

Introduction

THE AMERICAN presidency is a topic that attracts both widespread and intense interest. As the central feature on the American political landscape, it is a magnet for writers of various kinds, including political scientists, historians, journalists, and foreign commentators. The visibility of the presidential office also entices undergraduates into classes on the presidency and gets some of us onto radio or television.

Yet these attractions may have had inhibiting effects on the scientific and theoretical development of the subfield. Ironically, the detachment needed for theoretical and methodological innovation in studying the presidency can be hindered by its popularity as a subject. The prominence of the presidency as a topic of commentary lies, to some extent, in its ability to be personalized. It seems that we are never far from thinking of the presidency as merely the president. Perhaps more than any other subfield, the issues of the conduct of the president and the presidency seem stuck in a temporal context that constrains larger generalizations or inquiries. Attention tends to focus on incumbent presidents, often emphasizing normative judgments and ad hoc descriptions about their behavior.

When this occurs, we fail to make comparisons across presidents and other political executives, study changes in the presidency or the environment in which the presidency operates, and exploit theoretical groundings from the experimental and theoretical sciences of human behavior. Thus, the range of theoretical and empirical possibilities becomes limited. The purpose of this volume quite self-consciously is to expand that range.

The Status of Presidency Research

The status of presidential scholarship is relatively easy to document. The first wave of scholarship on the presidency largely focused

on the legal structures and roles of the presidency, exemplified in the work of Edward S. Corwin. Corwin's tradition of scholarship was put into modern dress by scholars such as Clinton Rossiter and Louis Koenig, who saw presidential roles responding to external conditions and thus expanding beyond strictly legal definitions.

A second set of presidential studies reflected an emphasis on political psychology, although, strictly speaking, the psychology was more on the order of political psychoanalysis. This line of psychological work on individual presidents was exemplified by Alexander George's study of Woodrow Wilson and later, if differently, by James David Barber's efforts to define and predict presidential character.

A third type of work has been the provocative and insightful essay regarding the exercise of presidential power and the operation of the White House written by astute former White House staff members who are also political scientists. The work of Richard Neustadt and Thomas Cronin exemplifies this type of analysis. Their efforts contain the basis for broader-scale theories and have stimulated important and valuable research on the presidency.

Many of these works contained potential hypotheses to be investigated but tended to shy away from explicit efforts to theorize. Few political scientists called attention to this situation. One who did, Donald Stokes, wrote in a 1966 paper that "it would indeed be possible to formulate Richard Neustadt's insistence that competing sources of information be built into the organization of the Executive Office in terms of much more general theories of information" (Stokes, 1966, 5). Such broader theoretical concerns were rarely voiced in the field of presidential studies, however. Scholars trained in scientific techniques chose to hone their methodological skills on legislative and voting questions, where theoretical formulation and systematic data seemed more accessible. The subfield of the presidency, on the other hand, seemed tied either to an unchanging subject, that is, formal powers, or to an idiosyncratic one, that is, presidents. The richer subfields continued to prosper while less developed subfields continued in their traditional ways.

As a consequence, the presidency was an underdeveloped subfield. Beginning a review published in 1975, Anthony King wrote:

To read most general studies of the United States presidency . . . is to feel that one is reading not a number of different books but essentially the same book over and over again. The same sources are

cited; the same points are made; even the same quotations . . . appear again and again. In addition, the existing literature is mainly descriptive and atheoretical: general hypotheses are almost never advanced, and, when advanced, almost never tested. (A. King, 1975, 173)

In a report for the Ford Foundation written two years later, Hugh Heclo concluded,

Political observers have written excellent interpretations of the Presidency. Important questions about Presidential power have been raised. But considering the amount of such writing in relation to the base of original empirical research behind it, the field is as shallow as it is luxuriant. To a great extent, presidential studies have coasted on the reputations of a few . . . classics . . . and on secondary literature and anecdotes produced by former participants. (Heclo, 1977, 30)

At the end of the decade, George Edwards commented:

Research on the presidency too often fails to meet the standards of contemporary political science, including the careful definition and measurement of concepts, the rigorous specification and testing of propositions, the employment of appropriate quantitative methods, and the use of empirical theory to develop hypotheses and explain findings. (Edwards, 1981, 146)

Yet the presidential subfield was changing even as these pessimistic statements were being written. Some scholars felt the presidency ought to be studied with data and explicit methodologies to test propositions. The need to anchor the study of the presidency in broader theoretical contexts also was making headway. Efforts to change the character of presidential research may or may not have been self-conscious, but they did have impact. A list of such work might include those writings of the editors. For example, Edwards's *At the Margins: Presidential Leadership of Congress* (1989) and *Presidential Approval* (1990); Rockman's *The Leadership Question: The Presidency and the American System* (1984); and Kessel's *The Domestic Presidency* (1975) and *Presidential Parties* (1984) are very different from one another, both in the facets of the presidency on which they focus and in the methods of analysis. They are, however, commonly guided by some larger theoretical concerns and include systematically gathered data.

Two books that explicitly aim to stimulate further presidential research have also appeared. George Edwards and Stephen Wayne's *Studying the Presidency*, published in 1983, contains chapters on the methodologies of case studies and quantitative analysis, the techniques of using libraries, legal sources, and interviews, and the role of concept development (Edwards and Wayne, 1983). Gary King and Lyn Ragsdale's *The Elusive Executive* provides statistical data on the presidency comparable to that which has been available for some time about the Congress (King and Ragsdale, 1988).

As Wayne writes in *Studying the Presidency*, "the existence of this methodological guide and commentary indicates that some of the problems [besetting presidential research] can be overcome. Not only do the contributors believe that more social science research is desirable, but their contributions demonstrate that it is possible" (1983, 8-9). King and Ragsdale write that they also "believe that research into the presidency should be conducted in a more rigorous, systematic, and, when possible, quantitative manner" (1988, 483). Both of these books aid in achieving these goals.

The community of modern presidency researchers has taken on some institutional form. The Presidency Research Group, organized under the leadership of Fred Greenstein in 1978, has become the Presidency Research Section of the American Political Science Association. By 1987, the Presidency Research Section had 310 members, making it the sixth largest of the APSA's organized sections. During the past decade, it has published a newsletter containing short articles and guides to research, and the program chairs of the Presidency Research Section and the relevant members of the regular program committee have worked closely together to ensure ample opportunity to present research results. And the amount of research has grown. In 1978 there were only two panels on the presidency at the annual meeting of the APSA. In the early 1990s there are five times as many.

Our view of the present status of presidential scholarship is that, although developments are promising, we are still short of a well-developed subfield that meets standards of cumulativeness and theoretical consistency. But much ground has been gained. Description is inevitable in work on the presidency, given new administrations every four or eight years, and there are now more developed data bases and models of their use for answering descriptive questions. To be sure, however, we do need more theoretical direction.

In the 1980s, a similarly NSF-sponsored conference on legislative studies yielded a *Handbook of Legislative Research* (Loewenberg, Patterson, and Jewell, 1985). We have not tried to provide the same encyclopedic completeness here, in large part because of differences between the extensiveness and rigor of the legislative and presidency literatures. The greater need, we feel, is to catalyze further research on the presidency. Thus, we have avoided duplicating work already done in the volumes by Edwards and Wayne and by King and Ragsdale. Our effort, instead, has been to capitalize on the momentum that has been achieved, call attention to particularly important substantive areas, and suggest theories that can be usefully incorporated into presidency research.

What Should We Study?

The most critical question in any research endeavor is to choose the focus of study. This may be what we seek to explain (a dependent variable) or a phenomenon whose consequences seem vital (an independent variable).

THE INDIVIDUAL OR THE INSTITUTION?

Views about the contribution of the individual to the presidency and about the analytical payoffs from studying individuals are quite divergent. A recent trend in political science has been the adoption of formal theoretical approaches to studying politics that deemphasize the study of individual variability. In addition, a substantial amount of work done from a variety of research traditions concludes that the president is frequently confined by environmental constraints, profoundly limiting his latitude to make a difference as an individual.

Further, we have begun to differentiate among the arenas in which the president is operating, (e.g., making decisions, implementing policy, or dealing with the public, the press, the Congress, or other nations). The arena of presidential operations turns out to be a critical variable in understanding the impact of the individual personality. For example, for years commentators have attributed Lyndon Johnson's success with Congress to his legislative skills, but there is now plenty of evidence that these skills, although certainly not unimportant, were not nearly so overpowering as folklore had made them

out to be (Edwards, 1989, chap. 9). Johnson's personality, broadly defined, seems to have had a more substantial difference in his decision making and decisional processes regarding Vietnam than in his relations with Congress (Burke and Greenstein, 1989).

Several chapter authors in this book raise issues about the role of the individual as president that are often left implicit in presidency research. Erwin Hargrove, for example, does not simply ask whether individuals make a difference, but asks under what circumstances they make a difference? The task of scholarship, according to Hargrove, is to integrate the study of individuals with the web of social and institutional forces that move them and which they, in turn, may influence.

Hargrove finds plenty of opportunity for the expression of individuality in the presidency. He suggests that the fit between personality and role tasks is important to understanding the individual as president. Leaders define and play their roles in ways that favor their strengths, and they seek out and respond in congenial ways to situations, tasks, problems, and challenges that favor those strengths. Different roles and situations evoke different elements of style in the same person.

Thus, he suggests we need to explain the dynamic relations between personality, role, and situations, which are inextricably linked. This requires us to clarify the relevant aspects of individuality; what makes a difference in political behavior and what elements of the environment can personality affect? In addition, Hargrove proposes that the best way to capture the political personality of a president is to delineate the recurring styles of leadership over time. His emphasis, therefore, is on operative leadership style, the explanation of which lies in strategic interactions between situational incentives, role experiences, and individual propensities. Hargrove's focus, thus, shifts away from earlier "political personality" studies that found the genesis of political personality in childhood.

Terry Moe views things differently. He concludes that there has been too much attention focused on the personal presidency, which he thinks has little theoretical payoff. The personal presidency promotes enormous complications in theory and research, opening a Pandora's box of individual motivation and behavior and orienting the field around causal mysteries that we are unlikely to solve. For example, leadership (or management) style has been the subject of in-

tensive analysis by organizational theorists for decades. Yet, in Moe's view it has produced few generalizations that can be applied to the presidency or to the link between leadership style and organizational performance. Conclusions typically are contingent on a wide range of variables. Thus, Moe concludes that research on style, personality, and other aspects of the personal presidency fails to provide a foundation for constructing theory.

Ironically, as Moe sees it, scholarly attention shifted from the institution of the presidency to the individual president at the same time as the presidency was becoming highly institutionalized. He argues that all presidents, whatever their personalities, styles, or backgrounds, behave similarly in basic respects. Consequently, Moe proposes building institutional theories of the presidency around interests, structures, roles, authority, control, hierarchy, incentives, and other general properties of organizations that shape presidential behavior regardless of who is president.

A similar view is echoed by Martha Feldman, who feels that it is important to separate presidents from the presidency, because offices as well as persons have power and there *is* some continuity across administrations. Employing concepts like roles lead us to think of what presidents have in common, the functions they perform because of the position they occupy, the history of the presidency as an organization, and the continuity in expectations about it. Feldman sees in the presidency the needs of other organizations—the struggle to reduce uncertainty, the development of routines, the effort to bound problem sets. Unlike Moe, however, Feldman is more agnostic as to whether the presidency or presidents ultimately are more important.

PUBLIC POLICY

Paul Light approaches the issue of what we should study in a different way. He argues that what is missing in the debate between leadership-based and institutional explanations of presidential behavior has been a strong dependent variable. He proposes that researchers adopt policy as that variable.

Light believes that policy is the most important product of the presidency and provides a baseline against which to assess competing explanations of presidential behavior. Being a visible expression of a president's ideology and world view, focusing on policy becomes a

way of tackling the impact of personal belief systems in shaping outcomes. As a variable, policy also is useful for studying the role of process and the rule of law, identifying players and procedures, and determining what difference they make. Policy also provides an avenue for testing the impact of presidential resources as a set of variables that affect presidential control of policy making.

Almost everyone agrees that policy differences matter. John Aldrich argues that the four “seasons” of presidential elections—asplicants choose to run, parties select candidates, the candidates selected campaign in the fall, and the victor attempts to govern—are only temporarily distinct stages. To understand the relationship between the governors and the governed requires an integration of campaigns and governance. In other words, we need to connect politics with policy.

For example, one model of how candidates conduct nomination campaigns emphasizes the dynamics of the campaign, the other focuses on substantive concerns, notably policy. The first predicts outcomes but does not indicate how candidates use their resources to generate support or why voters support them. The second looks at the role of issue stands and provides a possible way of linking the nomination process to the general campaign.

Apparently paralleling the two views of campaign strategy are two streams of empirical research on the primary electorate. The first presents voters as ill-informed, attuned to the horse race, possibly capricious, and perhaps vulnerable to manipulation. The second finds a somewhat more substantive basis for voter choice. Aldrich suggests that we may be able to bridge the gap between these different approaches to both the candidates and the electorate with the concept of expected utility accounts. He warns that it is important to recognize that more than the election imperative is involved in elections; policy is important as well. Thus, when we study presidential selection, we need to make sure that we are sensitive to the fact that candidates seek to make and implement public policy and that voters have policy concerns. Moreover, it is important to focus on the impact of campaign strategy on governance.

Yet other authors raise the importance of policy as a variable in analyzing the presidency. Along with Paul Light, Richard Rose also proposes that we employ policy as a variable to test theories of pres-

idential success. He further suggests that success needs to be evaluated across a number of policy areas and dimensions. Karen Hult argues that we should not study presidential advising in isolation from the impact of advice and advisory systems on presidential policy decisions. She also suggests the need to look for differences in advisory networks, for example, their stability, level of conflict, and degree of access to, and influence on, the president across policy areas involving routine and “adaptive” decisions. Barbara Sinclair also focuses attention on policy by stressing that the ultimate purpose of studying leadership is to assess its affect on policy outcomes.

How Should We Study the Presidency?

Presidency research lacks a powerful consensus on appropriate methodological and theoretical approaches. Diversity can be a strength as long as it contributes to advancing our understanding of the presidency, but it becomes an obstacle to progress if it creates a Tower of Babel that diminishes our capacity to recognize the value of alternative paths of scholarship and thinking. The objective of this book is to juxtapose the tried and true with the new by assessing where the former has led us and seeing where the latter might lead. We see no reason why existing scholarship cannot coexist with more recent developments in theory and methods. Indeed, we see no way to enrich our understanding if it does not. Ultimately, of course, the readers of this volume will judge for themselves which approaches have the most promise.

METHODOLOGY

No issue has plagued research on the presidency more than that of methodology. One of the principal challenges in researching the presidency has been dealing with the problem of “uniqueness,” the infamous $N = 1$ issue. This apparent obstacle to systematic study has traditionally inhibited serious thinking about quantitative measurement, data generation, and data analysis. Much of the literature, consequently, has been qualitative and of a historical or biographical nature.

There may be less to the quantitative-qualitative distinction than meets the eye, however. Gary King convincingly argues that there is

no inherent difference between quantitative and qualitative research. The rules of inference are the same, as is the need for both rigor and relevance. Indeed, several other chapters, including those by John Aldrich, Barbara Sinclair, and Paul Light, stress the importance of doing rigorous and systematic research, regardless of analytic mode. They agree with Gary King that it takes more than a cogently argued point, perhaps illustrated with a case study, to verify an empirical assertion about the presidency. Theoretical rigor comes from an explicit logical structure of propositions, and empirical rigor comes from variables that are precise, valid, and reliable.

Light emphasizes careful measurement of specific outcomes, which in his case are public policies. In the first instance, the discriminating classification of policies along several dimensions, he argues, helps us sort out the large volume of case studies on the presidency, reveals the gaps and overlaps in presidency research, and provides another tool for indexing and cross-referencing our conclusions. He also demonstrates the utility of classifying policies with an analysis of presidents' policy agendas. He is able to compare administrations and propose tests of various explanations for success and for what presidents propose and why they do so.

We require systematic descriptive work to provide the basis for more parsimonious explanations of presidential behavior and its consequences. The traditional literature, emphasizing history and thick description, is most useful, Gary King argues, for mining what needs to be explained by theory-driven research and for providing texture to more austere explanations and theories. It is less helpful, however, in providing useful explanations or theories. A principal problem with qualitative research is that it often fails to note the degree of uncertainty in results. Levels of uncertainty are especially relevant for those making prescriptions for the presidency, and King cautions us against making prescriptions on a weak basis. Since the number of presidents is too small to ever provide us an acceptable level of certainty, King advises us to turn from employing presidents as units of analysis and to focus on decisions or other observable consequences of the theory being tested or to examine observable implications of the theory at other levels of aggregation.

Anthony King suggests we do more than compare across presidents. He recommends that we make comparisons across chief executives in the democracies of economically developed nations. He

illustrates the utility of this approach by comparing the power of these chief executives within their own government systems. Such analyses will not be easily accomplished, however. As King points out, there are three difficulties in studying the American presidency in a comparative context: the lack of literature on chief executives in other nations, the paucity of comparative case studies of executive leadership, and the uniqueness of the American presidency.

One of the key concerns of several of the authors is parsimonious explanation. Terry Moe argues that it is better to focus on a few variables that can explain a great deal about the presidency than to attempt to study the presidency in all its individual complexity. Gary King warns us that theories cannot be so broad or so comprehensive that they cannot be falsified and that we cannot identify research methods capable of distinguishing whether a theory is true or false.

Barbara Sinclair suggests we study leadership by focusing on a limited number of variables and a few key actors. She does not want to incorporate the president's entire psyche into an analytical framework. Instead, she proposes that we include only the president's skill and goals in order to avoid overly complicated models of presidential behavior. Although Karen Hult offers an inductive strategy for studying advisory networks, which naturally focuses on the identification of relevant independent variables for conceptual mapping, she still recommends striving for parsimony in explanation.

THEORIES

Almost everyone agrees that research on the presidency should be more theoretical. *Theory*, however, turns out to be a remarkably plastic term, so different authors have different agendas when they make this assertion. For example, some, such as Karen Hult and Gary King, are broadly concerned with moving beyond description to an emphasis on explanation in research. Other authors have more specifically focused concerns. Most studies of individual presidents have been based on motivational theories rather than cognitive theories, yet presidents act on the basis of the information they can comprehend. There has been much recent activity in schema theories, social cognition, and information processing models. Many of these also are relevant to neoinstitutionalist approaches to political behavior.

Susan Fiske proposes that certain types of social cognitive explanations may provide new integrative themes and perhaps a fresh

unifying theory. She believes the complex interplay between motivation and cognition provides fertile ground for understanding the presidency and accompanying political phenomena. Moving beyond the traditional focus on consistency seekers from cognitive dissonance theory, the naive scientists of attribution theory, and the cognitive misers of schema theory, Fiske suggests that a motivated tactician who chooses between various cognitive strategies as the situation demands would be a better balanced approach. This would not commit an observer to any single interpretation of an actor's probable cognitive strategy, as it assumes that an actor will choose a more accurate type of processing if the situation demands it.

She also calls attention to a distinction between category-based thinking and attribute-based thinking that has wide application to problems facing presidential scholars. The former is top-down, often faster, and relies on short cuts such as stereotyping; the latter is bottom-up, inductive, and driven more by data. A less concerned voter, a White House decision maker who is subject to time pressure, or a member of an advisory network who has little regard for members of outgroups is more likely to use the more expeditious category-based processing. An issue-oriented voter, a president who expects to be held accountable and is aware of the cost of being wrong, or an expert in a specific domain will be motivated to use more comprehensive attribute-based processing.

Martha Feldman focuses on the presidency from an organization theory perspective that is cognitive and cultural in nature. She suggests that such an approach will help us answer important questions of organizational identity, how identities are developed, maintained, and communicated, and how organizational identities influence other decisions and actions. It will aid us in understanding what kind of information is available to those involved in the institutionalized presidency and how it is understood by the actors.

Some of our authors propose to employ theories based on rational choice. Terry Moe argues for the application of rational choice theory to understand institutional development in the presidency. Barbara Sinclair employs a "purposive behavior" approach inspired by rational choice theory that posits that individuals rationally (loosely defined) pursue specified goals. She, like John Aldrich (who also argues for the use of the notion of utility maximization), warns,

however, that we should be careful not to posit a single-goal assumption. Attributing multiple goals to actors is more realistic.

Formal modeling, usually associated with rational choice, has made substantial headway in political science in the past decade. Formalization may help presidency research in two ways. First, an experienced modeler may be able to identify areas in presidential research that are ready for formal statement. Second, the resulting models may point to critical questions on which further empirical work is needed.

Gary Miller illustrates the use of a formal approach to studying the presidency. He suggests that we know more about why presidents are weak than about why they succeed and why their power varies over time. He finds that abnormal politics serves as an important check on the more typical politics of stalemate. If a large exogenous shock informs and arouses the public, moving it from its normal state of rational ignorance, the president has a greater opportunity for change. Once the status quo is vulnerable, presidents can attempt to exploit these opportunities for leadership.

The president's dominant position in the free flow of information provides him the opportunity to gain access to the public and communicate his intentions to everyone. This unique potential to overcome the rational ignorance of the public creates the possibility for mass mobilization on an issue that may spark great changes in American politics. Thus the president has the potential to be the most powerful issue entrepreneur. He may also legitimize and motivate the efforts of those seeking change, such as civil rights protestors.

Miller argues that in such circumstances the president is positioned to direct media attention, elicit public support, coordinate social action, and direct extraordinary legislative coalitions. He can fill the crucial role in games of coordination by serving as a focal point and by influencing the pace and timing of social movements. He also can serve as a contract enforcer in legislative coalitions by facilitating the market for exchange of political support.

Evaluating the Presidency

Evaluating presidents is ubiquitous, whether in the worlds of journalism or of academia. Yet the prevalence of the activity has not led

to conceptual clarification of the standards of evaluation. How can social scientists move beyond individual presidents and focus on the presidency? What should be taken into consideration when evaluating individual presidents?

Richard Rose answers that there are inevitably normative and empirical dimensions to evaluating the presidency, and we should begin by recognizing their relationship. For example, we have substantial data on the president's standing in the public, including electoral results and public opinion polls, but the interpretation of these data in evaluating presidents requires us to apply normative standards. Thus, he suggests we apply both normative and empirical criteria in presidential evaluation.

We need to be as aware of the empirical implications of normative assumptions as of the normative implications of empirical data. Otherwise, we are likely to be blinded by normatively driven empirical preconceptions, such as the president is at the center of the political universe and has the potential to influence anyone (or any country) to support him. Instead, scholars should place the president's performance in office in a perspective that includes activity outside both Washington, D.C. and the nation's boundaries. Questions of the centrality of the president should be subject to empirical test, not assumed.

Susan Fiske raises another normative issue in evaluating presidents: the problem of setting the standards for good decision making. Who sets them? What is the optimal solution? What is accuracy? The normative criteria are wanting and deserve more attention. At the very least, they should be explicit. Richard Rose argues that ultimately scholars should employ the presidents' job definitions, their goals in office, and the environmental constraints on their influence as standards against which to evaluate their achievements. Presidents differ as to the ends and means of office, and our evaluations ought not to reflect a bias toward activism.

Barbara Sinclair agrees, contending that whether the president advances his goals is important for gauging success, and that we should consider both what a president attempts as well as what he accomplishes. We can evaluate presidents on both dimensions, but we should distinguish between them. Susan Fiske adds that we must evaluate presidents against their own performance goals as well as against others' agendas.

Outline of the Book

The next four chapters present critical reviews of the literature on some central areas of presidential scholarship. John Aldrich focuses on the literature on presidential selection, organizing his discussion around four central questions reflecting the temporally distinct stages of the selection process: Who runs? Who is nominated? Who is elected? And how do elections shape governance?

Erwin Hargrove addresses the time-honored question of whether leaders make a difference in political life. Thus, he reviews the literature on presidential personality and political style, seeking to understand the relative importance of individuality in the presidency.

One of the central issues in the study of the presidency is how presidents make decisions. Advising the president, the subject of Karen Hult's review chapter, is one of the most discussed and least understood aspects of presidential decision making. Hult asks, "Who advises the president? What do presidents do with the advice they receive? What explains continuities and discontinuities in presidential advising? To what extent can presidents control advising? And what effect does advising have on decision outcomes?"

Presidential policy making is the focus of Paul Light's contribution. He argues that public policy is what is most important about a presidency and thus should receive more rigorous attention from scholars. He divides the literature on presidential policy making into five areas; the substance of policy, the key players and their positions, the process and structure of policy making, the policies of individual presidencies, and the measurement of specific outcomes. He then offers a focus for future work on presidential policy making based on comparing policy differences among presidential administrations.

Part II of the volume departs from the focus of Part I. It is composed of essays by distinguished scholars who typically do not research the presidency. Our goal is to enrich presidential scholarship with perspectives that have proven fruitful in other areas. Barbara Sinclair begins this process from her background of expertise on Congress. She applies a framework developed for the study of congressional leaders to the analysis of presidential leadership.

Presidential scholars have frequently borrowed from the discipline of psychology, sometimes indiscriminately. Psychologist Susan Fiske

reviews four basic views of the social thinker in social cognition research: the person as consistency seeker, the naive scientist, the cognitive miser, and the motivated tactician (who chooses among the other cognitive strategies, depending on motivation). She then applies social cognition perspectives to problems within scholarship and argues that the complex interplay between motivation and cognition provides a fertile ground for understanding the president and surrounding political phenomena.

Martha Feldman brings her expertise in organization theory to the study of the presidency. There are three perspectives on how organizations produce products, one focusing primarily on outcomes, one on structures, and the third on meaning. She applies the third perspective, concerned with questions of organizational identity and how identities are developed, maintained, and communicated and asks how these organizational identities influence presidential decisions and actions.

Formal theory is playing an increasingly prominent role in the study of American politics, and Gary Miller illustrates an application to the study of the presidency. He shows how many of the concepts of importance to presidential scholars, such as communication, leadership, and the symbolic trappings of office, can be employed in formal theory to illuminate important aspects of presidential politics.

Terry Moe argues that it is most productive to view the presidency as an institution. He rejects the focus of the traditional presidential literature on individuals, arguing that all presidents, whatever their personalities, styles, or backgrounds, should tend to behave similarly in basic respects. He then employs theory anchored in rational choice in general and the economics of organization in particular to explain institutional choice in the presidency.

Gary King finds that most of the work on the presidency has not reached the point where concepts are to be measured and theories tested systematically. He does not argue that qualitative research work should be abandoned, however but rather, that it be done systematically and rigorously. The rules of scientific inference should apply to qualitative as well as quantitative research. He also suggests that it will not be productive to increase the richness of description and the inclusiveness of theoretical perspectives, nor is it useful to use the president as the unit of analysis. What we need, he contends, are less inclusive and more specific theoretical concepts.

Part III presents two essays that engage in comparisons. The first, by Anthony King, brings perspective to the study of the presidency by comparing the president with the heads of government in other economically developed democracies. He is concerned with the extent to which the head of government is in a position to assert his or her will over the rest of the cabinet, the bureaucracy, and the national legislature. In other words, how does the power of the president within the American system of government compare with the power of heads of government in other countries, within the national systems of government in those countries? His approach is to compare chief executives on the basis of potential sources of power.

Finally, Richard Rose examines one of the thorniest—and most common—issues in presidency research: evaluating presidents. He finds that there are both normative and empirical dimensions to evaluating the presidency and that scholars are subject to several pitfalls. One is to view the president's performance in office too narrowly, ignoring activity outside both the nation's capital and the nation's boundaries. Another pitfall is to impose a bias toward presidential activism rather than the standard of a president's own goals in office. Finally, of course, we need always to systematically delineate the political and policy constraints that affect the capacity of a president to exert influence, whether these constraints be endogenous to the U.S. political system or exogenous to the system.

References

- Burke, John P., and Fred I. Greenstein. 1989. *How Presidents Test Reality: Decisions on Vietnam, 1954 and 1965*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Edwards, George C., III. 1981. "The Quantitative Study of the Presidency." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 11 (Spring): 146–50.
- . 1989. *At the Margins: Presidential Leadership of Congress*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Edwards, George C., III, and Stephen J. Wayne, eds. 1983. *Studying the Presidency*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Hecl, Hugh. 1977. *Studying the Presidency*. New York: Ford Foundation.
- King, Anthony. 1975. "Executives." In *Handbook of Political Science*, vol. 5, ed. Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- King, Gary and Lyn Ragsdale. 1988. *The Elusive Presidency: Discovering Statistical Patterns in the Presidency*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Loewenberg, Gerhard, Samuel C. Patterson, and Malcolm E. Jewell. 1985. *Handbook of Legislative Research*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.