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Abstract
The purpose of this project was to produce a capstone work of an academic career at Ball State University that would serve as an exhibit of the lessons learned and skills attained from the college experience. It was not an easy task to combine several years of learning into a tangible document that would speak to the intensive academic training received at this university. This goal of this project is to provide a glimpse into the political process and the public sphere, areas that have been concentrated fields of study for four years.

The foundation for this work was laid during an internship with the Indiana state legislature during the spring semester of 2001. During this period, many contacts were made with legislators from both chambers of the Indiana General Assembly and with members from both sides of the aisle. As a result of this experience, a relationship was formed with Indiana State Senator Allie Craycraft, Jr. (D-Selma). When the opportunity arose to begin work on this project, it seemed a natural fit to participate in the re-election efforts of Senator Craycraft. This approach was taken because the opportunity for education stretches far beyond the classroom and textbook. It is only when the skills obtained in the academic world can be applied to real-world situations that a student truly obtains the full-learning experience.

Senator Craycraft was pleased with the idea and suggested that activities not be limited to his campaign, but a focus should also be placed on the campaign of his son who was seeking the office of Delaware County Sheriff. Steven G. Craycraft was running for the office being vacated by Sheriff Steve Aul, who was prohibited by term limitations from seeking re-election.
Nearly a year of service was dedicated to the efforts of electing Steve and Senator Allie Craycraft. If successful, this thesis will provide a chronicle of the events that transpired during this time, as well as providing a comparison to a textbook, *Campaign Craft*, written about campaigning in the modern America. The reader is to gain a better understanding about the electoral process, and the strategies associated with running for office. There are many unseen activities and intricate strategies that are necessary in achieving elected office, and this document strives to expose these elements.

**An Introduction to the Candidates**

A democratic system is one that is run by the people, specifically those elected by the general public to cast votes on matters of public policy. The two candidates who will be discussed have dedicated decades to serving the public in the hope of improving the lives of those in their communities. A government is only as good as those who serve in it, and the electorate must be informed about the individuals they elect to represent them.

State Senator Allie V. Craycraft, Jr. has served the citizens of District 26 for more than 24 years.\(^1\) Prior to his time in the state legislature, Senator Craycraft worked for 37 years at Hydra-Matic in Muncie (currently known as New Venture Gear).\(^2\) He and his wife Juanita have seven children and thirteen grandchildren, and the Senator credits his children with his start in public service. When his sons were children, Senator Craycraft served as their Cub Scout master, which led to his involvement in the community.\(^3\)
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1 Craycraft, Allie. 2002 Campaign materials.
2 Ibid.
His political aspirations began in 1970 when he was asked to run for Trustee of Liberty Township.\textsuperscript{4} He was successful in this endeavor and remembers being the first Democrat trustee in that township, but he noted there were several more from his party who succeeded him.\textsuperscript{5} In 1974 he campaigned for a seat in the Indiana State Senate. The incumbent at the time was retiring, and the race was be an open one.\textsuperscript{6} Senator Craycraft was unsuccessful in this bid, losing narrowly in the primary by a mere 46 votes.\textsuperscript{7} As was evident in the 2000 presidential election in Florida, this race emphasized the important of each individual vote. Craycraft admitted that he thought this loss marked the end of his career in public service, but he continued his involvement with the party following the defeat. He noted that a key component to success in politics and in life is staying involved and helping people.\textsuperscript{8}

In 1978, just four years after his defeat in his bid for a seat in the Indiana State Senate, Craycraft decided to challenge the man who had defeated him in the previous campaign. His opponent had gotten into some trouble during his time in office, and constituents were ready for a change.\textsuperscript{9} He successfully ousted his opponent in the primary, winning by approximately 2,500 votes, and then he cruised to victory in that fall’s general election.\textsuperscript{10} During his first term in the state legislature, his colleagues named Senator Craycraft as the “Outstanding Freshman Legislator.”\textsuperscript{11} He was

\textsuperscript{4} Craycraft, Allie. Personal interview. 26 Nov. 2002.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{7} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{10} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{11} Craycraft, Allie. 2002 Campaign materials.
successful in the following five elections and hoped that his sixth attempt would follow suit.

The election season of 2002 was a unique one for the Craycraft family, because not only was Senator Allie Craycraft up for re-election, but his son Steve was vying for the position of Delaware County Sheriff. The current sheriff of Delaware County, Steve Aul, was prohibited by law from seeking a third full term, thus the spot was open to anyone who felt qualified to lead the department. Steven G. Craycraft had been a member of the Delaware County Sheriff’s Department for approximately 21 years, and marshal for the town of Selma for the past ten years. He currently serves as an investigator with the county police force.

In addition to his professional responsibilities, over the years Steve Craycraft has served on many boards and belonged to several groups in the community. He volunteered his time to the Habitat for Humanity board, and he is a gubernatorial appointee to the state licensing board for private detectives. In addition, he was the coordinator for the Delaware County Child Protective Team and assisted with the Martin Luther King Dream Team. Steve Craycraft also has tried to be as involved as possible with the activities of his wife, Lorie, and their two children.

Steve Craycraft attended many law enforcement schools and participated in several programs to increase his knowledge about policing responsibilities and to further develop his skills to protect the public. He attended the Eastern Kentucky School of
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Law Enforcement, Court Security School, and Crisis Negotiation School run by the U.S. Department of Justice. In addition, he has received training with the Drug Enforcement Administration, First Witness Child Abuse Resource Center, the U.S. Department of Justice’s Child Abuse/Sexual Exploitation Investigation, and Project Trigger Lock through the U.S. Attorney’s Office among other training programs.

The Campaign

Once someone has decided they want to serve the public in the capacity of elected office, the long journey of campaigning begins. In this modern-day climate of glitzy advertising campaigns and mud-slinging politics, it is often easy to overlook the essential elements of a successful campaign and what it truly takes to win. Daniel Shea and Michael Burton have published a book, Campaign Craft, that details the strategies and tactics of successful campaigns, and many of their suggestions were evident in the campaigns of Steve and Allie Craycraft. However, it became obvious after many hours of working on the campaign trail that the “real world” is nothing like a textbook.

This section focuses largely upon the primary race for the sheriff’s office, with some detail at the conclusion about the general election. Since Senator Craycraft devoted the majority of his time and attention to his son’s electoral efforts, very little was done to campaign for this seasoned incumbent. The majority of the efforts were focused on the sheriff’s race, with very little activity in the senate contest.

One of the major shifts in modern American elections has been an increased popularity of professional campaign advisors. According to Shea and Burton, this shift
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toward costly, professionally-orchestrated campaigns can be traced back to 1896, yet the
trend really took hold as mainstream during Dwight Eisenhower’s race for the presidency
in 1952. The authors explained that the traditional grassroots style of campaigning is
archaic and some experts even deem it as “old style.” Although Shea and Burton did
not go so far as to agree with the preceding statement, they did point out that local party
volunteers are not the strong force they once were. Burton and Shea pointed out that
personal contact remains the best way to win voter support, and its importance should not
be overlooked in the modern era of elections, but it must be carefully targeted.

Planning is essential.

The authors described some key reasons why grassroots efforts are still effective.
Personal contact provided voters with a different way to receive and interpret other forms
of campaign communications. They pointed to the ability of voters to view nonverbal
cues, which are so often indicators of someone’s true personality and whether or not an
individual can be trusted. This style of campaigning also provided an opportunity for
the candidate to be humanized in a way that makes them a “real person,” instead of
simply a face on a billboard or a voice in an advertisement.

In the Craycrafts’ campaigns, the grassroots component of their campaign
strategies was a key to the successes achieved. Both of the candidates and committee
volunteers spent countless hours out in the community with the intent to reach out to
potential voters. This was particularly evident in Steve Craycraft’s campaign for sheriff.
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During the primary season, he ran against seven other men who all hoped to have their name as the Democrat candidate in the general election. The other Democrat contenders included John Balle, a political newcomer; Mark Berry, a Muncie city policeman; Kenneth Davenport, a perennial candidate for varied positions; Larry “Toby” Johnson, a Delaware County Police sergeant; Michael Scroggins, a captain with the county police; Robert Stahl, a Yorktown tavern owner; and Jason Walker, a deputy with the sheriff’s department.23

In the Democrat primary, Leon Dixon, a former member of the Muncie School Board, challenged incumbent Senator Allie Craycraft for a seat in the state legislature.24 Although two candidates were vying for a spot on the ballot in the general election, Craycraft faced minimal opposition. Dixon did not advertise his campaign, utilized no volunteers at the polls, and made few appearances at candidate forums.25 As a result, Senator Craycraft conducted very little, if any, discernible campaigning in his primary race.

During the primary, Craycraft volunteers used printouts supplied by the party that listed each registered Democrat voter by precinct. In the days and weeks leading up to the election, volunteers knocked on these specific doors to distribute campaign literature and provide answers to questions or concerns voiced by the voter on the other side.

In addition, volunteers were also equipped with voter registration forms. This was done so that if there were individuals in the household who wanted to vote but were not yet registered, then those people would not have to go out of their way to do so.

25 Ibid.
Steve Craycraft really pushed this aspect of his volunteers' activities, because he believed that those people would tend to remember his name on Election Day. He also acknowledged that the more voters who went to the polls, the better his chances for success. Burton and Shea commended such an activity in their text by saying, “Previously unregistered voters tend to be less partisan and, as such, less committed to opposing candidates. Moreover, because these are new voters, it is possible they will not be listed on opposition lists.”26 Other key volunteer activities included planting yard signs, making appearances in campaign t-shirts to distribute campaign literature at any place where a crowd might gather, and helping out at the various fundraisers.

This leads into another important component of modern electioneering: fundraising. Elections cannot be bought, but proper financial backing does not hurt a candidate’s chances by any means. Senator Craycraft held very few fundraisers in his re-election bid, but he did have a couple of golf outings and one luncheon for families. Given the long tenure of Senator Craycraft’s time in office, he received many contributions from political action committees (PACs), including I-PACE (a PAC representing the Indiana State Teachers Association) which contributed $15,000 in 2002.27 Other PAC contributions made to Senator Craycraft’s campaign included those from organized labor and other varied groups.28 Craycraft raised $34,832 prior to the primary, while his opponent netted only $4,000.29 The lone Republican running for the

28 Ibid.
seat, retired teacher Andrew Phipps, reported raising $8,647, primarily from individuals.\textsuperscript{30} The vast difference in funding levels can be attributed to the Senator's status as incumbent, given that most groups contribute to the candidate with the greater likelihood for winning. Professor Ray Scheele, a Ball State University instructor of political science, has been quoted about political fundraising in *The Star Press*, "... Lobbyists know what they are getting."\textsuperscript{31}

Steve Craycraft's fundraising efforts were much more aggressive. The Democrat primary was a highly contested race, and it took large sums of money to purchase advertising materials that helped to increase name recognition in the crowded field of eight contenders. He sponsored a few dances, golf outings, and countless dinners and lunches. Normally, volunteers were given tickets for the dances and dining fundraisers at committee meetings to sell to friends, family, and other members of the community. Prices usually hovered around $5 per ticket, and sometimes the Craycrafts encouraged giving complimentary tickets to some individuals as a way to boost attendance at the events and build support for the campaign. Tickets were also sold at the door to ensure those who did not purchase tickets in advance would not be excluded. Many restaurant owners opened their facilities for events and often made in-kind donations of the food to the campaign. Local establishments that sponsored events included The Anchor, Pete's Duck Inn, The Oasis, Red Dog Saloon, and several others. It was interesting that many of the sponsoring facilities were taverns, and all facilities served alcohol during the events. This came as a great surprise that a candidate running for a law enforcement position would have so many events in such venues. Another observation was that

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
voters between the ages of 18 and 20 were excluded from such events as a result of the legal drinking age. In a city that is home to a university, it seemed as if this segment of the population should not be overlooked. However, given the lackluster voting records of this group, perhaps this was not a large factor in making the decision about location of events. It apparently did not have an impact on attendance, because nearly all events were filled to capacity. In contrast, one of the sheriff candidates, Larry Johnson, announced that he would not conduct fundraisers in any establishments that sold alcoholic beverages.

The golf outings differed in recruiting methods, because teams would contact organizers to register for the event in advance. Obviously fees were higher for the golf events, but this was necessary to help recoup some of the costs of using the golf courses.

Another event for which voluntary help was essential was the chili lunch associated with Steve Craycraft’s official candidacy announcement. Volunteers prepared several batches of chili and other food items, served the food, and stood in support of his decision to seek the office of sheriff.

The fundraising efforts would by all accounts appear to have been successful. Figures indicate that as of April 20, 2002, Steve Craycraft had raised $14,688, ranking him third among those vying for the Democrat nomination. He reported to have spent less than $6,000 of that by the date reported. In an interview following the general election, Steve said that he had been able to raise a total of $125,000 for both elections in
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2002.\(^{35}\) County Police Captain Mike Scroggins raised the most money of all Democrat sheriff contenders by netting a reported $36,727.\(^{36}\) Scroggins’ uncle, Chief Deputy Don Scroggins, had originally declared candidacy in the race, but he dropped out citing health concerns. Don Scroggins served as chief deputy in the Aul administration and had the backing of the outgoing sheriff. The elder Scroggins contributed the money ($13,000) he had raised to his nephew’s campaign, and then Aul pledged his support to the younger Scroggins.\(^{37}\) Deputy Jason Walker raised the second-highest amount in the primary with $16,718.\(^{38}\) Other candidates raised fewer than $5,000 a piece, and interestingly John Balle reports having neither raised nor spent any money on his campaign.\(^{39}\)

Another strategy Shea and Burton addressed in their book was the telephone bank. They explained that use of this approach is a good way to reach a large number of voters when time is an important consideration.\(^{40}\) The authors added that this technique utilizes older or disabled volunteers to get involved when they are unable to walk door-to-door as part of a canvassing effort. Neither of the Craycraft candidates utilized this strategy during their campaigns, but the chair of the Delaware County Democrat Party, Dennis Tyler, instructed a few volunteers to call voters on Election Day as a reminder to get out and vote. Calls were made until 15 minutes prior to the close of the polls. Tyler wanted to remind his Democrat voters to go to the polls, but he also wished to gauge voter response about Steve Craycraft and his campaign. Although not a scientific

\(^{35}\) Craycraft, Steve. Personal interview. 4 Dec. 2002.
\(^{37}\) Ibid.
\(^{38}\) Ibid.
\(^{39}\) Ibid.
method of collecting information, Tyler was interested in what people had to say about the race. These calls also gave voters who did not have transportation to the polls an opportunity to request a ride. Party volunteers wrote down addresses of those who said they needed a ride, and drivers picked transported them to the polls. This method could have been more productive if more volunteers were involved, and if it had been done prior to Election Day. The last-minute nature of the effort did not give voters advance notice about Election Day or the opportunity to learn more about Steve Craycraft and his platform.

Another activity that was related to the phone banks is the distribution of letters, which were mailed to Democrat voters in many precincts. Several precinct committeemen had signed form letters stating their support for Steve Craycraft in the sheriff’s race and encouraging those in the area to do the same. This was a large, time-consuming effort that occurred prior to the May 2002 primary. An interesting note about this was that Senator Craycraft is a precinct committeeman, so of course all of his voters received the letter asking for support for his son’s electoral endeavor. It is hard to gauge the effectiveness of this one mailing, but it seems as if voters might place more confidence in a letter from their committeeman, someone who lives in the district and knows most voters in that area, rather than if it had been signed by the county chairman or any other official in the party and/or community.

An interesting mailing piece that Senator Craycraft was able to utilize was the weekly legislative updates the Senate Democrat caucus prepares on his behalf during the legislative session. These mailers were sent to a select group of constituents and serve as a way for Senator Craycraft to communicate with those in the district about his actions,
and issues of concern in the General Assembly. Although this activity was not funded by the Senator or his campaign, it allowed voters to hear from him. His position as the incumbent affords him this luxury.

A political commentator who follows Delaware county politics wrote about another noticeable aspect of the 2002 campaign season – yard signs. Larry Riley noted that in local races, yard signs were key to developing name recognition with voters and indicated the strength of a candidate and his or her popularity within the community.\footnote{Riley, Larry. “Plenty of Political Signs, but What do They Prove?” The Star Press 21 April 2002.} Prior to the campaign, he targeted a historically strong Democrat precinct on Muncie’s south side. In his travels, Riley noted seeing 36 signs for Mark Berry (who, months before the primary, posted his signs anywhere and everywhere possible), 31 for Craycraft, and 16 for Michael Scroggins.\footnote{Ibid.} Other candidates had five signs or fewer posted in this Democrat stronghold, according to Riley’s observations. He pointed out an interesting phenomenon evident to many observant passers-by that several homes displayed signs for opposing Democrat candidates, and some posted signs for candidates from both parties. This inconsistent behavior did not cease in the general election.

Another interesting note is that the Craycrafts used the novelty of two members in the same family running for election to maximize the willingness of friends to post signs and to better utilize materials. The larger, wooden signs that displayed each Craycraft candidate’s name were posted side-by-side on the same supports to ensure voters would notice both candidates’ names while passing by. This was an interesting yet risky
approach given that if voters had ill-feelings toward one of the men, those feelings could very well influence opinion of the other.

A new tool available to candidates wishing to reach out to voters in a high-tech, yet grassroots approach is the Internet. Many candidates vying for positions both federal and state as well as local positions have taken advantage of this new technology to spread their message. Steve Craycraft's campaign operated a Web site throughout the campaign. The site provided pictures and information about his personal life and his views about how to better operate the sheriff's department. Volunteers had the ability to access a calendar, which provided information about upcoming meetings and events. As time wore on, maintenance on the site suffered due to decreased action from the volunteer responsible for updating the site, and it was not as useful in regards to providing the most up-to-date information. There was also a link on the site for prospective voters to send a message to the Steve Craycraft or to members of the committee. The only other candidate in the sheriff's race that was known to have utilized such new methods of technology was George Sheridan, the Republican contender.

Shea and Burton emphasized the influence a Web site can have in an election. They pointed to the surprising election of Jesse Ventura as governor of Minnesota. Their research indicated that the Ventura team used their site to post messages about the candidate, arranged chat rooms where supporters and potential voters could share information about the race, and provided charts and figures about the campaign. They
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suggested that as much as 3% of Ventura’s total vote could be credited to the Web site, just enough to lead him to success in that close three-candidate race.\textsuperscript{44}

**People Make the Difference**

It is an obvious assumption that without the support of the electorate, a candidate does not have a chance to win an election. However, the support of volunteers is nearly as important as support of voters. A candidate only has the ability to be in one place at any given time, but the more people he or she has working on his or her behalf, the greater the ability to be everywhere at once. The Craycraft campaigns pooled support from a collective group of family, friends, and concerned strangers who believed in their messages. Steve Craycraft credited his committee and core of volunteers as having been one of the most positive elements of his campaign. Two active volunteers were interviewed about their involvement with the campaign, Jahma Gray and Jill Watson.

Jahma Gray serves as secretary to the Director of the Office of Payroll and Employee Benefits at Ball State University in Muncie. Her husband, Jack, is a deputy with the Delaware County Sheriff’s Department, and it was his position on the force that launched their involvement in the sheriff’s race. Gray stated that some of their motivation to become involved stemmed from the ability to help choose the new boss. If you like someone’s values, ideals, and morals more than others, then it was a positive to be able to help out the person you wanted to work for.\textsuperscript{45} She stated that originally Jack had aspirations to run for sheriff. However, when the Grays discovered Craycraft


\textsuperscript{45} Gray, Jahma. Personal interview. 31 October 2002.
intended to run for sheriff, and that many of the goals were the same for both men in regard to the department, they decided that the combination of their joint efforts would improve the chances for success.\textsuperscript{46} In the beginning, Gray remembered being fearful that her husband might receive negative reactions as a result of working on the Craycraft campaign, because there were many of his colleagues also in the race. She recalled the measures were not overt, but it was known that some in the department did not approve of Jack’s involvement with the Craycraft campaign (for instance, his shift was moved to midnight).\textsuperscript{47} She noted that this campaign was the first that she and her family had been so involved in, but she remembered helping out in Steve Aul’s first campaign for the position.\textsuperscript{48} As far as party influence having an impact on her decision to support the Craycrafts, she commented that party had little to do with it, but she acknowledged that in order to accomplish anything political in Delaware County it is helpful to be a Democrat.\textsuperscript{49}

Gray pointed out several positives in the Craycraft campaign and the dedication to running the race as cleanly as possible. She noted that if he said he was going to do something then that is what he did, and this gave people a sense of trust in him. Gray said, “People look to see if you’re going to be as good as your word, and by doing that and carrying that out, that’s proven to everyone. What he says, he means. He’s as good as his word.”\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{46} Gray, Jahma. Personal interview. 31 October 2002. \\
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
Although Gray had mostly positive feelings about her involvement with the campaign, she acknowledged a negative component was the time-consuming nature of working on a campaign. She remembered every weekend and all free time were occupied by working hard and ensuring that this dedication was obvious to others. Gray reflected upon her level of activity in the campaign by saying she doubted she would have wanted to do much else. Although she did not have a specific set of responsibilities on the committee, she remembered attending nearly every fundraiser and doing whatever needed to be done. She admitted how tiring it is to be actively involved in a campaign, and she felt relieved that Jack decided not to pursue the office, given the expense of the endeavor and the necessity to stay on top of everything. She admitted she would have never dreamed how much was involved in pursuing an elected office. She wished the candidates would have leaned more on those there to help them and not have been so afraid to ask for help when it was necessary. Volunteers can start to think that their time and efforts are not needed if organizers do not delegate responsibilities. She argued that anyone thinking of running for office should consult with previous candidates who have been successful and take their advice about being organized and on top of things.

Another woman who became very involved with the Craycrafts’ efforts was Jill Watson. She works for the American Automobile Association (AAA), and her husband Eddie serves as a reserve police officer. She remembered getting involved with the campaign after meeting Steve through a friend of a friend, and her family’s efforts were
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about helping a friend and working to make a difference.\footnote{Watson, Jill. Personal interview. 1 November 2002.} She emphasized her desire to get to know the candidates better (not just those running for sheriff, but for all offices) in order to supplement what was derived from the media.\footnote{Ibid.} Her responsibilities centered upon attending meetings, helping out with small tasks (for instance making phone calls or picking up supplies for events), and just making an appearance in the yellow Craycraft shirts anywhere there was expected to be a crowd.\footnote{Ibid.} She recalled being surprised at just how cutthroat things really were but also the depth to which her political knowledge was increased through working on a campaign.\footnote{Ibid.} She noted the biggest surprise came in trying to determine who was telling the truth.\footnote{Ibid.}

Not only did friendship play a role in Watson’s decision to join the committee, but party also played an increasing role as time wore on. Through her experiences on the campaign, she believed she has gained an understanding as to the importance of party unity not only during the campaign season, but especially once oaths were taken and the work of elected officials truly began.\footnote{Ibid.} She emphasized the importance of getting to know each candidate as much as possible in order to decipher that individual’s honesty and to find common issues of importance.\footnote{Ibid.} Watson seconded statements made by Gray about the surprisingly clean nature of the sheriff’s race, as well as the conclusion that the family should have delegated more responsibilities out to willing volunteers.\footnote{Ibid.} She recalled making many new friends, which has benefited her both personally and
professionally (she has recruited some new members for AAA). Looking back, she admitted it would take someone who was a good friend running for office to convince her to become so involved in the future, because she and her family sacrificed many activities and a lot of personal time for the sake of the campaign.

**Public Debate**

A democracy is characterized as providing its citizens the ability to speak freely and publicly on matters of social concern. The citizens of Muncie took advantage of this right, and several debates were held in order for candidates to answer the questions and concerns of voters. These forums were sponsored by The League of Women Voters and the Muncie-Delaware County Chamber of Commerce.

In *Campaign Craft*, Shea and Burton pointed out that debates are often one of the only opportunities for local candidates to receive free publicity, and that reporters cover such events to inform voters. They declared that often there are no winners or losers in debates between local candidates, usually because very few people attend such forums. At the debates for both Craycraft candidates, there were sizable crowds, although the numbers probably did not reach beyond 50. Shea and Burton said that debates provided an opportunity for candidates with less funding to build name recognition, and that sometimes those who strive to maximize the publicity offered at a debate will gear comments more toward those in the media as opposed to those in attendance or listening.
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in their homes.\textsuperscript{66} Campaign Craft also stated the tendency for some candidates to make clear, and sometimes confrontational statements, although there appeared to be very little blatantly confrontational remarks in either of the debates in which the Craycrafts participated.\textsuperscript{67}

The debate between the sheriff candidates occurred three weeks prior to the debate for Senate candidates, and many questions were raised by audience members as well as those prepared by the moderator. One issue of concern was that of illegal dumping in the county. Steve Craycraft emphasized the role of the Rural Policing Program, which placed uniformed officers out in the community in a proactive effort to curb miscreant behavior.\textsuperscript{68} Craycraft also pledged to help bring responsible parties to justice. His opponent, George Sheridan, spoke about his encouragement of officers to search through heaps of trash in an attempt to collect evidence, as well as his intent to work with Indiana Department of Natural Resources officials and conservation officers to hold the guilty accountable.\textsuperscript{69}

Another key issue throughout this election was that of jail overcrowding, a problem with which many communities across the state are currently facing. Steve Craycraft highlighted his alternative for a work release system in which inmates pay the expenses for housing and medical care, thus alleviating the burden upon taxpayers.\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid.
George Sheridan spoke about his plans to move the current work release system off of jail property, a move he claimed would help stop the loss of state funding to the jail, and there would not be a need to relocate the jail’s recreation area (now home to work release participants).71

When asked about deputies’ privilege to drive their patrol cars home, both agreed the policy was a good one and would remain intact. Sheridan emphasized the decrease in response time if officers have their vehicles with them.72 Craycraft stressed the important deterrent a police cruiser is to would-be offenders, as well as the round-the-clock nature of the job.73

Another important issue during the sheriff’s race was that of the current Sheriff Merit Board. The board had recently been criticized as a partisan, “old boys” club that granted favors to friends and political allies. Craycraft defended the current state of the board and said it was a fair and impartial body that serves the sheriff and the department as a whole.74 He emphasized that it is a non-partisan board made up of 3 Democrats and 2 Republicans.75 Sheridan took an opposing view and laid out his plan to implement a fair and impartial board for those being hired or promoted, and he hoped the new structure would be free of the sheriff’s influence by bringing in parties from outside the department.76
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When asked about the biggest challenge that facing the incoming sheriff, both candidates pointed to homeland security and counter-terrorism concerns. Sheridan noted that his training and expertise on the SWAT team makes him a strong leader, and he expressed his intention to work more closely with other law enforcement agencies in the future to ensure that all are aware of procedures so that miscommunication is not a problem. Craycraft also pointed to his experience, as well as his collaboration with Bill Gosnell, director of Delaware County Emergency Management, and Gosnell’s department as his strength, but he reminded the audience that events like those of September 11, 2001 are unlikely to happen in Delaware County.

Other questions centered upon the role of the department and interactions with youth as well as concern about the number of relatives each candidate had who worked for the government (Craycraft cited 4, while Sheridan had none). Given Steve Craycraft’s strong family political ties, this question provided some background though it added little substance to the debate.

In his closing statement, George Sheridan spoke about his job’s purpose as that of protection and service, and he emphasized that he is a police officer and not a politician. He expressed his intent to “get out from behind the desk” in an effort to directly serve the

community. He said it was time to open the department to the citizens of the county and a good, educated, and qualified leader was needed.

Steve Craycraft used his closing remarks to explain the aspects of the sheriff's job: customer service, compassionate and kind actions, an understanding of the needs of the community, and an open-minded approach to solving problems. He spoke of the need to have a sheriff with honor and integrity and one who will lead by example, and he too emphasized that his role is to serve the public.

One other interesting note from the sheriff candidates' debate was the criticism regarding his attire that Steve Craycraft received following the event. He wore his official deputy garb, an outfit he is rarely seen in given his rank of investigator. Muncie's newspaper, The Star Press, indicated that under state law, sheriff's deputies are not permitted to solicit votes or money for campaigns while in their official uniforms.

The paper also pointed out that the department itself has rules and regulations regarding wearing the uniform while campaigning. George Sheridan wore a suit to the forum, yet he said he had no intention of filing a formal complaint regarding the Craycraft fashion faux pas. Craycraft defended his attire by saying he thought it was important for those in attendance to know he was currently a member of the sheriff's department.
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Shea and Burton addressed this tendency for the media to pay close attention to issues such as the outfit debacle, because reporters are aware that a simple forum with questions and answers does not sell papers or generate viewer attention. They said that reporters pick up on even the smallest details that may add increased interest to the story. Perhaps Craycraft benefited from the exposure regarding his attire. The event placed his name in the news, although publication of mistakes do not usually bode well for candidates.

The candidates vying for the Indiana Senate District 26 seat also had an opportunity to debate the concerns of the electorate. The format for the debate mimicked that of the sheriff debate, and many questions were raised on a variety of issues. When asked about the option of considering adoption of daylight savings time across the state through a referendum, Andrew Phipps declared that a referendum represents the wishes of the people and he did not feel it was his role to decide the matter. Senator Allie Craycraft’s response to the question was that the Republican leadership in the Senate has vowed not to take up the matter of daylight savings time unless it first passes out of the Indiana House of Representatives. Thus, he did not see a referendum having a chance for discussion for quite sometime, although he noted that momentum is building in the issue’s favor.
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The candidates were also asked about their support for a future increase in the gasoline tax. Craycraft replied that he did not support the initial increase that was passed during the special legislative session in the summer of 2002; however, since it is considered a user tax, he noted he may vote in favor of one in the future based upon the will of the people.\textsuperscript{92} Phipps emphasized his disdain for tax and spend measures, but if it could be ensured that the funds raised would go toward road maintenance then he could possibly throw his support behind such a measure.\textsuperscript{93}

Questions were also raised about increased funding for childcare and home and community-based health services. Andrew Phipps responded that the state should draft policies that would address some sort of childcare assistance, and he would support a tax break for families who keep elderly relatives in the home.\textsuperscript{94} Senator Craycraft stressed the need for increased childcare funding, especially in light of current economic circumstances, and he emphasized his previous support for such measures.\textsuperscript{95} He also raised his voice in strong support of home healthcare. He reminded the audience of his work to increase the number of programs already in existence, because these are often cheaper and provide patients with more dignity, as well as his amendments that would help to lessen the number of people currently on waiting lists.\textsuperscript{96} He stressed his concern for, and the importance of, issues relating to children and seniors.
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Another key concern for voters during the 2002 election cycle was the loss of jobs, especially in Delaware County. Craycraft spoke of the lackluster job landscape in nearly all communities as a result of factories moving to other locations in search of cheaper labor and more tax incentives.\(^97\) He highlighted his efforts to designate large vacant buildings as special taxing districts in order for communities to entice businesses to establish facilities.\(^98\) Phipps argued that a new attitude regarding taxes was needed, because an unfavorable environment for economic growth has been created.\(^99\) He called for an end to the inventory tax (a statement Craycraft later rebuked in closing statements) as well as an integration of business and university leaders to formulate a plan in order to reverse the state’s position as first in bankruptcies yet last in job creation.\(^100\)

There were other areas of concern that were discussed this forum. One such issue was ballistic fingerprinting; a topic on which Craycraft deferred citing the need for more information, and Phipps responded with his support of gun owners.\(^101\) Regarding policies to keep college costs in line, both candidates stressed the need to pursue funding alternatives to tuition increases in times of budget constraints.\(^102\)

During his closing statement, Andrew Phipps noted that the state is at a critical juncture, and that things can and must be improved.\(^103\) He addressed the need to remedy
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the unfavorable tax situation currently in existence and called for new ideas and leadership.\textsuperscript{104} He asserted his knowledge of the district, and that he can provide a fresh approach and perspective to government.\textsuperscript{105}

Senator Allie Craycraft used his time during closing remarks to emphasize his work to bring more industry to the area and the need for government cooperation and bipartisan support to accomplish the people’s work.\textsuperscript{106} He made a pledge to continue his hard work and reminded those in attendance that each person has an opportunity to contribute to society.\textsuperscript{107}

There was a parallel between the explanation of debates by Shea and Burton and what was observed during the Phipps-Craycraft debate. The authors indicated that candidates should strive to be well prepared for debates, because the media will revel in errors made by debaters.\textsuperscript{108} Senator Craycraft refuted the need to repeal the inventory tax that his opponent advocated, because he pointed out that measures had already been taken to do so.\textsuperscript{109} Craycraft was not willing to leave the responsibility of reporting the gaffe with the media, so he used his time to address the inaccuracy.
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Election Results

After months of hard work and diligent campaigning efforts, the fate of Steve and Senator Allie Craycraft hung with the voters who went to the polls. Results in the Democrat Senate District 26 primary election were as follows: Allie Craycraft received 9,602 votes, while Leon Dixon took 2,243 votes. Republican Andrew Phipps was the only candidate on his ticket, so he received an automatic bid to run in November.

The sheriff’s race proved to be as close as speculated, and the results of the Democrat candidates were as follows: Steve Craycraft received 3,857 votes; Michael Scroggins won 3,537; Mark Berry received 2,159; Jason Walker got 1,826; Larry Johnson netted 817; Robert Stahl received 329; Kenneth Davenport got 52; and John Balle netted 49. The two Republican contenders for sheriff received the following vote totals: George Sheridan got 4,481 votes, while his challenger Jimmy Gibson netted 3,053. The contests were now clear for the race in November, incumbent Allie Craycraft would face Andrew Phipps, and Steve Craycraft would battle George Sheridan for the office of Delaware County sheriff.

Following six months of fundraising and support-building activities mirroring those in the primary, the candidates’ fates were with the electorate on November 5, 2002. Those in Steve Craycraft’s camp completed actions nearly identical to those done for the primary. Visits were made to voters’ homes; however, this time all doors were knocked, and the lists volunteers relied on in the primary to reach Democrats were not used.
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was important to gain support from voters affiliated with both parties, and Democrats alone could not be expected to elect Craycraft as sheriff. Fundraisers similar to those conducted for the primary were held to raise funds for the general election. Senator Craycraft mounted more of an effort against Andrew Phipps in the general election than he did against Leon Dixon in the primary, because Phipps ran a strong campaign. Senator Craycraft’s efforts still were not as active as one might expect, but he believed his cushion of incumbency would immunize him against defeat.

The results of the fall election were surprising in both Craycraft races. The contest between Andrew Phipps and the incumbent Senator was expected to be a landslide victory for Craycraft, but he narrowly held on to his job with a majority hovering around 600 votes. Andrew Phipps received 16,078 votes, while Senator Craycraft won with 16,722 votes. What would have seemed to be a toss up for sheriff by all previous accounts turned out to be a decisive win for George Sheridan who received 18,324 votes to Steve Craycraft’s 14,498 votes, representing a 3,826 vote margin of victory.

Following Election Day, both candidates reflected on the positive and negative aspects that they believed influenced the result at the polls. Senator Craycraft credited his work with helping people in the past as a large part of his winning effort. He also pointed to his ability to draw some votes from the Republican party, an important aspect in this race, because his opponent’s strong ties to the south side of Muncie allowed

---

Phipps to pull some votes from this traditionally Democrat stronghold. The Senator said he was able to draw votes from both parties because he does not inquire about political affiliation when asked for help; he does his best to treat all people equitably and fairly.

There was one component of his effort that the Senator would have changed in the 2002 contest, and that was to have his own committee and rely less on the efforts of his son’s volunteers. He admitted he should have gone to the people more and worked harder, which would have resulted in a larger margin of victory in the general election. Senator Craycraft would not speak to any future political goals, indicating he plans to take the next four years in office one at a time. He said he would step down if he ever becomes a detriment to the party, and he admitted he would like to have the freedom to do more in his personal life and spend more time with his wife and family. He reflected that he may not have run in the 2002 election if his son had not been on the ticket, but he felt they could help each other to get elected. He claimed that now he tries not to plan his career too far in advance because one vote could alter the support from his community dramatically. If constituents do not believe he is representing their views and casting votes in line with their opinions, then they may remember that at the polls in future elections.

---
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Although Steve Craycraft was unsuccessful in his bid for the sheriff’s job, he did think there were many things he and the committee did well throughout the primary and general races. He was proud of the hard work his committee did as a group not only for his campaign, but also for other candidates on the Democrat ticket.\textsuperscript{124} He was pleased with the high attendance at his fundraisers and the amount of money he was able to raise at them and other activities (in fact he thought he had the strongest campaign of any of the candidates running in the county).\textsuperscript{125}

He acknowledged the negative aspects that he believed contributed to his defeat, including the large number of opponents in the primary and the impact this had following the win in May. He explained that some who lost in that race were unable to get over their loss and the hard feelings of being defeated did not dissipate in the six months following the primary.\textsuperscript{126} He pointed to the need for some to be “more of a man about it all,” and that if he would have been defeated in May, he would have thrown his support behind the Democrat nominee.\textsuperscript{127}

Another change he would have made was the level of involvement by outgoing Sheriff Steve Aul following the primary. He said he appreciated Aul’s efforts, but Craycraft thought that the vast unpopularity of his boss as he left office could have cast a dark cloud upon his efforts.\textsuperscript{128} There was evidence as to the truth of this statement given that both candidates whom the sheriff endorsed (Scroggins in the primary, and Craycraft in the general election) were defeated. However, Craycraft said that when someone
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wants to help you and makes that commitment, as a candidate it is only proper to accept the assistance.\textsuperscript{129} He believes voters in the 2002 election cast their November ballots against Democrats in general, a trend that was evident both Delaware County's races as well as those across the nation.\textsuperscript{130} The strong popularity of President George W. Bush enabled many in the Republican Party to ride on his coattails to victory.

Another reflection Steve Craycraft made about his defeat was the fact that both he and his father were on the ballot at the same time, and he believes this hurt both of them. He pointed to past elections in which two members of the same family were running simultaneously, and those the contests he could recollect all resulted in one victory while the other faced defeat.\textsuperscript{131} Steve confided his future plans include another run for the office of sheriff in 2006, but he says he will take each day as it comes.\textsuperscript{132} He noted that he does not have political aspirations at this time that go beyond the sheriff's department.

\textbf{Personal Reflections}

Practical applications of lessons learned in the classroom are said to be the real tests of a student's education, and that was the intent of this project. Learning from textbooks and memorization of facts are an essential part of an education, but it is applying these lessons in real-world situations that really matters. When this project began, I hoped to gain a better understanding as to what was involved in running for
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elected office, but in the end I learned so much more. The bulk of this project’s workload rested with the countless hours of volunteer work that was completed over the course of nearly a year. Hopefully this analysis has provided a glimpse into some of the experiences I encountered during that time.

Through the generosity and openness of the Craycraft family, I became part of a team that worked tirelessly to achieve a goal. I saw many positive elements and a few areas that could have been improved upon, but these lessons that I take from my time on the campaign trail will hopefully last throughout my life. I commend both candidates, as well as their opponents, for keeping the contests as clean as possible, especially in a time when it seems as if more mud is exchanged between candidates than policy ideas to improve our communities.

I also gained a deeper appreciation for the importance of good volunteers who will work hard, not because they have to or feel it is in their own interest, but because they want to and they believe in what the candidate stands for. Steve Craycraft emphasized this point in his interview by commenting that the best volunteers are those who do not have a personal agenda, but those who believe in a candidate and want to work hard.133 He noted that those who aided him in the hopes of obtaining a job in his administration or other selfish reasons have since scattered in the days following his defeat.134 I believe neither campaign would have had the impact it did without the efforts of friends and family working on behalf of the candidates.

---
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I concur with Jahma Gray and Jill Watson that it would have been better if the Craycrafts had utilized their volunteers more and been able to ask for help when it was needed. Often times I inquired numerous times about tasks needing completion before one of the family members would delegate responsibility. Improved organization and an official campaign coordinator would have remedied this problem of underutilized volunteers, in my opinion. I attribute this inability to ask for help as the family not wanting to be a burden to those on the committee, but indeed the volunteers were there to help and sought to advance the efforts of the campaign. Perhaps an outside campaign manager could have served as a buffer between the candidates and committee members. Whether it was serving food at a fundraiser, picking up trash at these events, selling tickets, walking door-to-door, registering voters, making calls, or any of the other activities I completed while volunteering, I realized that the smallest deed was a help to the candidates. The list goes on and on as to the positive components of this campaign, but these are just a few of those that stood out to me during this long and arduous process.

As with any learning experience, one must also evaluate what could be improved upon in similar future endeavors. I agree with Senator Craycraft that his chances for losing his seat were elevated by him not establishing a committee of his own and having very few campaign activities. He played an essential role in his son’s bid for sheriff, but this came at the expense of his own campaign. Perhaps he believed that his reputation within the community and his status as the incumbent meant that he could “rest on his laurels” during the 2002 race, but Andrew Phipps’ impressive challenge proved that no candidate is ever truly safe (unless of course he or she is unopposed). Phipps mounted
an impressive campaign, and certainly out-hustled Senator Craycraft who was preoccupied with his son's efforts. I think that the Senator certainly understood that in the world of public service, one can never take anything for granted.

Another area I saw that could be improved upon was the element of communication. It often felt as if information had to be sought out by volunteers in order to know what was going on and what activities the committee needed to complete. Eventually more calls were made reminding people of upcoming events, but it always seemed as if communication with the volunteers could have been better. I attribute this to the distraction those in charge had with so many things going on at one time. The addition of a campaign manager as described above, or even a secretary could have alleviated many of the problems of planning and organization.

All in all, I view my experiences working with these two campaigns in a positive light and feel lucky to have had the opportunity to participate. I learned so much about what it takes to run for public office and only wish more people in the electorate would choose to get involved. I gained a better understanding about the issues and candidates I worked for, as well as those in other races. Since both candidates were such strong party loyalists, it allowed for a lot of collaboration among those on the slate. A government is only as good as those in it, and by drawing more people into the process, our society only gains to improve.
Bibliography


Craycraft, Steven. 2002 Campaign materials.

Craycraft, Steven. Personal interview. 4 Dec. 2002.


Gray, Jahma. Personal interview. 31 October 2002.


Watson, Jill. Personal interview. 1 November 2002.


