



## The 1971 APSA Elections

Bernard Grofman

*PS*, Vol. 5, No. 3. (Summer, 1972), pp. 278-289.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0030-8269%28197222%295%3A3%3C278%3AT1AE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-V>

*PS* is currently published by American Political Science Association.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/apsa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## The 1971 APSA Elections\*

**Bernard Grofman**  
State University of New York  
at Stony Brook

For the third consecutive year there was a contest for offices of the American Political Science Association. The 1971 APSA election saw two groups fielding complete slates: the APSA nominating committee, and the Caucus for a New Political Science (overlapping in one Council nominee, Christian Bay) and two groups nominating or endorsing candidates, the Ad Hoc Committee and the Women's Caucus. The Ad Hoc Committee endorsements coincided with the nominations of the APSA nominating committee,<sup>1</sup> while the ten<sup>2</sup> Women's Caucus endorsements went to seven nominees endorsed by the New Caucus (three of whom were women) and four nominees of the APSA Nominating Committee (two of whom were women), the overlap being Christian Bay. (See Table 1).

The 1971 Election had much in common with its predecessors. The principal differences shown in Table 2 are a continuing decline in voter turnout, a slow but continuing increase in the number of women candidates, and the entry of the Women's Caucus into the electoral lists.<sup>3</sup>

The votes received by PS and AH nominees (exclusive of Bay) ranged from 4873 for Matthews to 4031 for Prewitt, with a mean of

4148 for Council nominees and of 4365 for non-Council nominees. The vote for Caucus nominees (again exclusive of Bay) ranged from 1495 for Rocco to 3106 for Dolbeare, with a mean of 2533 for Council nominees and of 2584 for non-Council nominees. 71% of the electorate voted for more PS + AH nominees than New Caucus nominees. Caucus strength does not seem greatly changed from that exhibited in previous years. (See Table 3).

The aggregate statistics above might suggest the existence of a large (over 4000) slate or near slate vote for PS and AH nominees, and a smaller but still sizable (well over 2000) near straight slate vote for Caucus nominees. The reality, however, is somewhat more complex. (See Tables 4 and 5.)

Some comparisons and contrasts between the three elections are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

If we regard a near straight slate vote as one for at least 10 out of 14 candidates (including Bay), then 47.9% (3510) of the electorate voted a near straight PS and AH slate and only 24.5% (1805) of the electorate voted for fewer than four PS and AH endorsed candidates; while 24.2% (1775) of the

\* Data processing and analysis were supported by the Research Foundation of the State University of New York, Grant #031-7237A. We wish to acknowledge our thanks to Gordon Tullock and Joseph Tanenhaus for suggesting the undertaking of this project and to our predecessors John E. Mueller, ("The Political Scientist Decides: An Examination of the 1969 APSA Ballots," *PS*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (Summer 1970), pp. 311-320), and Charles Taylor and Gordon Tullock ("The 1970 APSA Elections," *PS* Vol. 4, No. 3 (Summer 1971), pp. 349-357) from whose work we freely borrowed. Particular thanks also go to Paula Newhouse, without whose programming assistance this project could not have been carried out.

1 Albeit with some (!) reluctance, The Ad Hoc Committee's statement read (in part) as follows.

"First, the Ad Hoc Committee believes that almost all of the nominees proposed by the APSA Nominating Committee share the goals and professional orientations that unite Ad Hoc supporters.

Second, although one of the persons (Christian Bay), nominated for the Council by the APSA Nominating Committee, is also the chairman of the Caucus for a New Political Science and presumably shares its desire to use the Association as the action arm of its own political preferences, the Ad Hoc Committee decided, with some reservations to support his nomination to the Council. The desirability of unity and of the depolarization of the profession took precedence this year over the Committee's desire to provide members with a choice on the still vital issue of whether we should elect as officers persons who do not share the

basic purposes of the Association as stated in its Constitution and embodied in its practices."

2 The statement of the Women's Caucus distinguished between three candidates nominated by the Women's Caucus (May, D. James, and Tinker) and seven others who were "nominated for the purpose of endorsement." In accordance with the APSA Council decision we treat votes for Stiehm, who was erroneously listed on the ballot even though she was not a candidate, as if they were votes for May.

3 The decline in turnout might be attributed to any number of factors. A prima facie case can be made for simple boredom. With unanimous agreement on nominees from the Ad Hoc Committee and the APSA Nominating Committee, predicting the winners in the 1971 election was not difficult, and the novelty of the Caucus insurgency and Ad Hoc "counter revolution" had worn off. Moreover, five Caucus-endorsed nominees on the (1971-72) APSA Council (Prestage, Kariel, Mitchell, Robinson, and Rustow) — all of whom had been nominated by the APSA Nominating Committee and two of whom had also been endorsed by the Ad Hoc Committee — had been absorbed without any noticeable detriment to the Council's ability to carry out the basic purposes of the Association as stated in its Constitution and embodied in its practices. We are not, however, claiming an "End to Ideology," since such predictions are apt to prove embarrassingly premature, and in 1971, as we shall see, ballot patterns still showed the presence of major differences in voter orientations to the two groupings. Also, there were clearcut thematic differences in the ballot statements of PS + AH and New Caucus 1971 nominees.

**TABLE 1**

**Candidates Endorsements, Votes Received, 1971 (N = 7331)**

President Elect (Vote for not more than ONE)				Member of Council (Vote for not more than EIGHT)						
Falk (M)	C		3035	*Bay (M)	C	PS	AH	W	5591	
*Ward (M)		PS	AH	4200	*Cook (M)		PS	AH	4113	
					Dolbeare (M)	C			3106	
Vice President (Vote for not more than THREE)				*Earle (F)		PS	AH	W	4147	
Becker (M)	C		3063	*Fenno (M)		PS	AH		4647	
*Martin (M)		PS	AH	4056	James, D. (F)	C		W	2648	
Munoz (M)	C		1937	James, J. (M)	C			W	2264	
*Penniman (F)		PS	AH	W	*Keohane (M)		PS	AH	W	4142
Roelofs (M)	C		W	2277	*Krislov (M)		PS	AH	4234	
*Tanenhaus (M)		PS	AH	4214	Lipsitz (M)	C			2971	
Secretary (Vote for not more than ONE)				*Loewenberg (M)		PS	AH		3724	
*Dye (M)		PS	AH	4138	Petras (M)	C			2222	
†May (F)	C		W	2931	*Prewitt (M)		PS	AH	4031	
Treasurer (Vote for not more than ONE)				Rocco (M)	C				1495	
Fox (M)	C		W	2258	Tinker (F)	C		W	2952	
*Matthews (M)		PS	AH	4873						

\* elected

† combines votes for May and Stiehm

M—Male

F—Female

C—Caucus for a New Political Science

PS—Nominating Committee of APSA

AH—Ad Hoc Committee

W—Women's Caucus

**Amendment**

*Accept	3633
Reject	2011

electorate voted a near straight Caucus slate and 49.2% (3605) of the electorate voted for fewer than four Caucus endorsed candidates, with 11.1% (816) voting for no Caucus nominee. If we exclude Bay then 44.7% of the electorate voted for at least 10 of the remaining 13 PS, AH nominees, while 21.1% voted for at least 10 of the other 13 New Caucus nominees. In other words, using a liberal definition of "party voter" as one who votes for at least 10 of his party's candidates, then 72.1% of the electorate (65.8% even if

we exclude Bay from consideration) fall into this category.

**Ballot Patterns**

The slate and near slate tallies from Tables 4 and 5 might, however, lead one to underestimate the range of variation in ballot patterns. Both previous analyses of APSA elections have strongly commented on the remarkably idiosyncratic behavior of the APSA electorate. That idiosyncrasy manifested itself again in 1971 in full force. On

**The 1971 APSA Elections**

**TABLE 2**  
**Some Comparisons Between 1969, 1970, and 1971 APSA Elections**

	total # positions being contested	# candidates	# valid ballots cast (as % of eligible voters)	Total number of candidates endorsed by (number elected)					# Women Candidates (number elected)
				PS	AH	C	W	Other	
1969	15 <sup>a</sup>	27	8074 <sup>b</sup> (68%)	13 (12)	14 (14)	14 ( 3)	0 —	3 <sup>c</sup> ( 0)	1 (1)
1970	14	27	8386 (61%)	14 (12)	14 (12)	13 ( 3)	1 ( 1)	3 <sup>d</sup> ( 0)	3 (2)
1971	14	27	7331 (53%)	14 (14)	14 (14)	14 <sup>e</sup> ( 1)	10 <sup>e</sup> ( 4)	0 —	5 (2)

- a Includes one year Council Term for which there was no PS nominee and which was uncontested.
- b The Mueller 1969 analysis had access of to 7864 of the ballots cast. Subsequent tables use N = 7864 for the 1969 election.
- c The Black Caucus had two endorsements and the Ad Hoc Committee for Election of a Graduate Student to the APSA Council had one.
- d The Committee for a Responsible Political Science had one endorsement as did the Chicano Caucus, and as did Samuel Krislov.
- e Judith Stiehm's name is treated as deleted, and Judith V. May treated as having been endorsed by both the New Caucus and the Women's Caucus.

**TABLE 3**  
**Mean Votes for Candidates Endorsed by Various Groupings**

Mean Vote for Candidates Endorsed By:	(As percentage of total ballots cast)					
	PS but not AH or C	AH but not PS or C	C but not AH or PS	PS + C but not AH	PS + AH but not C	PS + AH + C
1969 (N = 7864)	—	4888 (62%)	2471 (31%)	3648 (46%)	5086 (65%)	5852 (75%)
1970 (N = 8386)	—	3947 (47%)	2971 (35%)	4195 (50%)	4953 (59%)	5271 (63%)
1971 (N = 7331)	—	—	2551 (35%)	—	4248 (58%)	5591 (76%)

the 7331 valid ballots cast, there were 3985<sup>4</sup> distinct whole ballot patterns. (See Table 6). We might also note that, of the 42 possible legal patterns for the Vice-Presidential Race, every single one occurred at least four times (with the least popular configurations being these involving Munoz).

<sup>4</sup> Note, however, there are over three million possible whole ballot patterns even if each voter is assumed to have voted for a full fourteen candidates. As it was, only 60.6% of the voters cast a full fourteen votes, and 8.6% of the voters cast fewer than 10 votes. The mean number of votes cast was 12.8 on the ballot as a whole, 7.1 for the Council races, and 2.8 for the vice-presidencies.

An examination of the more common whole ballot voting patterns reveals the expected slate or near slate patterning but with some interesting features. (See Table 7).

We note that the reluctance of the Ad Hoc Committee to support Bay was shared by 523 hard core PS, AH supporters who simply eliminated him from the ticket even at the cost of throwing away their eighth Council vote and by *at least* 51 other otherwise straight PS, AH slate voters who replaced him with a candidate endorsed by the New Caucus.

**TABLE 4****Slate and Near Slate Voting for PS and AH Nominees (including Bay)**

	Number Voters	Percentage of Voters	Cumulative Frequency	
Straight PS + AH slate	1355	18.5%	(1355)	18.5%
Straight slate —1	999	13.6%	(2354)	32.1%
—2	445	6.1%	(2799)	38.2%
—3	360	4.9%	(3159)	43.1%
—4	351	4.8%	(3510)	47.9%
—5	366	5.0%	(3876)	52.9%
—6	319	4.4%	(4195)	57.3%
—7	320	4.4%	(4515)	61.7%
—8	353	4.8%	(4868)	66.5%
—9	322	4.4%	(5190)	70.9%
—10	336	4.6%	(5526)	75.5%
—11	368	5.0%	(5894)	80.5%
—12	426	5.8%	(6320)	86.3%
—13	939	12.8%	(7259)	99.1%
No votes for any member of PS + AH slate	72	1.0%	(7331)	100.0%

Straight slate  
or near Straight  
slate  
Voting

Non-Slate  
Voting for  
PS + AH  
Nominees

**TABLE 5****Slate and Near Slate Voting for New Caucus Nominees (including Bay)**

	Number of Vote	Percentage of Voters	Cumulative Frequency	
Straight Caucus Slate	711	9.7%	( 711)	9.7%
Straight Slate —1	342	4.7%	(1053)	14.4%
—2	259	3.5%	(1312)	17.9%
—3	223	3.0%	(1535)	20.99%
—4	240	3.3%	(1775)	24.2%
—5	259	3.5%	(2034)	27.7%
—6	292	4.0%	(2326)	31.7%
—7	327	4.5%	(2653)	36.2%
—8	308	4.2%	(2961)	40.4%
—9	381	5.2%	(3342)	45.6%
—10	384	5.2%	(3726)	50.8%
—11	401	5.5%	(4127)	56.3%
—12	552	7.5%	(4679)	63.8%
—13	1836	25.0%	(6515)	88.8%
No Votes for any Caucus Nominee	816	11.1%	(7331)	100.0%

Straight Slate  
or near  
Straight Slate  
Voting

Non-Slate  
Voting for  
Caucus  
Nominees

**TABLE 6****Number of Ballots By Popularity of Voting Pattern**

Voting Pattern	Whole Ballots (Excluding Amendments)		Council Only	
	1970	1971	1970	1971
	Unique Ballots	4260(51%)	3384(46%)	2301(27%)
Ballots Whose Patterns have 2-14 Voters Each	1407(17%)	980(13%)	2548(30%)	2230(30%)
Ballots Whose Patterns have 15 or more Voters Each	2707(32%)	2967(40%)	3527(42%)	3717(51%)

**TABLE 7**  
**Voting Patterns (Whole Ballot, Including Amendment)**

Pattern	Amendment		Number of Voters
Straight PS, AH	Yes	734	1355
	No	411	
	No Vote	210	
Straight Caucus (Stiehm)	Yes	265	603
	No	176	
	No Vote	162	
PS, AH—Bay	Yes	199	523
	No	213	
	No Vote	111	
Straight Caucus (May)	Yes	55	108
	No	25	
	No Vote	28	
PS, AH + May-Dye, Yes			41*
PS, AH + Dolbeare-Bay, Yes			27
PS, AH—Bay + Tinker, Yes			24*
PS, AH + Falk-Ward + May-Dye, Yes			15
			2696

\* This pattern except for a no-vote on the Constitutional amendment was found 14 times.

More light may be shed on the question of Bay's sources of strength and opposition by inspection of Table 8. We see that of the near straight PS,AH voters 1134/3510 (32.4%) did not vote for Bay. When we compare this to the 352/3510 (10.0%) who did not vote for Loewenberg, and the 98/3510 (2.8%) who did not vote for Fenno, respectively the lowest and highest vote getters among PS + AH endorsed Council candidates, we see that there was indeed a considerable "Dump Bay" movement among strong PS, AH supporters. (Also see Table 9).

In the voting for Vice-President in 1969, Mueller notes that there were 216 Bullet votes (votes for a single candidate) and that these went disproportionately to one candidate (Riker). In 1971, there were 430 (5.9%) Bullet votes for VP which again were disproportionately split: 145 for Becker, 31 for Martin, 21 for Munoz, 114 for Penniman, 39 for Roelofs, and 80 for Tanenhaus. There were only 53 Bullet votes for the 1971 Council

votes which went 14 for Bay, 7 for Keohane, and scattered votes for the others.

The most popular candidate among voters voting for fewer than five Council positions was Christian Bay, who received 349 votes from voters in that category. Other Council candidates popular among these high abstention voters were Fenno, 246; Earle 100; Dolbeare 159; Krislov, 185; Lipsitz, 130; Prewitt, 144; and Tinker, 113.

Another interesting bit of ballot information revealed by Table 7 is the existence of several score otherwise hard-core PS,AH supporters who dumped Dye for May. Further light on this question may be found in Table 9. Inspection of this Table reveals that relatively little of May's strength comes from near straight slate PS,AH voters but her support from PS, AH voters was still considerably greater than that accorded most other New Caucus nominees.

**TABLE 8****Sources of Strength and Opposition for Christian Bay**

Ballot Pattern	Voted for By (% of Total Bay Vote)	Not Voted for By (% Total Non-Bay Vote)	Relative Percentage Who Voted for Bay
PS, Straight AH Voters	1355 (24.2%)	—	100.0%
Straight PS, AH Slate—1	327 ( 5.8%)	672 (38.6%)	32.7%
Straight PS, AH Slate—2	231 ( 4.1%)	214 (12.3%)	51.9%
Straight PS, AH Slate—3	230 ( 4.1%)	130 ( 7.5%)	63.9%
Straight PS, AH Slate—4	<u>233 ( 4.2%)</u>	<u>118 ( 6.8%)</u>	66.4%
TOTAL PS, AH Straight and Near Straight Voters	2376 (42.4%)	1134 (65.2%)	
Straight New Caucus Voters—4	229 ( 4.1%)	11 ( .6%)	95.4%
Straight New Caucus Voters—3	206 ( 3.7%)	17 ( 1.0%)	92.4%
Straight New Caucus Voters—2	233 ( 4.2%)	26 ( 1.5%)	90.0%
Straight New Caucus Voters—1	291 ( 5.2%)	51 ( 2.9%)	85.1%
Straight New Caucus Slate	<u>711 (12.7)</u>	<u>—</u>	100.0%
TOTAL New Caucus Straight and Near Straight Voters	1555 (27.7%)	101 ( 6.0%)	

The percentages given in Tables 4 and 5 are very similar to those previously reported by Mueller and by Taylor and Tullock, with somewhat more straight slates voters than previously reported (28.2% in 1971 as compared to 20.2% in 1970 and 19.5% in 1969), probably due to the sharper polarization of the 1971 Election as a basically two-party contest between two full slates. Combined with the evidence from Tables 3 and 9, they suggest that PS + AH strong supporters outnumber strong Caucus supporters by about 2 to 1, an advantage which is partially compensated for by a marginally greater willingness of "non-partisan" voters to vote for Caucus candidates, which reduces the ratio of PS,AH support to Caucus support to about 1.7 to 1.

**Strength of the New Caucus**

Table 10 supports the proposition that given present voting patterns, New Caucus nominees can never be elected unless they are endorsed by either PS, or the Ad Hoc Committee, or both.

As long as the Ad Hoc Committee and APSA combine forces, it would appear that the Caucus can be frozen out, except for such nominees as are "given" it by the APSA Nominating Committee. This assertion is reinforced by a look at the difference between the lowest winning candidates and the highest losing candidates (of another major grouping). (See Table 11). The best any candidate endorsed only by the New Caucus has been able to do against a jointly endorsed PS & AH candidate is to come within 600 votes.

**The 1971 APSA Elections**

**TABLE 9**  
**Sources of Strength for All Candidates**

Name of Candidate	Total Vote	Votes from Straight and Near-Straight PS, AH Voters (% of candidate's total votes recvd.)	Votes from Straight and Near-Straight New Caucus Voters (% of candidate's total votes received)	Votes from† Other Voters (% of candidate's total votes received)
Richard A. Falk C	3035	155 ( 5.1%)	1732 (57.0%)	1148 (37.9%)
Robert E. Ward PS, AH	4200	3343 (79.6%)	39 ( .9%)	818 (19.5%)
Theodore L. Becker C	3063	318 (10.3%)	1653 (55.9%)	1092 (33.8%)
Robert E. Martin PS, AH	4056	3262 (80.4%)	84 ( 2.0%)	710 (27.6%)
Carlos Munoz C	1937	80 ( 4.1%)	1464 (75.6%)	393 (20.3%)
Clara Penniman PS, AH, W	4710	3281 (69.7%)	363 ( 7.7%)	1066 (22.6%)
Mark Roelofs C, W	2277	85 ( 3.7%)	1564 (68.6%)	628 (27.7%)
Joseph Tanenhaus PS, AH	4214	3329 (79.4%)	65 ( 1.5%)	820 (19.1%)
Thomas R. Dye PS, AH	4138	3185 (77.0%)	84 ( 2.0%)	869 (21.0%)
Judith V. May* C, W	2931	290 ( 9.9%)	1663 (56.8%)	978 (33.3%)
Charles J. Fox C, W	2258	42 ( 1.8%)	1607 (71.3%)	609 (26.9%)
Donald R. Matthews PS, AH	4873	3446 (70.7%)	142 ( 2.9%)	1285 (26.4%)
Christian Bay PS, AH, C, W	5591	2376 (42.4%)	1670 (29.9%)	1545 (27.7%)
Samuel D. Cook PS, AH	4113	3251 (79.0%)	161 ( 3.8%)	701 (17.2%)
Kenneth Dolbeare C	3106	440 (14.1%)	1650 (53.2%)	1016 (32.7%)
Valerie A. Earle PS, AH, W	4147	3145 (75.9%)	266 ( 6.4%)	736 (17.7%)
Richard F. Fenno Jr. PS, AH	4647	3412 (73.5%)	151 ( 3.2%)	1084 (23.3%)
Dorothy B. James C, W	2648	222 ( 8.5%)	1646 (62.3%)	780 (29.2%)
Judson L. James C, W	2264	103 ( 4.6%)	1598 (70.5%)	553 (24.9%)
Robert O. Keohane PS, AH, W	4142	3110 (75.0%)	269 ( 5.4%)	763 (19.6%)
Samuel Krislov, PS, AH	4234	3314 (78.3%)	105 ( 2.4%)	815 (19.3%)
Lewis Lipsitz C	2971	338 (11.3%)	1652 (55.5%)	981 (33.2%)
Gerhard Loewenberg PS, AH	3724	3158 (84.8%)	62 ( 1.7%)	504 (13.5%)
James F. Petras C	2222	110 ( 4.9%)	1573 (70.9%)	539 (24.2%)
Kenneth Prewitt PS, AH	4031	3155 (78.3%)	114 ( 2.8%)	762 (18.9%)
Raymond Rocco C	1495	38 ( 2.6%)	1282 (85.9%)	175 (11.5%)
Irene Tinker C, W	2952	417 (14.1%)	1606 (54.4%)	929 (31.5%)

\* Includes votes for Judith Stiehm.

† The category of "other" includes some voters who might be considered as party supporters in that they voted *only* or *almost only* for candidates of a given slate, but who voted for fewer than 14 candidates. There are only a handful of voters in this category.



**TABLE 10**

**Success of Candidates of Various Groups**

	Number of Candidates Endorsed By: (Number Elected)							
	PS Only	AH Only	C Only	PS + C Not AH	C + AH Not APSA	PS + AH Not C	PS + AH + C	Neither AH Nor PS Nor C
1969	0	2 (2)	10 (0)	2 (1)	1 (1)†	10 (10)	1 (1)	1 (0)
1970	0	4#(2)	8 (0)	4 (2)	0	9 ( 9)	1 (1)	1 (0)
1971	0	0	13 (0)	0	0	13 (13)	1 (1)	0

† One year Council term for which there was no APSA Nominating Committee endorsement and which was untested.

# Victoria Schuck was also nominated by the Women's Caucus and was endorsed (though not on the ballot) by the New Caucus. She is not counted as a New Caucus nominee.

**TABLE 11**

**Differences Between Lowest Winning Candidate and Highest Losing Candidate of Another Major Grouping\***

	PRES.	V.P.	SEC.	TREAS.	COUNCIL
1969	5198 (PS,AH) <u>2609 (C)</u> 2589	4932 (PS,AH) <u>2412 (C)</u> 2520	5415 (PS,AH) <u>2235 (C)</u> 2180	5213 (PS,AH) <u>2489 (C)</u> 2724	3671 (PS,C) <u>2696 (C)</u> 975
1970	4716 (PS,AH) <u>3548 (C)</u> 1168	4589 (PS,AH) <u>4530 (PS,C)</u> 69	5523 (PS,AH) <u>2607 (C)</u> 2916	5745 (PS,AH) <u>2444 (C)</u> 2301	4019 (AH) <u>3421 (PS,C)</u> 598
1971	4200 (PS,AH) <u>3035 (C)</u> 1165	4056 (PS,AH) <u>3063 (C)</u> 993	4138 (PS,AH) <u>2931 (C)</u> 1207	4873 (PS,AH) <u>2258 (C,W)</u> 2615	3724 (PS,AH) <u>3106 (C)</u> 618

\* Combined Endorsements are treated as separate Groupings. Major Groupings are: PS, PS + AH, PS + C, PS + AH + C, AH, and C.

However, the Ad Hoc Committee runs a risk of defeat if it breaks with the APSA Nominating Committee "compromises." While it is impossible to tell from the 1971 data what would have happened had the Ad Hoc Committee attempted to "dump" Christian Bay and replace him with a candidate of their own, evidence from 1969 and 1970 (See Table 10) supports the proposition that the Caucus has, in general, about an even chance to elect one of its nominees who is also endorsed by

the APSA Nominating Committee in a field which includes candidates endorsed solely by the Ad Hoc Committee. Since the highest vote received by a Caucus-only-nominee for Council was only 618 votes away from the lowest winning total, we think it unlikely (although certainly not inconceivable), that the Ad Hoc Committee would have succeeded in dumping Bay had they attempted to do so, especially since Bay won despite the desertion of over 1000 PS,AH supporters. (We

## The 1971 APSA Elections

would not be prepared to make a similar claim had the candidate to be dumped been less well known than Bay).

Professor Steven Brams<sup>5</sup> has argued for the adoption of a form of proportional representation for APSA elections which he proposed as a Constitutional Amendment which was tabled at the 1970 Annual Meeting and defeated 73-41 at the 1971 Annual Meeting.<sup>6</sup> If some scheme of PR were adopted, presumably the New Caucus could gain between one-third and two-fifths of the Council seats, (3, if the Council remained at 8), and one Vice-President. The New Caucus currently is "given" 1-3 Council positions by the APSA Nominating Committee and one vice-presidency is likely henceforth to be "reserved" for a New Caucus, Women's Caucus, or minority nominee.<sup>7</sup> Thus, it is unlikely that the introduction of PR would significantly effect the balance of power in the Association. The APSA Nominating Committee's response to electoral insurgency has been (highly selective) englobement of its adversaries.<sup>8</sup>

### Strength of the Women's Caucus

Evaluating the importance, in general, of Women's Caucus endorsements on the vote totals, is very difficult, because of the presence of a plethora of confounding factors. Looking only at straight and near straight slate PS + AH voters, there is no statistically significant difference in votes received between the 3 PS,AH candidates endorsed by the Women's Caucus and the 10 (excluding Bay) not so endorsed. (See Table 9). However, Penniman, Earle and Keohane do run significantly better among New Caucus supporters than the other PS, AH candidates, suggesting that a Women's Caucus endorsement picks up

5 Steven J. Brams, "The APSA and Minority Representation," *PS*, Vol. 3 No. 3 (Summer 1970), pp. 321-335.

6 "Minutes of the APSA Annual Business Meeting," *PS*, Vol. 5 No. 1 (Winter 1972), p. 34.

7 Personal communications from a member of the 1970-71 APSA Nominating Committee.

8 Cf. Alan Wolfe, "Practicing the Pluralism We Preach: Internal Processes in the American Political Science Association," *Antioch Review*, No. 29 (1969-70), pp. 353-374.

votes for PS, AH nominees among Caucus supporters. The picture among Women's-Caucus-endorsed New Caucus nominees is more difficult to decipher. It appears, however, that both among Caucus supporters and among PS+AH supporters, nominees endorsed by both the Women's Caucus and the New Caucus and those endorsed only by the latter ran about equally well.

In order to get some handle on the problem of evaluating the effects of multiple endorsements, we performed a factor analysis, using the method of principal components with iteration.<sup>9</sup> Factor 1 could be identified with endorsement of a candidate by the New Caucus (or with non-endorsement by PS + AH). This factor accounted for 53.0% of the variance in the ballot patterns.<sup>10</sup> A second factor, which could be identified with endorsement by the Women's Caucus, accounted for only an additional 3.1% of the variance.<sup>11,12</sup> Note that party endorsements in toto could be used to account for roughly 56.1% of the variance in ballot patterns.<sup>13</sup> (See Table 12).

### Race for Secretary

One obvious question concerning the 1971 APSA Election is the effect on the outcome of the race for Secretary of the May-Stiehm mixup in which May was not listed as having the New Caucus endorsement while Stiehm was erroneously listed on the ballot as the

9 For documentation, see Nie, Bent, and Hull, *SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*, New York: McGraw Hill, 1970, Chapter 17.

10 Bay's loading on this factor was .275, i.e. Bay scaled with the New Caucus endorsed candidates rather than with those endorsed by PS,AH — but only marginally so: all the New Caucus endorsed candidates loaded positively on this factor and the next lowest positive candidate loading on this factor was .685.

11 A third factor, the next most important, could not be identified (at least by this author). However, this third factor only accounted for under — of the variance. Use of varimax rotation did not significantly alter these results. Although it did bifurcate Factor 1 into a "Caucus" factor and a "PS,AH" factor.

12 Of the nominees endorsed by the Women's Caucus only Roelofs and Bay do not have significant positive loading on Factor 2, and no candidate not endorsed by the Women's Caucus has a significant positive loading on this factor.

13 For reasons having to do with the nature of the mathematical constraints imposed by multi-candidate elections, this estimate of explained variance is marginally too high — exactly how much too high we are not at present sure.

**TABLE 12****Factor Matrix Using Principal Factor With Iterations**

Name of Candidate	Factor 1 New Caucus Endorsement (PS, AH Nonendorsement)	Factor 2 Women's Caucus Endorsement
Falk C	0.82140	—0.07802
Ward PS, AH	—0.82095	0.07973
Becker C	0.73197	—0.20453
Martin PS, AH	—0.75949	0.10654
Munoz C	0.72401	—0.02836
Penniman PS, AH, W	—0.65199	0.28236
Roelofs C, W	0.75336	0.07702
Tannenhau PS, AH	—0.79537	—0.02607
Dye PS, AH	—0.75192	—0.28406
May† C, W	0.74175	0.32911
Fox C, W	0.79881	0.23092
Matthews PS, AH	—0.80029	—0.20012
Bay PS, AH, C, W	0.27455	0.02314
Cook PS, AH	—0.71341	0.08978
Dolbeare C	0.68739	—0.18680
Earle PS, AH, W	—0.64901	0.35710
Fenno PS, AH	—0.77981	—0.10525
James (D) C, W	0.74242	0.18934
James (T) C, W	0.75577	0.14689
Keohane PS, AH, W	—0.63094	0.28633
Krislov PS, AH	—0.77364	—0.05239
Lipsitz C	0.71530	—0.16834
Loewenberg PS, AH	—0.75339	0.07627
Petras C	0.74813	—0.05103
Prewitt PS, AH	—0.72386	—0.01079
Rocco C	0.68471	—0.01313
Tinker C, W	0.68470	0.18298
EIGEN VALUES	14.31102	.82996

† combines May/Stiehm Voters.

**TABLE 13****Age, Age Disclosure, and Success in the 1971 APSA Election**

	Age Bracket	Mean Vote for Candidates Who Disclosed Exact Age	Mean Vote for Candidates Who Did Not Disclose Age
PS, AH*	50—59	4455 (N = 2)	4101 (N = 2)
C*	50—59	—	—
PS, AH	40—49	4301 (N = 6)	—
C	40—49	3071 (N = 2)	2615 (N = 2)
PS, AH	30—39	4140 (N = 2)	4031 (N = 1)
C	30—39	2931 (N = 1)†	2518 (N = 6)
C	Unknown	—	1877 (N = 2)

\* Excluding Bay.

† Combined vote for May and Stiehm.

## The 1971 APSA Elections

New Caucus nominee. Table 9 makes clear, we believe, that this outcome was, for all practical purposes, unaffected by the errors. May and Stiehm between them gathered in virtually all the potential votes from New Caucus supporters and somewhat more votes from PS, AH supporters and "others" than most other New Caucus (or New Caucus & Women's Caucus) nominees. The notion that the dilemma of which of two women candidates to vote for might have shifted pro-New Caucus or pro-Women's Caucus voters into voting for Dye is totally unsupported by the data.

### Vote on Constitutional Amendment

It is difficult to place the one Constitutional amendment ("Substituting 'Administrative Committee' for 'Executive Committee' ") in an ideological context though the debate between Lane and Mansfield<sup>14</sup> seemed to be about whether a constitutional change instituted via a change in administrative practice required/deserved legitimation/permanency through formal constitutional amendment — surely a familiar set of issues for most American Political scientists.

Only 77% (5644) of those who voted bothered to vote on the Constitutional Amendment. Among slate and near slate AH, PS voters, 52% voted yes, 37% voted no, and 11% did not vote on the amendment. Among New Caucus slate and near slate voters, 48% voted yes, 26% voted no, and 26% did not vote. Among the electorate as a whole, slightly over 50% voted yes, and 27% voted no, while 33% abstained.

These differences in percentages do not appear of any significance we can fathom except that possibly AH, PS supporters are somewhat more attuned to constitutional hairsplitting than other APSA members. One further note: As might have been expected, the more candidates a voter voted for the more likely he was *not* to abstain on the Constitutional amendment, e.g. 68% of the voters who voted for fewer than 5 candidates abstained on the amendment, while only 20%

of the voters who voted for 10 or more candidates abstained.

### Informal Analysis of Candidate Statements

We believe that there are limits to the amount of information which can be wrung solely from an analysis of ballot patterns — limits essentially reached by the Taylor-Tulloch study which preceded this one. Hence, we sought to extend the range of analysis by soliciting data from Council nominees, members of the various nominating committees, and a random sample of the APSA electorate. However, the results of this work are not yet available, and the combination of low response rate on the part of recipients and flaws in the research design make it unlikely that this work will ever see daylight. Thus, we now turn to the only other readily available data source — that provided by the candidates (and nominating groups) in the statements which accompanied the ballots. We performed an informal content analysis on these statements.<sup>14</sup> The statement of the APSA Nominating Committee stressed two themes: "representation (diversity)" and "effectiveness." The statement of the New Caucus stressed a number of themes, including the need for "policy (issue) focus," "dissatisfaction with the establishment," and the importance of teaching. The dominant motif of the Ad Hoc Committee statement was the need to defend "scholarly concerns" and "professional values." By looking at their "statement of views," we can usually distinguish PS + AH candidates from New Caucus candidates simply by looking for the words "scholarly" and "professional" used with positive connotation. All but three of the PS + AH candidates used one or both of these terms. Of the three who did not, Matthews hit one of the two keynotes sounded by the APSA Nominating Committee, effectiveness. He used terms like "sensible," "full and comprehensible," etc. Cook, on the other hand, argued for "vision," "moral urgency," and a need to "transcend the status quo," themes associated with the New Caucus; while Prewitt posed a dilemma of choice unclassifiable in ideological terms and

comprehensible only in the light of Prewitt's own work on the undesirability of public office. Only one New Caucus candidate, Dolbeare, spoke about "scholarly activities" in his statement of views; although another, Becker, spoke about his "academic achievements"; and a third, Tinker, used the term "the profession" in a neutral way; while a fourth, Lipsitz, used the term "scholarly interests" in his biographical statement. We might note that these four were the only New Caucus nominees to have received over 300 votes from Near Straight PS + AH voters (See Table 9). Of course, their popularity with PS + AH voters may have had nothing to do with their choice of vocabulary in their statement of views (e.g., it may have been due to their general reputation as scholars) and there is no way to tell for sure from the available data. However, the possible importance of the candidates' written statements is also suggested by two other facts.

(1) Except for Fenno (who is widely known for his stint as APSA Book Review Editor), the three PS + AH candidates who did not sound the usual PS, AH note of scholarship and professionalism (Matthews, Cook, and Prewitt) did marginally better among Near Straight Caucus voters than the other PS + AH candidates also not endorsed by the Women's Caucus. (Again, of course, reasons having nothing to do with their statements can be advanced to account for this.)

(2) The three New Caucus candidates who did not provide statements (Munoz, Roelofs, Rocco) did very badly, receiving the fewest votes of any New Caucus candidates from New Caucus supporters, and running poorly with PS, AH supporters and "others" as well. Only Roelofs, the best known of the three and having the additional advantage of a Women's Caucus endorsement, came close to receiving the mean vote for Caucus candidates. (See Table 9.)

Another clear differentia between PS, AH nominees and New Caucus nominees in 1971 was willingness to reveal one's exact age. In addition to Bay (who gave his exact age) 10 of the remaining 13 PS, AH nominees also

revealed their exact age in biographical statements accompanying the ballot, while only 3 of the 13 other New Caucus nominees did so.<sup>15</sup> A check of the APSA Directory revealed the ages of all but 2 of the candidates. Using this data, we learn that New Caucus nominees ranged in age from 31 to 50, with the median age 35, while PS, AH nominees ranged in age from 30 to 57 with the median age 45.<sup>16</sup> The median age of the candidates who gave their age was 43, of those who did not, 35.

Table 13 would appear to argue for the rationality of candidates informing voters of their exact age, since those who disclose their age seem, on the average, to do better. However, given the low N, the marginality of the differences, and the artificiality (combined May-Stiehm vote) for the Caucus 30-39 category, this conclusion is rather shaky; it may well be that younger candidates should, rather, *not* give their age, and instead hope that voters will think them older than they in fact are; since when we control for endorsement and for age disclosure, we see from Table 13 that older candidates, on the average, do marginally better than younger ones. Presumably, this simply reflects a generally greater professional visibility. Unfortunately, however, this conclusion is also suspect, since it is quite likely that the difference is artificial, reflecting the fact that both the mean age of candidates and the mean number of votes received by candidates with a given endorsement generally vary positively with the magnitude of the office sought.

14 I.e., we read the statements over several times.

15 Three of these 13 New Caucus nominees did not submit biographical statements.

16 We might also note that *all* PS, AH candidates were tenured and 11 out of 13 (12 of 14 if we include Bay) were full professors. Only 9 of the New Caucus nominees were tenured and only 4 were full professors (5 including Bay).