Political Parties: The Missing Variable in Women and Politics Research

DENISE L. BAER, AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION 1992–1993, CONGRESSIONAL FELLOW

An explosion in the literature on women and politics has been stimulated by the contemporary women's movement. This paper argues that an early diversity in theoretical orientation and methodology has been replaced by a narrow orthodoxy characterized by the use of polling and the survey method, and the theoretical voting behavior model employed by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan. Left out of this approach is the study of political parties as organizations–a variable presented here as essential to the study of women in politics. The image of parties in women and politics scholarship is surveyed, as are the theoretical implications of ignoring women's gains in political parties in such studies.

It's not just what we inherit from our mothers and fathers that haunts us. It's all kinds of old defunct theories, all sorts of old defunct beliefs, and things like that. It's not that they actually live *on in us; they are simply lodged there, and we cannot get rid of them. I've only to pick up a newspaper and I seem to see ghosts gliding between the lines.* Henrik Ibsen, *Ghosts*, 1881.

Women and politics research and the real world influence of women in politics are inextricably intertwined. The women's movement is a bid for political power on the part of women. As women become more powerful in office and in the voting booth, scholars knowledgeable about the women's vote become more prominent in the political process. It is no accident, for example, that noted women and politics researcher Ethel Klein served as a consultant in the 1988 bid of then presidential candidate Representative Richard Gephardt (D-MO), or that she served as a project consultant (with Celinda Lake) to the Business and Professional Women/USA Foundation's

NOTE: The author wishes to acknowledge the stimulating debates over women's progress at political science meetings over the years, as well as the helpful criticism of anonymous reviewers and Walter Stone.

Women and Politics-Election '88,[1] or that she co-authored a *Polling Report* article on the gender gap (Farah and Klein 1988). When an academic and scholar who studies women's participation is suddenly in demand as a professional political consultant, scholarship and politics become intimately linked. This paper is about contemporary ghosts and theories. The feminist critique of "conventional" political science research has attempted to redirect scientific research to domains of greater relevance to women. The politicization of women and politics research per se is not a problem since science is intended to provide information of import to those in public life. However, when political scientists, surveying women and politics scholarship stimulated by the women's movement over the past twenty years (Githens 1983, 1984; Steuernagel 1987), are concerned with its limited contribution to either political science research or women's politics, one must question the politicized nature of contemporary gender-directed scholarship. I argue here that research on women and politics has developed a narrow orthodoxy that has left the promise of the early gender-sensitive research of the 1970s stillborn, and an entire area of political science central to the political influence of women–political parties–has been both ignored and misunderstood.

Women's Studies and Gender-Related Research

The past twenty or so years have seen an explosion in research on women and politics. This new research can be divided chronologically into three distinct eras: (1) The Early Period–1966–70; (2) The First Decade–the 1970s; and (3) The Second Decade–the 1980s. The Early Period dates from the formation of the National Organization of Women (NOW) in 1966 and is characterized by articles written on women and politics by men (e.g., Gruberg 1968; Jennings and Thomas 1968) as well as by women (e.g., Werner 1966, 1968; Gehlen 1968; Lamson 1968) using traditional political science approaches. The First Decade was characterized by work by less established scholars pursuing unorthodox and unconventional research agendas and drawing upon a rich diversity of theoretical material. Most scholars writing in the First Decade were older, and their training and research interests spanned many of the subfields of political science. Traditional political science and the then "new" behavioral research had both largely ignored women. It was not until the 1970s that the influence of the women's movement was manifest in a new scholarship in which *women* political scientists sought to study the political roles of women in diverse new ways. During the First Decade many

[1] This monograph, originally developed for the Women's Agenda Conference held in Des Moines, Iowa, January 22–24, 1988, was also distributed to delegates attending the 1988 Democratic Convention.

serious and provocative questions were raised about the ways in which both traditional and behavioral political science veiwed women (e.g., Jaquette 1974 and Githens and Prestage 1977). Women and politics research moved into the mainstream of political science during the Second Decade. Along with the founding of the journal *Women and Politics* in 1980, two remarkable essays debating women and politics research appeared in the *American Political Science Review* in 1981 (Sapiro 1981; Diamond and Hartsock 1981) demonstrating the seriousness with which women and politics were now taken by the discipline. This expanded interest was not accompanied by any new theories; it merely acknowledged women as a special case of deviance (Githens 1983). Along with the increasing acceptance of the women's movement and gender-directed research there has been an increase of male scholars (e.g., Gertzog 1984; Poole and Zeigler 1985) publishing in the area of women and politics.

Reviews of gender-related research (Bourque and Grossholtz 1974; Jaquette 1974, 1976; Kraus 1974; Boals 1975; Goot and Reid 1975; Shanley and Schuck 1975; Carroll 1979; Githens 1983, 1984) are remarkably similar in their critique of the use of male criteria to evaulate women's role in politics. Combined with an increasing dissatisfaction with the current models of participation, a major finding of Second Decade research is that men and women do not differ greatly in participation levels. Consider, for example, the two main conclusions drawn by Kristi Anderson in a review of Karen Beckwith's *American Women and Political Participation*:

> *One* (this is more in the nature of a reiteration and confirmation of something we know from previous research) *is that there are few significant differences* in the frequency with which men and women vote; participate in electoral campiagns, and write letters to public officials; although there are attitudinal differences (women are less efficacious and less interested in politics). The *second lesson is that the ICPSR election study data are ultimately unsatisfactory for understanding women's (or men) involvement in politics on any but a superficial level.* (Anderson 1988: 92; emphasis added)

In her review of women and politics research, Marianne Githens (1983) makes the distinction between universal and dominant norms and stresses the problems that gender-related research has in separating the two, *especially* in connection with minorities and subcultures: "In conclusion, it would seem that a major problem with research on women's political participation to date is the fact that the norms for judging and measuring effective political participation at the citizen level are based on dominant male norms" (Githens 1983: 483).

Gertrude Steuernagel (1987) has come to similar conclusions in assessing the work of Virginia Sapiro (1983), Ethel Klein (1984), and Keith T. Poole

and L. Harmon Zeigler (1985). Steuernagel asks whether "we now know more about women and political participation than we did 20 years ago when political scientists for the most part assumed that women followed their husband's/father's/son's/brother's cues?" (1987: 10). Steuernagel concludes that the answer is "No," due in large part to the clear limitations of the survey research methodology employed by Sapiro, Klein, Poole and Zeigler, and others. The problem, Steuernagel suggests, is the Law of Instrument formulated by Abraham Kaplan who summarized it thusly: "Give a small boy a hammer, and he will find that everything he encounters needs pounding" (Kaplan 1964: 28). Sapiro (1987), Klein (1987), and Poole and Zeigler (1987) all responded to Steuernagel's critique by arguing that the survey method can yield much usable information. Yet, one wonders why such a powerful method has produced so little insight in the eyes of those assessing Second Decade (mainstream) women and politics research. The implicit critique that Githens and Steuernagel have raised, I will argue, is not only the limitations of the survey method, but also the dominant influence of *one* (male dominated) survey organization–the Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Michigan.

The Survey Method, Hegemony and the Survey Research Center

Survey research is a highly specialized research method that requires considerable technical skill and administration. In theory, it is not different from other methodologies. In practice, survey research is only accurate when surveys are consistently administered, thus, "the magnitude of the survey endeavor requires a large *organization*" (Bositis 1990: 115). Because of this, it is difficult to separate the limitations of the *method* from the *organization*.

The Method of Survey Research

In addition to survey research, there are a variety of methods that can be used to study politics: experimentation, personal interviews, participant and non-participant observation, as well as documentary research. Survey research was the method sine qua non of behavioralism–it was analytic reductionism which reduced all political phenomena to individual behavior. As a method, it focused on systematic analysis of individual responses (the behaviors) to structured questions–given to a random sample of individuals. Thus, one could analyze behaviors from the statistical analysis of a matrix of responses. The key was *objectivity* and *replication*. Certainly, within the confines of objectivity and replication, there is no better method than survey research to ascertain how typical a specific attitude or opinion is among a large popoulation. But it relies on a *reconstructed reality*–survey research as a method is divorced from context.

This so-called strength of the survey method leaves a wide variety of areas in which survey research is grossly inadequate. Leadership is particularly difficult to study via survey research. Consider Robert Huckshorn's assessment of the utility of survey research in studying political leaders:

> Numerous party chairmen informed me that they accumulated as many as ten to fifteen mailed questionnaires at a time and, in many cases, made no attempt to complete them. Some simply discarded the questionnaires while others relied on staff assistants to complete them. One chairman showed me an accumulation of eleven questionnaires ranging in length from one to thirty-four pages and submitted by graduate students, faculty members, and interest groups as well as partisan and nonpartisan organizations. He had no intention of completing any of them although he expressed a willingness to give me two hours of his time for interview purposes. The incidence of this was so common that I became increasingly convinced that personal interviews with officials who practice politics as a *vocation* are essential to this kind of data gathering. (1976: xi)

Political mobilization of women developed via a new mechanism: a social movement (McGlen and O'Connor 1983; Freeman 1975, 1983; Baer and Bositis 1988, 1993). Social movements are very difficult to study via survey research for a variety of reasons. Social movements challenge the status quo, thereby engaging the participants in socially undesireable actions, often including acitivities which are unconventional and illegal. They are only partially organized, meaning that neither the general population nor organized groups can yield a reliable universe to sample. They depend upon leadership by outgroup elites–individuals who are unlikely to represent the mass in identical values or to complete pencil and paper surveys. Communication occurs not via the mass media, but through specialized interpersonal communications unavailable to outsiders. And finally, social movements are about power relationships, something not accessible to individual-level data collection.

When groups are altering their power relationships, meaning is in flux and context becomes critical. It is no accident that polls looking at the issue of sexual harassment failed to predict the dramatic change in opinion toward attorney Anita Hill by women a year after the nomination hearings of Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas, while extended, open-ended, in-person interviews with women by a team of anthropologists did.[2] This technique allowed

[2] The study, under the direction of Frances Trix and Andrea Sankar at Wayne State University, was presented at the 1992 Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association in San Francisco, December 6. Hill, formerly an employee under Thomas at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, accused him of sexual harassment. Most polls at the time (October 1991) found about 45 percent of women who

respondents to "sort through their feelings out loud with an attentive listener, and clarify and even form their opinions as they spoke" (Rauch 1992: A3; see also Benthall 1993).

It is precisely because survey research fails to yield information allowing one to compare observations made in a context-specific environment with the larger universe that makes its use so problematic. Some of the most fascinating scholarship on women and politics has been conducted not by political scientists, but by sociologists utilizing in-depth interviewing and participant observation.[3] In political science, it is rare to find survey research combined with participant observation, although it has been done in the best research, such as the widely cited study of *Common Cause* (McFarland 1984). Even among those subjects whose parameters are best known to the survey community, the key problem with survey research *qua* method is that it tends to become "somewhat atheoretical, mechanistic and data-emergent," dominated by technique (Bositis 1990: 49). For example, theoretically driven survey research could be conducted at the local level, but is rarely given the prominence of the national-level studies of the Survey Research Center. The survey method has tended to be hegemonic—it has given rise to the incorrect view that *non*-survey research methodologies are somehow nonempirical, unsystematic and unscientific. The question "Where is your data?" is a common one,[4] which looks for things one can count. Observations made in context, whether social or in terms of roles, do not necessarily produce counts.

The Organization of Survey Research

Survey research has become a national survey research community. In studies of American politics, the preeminent survey organization is the SRC. The SRC has been a dominant influence in political science for several reasons. First is its dominance of available funding in American politics through the government (the National Election Study [NES] is funded by the National Science Foundation), and also private funding (the Convention Delegate Study also located at Michigan was funded through the Russell Sage Foundation)—a phenomenon which diverts scarce research dollars to one research program.

believed Thomas, while the Trix-Sankar study found 53 percent of women believed Hill—similar to polls in October, 1992.

[3] An example is Kristin Luker's (1983) analysis of pro-choice and pro-life groups: she demonstrates why abortion is a battle among women who have divergent world views about family and the role of the mother by presenting each side of the abortion issue on their own terms so sympathetically that it is impossible to tell her own feelings.

[4] This is a question raised by an early reviewer of this paper. Apparently the observations included in this article were not considered empirical.

SRC data are central to almost all research on American politics, both as a theoretical model and through the dissemination of data throughout the political science community via the associated Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR)–the "Law of the Available Data" (Sorauf 1967: 40) in action. Furthermore, the University of Michigan's own graduates have been widely disseminated throughout the discipline, creating in effect an "invisible university" (Bositis 1990). Second, its individual and consumer-based model of voting behavior and mass politics, drawing upon the early work by the National Opinion Resarch Center (NORC) of Bernard Berelson and Paul Lazarsfeld and the later work of the SRC, has been widely accepted (Bositis 1990; Natchez 1985). Ironically, this occurred even though the original approach, borrowed from marketing, assumed something like a "brand-preference" among voters, with selected purchases made periodically.

> . . . the reasons they were purported to be important are . . . entirely wrong. Lazarsfeld invented the "classical democratic theory" which he uses to explain the importance of his work. A generation of students of voting behavior took Lazarsfeld's conclusion seriously in the sense that they identified the importance of his findings in terms of a theory that does not exist. (Blydenburgh 1985: 7–10)

Much of the understanding of politics reflected in *The American Voter* has proved to be wrong. While *The American Voter* assumed "that an issue did not matter unless *the entire public* was aware of *specific legislation* concerning it," about one-third of voters were aware of the Taft-Hartley Act and voted on their knowledge. Thus, "what *The American Voter* demonstrates is not public indifference to Taft-Hartley . . . but the use of inappropriate standards for judging public opinion and inadequate survey measures for assessing public concern with unions" (Popkin 1991: 29).

The SRC has not produced any general theory of electoral behavior. While the tremendous changes in the electorate have made theorizing more difficult, these components of change are precisely the subjects that voting surveys cannot conceptualize. Robert Dahl (1961) pointed out some years ago that survey and behavioral research, once a protest, has become the reigning orthodoxy through the intellectual leadership of influential individuals and universities and support by the government and private foundations. Even more important than the pervasive influence of the *invisible university* which lent acceptance to the dominance of the survey method in the academic community has been the leadership of the University of Michigan in training new women Ph.D.s just as women were entering the field in large numbers. Maurice Duverger's observation about recruitment in politics is just as salient when applied to intellectual leadership in political science: when a

"man [*sic*] of the people" is recruited through the institutions of the governing oligarchy, "he must also work his way up the ladder of middle-class education and lose contact with the class in which he was born" (1954: 246). Among women and politics scholars, the dominance of the SRC model is perhaps most evident in the work of women and politics researchers who all received their advanced training at the University of Michigan and who worked at the SRC: Virginia Sapiro, Barbara Farah, Ethel Klein, Majorie Lansing (Baxter and Lansing 1980), political consultant Celinda Lake (Lake and Heidpriem 1988), sociologist Sandra Baxter.[5] While other senior women and politics scholars received their training elsewhere and have adopted different theoretical approaches, these women certainly would be considered among the first rank of women and politics researchers in terms of the contribution of their scholarship and their institutional positions. The recruitment and socialization of the best and the brightest among potential women political scientists in the 1970s has meant the continued dominance of the SRC model even where it least fits–among emergent groups such as women.

There are some important reasons why survey research employing the SRC model is a limiting tool for studying women. The survey method itself is incapable of studying new groups, especially social movement groups. The organizational requirements of large survey organizations tend to oligarchy, and oligarchies are largely insensitive to emergent groups. There have been people at the SRC, of course, who have been helpful to feminist political scientists.[6] But apart from this personal sensitivity to new individuals entering the field (a sensitivity entirely explicable through self-interest[7]), the voting studies have only provided a superficial understanding of women and politics.[8] The early Columbia and University of Michigan studies were full of

[5] Let me stress that this is not an *ad hominem* argument. My guess is that these scholars would be among the top tier of political scientists regardless of where they received their training. The point is that it was the University of Michigan and the SRC that recruited and trained them.

[6] This is obvious to anyone who reads the prefaces and acknowledgements authored by Sapiro (1983) and Klein (1984). Few women political scientists can say that they have had the kind of supportive environment that Sapiro and Klein found at the University of Michigan.

[7] While it may make some uncomfortable to use our analytical tools for analyzing political influence to study the spread of ideas, this article is based on the assumption that political scientists are no more immune to the laws of behavior than those we study.

[8] The SRC studies have been criticized elsewhere for producing a meager contribution to political science generally (Bositis 1990; Natchez 1985) and for the limited understanding they bring to the study of political parties in particular (Cotter, Gibson, Bibby and Huckshorn 1984; Sorauf 1967).

"spectacularly inaccurate predictions about the possibility of a 'woman's vote' " (Popkin 1991: 57).

From a methodological standpoint, the survey researcher is alienated from her subject of study. Surveys are usually conducted from afar; survey directors do not work as field interviewers. More important, survey researchers do not study women by addressing the experiential worlds which have meaning to women; rather, they impose an artificial and alien set of meanings on survey subjects. David Bositis concludes that

> it is very doubtful that pollsters, survey managers, and others who observe the "mass" public know their subjects as neighbors and fellow citizens. Equally important is the fact that managers of large surveys are political elites, inevitably separated (Michels's "psychological transformation of leaders") from the mass public. Elite survey researchers in academic institutions and elsewhere do not speak the same language as their subjects, nor is it clear that they understand the various idioms, political and otherwise, of the mass public or the cadences of its political life. (1990: 45)

From an *organizational standpoint*, the survey model taught at the SRC inclines survey resarchers to "know their subjects as a marketer or advertiser knows his customers" even though political scientists may have the individual or personal capacity to bridge the experiential worlds separating elite women scholars from women in the *demos*. It is no accident, Bositis argues, that survey researchers employing a "stimulus-response" model of "advertising/marketing → consumption" "assign a prominent role to the mass media, campaign consultants and individual attitudes" (Bositis 1990: 45, 42). These facets of contemporary survey reserach make it almost indistinguishable from public opinion polling despite the fact that scholars aim for different and presumably higher levels of knowledge. Polling is the tool of political consultants and the sine qua non of the mercantilist style of campaigning which stresses advertising (Jensen 1980). This kinship is nowhere more evident than in the politicization of the gender gap.

The Gender Gap and the Triumph of the SRC Model

The gender gap in political preferences unearthed by exit pollsters following Jimmy Carter's defeat in 1980 is arguably the most successful extension of the mercantilist model of voting behavior. The gender gap, an erratic phenomenon ranging from 0 percent to 15 percent difference between the average survey response of male and female respondents, is perfectly situated as a subject of study appropriate for analysis using the quadrennial NES data collected by the SRC. The legacy of the SRC model is a focus on women as a unit of study at the mass level of politics, and a focus on average differ-

ences between men and women on a limited set of attitudes and attributes.[9] The gender gap has produced an entire cottage industry of public opinion specialists in political consulting. Perhaps the foremost is Celinda Lake (Gottlieb 1986), currently a partner in the Analysis Group (President Bill Clinton's pollsters) and formerly the Campaign Services Director for the Women's Campaign Fund, closely followed by Barbara Farah, Director of Surveys for the *New York Times* (Sapiro and Farah 1980; Jennings and Farah 1981).

There are fundamental differences between the type of information produced by opinion polling and that produced by leaders representing members of organized groups. Pollsters and consultants ply their trade best when they can convince candidates that only they can locate and communicate to essential electoral groups. Consider two concepts introduced and marketed solely by consultants: the "yuppie"–*Y*oung *U*pwardly mobile *P*rofessionals (marketed by Pat Caddell in 1984)–and the "new collar voter"–baby boomers working in service jobs who are neither professionals nor blue collar (marketed by Ralph Whitehead in 1986 (Whitehead 1985)). These concepts refer to groups that were born during the "baby boom" years (1946–64). Both concepts (like "baby boomer") are a statistical creation existing only in the matrices of campaign researchers. Certainly there is no naturally occurring or organized group to which these individuals belong. "Yuppies" may consume similarly when it comes to material goods because of their similar socioeconomic status, but there is *no* evidence that all those who own, say, expresso coffee-makers, drive BMW's or drink imported beers respond the same in politics. If yuppies or new collar voters were genuine groups, then they would persist as a strategically critical target beyond one election cycle. By 1988, for example, Ralph Whitehead (1988) had foresworn new collar voters for "bright collar voters"–those baby boomers who work in white collar jobs[10]

[9] Undoubtedly the gender gap has tremendous political significance. Women, now 53 percent of the eligible electorate and turning out to vote at rates and in numbers exceeding men, comprise a potential voting bloc that few candidates can ignore. Yet, distinct from this politicization, one must ask whether the "gender gap" is a phenomenon of intrinsic interest to either political science because it was so unpredicted by political science theory and research of the 1950s when the few differences between men and women were presumed to be explicable by the different lives that men and women led. As women attained educational levels and entered the work force and the professions in numbers comparable to men, any gender-related differences were expected to disappear.

[10] I do not mean to imply here that all consultants utilize Whitehead's concepts of new-collar and bright-collar voters. My point is to stress the similarity of the types of concepts employed by consultants, who all use polling data and sample opinion, not personal contact with indigenous or organized groups. For example, many consultants dubbed 1988 "The Year of the Child." Children, another unorganized group, repre-

(concept longevity ≤ two years).

The gender gap shares important similarities with the consultant-based concepts of "yuppies" and "new collar voters." Like these concepts, the gender gap only exists in the minds of consultants. Because the gender gap does not refer to an indigenous group of women, but rather, an average difference between political responses of men and women, it references a contrived category available only to pollsters. Lake and Heidepriem (1988) conclude that "women and men do not have separate policy agendas, but often think about the same issues in dfferent ways." By using early polling and paying "special attention to the shape and content of your message, the identity of your messenger, and your means of communication," they argue that any candidate–Republican or Democrat–can target women voters successfully (1988: 37). It should come as no surprise that the gender gap has been most adroitly exploited by Republican consultants such as Richard Wirthlin (Mueller 1988). In 1984, funded by the American Medical Association's political action committee, Wirthlin subdivided women into 64 categories based upon age, marital status, and employment (Witt 1985). Later, collapsed into eight groups based upon Reagan's strengths and weaknesses, Wirthlin's profiles were used to target women through direct mail, media, and personal appearances (Peterson 1985). The definition of women's interests as a polling and marketing phenomenon plays to the strength of the Republican party. Indeed, the Republican party approach is to assume that women can be appealed to outside of women's organizations. While the discovery of the gender gap seemed to prove the importance of women and the women's vote to feminist leaders, the gender gap concept has since been used against women's groups. Poole and Zeigler argued in *Public Opinion* that the gender gap acutally represented "simply one more illustration of the difference between leaders and followers . . . [in fact] Contrary to what leaders of the feminist movement might have us believe, not all women share common interests or commitments" (1985: 54–55). The gender gap represents a fundamental misunderstanding; it is not based on the most prominent feminist issues such as ratification of the now defunct Equal Rights Amendment or the choice issue in reproduction which all nonpartisan women's organizations endorse (with the exception of certain religious groups), nor necessarily on issues such as sexual harass-

sented a nonvoting constituency that many politicians were naturally uncertain how to reach. Sen. Lloyd Bentsen, the 1988 Democratic Vice Presidential nominee, cuddled toddlers in day-care centers, despite the fact that his friends know him to be a man "who wouldn't hold his own grandchildren" (White 1990). Presumably, Sen. Bentsen was soliciting the votes of the parents rather than the children, but while parents of toddlers may consume similarly (i.e., cribs and playpens), we still have no evidence that they respond the same in politics.

ment or job discrimination. There are no large women's organizations specifically organized around the issues which do comprise the gender gap—war and peace, the environment, and social welfare. In marketing the gender gap, women's groups have used polling data in ways unlike other minority groups. Blacks, gays, and Hispanics, for example, do not cite polling data to justify the inclusion of blacks, gays or Hispanics; nor do they use polling data to demostrate the importance of their group. In fact, it is the opponents of these groups who have used polling data to refute and undermine the organized group leaders.[11]

Contemporary women and politics researchers, employing the SRC consumer model of voting, have not produced any new models of voting, and they have gone one step further in endorsing and legitimizing a model which fundamentally trivialized national women's organizations. In this, they have committed the feminist equivalent of a physican breaking the Hippocratic Oath of "Do no harm," for how can women argue that they should be recruited to elite ranks of politics if the political parties and other elite groups do not need to recruit women to appeal to women since pollsters and consultants can fulfill that role? Equally destructive to women's organizations, the SRC model of voting behavior has been extended to the study of elites. Studying elites as if they are consumers rather than makers of politics fundamentally trivializes elites as peripheral to politics. The SRC model is likewise evident in the Convention Delegate Study, which provided an extensive data base where women are portrayed as destructive amateurs endangering the party system (Kirkpatrick 1976). While women and other "new elite" groups were criticized in Kirkpatrick's (1976) analysis of the SRC's Convention Delegate Study, women were hardly mentioned in the SRC over-time analysis of the circulation of elites in the post-reform party system (Jennings and Miller 1986). Needless to say, the SRC has not boasted of its role in helping to

[11] For example, in 1985, a private poll conducted by Linda Lichter (1985), Co-Director of the conservative Center for Media and Public Affairs, was published in the AEI's *Public Opinion* magazine and highly publicized in major newspapers such as the *Washington Post* (Taylor 1985). On the basis of the published results, Lichter argued that black leaders were extremely liberal and did not represent black public opinion. Black leaders were incensed at the publicity granted this poll, while conservatives like Clarence Pendleton ("we all feel vindicated"), President Reagan's Chair of the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights, cheered (J. Williams 1985). Eddie Williams, President of the Joint Center for political Studies strongly protested the validity of the findings (1985). As any survey researcher knows, polls can be constructed so as to achieve particular results. The validity of this particular private poll was brought into serious question a few months later when the *Washington Post* conducted one of the few systematic polls of the opinion of blacks, using black interviewers, based upon a random sample of 1,022 respondents (Coleman 1986).

portray women as a destructive force in party politics. The widespread acceptance of the SRC voting-behavior model and the post-1980 politicization of the gender gap has left us an entire decade of research blind to women's success in parties.

The Success of Women in Political Parties

Observers of the political success of women in the contemporary era have been struck by the incongruity of the marginal success of women in public office, while they have gained parity or near parity in political parties and in voting and most other forms of participation (Burrell 1988; Darcy, Welch and Clark 1987; Gugin 1987). At the 1988 Democratic and Republican conventions, delegates were given "5% buttons" a reference to the extermely low proportion of women in the U.S. House of Representatives. Following the 1992 elections, women had finally reached the 10 percent level in the House and 6 percent in the U.S. Senate. Women now hold 20 percent of state legislative seats. While success in public office-holding has been marginal, success in political parties has not. The proportion of women voting has incrementally increased since ratification of the 19th Amendment in 1920, but women comprised only a small proportion of national nominating convention delegates as recently as 1968; only 13 percent of the Democratic delegation and 18 percent of the Republican delegation. Following implementation of the McGovern-Fraser reforms, the 1972 Democratic convention increased to 40 percent female and the Republican convention to 32 percent female. While the 1976 selection rules were less demanding and the proportion of women and other targeted groups dropped (Baer and Bostis 1988), by 1980, women had achieved an astounding near parity of representation in the reformed party system. This has for the most part been unrecognized by women and politics scholars.

The advances of women in political parties has been even more impressive in comparison with the other origianlly targeted groups: blacks and youth–a fact of which poltical party scholars have taken great note. Consider this assessment by William Crotty: "The big winners in the battle over representation appear to be women and party officeholders. . . . The big losers are blacks and other minorities and youth" (1983: 137). Byron Schafer, who chronicled the McGovern-Fraser Commission, traces the success of women to the influence of the then newly formed NWPC and organized feminism generally in the original McGovern-Fraser reform:

> After 1972, in a sort of metaphor for the entire situation, even the entire quota provisions hammered out in the fall of 1971 were to confirm this distinction [between demographic groups]. Within four years, explicit quota provisions applying to women would begin to expand, to every

> aspect of party affairs, including membership–equal division–on the reformed National Committee. Within four years, quota provisions applying to blacks would be *dropped*, even at the national party conventions. (Shafer 1983: 491, emphsis added)

In the post-reform party system, the proportion of women convention delegates and national party committee members remains far smaller in the Republican party. There are no provisons requiring equal division in the delegate selection process in the Republican party, although there are on most party committees, including convention committees. In 1984, the proportion of Republican women increased to a record 44 percent largely through the efforts and personal intervention of President Reagan's campaign manager, Ed Rollins, who called every state party asking that they include more women.[12] In 1988, however, when the race involved a contested primary and no incumbent, the proportion of women delegates dropped to about one-third; while in 1992, with an incumbent president, the proportion increased to 41 percent. This is due in large part to the "unreformed" nature of the Republican party (Baer and Bositis 1988), as well as entirely different norms of representation in Republican party culture (Freeman 1986), even though party scholars have maintained that the Republican party has been greatly affected by Democratic party reforms (Polsby 1983a).

Despite the drop in the overall representation of women, women made some important gains at the 1988 convention. A key issue for long-time Republican feminists is not representation, but rather, what *kind* of women will be represented.[13] In the nomination of 1980, ushering in the Regan era, for example, about one-half of the Republican women delegates were full-time homemakers (Baer 1983). Even in 1984, the highwater mark in numerical representation of women, Republican women were more than twice as likely to be housewives than their Democratic counterparts (Baer and Bositis 1988). Thus, as the proportion of women delegates dropped 25 percent from 1984, in key areas of convention decision-making, "a feminist presence re-emerged at the 1988 Republican Convention after an eight year hibernation" (Freeman 1989: 39). Feminists lost on the choice issue, but gained commitment from the party to support women candidates. The Republican Task Force of the NWPC also sponsored a "Forum on the Republican Party and the Women's Vote" which included Representatives Bill Green (R-NY), Nancy Johnson (R-CT), Susan Jolinari (R-NY; then New York City Council member), State

[12] Personal interview with Ed Rollins by the author, 1988 Republican Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana.

[13] Personal interview with former Republican National Committee Chair, Mary Louise Smith by the author, 1988 Republican Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Representative Deborah Ray Anderson (Speaker of the House in SD), pollster Linda DiVall, Tanya Mellich (NWPC member and Executive Director of the New York State Republican Family Committee) in a discussion moderated by former Republican National Committee Chair Mary Louise Smith.[14]

Republican women also made a significant advance when the 1988 Convention approved an RNC proposal granting the president of the National Federation of Republican Women (NFRW) a vote on the RNC Chairman's Executive Council. The twenty-eight member Executive Council controls the majority of the executive and administrative functions of the RNC between meetings of the National Committee. The NFRW, while split over the abortion and Equal Rights Amendment issues (upon which it no longer takes independent stands) is not usually regarded as a feminist organization. However, the NFRW is the only financially self-sufficient Republican affiliate (since 1977) and now the only affiliate with a vote on the Chairman's Executive Council. Originally formed in 1938 as a financially dependent subsidiary of the FNC Women's Division (itself created in 1919 in anticipation of ratification of the 19th Amendment), in subsequent years, the NFRW has achieved effective control over the Women's Division, establishing itself as the one organization representing elected women public and party officials and volunteer activists. The NFRW has provided a residence for its president in Washington, D.C. since 1956, and is now raising funds for its own building there. While the NFRW does not now take political stands in opposition to the Republican party, it *does* advance the cause of women in the party. Now one of the largest women's political organizations in the country with approximately 160,000 members in over 2,000 clubs, it has a full-time professional staff of seven, and sponsors regional Polling Schools and Campaign Management Schools, as well as a Women Candidates Seminar for Republican women considering a run for public office (Baer 1991).

The success of women in political parties is most remarkable at the national levels. In addition to the national committees and nominating coventions, those familiar with party staff identify "a quiet revolution . . . in behind-the-scenes politics" with women found "directing most of the political and administrative functions" at the Democratic National Committee and com-

[14] The feminist presence also is reflected in the Republican Mainstream Committee, a group organized at the convention to work for (among other issues) women's equality and reproductive choice. Smith serves as a Vice Chair and coordinator of its pro-choice/pro-family planning legislative advocacy network and speakers' bureau. Former Republican Party Co-Chair Mary Dent Crisp, who resigned her position in 1980 to protest the Republican platform position opposing reproductive choice and the omission of the previous endorsement of the Equal Rights Amendment, now chairs a pro-choice organization – National Republican Coalition for Choice – founded in 1989.

prising "more than half of the key figures" at a meeting of the "Republican party's top national strategists and technicians" (Glenney 1982: 18). Although women are far from attaining parity at the state and local levels, there has nonetheless been an incremental increase in the numbers of women serving as state and county chairs. The dramatic increase of women and women's influence in both the permanent (party officers and staff) and temporary (nominating conventions delegates) national party organizations has coincided with the increase in power of the national parties. Republican women and Democratic women have taken different paths to power; yet over the past two decades notable successes have been attained in both parties–successes which have been misunderstood and ignored in contemporary women and politics scholarship.

The Image of Parties in Women and Politics Research

For a party scholar, the concept of political party in women and politics research is missing where one would most expect it–in studies of recruitment and public office holding. Two recent book-length studies of women candidates and recruitment (Carroll 1985; Darcy, Welch, and Clark 1987) barely mention political parties. Given that one of the major functions of parties is to recruit and screen candidates, one might expect to find at minimum a full chapter on parties. Carroll (1985) concludes that the parties are more likely to nominate women candidates as "sacrificial lambs," while Darcy et al. (1987) argue that it is the electoral system rather than political parties which limit political opportunities for women. One earlier monograph on women candidates (Mandel 1981) provides at least a respectable index entry on political parties; however, this work draws more from journalism than poltical science. Several women and politics scholars (Fowlkes, Perkins, and Rinehart 1979; Sapiro and Farah 1980; Jennings and Farah 1981; Fowlkes 1984; Baer and Bositis 1988) have used parties as their major focus. However, it has been used not as a theoretical construct, but rather as a sampling frame from which respondents are selected. To this extent, the concept of party-as-organization is absent. Instead, parties are viewed as cognitions–this time not in the minds of voters, but rather, as cognitive frames of reference in the minds of party elites. Or, alternately, parties are construed as ambitions in the minds of candidates. This construct represents an extension of the mass consumer model of voting into the study of political elites.

As the party variable is missing where one would expect to find it–in studies focusing on women at the elite level–one is perforce limited to examination of party in general surveys of women's role in politics. In these studies which *do* address the role of party in some fashion, the image of party presented yields the impression of either being stuck in a time warp, or else

being confronted with a highly distorted image of party. Because these scholars (unlike Caroll 1985 or Darcy et al. 1987) have not sought to study candidates or parties exclusively, examining their assertions out of context is admittedly unfair. My intention here is only to identify commonly held misunderstandings about the contemporary changes in political parties and how they affect the study of women.

Images of party in the women and politics literature are contradictory and quite inconsistent with contemporary scholarship on parties. One strain (call it *virus A*) considers parties to be in decline and unable to recruit women, even as political party scholars are heralding the increased strength of local and state party organizations (Cotter et al. 1984); an increased national party role in recruiting, training, and supporting candidates (Kayden and Mahe 1985; Herrnson 1988); and the nationalization and institutionalization of the party system (Baer and Bositis 1988; Herrnson 1988; Baer 1992). Janet Flammang views parties as a vacuum, arguing that "Parties in this country have been little more than umbrella organizations tenuously holding together changing arrays of voters in loose coalition" (1984: 111). And Joyce Gelb concluded recently that "the past decade has seen the further decline of political parties and the rise of single-issue politics" (Gelb 1989:21; see also Darcy et al. 1987: 82).

The slighting of political parties is so prevalent that one suspects that there is more to its absence than the hegemony of the SRC. In part, this is probably due to the legacy of the Progressive Era[15]—in particular, the distrust of parties by educated individuals and academics. The women's movement in the U.S. has been closely linked to the Progressive movement, which has been anti-party in spirit and deed. Women achieved public prominence during the Progressive Era (Firestone 1971), and many women such as Molly Dewson and Frances Perkins, who later attained party leadership roles, served a "progressive apprenticeship" (Ware 1987). Women academics are strongly linked to progressivism as many worked in progressive groups because they were shut out of universities and political science departments (Cook 1983). Only the ghost of progressivism can explain the stress placed by Janet Flammang (1984) on the role of women's organizations in filling the party void in

[15] One legacy of progressivism is the role of civic volunteerism as an alternate training ground and recuitement vehicle for women (Kirkpatrick 1974; Flammang 1985). The League of Women Voters, a progressive organization developed to train women to exercise their franchise effectively after the National American Women's Suffrage Association had achieved its aim in the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920, has provided this crucial recruitment vehicle for numerous women elected officials (Johnson and Carroll 1978).

California's Santa Clara County–the "feminist capital of the nation." However altruistic in aim, party scholars regard interest groups as a threat to democracy, while parties are considered essential to democracy (Schattschneider 1960; Epstein 1983). Flammang surveys "women's partylike power" in five areas[16] and wonders whether women's organizations will provide "a wholly-new form of collective power to replace parties" (1984: 111). Flammang believes that "these women are delivering on the Progressive promise of an informed and active citizenry" (1984: 88). Party scholars (Epstein 1983) do not believe that an active and informed citizenry can develop in the absence of party and greatly fear the decline of party.

A second strain of women and politics literature (*virus B*) suggests that political parties are strong, yet also closed and actively hostile to recruiting women. This is ironic at a time when parties are more permeable to women and other emergent groups than ever before (Baer and Bositis 1988). Consider Kendrigan's assessment that

> the failure of the parties [to nominate women] cannot be attributed to the lack of qualified women candidates. If qualifications are measured in terms of age, occupation, education, training and interest, there are far more qualified women available than have been nominated. Discrimination appears the only factor that can explain the scarcity of women who are nominated by their political parties. (1984: 101–102)

It is difficult to envision from most women and politics research how this discrimination works, because it stresses *nomination* while political party scholars universally bemoan the fact that primary elections mean that parties do *not* control their own nominations.

The increasing strength of political party organizations means that parties are more important than ever before in recruiting candidates and perhaps this is an area in which discrimination limits women. Parties continue to be deprecated as a recruitment vehicle because, in the words of one women and politics scholar, "numerous (if not most) women seeking political office at all levels in the United States have bypassed traditional centers of candidate support and sought other routes to elective and appointive office" (Gelb 1989: 66–67). This view, while true during an earlier era of party recruitment–the pre-reformed party system (see Kirkpatrick 1974)–gives a false feeling of security when the party system is increasingly the only avenue of recruitment. With the decline of third parties and the advent of primary nominations in the Progressive Era, the Democratic and Republican parties have

[16] Flammang argues that women and women's organizations serve as "ward heelers, informal and ad hoc networkers, political educators, political recruiters and endorsers . . . campaign fundraisers, and workers" (1984: 88).

become fully entrenched through state regulation of elections and with the 1974 amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act which channels participation only within those two parties (Feigenbaum and Palmer 1988; Smith 1991; Baer 1993). In the 1980s, national, state, and local party committees have taken a new aggressive role in recruiting, training, and financing candidates for office[17] (Herrnson 1988; Cotter et al. 1984; Conlan, Martino, and Dilger 1984; Patterson 1989). In the reformed party system, the party game is the only game in town. Some recognition is paid to the increased presence of women among convention delegates in the reformed party system by at least a few women and politics scholars. However, these gains are not granted the import that political party scholars accord them. Gelb, for example, argues that the gains have been small because "the role of convention politics in the American policy-making process is limited and marginal at best" (1989: 66–67). Kendrigan acknowledges that women do serve as convention delegates and are present on most party committees. However, she argues that "their effectiveness in such positions is usually determined by men, it is not likely that these women will challenge 'business as usual' " (1984: 27). Kendrigan argues that women in parties will not be openly feminist, and will "use the political party as their only form of public activity" (ibid.). To make statements such as these is to demonstrate a profound ignorance of the nearly universal condemnation of contemporary party reforms by major party scholars (Polsby 1983a, 1983b)–reforms which have greatly benefited women and limited the representation of other groups, namely white males (Price 1984). How Kendrigan would account for the intense and calculated assaults on the reforms by feminsts' opponents is unclear. Further, both Gelb and Kendrigan are deprecating the intense efforts and success women party elites and women's groups have made in attaining representation in political parties on a par with men.

Women and politics scholars also portray women as outsiders in political parties. Even as party scholars are declaring that the day of the volunteer is over (Kayden and Mahe 1985), women and politics scholars continue to stress the volunteer role for women. Early work highlighted the fact that women *did* participate in parties and campaigns, but women were relegated

[17] Candidates still tend to be self-recruited in the minimal sense of being politically ambitious. I use recruitment to mean the provision of needed resources for a competitive campaign, serious candidates are "strategic" (Jacobson 1992). "Kamikaze" candidates are a perennial feature on ballots–the real issue is who provides volunteers, phonebanks, skilled campaign staff, lists of potential contributors, sponsors for fundraisers, endorsements, invitations to organizaitons for appearances, and introductions to potenital supporters critical to being competitive.

to "lickin' and stickin' while men plan the strategy" (Boneparth 1977: 289). While no longer the case (Glenney 1982), ten years later the same plaint is made:

> Although women are conspicuously absent from public office, they are at the same time conspicuously present in political party activity. They are members of the 'auxiliary.' *Political parties could not exist as we know them in this country without the work of the volunteer. It is in this role that women are very active in party politics.* However, most women who hold any political office or position are likely to be in the local sphere of the intraparty offices. By far the most common role is that of the volunteer who pours coffee, rings door bells, licks envelopes, "mans" booths, and takes care of many of the other petty details that need to be done. (Kendrigan 1984: 27; emphasis added)

Feminist scholars also display an ignorance of the contemporary Republican party. This may be related to the overwhelming Democratic sympathies of feminist groups like NOW (Mansbridge 1986: 301 n. 2; Freeman 1988; 1989). For example, Joyce Gelb asserts:

> In the Republican Party a Woman's Division was created in 1983, joining the (virtually defunct) National Federation of Republican Women, but its major functions were to mobilize, recruit, and publicize party accomplishments rather than to work as an advocacy group within the party. In fact, in the Republican Party, feminists are viewed as having competing loyalties and have been eliminated from leadership and administrative roles. Instead, rightwinger Phyllis Schafly has become the major policy arbiter on women's issues. (Gelb 1989: 65)

As noted earlier, the National Federation of Republican Women is not only *not* defunct, but, rather, is one of the largest and most active women's partisan organizations in the country. Further, this analysis both ignores the role of important Republican women such as former Ambassador Margaret Hechler, Senator Nancy Kassebaun (R-KS), Labor Secretary Elizabeth Dole, Trade Representative Carla Hills, former RNC Chair Mary Louise Smith, Representatives Nancy Johnson (R-CT), and Susan Molinari (R-NY) and others, and inflates the role of Schafly who has never held any major party or public office.[18]

These misperceptions about parties are prevalent in almost all scholarship on women and politics. A major exception is the work of Jo Freeman

[18] Schafly was defeated in her campaign for the presidency of the NFRW in 1965 and has run unsuccessfully for Congress three times. She was not a presence at the 1989 NFRW biennial convention, nor were her associates. Schafly was an important voice in the 1988 and 1992 Republican platforms (particularly on family issues), that was only because George Bush, the apparent party nominee, did not attempt to influence the platform writing process.

(1975; 1983; 1986; 1988; 1989).[19] Freeman has added significantly to our understanding of social movements; also contributing original conceptual development in the study of parties by arguing the applicability of the concept of "political culture"–particularly in the way that Republicans and Democrats incorporate groups like women. Freeman's work stands out precisely because she has used an orginal method–participant observation–uncommon to the dominant survey-oriented women and politics research of the Second Decade. Freeman concludes that culturally distinct norms of appropriate conflict shape women's access to power when they disagree with the party standard bearer. Despite NOW's refusal to endorse Carter in 1980 and its leadership of an embarrassing convention floor fight, NOW's position was strengthened "within the party because it had demonstrated clout" while feminists critical of President Reagan for his opposition to the ERA were branded disloyal and "have been virtually read out of the Republican party" (1986: 346).

The Costs of Misunderstanding Political Parties

There are significant costs imposed by our collective myopia on women in political parties. First and foremost, we are consigned to studying women at the mass level–a level of study which of necessity treats women as politically passive. Women have achieved near parity at one level of elite politics–in political parties–a fact which deserves recognition. If, as argued here, women's groups have been co-conspirators in creation of their own irrelevancy to politics through their maketing of the gender gap, then gender gap "specialists" have served as their handmaidens. Next, by leaving the study of parties to the party scholars, women and politics scholars have allowed the story of party

[19] Another exeption is the excellent study by political scientist Jane Mansbridge (1986) on "why we lost the ERA" (its focus on an autopsy of a public policy issue no longer on the public agenda addresses an entirely different facet of women and politics than the present concern on the processes and level of women's political participation). Mansbridge is unnecessarily apologetic about her use of the participant method ("My participation in the struggle to ratify the ERA poses interpretive as well as personal and political problems" p. x). While seldom recognized, some of the most highly regarded works in the study of parties are *surveys* that had their beginnings in participant observation–the Party Transformation Study (Cotter et al) and Eldersveld's classic *Political Parties* (1964). Bositis points out that while participant observation is undervalued in political science, that "Participant observation designs can be logically valid (i.e., conform to norms of scientific procedure), and are represented in some classic scientific investigations." Stressing that participant observation should be theory-driven, Bositis point out that participant observataion contains "features that make their findings especially persuasive: they are contrived and manipulative in conception, less reactive than survey research, and when properly done, very convincing" (1990: 86).

reform to be told by interests hostile to the reform process–and to women. Several of the party scholars (Ranney 1975; Kirkpatrick 1976, 1979) who have written so critically of party reform have also been members of the factional group Coalition for a Democratic Majority which has actively opposed the McGovern-Fraser reforms. Critics of party reform have decried women's gains because, in their view, women's organizations have no grassroots base (Polsby 1983a, 133). Shafer (1983) has argued that women have gained over other groups in the reform process *not* because of the ability of women's organizations to exploit "education and technical skills" rather than because of "social solidarity" (1983: 491). In fact, Shafer further demeans the organized activities of groups like the National Women's Political Caucus by implying that the reforms were advanced by "pillow talk":

> . . . black political leaders lacked the immediate social access to national reform principals of the feminist spokesmen. In the obvious but critical case, Mayor Richard G. Hatcher of Gary, Indiana, chairman of the National Conference of Black Elected Officials, could not possibly have the access to Don Fraser, the Chairman of the Party Structure Commission, that Arvonne (Mrs. Don) Fraser of the policy council of the National Women's Political Caucus had. If the case of the Frasers seemed an extreme example, the case of the Segals, Eli and Phyllis, was little different, and those commission personnel with an interest in demographic representation were, in fact, uniformly concerned with women rather than blacks or youth. (Shafer 1983: 471)

If the writing of history is one of the spoils of the victors, in the case of party reform, it is the vanquished who have written its history (Baer and Bositis 1988). Along with the silence of the architects of party reform, women and politics scholars must share some responsibility for the vacuum in party research so one-sidedly filled by reform critics.[20]

Third, women and politics researchers have relied on a narrow definition of feminism which excludes women who would otherwise be natural allies. This bias has treated the Republican party as if it were synonymous with Ronald Reagan's mythical "cave man" (" . . . I happen to be one who believes that if it wasn't for women, us men would still be walking around in skin suits carrying clubs" [Bonk 1988: 98]. For example, in October 1989, while attending the biennial convention of the National Federation of Republican Women in Baltimore, Maryland, I observed the husband of the President of the Maryland Federation (which hosted the convention) complaining bitterly

[20] A singular exception is Bella Abzug's (1984) history of reform. Unfortunately, she combines it with a celebration of the gender gap which has been used to undermine women's organizations.

about the snub that the Republican women had received from Vice President Dan Quayle who had declined to give the keynote speech (Quayle first offered to send his wife, and then demurring from making the 40-mile trek to Baltimore, said he needed to spend time with his family). He declared, "Now, Janet's no feminist *but*. . . !" Everyone at the table was equally incensed–emphatically asserting that it was the (Republican) women who elected George Bush and Dan Quayle. The insult of offering "to send the wife"[21] was particularly galling when President George Bush spoke at the NFRW Convention the next day, as had Vice President George Bush at the 1987 NFRW convention. I suspect that there are a number of lessons to be learned about gaining power inside the party from the different path of the NFRW, but the current orthodoxy dismisses Republican women and Republican women's clubs as non-feminist and as of little interest.

Finally, we know little about *why* there are so few women elected to public office. By not studying parties from the inside, we cannot begin to answer this question. In an intriguing analysis, Robert Bernstein argues that from 1974 on, increasingly ambitious men entering open-seat races for the U.S. House meant that female candidates faced "much stiffer" male competition (1986: 162). If so, then the election of women to office is also dependent upon dynamic factors of party organizational strength, candidate recruitment and training, and the provision of campaign resources by party elites–not merely the structural constraint imposed by the (male) incumbency advantage.

Conclusions

Women and politics research has been hampered by old theories, and yes, ghosts. The suffrage movement was intimately connected to progressivism and its anti-party impulse. One of the ghosts the contemporary scholarship is haunted by is an inability to appreciate party politics. Women need political parties–and we scholars do women and the women's movement a disservice by ignoring parties in our research. The National Organization for Women (NOW) is so convinced that women have achieved nothing in the reformed party system that it has advocated the possibility of forming a third party. Not only is NOW wrong on the first count but the day of the third party is over. It is an extreme irony that the selling of the gender gap by NOW has made it so irrelevant to the Democratic party that NOW is currently consid-

[21] Contrary to previous years, the 1988 Democratic nominee Michael Dukakis "sent the wife" (Kitty Dukakis) rather than speaking himself at the meeting of the Democratic National Committee's Women's Caucus at the 1988 Democratic National Convention. In 1992, Bill and Hillary Clinton spoke at the Democratic National Convention's Women's Caucus meeting together.

ering organizing its own party. The progressive ghost is one we must exorcise if this is to change.

The introduction of women to elite politcs, and women to political science has produced a limited theoretical harvest. One might have expected more with the maturation of the new generation of women scholars entering the discipline in the 1970s. There are some fields–such as primatology[22]–in which new women scholars, using new methods and conducting original research on the cutting edges of their disciplines, have reached startling conclusions that have transformed their fields. This is what was hoped for in the First Decade of women and politics research; yet women as a subject of study have been incorporated into the ongoing SRC research program without any theoretical revision. Marianne Githens (1983) has argued that we need to consider "unconventional" participation as equivalent forms of political influence. To do so, however, would require a new theoretical model of politics, for unconventional participation is *not* a consumer-based politics. Political elites and activits are *pro*-active, not *re*-active. For women and politics scholarship to recast theory and transform the discipline of political science, women and politics researchers must add participant observation and other non-survey based methodologies to our arsenal of empirical research tools.

As Frank Sorauf pointed out some time ago, despite the plethora of data on presidential elections, we suffer from a paucity of data on political parties because "survey methods . . . are not ideally suited to analysis of organizations and structures–in either their internal life or their external activities" (1967: 40). And it is in both the internal life and external activities of parties that we might look for areas in which women may be promoted or discriminated against–yet these studies are silent on this. Paradigms are not to be challenged by using existing research models. Perhaps we are learning the hard way that even in a gendered world, if one has a hammer it does not matter much if it is a little girl or a little boy.

References

Abzug, Bella, and Mim Kelber. 1984. *The Gender Gap*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mlfflin.

Amundsen, Kirsten. 1971. *The Silenced Majority*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Anderson, Kristi. 1988. Review of Karen Beckwith, *American Women and Political Participation*. New York: Greenwood Press (1986). *Women and Politics* 8: 92–93.

[22] The research by such figures as Jane Goodal and Diane Fosse is well known. Other prominent researchers include Jane Lancaster (1985), Sara Blaffer Hrdy (1984). The contributions of women primatologists are collected in Small (1984), and have been so revolutionary as to be discussed in the mass media (Eckholm 1984).

Baer, Denise L. 1983. "Men and Women in Political Parties." Ph.D. dissertation. Southern Illinois University.

———. 1991. "National Federation of Republican Women." In L. Sandy Maisel, ed., *Political Parties and Elections in the United States: An Encyclopedia.* New York: Garland.

———. 1993. "Who Has the Body?" Party Institutionalization and Theories of Party Organization." *American Review of Politics* 14 (Spring).

Baer, Denise L., and David A. Bositis. 1988. *Elite Cadres and Party Coalitions.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

———. 1993. *Politics and Linkage in a Democratic Society.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Baxter, Sandra, and Marjorie Lansing. 1984 (1980). *Women and Politics.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Benthall, John. 1993. "Arms Against a Sea of Troubles." *Anthropology Today* 9 (February): 1–2.

Berstein, Robert A. 1986. "Why Are There So Few Women in the House?" *Western Political Quarterly* 39 (March): 155–64.

Blydenburgh, John C. 1985. "Introduction." In Peter B. Natchez, *Images of Voting/Visions of Democracy*, pp. 3–15. New York: Basic Books.

Boals, Kay. 1975. "Political Science–The Politics of Male-Female Relations: The Function of Feminist Scholarship." *Signs* 1: 161–74.

Boneparth, Ellen. 1977. "Women in Campaigns." *American Politics Quarterly* 5: 289–300.

Bonk, Joyce. 1988. "The Selling of the 'Gender Gap': The Role of Organized Feminism." In Carol M. Mueller, ed., *The Politics of the Gender Gap*, pp. 81–101. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bositis, David A. 1990. *Research Designs for Political Science.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bourque, Susan C., and Jean Grossholtz. 1974. "Politics as Unnatural Practice: Political Science Looks at Female Participation." *Politics and Society* 4: 225–65.

Burrell, Barbara C. 1988. "The Political Opportunity Structure of Women Candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1984." *Women and Politics* 8: 51–68.

Carroll, Bernice. 1979. "Part I: American Politics and Political Behavior." *Signs* 5: 289–306.

Carroll, Susan J. 1985. *Women as Candidates in American Politics.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Coleman, Milton. 1986. "Reagan Rating Falls in Polls of Blacks." *Washington Post*, January 18, pp. A1, A6.

Conlan, Timothy, Ann Martino, and Robert Dilger. 1984. "State Parties in the 1980s: Adaptation, Resurgence, and Continuing Constraints." *Intergovernmental Perspective* 10: 6–13.

Cook, Beverly B. 1983. "First Women in Political Science: No Home in the Discipline." A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.

Costain, Anne N. 1988. "Women's Claims as a Special Interest." In Carol M. Mueller, ed., *The Politics of the Gender Gap*, pp. 150–72. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Cotter, Cornelius P., James L. Gibson, John F. Bibby, and Robert J. Huckshorn. 1989 (1984). *Party Organizations in American Politics*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Crotty, William J. 1983. *Party Reform*. New York: Longman.

Dahl, Robert A. 1961. "The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest." *American Political Science Review* 55: 763–72.

Darcy, R., Susan Welch, and Janet Clark. 1987. *Women, Elections, and Representation*. New York: Longman.

Diamond, Irene. 1977. *Sex Roles in the State House*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Diamond, Irene, and Nancy Hartsock. 1981. "Beyond Interests in Politics: A Comment on Virginia Sapiro's 'When are Interests Interesting?' " *American Political Science Review* 75: 717–21.

Eckholm, Eric. 1984. "New View of Female Primates Assails Stereotypes." *New York Times*, September 18, p. C1.

Eldersveld, Samuel. 1964. *Political Parties: A Behavioral Analysis*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Epstein, Leon D. 1983. "The Scholarly Commitment to Parties." In Ada Finifter, ed., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, pp. 127–53. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.

Farah, Barbara G., and Ethel Klein. 1988. "The Return of the Gender Gap." *Polling Report* 4: 1, 6.

Feigenbaum, Edward D., and James A. Palmer. 1988. *Ballot Access*. Washington, DC: FEC.

Firestone, Shulamith. 1971. "On American Feminism." In Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran, eds., *Woman in Sexist Society*, pp. 665–86. New York: New American Library.

Flammang, Janet A. 1984. "Filling the Party Vacuum: Women at the Grassroots Level in Local Politics." In Janet A. Flammang, ed., *Political Women*, pp. 87–113. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

———. 1985. "Female Officials in the Feminist Capital: The Case of Santa Clara County." *Western Political Quarterly* 38 (March): 94–116.

Fowlkes, Diane L. 1984. "Ambitious Political Woman: Countersocialization and Political Party Context." *Women and Politics* 4: 5–32.

Fowlkes, Diane L., Jerry Perkins, and Sue Tolleson Rinehart. 1979. "Gender Roles and Party Roles." *American Political Science Review* 73: 772–80.

Frankovic, Kathleen A. 1982. "Sex and Politics: New Alignments, Old Issues." *P.S.* 15: 439–48.

———. 1988. "The Ferraro Factor: The Women's Movement, the Polls and the Press." In Carol M. Mueller, ed., *The Politics of The Gender Gap*, pp. 102–23. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Freeman, Jo. 1975. *The Politics of Women's Liberation*. New York: Longman.

———, ed. 1983. *Social Movements of the Sixties and Seventies*. New York: Longman.
———. 1986. "The Political Culture of the Democratic and Republican Parties." *Political Science Quarterly* 101: 321-56.
———. 1988. "Women at the 1988 Democratic Convention." *P.S.* 21: 875-81.
———. 1989. "Feminist Activities at the 1988 Republican Convention." *P.S.* 22: 39-46.
Gehlen, Frieda. 1969. "Women in Congress." *Transaction* 6: 36-40.
Gelb, Joyce. 1989. *Feminism and Politics: A Comparative Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Gertzog, Irwin N. 1984. *Congressional Women*. New York: Praeger.
Githens, Marianne. 1983. "The Elusive Paradigm–Gender, Politics and Political Behavior. The State of the Art." In Ada W. Finifter, ed., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*. Washington, DC: APSA.
———. 1984. "Women and State Politics: An Assessment." In Janet A. Flammang, ed., *Political Women*, pp. 41-64. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Githens, Marianne, and Jewell L. Prestage, eds. 1977. *A Portrait of Marginality*. New York: David McKay.
Glenney, Daryl. 1982. "Women in Politics: On the Rise." *Campaigns and Elections* 3 (Winter): 18-24.
Goot, Murry, and Elizabeth Reid. 1975. "Women and Voting Studies: Mindless Matrons or Sexist Scholarship." Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Gottlieb, Paul D. 1986. "Women's Campaigner Puts Numbers to Work." *National Journal*, September 20, p 2262.
Gruberg, Martin. 1968. *Women in American Politics*. Oshkosh, WI: Academia Press.
Gugin, Linda C. 1986. "The Impact of Political Structure on the Political Power of Women: A Comparison of Britain and the United States." *Women and Politics* 6: 37-55.
Herrnson, Paul. 1988. *Party Campaigning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Hrdy, Sarah Blaffer. 1981. *The Woman That Never Evolved*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Huckshorn, Robert J. 1976. *Party Leadership in the States*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
Jaquette, Jane S., ed. 1974. *Women in Politics*. New York: Wiley.
———. 1976. "Political Science." *Signs* 2: 147-64.
Jennings, M. Kent, and Barbara Farah. 1981. "Social Roles and Political Resources." *American Journal of Political Science* 25: 462-81.
Jennings, M. Kent, and Norman Thomas. 1968. "Men and Women in Party Elites: Social Roles and Political Resources." *Midwest Journal of Political Science* 12: 469-91.
Jensen, Richard. 1980. "Armies, Admen and Crusaders." *Public Opinion* 3 (October/November): 44-49, 52-53.
Johnson, Marilyn, and Susan Carroll. 1978. "Statistical Report: Profile of Women Holding Office: 1977." In John and Carroll, *Women in Public Office*. 2nd ed., 1A-68A. Methuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Kaplan, Abraham. 1964. *The Conduct of Inquiry*. San Francisco: Chandler.
Kayden, Xandra, and Eddie Mahe, Jr. 1985. *The Party Goes on United States*. New York: Basic Books.
Kendrigan, Mary Lou. 1984. *Political Equality in a Democratic Society*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
Kirkpatrick, Jeane Jordan. 1974. *Political Woman*. New York: Basic Books.
———. 1976. *The New Presidential Elite*. New York: Russell Sage.
———. 1979. *Dismantling the Parties*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.
Klein, Ethel. 1984. *Gender Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
———. 1987. "A Response to Steuernagel." *Women and Politics* 7 (Winter): 15–19.
Kraus, Wilma Rule. 1974. "Political Implications of Gender Roles: A Review of the Literature." *American Political Science Review* 68: 1706–23.
Lake, Celinda, and Nikki Heidepriem. 1988. "Whatever Happened to the Gender Gap?" *Campaign and Elections* 8: 37–40.
Lamson, Peggy. 1968. *Few Are Chosen*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
Lancaster, Jane B. 1985. "Evolutionary Perspectives on Sex Differences in Higher Primates." In Alice S. Rossi, ed., *Gender and the Life Course*, pp. 3–27. New York: Aldine.
Lichter, Linda. 1985. "Who Speaks for Black America?" *Public Opinion* 8 (August/September), pp. 41–44, 58.
Luker, Kristin. 1983. *Motherhood and the Politics of Abortion*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
McFarland, Andrew S. 1984. *Common Cause*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
McGlen, Nancy E., and Karen O'Connor. 1983. *Women's Rights*. New York: Praeger.
Mandel, Ruth B. 1981. *In the Running: The New Woman Candidate*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
Mansbridge, Jane J. 1986. *Why We Lost the ERA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Matlack, Carol M. 1988. "Women at the Polls." *National Journal*, December 19, pp. 3208–15.
Mueller, Carol M. 1988. "The Empowerment of Women: Polling and the Women's Voting Bloc." In Carol M. Mueller, ed., *The Politics of the Gender Gap*, pp. 16–36. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Natchez, Peter B. 1985. *Images of Voting/Visions of Democracy*. New York: Basic Books.
Patterson, Samuel C. 1989. "The Persistence of State Parties." In Carl E. Van Horn, ed., *The State of the States*, pp. 153–74. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
Peterson, Bill. 1985. "Reagan Did Understand Women." *Washington Post*, March 3, p. C5.
Polsby, Nelson. 1983a. *Consequence of Party Reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
———. 1983b. "The Reform of Presidential Selection and Democratic Theory." *P.S.* 16: 695–98.
Poole, Keith T., and L. Harmon Zeigler. 1985. *Women, Public Opinion and Politics*. New York: Longman.

———. 1985. "Political Woman: Gender Indifference." *Public Opinion* 8 (August/September): 54–57.

———. 1987. "Comment on Steuernagle's 'Reflections on Women and Political Participation.' " *Women and Politics* 7: 29–30.

Popkin, Samuel L. 1991. *The Reasoning Voter.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Price, David E. 1984. *Bringing Back the Parties.* Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Ranney, Austin. 1975. *Curing the Michiefs of Faction.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rauch, Kate Darby. 1992. "Interviews Find Different Take on the Hill-Thomas Controversy." *Washington Post,* December 7, p. A3.

Sapiro, Virginia. 1981. "Reasearch Frontier Essay: When Are Interests Interesting? The Problem of Political Representation of Women." *American Political Science Review* 75: 701–16.

———. 1983. *The Political Integration of Women.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

———. 1987. "Reflections on Reflections: Personal Ruminations." *Women and Politics* 7: 21–27.

Sapiro, Virginia, and Barbara Farah. 1980. "New Pride and Old Prejudice: Political Ambition and Role Orientations Among Female Partisan Elites." *Women and Politics* 1: 13–36.

Schattschneider, Elmer E. 1960. *The Semi-Sovereign People.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schlesinger, Joseph A. 1985. "The New American Political Party." *American Political Science Review* 79: 1152–69.

Shafer, Byron E. 1983. *Quiet Revolution.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Shanley, Mary, and Victoria Schuck. 1975. "In Search of Political Woman." *Social Science Quarterly* 55: 632–44.

Small, Meredith F., ed. 1984. *Female Primates: Studies by Women Primatologists.* New York: Alan R. Liss.

Smeal, Eleanor. 1984. *How and Why Women Will Elect the Next President.* New York: Harper and Row.

Smith, Bradley A. 1991. "Note: Judicial Protection of Ballot-Access Rights: Third Parties Need Not Apply." *Harvard Journal on Legislation* 28: 167–217.

Sorauf, Frank J. 1967. "Political Parties and Political Analysis." In William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham, eds., *The American Party Systems,* pp. 33–55. New York: Oxford University Press.

Steuernagel, Gertrude A. 1987. "Reflections on Women and Political Particpation." *Women and Politics* 7 (Winter): 3–13.

Taylor, Paul. 1985. "Black Leaders, Public Differ on Issues." *Washington Post,* September 16, p. A15.

Ware, Susan. 1987. *Partner and I: Molly Dewson, and New Deal Politics.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Werner, Emmy E. 1966. "Women in Congress, 1917–1964." *Western Political Quarterly* 19 (March): 16–30.

———. 1968. "Women in State Legislatures." *Western Political Quarterly* 21 (March): 40–50.

White, John. 1990. Comments made at a conference held at Ashland University, November 10, "The Future of Political Parties."
Whitehead, Ralph. 1985. "More Votes, More Heart." *Boston Globe Sunday Magazine*. April 14, pp. 10–35.
———. 1988. "The Bright-Collar Boom." *Boston Globe Sunday Magazine*, January 17, pp. 14–42.
Williams, Eddie. 1985. "Responses to Linda Lichter's 'Who Speaks for Black America?'" *Public Opinion* 8 (October/November): 58–60.
Williams, Juan. 1985. "Poll Irks Blacks Leaders." *Washington Post*, September 20, p. A11.
Witt, Evans. 1985. "What the Republics Have Learned about Women." *Public Opinion* 8 (October/November): 49–52.

Received: February 18, 1991
Accepted for Publication: January 14, 1993