

Coding Instructions

DEGREE of ORGANIZATION

[This material is condensed from Chapter 9 of Kenneth Janda's *Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey*. New York: The Free Press, 1980.]

PARTY ORGANIZATION is often cited as the major independent variable in explaining party "effectiveness" (see Katz and Eldersveld 1961; Cutright and Rossi 1958; Gatlin 1968; and Crotty 1968). From an alternative theoretical perspective, the degree of organization is seen to depend on other variables, such as the party's ideological commitment and the nature of the electoral system. Regardless of the theoretical approach, most analyses of political parties devote considerable attention to party organization.

"Organization" is an alias for several different concepts in party analysis, however. One common usage of "organization" pertains to the concentration of power within the party; a party with a "strong organization" is one that is centrally directed. This particular usage of the term is subsumed by the concept in the next chapter, plainly labeled "centralization of power." A second sense of organization relates to the stability of interaction patterns within the party; a "well-organized" party is one that functions smoothly in executing its activities, time after time. We do not use the term in this sense either, for it blends into our previous concept, "institutionalization."

Our usage of "organization" conforms instead to Anderson's "formalization" dimension in his review of organizational theory and the study of political parties. Anderson defines "formalization" as structured patterns of interaction that are prescribed either by formal rules of procedure or by traditions and unwritten rules (1968, pp. 398-399). The more formalized the organization, the more structured the behavior patterns—with "structure" meaning "complexity." This same concept is labeled "structural differentiation" by other writers and it seems identical to Huntington's "complexity-simplicity" dimension of political institutions (1965, p. 399). It appears that this conceptualization of party organization also equates with what Duverger usually means in his diverse references to the structural "articulation" of a party. Following Blau's general definition of an organization (1968, p. 298), we define "degree of organization" specifically as the complexity of regularized procedures for mobilizing and coordinating the ef-

forts of party supporters in executing the party's strategy and tactics. Seven basic variables are advanced as operational measures of degree of organization. A number of these measures, outlined below, are inspired by Crotty's indices of party organization (1968, pp. 298-303).

- 8.01 Structural Articulation
- 8.02 Intensiveness of Organization
- 8.03 Extensiveness of Organization
- 8.04 Frequency of Local Meetings
- 8.05 Frequency of National Meetings
- 8.06 Maintaining Records
- 8.07 Pervasiveness of Organization

Basic Variable 8.01 Structural Articulation

Duverger attributes considerable explanatory power to the concept of "general articulation" in party organization, which he contends has "a profound influence upon its militants, upon its ideological unity, and the efficacy of its action, and even upon its methods and principles" (1963, p. 40). In an effort to separate his usage of "articulation" in an organizational sense from its usage in the sense of *interest* articulation, we refer to this variable as "structural articulation."

Duverger takes pains to distinguish his concept of articulation from that of centralization of power, but he is clearer in stating what the concept is *not* than in defining the concept positively. Although he introduces the concept with reference to "the arrangements for linking and relating the primary groups of the party" (1963, p. 40), he later stresses the importance of distinguishing between strong and weak articulation, on the one hand, and between vertical and horizontal links, on the other (1963, p. 47). He also associates the articulation concept with the degree of structural identity and the degree of clarity in prescribing how positions in the structure are attained.

We can fashion an explicit definition of structural articulation using the three basic ideas in Duverger's im-

licit discussion of the concept. These are (1) identifying the existence of party organs, (2) specifying the ways in which membership in these party organs is attained, and (3) establishing the functional relationships (linkages) that exist among these various organs. Thus, a party that ranks high in structural articulation demonstrates a well-defined set of party organs, features fixed membership with definite terms of service, and prescribes clear selection procedures. The relationships between the various organs are differentiated by function but not necessarily by lines of authority. Assessing relationships among party organs according to lines of authority is a matter for the "centralization of power" variable cluster. Here, we seek to measure a concept that is logically independent of the centralization of power.

Given our concern with political parties in national politics, we are mainly interested in the structural articulation of national party organs. A distinction between "governing" and "administrative" agencies may be helpful in identifying types of national party organs. Within the category of "governing" agencies, there are three general types of organs. (1) "Legislative assemblies" of large numbers of party members constitute the most authoritative organs within parties by virtue of their size and relatively representative composition. More commonly, these legislative assemblies are called party "congresses," "conferences," or "conventions." To be counted as an "existing" national organ within each of our two time periods, a party's legislative assembly must meet at least once, which should handle the situation of a legislative assembly existing on paper but not in practice. (2) "National committees" of some sort are usually empowered to carry on party activities between legislative assemblies. These are commonly called "national committees" or "central committees," and frequently they are further subdivided into small executive committees for guiding day-to-day activities of the party. Such smaller committees, if clearly defined, would themselves be counted as additional national organs. (3) "Councils" of party leaders of a size between the legislative assemblies and the executive committees sometimes exist to fill the authority gap between the two. Such party councils have a variety of names.

Within the category of "administrative" agencies, there are many types of organs; we examine four. (1) The "parliamentary" organization is undoubtedly the most important of these, and some might with good reason classify this organization under the "governing" category. Where the parliamentary organization is classified matters little because of the heuristic nature of the categorization. It is more important to count a well-defined party organization within the legislature as another national party organ—and to count two national organs if separate organizations exist for each chamber in a bicameral legislature. (2) "Research" organizations

are taken to include party groups formed to formulate policy, expound ideology, or otherwise engage in the substance of political issues. (3) "Nomination" committees refer to standing party agencies that pass on the suitability of party candidates. (4) "Finance" committees refer to standing party committees entrusted with the task of raising or dispensing funds. Other administrative or task-oriented committees might be identified, such as "patronage" committees, but enough have been mentioned to suggest differentiations among national party organs. In general, the greater the number of national organs that can be identified, the more structurally articulated the party.

A distinction needs to be made between "informal cooptation" of members into party organs and "prescribed selection" of members. Informal cooptation is the process of having members of the party organ themselves select additional members to fill out its membership. This process would also apply to the party leaders' unilateral selection of members to create a party organ. In contrast to the informal and unregulated process of cooptation is the process of prescribed selection, which sets forth the procedures involved in achieving party office, including eligibility and rules of election. In its classic form, prescribed selection involves other party organs, usually lower ones, electing or otherwise designating representatives to sit on the various national bodies. Prescribed selection also includes the case of members of a party organ formally subdividing into other party organs. In general, the process of prescribed selection is assumed to involve more structural articulation than informal cooptation.

Operational Definition. Parties were scored for structural articulation according to the most appropriate of the following categories, ranging from the lowest articulation to the highest.

- 0 Organization is so vague, diffuse, or changeable that no institutionalized organs can be identified at either the national or local levels.
- 1 The only organs that can be identified exist at the local level; organization at the national level is so vague or changeable that no institutionalized organs can be identified.
- 2 One national organ can be identified, but the selection procedures for membership on this organ either are indeterminate or involve a substantial amount of *informal cooptation*.
- 3 One national organ can be identified, and the selection process for membership on this body is characterized by *prescribed selection*.
- 4 Two or three major national organs can be identified; the selection procedures are either largely indeterminate or involve a substantial amount of

VARIABLES, CODES, AND SUMMARY STATISTICS

informal cooptation, and the functional responsibilities of these organs are indeterminate or overlapping.

- 5 Two or three major national organs can be identified; the selection procedures are either largely indeterminate or involve a substantial amount of *informal cooptation*, but the functional responsibilities of these organs are relatively clearly specified.
- 6 Two or three major national organs can be identified; the selection procedures are characterized by *prescribed selection*, but the functional responsibilities of these organs are indeterminate or overlapping.
- 7 Two or three major national organs can be identified; the selection procedures are characterized by *prescribed selection*, and the functional responsibilities of these organs are relatively clearly specified.
- 8 Four or more major national organs can be identified; the selection procedures either are largely indeterminate or involve a substantial amount of *informal cooptation*, and the functional responsibilities of these organs are indeterminate or overlapping.
- 9 Four or more major national organs can be identified; the selection procedures either are largely indeterminate or involve a substantial amount of *informal cooptation*, but the functional responsibilities of these organs are relatively clearly specified.
- 10 Four or more major national organs can be identified; the selection procedures are characterized by

prescribed selection, but the functional responsibilities of these organs are indeterminate or overlapping.

- 11 Four or more major national organs can be identified; the selection procedures are characterized by *prescribed selection*, and the functional responsibilities of these organs are relatively clearly specified.

Coding Results. Tables 9.1a and 9.1b contain the pertinent statistics from our coding of BV801, "structural articulation." Over 90 percent of our parties were scored for BV801, but there was a pronounced correlation of .63 between the confidence of our coding judgments and the variable scores. Parties whose structure was described at length in the literature tended to be those which received high scores on this variable. Parties whose structure received little attention in the literature were apt to be given low scores. While intuitively understandable, this relationship between literature treatment and coding judgments needs to be noted.

According to our coding of political parties in the decade of the 1950s, the modal frequency stood at the highest point on the scale, which indicated the presence of four or more national organs characterized by prescribed selection and clearly specified functional responsibilities. But this category accounted only for about one quarter of the parties; the rest were well spread along the continuum of structural articulation, suggesting a good deal of variance in this attribute of parties across nations.

TABLE 9.1a

SUBFILE	FIRST				
BV801	STRUCTURAL ARTICULATION				
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	
VAGUE, DIFFUSE	1	2	1.5	1.6	
ONLY LOCAL ORGANS	2	2	1.5	1.6	
NATL ORG, INFORM SEL	2	13	9.6	10.5	
NATL ORG, FORMAL SEL	3	1	.7	.8	
2-3 ORGS OVERLAPPING	4	17	12.6	13.7	
2-3 ORGS, SPECIFIED	5	4	3.0	3.2	
2-3 ORGS FORMAL-OVLP	5	9	6.7	7.3	
2-3 ORGS FORMAL-SPEC	7	13	9.6	10.5	
4 ORGS INFORMAL-OVLP	8	1	.7	.8	
4 ORGS INFORMAL-SPEC	9	12	8.9	9.7	
4 ORGS FORMAL-OVLP	10	19	14.1	15.3	
4 ORGS FORMAL-SPEC	11	31	23.0	25.3	
	BLANK	11	8.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	7.347	STD DEV	3.362		

 VARIABLE AC801
 MEAN 6.452

TABLE 9.1b

SUBFILE	SECOND				
BV801	STRUCTURAL ARTICULATION				
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	
VAGUE, DIFFUSE	0	2	.7	.7	
ONLY LOCAL ORGANS	1	1	.7	.7	
NATL ORG, INFORM SEL	2	11	7.5	8.1	
NATL ORG, FORMAL SEL	3	1	.7	.7	
2-3 ORGS OVERLAPPING	4	23	15.6	17.0	
2-3 ORGS, SPECIFIED	5	5	3.4	3.7	
2-3 ORGS FORMAL-OVLP	6	11	7.5	8.1	
2-3 ORGS FORMAL-SPEC	7	13	8.8	9.6	
4 ORGS INFORMAL-OVLP	8	4	2.7	3.0	
4 ORGS INFORMAL-SPEC	9	12	8.2	8.9	
4 ORGS FORMAL-OVLP	10	20	13.6	14.6	
4 ORGS FORMAL-SPEC	11	33	22.4	24.4	
	BLANK	12	8.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	147	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	7.433	STD DEV	3.173		

 VARIABLE AC801
 MEAN 6.681

**Basic Variable 8.02
Intensiveness of Organization***

"Intensiveness of organization" derives from Duverger's emphasis on the "basic element"—or smallest organizational unit—in party structure as a variable having considerable consequences for party behavior. The party's strategy and selection of tactics, for example, are related to its structural basis. As Duverger points out, "the choice of the cell as the basis of organization entails a profound change in the very concept of a political party. Instead of a body intended for the winning of votes, . . . the political party becomes an instrument of agitation" (1963, p. 35). The basis of party organization is also hypothesized to be related to party membership, discipline, and solidarity.

Most parties are organized on spatial rather than on functional lines, and a spatial or geographic scheme seems most generally suited for determining the most "intensive" level of party organization. We recognize that parties may not be organized as intensively in some areas of a country as in others, where their strength may be weaker. But, in this variable, we ignore variations in intensiveness of organization and seek instead to score parties according to the *most* intensive level of organization that the party has been able to achieve and maintain. Another variable, 8.03, assesses variations in intensiveness of organization.

The least intensive basis of party organization corresponds to what Duverger calls the "caucus"—assemblages of limited numbers of semi-coopted party notables drawn from relatively large geographic areas. We distinguish between national and regional caucuses. The next three categories constitute progressively diminishing areal bases of organization: the constituency, branch or ward, and precinct. Finally, the most intensive basis of party organization—in the sense that it involves the fewest number of party members—is a "cell" or "militia unit." Comprising small numbers of dedicated partisans, cells may be organized on either a geographical or, what is more likely, an occupational basis. This departure from the spatial classification scheme can be handled within our conceptualization for it occurs only at the most intensive end of our continuum.

Operational Definition. A party is scored according to the smallest unit of organization it has been able to achieve and maintain.

- 0 Organization is so vague, diffuse, or changeable that no institutionalized organs can be identified.
- 1 *National caucus.* There are no institutionalized party organs below the national level.

- 2 *Regional caucus.* There are no institutionalized party organs below the regional level, with region being interpreted to mean component states in a federal system or other major administrative subdivisions or prominent geographical divisions of the country.
- 3 *Constituency/municipal/commune/county basis.* There are no institutionalized party organs below the constituency level. In the absence of a clear empirical referent for these labels, this category is construed to define units smaller than regional and containing 50,000 or more voters.
- 4 *Branch or ward basis.* These are usually electoral subdivisions of the above category. In the absence of a clear empirical referent to these labels, this category is construed to define units that correspond to areas containing between 50,000 and 1,000 voters.
- 5 *Precinct basis.* This is usually a subdivision of the above category, and it involves 1,000 voters or less; small villages are included in this category.
- 6 *Cell basis.* Usually not defined on the basis of voters that the territory embraces; usually involves less than 100 party members; this category is used for militia units as well.

Coding Results. "Intensiveness of organization" proved to be somewhat more difficult to code than "structural articulation," with about 20 percent of the parties lacking a code for BV802. In line with the rationale concerning data quality and coding judgments for the preceding variable, there was again a significant positive correlation of .44 between the BV and AC scores. The relevant statistics are detailed in Tables 9.2a and 9.2b, which also show that a plurality of parties (nearly 40 percent) is organized on a branch or ward basis. Approximately 20 percent more feature the most intensive type of organization, commonly described as a "cell" even if the party itself refrains from this designation. Intermediate between these two points on the continuum is the "precinct" organization, which accounts for another quarter of the world's parties. Readers are reminded that the term "precinct" is used here in a broad sense, including village-level organizations as well as urban subunits.

**Basic Variable 8.03
Extensiveness of Organization**

The degree of party organization includes the geographical coverage or *extensiveness* of organization as well as the intensiveness of organization, which is measured by the preceding variable, 8.02. A party that establishes and maintains local organizations throughout the country is considered more highly organized than one whose local organizations are concentrated in part

*Gilbert Rotkin assisted in writing this section.

VARIABLES, CODES, AND SUMMARY STATISTICS

TABLE 9.2a

SUBFILE FIRST		INTENSIVENESS OF ORGANIZATION			
BV002					
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	
NATIONAL CAUCUS	1	1	.7	.9	
REGIONAL CAUCUS	2	2	1.5	1.8	
CONSTITUENCY BASIS	3	9	6.7	8.1	
BRANCH-WARD BASIS	4	44	32.6	38.9	
PRECINCT BASIS	5	31	23.0	27.4	
CELL BASIS	6	26	19.3	23.1	
BLANK		22	16.3	MISSING	
TOTAL		135	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	4.593	STD DEV	1.041		

VARIABLE	AC802				
MEAN	6.531				

TABLE 9.2b

SUBFILE SECOND		INTENSIVENESS OF ORGANIZATION			
BV012					
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	
NATIONAL CAUCUS	1	2	1.4	1.7	
CONSTITUENCY BASIS	3	11	7.5	9.1	
BRANCH-WARD BASIS	4	49	33.3	40.5	
PRECINCT BASIS	5	34	23.1	28.1	
CELL BASIS	6	25	17.0	20.7	
BLANK		26	17.7	MISSING	
TOTAL		147	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	4.554	STD DEV	1.024		

VARIABLE	AC802				
MEAN	6.554				

of the country. More properly speaking, we are interested in the proportion of the population served by the party rather than the proportion of the territory it covers.

Categories of local organization presented in variable 8.02 are used to establish the extensiveness of party organization. From the least to the most intensive, there are four basic types of party organization: constituency, branch, precinct, and cell. We are interested in learning how widespread is the party's usage of its *most* intensive level or organization as identified in variable 8.02.

Operational Definition. A party is rated according to the highest code that applies from the following set of categories.

- 0 Either there are no identifiable party organs or the only organs that can be identified are national organs.
- 1 There are no "local organizations," but there are "regional organizations" in *some* major regions of the country.
- 2 There are no "local organizations," but there are "regional organizations" in *all* major regions of the country.
- 3 The *most* intensive level or organization for the party is limited to areas of the country less than one-third of the population.
- 4 The *most* intensive level of organization for the party is limited to areas of the country with one-third to two-thirds of the population.
- 5 The *most* intensive level of organization for the party can be found scattered all over the country, but the strength of these organizations is variable and the coverage is far from complete.
- 6 The *most* intensive level of organization for the party can be found throughout the country; while the strength of these organizations may be variable, the coverage is rather thorough.

Coding Results. We drop almost another 10 percentage points in our ability to code parties on this next variable in the degree of organization cluster. Moreover, the mean values for AC803 in Tables 9.3a and 9.3b are decidedly lower than their counterparts in the previous two variables. The literature's failure to provide data concerning the character, number, and distribution of party organizations for most countries accounts for this drop in the coverage and quality of our coding. In this case, however, there is no significant relationship between the confidence of our judgments and the scores they produced. As can be expected from our sampling of national rather than regional parties, the distributions in the tables are bunched toward "extensiveness" of party organization across the nation. Because there is relatively little variance in the distributions, our operationalization of this variable appears to have been too crude for the measurement task. But, considering the paucity of good information in the literature on the spatial existence of party organizations, one wonders whether an even more refined scale would have proved manageable in its place.

**Basic Variable 8.04
Frequency of Local Meetings***

The mere existence of local party units is an indicator of degree of organization. Another indicator is the frequency of meetings of the local party units. Meetings serve as a forum for the dissemination of information, provide a focus for the collection of information, and aid in the formation and evaluation of party issues and goal orientations. The more frequent the meetings, the greater the potential for party organization. In addition to the frequency of meetings, the *regularity* of meetings must also be considered as contributory to organization.

*Gilbert Rotkin assisted in writing this section.

Degree of Organization

TABLE 9.3a

SUBFILE FIRST				
BV803		EXTENSIVENESS OF ORGANIZATION		
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO LOCAL ORGANS	0	2	1.5	2.0
SOME REGIONAL ORGANS	1	2	1.5	2.0
ORGANS FOR .33 PCP.	3	14	10.4	13.9
ORGANS FOR .33-.67	4	7	5.2	6.9
ORGANS SPREAD AROUND	5	33	24.4	32.7
THOROUGH COVERAGE	6	43	31.9	42.6
	BLANK	34	25.2	MISSING
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0
MEAN	4.931	STD DEV	1.368	

VARIABLE AC803
MEAN 5.584

Variable 8.02 sets forth four basic types of local party organization: constituency, branch, precinct, and cell—listed in order of increasing intensiveness. In keeping with the practice established in variable 8.03, extensiveness of party organization, we conceptualize the frequency of local meetings in terms of the most *intensive* unit of party organization.

Operational Definition. Parties are coded according to what constitutes the *modal* category of frequency of meetings for the *most intensive* unit of party organization. The highest code applicable is used.

- 0 There either are no local party organs or the local units do not meet.
- 1 Basic party units do meet, but rarely and irregularly.
- 2 Basic units meet during campaigns only.
- 3 Basic units meet once or twice a year.

TABLE 9.4a

SUBFILE FIRST				
BV804		FREQUENCY OF LOCAL MEETINGS		
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO UNITS OR MEETINGS	0	1	.7	1.7
IRREGULAR MEETINGS	1	1	.7	2.7
ONLY DURING CAMPAIGN	2	8	5.9	13.6
1-2 TIMES PER YEAR	3	9	6.7	15.3
3-6 TIMES PER YEAR	4	9	6.7	15.3
7-11 TIMES PER YEAR	5	4	3.0	6.8
ONCE A MONTH OR MORE	6	27	20.0	49.8
	BLANK	76	56.3	MISSING
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0
MEAN	4.441	STD DEV	1.695	

VARIABLE AC804
MEAN 5.729

TABLE 9.3b

SUBFILE SECOND				
BV803		EXTENSIVENESS OF ORGANIZATION		
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO LOCAL ORGANS	0	2	1.4	1.9
SOME REGIONAL ORGANS	1	1	.7	.9
ORGANS IN ALL REGION	2	2	1.4	1.9
ORGANS FOR .33 POP.	3	16	10.9	14.0
ORGANS FOR .33-.67	4	7	4.8	6.5
ORGANS SPREAD AROUND	5	34	23.1	31.5
THOROUGH COVERAGE	6	46	31.3	42.6
	BLANK	39	26.5	MISSING
	TOTAL	147	100.0	100.0
MEAN	4.880	STD DEV	1.365	

VARIABLE AC803
MEAN 5.565

- 4 Basic units meet three to six times a year.
- 5 Basic units meet seven to eleven times a year.
- 6 Basic units meet once a month or more.

Coding Results. Our experience with BV804 continues the decline in our ability to code parties on degree of organization. We were successful barely 40 percent of the time in ascertaining how frequently the local units are apt to meet, and the mean values for AC804 admit the shakiness of some of our estimates (see Tables 9.4a and 9.4b). There is, however, no significant correlation between BV804 and AC804. Based on our attenuated sample, the distributions for BV804 project meetings at least monthly for a plurality of the world's parties. But another group of about equal size (codes 0 through 4) meets far less often, and this variable does seem to capture considerable variance in party practice across nations.

TABLE 9.4b

SUBFILE SECOND				
BV804		FREQUENCY OF LOCAL MEETINGS		
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO UNITS OR MEETINGS	0	3	2.0	6.5
IRREGULAR MEETINGS	1	3	2.0	6.5
ONLY DURING CAMPAIGN	2	8	5.4	12.1
1-2 TIMES PER YEAR	3	9	6.1	13.6
3-6 TIMES PER YEAR	4	10	6.8	15.2
7-11 TIMES PER YEAR	5	5	3.4	7.6
ONCE A MONTH OR MORE	6	28	19.0	42.4
	BLANK	61	55.1	MISSING
	TOTAL	147	100.0	100.0
MEAN	4.227	STD DEV	1.879	

VARIABLE AC804
MEAN 5.818

VARIABLES, CODES, AND SUMMARY STATISTICS

**Basic Variable 8.05
Frequency of National Meetings***

The same arguments made in behalf of the frequency of local meetings as an indicator of the degree of party organization apply to frequency of national meetings as an organizational variable. The more frequent the meetings at the national level, the greater the potential for party organization.

In conceptualizing this variable, we limit our concern to "governing" agencies of the "national committee" and "council" types. (See the distinction between governing and administrative agencies and the discussion of types of organs in each category as presented for variable 8.01.) This means that we count only the meetings of these national party organs. We do *not* count meetings of the "inner" executive committees, "politbureaus," or secretariats, which meet more often.

Operational Definition. A party is scored with the highest appropriate code along the following scale of frequency of meetings:

- 0 Either there are no national committees or councils or they meet but rarely and irregularly.
- 1 National committee or council meets cyclically less than once a year, perhaps at campaign times.
- 2 National committee or council meets regularly but only once a year.
- 3 National committee or council meets two to three times a year.
- 4 National committee or council meets four to five times a year.
- 5 National committee or council meets six to eleven times a year.
- 6 National committee or council meets monthly or about twelve times a year.

*Gilbert Rotkin assisted in writing this section.

TABLE 9.5a

SUBFILE FIRST		FREQUENCY OF NATIONAL MEETINGS			
8V805					
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	
NO MEETINGS	0	4	3.0	5.7	
UNDER ONCE A YEAR	1	2	1.5	2.9	
ONCE A YEAR	2	7	5.2	10.0	
2-3 TIMES A YEAR	3	17	12.6	24.3	
4-5 TIMES A YEAR	4	12	8.9	17.1	
6-11 TIMES A YEAR	5	12	8.9	17.1	
MEETS MONTHLY	6	7	5.2	10.0	
MORE THAN MONTHLY	7	9	6.7	12.9	
	BLANK	65	48.1	MISSING	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	4.000	STD DEV	1.896		

VARIABLE AC805	MEAN
AC805	6.271

- 7 National committee or council meets more frequently than monthly.

Coding Results. The parties' literature is more apt to comment on the frequency of national than local meetings, but the difference is not enough to promote notably greater success in coding BV805, which was omitted for about half of our parties. The data that were obtained are reported in Tables 9.5a and 9.5b, which display considerable variance in the frequency of national party meetings. Code 3 emerges as the modal category by a small margin, establishing the fact that about one-fifth to one quarter of the national committees meet two or three times a year. Although the coders were specifically instructed to limit their coding to national committees as defined above, they sometimes lapsed from the straight and narrow and seized upon meetings of "executive committees" and even party conferences on occasion. I hope that these mistakes have all been caught and corrected so that the final codes are faithful to our operationalization as intended.

**Basic Variable 8.06
Maintaining Records***

This variable contains three basic components that, taken together, constitute a broad conception of maintaining records, an activity thought to be indicative of structural differentiation. We take the most important indicator of recordkeeping to be maintaining lists of party members or party activists. The second component of recordkeeping is the preparation and publication of party propaganda—for example, speeches and policy statements—for either internal or general distribution. The third component is the maintenance of

*Donald Sylvan assisted in writing this section.

TABLE 9.5b

SUBFILE SECOND		FREQUENCY OF NATIONAL MEETINGS			
8V805					
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	
NO MEETINGS	0	6	4.1	7.2	
UNDER ONCE A YEAR	1	4	2.7	4.8	
ONCE A YEAR	2	8	5.4	9.6	
2-3 TIMES A YEAR	3	21	14.3	25.3	
4-5 TIMES A YEAR	4	11	7.5	13.3	
6-11 TIMES A YEAR	5	13	8.8	15.7	
MEETS MONTHLY	6	8	5.4	9.6	
MORE THAN MONTHLY	7	12	8.2	14.5	
	BLANK	64	43.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	147	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	3.904	STD DEV	2.020		

VARIABLE AC805	MEAN
AC805	6.181

Degree of Organization

some type of party archive, repository, library, or research division as an institutionalized organizational resource.

In general, we limit our concern to maintenance of records as carried out by the national party organization, rather than local or regional organizations. But we do allow for national *access* to membership lists maintained by local or regional organizations if the national organization itself does not maintain such lists.

Operational Definition. In the absence of adequate data to make more specific coding distinctions, we were forced to be broadly judgmental in scoring parties on this variable. We employed an arbitrary progression of scores to weight our components according to their presumed importance in record maintenance. We gave parties the *sum* of the scores applicable from Table 9.6.

The highest possible score that a party can obtain from this table is 2 for publishing party propaganda, plus 6 for maintaining party archives, plus 8 for maintaining membership lists—for a total of 16. The lowest possible score is 0.

Coding Results. According to our scoring of BV806, political parties throughout the world vary greatly in maintaining records. The distributions in Tables 9.7a and 9.7b show parties spread rather evenly along the continuum of possible scores for BV806. Slightly more than 10 percent of the parties earn a code of 16 by rating highly on all the scale components: pursuing an energetic publishing program, maintaining an outstanding archive or research division, and keeping excellent membership lists. But a comparable percentage of parties does little more than publish occasional propaganda (code 1), while a few do nothing at all along this line (code 0). Our fortune in coding party organization turns upward with BV806 as we return once more to the 85-90 percent success level. For the purist, however, we must point out that there is a significant correlation of .40 between BV806 and AC806, indicating the return also of a tendency to downgrade parties for not maintaining records if the literature neglects discussing the activity.

Basic Variable 8.07 Pervasiveness of Organization*

"Pervasiveness of organization" refers to party penetration into mass social and economic groups representing politically significant sectors of the population. Typically organized into youth cadres, women's clubs, commercial associations, labor unions, agrarian leagues, and religious bodies, such groups articulate their aspirations while mobilizing support for the party. Duverger refers to such party-affiliated organizations as "ancillary" organizations, which he describes as "various bodies, created by the party and controlled by it constitutionally or in fact, which make possible wider or greater participation: wider participation, by grouping around the nucleus of members proper, satellite organizations made up of supporters; greater participation, through completing the political organization of the member by organization on the family, social, and cultural plains" (1963, pp. 106-107). Although Duverger sees these ancillary or "auxiliary" organizations as controlled by the party, they may, in the words of Clement Moore, lead an "equivocal existence," operating as pressure groups with "a measure of freedom to influence policy" and yet subordinating their particular interests to the party interest, sapped of their vitality by close party supervision (1965, p. 159).

"Pervasiveness" in our conceptualization is measured by the number of major sectors of society represented in organizations ancillary to the party and by the proportion of individuals in each sector involved in the organizations. We do not here assess the situation in which an organization controls the party—a subject for the "autonomy" variable cluster—but we do evaluate the extent of party control of ancillary organizations and the extent of organizational activity in the party's behalf. We really assess the consequences of party control rather than the processes of control, for we score party control or activity as "high" if the organization is

*This section was drafted by Gilbert Rotkin.

TABLE 9.6
Scheme for Coding Maintaining Records

Publishes party propaganda (include party newspaper)	
Does little or none of this	0
Expend some energies in publishing party propaganda	1
Expend considerable energies in publishing program	2
Maintains party archive as institutionalized organization resource	
Does little or none of this	0
Maintains an archive, but not an outstanding resource	3
Maintains an outstanding archive or research division	6
Maintains membership lists or has access to lower organ's lists	
Virtually no lists of any quality are available	0
Maintains lists but they are incomplete and inaccurate	4
Maintains very good lists notable for quality	8

VARIABLES, CODES, AND SUMMARY STATISTICS

TABLE 9.7a

SUBFILE FIRST					
BV886 MAINTAINING RECORDS					
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	
MAINTAINS NO RECORDS	1	4	3.7	3.5	
PUBLISHES SOME PROP	1	14	10.4	12.2	
PUBLISHES MUCH PROP	2	13	9.6	11.3	
	4	5	3.7	4.3	
	5	11	8.1	9.6	
	6	12	8.9	10.4	
	7	1	.7	.9	
	8	6	4.4	5.2	
	9	6	4.4	5.2	
	10	15	11.1	13.9	
	11	1	.7	.9	
	12	5	3.7	4.3	
	13	6	4.4	5.2	
PUBLISH+ARCHIV+LIST	16	16	11.9	13.9	
	BLANK	20	14.8	MISSING	
	TOTAL	135	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	7.413	STD DEV	5.166		

VARIABLE AC806
MEAN 5.733

TABLE 9.7b

SUBFILE SECOND					
BV886 MAINTAINING RECORDS					
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	
MAINTAINS NO RECORDS	1	5	3.4	4.0	
PUBLISHES SOME PROP	1	15	10.2	12.0	
PUBLISHES MUCH PROP	2	13	8.8	10.4	
	4	3	2.0	2.4	
	5	13	8.8	10.4	
	6	17	11.6	13.6	
	7	1	.7	.8	
	8	5	3.4	4.0	
	9	6	4.1	4.8	
	10	17	11.6	13.6	
	11	1	.7	.8	
	12	7	4.6	5.6	
	13	6	4.1	4.8	
	14	1	.7	.8	
PUBLISH+ARCHIV+LIST	16	15	10.2	12.0	
	BLANK	22	15.0	MISSING	
	TOTAL	147	100.0	100.0	
MEAN	7.364	STD DEV	4.955		

VARIABLE AC806
MEAN 5.760

faithful to party policies and leaders or if it cooperates with the "regular" party organization in election campaigning, propaganda dissemination, and discipline.

Operational Definition. The limitations of our information force us to make rough judgments of the pro-

portion of individuals in each sector involved in the ancillary organizations and to use a simple "low-medium-high" trichotomy for judging party control of these organizations or the activity of the organization on behalf of the party. We assign the highest applicable code from Table 9.8.

TABLE 9.8
Scheme for Coding Pervasiveness of Organization

Penetration into Society	Party Control/Activity		
	Low	Med	High
There are no significant socioeconomic organizations in the country, or such organizations exist but are autonomous of the party.	0	0	0
The party is represented by youth (including students) or women's organizations, but these have failed to enlist more than insignificant proportions of their respective sectors.	1	2	3
The party is represented by youth or women's organizations, and these have enlisted significant proportions of their respective sectors.	4	5	6
Some socioeconomic sectors (i.e., one or two of the following: commercial, labor, agrarian, religious, ethnic) are associated to the party through ancillary organizations, but these organizations have enlisted relatively few members of the sectors.	7	8	9
Some socioeconomic sectors are penetrated by ancillary organizations, and they claim relatively many adherents.	10	11	12
Many socioeconomic sectors (i.e., three or more exclusive of youth and women) are penetrated, but the ancillary organizations count relatively few adherents.	13	14	15
Many socioeconomic sectors are penetrated and the ancillary organizations have relatively many adherents.	16	17	18

Degree of Organization

Coding-Results. With approximately 85 percent of the parties coded on BV807, we again report substantial variance in the "pervasiveness" of party organization throughout society (see Tables 9.9a and 9.9b). About fifteen parties in each time segment demonstrate control over ancillary organizations in several sectors of the society, and these organizations claim substantial membership. These parties are balanced at the other end of

the continuum by an equal or larger number that have virtually no supportive links with any social organizations. Our tendency to score parties as low on BV807 is definitely a function of the quality of our information, however, and the existence of a strong correlation of .40 between BV807 and AC807 must be taken into consideration in assessing the pervasiveness of organization.

TABLE 9.9a

SUBFILE FIRST		PERVASIVENESS OF ORGANIZATION		
BV807				
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO SIG. S-E GROUPS	0	16	11.9	13.8
YOUTH-WOMEN, FEW, LO	1	1	.7	.9
YOUTH-WOMEN, FEW, MD	2	4	3.0	3.4
YOUTH-WOMEN, FEW, HI	3	11	8.1	9.5
YOUTH-WOMEN, MANY-LO	4	1	.7	.9
YOUTH-WOMEN, MANY-MD	5	2	1.5	1.7
YOUTH-WOMEN, MANY-HI	6	9	3.7	4.3
SOME GROUPS, FEW, LO	7	16	11.9	13.8
SOME GROUPS, FEW, MD	8	8	5.9	6.9
SOME GROUPS, FEW, HI	9	7	5.2	6.4
SOME GROUPS, MANY-LO	10	6	4.4	5.2
SOME GROUPS, MANY-MD	11	3	2.2	2.6
SOME GROUPS, MANY-HI	12	8	5.9	6.9
MANY GROUPS, FEW, LO	13	4	3.0	3.4
MANY GROUPS, FEW, MD	14	1	.7	.9
MANY GROUPS, FEW, HI	15	3	2.2	2.6
MANY GROUPS, MANY-LO	16	2	1.5	1.7
MANY GROUPS, MANY-MD	17	5	3.7	4.3
MANY GROUPS, MANY-HI	18	13	9.6	11.2
BLANK	19		14.1	MISSING
TOTAL	135		100.0	100.0
MEAN	8.414	STD DEV	5.782	

VARIABLE AC807
MEAN 6.526

TABLE 9.9b

SUBFILE SECOND		PERVASIVENESS OF ORGANIZATION		
BV807				
CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO SIG. S-E GROUPS	0	22	15.0	16.7
YOUTH-WOMEN, FEW, LO	1	5	3.4	3.8
YOUTH-WOMEN, FEW, MD	2	6	4.1	4.5
YOUTH-WOMEN, FEW, HI	3	12	8.2	9.1
YOUTH-WOMEN, MANY-LO	4	2	1.4	1.5
YOUTH-WOMEN, MANY-MD	5	3	2.0	2.3
YOUTH-WOMEN, MANY-HI	6	5	3.4	3.8
SOME GROUPS, FEW, LO	7	13	8.8	9.8
SOME GROUPS, FEW, MD	8	8	5.4	6.1
SOME GROUPS, FEW, HI	9	7	4.8	5.3
SOME GROUPS, MANY-LO	10	7	4.8	5.3
SOME GROUPS, MANY-MD	11	2	1.4	1.5
SOME GROUPS, MANY-HI	12	9	6.1	6.7
MANY GROUPS, FEW, LO	13	4	2.7	3.0
MANY GROUPS, FEW, MD	14	2	1.4	1.5
MANY GROUPS, FEW, HI	15	3	2.0	2.3
MANY GROUPS, MANY-LO	16	1	.7	.8
MANY GROUPS, MANY-MD	17	8	5.4	6.1
MANY GROUPS, MANY-HI	18	13	8.8	9.8
BLANK	19		10.2	MISSING
TOTAL	147		100.0	100.0
MEAN	7.841	STD DEV	6.044	

VARIABLE AC807
MEAN 6.318