Director’s Update

In the wake of the tumultuous 2020 election, I wrote that elections often provide a reflection point, the opportunity for a nation to take stock and consider if they like what they see. Last year’s midterm elections were no different. Against the backdrop of the historic January 6 hearings, a deadly war in Ukraine, and an economy running hot and cold at the same time, the nation again went to the polls in 2022.

Here at the institute, we ran a series of weekly events centered around the midterm elections during the fall (see pages 7–11). That series, which also had an associated academic course available for WSU students, included some of the nation’s leading experts on Congress, campaigns, and elections. Now that the elections are over, what can be said about them?

To begin with, over 112 million people voted, a turnout rate of almost 47 percent. This was less than the 67 percent who turned out in the 2020 general election, but high for a midterm election. Older voters continued to be more likely to cast ballots than younger voters. The turnout for those over forty-five was 50 percent, while just 27 percent of voters under twenty-nine voted.

The election did not produce the “red wave” that some Republicans expected, and that history might have predicted. Republicans had a net gain of ten seats in the House, giving them control of that chamber by 222 seats to 213. However, Democrats gained an additional seat in the Senate, breaking what had been a fifty-fifty tie and giving them a 51 to 49 seat majority.

As the party in power, Democrats overperformed compared to other midterm elections. During the modern era the incumbent president’s party has lost on average 26 seats in the House and 4 seats in the Senate during midterms. Democrats may have done better than expected because they lost their most vulnerable House seats back in the 2020 election and because they had fewer seats in the Senate to defend—fourteen versus twenty-one for Republicans.
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The new 118th Congress has eighty-six members who were elected to their first term (seven senators and seventy-nine representatives), including twenty-five-year-old Maxwell Frost from Florida, the first Gen Z member of Congress. It is also the most diverse in American history, with a record number of women—150 seats (nearly 30 percent)—and 133 members who identify as people of color, also a record.

Hakeem Jeffries of New York (pictured above) made history as the first African American to be named a party leader when House Democrats selected him as minority leader. But the 118th Congress remains one of the oldest on record. The average age is almost 64 years in the Senate and 58 in the House.

Probably the most important fact about the midterm elections and the new Congress is that they reveal a nation that continues to be closely and deeply divided. There was only a 3 million vote gap (less than 3 percent) between votes cast for Republican versus Democratic House candidates. More importantly, Democratic and Republican candidates ran dramatically different campaigns, as if living in separate political universes. While Republican candidates talked about high inflation, crime, and “wokeness”; Democrats focused on infrastructure, low unemployment, and abortion rights. Different worlds indeed.

The experts in our fall series predicted much of what happened during the midterm elections with surprising accuracy. They also warned that the ongoing level of deep division and polarization continue to pose serious risks for American democracy. Importantly, they also offered insight into how we can reinvigorate our country’s democratic norms. The lectures were viewed by thousands, and if you missed them, I encourage you to go to the institute’s YouTube channel where you can still see them.

In addition to our series on the midterm elections, the institute hosted an assortment of other important events. James Mattis, former four-star Marine Corps General and Secretary of Defense, delivered a Foley Distinguished lecture to a packed Bryan Hall Auditorium on March 23 (see page 6). In addition to discussing the war in Ukraine, US relations with China, and other security concerns, Mattis said the greatest threat to our country lies in our internal divisions, not external enemies. Quoting Lincoln, he said Americans “are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection”, and he called on the next generation to heal the ruptures that have emerged in recent years.

In April the institute hosted a dinner in Spokane, Washington, to debut a new documentary film on the life and leadership of Tom Foley, “The Gentleman Speaker: Conversations with Tom Foley” (see page 5). The film explores the former Speaker’s long history in politics through a series of stories told around a dinner table with other guests, and is narrated by Chris Matthews, who was the featured speaker to a crowded hall at the event. You can see the documentary on the Foley Institute’s YouTube channel: youtube.com/@FoleyInstitute/videos
The institute also hosted the usual assortment of journalists, policymakers, and political leaders during the year, including Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers (see page 12), Washington attorney general Bob Ferguson (see page 12) and local state legislators (see page 13).

Finally, the institute has continued to advance its mission to engage young people in public service. In addition to seeing news about our Foley interns who were posted to various public agencies across the nation (see pages 16-17), you can also read about the new class of Foley graduate research fellows and the important research that they are undertaking in this newsletter (see pages 18-19).

The work we do at the institute is enabled by people like you. So, let me thank all those who have supported the institute and its programs this past year and encourage others to join us in the future. Your support continues to make it all possible.
On April 21, the institute hosted a public dinner event at Riverfront Place in Spokane, Washington, to mark the release of a documentary, “The Gentleman Speaker: Conversations with Tom Foley.” The film explores the former Speaker’s long history in politics through a series of stories told around a dinner table with invited guests, and is narrated by Chris Matthews, who spoke to a crowded hall at the event in Spokane.

Sharing stories of his time in Congress, Matthews talked about his respect for Foley and how he admired Foley’s civility and bipartisan instincts. A former speech writer, Matthews recounted how he was once tasked by the then-Speaker Tip O’Neill to edit a speech to be delivered by then-Majority Whip Tom Foley. Matthews said he wanted to include negative comments about President Reagan’s tax cuts in the speech, but Foley refused, saying that on that particular issue, the President was correct, framing this as an instance of bipartisanship that was well received in his district.

Other speakers at the event included Heather Foley, U.S. Senator Maria Cantwell (D-WA), and former Spokane Mayor David Condon. Matthews was interviewed by Spokesman-Review editor Rob McCurley, and he also signed copies of his book, “This Country: My Life in Politics and History” published in 2021 by Simon & Schuster.
James Mattis Distinguished Lecture

Democracy at home and abroad

James Mattis, former four-star Marine Corps General and Secretary of Defense, visited the institute and delivered a lecture to a packed Bryan Hall Auditorium on March 23.

Mattis began his talk by stating that the biggest threat to democracy was the internal bickering that hurts America’s ability to govern itself. He urged Americans to move past the hot political rhetoric seen in politics and have uncomfortable but civil conversations with one another. He emphasized his belief that compromise is the only way we will move forward as a nation.

Mattis then took questions about the ongoing war in Ukraine, U.S. foreign policy, and the state of democracy. He argued that it was important to keep the war limited to between Russia and Ukraine while continuing to sanction Russia and assist Ukraine. He suggested that sharing intelligence information with allies of U.S., in addition to the press, demonstrated greater international cooperation and took the thunder away from Russia’s invasion. Mattis said that the U.S.’s strategy was working so far but required more humanitarian aid to Ukraine to be fully effective.

Mattis also discussed relations between China and the United States, saying that he did not think war was inevitable. Through diplomacy and hard conversations, he said, war could be averted by working with a broad coalition of nations to constrain China’s actions similar to how the U.S. is constraining Russia now.

Commenting on the war in Yemen, Mattis said cooperation with Saudi Arabia is necessary to counteract Iranian plans to dominate the region. If the Iran-backed Houthi rebels took control of Yemen, he argued, Iran would destabilize the region.

In closing, Mattis argued that the January 6th riots show the absolute need to keep our internal friendship as a nation. He called on young people to make amends for the failures of his generation and roll up their sleeves and heal the nation.

Following his talk, General Mattis met with students at the institute.

Pictured left to right are cadets Meghan Bernard, Connor Parkinson, Tawny Bidegain, General Mattis, Cody Wells, Olivia Hayden, and Nicole Keyser.
In the fall of 2022, the institute hosted a series of special lectures centered around the 2022 elections. Experts from numerous fields of study spoke to students and the wider WSU community about some of the critical issues facing the electorate in what was widely considered to be one of the most important mid-term elections of recent years.

**After Dobbs, the elections and the Court’s future direction**

On September 6, the series opened with Stefanie Lindquist, professor of law and political science at Arizona State University. She gave a talk on the Dobbs decision’s impact on public trust in the Supreme Court and how it might effect the midterm election.

She said that recent decisions on the EPA, separation of church and state, and gun rights have undermined trust in the Court. Groups that have ample representation in the political process, like religious organizations and large companies, received even greater protections in these rulings, raising questions about the Court’s obligation to protect those with less power.

Professor Lindquist suggested that the Dobbs decision was hotly contested because it both overturned longstanding precedent in Roe v. Wade, and because it appeared to be made with naked political motivations. Lindquist stressed that the decision likely undermined long term faith in the Supreme Court, and said that public approval of the Court had fallen dramatically since the decision.

She concluded her talk by noting that the Supreme Court was moving in an uncertain direction during a period of intense political polarization and the response to the Dobbs decision demonstrated a continuing trend of declining trust in political institutions in recent years.

**Who’s going to win? Predicting election results**

On September 13, Kyle Kondik, managing editor of the University of Virginia’s Sabato’s Crystal Ball, gave a talk on how prognosticators predict the 2022 midterms.

He noted that growing partisanship has eroded the presence of ticket splitting, where states elect both Republicans and Democrats to their House and Senate delegation. Instead, states are becoming increasingly mono-political, often electing only one party in significant numbers to powerful positions in their state.

In all midterm elections, he said, presidential approval plays a large role in determining the success of the incumbent political party. Biden’s approval rating was low, and so Kondik suggested that Democrats may well see a significant political hit from the president’s sagging popularity.

He said that strong inflation and the lingering COVID pandemic would hurt the Democrats in the election, whereas the controversial Dobbs decision and the variable quality of some Republican nominees would weigh on its chances to win the midterms. Early generic ballot polls, he said, gave a thin advantage to the Democrats, and the special House election in Alaska gave Democrats a surprise win. Essentially, Republicans are expected to at least regain control of the House with control of the Senate a toss-up.

Kondik ended his talk by noting that regardless of the outcome in the 2022 midterms, the 2024 Senate races clearly favor Republicans as many vulnerable blue states have Senate seats up for reelection.
Broken promises, close elections and party failure in Congress

On September 26, the institute welcomed Princeton political science professor Frances Lee to discuss the impacts political gridlock and close elections have on democracy.

Professor Lee began her talk by noting that the 2022 midterms are unlikely to produce a major shift away from the gridlock and thin majorities seen in the past three decades. In recent decades, she said, landslide elections have become less common, states rarely change party control, and divided government has become the norm. Close competition and party parity has defined our politics since the 1990s, driving parties to become more combative in order to differentiate themselves and to demonize the other party.

The shift towards a more competitive partisan environment, Lee noted, has also led the parties to rely more on “base” strategies of campaigning, where they speak only to their strongest supporters and forego making bipartisan appeals. The 1994 and 2006 midterms were previous, iconic examples of the parties taking hardline political positions and demonizing the other side. Such strategies, Lee suggested, lead parties to over-promise during campaigns and defeat bipartisanship, as any work done with the opposition party actively helps the majority stay in power.

Lee noted that while intensified partisanship during periods of close electoral competition could lead to party unity during elections, it did not alleviate intraparty differences on key pieces of legislation after. Consequently, she said, parties rarely succeed in enacting the legislation they promise during the campaign, creating a cycle of failed ruling coalitions that collapse and give way to more faulty promises.

The next Congress, what legislation can pass?

On October 4, James Curry, University of Utah, delivered a talk on what kinds of legislation the 118th Congress might be able to pass after the upcoming 2022 midterms.

Echoing comments made by Francis Lee, Professor Curry reminded the audience how political parties routinely under-deliver on their election promises. While many argue this is an example of Congress’s declining efficiency, and while it is true that the total number of laws passed each Congress has declined in recent decades, the amount of policymaking in Congress, he said, has actually increased in recent years as a result of the use of omnibus legislation, where multiple issues are packaged into a single law.

Curry noted that, contrary to popular belief, bipartisan voting on legislation has not declined significantly over the past five decades. Congress still must make compromises on key pieces of legislation, with the majority party seeking support from the minority party by removing radical proposals from legislation or incorporating the opposition party’s priorities into new laws.

He concluded that while parties may be growing more hardline in their rhetoric and campaign styles, the overall need for majority parties to compromise and seek broad support for their policies has not disappeared.
Abortion, LGBTQ+ rights, and the courts

On October 11, the institute hosted Alison Gash, University of Oregon, to give a talk on the future of abortion and LGBTQ+ rights and their role in the midterm elections.

Professor Gash began her talk by emphasizing the consequences of the Dobbs decision and that it might well become a precedent to roll back other privacy rights involving women and the LGBTQ+ communities.

Her talk focused on the language of the 14th Amendment and the meaning of its two major clauses involving due process and equal protection. Taken together, she said, these clauses require government actions to pass a ‘strict scrutiny’ test and to show that the action serves a “compelling state interest” if government seeks to intrude upon personal privacy.

Although the right to privacy is not specifically enumerated in the Constitution, most Americans believe that individuals must be free to make personal life choices about their lives, and several landmark Supreme Court rulings like Griswold v Connecticut have recognized this over the years. The right to privacy, she said, thus has become an important implied right regarding one’s own bodily autonomy and the conduct of intimate relationships.

Gash was concerned that while the Dobbs decision did not explicitly overturn the right to privacy, the nature of the Court’s rationale in reversing Roe v. Wade had ominous implication for privacy rights going forward.

Redistricting, election laws, and the midterms

On October 25, Paul Gronke, Reed College, discussed how election administration and various state laws affect elections and the midterms.

Professor Gronke began his talk by noting that rational voters might have a disincentive to vote. Given the fact that a single vote will rarely if ever determine the outcome of an election, individuals would act rationally by not voting if it took much too time or effort to vote, and these are therefore important factors in determining voter turnout.

He suggested that this is why it is important to lower the cost barriers to voting and make it more convenient. When voting by mail was implemented in Oregon and elsewhere, it was enacted in hopes of increasing voter turnout by reducing the amount of time it took to vote. While turnout increased in the years following its adoption, it remained similar to turnout seen during the late 1960’s.

Gronke went on to explain the complexity of election laws in the U.S., with responsibility shared by federal, state and local governments. Elections are run by over 8000 different jurisdictions, each with their own rules and policies to govern voting and elections. Voter registration is also complex, with a multilayered system of registration, vote tabulation, and counting.

He ended his talk by discussing the recent debates over voting laws in the wake of the 2020 election, and especially partisan efforts to change voting practices such as mail in ballots, electric voter registration, or certain ID laws, for partisan purposes.
On November 8, the institute held a special election day prediction panel with Todd Donovan, Western Washington University, and Travis Ridout and Michael Ritter, both from WSU. Each of the panelists was asked to make predictions on how the midterm elections would turn out and to discuss what they saw as the most important factors in the elections.

Professor Donovan said that ballot measures on direct democracy, abortion, incarceration, marijuana, and ranked choice voting may impact turnout, and noted that the victory of a Democrat in Alaska’s recent special election cast some doubt on expectations of a ‘red wave’ for the U.S. House of Representatives. Donovan stated that a wide ray of outcomes were possible, though he expected Democrats to take losses in both chambers.

Professor Ridout noted that Biden had won in a majority of the House seats up for election in 2020, but that current polling for Democrats was far below what they may need to keep control of that chamber. Further compounding this, was the fact that polls had in the past failed to accurately measure Trump’s support base. Midterms also tended to attract more partisan, educated voters who tended to vote the party line. Despite the polls looking ominous for Democrats, several high-profile Republican candidates like Hershel Walker and Mehmet Oz had suffered from numerous campaign scandals that he predicted would hinder Republican chances in the Senate. Ridout also agreed with Donovan that Democrats would likely lose the House but expected Democrats would keep the Senate.

Professor Ritter spoke on how state election laws affect election results. Early voting restrictions can advantage one party over another by allowing certain kinds of voting, with in person early voting favoring Republicans and mail voting favoring Democrats. State by state voting law discrepancies caused great confusion and mistrust of the 2020 election that may again surface in 2022. Ritter expected Republicans to retake the House but that the Senate was a toss-up.
Election norms and democracy

On November 1, Eric Groenendyk, Memphis University, spoke about ideology and norm conformity within political parties.

Professor Groenendyk argued that partisan ideology can act less like a set of rigid beliefs and more like a group identity. Similarly to how sports fans take offense to another team’s jersey, partisan ideological groups take offense to those who break ranks on policy positions. He argues that under certain conditions ideology leads to ‘norm conformity,’ where voters refuse to break ranks with their party’s political elites.

He discussed his research on norm conformity, where participants in an experiment were asked to define the policy positions within their party and identify whether these views aligned with their own ideology. His study found that there was strong pressure to conform to the liberal or conservative ideological norms that individuals believed their party held. When individuals broke from those norms they were usually unaware they were doing so, although some (about a third) did so knowingly. Understanding that behavior, he argued, was important for thinking about how to depolarize today’s level of toxic partisanship.

Groenendyk ended his talk by noting that while individuals can break ranks from fellow partisans or ideological group members, political leaders and elites play the crucial role in defining group norms. Thus, they have an important responsibility to play in recasting the nature of today’s polarized politics.

Watch our events again!

Many of our events are recorded, and available to watch again.

Go to YouTube and search for Foley Institute
Taking on powerful corporations

On October 18, Washington State Attorney General Bob Ferguson gave a talk on his office’s legal action against Facebook for violating campaign finance law.

Attorney General Ferguson explained that his office serves the people of Washington, with decisions and consultations made regardless of external political pressure. His office was pursuing legal action against Meta (the parent company of Facebook) for violations of campaign finance law, which requires public disclosure of the funding of political advertisements. Meta violated this policy by refusing to disclose online ads posted to its social media pages and continued to do so after it had received a warning.

Ferguson suggested that the stakes for election integrity and public faith in democracy were quite high in the case. Should Meta win, Washington’s voter-backed election laws would be rolled back, and political action committees would be able to pump money into elections without any accountability. Considering the spread of conspiracy theories relating to the 2020 election, Ferguson argued that now more than ever, election integrity must be protected.

Ferguson also mentioned his work concerning the opioid crisis, where nine states, including Washington, filed a $1.6 billion suit against the misleading marketing tactics large companies used to push prescriptions to doctors. While this case may not bring true justice to the families who lost children and relatives to addiction, he said that it is an important element to preventing future such actions.

A conversation with Cathy McMorris Rodgers

On Thursday October 27, the institute welcomed Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-WA 5th district) for a conversation on her work in Congress and on current events.

Congresswoman Rodgers opened by discussing her upbringing and early years in politics in Washington state, when she served as state representative. Originally elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 2004, Congresswoman McMorris Rodgers is serving in her tenth term, and following her reelection in 2022, currently sits as the Chair of the Energy and Commerce committee, which is the oldest committee in the U.S. Congress.

While noting that current circumstances surrounding the economy were not ideal, she suggested that there is hope for the future and opportunities to improve the situation. She mentioned specific legislation including regulations on corporate use of private data collection and sales to 3rd party entities, with a ban on sales to advertising firms of personal data belonging to those under 17.

She also discussed the need for energy independence to mitigate the effects of oil embargoes from foreign powers, and argued that Washington should expand its use of hydroelectric energy.
Race for Congress

On November 3, the institute hosted the Democratic candidate for Washington’s Fifth Congressional District, Natasha Hill.

Ms. Hill described her childhood as a fourth generation, working class Washingtonian from Spokane. She then went on to talk about how she developed strategies to deal with racism from an early age, learning to call out racism in a conversational way that emphasized assertion and education. She talked about working her way through school to receive a degree from the University of Washington, and a law degree in Southern California.

Drawing on her experience in searching for a job during a recession and saddled with debt, Hill explained why she thought our economic systems needed to change. She suggested that the current system of consumer debt, “corporate welfare”, and failed “trickledown economics” actively prevents our country from moving forward. Hill argued strongly in favor of funding community health centers, education, and giving police sufficient resources to respond to drug and mental health crises.

Talk with your WA Ninth District legislators

On December 6, Washington State Senator Mark Schoesler (R-Ritzville) and Representative Mary Dye (R-Pomeroy) gave their annual talk at the institute about the upcoming legislative session. Representative Joe Schmick (R-Colfax) was unable to make it due to a previous commitment.

Senator Schoesler discussed his role as the ranking Republican on the Capital Budget Committee. He noted that the committee is generally bipartisan, with Senator Mullet from the 5th legislative district amongst his favorite colleagues to work with. Schoesler said that his role on Labor, Commerce, and Tribal Affairs involves challenging disputes over labor rights, cannabis use, and gambling.

Representative Dye discussed her role on the Appropriations, Capital Budget, and Environment and Energy Committees. She talked about the recent cap and trade policy passed in Washington’s legislature and argued that more of the revenue received by the act should go towards building resiliency as opposed to immediate benefits.

Dye emphasized the bipartisanship found in her committee, and said she was looking forward to the upcoming session.
**Gunfight! Gun policy and the gun industry**


Mr. Busse began his talk by highlighting his love of gun sportsmanship and deep belief that responsible gun ownership provides fundamental benefits to society. He noted that when he first entered the gun industry in the late 1990s, there was generally a responsible and healthy adherence to gun ownership standards.

He then detailed how he saw the gun industry change under a increasingly radicalized and politicized NRA. Busse argued that the heroization of self-defense stories, the spike in conspiracy theories revolving around a mass seizure of firearms, and misuse of open carry laws have all contributed to a toxic fear-driven discussion of the Second Amendment, while the melding of the NRA and gun manufacturers has created political juggernaut in campaign spending and a fabricated a fear narrative of a mass gun seizure by the US government.

He concluded by expressing a glimmer of hope, suggesting that responsible gun owners have the power to break away from extremist groups like the NRA and to start their own advocacy groups to create change.

---

**Populism and democracy in Central Europe**

On September 20, the institute welcomed Miro Haček, head of the political science and public policy department at the University of Ljubljana in Slovenia, to give a talk on the effect of rising populism in central Europe.

Professor Haček began his talk by defining populism, where anti-establishment rhetoric is employed to gain or maintain power. While not inherently harmful, it has been used recently to push anti-immigrant and authoritarian ideas in Central Europe. Mistrust of major political institutions leads outsiders to attack the political mainstream, fueling radical ideologies, he argued.

Populists typically take power at a time when trust in democracy is low, and democracy often backslides as populists attack major political institutions. The 2008 financial crisis saw a wave of anti-European Union sentiment, giving right wing populists a prime opportunity to gain power.

Haček’s home country of Slovenia was used as an example of populism failing to promote stable democratic leadership. He analyzed several waves of populist elections where shaky coalitions quickly collapsed and led to new parties taking over.

Central European nations ultimately adopt populism, he said in conclusion, because of their traumatic history of authoritarianism, growing economic uncertainty, the migrant crisis, social media, and lack of political incentive to collaborate with other political parties.
Cosponsored Events

The shifting landscape of American religion and politics

On February 28, Diana Butler Bass, a Christian historian, spoke as part of the institute’s ongoing collaboration with the WSU Common Ministry. Butler Bass’s talk focused on the recent history of Christian fundamentalism and its resurgence since World War II.

Dr. Butler Bass noted that in the early 20th century Christian institutions were held in high regard. Fundamentalist ministers were often trusted, held high levels of esteem, and their views on current issues were taken very seriously.

The status of Christian fundamentalism, however, changed dramatically after the Scopes Monkey Trial in the 1920s over whether evolution should be taught in school. While the court upheld the state mandated ban on teaching evolution, the public viewed the fundamentalist case in favor of the ban to be out of touch and counter factual. It was a major blow to fundamentalist beliefs and ministries in the U.S. However, while the trial was a major setback for fundamentalism, it did not go away.

The 1950’s saw a revival of Christian fundamentalism in wake of World War II. Internationally recognized ministers like Billy Graham gained huge followings for their beliefs that America is a uniquely protected place under God. According to Butler Bass, more radical parts of this movement eventually emerged and gained greater prominence and political power, arguing in favor of a white-dominated, traditionally-centered social, political, and economic system. She noted that during the post-Cold War period, these radical fundamentalists have become more popular both in the United States and the globe, including, for example, Russian Orthodox leaders who supported the Ukraine invasion because of their belief in Russian ethnonationalism.

She concluded by remarking that the struggle to define faith in the U.S. is a continual one, and while trends of radical fundamentalism are concerning, they are only one part of the broader history of faith in America.

Taxpayer rights, taxpayer advocates, and trust in the tax system

On February 15, Nina Olson, Executive Director of the Center for Taxpayer Rights, spoke at an online event cosponsored with the WSU Hoops Institute of Taxation Research & Policy.

Ms. Olson began her talk by pointing out the importance of taxation to meet public needs. However, she noted that as part of due process, taxpayers have a right to be informed and a right to quality service, and that the IRS has lagged behind these standards recently. Olson said that an understaffed IRS has not provided timely service to taxpayers, and that COVID exacerbated the problem, leading to what Olson predicted would be the worst filing season since 1985.

Olson outlined the process that the IRS goes through during filing season, which involves a lot of manual work, including catching more than 13 million math errors every year, each of which had to be examined individually by a person. She felt that there should be an automated method of correcting math errors so that taxpayers can get their returns in a timely manner, but at the same time, there is currently an environment of distrust and frustration with the IRS, making it difficult for the IRS to get necessary funding.
The institute has continued to make public service internship opportunities available for WSU undergraduates in 2022.

There were four students who participated (virtually) in the Washington State Legislative Internship Program: Rachel Biden, Kevin Oywak, McKenna Plowman, and Josh Pratt. Also, Gisselle Salazar represented the Associated Students of Washington State University to the legislature in her role as Director of Legislative Affairs.

Other ASWSU interns included Christine Benjamin (Global Campus Vice President), Angelina Hermens (ASWSU Senator), Gabrielle Lund (ASWSU Senator), and Alyssa Novelli (Global Campus Director of Academic Affairs).

Collin Gammon interned as Director of Student Legal Services (SLS) at WSU, and other SLS interns were Shaston Fucal-Kanuha, Sophie Mejia, Annika Peterson, and Stephanie Sanchez Quiñones.

The following students were interns with the WSU Pre-Law Resource Center: Grace Ande, Jilian Hutchison-Blouin, and Giulia Renner.

Also at WSU, Austin Conley and Esther Lamont interned with the Division of Governmental Studies and Services, and Zachary Daniels completed an internship with WSU Athletic Communications.

Eliana Farber interned on the Borgen Project, Nate Huskey interned remotely with the Washington D.C. consultancy firm Actum LLC, and Andrew Green served as a U.S. Army paralegal intern.

Finally, we thank this year’s Foley Institute interns: Sarah Gorrell (who also interned over the summer at the Washington, D.C. office of K&L Gates), and our lead and often only intern during the year, Gus Waters.

Thanks to the generous support of our donors, the institute is able to offer scholarships to our interns, including the Lance LeLoup Congressional Scholarship for internships in the U.S. Congress. Please contact us or visit us online at foley.wsu.edu if you would like to know more and/or are interested in contributing to our scholarship funds.
Undergraduate Internships

In Washington D.C., John Goettle was awarded the Lance T. LeLoup Congressional Scholarship. He interned in the office of U.S. Representative Adam Smith (D-WA 9th District) with whom he is here pictured. Rep. Smith was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1996 and was reelected to his twelfth term in 2022.

John had the opportunity to work directly with constituent communications, in addition to researching information on energy, environmental, and healthcare issues. John graduated from WSU in Fall 2022, and has been accepted into a Master of Public Policy program at Portland State University for Fall 2023.

The Lance T. LeLoup Congressional Internship Scholarship honors the memory of former WSU political science professor, Lance LeLoup.

Help an Undergraduate Scholar

Help the Foley Institute provide scholarships to support undergraduate internships.

Yes, I would like to support Foley public presentations, events, and student internships in public service:

Name(s): _______________________________________________________________________________________________
Address: _________________________________________________________________________________________________
City, State, Zip: __________________________________________________________________________________________
Email: ___________________________________________ Phone: ___________________________________________

Enclosed is my tax-deductible gift of:

☐ $25 ☐ $50 ☐ $100 ☐ Other

Credit Card #: __________________________ Exp. Date: _________
Signature: _________________________________________________________

Please return this completed form to:
WSU Foundation, PO Box 641927, Pullman WA 99164-1927

You can also make your gift online at:
give.wsu.edu.

Questions? Call 800-448-2978 or email foundation@wsu.edu

Thank you!
Each year the institute awards research fellowships to graduate students working on important public policy questions. These fellowships are available thanks to the generosity of Scott and Betty Lukins, Alice O. Rice, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Foundation.

**Shawna Beese** (Nursing) is researching how the social determinants of health interplay with our epigenetics, biology, and health behaviors to determine increased neighborhood resilience, and overall capacity to adapt to stressors as individuals and collectively. The aim is to start to address the underlying causes of the widening rural-urban mortality gap, such as isolation, loneliness, and despair. Beese expects to create a clear operational definition of neighborhood resilience in addition to the antecedents, attributes, and consequences of that concept. The fellowship enabled a comprehensive review the literature on resilience in the neighborhood setting, which will be foundational in clarifying the understanding of key neighborhood concepts for future research.

**Yin Ru Chen**’s (political science) research explores the design and the implementation outcomes of the Gender Mainstreaming (GM) program in Taiwan to provide direction for program improvement and an academic contribution to gender policy studies in Asia. This research employs multi methods, such as content analysis, face-to-face interviews and qualitative comparative analysis (QCA), and studies the GM program from two perspectives: macro and micro. The macro perspective examines the program design, and the micro perspective evaluates the program outcomes. The two perspectives together can help to unveil how program design impacts the program outcomes and provide indications for future improvement.

**Chioma Ezeh** (language, literacy, and technology) focuses her research on multilingual education, and how multilingualism and sociocultural factors interplay with power structures to shape learning and assessment practices, and language education policy. Ezeh conducted a case study that explored the intersection of macro (Washington state) language policy and micro (second-grade classroom) policy enactments in positioning and bridging multilingual learners’ language practices for meaning-making during learning and assessment events.

**Athar Ali Khan**’s (anthropology) research examines how socially and economically marginalized agropastoralist tribes in highly fragile mountain ecosystems of Central Karakoram in Pakistan are adapting to climate change by relying on their Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK). Worldwide, Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) is considered costly and complex as it requires tradeoffs in livelihoods and wellbeing strategies. The research aims to explore the CCA strategies of agropastoral tribes which can be useful for inclusion in climate change adaptation plans and policies for Pakistan, which is 61% mountainous.
April Kraft-Duley’s (criminal justice) research examines the School Violence Prevention Program (SVPP) that was implemented after the Parkland School shooting. She examines the intersection of who is funded and what is funded, specifically, a) the sociodemographic characteristics of the applicants; b) safety measures they request; c) whether those safety measures are supported by existing research, and if so, what types; and d) the statistical interactions between who is funded and what is funded. Kraft-Duley aims to evaluate the SVPP’s intended outcome of safer students, and whether this safety outcome is implemented equitably for all students and districts.

Erica Magaña’s (criminal justice) research focuses on females who commit sexual offenses, using police-reported and self-reported sexual victimization data to examine the following questions: a) what types of sexual offenses do females perpetrate, b) can these sex offenses be classified into distinct groups or ‘types of sex offenses,’ c) are these offense ‘types’ consistent with existing offender typologies of female sexual offenders, and d) are there observed offense differences between police-reported and self-reported sexual victimization data? She aims to provide policy suggestions to help responses to female-perpetrated sexual violence in order to prevent or reduce its prevalence.

Abbas Mammadov (political science) researches the role of political leadership in the decision-making process, in particular the impact of personal qualities of leaders on foreign policy issues. His primary region of interest is Russia and its foreign policy, its role in ongoing conflicts in the Middle East and Eastern Europe, and Russia’s relations with Western democracies, especially the United States. Mammadov utilizes methods such as leadership trait analysis to study the personality traits of various heads of state and government, including Vladimir Putin, Donald Trump, and others.

Helary Yakub (political science) studies trauma and violent extremism. She addresses the issue of what drives people to join violent extremist groups and how they are recruited. She is currently developing her own model to respond to this question, which she has coined “the social ecology of trauma.” She aims to accomplish her goal for bringing healing to people and communities around the world through her research. This study will also shed light on the flawed structures that continue to foster trauma and consequently violence on a global scale. She therefore expects that this study would illustrate the need for systemic reform.
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