

VOX POP Newsletter

of Political Organizations and Parties

An official section of the American Political Science Association

Produced by the Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics, The University of Akron

Founding POP: The Origins of Our APSA Section

Kenneth Janda, Northwestern University

Few members of today's Political Organization and Parties Section know its origins nearly thirty years ago within the American Political Science Association. Some oldtimers may recall that its original acronym (POPO) was also the name of a clown, but otherwise the group's history proved foggy even to those present at the beginning. When John Green asked me, as one of POP'S early chairs, to write about its origins, I planned to contact some key emeritus professors and write it from collective memory. Our memories were all faulty, however, and I had to read back issues of *PS* and *VOX POP* to reconstruct its creation.

Unlike other professional associations in anthropology, psychology, and sociology, the APSA had no subdivisions by scholarly fields for the first 70 years of its existence. Responding to calls for change, the APSA Council in 1976 directed the 1977 Program Committee to "explore the degree of interest in beginning to organize continuing sections" for the annual APSA meeting.

The co-chairs of the 1977 convention, James Q. Wilson and Harvey Mansfield, Jr., addressed their mandate in an item titled, "Shall the APSA Have Organized Subfields?" in the Winter 1977 issue of *PS* (p. 67). They scheduled separate meetings of scholars in various subfields to "discuss and make recommendations regarding the feasibility and desirability of having permanent or semi-permanent, sections," with an aim "to provide greater clarity and continuity in the program sections and to permit scholars working in those subfields to participate more fully in defining the panel topics." Distinguished conveners were invited to preside over eleven different subfields:

- Political philosophy and political thought (Dennis Thompson);
- Empirical theory, methodology, and the philosophy of science (Henry Teune);
- Comparative politics (Suzanne Berger);
- International and transnational politics, and international organization (Robert Keohane);
- Public policy analysis (Aaron Wildavsky);
- Electoral and voting behavior (Donald Stokes);
- Law, courts, and judicial behavior (Samuel Krislov);
- Legislative processes, behavior, and representation (Samuel Patterson);
- Administration, organization, and executives (Francis Rourke);
- Political psychology and political socialization (Jack Dennis); and
- Federalism, intergovernmental relations, and urban politics (Deil Wright).

Note that political parties and interest groups were not among the invited subfields.

Apparently, five of the chosen eleven decided against the idea of sections at that time, for the next Program Chair, Elinor Ostrom, arranged for only seven "organized subfields" to meet at the 1978 convention (*PS*, Spring

1978: 203-204). Left to continue the discussion were these six groups (different conveners are in parentheses) and a seventh and new group:

- Electoral and Voting Behavior;
- Law, Courts, and Judicial Behavior (Joseph Tannenhaus);
- Legislative Processes, Behavior, and Representation;
- Federalism, Intergovernmental Relations, and Urban Politics;
- Administration, Organization, and Executives (John Kirlin);
- Political Psychology and Political Socialization; and
- Political Economy (Edward Tufte).

Still, there was no representation of political parties and interest groups.

When Leon Epstein became President-elect of the APSA in 1978 and began planning for the 1979 convention, things changed. Known for the comparative analysis of political parties, Leon asked Frank Sorauf, fellow parties scholar and Chair of the 1979 Program Committee, to explore interest in organizing a subfield around political organizations. In a personal communication, Frank admitted that he and Leon were both concerned about growing specialization in the discipline but thought that if organized subfields were inevitable, political parties and interest groups ought to be represented. Busy himself with the 1979 program, Frank sought help from others, including Kay Lawson who more than anyone became the moving force behind the effort to establish our section.

When asked to help unravel the early days of the parties and organizations section, Kay Lawson wrote in an email:

Frank Sorauf initiated POP. When Frank was APSA program chair, he thought there should be such a section and asked me to form it. As still quite junior faculty I was certainly honored and did my best. As I recall,

(Continued on page 3)

Founding POP	1, 3
From Headquarters	2
Scholarly Precincts	2, 4, 5, 6, 7
From the Field	7, 8

Chair: Russell Dalton, University of California, Irvine
Secretary-Treasurer: Holly Brasher, University of Alabama at Birmingham
VOX POP Editor: John Green, The University of Akron
Program Chair: Seth Masket, University of Denver and Jennifer Victor, University of Pittsburgh
Website Coordinator: Amy Alexander, University of California, Irvine
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL: Scott Ainsworth, University of Georgia; Lonna Rae Atkeson, University of New Mexico; Tom Carsey, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Kira Sanbonmatsu, Rutgers University; Maryann Barakso, American University; Miki Caul Kittilson, Arizona State University; Geoffrey Layman, University of Maryland; and Michael Laver, New York University.

FROM HEADQUARTERS

Letter from the Chair January 2008

The 2008 elections promise to be one of the most dramatic in American political history, and our members will be there to analyze and interpret the outcomes. Herbert Weisberg published a book that described elections as “democracy’s feast”—and we will all have more than we can eat by the time the ballots are counted.

One sign of this vitality will be the panels that Jennifer Victor and Seth Masket are assembling for the 2008 APSA meetings. The APSA panel and paper submissions are an impressive representation of the high quality work in which our section members are currently engaged. They received a healthy number of proposals: 180 paper submissions and 17 panel submissions for the 12 panels initially allocated to the section. Through panel co-sponsorships, they anticipate that POP will be represented in about 20 panels at APSA this year—a very strong presence! Some highlights include a congressional elections forecasting panel with Stephen Ansolabehere (MIT), Gary Jacobson (UCSD), Carl Klarner (Indiana State), and Thomas Mann (Brookings). In addition, POP will host a roundtable discussion on the current research on parties with John Aldrich, Kathy Bawn, Jon Bernstein, Casey Byrne Dominguez, Hans Noel, David Karol, David Mayhew, Marty Cohen, and John Zaller. We are looking forward to seeing you all in Boston.

POP’s executive committee is now discussing a proposal for the section to establish *Party Politics* as the official journal of the section. The journal’s identity closely matches the dual themes of the section. Its banner states: “An international journal for the study of political parties and political organizations.” This relationship would give new voice and visibility to the section, provide a copy of the journal along with section membership, and we expect it will increase section membership. If it comes to fruition, we would also explore initiatives to increase the visibility of the political organizations aspect of our section.

I want to point out the accompanying announcement about raising funds to endow a cash prize as part of the Leon Epstein Best Book Award from POP. The award itself acknowledges the best scholarship on political organizations and parties, as well as Leon’s contributions to the field. The cash award is an additional bonus. We hope you will consider donating to recognize Epstein’s contribution to our field and the work of future scholars.

This is also time to consider nominating books and papers for POP’s various awards. The nomination deadline is April 30th, and the explanation of each award appears on the section’s website (www.apsanet.org/~pop):

Samuel J. Eldersveld Career Achievement Award

Chair: Frank Baumgartner, frankb@la.psu.edu

Leon D. Epstein Outstanding Book Award

Chair: Herbert Kitschelt, h3738@duke.edu

Jack Walker Outstanding Article Award

Chair: Kira Sanbonmatsu, sanbon@rci.rutgers.edu

Emerging Scholars Award

Chair: Geoffrey Layman, glayman@gvpt.umd.edu

POP Best APSA Paper Award

Chair: Maryann Barakso, barakso@american.edu

In addition, if you are hosting an upcoming conference on POP themes, have a project website dealing with POP topics, or have other ideas to list under resources or news, please email our webmaster Amy Alexander (alexanda@uci.edu) and we will add them to the website.

Russell Dalton
University of California, Irvine
rdalton@uci.edu

POP /APSA Leon Epstein Fund

The effort to endow a monetary prize accompanying the Leon Epstein award has been very successful so far. We are only a few hundred dollars short of our goal. If you are interested in contributing, please send your contribution to: POP/APSA Leon Epstein Fund, Russ Dalton, Department of Political Science, School of Social Science, University of California, Irvine, 3151 Social Science Plaza, Irvine, CA 92697-5100.

List of POP Awards Committees for 2008 Nomination Deadline: April 30th, 2008

JACK L. WALKER, JR. OUTSTANDING ARTICLE AWARD

This award honors an article published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties.

Chair: Kira Sanbonmatsu, Rutgers University,
sanbon@rci.rutgers.edu

LEON D. EPSTEIN OUTSTANDING BOOK AWARD

This award honors a book published in the last two calendar years that makes an outstanding contribution to research and scholarship on political organizations and parties.

Chair: Herbert Kitschelt, Duke University,
h3738@duke.edu

SAMUEL J. ELDERSVELD AWARD

This award is to honor a scholar whose lifetime professional work has made an outstanding contribution to the field.

Chair: Frank Baumgartner, Penn State University,
frankb@la.psu.edu

EMERGING SCHOLAR AWARD

This honor is awarded to a scholar who has received his or her Ph.D. within the last seven years and whose career to date demonstrates unusual promise.

Chair: Geoffrey Layman, University of Maryland,
glayman@gvpt.umd.edu

BEST PAPER AWARD

This award honors the best paper presented on a POP panel at the preceding APSA annual meeting.

Chair: Maryann Barakso, American University,
barakso@american.edu

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS

JOURNAL SCAN

Explaining Turnout Decline in Britain, 1964-2005: Party Identification and the Political Context. *Political Behavior*, Dec. 2007, Vol 29 Issue 4, p493-516. By Health, Oliver.

Party Identification and Emotional and Political Context: A Replication. *Political Psychology*, Dec. 2007, Vol 28 Issue 6, p667-688. By Neely, Francis.

The Aggregated Consequences of Motivated Reasoning and the Dynamics of Partisan Presidential Approval. *Political Psychology*, Dec. 2007, Vol. 28 Issue 6, p719-746. By Lebo, Matthew J.; Cassino, Daniel.

Coalition-Formation and Centre-Periphery Relations in a National Political Party. *Party Politics*, Nov. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 6, p651-668. By Laffin, Martin.

Voter Support for Minor Parties. *Party Politics*, Nov. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 6, p669-693. By Borisyuk, Galina; Rallings, Colin; Thrasher, Michael; van der Kolk, Henk.

Electoral System, Party Systems. *Party Politics*, Nov. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 6, p721-740. By Pappalardo, Adriano.

JFK, LBJ, and the Democratic Party. *Party Politics*, Nov. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 6, p763. By Moran, Andrew D.

Party Movements in the United States and Canada: Strategies of Persistence. *American Journal of Sociology*, Nov. 2007, Vol 113 Issue 3, p874-876. By Minkoff, Debra.

(Continued on page 4)

FOUNDING POP (Continued from page 1)

that meant setting up some panels and starting a newsletter. I do remember very clearly indeed typing the first newsletters (and I do mean typing: on a typewriter), xeroxing what I typed, cutting it up and pasting it into columns so it would look like a “real” newsletter, xeroxing all that again, and mailing it out as widely as I could - which was, of course, done by what we now call snail mail.

Kay neglected to mention the clever tactic she employed for the 1979 convention and implemented through her dual role as organizer of our subfield and section head of the program committee. Given that scholars in political parties and interest groups were already two years behind other subfields in planning for a role in the APSA program, Kay opted to catch up by combining the initial organization meeting for the subfield, “Parties and Other Political Organizations,” with a series of seven panels under the section heading: “Parties and Other Political Organizations.” As a result, the scholars who met on Saturday, September 1, 1979 to form the subfield had, in effect, their own place in the 1979 APSA program.

Members present at the first organized subfield business meeting elected John Bibby as Chair and Kay Lawson as Secretary. John served for two years to 1981. I succeeded him and served until 1983. Kay fortunately stayed on until 1982. All three of us wrestled with three key issues confronting the group in its infancy: (1) should the group pick a name? (2) should we formally affiliate with the APSA? (3) should we start our own journal? — and (4) how should we treat voting behavior?

Name Change: Because “Parties and Other Political Organizations” was a section title for the 1979 APSA panels and the working title for the business meeting, the group took on the obvious acronym, POPO. However, POPO sounded undignified to enough members that Kay Lawson put this question to members in the group’s second newsletter:

“Do you have a new name for the sub-field?” Does the acronym POPO trouble [], amuse [], or seem unimportant [] to you? If you have thoughts on this weighty matter, please let us know (POPO Newsletter, Spring, 1981).

Kay wrote one other POPO newsletter (Spring 1980), and I wrote the third as the new Chair in November 1981. (Go to <http://www.uakron.edu/bliss/VoxPop.php> for past newsletters.) In a letter dated November 6, 1981, Kay noted that some people thought POPO “sounds sort of silly,” recalled that “the name was an accident anyway” of the 1979 section and meeting titles, and suggested that the name be changed—but noted that previous attempts generated “so much argument it wasn’t worth it.”

Kay, John Bibby, and I decided to change the name ourselves and then put the change to the membership. The next newsletter in Winter 1982, the first as *VOX POP*, began with this paragraph:

Exit POPO, Enter POP

“Parties and Other Political Organizations” seemed like a perfectly good name for our subfield when it was formed at the 1979 APSA Convention. As an acronym, however, POPO drew some snickers from members and prospective members. To fashion a more sober short name for the group with a minimum of fuss, the Chair, Secretary, and past Chair agreed to change our title to “Political Organizations/Parties.” This produced the new acronym, POP, and the new name for our Newsletter, *VOX POP*. Our trilateral action will be reviewable at our Annual Business Meeting at the 1982 APSA Convention in Denver. Friends of POPO will have their chance to undo our action, if they wish. The members accepted the name change at the 1982 business meeting.

Joining APSA: Although the APSA Council had voted to “explore” the idea of organized subfields in 1976, it did not approve of establishing “sections or organized subfields” until 1981, when it directed its staff to prepare guidelines for their organization and operation for approval at the 1982 Council Meeting (*APSR* Autumn, 1981, p. 729). The Fall 1982 issue of *VOX POP*

outlined the costs of joining (POP members must belong to the APSA) and benefits (maintenance of membership lists and mailing and preferential treatment in the annual program). That issue of *VOX POP* asked members to complete a questionnaire concerning their desire to affiliate with APSA at different rates of dues.

The Winter 1983 issue summarized responses from 49 returned questionnaires: most POP members already belonged to the APSA, were willing to pay a few dollars in dues, and offered positive comments about joining. The issue also called for more responses from the 194 members. A “special edition” of *VOX POP* in August 1983 reported that members had voted 113 to 6 in favor of section status. Accordingly, I petitioned the APSA for affiliation. POP was among the first five groups admitted in 1983 as APSA Sections. There are now 38.

Founding a Journal: Interest in publishing a journal, tentatively called *Political Organization* surfaced at the initial subfield meeting in 1979. Kay Lawson, as usual, took the lead in exploring the matter, and she reported in her second newsletter on the state of affairs at the 1980 business meeting. In May 1981, Kay submitted a formal proposal to M.I.T. Press for Publishing *Political Organization*, but the Press took no action. In the Fall/Winter 1983 issue of *VOX POP*, Bill Crotty as POP’s new Chair recounted the difficulties of “midwifing a new journal” and asked for suggestions of alternative university or commercial publishers. Despite a great deal of effort in pursuit of this avenue, POP did not succeed in publishing its own journal. (To this day, there is no journal called *Political Organization*.) However, *VOX POP* has grown beyond being a newsletter into a mini-journal. Moreover, the international journal *Party Politics* maintains links to POP and *VOX POP* on its website and sponsors the annual prize for the best paper delivered at POP panels at the APSA Annual Meeting. POP names the committee that determines the award winner. The *Party Politics* website is <http://www.partypolitics.org/>. (A proposal for a more formal association between POP and *Party Politics* is currently under discussion.)

The problem of voting behavior: The subjects of political parties and voting behavior are closely linked in American and comparative politics, and many scholars do original research on both subjects. More APSA members, however, focus on voting behavior than on political parties. Recall that the “Elections and Voting Behavior” was one of the original eleven “continuing subfields” invited to organizational meetings at the 1977 convention. Even now, that subfield is more popular. The APSA web site lists 837 members in the section on “Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior” and only 590 in POP (as of April 2007). Moreover, POP members seem more interested in their section than vice versa. According to 2004 data in the APSA’s “section by section” matrix, only 25 percent of members in the elections section belong to POP, while 34 percent of POP members belong to the elections section.

By forming POP, we aimed at creating a regular outlet for panel papers devoted to parties and other political organizations. The POPO newsletter of Winter 1981 reported on the neglect of panels on political parties and other political organizations in the official APSA programs from 1971 to 1981. In 1972 and 1973, for example, there were no sections on either political parties or political organizations and only a total of six panels in both conventions that dealt with either. The 1976 and 1978 conventions had a handful of separate panels but no sections on political organizations. By stretching the scope of POP to include public opinion and voting behavior, we feared that papers on voters would overwhelm our primary focus on political organizations. In any event, “Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior” is now an APSA section itself. It was the 32nd Section to join.

Despite getting a late start as a continuing subfield in the APSA, POP established itself quickly among the first official Sections in the Association and has flourished since. POP’s current activities are described at <http://www.apsanet.org/~pop/>.

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS (Continued from page 2)

Community Politics? Grassroots Liberal Democrats and the 2003 Scottish Parliament Elections. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, Nov. 2007, Vol 9 Issue 4, p696-712. By Clark, Alistair.

Democratization and Electoral Reform in the Asia-Pacific Region. *Comparative Political Studies*, Nov. 2007, Vol 40 Issue 11, p1350-1371. By Reilly, Benjamin.

The Growing Importance of Issue Competition: The Changing Nature of Party Competition in Western Europe. *Political Studies*, Oct. 2007, Vol. 55 Issue 3, p607-628. By Green-Pedersen, Christoffer.

When Voters and Parties Agree: Valence Issues and Party Competition. *Political Studies*, Oct. 2007, Vol. 55 Issue 3, p629-655. By Green, Jane.

Duverger's Law and the Size of the Indian Party System. *Party Politics*, Sept. 2007, Vol 13 Issue 5, p539-561. By Diwakar, Rekha.

Electoral Support for Islamic Parties in the Middle East and North Africa. *Party Politics*, Sept. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 5, p611-636. By Garcia-Rivero, Carlos; Kotzé, Hennie.

Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market. *Party Politics*, Sept. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 5, p637-639. By Goodwin, Matthew J.

Fissions and Fusions, Foes and Friends. *Comparative Political Studies*, Sept. 2007, Vol. 40 Issue 9, p1112-1137. By Rakner, Lise; Svåsand, Lars; Khembo, Nixon S.

Spatial Distribution of Political Parties in Hungary 1990-2006. *Political Geography*, Sept. 2007, Vol 26 Issue 7, p804-823. By Mészáros, József; Solymosi, Norbert; Speiser, Ferenc.

Perspectives on Democratic Consolidation in Southern Africa: The Five General Elections of 2004. *Political Geography*, Sept. 2007, Vol. 26 Issue 7, p824-850. By Lemon, Anthony.

Above the Fray? The Use of Party System References in Presidential Rhetoric. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Sept. 2007, Vol. 37 Issue 3, p399-426. By Coleman, John J.; Manna, Paul.

The Effects of Campaign Spending in the State Supreme Court Elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, Sept. 2007, Vol. 60 Issue 3, p489-499. By Bonneau, Chris W.

The Paradox of Term Limit Support. *Political Research Quarterly*, Sept. 2007, Vol. 60 Issue 3, p516-530. By Weissert, Carol S.; Halperin, Karen.

British Social Democracy Beyond New Labour: Entrenching a Progressive Consensus. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, Aug. 2007, Vol. 9 Issue 3, p346-364. By Leggett, Will.

Funding Local Political Parties in England and Wales: Donations and Constituency Campaigns. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, Aug. 2007, Vol. 9 Issue 3, p365-395. By Johnston, Ron; Pattie, Charles.

Party Politics and the Reemergence of Social Pacts in Western Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, Aug. 2007, Vol. 40 Issue 8, p971-994. By Hamann, Kerstin; Kelly, John.

A New Winning Formula? The Programmatic Appeal of the Radical Right. *Party Politics*, July 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 4, p411-435. By de Lange, Sarah L.

Legislation On Political Parties: A Global Comparison. *Party Politics*, July 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 4, p437-455. By Karvonen, Lauri.

Discipline and Party Institutionalization in Post-Soviet Legislatures. *Party Politics*, July 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 4, p456-477. By Thames, Frank C.

The Comparative Politics of Communist Euroscepticism in France, England, and Spain. *Party Politics*, July 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 4, p478-499. By Benedetto, Giacomo; Quaglia, Lucia.

Candidates or Parties? Objects of Electoral Choice in Ireland. *Party Politics*, July 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 4, p500-527. By Marsh, Michael.

Party Politics in New Zealand. *Party Politics*, July 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 4, p534-536. By Ingle, Stephen.

Strategic Party Government: Party Influence in Congress, 1789-2000. *American Journal of Political Science*, July 2007, Vol. 51 Issue 3, p464-481. By Lebo, Matthew J.; McGlynn, Adam J.; Koger, Gregory.

A Delayed Return to Historical Norms: Congressional Party Polarization after the Second World War. *British Journal of Political Science*, July 2007, Vol. 37 Issue 3, p505-531. By Han, Hahrie; Brady, David W.

Partisans, Nonpartisans, and the Antiwar Movement in the United States. *American Politics Research*, July 2007, Vol. 35 Issue 4, p431-464. By Heaney, Michael T.; Rojas, Fabio.

Retrospective and Prospective Performance Assessments during the 2004 Election Campaign: Tests of Mediation and News Media Priming. *Political Behavior*, June 2007, Vol. 29 Issue 2, p249-278. By Malhotra, Neil; Krosnick, Jon.

New Labour: The Phoenix Has Risen. *Contemporary Politics*, June 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p139-146. By Dolowitz, David P.

Party Politics and Fiscal Discipline in a Federation. *Comparative Political Studies*, June 2007, Vol. 40 Issue 6, p691-712. By Khemani, Stuti.

Two Parties, Two Types of Nominees, Two Paths to Winning a Presidential Nomination, 1972-2004. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, June 2007, Vol. 37 Issue 2, p203-227. By Berggren, Jason D.

Presidential Republics and Divided Government: Lawmaking and Executive Politics in the United States and France. *Political Science Quarterly*, Summer 2007, Vol. 122 Issue 2, p257-285. By Conley, Richard S.

A New Look at the Republican Advantage in Nonpartisan Elections. *Political Research Quarterly*, June 2007, Vol. 60 Issue 2, p240-249. By Schaffner, Brian F.; Streb, Matthew J.; Wright, Gerald C.

What Goes Around, Comes Around: Race, Blowback, and the Louisiana Elections of 2002 and 2003. *Political Research Quarterly*, June 2007, Vol. 60 Issue 2, p328-337. By Bejarano, Christina; Segura, Gary.

Party Fundraising, Descriptive Representation, and the Battle for Majority Control: Shifting Leadership Appointment Strategies in the U.S. House of Representatives, 1990-2002. *Social Science Quarterly (Blackwell Publishing Limited)*, June 2007, Vol. 88 Issue 2, p404-421. By Heberlig, Eric S.; Larson, Bruce A.

Left-Right Positions of Political Parties in Switzerland. *Party Politics*, May 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 3, p305-330. By Hug, Simon; Schulz, Tobias.

Reforming Candidate Selection Methods. *Party Politics*, May 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 3, p375-394. By Barnea, Shiomit; Rahat, Gideon.

Protestant Political Parties: A Global Survey. *Party Politics*, May 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 3, p401-403. By Van Hecke, Steven.

Prospecting for (Campaign) Gold. *American Journal of Political Science*, April 2007, Vol 51, Issue 2, p255-268. By Tam Cho, Wendy K.; Gimpel, James G.

Strategic Voting Under Conditions of Uncertainty: A Re-Evaluation of Duverger's Law. *British Journal of Political Science*, April 2007, Vol. 37 Issue 2, p313-332. By Clough, Emily.

Legislative Preferences, Political Parties, and Coalition Unity in Chile. *Comparative Politics*, April 2007, Vol 39 Issue 3, p253-272. By Aleman, Eduardo; Saiegh, Sebastian M.

Election Pledges, Party Competition, and Policymaking. *Comparative Politics*, April 2007, Vol. 39 Issue 3, p311-329. By Mansergh, Lucy; Thomson, Robert.

SCHOLARLY PRECINCTS (Continued from page 4)

Political Parties and Political Development. *Party Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p139-140. By Dalton, Russell J.; McAllister, Ian.

Reflections on Political Parties and Political Development, Four Decades Later. *Party Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p141-154. By Lapalombara, Joseph.

Political Sequences and the Stabilization of Interparty Competition. *Party Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p155-178. By Mainwaring, Scott; Zoco, Edurne.

Partisanship and Party System Institutionalization. *Party Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p179-196. By Dalton, Russell J.; Weldon, Steven.

Political Parties and Democratic Consolidation in Post-Communist Societies. *Party Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p197-216. By McAllister, Ian; White, Stephen.

Party Mobilization and Political Participation in New and Old Democracies. *Party Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p217-234. By Karp, Jeffrey A.; Banducci, Susan A.

The State and the Parties/Public Funding, Public Regulation, and Rent-Seeking in Contemporary Democracies. *Party Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p235-254. By Biezen, Ingrid Van; Kopecy, Petr.

Parties and Accountable Government in New Democracies. *Party Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p255-274. By Carey, John; Reynolds, Andrew.

Democrats, Republicans, and the Politics of Women's Place. *Party Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p275-277. By Kittilson, Miki Caul.

Political Parties in the Regions of Russia: Democracy Unclaimed. *Party Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 2, p277-279. By Hutchesson, Derek S.

In Search of An Identity: Finland's Left Alliance and the Experience of Coalition Government. *Contemporary Politics*, March 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 1, p37-55. By Dunphy, Richard.

Black Voters, Black Candidates, and Social Issues: Does Party Identification Matter? *Social Science Quarterly (Blackwell Publishing Limited)*, March 2007, Vol. 88 Issue 1, p165-176. By Kid, Quentin; Diggs, Herman; Farooq, Mehreen; Murray, Megan.

Remeasuring and Rethinking Social Cleavages in Russia: Continuity and Changes in Electoral Geography 1917-1995. *Political Geography*, Feb. 2007, Vol. 26 Issue 2, p179-208. By Perepechko, Alexander S.; Kolossov, Vladimir A.; ZumBrunnen, Craig.

The Decline of Third-Party Voting in the United States. *Journal of Politics*, Feb. 2007, Vol. 69 Issue 1, p1-16. By Hirano, Shigeo; Snyder Jr., James M.

The Variance Matters: How Party Systems Represent the Preferences of Voters. *Journal of Politics*, Feb. 2007, Vol. 69 Issue 1, p182-192. By Ezrow, Lawrence.

Making Candidates Count: The Logic of Electoral Alliances in Two-Round Legislative Elections. *Journal of Politics*, Feb. 2007, Vol. 69 Issue 1, p193-205. By Blais, André; Indridason, Indridi H.

Party Groups and Policy Positions in the European Parliament. *Party Politics*, Jan. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 1, p5-28. By McElroy, Gail; Benoit, Kenneth.

Charisma, Leader Effects and Support for Right-Wing Populist Parties. *Party Politics*, Jan. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 1, p29-51. By van der Brug, Wouter; Mughan, Anthony.

The Political Economy of Polarized Pluralism. *Party Politics*, Jan. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 1, p53-67. By Pelizzo, Riccardo; Babones, Salvatore.

The New Sub-National Politics of the British Labour Party. *Party Politics*, Jan. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 1, p88-108. By Laffin, Martin; Shaw, Eric; Taylor, Gerald.

The Front-Runner Falls: The Failure of Howard Dean. *Party Politics*, Jan. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 1, p109-126. By McSweeney, Dean.

New Labour's Pasts: The Labour Party and its Discontent. *Party Politics*, Jan. 2007, Vol. 13 Issue 1, p133-135. By Lawson, Neal.

Principle vs. Pragmatism: Policy Shifts and Political Competition. *American Journal of Political Science*, Jan. 2007, Vol. 51 Issue 1, p151-165. By Tavits, Margit.

The PM and the Pendulum: Dynamic Forecasting of British Elections. *British Journal of Political Science*, Jan. 2007, Vol. 37 Issue 1, p71-87. By Lebo, Matthew J.; Norpoth, Helmut.

Issues, Party and Character: The Moderating Role of Ideological Thinking on Candidate Evaluation. *British Journal of Political Science*, Jan. 2007, Vol. 37 Issue 1, p139-163. By Lavine, Howard; Gschwend, Thomas.

Campaign Finance Reform as Institutional Choice. *American Politics Research*, Jan. 2007, Vol. 35 Issue 1, p79-102. By Moscardelli, Vincent G.; Haspel, Moshe.

Movement Activists and Partisan Insurgents. *Studies in American Political Development*, March 2007, Vol. 21 Issue 1, p92-109. By Miroff, Bruce.

Organizational Identity as a Constraint on Strategic Action: A Comparative Analysis of Gay and Lesbian Interest Groups. *Studies in American Political Development*, March 2007, Vol. 21 Issue 1, p66-91. By Engel, Stephen M.

BOOK SCAN

The Second Civil War: How Extreme Partisanship Has Paralyzed Washington and Polarized America by Ronald Brownstein; 2007; Penguin Press HC

American Credo: The Place of Ideas in American Politics by Michael Foley; 2007; Oxford University Press, USA

Building Red America: The New Conservative Coalition and the Drive for Permanent Power by Thomas Byrne Edsall; 2007; Basic Books

The Transformation of American Politics: Activist Government and the Rise of Conservatism (Princeton Studies in American Politics) by Paul Pierson (Editor), Theda Skocpol (Editor); 2007; Princeton University Press

Issues for Debate in American Public Policy by The CQ Researcher; 2007, CQ Press; 8th Edition

American Political Parties and Elections: A Very Short Introduction (Very Short Introductions) by L. Sandy Maisel; 2007; Oxford University Press, USA

The American Presidency: A Very Short Introduction by Charles O. Jones; 2007; Oxford University Press, USA

Open Secrets of American Foreign Policy by Gordon Tullock; 2007; World Scientific Publishing Company

All in the Family: The Private Roots of American Public Policy by Patricia Strach; 2007; Stanford University Press; 1st Edition

Party Influence in Congress by Steven S. Smith; 2007; Cambridge University Press

The Fall of the American Empire by Jerry Bailey (Author); 2007; Wheatmark

American Government and the Vision of the Democrats by Mark Louis Latour (Author); 2007; University Press of America

What a Party!: My Life Among Democrats: Presidents, Candidates, Donors, Activists, Alligators and Other Wild Animals by Terry McAuliffe, Steve Kettmann; 2007; Thomas Dunne Books

Is “Indigeneity” a Method? The Making of When Parties Prosper

Kay Lawson, San Francisco State University

When Parties Prosper: The Uses of Electoral Success (Lynne Rienner: 2008), the book that Peter Merkl and I recently edited, is different in many ways from our earlier volume, *When Parties Fail: Emerging Alternative Organizations*, published twenty years ago by Princeton University Press. The most obvious difference is that this time we and our authors recognize that parties have not failed, not in the sense seemingly threatened in 1988. They certainly have not been entirely replaced by alternative forms of political organization. They still present candidates for election and campaign for them. They still provide the basic building block for the political organization of governments.

In fact, the idea for a kind of sequel to *When Parties Fail* came from Peter who was impressed by how strong parties now appear to be and how successfully in fighting off the threat we had earlier identified. We should document that, he said, and say so. I had to admit that on the face of it he seemed to be right. Still, I couldn't help but argue a bit. After all, it seems very clear that the traditional work of parties is now greatly supplemented by other organizations. In fact, in some cases they appear to have fallen completely under the control of other organizations, so that the linkage they provide is now more often to special interest and their significant donors than to citizens. I had to admit that the myth of party as linchpin of democracy had grown ever stronger, but I wondered if that was not in inverse proportion to the diminished truth of that myth. Maybe what we need to explore was not whether parties were, after all, succeeding, but rather whether they were *prospering*, that is to say, doing the job of winning office very well, but at the same time not really very good at doing what we political scientists always tell our students they do: providing democratic linkage between citizen and state.

Now we could have focused just on the American case, but Peter and I are comparatists: we definitely wanted to look more widely. What characterizes the behavior of political parties that routinely win elections – or heavily influence the outcome of elections in multiparty systems – in today's very different world? What do the people who know them best think are their most important traits?

Some questions can be answered quite straightforwardly and relatively easily. There may be a sufficient body of research on the matter so that all that is necessary is to develop a few indices as to what would constitute sufficient signs one's idea is true and then check out the literature. One may have a proclivity for one kind of data over another or be fairly open to data gathered by a wide range of methods (as in fact I think both Peter and I tend to be). In any case, by playing fair indices, the data available, and the rules of logic and probability, one will surely arrive at some “findings,” even if not the ones hoped for.

Of course it may be the case that existent data just isn't good enough and new data is needed. But this too is possible. If, for example, the matter at hand has not been sufficiently researched but is nonetheless quite straightforward and the idea one has applies to a relatively small world with which one is familiar (e.g. the newly elected appear to have been less corrupt than incumbents in one's home town's municipal council for the past two years: is it so?), then one may be able to gather convincing data to give a convincing answer, without exhausting self or budget. And even if the hypothesis of choice applies to a much larger universe (e.g., guessing that the newly elected have been less corrupt than incumbents in the municipal councils of this country for the past five years), one may still be able to develop one's own data, cleverly amassing the research funds and the research team, and drawing on one's own impressive managerial skills.

But suppose one is puzzled and intrigued by a question about a very complex political phenomenon, such as political parties, found almost everywhere in the world? Suppose, further one knows this phenomenon is always profoundly shaped by the very different cultural-socio-economic-political contexts in which it functions, and, furthermore, that in recent years new and powerful worldwide forces have been added to the mix, further shaping

the contexts in which parties operate, in addition to the typical endogenous forces. How can one possibly know and judge all the factors that impinge on parties, and determine how and why some are strong (prospering) and some are not?

This kind of puzzle requires quite a different approach, and goals that are both more grandiose and more modest. Of course one could find a way to reduce the problem to proportions manageable by the usual methods. Leave out context. Leave out worldwide forces. Refuse to be troubled by the suspicion that something big is going on across the globe, interacting with context in all its complexity to cough up a brand new world of politics. Look for variables that are measurable and distinct (we can call them MDV's) and trim one's sails accordingly. That's a different kind of modesty, and it often produces some very interesting results. One can, for example, provide clear and persuasive answers to quite a few questions about the nature of parties today by doing just that. It is, after all, what most party scholars do.

But if one knows that the answers acquired this way will leave out a host of TMs (thoroughly mixed up variables) that can never be separated out and properly measured because that is just not the way they work—painfully complex variables like political history, the distribution of wealth, the oh so variable power of each nation, the worldwide spread of a new technology—in short, variables that interact differently in every place and at every moment of time, and surely influence the nature and role of many contemporary political phenomena, including political parties, what then? Choosing MDV's that capture only some aspects of the problem may very well mean leaving out what may be more powerfully explanatory factors than anything can be handled in the usual ways.

Perhaps it is time to try “indigeneity.”

Indigeneity means relying on those who know first hand and leaving them free to say what they have to say. It does not mean trying to develop a research scheme built around MDV's, guessing what the answers might be and then asking indigenous scholars to find out if you are right. That is not real indigeneity. Real indigeneity requires a different kind of modesty, one American political scientist in particular may find it difficult to muster—or even to believe in. It is almost certainly not going to lead to the same degree of certainty political scientists now normally like to have. But it does offer the possibility of finding some interesting answers to some very interesting questions while at the same time giving new reasons for believing they are true.

How does it work? Pose a deliberately large and even ambiguous question. (In our case, the question was simply this: tell us about the party in your nation that most consistently wins elections and say whether or not you think it is prospering.) Get answers from as many different nations as you reasonably can, always from scholars who know their countries *from the inside*. When the results are in, let the chapters talk to you. Read them over and over again—not to find ways to reshape them into what you expected but rather just to see what, altogether, they are telling you. What is the *ubertext*? When you think you have it, write it down, document it from the chapters (adding perhaps, as Peter does so impressively well in his chapter, examples from what you yourself have learned, elsewhere). Say exactly what you think, but then hope that others who read the book will challenge you by doing the same thing, possibly discovering similarities or differences you failed to notice.

Is indigeneity a method? Or too simple to count as one? Well, it is perhaps as much an anti-method as a method, but it is not, after all, all that simple. In the first place, it isn't that easy to find indigenous scholars well reputed for the work they have done on the parties of their own nations who are willing to join such a project—especially if one is determined to include as many non-western as western nations and does not pay the authors or give them simple and straightforward guidelines. But the main reason indigeneity is not “too simple” is that in fact it excludes nothing a priori. Every author can include all the thoroughly mixed up variables he or she knows about and thinks matters, *in and for the case at hand*.

In his concluding chapter, assessing what authors have to tell us about how parties have changed in response to a changed world, Peter notes many

interesting and important differences. In my own I find four quite striking similarities. I argue that what do many different case studies focusing on how parties prosper at the polls reveal is how common it now is for parties across the globe to serve as agencies not of democratization, but of de-democratization.

Specifically, I argue that these chapters show that parties everywhere have strengthened their own leadership at the expense of their members and supporters, have become ever more committed to campaigning to the center regardless of their original program and its continued appeal to their members and supporters, and have learned to use power ever more effectively to enact self-protective legislation and—in most but not all the cases—to engage in practices of personal corruption. These acts contribute to electoral success, but they are also undeniably acts of de-democratization. They make it more difficult for citizens across the political spectrum to control and guide their political leaders via the vote, to create effective new parties when existent parties cease to please, and to ensure that the funds of government are used for public good rather than for personal enrichment. Parties are, in these ways, being transformed from agents of democratic linkage between citizens and the state to agents of de-democratization.

It's a strong claim, and after reading the book, you may not agree with me. You may or may not agree with Peter. We may be wrong and even some of our authors may think so (all of them carefully employ more familiar methods, methods that work very well inside single nations). Indigeneity does not offer editors much by way of foolproof insurance. But it offers them and the readers of books so designed the opportunity to take on large, contemporary, and significant questions and consider what those who ought really to know, *from the inside*, have to say about them.

Here is our Table of Contents:

When Parties Prosper: The Uses of Electoral Success, by Kay Lawson and Peter H. Merkl

Part 1 — Parties on the Left

Britain's New Labour Party: Prospering in an Anti-party Climate, by David McKay

Sweden: Still a Stable Party System?, by Tommy Moller

European Social Democracy: Failing Successfully, by William E. Paterson and James Sloam

Poland's Democratic Left Alliance: Beyond Postcommunist Succession, by Hieronim Kubiak

The Lithuanian Social Democrats: A Prosperous Postcommunist Party, by Algis Krupavicius

The Uruguayan Party System: Transition Within Transition, by Jorge Lanzaro

Part 2 — Parties on the Right

Germany's Christian Democrats: Survivors in a Secular Society, by Frank Bosch

Japan: Why Parties Fail, Yet Survive, by Haruhiro Fukui

Russia's Political Parties: Deep in the Shadow of the President, by Natoly Kulik

Mexico: Helping the Opposition Prosper, by Mark A. Martinez

Israel's Shas: Party Prosperity and Dubious Democracy, by Yael Yishai

Chile, From Individual Politics to Party Militancy, by Alfredo Joignant and Patricio Navia

Part 3 — Comparing Opposing Parties

Italy: A Tale of Two Parties, by Gianfranco Pasquino

France: Antisystem Parties vs. Government Parties, by Florence Haegel and Marc Lazar

The U.S. Two-Party System: Using Power to Prosper, by Robin Kolodny

Part 4 — Conclusions

Becoming the Party of Government, by Peter H. Merkl

When Parties De-democratize, by Kay Lawson

Papers of Interest

2007 American Political Science Association Annual Meeting (Continued from Volume 26, Issue 2)

"Candidate Perceptions of Campaign Financing in State Legislative Elections." Keith E. Hamm, Rice University and Robert E. Hogan, Louisiana State University.

"The Democratic Party Coalition: A Social Network Analysis of Leadership PACs, Party Committees and Interest Groups." Casey Byrne Dominguez, University of San Diego.

"Who Gives? Political Party Donations in Institutional and Cultural Context." Susan Scarrow, University of Houston.

"The Transformation of Chilean Party System and Post Transition Political Stability." Pierre Ostiguy, Northwestern University.

"When Do Parties Compete? Party Formation and Conflict in Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Kenya." Adrienne LeBas, Michigan State and Oxford Universities.

"Federalized Party Systems: Patterns of Competition and Hegemony." Edward Gibson, Northwestern University and Julieta Suarez Cao, Northwestern University.

"Party System Institutionalization and the Level of Democracy." Frank C. Thomas, Texas Tech University and Joe Robbins, Texas Tech University.

"Getting into the Voting Rights Act: The Availability of Translated Registration Materials and its Impact on Minority Voter Registration and Participation." Israel S. Waismel-Manor, University of Haifa and Michael A. Jones-Correa, Cornell University.

"County-Level Implementation of the Help America Vote Act and its Impact on Voter Turnout." Anne E. Baker, University of Notre Dame.

"The Effect of Voter Identification Requirements on Turnout." Delia Bailey, California Institute of Technology and Jonathan N. Katz, California Institute of Technology.

"Convenience Voting Reforms and Voting Turnout." Paul Gronke, Reed College and Priscilla L. Southwell, University of Oregon.

"The Effect of Voter Identification Laws on Turnout." Jason D. Mycoff, University of Delaware: Michael W. Wagner, University of Delaware and David C. Wilson, University of Delaware.

"Voting When Few Care and Most Don't Know: Voter Decision Making in School Board Election." Gary W. Copeland, University of Oklahoma and Gregg Garn, University of Oklahoma.

"Who Votes When?: Voter History and the Dynamics of Turnout." Daniel Schlozman, Harvard University and Ian Brett Yohai, Harvard University.

"Urban Form and Political Inequality: How Metropolitan Fragmentation Impacts Electoral Turnout in the U.S." Michael Latner, University of California, Irvine and Jefferey M. Sellers, University of Southern California.

"Voting During Change: The Contextual Effects of Individual Political Participation in a New Chicago." Ryan Donald Enos, University of California, Los Angeles.

"The Impact of Public Financing Programs in Municipal Elections: Evidence from New York and Los Angeles." Brian E. Adams, San Diego State University.

"Cowboys Can't Be Gay! The Politics of Brokeback Mountain Parodies." Charlotte Lee Ridge, University of Iowa.

"The Majority Party and 'the Cohesive Power of Public Plunder.'" Henry A. Kim, University of California, San Diego and Royce A. Carroll, Rice University.

"Political Parties and Ideology: War as a Casual Factor." Robert P. Saldin, University of Virginia.

"Show Me The Money: Political Parties and the Strategic Allocation of Resources." Brian J. Brox, Tulane University.

"Can Where People Vote Influence How They Vote? The Influence of Polling Location Type on Voting Behavior." Marc Meredith, Stanford GSB.

"Party Organization and Partisanship." George Kernell, Columbia University.

"Party Organization Culture." Shannon Jenkins, University of Massachusetts and Douglas D. Roscoe, University of Massachusetts.

FROM THE FIELD (Continued from page 7)

- "Discursive Practice and Environmental Politics: Enacting Democracy in Social Change Nonprofits." Jennifer Doge, New York University.
- "Interest Group Discourses of Gender, Race, and Class in the 2005 Social Security Debates." Susanne Beechy, George Washington University.
- "The Changing Family Values Spin: The Christian Right's Turn Toward Public Reason." Nathaniel Klemp, Princeton University.
- "Religious Groups Are Different: How to Study and Learn from The Prophetic Impulse." Paul A. Djupe, Denison University and Jacob R. Neheisel, Denison University.
- "Media Amplification of Interest Group Voices: The Supply Side of Expert Sourcing." Matt Grossmann, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Voter's Information, Electoral Competition and the Influence of Interest Groups in the United States." Tim Wegenast, Universitat Pompeu Fabra and Tobias Hofmann, Free University of Berlin.
- "Why Protest Supporters Don't (always) Show Up: Mobilization Deficit in a Comparative and Empirical Perspective." Stefaan Walgrave, University of Antwerp and Joris Verhulst, University of Antwerp.
- "Multi-Media Communication Strategies: Interest Groups, Information, and the Public." Melissa K. Poague, University of Washington.
- "How Business Lobbying is Affected by the Policy Environment and Industry Changes." Henry E. Brady, University of California, Berkeley; Lee Drutman, University of California; Sidney Verba, Harvard University and Kay Lehman Schlozman, Boston College.
- "The Patient Interest Group Phenomenon: Politics, Research, and Expertise in Disease Advocacy." Ann C. Keller, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Impact of the Interest Group Testimony on Lawmaking in Congress." Nina Therese Kasniunas, Loyola University of Chicago.
- "The Social Embeddedness of Lobbying." John C. Scott, Cornell University.
- "Do Amicus Briefs Advocating Decision Reversal Outweigh Those Advocating Affirmation?" Amy Melissa McKay, University of Iowa.
- "Why Primaries? A Theory of Endogenous Party Democratization." Gilles A. Serra, Harvard University.
- "The Legacy of Dictatorship for Democratic Parties in Latin America." Barbara Geddes, University of California, Los Angeles and Erica Emily Frantz, University of California, Los Angeles.

- "Class Politics and Left Parties in Contemporary South America." Samuel Paltiel Handlin, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Party System Transformation: Venezuela's Party System Collapse in Comparative Perspective." Jana Morgan, University of Tennessee.
- "Institutional Change? An Analysis of Violence and Other Factors on Political Party Systems in Latin America." Stella M. Rouse, Louisiana State University.
- "The Historical Evolution of the Permanent Campaign: Presidents, Fundraising, and The Electoral College." Brendan J. Doherty, U.S. Naval Academy.
- "The Rise and Conundrum of Muslim Democrats in Turkey." Gunes Murat Tezcur, Loyola University, Chicago.
- "Religion and Politics in the Indonesian Party System: Explaining the Lack of Success of Radical Islamic Parties." Mirjam Kunkler, Columbia University.
- "Islamic Parties and Democracy in Bangladesh." Ali Riaz, Illinois State University.
- "Electoral Platforms, Ideologies, and Strategies: Hamas and the 2006 Palestinian Legislative Elections." Manal A. Jamal, University of California, Berkeley.
- "Le Grand Consensus Seculaire? Islam, Party Politics, and Democracy in Mali." Matthias Basedau, German Institute of Global and Area Studies.
- "Why Flip-Flopping Works: The Limits of Reputational Constraints Explained." David Karol, University of California, Davis.
- "Political Parties' Strategic Response to Electoral Loss." Josephine T. Andrews, University of California, Davis; Robert W. Jackman, University of California, Davis and Zeynep Somer-Topcu, University of California, Davis.
- "Issue Change in Major Parties: The Dynamic Reciprocal Relationship between Party Strategy and Public Opinion." Antje V. Schwennicke, Indiana University.
- "Relative Extremism and Relative Moderation: Strategic Party Positioning in Democratic Systems." Paul V. Warwick, Simon Fraser University and Emily Clough, University of North Texas.
- "The Role of Campaigns in the 2006 Election." Kim L. Fridkin, Arizona State University.
- "Parties, Interest Groups, and the Effectiveness of Voter Contracting: 1956-2004." Daniel C. Reed, University of Georgia.
- "The De-institutionalization of Russian Politics: Where Have All the Parties Gone?" Kathryn E. Stoner-Weiss, Stanford University.



Ray C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics
Akron, OH 44325-1914

FIRST CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
THE UNIVERSITY OF
AKRON

Vox Pop is an abbreviation of the Latin phrase Vox Populi meaning the voice of the people, and the opinion of the man & woman on the street. We don't need MPs to represent us now we can represent ourselves. In pre-internet times, it made sense to elect one person to represent our views in the House of Commons, but technology has moved on and direct democracy is now a real possibility, where everyone's voice can be heard. Vox pops videos are always produced by compiling clips from these intercept interviews. This means the final videos have a very distinct style. Interviewees aren't airbrushed and wearing make-up. Instead, they are often windswept and carrying shopping. Passers-by in the background also make it obvious that the respondent hasn't been pre-recruited or vetted on what to say, which is particularly important if the video is being used for market research. Vox populi (/ˈvɒks ˈpɒpjuːli, -lə/ VOKS POP-yoo-lee, -lə) is a Latin phrase that literally means "voice of the people". It is used in English in the meaning "the opinion of the majority of the people". In journalism, vox pop or man on the street refers to short interviews with members of the public. American television personality Steve Allen as the host of The Tonight Show further developed the "man on the street" interviews and audience-participation comedy breaks that have become commonplace on vox pop definition: 1. the opinions of people recorded talking informally in public places 2. a broadcast for radio or TV. Learn more. Meaning of vox pop in English. vox pop. noun. UK informal. uk. Your browser doesn't support HTML5 audio. /ˈvɒks ˈpɒp/ us.