

VOX POP Newsletter

of Political Organizations and Parties

An official section of the American Political Science Association
Produced by the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, The University of Akron

***ISSUE THEME: LOCAL POLITICAL PARTIES**

TAKING STOCK OF LOCAL PARTY ORGANIZATIONS

Gregg W. Smith, Department of Political Science
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, PA 17325

It is commonplace to authoritatively proclaim that parties aren't what they used to be. To make such bold statements as to what parties were and are requires data that meet a minimal standard for reliability and rigor. Unfortunately, parties are empirically elusive, a problem aggravated by conceptual elusiveness and compounded by environmental change. The lack of good data is surprising since much of the research on political parties in the United States has been conducted at the local level. Although many of these studies are excellent, the variation in approach is so great that it makes generalizations difficult to say the least, and the bulk of research has not been sustained over time, and thus complicates attempts to identify trends. Eldersveld's examination of Detroit precincts beginning in 1956 and Marvick's Los Angeles study of party activists beginning in 1963, are important exceptions, as are studies of party machines in some areas. We know a lot about Chicago, New York, and Boston, but much less about Buffalo and Denver. And more importantly, what about the other counties, precincts, wards and townships that have been understudied or not at all studied—supposedly because there is nothing there? The implication is that when we define the universe of local parties as consisting of the nation's 3,137 counties, 852 county-type units (e.g., towns in New England) and some 180,000 precincts, we cannot make broad historical claims because the "then" data is largely not there.

The concept of party organization qua organization is virtually absent in Arthur Holcombe's 1924 text on political parties. But by 1929, Merriam and Gosnell were conceptualizing party as a multidimensional phenomenon, and personalities, motives, and organization were among their list of "elements." Their analysis of local organizations

was largely confined to the organization on-paper because they lacked the data to observe what the organization was in actuality. Their empirical data was limited to Chicago and a few other large cities. During the next 40 years, a considerable amount of data was collected, with the one-time case study being the preferred methodology. Case studies work against comparative generalizations, but this work was collectively important because conceptual progress was made by delineating the field of inquiry. In his 1986 text, Crotty cites the following dimensions for evaluating local parties as organizations: formal structure, decision-making norms, openness of membership, activist motives,

(continued on page 3)

THEME: Local Political Parties

From Headquarters	2
Selective Incentives	3
Scholarly Precincts	4
Early Returns	5

- Chair:** Margaret Conway, University of Florida
- Secretary-Treasurer:** Charles Hadley, University of New Orleans
- Program Chair:** Ruth Jones, Arizona State University
- VOX POP Editor:** John Green, The University of Akron
- Executive Council:** William Keefe, University of Pittsburgh; Michael Malbin, SUNY-Albany; Marian Palley, University of Delaware; Richard Boyd, Wesleyan University; Anne Costain, University of Colorado; Diane Pinderhughes, University of Illinois; Gerald Pomper, Rutgers University; Charles Barrileaux, Florida State University; Joyce Gelb, City University of New York; Anne Hopkins, University of Minnesota; John S. Jackson III, Southern Illinois University

MINUTES

**Political Organizations and Parties Section
American Political Science Association
San Francisco, August 31, 1990**

The Section meeting was called to order by M. Margaret Conway, Chair, at 5:30 p.m. The following order of business transpired:

OLD BUSINESS

1. Treasurer's Report:

\$2,526.49 was transferred from Sorauf to Hadley, October 4, 1989.

(2.00) to open an interest-bearing account at the University of New Orleans Federal Credit Union with the APSA Tax ID number.

917.00 Dues portion received from APSA.

113.62 Interest earned to date.

\$3,555.11 Cash on hand.

2. By-Laws Revision Committee:

Ann Costain, Chair, for the Committee composed of herself, James Guth and Sarah McCally Morehouse, recommended the changes published in *VOX POP, Volume 9, Issue 1, p.2*. Charles D. Hadley offered a friendly amendment to the proposed Section 1, from "The Chair shall be responsible . . ." to "The Chair and Secretary-Treasurer shall be responsible . . ." to reflect the fact that the Treasurer is required to complete a yearly financial report (form) to receive the second of two Section dues checks from ASPA. It was accepted. The recommended By-Laws revision then was accepted by unanimous vote.

3. Nominating Committee Report:

Marian Palley, Chair, for the Committee composed of herself, Paul S. Herrnson and Richard Boyd, placed in nomination the following slate for two-year terms on the Board:

Charles J. Barrilleaux, Florida State University; Joyce Gelb, City College of New York; Anne Hopkins, University of Minnesota; John S. Jackson III, Southern Illinois University.

A motion was made to accept the recommendations. John Green moved to close nominations. They were accepted by a unanimous vote.

4. Program Report:

The Chair recognized Ruth Jones who was appointed to the APSA Program Committee for the next two

years to take charge of the panels for political parties and political organizations. Ruth noted that she looked forward to our suggestions.

5. Newsletter Report:

John Green requested that everyone keep the information coming to him, especially given the necessity of communication.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. John Green recommended that the POP Award for the Best Article be changed to the Jack L. Walker Award for the Best Article. Seconded by Frank Feigert. Adopted by unanimous vote.

2. Report of the Chair:

M. Margaret Conway reported that the Section Council felt the idea of hold some Research Agenda workshops was a good idea. To that end, the Executive Committee will have two workshops at the 1991 APSA Annual Meeting.

(a) The first will be held in advance of the Annual Meeting on Wednesday afternoon. Its focus will be the "Study of Local Party Organizations" from both methodological and theoretical/practical standpoints. It will be held only if 25 or more of our colleagues register for it in advance.

(b) The second will be held on Friday morning on the regular program. Its focus will be "Political Organizations" or "Political Movements."

3. Chair Conway explained the APSA Program Committee "Rule of 3" as it related to both the Section and the Program Committee. Past practice was for both the Section and Program Committee designee to share the establishment of panels related to the Section subject area. This was changed for the 1991 Annual Meeting to the requirement that three names be submitted by the Section to the Program Chair who would select one of the Section nominees, the ostensible reasons being Program Committee diversity (region, race, etc.). It was done with a strong recommendation for Ruth Jones and under strong protest. Ruth Jones, as noted above, was selected for a two-year term.

(continued on page 7)

POLITICAL PARTIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

Ruth S. Jones, Department of Political Science,
Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-2001

Proposals for papers, panels and roundtables focused on research on all levels (national, state, local) of political parties and organizations are invited. A balance will be sought between panels on political parties and panels on other political organizations. Papers on interest groups, PACs, and campaign organizations are therefore encouraged as are papers that deal with traditional aspects of party organizations, party governance and party reform. Similarly, proposals that address the intersect of parties

and/or other political organizations with such topics as campaign technology, political media, the courts and party rules, and political recruitment are welcomed as are proposals targeted on the partisan dimensions of campaign finance, conflicts of interest and political ethics. Proposals that have a comparative design are also solicited. Suggestions for papers, panels and roundtables on particular themes or topics (i.e., parties as agents of democratization) are particularly encouraged.

POP RESEARCH AGENDA WORKSHOPS

POP plans on sponsoring two research agenda workshops in conjunction with the 1991 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Washington, DC.

One workshop is planned for the Wednesday before the meeting begins and is expected to be studying local political parties. This workshop will involve presentations on substantive and methodological issues.

The other workshop is planned for Friday morning during two successive panel sessions and is expected to be on studying interest groups and/or social movements. The specific topics for this workshop have yet to be selected and suggestions are welcome.

Anyone interested in serving as a presenter for either workshop or who has suggestions as to the topics to be covered should call or write Ruth Jones, Department of Political Science, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-2001; (602) 965-6551.

SURVEY OF POP MEMBERSHIP

A brief questionnaire concerning the interests and attitudes of POP members is included with this issue of *VOX POP*.

We hope you will take a few minutes to fill out the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed business reply envelope.

This survey will help us plan programs, workshops and identify potential recipients for our annual awards. The results will be printed in *VOX POP*. Note that the questionnaire is entirely anonymous.

*Thank you for your time
and consideration.*

LOCAL PARTY ORGANIZATIONS *(continued)*

policy orientations, campaign period activities, inter-campaign period activities, political support, and constituent base. Since the organization is run by people, we would also want to know the social characteristics and attitudes of the cadre, and their linkages to other political organizations. And we have acquired a fair amount of intensive data or colorful depictions on many of these dimensions for various times and places. After 1969, the volume of local party studies began to decline, perhaps because case studies came under attack on methodological grounds.

Nationwide studies of local organizations—and there have only been a few—are hardly a panacea for party research. To some extent, what a party is and does is the

product of a local environment, and I'm thinking here of 50 sets of state statutes that regulate party and electoral activity, various political cultures and history, and demographic variation. The forte of a national study is that it permits us to describe and generalize about party characteristics, but diversity in party environment makes it hard to take the research the next step and examine the causes and consequences of party organizational behavior.

The most comprehensive national study comes from the 1980 data collected by Cotter et al. and followed up by Gibson et al. in 1984. The 1980 study sent mail questionnaires to all county chairs and received more than

(continued on page 7)

STUDYING LOCAL POLITICAL PARTIES: THE NEED FOR BETTER DATA

Frank J. Sorauf, University of Minnesota

In very few areas of political science is our data poverty as apparent as it is in the study of state and local politics parties. Useful survey data are scarce, and state laws are far less likely than federal statutes to compel the parties to much financial disclosure. Even newspaper reporting of local party officials, party conventions, and party decisions (e.g., endorsements) is spotty at best. Nor does it help that most state and local parties seem chronically unable to keep even the most rudimentary files or records.

For me the conclusion is inescapable: advances in the study of local parties require the collection of new data about them. In a sense we need to recapture that old tradition of entering the arenas of local politics that gave us those lively reports on urban parties from Ostogorski to Gosnell. To be sure, the new data must be systematic, and they must bear on strategies driven by analytical concerns. But the central need remains new and expanded data about local parties, data that must largely come from observing and interviewing, and even by locating new records and documents. In the long haul, that is, we have to push ourselves and our students beyond data that UPS brings and into direct contact with political actors and events.

Urging young scholars into the fields of local politics suggests another issue. The study of local political organizations and processes of any kind has rarely enjoyed the prestige of studies of national phenomena. In part that results from the greater excitement of dealing with the renowned and powerful (not to mention the “relevant”), and in part it results from the advantages in publication opportunities—books as well as journals—for studies of national scope. (one can, of course, think of published exceptions such as Eldersveld’s study of the Wayne county parties.) We may not be able to do much about the excitement factor, but we can as editors, referees, members of editorial boards, and scholarly consumers do something about the publication factor.

As for an agenda of work waiting to be done on local parties, every scholar in the field surely has a list. The Cotter, Gibson, Bibby, and Huckshorn work points the way, but as all important research does, it poses new issues on the new frontiers they established. My own agenda includes the following items (some of which I have been trying to sell to graduate students for years):

- Within the party hierarchies we know relatively little about the relationships of local and state parties to the newly powerful national parties. Does, for example, the increasing transfer of funds and services from na-

tional party committees bring interventions into local party affairs?

- Within those same hierarchies, what has been happening to state-local relations? And what of lateral relationships? Are legislative parties in state legislatures and local councils finding the same independent roles as the Congressional parties? The issue, of course, is nothing less than shifts in power within party structures and the causes of those shifts.

- How do the newly powerful interest groups and candidate organizations relate to party organizations? Do they—the organizations of long-time officeholders especially—come to dominate the formal party? Is the local party perhaps a pool of activists energized primarily by candidates? Do parties compete with these other political organizations for resources, even for a political role, and what forms does the competition take?

- How is local party leadership chosen, and how does it function? In our concern for mass participation within the party organization, have we perhaps ignored all the issues surrounding the party elites, not to mention elite theory more generally?

- What in fact do local parties do these days? Have they much useful role in selecting and electing candidates? Have they been forced to become fund-raising auxiliaries and suppliers of services to candidates? If two-party competition is dropping in the local constituencies, are the parties sustaining a role in the crucial primaries?

- Finally, what can one say about the “decline of political parties” from the local perspective? If there is new strength, how is it manifested? If there is not, how have the parties adapted or changed in response to a diminished role in local politics?

Such an agenda proceeds on an explanatory level. There are, however, analytical issues aplenty. For example, it has always seemed to me that the study of local parties offered the major opportunity for mapping out the flow of resources—the inputs and outputs, cash and noncash—in a political party. Doing that would certainly advance the scholarly enterprise beyond the generalities of organization theory and the outdated wisdom about the urban machines.

That reference to “outdated wisdom” leads to another point. Our knowledge about local parties is so sketchy and so often outdated that reconstructing knowledge about

(continued on page 7)

PARTY ORGANIZATIONS IN URBAN AREAS:

Roundtable 1990 Midwest Political Science Association Meetings

**Alan R. Gitelson,
Loyola University Chicago (co-chair)**

The roundtable on "Party Organizations in Urban Areas" focused on a discussion on past, present, and future directions of research on political parties at the local, urban level.

Michael Margolis argued that few, if any, urban political party organizations perform those functions most closely associated with the powerful organizations that—at least until the 1950s—dominated local politics, overshadowed state and national party organizations, and reinforced the backbone of American federalism. His position was based upon firsthand research of local and county party organization in the Pittsburgh area and upon other evidence about local organizations elsewhere. Professor Margolis will present a paper at the 1990 APSA meeting on his Pittsburgh study.

Barbara Burrell presented an overview of research on urban party politics, arguing that research should explore the nexus between candidates, their organizations and local party committees. Drawing on her own research on state legislative campaigning in Massachusetts, Professor Burrell emphasized the importance of tracing the linkage between candidate organizations and party committees at the local level and their interaction with both amateur based and high technology campaigns.

John Frenreis argued that party organizations in urban areas are, first and foremost, local organizations, with their primary focus being local races. Second, political party organizations are organizations that exist and operate in the world of the political elite. Third, in many important cases reformed municipal structures have not produced or sustained the nonpartisan political environment often supposed. Finally, the potential importance of contextual factors such as size of place, governmental form, competitive position, and state-level factors suggests the need for systematic, comparative information—with the depth reflected in all of our knowledge about our own areas but a broader basis of experience.

THE SOUTHERN GRASS-ROOTS PARTY ACTIVISTS PROJECT: A Summary

The National Science Foundation awarded \$162,491 over 1990-92 to fund a study of party organization, activism, and politics in 11 southern states. The purposes of the proj-

ect are: (1) to develop a baseline of comparative descriptive data about local party organization, party activists, and state politics; (2) to test contemporary explanations how each of the state party systems relate to the entire region and to the national party system; (3) to encourage other analyses of state/regional party systems and later longitudinal analysis of grass-roots politics in the South; and (4) to contribute the data set to the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPRS) archive for general use by the community of scholars interested in political party organization and behavior, in southern politics, and in comparative state politics.

The project is under the general direction of co-principal investigators Charles D. Hadley, University of New Orleans, and Lewis Bowman, University of South Florida. A team of 17 political scientists at 11 southern universities are collaborating to collect the data, analyze party politics in their respective states and write chapters on their state for the initial book developed from the research project. Participants include: Patrick R. Cotter, The University of Alabama; Diane D. Blair, University of Arkansas; Bowman, William E. Hulbary and Ann E. Kelley, University of South Florida; Brad Lockerbie, The University of Georgia; Hadley, University of New Orleans; Stephen D. Shaffer and David A. Breaux, Mississippi State University; Charles L. Prysby, University of North Carolina, Greensboro; Robert P. Steed, Laurence W. Moreland, and Tod A. Baker, The Citadel; David M. Brodsky, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga; Frank B. Feigert, University of North Texas; and, John J. McGlennon, College of William and Mary.

SURVEY OF POP MEMBERSHIP

A brief questionnaire concerning the interests and attitudes of POP members is included with this issue of VOX POP.

We hope you will take a few minutes to fill out the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed business reply envelope.

This survey will help us plan programs, workshops and identify potential recipients for our annual awards. The results will be printed in VOX POP. Note that the questionnaire is entirely anonymous.

*Thank you for your time
and consideration.*

COMPARATIVE IMAGES OF NATIONAL AND LOCAL PARTIES BY LOCAL CITIZENS AND PARTY OFFICIALS

Paul A. Smith, SUNY-Binghamton

How do citizens think about national parties compared to their local parties? To what extent does their thinking distinguish between the two organizations, and do their party images derive from the electoral campaigns of party candidates, or are they determined primarily by the performance of parties in government? And what about party activists? Are their images of local and national parties different from those of the public?

To begin to answer such questions, we applied similar interview schedules to samples of citizens and party committeemen in Broome County, New York—an upstate community located in the “southern tier” of the state (about 175 miles northwest of New York City). Among the questions was an extended battery, adapted from those used in national studies, asking what respondents liked and didn’t like about the national and local parties, and whether these views had changed “over the last 10 years or so.” At the same time, aggregate registration and election data covering both local and national candidates were analyzed to determine if there was evidence of realignment and dealignment between 1972 and 1988.

Our statistical analysis of registration and election data from 1972 to 1988 showed no evidence of a recent realignment—or even dealignment—occurring in the county. These findings were supported by our interview findings. Both our leaders and public gave no indication of a fall-off in party loyalty over the last decade. Among the public, party attachments were generally weak, but our respondents could not recall a time in which it was stronger. Significantly, what happened to presidential candidates in 1980, 1984, and 1988, was thoroughly associated with their political parties—Democrats being seen as an ineffective party of losers and Republicans as a competent party of winners. What is more, some of these negative Democratic images filtered down to the local party, which, despite its recent victories, was also seen by many as less able than the Republicans.

Negative images of the national Democratic party were distinctly present among Democrats, with more than 50 percent of even “strong” Democrats volunteering criticisms of their party for not fielding stronger presidential candidates. And among “weak” partisans (of both parties), the perceived ineffectiveness of the Democratic party in presidential elections undermined attachments. Thus, our findings suggest that repeated presidential defeats sharply erode the loyalty of weak partisans, moving them away from the losing and toward the winning party.

Not a single respondent appeared to give credit to the Democrats for controlling Congress, and especially the House of Representatives, through most of the last 60 years. The image of the national Democratic party as ineffective clearly is based on presidential, not congres-

sional elections. Indeed, when passing references were made to Congress, it was to emphasize fragmentation and lack of direction rather than leadership or control. And the tendency to associate parties with their governmental executives, not legislators, was also true at the local level. The image of the local Democratic party was associated predominantly with the recently elected Democratic county executive, who, unfortunately for his party’s image, was having severe budgetary problems during the period of our study!

With respect to presidential style and policies, the image impact of George Bush and Ronald Reagan on their national party was interesting. Reagan generated sharp critical reactions among all groups, but especially Democrats, because of his policy positions. (Although he was almost universally seen as “strong,” which contributed to the Democratic image of weakness noted above.) Therefore, given his “kinder and gentler” style, we hypothesized that George Bush would have a moderating influence on the image of his party. Especially among Democrats, over half of whom (both leaders and public) observed that Bush “had not been as bad as expected,” this turned out to be only partially true—but only partially because among all our respondents, Bush was seen in such a mixture of ways—as a puppet, a wimp, a surprising winner, a nice guy, etc.—that he had little impact on the Republican image formed largely by Ronald Reagan.

General public images of the national parties were predominantly conventional, and quite partisan in meaning. Democrats were seen as “for the little guy,” “big government,” and “liberal,” and Republicans “for big business,” “small government,” and “conservative,” depending on the partisanship of the respondent. But one policy position of Reagan and Bush had an immediate impact on how both leaders and citizens felt about the Republican party: abortion. More telling than the 20 percent of Democratic citizens who mentioned abortion as a reason why they disliked the opposition party were the 20 percent of female Republicans (who were a majority in our Republican sample) who singled out its stand on abortion as a reason they did not like their party.

All of these policy images became quite confused in the case of the local parties, since local policy issues seldom were in terms of national party images. This was because local executives seldom took policy positions that could be associated with national ideologies. In fact, our respondents who were attuned to national party positions were often critical of their local leaders because, for Democrats, their local executives were too conservative, and for Republicans, they were too liberal. Thus, we found there was little carry-over of national party images to those of the local parties. The latter tended to be locally specific and ideologically obscure.

MINUTES *(continued)*

Chair Conway posed two questions: (1) Should we return to past practice? (2) Should panels be awarded in proportion to Section membership? An extensive discussion ensued.

Frank Sorauf moved the establishment of a Nominating Committee to recommend three names to the Section for approval. Frank Feigert seconded. Adopted by unanimous vote.

4. Awards Ceremony:

The Annual POP awards ceremony was conducted. See announcement of awards (right). There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles D. Hadley, Secretary-Treasurer

THE 1990 POP AWARDS

FRANK SORAUF, University of Minnesota, winner of the Samuel Eldersveld Award for a lifetime of distinguished scholarly and professional contributions to the field.

SEYMOUR M. LIPSET, Stanford University, and **STEIN ROKKAN**, editors, winners of the Leon Epstein Award for a book that has made a distinguished contribution to the field (for *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*).

JACK DENNIS, University of Wisconsin, winner of the award for an article of unusual importance and significance to the field (for "Support for the Party System by the Mass Public," 1966 APSR 60:600-615 and "Trends in Public Support for the American Party System," 1975 BJPS 5:187-230).

THE NEED FOR BETTER DATA *(continued)*

them will of necessity be partly descriptive in the early stages. Much of the best of our analytical work in American politics depends on exploiting patterns of institutions and processes in which one can find the variables and controls for a sophisticated research design. But to seize those opportunities one needs at least a basic map to the terrain, in this case a basic description of the varieties of party experience there must be "out there."

Tip O'Neill's often-quoted observation that all politics is local is surely hyperbolic. Party politics are not exclusively local, and indeed, they are increasingly national. But the American parties remain—and probably must remain—both local and national in a federal system. One can study the Congress, the Presidency, or the Supreme Court as complete and self-contained entities. No such option is open to scholarship on the American political parties.

LOCAL PARTY ORGANIZATIONS *(continued)*

3,900 responses. This data reveals that the typical county chair is a middle-aged, educated white male who has lived in the county a long time and is ideologically moderate with the Democrats leaning to the left and the Republicans to the right. This profile is remarkably similar to Sonya Forthal's description of 600 Chicago precinct captains in the 1920s. Probably the most significant change in social profile between the 1920s and the 1980s is that

more women and minorities are involved, and with the decline of patronage, the number of blue collar activists has decreased relative to upper SES types.

The 1980 data show that most county chairs seek the position because they were urged to do so by other local party leaders, but more than one-third decided to run on their own. The strongest motive was attachment to the party followed by a way to influence public policy, political work as a way of life, and a sense of community obligation. Concerning the amateur-professional literature, about 50 percent of the 1980 chairs were in the mixed category, about 30 percent were primarily amateur, and about 20 percent were primarily professional. However, role orientation does not vary by party nor is it related to party structure or activity. Almost 70 percent of the counties operate under a specified set of rules; about 85 percent have a complete set of officers; about 25 percent operate with a regular annual budget; but considerably less have a telephone listing, office, or paid staff. So we have a picture of an organization that is structurally functional, but lacks sophistication. The lack of sophistication has not deterred the county party from doing what we would expect them to do best: engaging in electoral activities. For example, almost 80 percent distribute campaign literature, over 60 percent organize telephone campaigns, and about 50 percent conduct registration drives.

An important contribution of the Cotter et al. and the Gibson et al. investigations is that they were able to draw on the existing literature to conceptualize party organizational strength as consisting of structure and programmatic activity, and then creatively measured these

(continued on page 8)

LOCAL PARTY ORGANIZATIONS *(continued)*

dimensions. As a result of this effort, we are in a strong position to describe county party organizations as they exist today. To the extent there has been a trend in organizational strength, it appears that county parties are getting somewhat stronger and this inference is based on an examination of 1964, 1980, and 1984 data as well as retrospective evaluations by county chairs. If we look at only the 1980 counties for which there was a response from both chairs, the Republicans are somewhat stronger than the Democrats and this is most evident concerning the structural dimensions of organization.

The research that I think is most promising for improving our knowledge of the role local party organizations play in the political process are those that use organization as an independent variable. It appears that local parties are alive and active, but what difference do they make? Is the strength of the organization related to electoral outcomes? What role do strong organizations play in the nomination process? These and other questions are only beginning to be addressed. Congressional candidates studied by Herrnson reported that local parties were more effective at "get out the vote drives" and recruiting campaign workers than other political actors. Frensdreis, Gibson, and Vertz concluded that although the direct effect of county party organizational strength on outcome is relatively small, parties do play a role in the larger context of electoral politics. In my own research, I found that voter turnout is higher in counties that have strong party organizations and this effect remained significant after controlling for registration laws and social demographics.

In recent years the national party committees and especially the RNC, have spent money to strengthen county organizations. The Republicans are continuing this strategy although most of the support is currently going through state committees. Under Ron Brown, the Democrats appear to be backing away from direct support of regular party organizations in favor of a "coordinated campaign" which would funnel resources to candidate organizations.

Given the diversity of environments within which the local parties must operate, it would be a mistake to allow the methodology pendulum to sway too far towards extensive studies at the expense of intensive research. Crotty's 1986 study is an attempt to balance the two approaches. In a collaborative effort, five large cities are intensively examined using a common framework. I was struck by Kay Lawson's piece in the last issue of *Vox Pop* in which she argued that self reports by the cadre should be supplemented by direct observation and since there are many parties to study, a collaborative effort is necessary. Finally, if a comparative approach to the study of party organizations is to be fruitful, I think more work needs to be done concerning what we mean by comparative method.

Much of my thinking on party organizations is based on the work of others so some references have been included, but I have chosen to omit full citations. I would be happy to provide a source list upon request.

SURVEY OF POP MEMBERSHIP

A brief questionnaire concerning the interests and attitudes of POP members is included with this issue of *VOX POP*.

We hope you will take a few minutes to fill out the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed business reply envelope.

This survey will help us plan programs, workshops and identify potential recipients for our annual awards. The results will be printed in *VOX POP*. Note that the questionnaire is entirely anonymous.

*Thank you for your time
and consideration.*

— 8 —



Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics
Akron, OH 44325-1904

Nonprofit Organization
BULK RATE
U.S. Postage Paid
Akron, Ohio
Permit Number 222