saving research time and being able to complete further, alternative research if my hypothesis was proven wrong, I opted to only include the most recent Senate election in my data set.

I have decided to focus on the most recent Senatorial elections with these restrictions for two reasons. Firstly, excluding independent and minor party candidates allows me to focus on what I want to study, the inner workings of the two major parties. Secondly, excluding short-term Senators ensures that I look at only those who have fostered relationships in the Senate and with the party’s fundraising arm.

In constructing the data set, I look at the four quarters of the calendar year for 2012. In this way, I was able to get a clearer picture of contributions from the party across an election, including the primary season. In this manner, I would be able to judge differences in party funding over time, including earlier funding and last minute funding, if this was significant in my findings.

The other variable examined in this study is the appearance of a candidate at party functions. This is calculated in a two-fold manner; by compiling mentions of attendance with other Senators at fundraisers from the political watchdog organization the Sunlight Foundation, and attendance at the candidate’s 2012 party convention. Analyzing appearances at party functions is a reasonable way to gauge the creation and cultivation of interpersonal relationships within the parties that leads to increased mutual financial support, the relationship I wish to examine. It is difficult to properly
measure these kinds of relationships for the outside researcher, because these kinds of contacts are often not made a part of the public record. This data, being publicly available, is what I found most convincing. While there is no scientifically quantifiable way for a political science researcher to measure influence or friendliness in a political setting, I believe my analysis will come reasonably close to achieving that, given the restrictions I would have in conducting personal interviews. I do not have the time or training to conduct in-person research, and there is of course the obstacle that the inner workings of any party are closely held secrets. By studying publicly available, numerical data, I avoid potential misrepresentation that could arise in personal interviews, and this further allows me to analyze a larger pool of cases than would be possible with personal interviews with candidates and their staffs.

Hypothesis

I hypothesize that the more party events a candidate attends, the more likely he or she will be to receive coordinated funding from the party towards his or her campaign efforts. A positive correlation suggests that relationships are being formed at party events which benefit the candidate and suggest that the party seeks to aid candidates that seek to curry favor with the party.

Significance of the Research

I understand that there are limits to the inferences I can make with this data set, and that the results I attain may be construed by other scholars to have an entirely different meaning, or to be inconclusive. However, I still believe that my research is valuable and novel in the field of campaign finance. As far as my research has found,
there is as yet little to no research on the impact personal relationships between party 
elites and candidates have on the financial resources given by the party to a candidate. 
What little scholarship there is, that I have found, focuses on House elections. Much 
previous research centers around the practical reasoning for party financial 
involvement; the candidates most likely to win, and in need of the most financial 
support, will receive monies from the party committees. The research I am undertaking 
looks at much studied data in a new light.

**Chapter II. Current Scholarship**

*Theories of Parties in Elections, and Parties Generally*

The party serves several capacities for its members who run for office. Parties 
serve as leadership bodies, and in order to be effective, “party leaders need the 
authority to reward cooperation with, or punish defection from, the party,” which helps to 
explain the trend towards party ideological unity (Jacobson *Politics* 241-242). National 
parties allow for state-wide elections to receive national inspection and 
involvement (Jacobson *Politics* 18). A Senate candidate runs only to represent his or 
her state and its interests, but the exposure and connections of the national party allow 
him to have national recognition and fundraising resources beyond his or her home 
state. These national fundraising and social networks are utilized by the party to find 
resources for members to further “the party line” (Cann 97). Along with their leadership 
roles, parties are theoretically understood to be practical organizations for the building 
of coalitions and action by constituent groups (Sides 240). This activity is a primary role
of party organization and is something any individual candidate could not do himself or herself. Therefore, most scholarship finds that parties serve as mass-organizing bodies that serve as symbols of public policy preferences to citizens.

*Party Money: The Party in Decline*

Over time, political action committees (PACs) have greatly increased their share of campaign contributions (Sorauf 46). In contrast, party monetary resources average to less than 20 percent of a campaign’s resources, with the large majority of funds coming from individual donations (Jacobson *Politics* 75). Most candidates feel they cannot rely on party financing or connections, instead developing their own resource base among individual donors and PACs (Jacobson *Money* 89).

*Party Money: The Party as a Default Source*

While it is generally concluded that part influence over candidate finances decreased in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, the trend may be reversing despite the growth of PACs and the candidate centered campaign (Jacobson *Politics* 18). According to some scholars, the party has become subservient in a way to the needs of candidates, and supply candidates as their campaigns need, and not as the party dictates from on high. Parties spend more money on candidates who are in need or are in tight elections, usually disregarding that candidate’s party loyalty or incumbency (Jacobson *Politics* 74). While a PAC spends money on a candidate hoping he or she will further the PAC’s policy goals, parties tend to believe it is their responsibility to support a candidate (Jacobson *Money* 82). This may be because given
the current polarization of the parties, each candidate will likely toe the party line, thus making each Senator elected from the party a voice on the national stage with each vote in the Chamber.

In some cases the party provides financing in ways that are indirect, and are harder for traditional studies of party money streams to detect. Parties provide much of the funding for opposition research, consulting, and vendors, although this is not formally a “cash contribution” (Sides 240).

**Party Money: Buying Leadership and Support**

This does not mean, though, that parties are weakening with respect to the candidate-centered campaign, but instead are finding new outlets to assert financial dominance, some argue. When party money is given, in some cases, local campaign directors have complained that the party will dictate exactly how much the money is to be spent, demanding cooperation from the recipient for the funding (Jacobson *Politics* 79).

In playing the party’s game, a candidate has much to gain in the long-term. Once incumbency has been established, most candidates are safer than if they had been challengers. So these people become donors to others through the party money transferal apparatus. Parties “use their monopoly over access to powerful institutional positions to create selective incentives” for those that give funding (Heberlig 19). In giving money to others, they buy influence and favors from other members of the Senate, on whom they can depend for help to rise to leadership positions (Jacobson
Politics 80). In the House of Representatives, for example, the more a Congressman gives to other Congressmen or their party, the more likely he is to be selected for committee and leadership assignments (Cann 97). While no comparable research has been done with Senate cases, it would be reasonable to assume that a trend may exist in the Senate as well. When an incumbent party member is in need, he will get more money from party sources than ANY other type of candidate (Jacobson Money 120).

Chapter III. Methodology

Overview

In order to calculate the relationship between a candidate’s party relationships and connections and his or her fundraising network, I plan to compare receipts of monies from sources I consider to be “party organized” with a candidate’s appearances at party sponsored events. The Senate pool of the last election cycle is an interesting set of examples. Much more research of financing and party control has been conducted at the Congressional level, in comparison with a dearth of comparable information at the Senate level. I am curious to see if interpersonal relationships of Senators extend into the fundraising sphere.

While most of the existing literature on intra-party giving focuses on the relationship between receipts and incumbency, or on donors and leadership rank, my research seeks to better understand the relationship between receipts and party support. Further, I will attempt to provide evidence that interpersonal relationships are important in determining which Senate candidate receives funds.
Analysis of event invitations and news articles relating to a candidate’s attendance could be considered open to bias and human error, but I will eschew any value judgments or reading of full texts, and instead focus on simply collecting the number of party appearances a candidate makes, as far as that information is available to me. For quantitative research, the synthesis will be relatively simple, using Excel charts, graphs, plots, and tables. While this may pose some challenges in parsing the data at a more complex level, I plan on separating the data sets and comparisons into smaller subsets so as to avoid confusion on my part. Setting these individual charts side by side instead of creating a more complex regression should be simpler to do and show the same basic data.

Data Collection

I am collecting two series of data; receipts of candidates from their party, and appearances at party events. The first series will be divided by sets into the two types of receipts I will look for, formal and informal contributions. Formal contributions are those explicitly stated as party funds in the FEC database, and informal contributions are those which I find by looking through other categories, such as “unidentified receipts,” or those erroneously placed in “PAC contributions.” Thus, formal party receipts are those which are openly declared by a candidate to be from the party, whereas informal will refer to those receipts which I discovered that were not formally declared as such by the campaign.

In order to count as a monetary contribution from a party or from a fellow candidate, the contribution must be listed under the category of “party
contribution”. The FEC data does not make clear exactly which party committees the monies come from, and lumps it into one party category. Thus, some committee money which I assume to be from other candidates could in fact be from a party committee or from the candidate’s personal committee. While it is a great deal of time and work, I also analyze each major party candidates records exhaustively. Using the Boolean operators “for Senate,” “for Congress,” “Senator,” and “Congressman,” I was able to filter out the campaign committees of fellow Congressmen from the data series to create a more accurate depiction of party coordinated funds received by candidates than what is formally mentioned in the party category. Thus, I have two sources of party funding in my collected data sets.

In order to find those seeking election in the 2012 cycle, their incumbency status, and their results in the election, I consulted the *New York Times* Election Resource database for the 2012 election. I looked at the current roster of United States Senators, excepting those who gained office by appointment. I then searched their name for their most recent election cycle in the Congressional finance database, using the Maps tool on the Federal Election Commission’s website. I combined their formal party receipts from each of the four quarters of that election year, and their informal party receipts. It is the total sum of the year that I will use to calculate my regression compared to event appearances.

To calculate party appearances, I used the same Senate roster and schedule of election cycles to find out the candidate’s appearances at party functions.
By searching the Sunlight Foundation’s database of political fundraisers for a candidate’s name, and cross referencing it with appearances by other candidates, I was able to roughly surmise the number of joint fundraisers attended by Senate candidates in 2012. Further, I searched for news articles reporting candidate non-attendance at his or her party’s 2012 convention. While this is not a precise measurement, it is the closest way I may measure candidate interaction and suggest that political and financial negotiations may be occurring. Party financial goals and interpersonal relationships are shrouded in privacy and can be hard to quantify for academic research. This method of data collection negates the need for time consuming personal interviews or potentially “whitewashed” hear-say from those more involved with these matters who could be better resources for this type of information than reports of appearances in media sources.

*Synthesis*

Data analysis includes basic models for comparing instances of party financial support and party event attendance, using Microsoft Excel. These results were measured against incumbency status, election result statistics, leadership positions held, etc. as pulled from ProQuest Congressional Member Search. Leadership is defined as having held a party leadership position in the Senate, or having Chaired or Vice-Chaired a Standing Select, or Special Senate Committee.

Much present research focuses on incumbency as the deciding factor of receiving party support, and as the leading indicator of a candidate’s chances at winning. By holding incumbency constant for relevant data sets, I will gain a better
understanding of who receives party money, and if there are other factors at play that could explain attendance at party functions other than requests for funding or incumbency.

Chapter IV. Results

Overview

The main premise of the thesis was not confirmed by data collected in the course of the thesis. No strong correlation is suggested by the data between a candidate’s party participation and higher funds raised from the party. Using both metrics for party participation, including fundraising with other Senators and attendance at the Party’s convention preceding the election, no strong correlation was found. As is demonstrated in the graphics below, candidates received a wide range of party financial support regardless of the numbers of joint fundraisers they attended. Further, those attending and not attending the conventions received a wide range of contributions alike. Participation with other party members appears to have no effect, positive or negative, on one’s party receipts. Although one would think that greater numbers of fundraisers with other Senate candidates would raise receipts simply from having more events, even that is not the case.
As the data above did not confirm the hypothesis, less concrete measures of intra party connections leading to greater internal fund transferring were measured. I compared incumbency status, factored as a +1 in calculations, and Freshman Senator
status, factored as a 0, against a candidate’s combined party receipts. I predicted that as a incumbents have six years to form relationships with other Senators, party leaders, they would receive more funding. However, continuing the trend evinced by the first data set, there was no significant correlation. I considered this curious, given that current scholarship suggests that incumbents have an advantage in overall fundraising (See Addendum 1). Thus, I delved deeper into the candidate’s incumbency status to factor the length of time a member had served, as measured by number of Congresses. Even using this more refined measure, incumbency appears to have no significant effect on total party receipts a candidate for Senate receives (See Addendum 2). A freshman candidate may raise nothing or over $65,000 dollars from fellow party members, while no Senator with more than three Congresses was able to meet that fundraising standard. Incumbents may indeed have an advantage in winning their races, but that electoral boost is not funded by coordinated party expenditure.

As in previous studies of Senate and House fundraising, more highly contested races receive more attention. Data culled in this study confirmed previous data that the tighter the race, the higher the amount of funds raised by the candidate (See Addendum 3). As the candidate’s percentage of the vote neared the 50% mark, receipts from the party increased, and a lower proportion of candidates received no funding. Even so, this trend is not generalizable to all candidates. While on the whole, candidates in closer races received more party funding, not every candidate in that position received significant party support in difficult electoral times. Furthermore, party contributions may
have been influenced by the amount a candidate was able to raise alone. If there was no need for money, why give it?

Also as suggested by previous research, party contributions to Senate candidates in the 2012 race remained a small proportion of overall receipts. On average, Senate candidates raised $9430294 per campaign, with a paltry average of $29042 coming from combined party sources. Of that $29042, the average candidate raised $19555 from official party sources and $15689 from informal sources (See Addendum 4).

**Notable Groups**

In combing through FEC data, two categories of candidate stood out as being unique or unusual. Both groups compromise a small fraction of the already small number of candidates. The first is comprised of those candidates occupying leadership positions. In this analysis, leadership is defined as holding a Chamber wide position of power in the Party’s official leadership structure, or as the Chair or Ranking Member of a Committee. Those candidates in leadership positions raised significantly less, from party sources and generally, than those candidates who had no leadership experience in the past (See Addendum 5). Further, those candidates appointed to leadership after the election, in the 113th Congress, also had less funding behind them than their average peer (See Addendum 6). It may be that these figure have safer seats and are encouraged to give to others, and not the other way around.

The second notable group is the women of the Senate. Half of those candidates running for Senator do not engage in fundraising events with others in election season.
women Senators, however, appear together with Senators at fundraisers far more often than men (See Table). They appear with other female Senators more often than with males. Of the ten Senators who participated in the most joint fundraisers in the 2012 election cycle, only three were men. And among all candidates who fundraised with others, nine out of the 27 were women. While this does not seem significant, it is worth noting that not that that is nearly half of the twenty women currently serving in the Senate (Secretary).

Challenges

Multiple challenges were faced in the collection of the data. The Federal Election Commission, apparently, does not require that all campaign contribution be itemized. Campaigns are permitted to file certain receipts as “Other” without any reference to its source made available to the public. Furthermore, data available to the public are not always presented in easily accessible form. Many itemized campaign receipts are filed in unrelated folders, and not all campaign data published by the FEC may be downloaded.

The way party receipts were operationalized for the purposes of this study is a case in point of the inherent difficulties associated with mining FEC data. While I counted all those receipts categorized by the FEC as party receipts as “Formal Party Receipts,” with the FEC’s lackluster standard for organization it is very possible that not all contributions listed in that category were from the party, thus skewing my data. Secondly, the method used for determining Informal Party Receipts was hampered by the methods campaigns use when filing contributions with the FEC. I found party
contributions appeared in all categories of filings, and my findings are not complete. Not every campaign committee associated with a Congressman or the party is clearly titled as such, hampering my efforts to collect conclusive data.

In collecting data related to party support and socialization, it was difficult to operationalize relationships and contacts. Interpersonal relationships and power structures are incredibly difficult to substantiate firmly, let alone map. The metrics used to quantify relationships in my analysis, attendance at fundraisers and the 2012 convention, are not without flaw. However, given how tightly controlled many Senators are by their press handlers, more in-depth measures were impossible to collect. These metrics were readily available, easily quantifiable, and showed clear relation to the phenomenon I wished to examine. That my hypothesis was not confirmed by the data is probably the result of trends in Senate campaign fundraising, and not the result of an overly flawed data collection mechanism.

Chapter V. Analysis

*Formal and Informal Funding*

The amount of formal party funding pales in comparison to overall receipts in Senate campaigns, as is shown previously. Even when informal party receipts are calculated, they barely scratch the surface of the average candidate’s overall budget. This data seems to suggest that party money is an unimportant source of income for candidates for the United States Senate. It would seem to suggest that the party’s role as an internal fundraiser has been surpassed by the efforts of individual candidates to seek out funding from PACs, corporations, and individuals.
However, analyzing just the monies received from the party, informal receipts are a significant contributor to campaigns. As shown above, informal receipts almost equal formal receipts. That nearly doubles the percentage of the campaign funded by party receipts, conservatively. Thus, although it is still a small part of a campaign’s financial toolbox, party funding is a bigger resource than it would appear from the FEC’s filings. There are multiple resources this may be the case. Party donations may signal to PACs and individuals that the candidate is a good candidate in which the party believes. Secondly, donations likely signal that a candidate is being singled out by the party as viable. Other resources may be supplied beyond money, like consulting and campaign strategy. Given the small amount that informal and formal party receipts make up, it is curious that these sums are not tallied together in FEC filings. Whether this is the fault of the FEC or the campaigns is unknown.

**Women’s Behavior**

The behavior of women candidates, take as a group, suggests a sense of camaraderie between women Senators that does not exist between their male colleagues. The cohesiveness of female candidates may be a statistical anomaly, given their small number within an already small sample. After all, this is not the House of Representatives. However, I believe that although their population is small, their behavior is still significant and worthy of examination. Do women have special network, like Emily’s List or Susan B Anthony’s list, that empower them as a group in a way men do not need? Do women feel they are in an oppressed minority in the Senate, and rely on the power of groups to bolster their fundraising capabilities? As women become a
larger and larger part of the political landscape, will these joint efforts become a thing of the past, unnecessary as women become more empowered in the Senate and on the campaign trail?

I posit that women are more likely to fundraise with other Senators because they are a minority. They rely on one another and one another’s networks of donors who support women politicians.

**Leadership**

The leaders of the Senate, surprisingly, are not its biggest intra-party political fundraisers. Those in leadership in the 112th Congress who raised the most in the election cycle did not return to the leadership. Some of this may be due to losing the bid for re-election, but it further reinforces the point that party money just is not as important as other sources in determining much of anything, including leadership in the Chamber. This may be because, as entrenched leaders in the party, they raise money not just for themselves but for others, and do not need the support of others but are, instead, sources of support. It is possible that they, in their leadership roles, have access to other avenues of funding that lower ranking members do not, and thus do not need the funding from fellow party members.

An unusual case noted in the process of data collection and synthesis was the reoccurrence of political donations to Democratic Senate candidates by Senator Carl Levin. By far more than any other intra-party donor, Senator Levin donates to more candidates, and more generously, than any other politician by far. In the 2012 election cycle, Senator Levin donated to 18 candidates, not all of whom had previously been
colleagues of the Senator. To put that in perspective, half of the Democrats who ran received funding from Senator Levin. Considering Mr. Levin is a leader in the Chamber, it bodes well to ask if his generosity towards his fellow Democrats influences his rise to a leadership position. It may be that Mr. Levin is community spirited, or it may be that he has excess funds he believes will never be put to use. However, one could reasonably deduce that the Senator’s generosity and connections with his fellow colleagues is part of the reason he has ascended into the leadership.

Accountability and Transparency

The trends noted earlier in disorganized FEC data show that the supposed transparency laws of campaign finance are either unenforced or too broadly defined. In many campaigns, huge sums go unreported as “Other Receipts,” unexplained and undocumented. Josh Mandel, Republican of Ohio, for example, had $2825278 in Unaccounted For receipts that were filed without a proper source in the FEC database. Some candidates’ data was unsearchable online, necessitating downloading the PDF spreadsheet and analyzing it line by line. If the FEC were to mandate that all filings come in a unified manner to the agency, navigating the trove of data would be easier for future researchers. This may be difficult to enforce, however, given that campaigns likely do not want further regulation and that the FEC has limited time and resources.

The labyrinth-like data sets housed on the FEC’s website could be caused by one of two phenomena. First, the FEC regulations on campaigns’ filings may be unclear. When campaigns are unclear as to where a contribution should be filed, they may just file it in a random folder, and the FEC does not scrutinize the filings carefully
enough. Secondly, the campaigns may purposefully direct filings to misleading folders in order to massage their financial data. In the case of undisclosed filings, perhaps campaigns do not want the public to see the sources providing funding. For those filings that are misplaced, the percentage of party and PAC support, much disliked in the general public, can be lowered by filling ‘excess’ contributions in other categories. Regardless of the intent behind them, inaccurate filings pose a threat to accountability and openness that the FEC purports to uphold.

Chapter VI. Future Research

As an Honors thesis, this research is necessarily limited in scope. Given more time and resources, a more thorough examination of FEC filings by candidates could lead to more accurate results. For example, instead of using the search terms “Senator,” “Congressman,” “Representative,” etc. to find intra-party transfers, a more accurate measure would be to search for the names of all sitting Congressmen. While obviously time consuming, this would yield superior results. And with more resources, interviews with schedulers and campaign managers would yield a great deal more insight into how often Senators attend party events and associate with one another away from the Capitol. It is difficult to gauge interpersonal connections using publicly available data alone. Personal interviews are likely the only way to get an accurate picture of how Senators spend their fundraising time, as official schedules made available to the public may be either inaccurate or lead the public in a more ‘palatable’ direction.
Perhaps the focus of future research on intra-party relationships and fundraising should focus on the donors and not the recipients as I have done. If, as I suggest, Senator Levin has risen to power partly because of his generosity with others, it could be rewarding to investigate who donates to other candidates, and how they are rewarded for their generosity, if that is the case. Even if money is not the base of power in the leadership of the Senate, it would perhaps give clues as to why some Senators become leaders in the chamber and others do not.

Furthermore, the role of women in the Senate and their style on the campaign trail should be studied in greater depth. While the group-aligning behavior of Senate women may be due to their minority status in Congress, and thus engender a sense of camaraderie, women may naturally drift towards a different campaign style than men. As more women enter politics, it will be interesting to see how women change political behavior on the Senate floor and at the fundraising gala. Will women continue to fundraise in groups? Or will they follow the route of the men in the Chamber, opting to go it alone?

Chapter VII. Conclusion

My research sought to identify and quantify personal relationships between a party and its candidate running for the United States Senate. Specifically, I wanted to study the link between relationships and financial contributions. In order to establish that linkage, I evaluated the FEC data of candidates from the Republican and Democratic parties for the United States Senate, looking specifically at formal and informal party income received in the election year 2012. This topic is of importance
because so much more research has been conducted at the House level, and in the wake of the *Citizens United* case and increased party polarization, it is important for scholars to have an understanding of what goes on in the fundraising world of the US Senate.

In order to operationalize the relationship between a candidate’s party relationships with his or her fundraising network, I compared and contrasted receipts of monies from sources I consider to be “party organized” with a candidate’s appearances at party sponsored events, such as joint fundraisers and party conventions. Curiosity led me to study whether or not relationships between Senators extended into the fundraising sphere. While most of the existing literature on intra-party giving focused on the relationship between receipts and incumbency, or on donors and leadership rank, my research examined the relationship between receipts and party support, putting new light onto previously researched data.

For quantitative research, I synthesized and operationalized the relationship between FEC filings with event attendance, gender, and leadership. Using simple methods, namely Excel, I separated and analyzed the data sets and made comparisons. While this posed some challenges in parsing the data at a more complex level, setting these individual charts side by side instead of creating a more complex regression proved simpler to do and showed the same basic data. Personal interviews are likely the only way to get an accurate picture of how Senators spend their fundraising time, as official schedules made available to the public may be either
inaccurate or lead the public in a more ‘palatable’ direction. But barring that opportunity, I believe my methods were satisfactory.

After careful consideration of my results, no strong correlation was found. The behavior of women and Chamber leaders, however, provided interesting material for analysis. Perhaps the focus of future research on intra-party relationships and fundraising should focus on the donors and not the recipients, as I have done.

To conclude, the findings suggest that personal relationships with political parties do not substantially affect the campaign fund distribution of political parties. However, Senators in leadership roles and female Senators behave differently than other Senators, and these cases warrant further study.
Bibliography


Addenda

Addendum 1
Total Party Receipts to Incumbency
$Y=USD, X=Incumbency(\pm 1)$

Addendum 2
Total Party Receipts to Number of Congresses Served
$Y=USD, X=No. Congresses Served$
Addendum 3
Competeiveness of Election
Y=USD Party Receipts, X=Percent Vote

Addendum 4
Formal and Informal Party Receipts
Y=Receipts in USD, X= Candidates by State(Alphabetical Order, Left to Right)