Political Studies Association

Political Studies REVIEW

Article

Political Studies Review
1–13
© The Author(s) 2016
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1478929916644868
psrev.sagepub.com

Political Parties and Interest Organizations at the Crossroads: Perspectives on the Transformation of Political Organizations

Bert Fraussen and Darren R Halpin

Abstract
This article reviews the case for considering the study of parties and interest organizations together, under the umbrella of "political organizations." While both literatures are rather disconnected at the moment, we believe that they share many commonalities. A common narrative involves the apparent transformation of parties and interest organizations, as both organizations are continuously adapting to changing environments. In this review, we integrate both literatures and assess arguments for organizational convergence vis-à-vis claims of continuing diversity. Building upon recent work that takes a more joined-up approach, we advance a common research agenda that demonstrates the value and feasibility of studying these organizations in tandem.

Keywords
political organizations, political parties, interest groups, interest organizations

Accepted: 4 March 2016

Scholars of political parties and interest organizations increasingly seem to grapple with very similar questions, such as the evolving position of these organizations between society and state, the difficulties of engaging citizens and the extent to which external factors, such as state regulation and mediatization, shape organizational structures and practices. So far, unfortunately, a lack of engagement across the party and interest organization literatures has resulted in highly informative yet parallel conversations on what might productively be conceptualized as the same basic trends or processes. We believe our understanding of the organizational form and development of interest organizations and political parties would be advanced substantially by addressing them under the broader

Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia

Corresponding author:
Darren R Halpin, Australian National University, Haydon Allen Building, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia.
Email: darren.halpin@anu.edu.au

gauge phenomenon of "political organizations." While we can think of many areas in which such a combined effort could be highly productive, its value is particularly apparent for understanding their organizational transformation or how they respond to changes in political systems and society. This is a crucial question as it addresses their critical role as intermediaries between citizens and the state and how they make trade-offs between a solid embeddedness in society and a strong representation at the political level. To demonstrate how insights from both literatures can be integrated, we evaluate the discussion of organizational forms and development in both literatures and put forward an avenue for a combined research agenda, applying a constituency-oriented approach.

We seek to connect with a long-standing tradition in political science of discussing political organizations as forms or types of political linkage (see, for instance, Key, 1942; Schattschneider, 1948). Given the high level of similarities, not only in organizational form but also in the external challenges that they face, we believe studying political parties and interest organizations in tandem can deliver more insights into the nature and evolution of these organizations. The decisions that both types of organizations make vis-à-vis their organizational structure and activities, for instance, are strongly shaped by the behavior of other actors in their environment, including other political organizations. As David Easton (1971) argued several decades ago:

> The political situation may be the point of intersection of the activities of several formal non-governmental organizations. The leadership in a large interest group is constantly confronted with the need to make a decision which, ultimately through the political process, affects authoritative policy. In making such decisions, the leadership must take into account the threat to itself of the existence of various external and internal groups such as parties, other interest groups, and semi-organized competing leadership groups within its own organization (Easton, 1971).

Our argument seems timely as scholars of various disciplines have observed the segregation between both literatures and called for a return to the thread of pre-war political science where groups and parties were viewed as obvious comparators (e.g. Mudge and Chen, 2014; Tichenor and Harris, 2005). Furthermore, we believe that previous work has convincingly demonstrated the added value of applying a "political organizations" lens and considering the behavior of a range of political organizations (e.g. Burstein and Linton, 2002; Maisel and Berry, 2012; Wilson, 1974), while more recently some scholars have started addressing specific topics (such as membership, for example, Gauja, 2015a; or coalitions, for example, Heaney, 2012) from the perspective of political organizations, rather than that of political parties or interest organizations.

While it has inherent difficulties, we argue it makes sense to treat political organizations as a class of organization because there are clear similarities in their core tasks and the challenges they face. It is of course important to retain distinctions between interest organizations, political parties, not-for-profits (NFPs) and social movement organizations (SMO), but these do not in our view preclude aggregating upward when seeking explanations of, for instance, organizational change and transformation. We suggest that a basis for proceeding with a broader focus on "political organizations" could include that they have in common (1) a position outside of the private sector and the public sector, (2) a presumption to seek to advocate politically for a constituency or a cause and (3) a need to address three organizational tasks of (a) mobilizing support/members, (b) seeking political influence/re-election and (c) securing organizational survival.

Our "class" of political organizations involves the study of parties, on one hand, and a range of other organizations—such as non-profits, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society organizations, SMOs and interest organizations—which we group under the label of "interest organizations." In recent decades, rather distinct sub-literatures concerning these latter organizations have developed (including specific field-related concepts and journals), as scholars focused on the organization and activities of non-profits, civil society organizations, social movements (SMs), NGOs and interest organizations. Focusing on the broad "third sector" research field, it has been argued that "each research tradition focuses on an organizational form that is dominant and characteristic of the class of organizations it studies, and this form drives much of the research enterprise" (Hasenfeld and Gidron, 2005: 98). Painting with a very broad brush, one could say that where non-profit scholars focus on legal definitions and tax status, SM researchers emphasize the aims and methods of protest and social change, while civil society scholars emphasize participation and horizontal networking among citizens (for a more detailed discussion, see Beyers et al., 2008b: 1109–1111). Still, some suggest that "as they evolve over time, [third sector organizations] incorporate multiple purposes and structural features from all three prevailing forms" (Hasenfeld and Gidron, 2005: 98; see also Billis, 2010). Earlier work also underlines the difficulty of distinguishing SMs from interest organizations, as similar groups are being classified in different ways by various observers (Burstein, 1998; McAdam et al., 1996: 27, cited in Burstein and Linton, 2002: 392). Hence, while sound arguments can be made for distinguishing these different political actors, when empirically mapping their central organizational features, differences seem in fact rather limited (see, for instance, Salamon and Anheier, 1996, on NFPs; Diani, 2003, on SMOs; and Jordan et al., 2004, on interest organizations). Indeed, in organizational terms, they are commonly accepted as being formal organizations that share a collective nature (have members/affiliates/a constituency) and do not take part in elections, while they are neither a component of government nor part of the private sector (see Halpin, 2010: Chapter 2 for a more sophisticated discussion; see also Beyers et al., 2008b).

Adopting this (deliberately integrative) definition of interest organizations, one critical distinction with political parties would be that these organizations do not seek political office or compete in elections, and therefore are dependent on interactions with policy-makers in order to shape policy. Notwithstanding this important difference, several authors have observed many commonalities between interest organizations and political parties. Burstein and Linton (2002: 381–382), for instance, observe that these organizations perform fairly similar tasks, as they "define public problems, propose solutions, aggregate citizen's policy preferences, mobilize voters, make demands of elected officials, communicate information about government action to their supporters and the larger public, and make relatively coherent legislative action possible." In a similar fashion, while acknowledging differences in their main activities (in particular, seeking public office by contesting elections), Allern and Bale (2012b: 9–10) note that "both parties and interest organizations aggregate individual interests and preferences into collective demands and seek to influence the form and content of public policy, and both terms exclude entities like latent social groups and totally unorganized groups of individuals." We believe that there is sufficient common ground to study the organization and development of political parties and interest organizations in tandem.

Much recent work suggests that many of the aforementioned classes of political organization have experienced organizational transformation and convergence and that this is

due—among other things—to the increasing reliance among such organizations on the state for resources, legitimacy and assurances of survival, rather than a solid embeddedness in society. As we will discuss in more detail below, this basic analysis is found in the specialist party, NFP, SMO and interest group literatures. This account has, understandably and rightly, been subject to significant counter-claim, as some have pointed out that there is still much variation in the organizational design of political organizations. We do not intend to resolve this discussion here. However, the observation that we are all engaged in debates over similar macro-processes and organizational-level responses indicates that we might profit from more consciously developing and sharing theoretical and conceptual approaches. Apart from empirical reasons for working across the full gamut of political organizations, there are also theoretical and conceptual benefits. From our vantage point as predominantly interest group scholars, we see a party literature with some great strengths: for instance, the existence of well-defined party forms and well-crafted, coded and readily available datasets. We concur with Beyers et al. (2008a: 1300) who argued that

> the development of operational concepts for measuring the number of relevant parties or party system fragmentation as well as joint endeavours studying party manifestos contributed in important ways to the accumulation of knowledge on how parties work in very different contexts (Beyers et al., 2008a: 1300).

We also see an SMO literature that benefits from a strong theoretical tradition and that has firm links to broader organizational theories (e.g. resource mobilization, ecological and institutional; see, for instance, Soule, 2012; Soule and King, 2008). The hotly contested debate over the apparent transformation of parties and interest organizations provides, in our view, an ideal canvas to demonstrate the value of the comparative study of political organizations.

The Convergence of Political Organizations or the Persistence of Multiple Organizational Forms?

One crucial element that all these literatures seem to share is a strong debate around the (apparent) transformation of political organizations. We argue that it is possible to identify highly influential accounts in all genres that point to the usurping of some "gold standard" of political organization and its replacement with some kind of professionalized variant. Sub-literatures seem to almost uniformly debate the transformation of historically dominant political organizational forms—key features include a democratic and participatory style, as well as a de-centralized structure with local chapters, and a reliance on civil society resources—toward a "new" form which is better adapted to contemporary conditions and characterized by a key role for professional staff, a centralized structure, more remote members or supporters, and increased reliance on alternative, non-member sources of income. Following this narrative, which is found in accounts across the full range of political organizations, it seems that the political leverage of contemporary political organizations mainly relates to "their ability to raise funds (including from the public purse), to employ highly professionalized staff, and to engage the resources of professional lobbyists and campaigners," making politics "a battle between groups of professionals who claim to represent certain (ever more heterogeneous) constituencies but who are no longer socially or organizationally tied to them" (Van Biezen and Poguntke, 2014:

213). Or, as phrased by Hilgartner and Bosk (1988: 57), “not all the actors who market social problems can be considered ‘activists’. For some, social problems are just another day at the office.” In this section, we clarify this narrative, which is present in both the political party and interest organizations literature (although the former offers a more elaborated account of this process), and explore to what extent this perspective understates the organizational diversity of contemporary political organizations.

The party literature, for instance, has discussed the “decline” or “failure” of parties (see Lawson, 1988; for more recent discussions, see Bardi et al., 2014a, 2014b) and has utilized several distinctions to designate different party forms or models: elite/cadre party, the mass party, the catch-all party and the cartel party (see Blyth and Katz, 2005; Katz and Mair, 1995). To crudely summarize, a key element of the transformation to a cartel party form is about seeking state support—as opposed to seeking to mobilize the “base”—as a way of securing party organizational survival. These models, or forms of party, are often presented within a period-based argument—each form is replaced by a new dominant form. While it is the case that this account is interpreted as a claim that parties—and party systems—move in lock-step along this trajectory, Katz and Mair explain that in applying these to individual cases “these models represent heuristically convenient polar types, to which individual parties may approximate more or less closely at any given time” (Katz and Mair, 1995: 19). Thus, “contemporary parties are not necessarily wholly cartel parties any more than parties in previous generations were wholly elite parties, or wholly mass parties, or wholly catch-all parties” (Katz and Mair, 1995: 19).[1] The point is that one form or another might be considered an optimally adapted *generic* form, but the extent to which it summarizes the precise *empirical* form of specific parties is an open question (see also Koole, 1996).

Likewise, highly influential accounts point to a series of generational shifts in the structures of interest organizations, suggesting that changing conditions are conspiring to undermine their role as democratic agents. McCarthy and Zald (1977) described the increasingly defunct nature of the “classical” SMO, which they saw being replaced by a “professional” SMO form (characterized by a reliance on paid leaders and broad support from “conscience constituents” who provide money but do not otherwise get involved). More recently, both Robert Putnam (2000) and Theda Skocpol (1999) have made similar observations about civil society organizations. According to the latter, the groups formed in the early 1900s (based on local branch structures and face-to-face membership engagement) have been transformed into centralized organizations run by professional staff. These organizations are often empty of membership involvement and characterized by a single-issue policy agenda, leading to a “diminished democracy” (Skocpol, 2003) in which integrative policy capacities, important to strategic policymaking and good governance, are lost. Furthermore, the advent of direct mail and other recruitment processes has, it is argued, undermined the logic of a “membership” model and supported a “professionalized” model, that is best exemplified by “relatively centralized and professionally led organizations focused on policy lobbying and education” (Skocpol, 1999: 471; for similar observations on contemporary environmental organizations, see Bosso, 2005; Jordan and Maloney, 1997).[2] The NFP literature is also well versed in contemplating the implications of shifting levels of reliance on the state for resources. More specifically, various authors have demonstrated the double-edged nature of these relations with pubic authorities: while they are often beneficial to professionalization, they can also result in a loss of organizational autonomy and a decreased sensitivity to an organization’s constituency (e.g. Mosley, 2012; Nikolic and Koontz, 2008; Schmid and Almog-Bar, 2014;

Verschuere and De Corte, 2014). Furthermore, accounts about non-profits becoming more business-like echo many of the processes described above, such as an increased reliance on paid staff and a reduced role for volunteers (due to limited opportunities for internal democracy), and ultimately threaten the social goods which non-profit organizations (NPOs) can provide (Maier et al., 2014: 13).

In sum, both interest organizations and political parties seem to replace "old" styles of organizing with forms that provide a better fit with contemporary conditions. These so-called professionalized and centralized models are geared more toward lobbying activities and securing close relations with government officials and politicians (rather than providing services or building a strong local presence). Yet, we believe that this particular transformation touches only upon one single trend that applies to a particular (and in our view, limited) set of political organizations, rather than the overall population of parties or organized interests. Indeed, various authors have queried the empirical accuracy of this account, arguing that "large, affluent and heavily professionalized" groups are only "a tiny proportion of the total population," and in this way have discounted the period-based arguments made by other authors (Edwards and McCarthy, 2004: 136). One reason for the contradiction, they argue, is that scholars have a propensity to study what they are familiar with. And often, findings from these particular groups become incorporated into the literature as broader trends or findings. As John McCarthy (2005) points out:

> Widespread images of SMOs *without members* and with *checkbook members* have drawn attention away from both an empirical and a theoretical focus on more traditional SMO forms, and, as a result, have provided a distorted picture of the recent evolution of the population of national SMOs (McCarthy, 2005: 195; emphasis in original).

Based on analysis of the US national SMOs, he concludes that the "rate of founding of federated SMOs with members has not declined during the past several decades as the focus upon the emergence of professional SMOs has suggested" (McCarthy, 2005: 205). Other work focused on this topic has also questioned the empirical accuracy of the transformation account, finding a continued diversity of organizational forms within the interest group landscape, as well as a possible complementarity or mutualism between membership and non-membership groups (Minkoff et al., 2008; Walker et al., 2011). In short, populations do not seem to be changing complexion, but when one stumbles across contemporary "memberless" groups, they are conveniently interpreted as part of a broader shift. For this reason, we urge for a greater sensitivity to differences in organizational forms and variance in organizational trajectories.

The party literature also bore witness to a critical discussion about whether the shift to cartel parties is irresistible (for a recent systematic assessment of the cartel-argument, see Van Biezen and Kopecky, 2014). The evidence of declining memberships and atrophying internal party organization led some to suggest that the party was losing its role as a linkage between civil society and the state. For some, the attention was toward other types of political organizations, such as interest organizations (Hirst, 1994; Katz, 2014; Merkl, 1988). Recent research strikes a somewhat different tone. For instance, there is skepticism as to whether parties can rely on stronger linkages with civil society organizations (so-called "collateral organizations") in order to increase their social anchorage or representative capacity, as the latter appear subject to similar processes of professionalization (e.g. Van Biezen and Poguntke, 2014). Other work questions the universal nature of membership decline among parties. In addition, the evolution of a party's membership base

(and its importance to organizational survival) seems closely related to its life-cycle (Kölln, 2014). More generally, in their seminal article, Katz and Mair made clear that their models did not imply a straightforward shift toward one dominant form. They also criticized the use of the mass party as the main benchmark as it "fails to take account of the ways in which parties can *adapt* to ensure their own survival" (Katz and Mair, 1995: 25; emphasis added). For instance, rather than seeing the (formal) membership decline of political parties as indicative of organizational decline or their "hollowing out," changing models of policy development and internal decision-making (with a greater reliance on supporters and groups within the broader community) could be considered as attempts to develop a more "open party" and create issue-based communities, and therefore represent part of a trajectory of organizational adaptation to changed patterns of citizen participation (Gauja, 2015b, see also Saward, 2008). Work on the organizational structure of new parties has also demonstrated considerable diversity in organizational forms, for instance, distinguishing between hierarchy, stratarchy and federation (Bolleyer, 2012). This is a thread that ought to be more closely followed up and might inform our approach to the study of political organizations more generally.

Toward a Common Research Agenda of Political Organizations

In a special issue focused on the state of interest group research in Europe, Jan Beyers et al. (2008a) argued that

> a more thorough comparative analysis of political parties and interest organizations would be instructive in order to examine both *the specific features of each type of political organisation* and *the interaction between and among them*. Such an integrated approach would represent an important advance beyond the isolated focus on single types of political organisation (Beyers et al., 2008a: 1120; emphasis added).

A similar argument was made by Michael Heaney (2012: 569) in his review of the literature on parties and interest organizations in the United States. He concluded that while

> a substantial body of political science research explores the linkage between political parties and interest groups […] the perspective that parties and groups *are inextricably bound* has not been a part of the dominant paradigm either in the study of parties or in the study of groups in recent years (Heaney, 2012: 569; emphasis added).

The "complex relationships" between these organizations have received much more scholarly attention in recent times (see, for instance, the special issue of *Party Politics* by Allern and Bale, 2012b; Bawn et al., 2012; Berkhout, 2013; Karol, 2009; Witko, 2009; see also Heaney and Rojas, 2015; Schwartz, 2010 on the interaction between SMs and political parties). In contrast, much less progress has been made in examining what Beyers et al. referred to as "the specific features of each type of political organization," their organizational form and development. This omission is not unique to political science; in studies of "organizations" in a more generic sense, interactions between organizations and their external environment have generally received closer examination compared to their internal structures and processes (e.g. Argote and Greve, 2007: 344). In the closing section of this article, we formulate a research agenda that aims to address this

omission, one that we believe would stimulate the development of theoretical frameworks that could guide the analysis and comparison of organizational forms and assessments of organizational transformation.

One productive way forward is to consider the manner by which particular constituencies (or interests) are organized politically and to describe and analyze their organizational repertoires. Instead of taking the "group landscape" or party system as the point of departure, the starting points are constituencies or societal interests, which may associate and mobilize politically in a great variety of forms. This "constituency-oriented approach" asks what set of organizations is involved with the articulation of a given set of interests. We find traces of this approach in the observation that "the articulation of interests refers to the role played by parties and other institutions (typically single issue interest groups or social movements) in publicly expressing and pursuing the political demands of social groups" (Webb and White, 2009: 15). This approach is broadly evident through work on the US context charting the emergence of specific ways of organizing politically (Clemens, 1997) and more specific studies of organizational forms, for instance, consumer groups (Rao, 1998).

It is an appreciation of the interrelated nature of these sets of organizations that is salient to our approach. As Heaney (2012: 569) argues "parties and groups have grown, declined, and changed form in tandem and in response to one another" (Heaney, 2012: 569). In organizational sociology and ecology, mutualistic and symbiotic relationships are of increasing scholarly interest because they gesture to the way(s) in which organizations, which are assumed to compete for resources in a zero-sum game, often times find that cooperation fosters a positive-sum game (Goss, 2013; Minkoff et al., 2008; Walker et al., 2011). As highlighted by Christopher Witko (2009: 233), "in a highly complex, interactive process, party leaders and partisans have found it in their interests to more closely identify with particular interests, and many organized interests have found it useful to form [a] relationship with one of the parties" (see also Gimpel et al., 2014). Empirically, for instance, we sometimes observe that interest organizations will become the opportunistic "party on the ground" for independent candidates or micro-parties. In turn, political parties can be the "political extension" of certain grassroots issue movements or advocacy groups (e.g. Bawn et al., 2012). Another classic scenario is that of interest organizations as key providers of policy expertise, providing "legislative subsidies" to policymakers (Hall and Deardorf, 2006). That is, while individually some political organizations might lack connections to civil society, or political know-how, a network of organizations which all advocate for a similar constituency might be able to *collectively* fulfill these different functions. In other words, trade-offs between a focus on membership involvement or policy influence can not only be addressed at the level of an individual organization but might also be examined at a network or ecological level, across different political organizations. This resonates with one of the conclusions by Allern and Bale (2012a: 106). Noting the volatility of voters (and thus access to stable revenues), they claim that "through interest groups, parties may still mobilize their constituencies, seek regular financial support and get access to valuable political information."[3]

Inspired by the work mentioned above and recent innovative approaches by party and group scholars, we distinguish two avenues for applying a constituency-oriented approach to the comparative study of political organizations. A first approach involves a closer examination of the key organizational choices that these organizations need to make in order to establish and maintain themselves. In one of the most sophisticated articles on

associational diversity, Debra Minkoff et al. (2008) highlight three structural elements of organizational form: organizational structure, membership strategies and resources (Minkoff et al., 2008; see also Andrews and Edwards, 2004: 487–489; Halpin, 2014: Chapter 4 for similar observations). These elements not only reflect key organizational choices for interest organizations but also represent core organizational aspects of political parties. Recent work by Anika Gauja on the construction of party membership strongly echoes our view. Her working assumption is that conceptions of membership that are rooted in sub-disciplinary boundaries are no longer adequate for analysing contemporary trends in political participation—and that we need to re-evaluate and engage more critically with what is meant by the concept of "membership" in studies of political organization (Gauja, 2015a: 1; see also Van Biezen et al. (2012: 41) on the need to complement analysis of party membership numbers with research on equivalent processes among so-called collateral organizations).

Tackling a similar question, Nicole Bolleyer (2013) has focused our attention on whether intensifying party–state interpenetration is a party-specific or rather a broader societal development that is also characteristic of voluntary organizations. We believe these statements can also be applied to other critical elements of political organizations, such as their organizational structures (e.g. the work of Bolleyer, 2012, on the internal structure of new parties). Only by closer attention to these elements, and studying configurations of a wide array of political organizations in a comparative fashion, will we acquire a better understanding of how external factors—such as differences between federal and unitary political systems—interact with organizational features (e.g. identity or ideology) in shaping the design and potential transformation of political organizations.

An alternative yet highly complementary approach would involve focusing on organizational trajectories, or the varying organizational development and adaptation, of political organizations.[4] As Gauja (2015b: 90) indicates, "political parties are generally accepted to be adaptive organizations," and we think a similar claim can be made as regards interest organizations (e.g. Fraussen, 2013; Halpin, 2014). A key contribution to this area was made by Ingrid Van Biezen (2005), who assessed the explanatory value of three different perspectives on the development of parties in new democracies in Europe, namely, life-cycle scenarios, generational and period effects. Whereas in the life-cycle scenario parties would have identical features at birth and follow a similar process of development, generational effects imply the persistence of the initial form of parties, leading to organizational differences between parties established in different contexts or waves of democratization. Period effects, third, assume a strong effect of the external environment, resulting in highly similar party types in a similar environment, at any given period. Here, external pressures trump the origins of parties. The value of this framework is that it encourages a deeper reflection on organizational forms, while it can also be applied to different political organizations, such as interest groups, where most scholarly attention has been somewhat more focused on organizational foundings rather than on organizational adaptation; or the shift of one particular model of advocacy to another (e.g. Walker et al., 2011). In addition, we see this approach as highly complementary to recent path-breaking work on organizational dynamics and innovations in SMs and non-profits that emphasizes hybridity and examines how political entrepreneurs creatively recombine elements from different organizational models to respond to varying demands from actors in their environment or different institutional logics (e.g. Goss and Heaney, 2010; Skelcher and Smith, 2015).

To conclude, we believe that the contribution of this constituency-oriented approach to the comparative study of political organizations is twofold. First, it urges a greater sensitivity to the common challenges that these organizations face. In the previous sections of this article we clarified that political parties and interest organizations face similar internal and external pressures. Both political organizations, for instance, are experimenting with new approaches to membership and forms of supporter engagement and also struggle with managing financial resource dependencies. Moreover, recent work also indicates that they often rely on a very similar pool of supporters who provide both membership muscle and financial resources, as people move from party to movement and back (e.g. Heaney and Rojas, 2015). Considering all this, it is no surprise that many scholars expect these organizations to co-evolve and to develop both complementary — for example, in their role as advocates for a particular constituency, and competitive relations — for instance, in their quest for financial resources. A comparative study design, including a variety of political organizations, will enable a more systematic analysis of these interdependencies, and the extent to which organizational innovations spread across different types of organization. Second, and more fundamentally, if we seek a comprehensive understanding of critical political science questions, such as bias in political representation and policy influence, examining the organizational choices and evolution of one particular type of political organization can only provide partial answers. Rather than looking for sequences, with organization transitioning from SM to party and so on, different types of political organization might be found to co-exist. With some notable exceptions, however, the absence of engagement across the party and interest organization literatures has resulted in parallel conversations on what might productively be conceptualized as the same basic trends or processes. A more intensive sharing of core ideas and findings regarding organizational choices and evolutions, applicable to the full range of political organizations, is likely to facilitate deeper insights into "who gets what, when and how."

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the journal editor, as well as the three anonymous referees, for their valuable feedback and comments. We would also like to acknowledge participants at a panel on Political Organizations at the American Political Science Association 2014 Annual Meeting (Washington), a workshop at the 2014 ECPR Joint Sessions (Salamanca) and a workshop at the 2014 Politicologenetmaal (Maastricht) for comments and discussion of earlier drafts.

Funding

The research presented here has been supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC) Discovery Scheme (DP140104097).

Notes

1. We would, however, observe that this important instruction on how to utilize this conceptual apparatus seems too often be forgotten when it is evaluated by critics, who frequently seem to suggest the claim is teleological in nature.
2. The distinction between these models obviously closely resonates with the associative logics of membership and influence, eloquently formulated by Schmitter and Streeck (1999).
3. At the same time, it should be noted that advocacy groups face similar challenges in gathering members and maintaining their societal roots, leading some to suggest that "the world of collateral organisations may no longer be capable of offering a refuge to parties, and that it offers little potential for the parties to make up for their own declining membership" (Van Biezen et al., 2012: 43).
4. On the need to make this distinction between formation and adaptation, see Halpin (2014) and Van Biezen (2005).

References

Allern EH and Bale T (2012a) Conclusion: Qualifying the Common Wisdom. *Party Politics* 18 (1): 99–106.

Allern EH and Bale T (2012b) Political Parties and Interest Groups: Disentangling Complex Relationships. *Party Politics* 18 (1): 7–25.

Andrews K and Edwards B (2004) Advocacy Organizations in the US Political Process. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 479–506.

Argote L and Greve HR (2007) A Behavioral Theory of the Firm—40 Years and Counting: Introduction and Impact. *Organization Science* 18 (3): 337–349.

Bardi L, Bartolini S and Trechsel A (2014a) Party Adaptation and Change and the Crisis of Democracy. *Party Politics* 20 (2): 151–159.

Bardi L, Bartolini S and Trechsel AH (2014b) Responsive and Responsible? The Role of Parties in Twenty-First Century Politics. *West European Politics* 37 (2): 235–252.

Bawn K, Cohen M, Karol D, et al. (2012) A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands and Nominations in American Politics. *Perspectives on Politics* 10 (3): 571–597.

Berkhout J (2013) Why Interest Organizations Do What They Do: Assessing the Explanatory Potential of 'Exchange' Approaches. *Interest Groups and Advocacy* 22 (2): 227–250.

Beyers J, Eising R and Maloney W (2008a) Conclusion: Embedding Interest Group Research. *West European Politics* 31 (6): 1292–1302.

Beyers J, Eising R and Maloney W (2008b) Researching Interest Group Politics in Europe and Elsewhere: Much We Study, Little We Know? *West European Politics* 31 (6): 1103–1128.

Billis D (ed.) (2010) *Hybrid Organizations in the Third Sector: Challenges of Practice, Policy and Theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave

Blyth M and Katz R (2005) From Catch-All Party to Cartelisation: The Political Economy of the Cartel Party. *West European Politics* 28 (1): 33–60.

Bolleyer N (2012) New Party Organization in Western Europe: Of Party Hierarchies, Stratarchies and Federations. *Party Politics* 18 (3): 315–336.

Bolleyer N (2013) The Change of Party–State Relations in Advanced Democracies: A Party–Specific Development or Broader Societal Trend? In: Müller CW and Narud MH (eds) *Party Governance and Party Democracy*. New York: Springer, pp.231–252.

Bosso CJ (2005) *Environment, Inc.: From Grassroots to Beltway*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Burstein P (1998) Interest Organizations, Political Parties, and the Study of Democratic Politics. In: Costain A and McFarland A (eds) *Social Movements and American Political Institutions*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp.39–56.

Burstein P and Linton A (2002) The Impact of Political Parties, Interest Groups, and Social Movement Organizations on Public Policy: Some Recent Evidence and Theoretical Concerns. *Social Forces* 81 (2): 381–408.

Clemens ES (1997) *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890–1925*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Diani M (2003) Networks and Social Movements: A Research Programme. In: Diani M and McAdam D (eds) *Social Movements and Networks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.299–319.

Easton D (1971) *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*. 2nd edn. New York: Knopf.

Edwards B and McCarthy JD (2004) Resources and Social Movement Mobilization. In: Snow DA, Soule SA and Kriesi H (eds) *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, pp.116–152.

Fraussen B (2013) The Visible Hand of the State: On the Organizational Development of Interest Groups. *Public Administration* 92 (2): 406–421.

Gauja A (2015a) The Construction of Party Membership. *European Journal of Political Research* 54 (2): 232–248.

Gauja A (2015b) The Individualisation of Party Politics: The Impact of Changing Internal Decision-Making Processes on Policy Development and Citizen Engagement. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 17 (1): 89–105.

Gimpel JG, Lee FE and Parrott M (2014) Business Interests and the Party Coalitions: Industry Sector Contributions to U.S. Congressional Campaigns. *American Politics Research* 42 (6): 1034–1076.

Goss KA (2013) *The Paradox of Gender Equality: How American Women's Groups Gained and Lost Their Public Voice*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Goss KA and Heaney MT (2010) Organizing Women as Women: Hybridity and Grassroots Collective Action in the 21st Century. *Perspectives on Politics* 8 (1): 27–52.

Hall RL and Deardorf AV (2006) Lobbying as Legislative Subsidy. *American Political Science Review* 100 (1): 69–84.

Halpin D (2010) *Groups, Democracy and Representation: Between Promise and Practice*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Halpin D (2014) *The Organization of Political Interest Groups*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Hasenfeld Y and Gidron B (2005) Understanding Multi-purpose Hybrid Voluntary Organizations: The Contributions of Theories on Civil Society, Social Movements and Non-profit Organizations. *Journal of Civil Society* 1 (2): 97–112.

Heaney MT (2012) Linking Political Parties and Interest Groups. In: Maisel LS and Berry JM (eds) *The State of Research on Political Parties and Interest Groups*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp.568–587.

Heaney MT and Rojas F (2015) *Party in the Street: The Antiwar Movement and the Democratic Party after 9/11*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hilgartner S and Bosk CL (1988) The Rise and Fall of Social Problems: A Public Arenas Model. *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (1): 53–78.

Hirst P (1994) *Associative Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jordan G and Maloney W (1997) *The Protest Business? Mobilizing Campaign Groups*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Jordan G, Halpin D and Maloney W (2004) Defining Interests: Disambiguation and the Need for New Distinctions? *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 6 (2): 195–212.

Karol D (2009) *Party Position Change in American Politics: Coalition Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Katz RS (2014) No Man Can Serve Two Masters: Party Politicians, Party Members, Citizens and Principal-Agent Models of Democracy. *Party Politics* 20 (2): 183–193.

Katz RS and Mair P (1995) Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy: The Emergence of the Cartel Party. *Party Politics* 1 (1): 5–28.

Key VO (1942) *Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Kölln A (2014) Party Membership in Europe: Testing Party-Level Explanations of Decline. *Party Politics*. DOI: 10.1177/1354068814550432.

Koole R (1996) Cadre, Catch-All or Cartel?—A Comment on the Notion of the Cartel Party. *Party Politics* 2 (4): 507–527.

Lawson K (1988) When Linkage Fails. In: Lawson K and Merkl PH (eds) *When Parties Fail: Emerging Alternative Organizations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp.13–38.

McAdam D, Tarrow S and Tilly C (1996) To Map Contentious Politics. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 1 (1): 17–34.

McCarthy JD (2005) Persistence and Change among Nationally Federated Social Movements. In: Davis G, McAdam D, Scott W, et al. (eds) *Social Movements and Organization Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp.193–225.

McCarthy JD and Zald MN (1977) Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (6): 1212–1241.

Maier F, Meyer M and Steinbereithner M (2014) Nonprofit Organizations Becoming Business-Like: A Systematic Review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 45 (1): 64–86.

Maisel LS and Berry JM (2012) The State of Research on Political Parties and Interest Groups. In: Maisel LS and Berry JM (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Parties and Interest Groups*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp.3–18.

Merkl PH (1988) The Challengers and the Party Systems. In: Lawson K and Merkl PH (eds) *When Parties Fail: Emerging Alternative Organizations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp.561–588.

Minkoff D, Aisenbrey S and Agnone J (2008) Organizational Diversity in the U.S. Advocacy Sector. *Social Problems* 55 (4): 525–548.

Mosley JE (2012) Keeping the Lights On: How Government Funding Concerns Drive the Advocacy Agenda of Nonprofit Homeless Service Providers. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22 (4): 841–866.

Mudge SL and Chen AS (2014) Political Parties and the Sociological Imagination: Past, Present, and Future Directions. *Annual Review of Political Science* 40: 305–330.

Nikolic JS and Koontz TM (2008) Nonprofit Organizations in Environmental Management: A Comparative Analysis of Government Impacts. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18 (3): 441–463.

Putnam R (2000) *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
Rao H (1998) Caveat Emptor: The Construction of Nonprofit Consumer Watchdog Organizations. *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (4): 912–961.
Salamon LM and Anheier HK (1996) *The Emerging Nonprofit Sector: An Overview*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Saward M (2008) Making Representations: Modes and Strategies of Political Parties. *European Review* 16 (3): 271–286.
Schattschneider EE (1948) Pressure Groups versus Political Parties. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 259: 17–23.
Schmid H and Almog-Bar M (2014) Introduction to the Symposium "Nonprofit Advocacy and Engagement in Public Policy Making." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 43 (1): 7–10.
Schmitter PC and Streeck W (1999) *The Organization of Business Interests: Studying the Associative Action of Business in Advanced Industrial Societies*. MPifG Discussion Paper. Köln: Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung.
Schwartz MA (2010) Interactions between Social Movements and US Political Parties. *Party Politics* 16 (5): 587–607.
Skelcher C and Smith SR (2015) Theorizing Hybridity: Institutional Logics, Complex Organizations, and Actor Identities: The Case of Nonprofits. *Public Administration* 93 (2): 443–448.
Skocpol T (1999) Advocates without Members: The Recent Transformation of American Civic Life. In: Skocpol T and Fiorina MP (eds) *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, pp.461–509.
Skocpol T (2003) *Diminished Democracy*. Norman, OK: Oklohoma University Press.
Soule S (2012) Social Movements and Markets, Industries, and Firms. *Organization Studies* 33 (12): 1715–1733.
Soule SA and King BG (2008) Competition and Resource Partitioning in Three Social Movement Industries. *American Journal of Sociology* 113 (6): 1568–1610.
Tichenor DJ and Harris RA (2005) The Development of Interest Group Politics in America: Beyond the Conceits of Modern Times. *Annual Review of Political Science* 8: 251–270.
Van Biezen I (2005) On the Theory and Practice of Party Formation and Adaptation in New Democracies. *European Journal of Political Research* 44 (1): 147–174.
Van Biezen I and Kopecky P (2014) The Cartel Party and the State: Party-State Linkages in European Democracies. *Party Politics* 20 (2): 170–182.
Van Biezen I and Poguntke T (2014) The Decline of Membership-Based Politics. *Party Politics* 20 (2): 205–216.
Van Biezen I, Mair P and Poguntke T (2012) Going, Going, Gone? The Decline of Party Membership in Contemporary Europe. *European Journal of Political Research* 51 (1): 24–56.
Verschuere B and De Corte J (2014) The Impact of Public Resource Dependence on the Autonomy of NPOs in Their Strategic Decision Making. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 43 (2): 293–313.
Walker ET, McCarthy JD and Baumgartner F (2011) Replacing Members with Managers? Mutualism among Membership and Nonmembership Advocacy Organizations in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology* 116 (4): 1284–1337.
Webb P and White S (2009) Introduction: Conceptualizing the Institutionalization and Performance of Political Parties in New Democracies. In: Webb P and White S (eds) *Party Politics in New Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.4–20.
Wilson JQ (1974) *Political Organizations*. New York: Basic Books.
Witko C (2009) The Ecology of Party-Organized Interest Relationships. *Polity* 41 (2): 211–234.

Author Biographies

Bert Fraussen is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Research School of the Social Sciences at the Australian National University (ANU). His research focuses on interest groups and lobbying, in particular, the organizational development of interest groups as well as their interaction with policymakers.

Darren R Halpin is Professor of Policy Studies at the Australian National University. He is Co-editor of the journal *Interest Groups and Advocacy* and the Foundation Series Editor for the book series 'Interest Groups, Advocacy and Democracy' (Palgrave). His two most recent books are *Groups, Representation and Democracy* (Manchester University Press, 2010) and *The Organization of Political Interest Groups* (Routledge, 2014).