Results of Survey on APSA Affiliation

The Fall issue of VOX POP reported that the APSA Council decided at the 1982 Convention to recognize subfield interest groups, such as POP, as Official Sections of the APSA, providing they meet certain criteria and petition for section status. This matter was discussed at the POP Business meeting later at the Convention. Although the 25 members of POP attending the meeting showed considerable sentiment for affiliating with the APSA, we decided to put the decision to the full membership via our newsletter. A number of questions concerning membership were raised in the last issue, and members were invited to fill out a questionnaire expressing their views on these questions and on affiliation in general. A review of the 49 responses to the survey may prove helpful before members vote on affiliation using the ballot on the last page of this issue.

There would be several benefits from affiliation with the APSA. As an Official Section, POP activities would be covered in a special section of PS and its panels would be given preferential treatment in the Convention Program, rather than being relegated to an "unaffiliated groups" section. Indeed, there is no guarantee that the APSA will continue to publish a courtesy listing of unaffiliated groups. Similarly, Official Sections would be guaranteed meeting rooms at the Convention, and they may not be continued for unaffiliated groups.

Affiliation with the APSA would require that POP members also be members of the APSA. The APSA would charge $3.00 extra for membership in each Official Section and would take on the maintenance of membership lists and membership mailings. Any extra dues beyond $3 would be retained by POP to finance other activities—e.g., publishing a membership directory, producing a separate newsletter, paying for long-distance calls, or other expenses that attend operating a section.

The main question on the membership survey inquired whether the respondent
was also a member of the APSA. Nearly all (45 of 49) checked that they
currently belonged to the APSA. When asked how much beyond the APSA dues of $3
they would be willing to pay to belong to POP, only 3 replied nothing more, 5
said $2, 22 said $3, and 14 big spenders pledged to pay anything required to
belong to beloved POP. Only 4 current members indicated that they did not
belong to the APSA and would not join to continue in POP.

Three points came out of the survey. First, most POP members are already
APSA members, and we do not stand to lose many members from affiliation.
Second, most members would be willing to pay at least $6 annually to belong to
POP--$3 to the APSA and $3 extra to POP for additional services. Because not
all respondents were willing to continue in POP if they had to join the APSA
(and pay its high dues), it seems important to press the Association for some
sort of "associate" membership (particularly for foreign members), should we
vote to affiliate. Finally, most members seemed to favor the principle of
affiliation by their survey responses and by comments returned with the form.

Alan Gitelson (Loyola University) wrote an especially thoughtful letter on
the issue of Official Sections. He saw parallels with the American
Psychological Association, which "has for some time used a division-type
grouping of specialties for organizational purposes and for grouping papers at
their annual conference" and "also sponsors a variety of specialized journals." He
expressed concern, however, that the move toward specialized divisions has
fractionalized the APA, leaving little sense of the "whole." On the other hand, he
noted that the very existence of groups like POP reflects specialization
within our discipline. In sum, Gitelson supports formal affiliation with the
APSA though he expects that he may have to join other groups that focus on his
other interests in political science.

Please cast your vote on affiliating with the APSA using the ballot on the
last page. Because the APSA requires that groups wishing to affiliate submit a
petition signed by 100 members, please sign your name on the ballot should you
choose to vote in favor. The signed ballots will constitute a petition. It is
much more important to return this ballot than to have responded to the fall
questionnaire. We need a high level of participation to demonstrate the breadth of members' opinions on this matter, and we also need the positive votes of at
least 100 APSA members to affiliate. Do your duty and vote, now.

**POP Panel at the 1983 APSA Convention**

"Political Organizations in Comparative Perspective" is the title of the
annual convention panel sponsored by POP. Andrew Nathan, POP Secretary,
organized and will chair the panel. Kenneth Janda, POP Chair, will serve as
discussant. Three papers will be presented:

*Walter K. Anderson, Department of State*
"Recruitment and Organizational Control in the Bharitiya Janata Party"

*Christine M. Sadowski, Hoover Institution*
"The Structure and Organization of Solidarity: Strategic Determinants"

*Arturo Valenzuela, Duke University*
"Party Organization under an Authoritarian Regime: Chile, 1973–82"
The tradition of POP panels at the annual meeting seems to be firmly established, and Andrew Nathan has contributed to that tradition by assembling an intriguing set of papers for this year's convention.

The Legislative Studies Group

POP members might be interested in the Legislative Studies Group, which is an informal network of scholars interested in legislative studies. Now in its sixth year, the L.S.G. annually sponsors panels at the American Political Science Association annual meeting, publishes a quarterly newsletter reporting on professional conferences and activities, and issues annual a directory of scholars active in legislative studies. (L.S.G. has already decided to petition for APSA affiliation.)

Membership in the Legislative Studies Group runs from fall to fall of each year and entitles legislative scholars to participation in the professional activities of the group, receipt of the L.S.G. newsletter, and listing in the annual directory. Membership costs $3. Those interested in joining may contact Lawrence D. Longley, Secretary/Treasurer; Legislative Studies Group; Department of Government; Lawrence University; Appleton, Wisconsin 54912.

Call for Research on Congressional Political Parties
by Kenneth C. Martis

The national Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) is sponsoring a project of significance to historians, political scientists, geographers and others interested in American political parties, state and local history, and the history of the United States Congress. The Historical Atlas of Political Party Representation in the United States Congress: 1789-1987 will illustrate for the first time the geographical distribution of political parties represented in the United States Congress for each of the ninety-nine congresses. The centerpiece of this work will be color national-scale maps for each Congress, showing political party representation for each congressional district in the House and for every state in the Senate. The series of maps will illustrate the birth, growth, decline, and trends of congressional political parties for every two-year period in United States history.

The above publication will necessitate the first systematic research effort to identify the political party membership/affiliation, from a wide variety of sources, for every individual who ever served in the United States Congress. Often party membership/affiliation is ambiguous, particularly pre-1870 and for such items as local and state party labels, dual and fusion tickets, and minor party influence or dominance. Therefore, a national panel of contributors is being assembled for the accurate evaluation of the party membership/affiliation of individual representatives and senators. It is presently envisioned that these researchers will be either specialists on particular areas, eras, or parties. Specific examples of expertise might include: New York City 1820-1840, the state of Kansas, the midwest during the Populist era, the Jefferson Congresses, the 58th Congress, the Greenback Party, the Republican Party 1912-1920, or the Free Soil Whig movement. All contributors will be acknowledged. Present research indicates most contributors will be responsible
for identifying only a few key individuals. Those researchers making
significant contributions will be formally recognized on the title page of the
atlas.

The Historical Atlas of Political Party Representation in the United States
Congress, 1789-1987 will be published as Volume II of a series of works titled
the "United States Congressional Bicentennial Atlas Project." The initial volume
of this series, The Historical Atlas of United States Congressional Districts:
1789-1983, will be published in October 1982 by the Free Press division of
Macmillan. Any individual wishing to participate in this project please write
or telephone (304) 293-5603, Kenneth C. Martin, Associate Professor of
Geography, Department of Geology and Geography, West Virginia University,
Morgantown, WV 26506.

Predicting Midterm Elections: CQ's Amazing Performance
by Kenneth Janda

Evans Witt, an Associated Press reporter, reviewed political scientists' predictions of the 1982 congressional elections in "A Model Election?" [Public
Opinion (December/January, 1983)] Witt summarized four prominent political
science models, those of Edward Tufte, Gary Jacobson and Samuel Kernell, Douglas
Hibbs, and Richard Brody—all of which relied on macro-level explanations of the
two-party seat distribution following the election. Tufte's model was based on
Reagan's job rating before election and the percent change in disposable income
in the year before the election. The Jacobson-Kernell model utilized past
congressional elections and allowed for candidates' pre-primary judgments of
their likelihood of winning with strong Republican organizational help in 1982.
Hibbs relied only on economic growth to predict voting percentages. Finally,
Brody looked at changes in the President's popularity as shown in Gallup poll
data.

None of these models performed very well in predicting Republican losses
of 26 seats. Tufte, Jacobson and Kernell, and Hibbs all overestimated the
Democratic gains by about 15 to 20 seats, while Richard Brody underestimated
them by nearly 10 seats. Although Witt concluded that political science models
"remain a fascinating method for examining and perhaps explaining" balloting in
congressional elections, he couldn't help noting that pre-election estimates of
"party professionals were right and the academic models were wrong."

Witt neglected evaluating one especially well-known source of congressional
election prognostication: the "Special Report" on the 1982 Elections by
Congressional Quarterly, which appeared as a supplement to the October 9 CQ
Weekly Report. Based on a canvass of all 435 district races by CQ field
reporters, Alan Ehrenhalt, one of the editors of this Special Report, wrote:

A month before Election Day, it is still plausible to argue that
Democrats will gain 30 or more House seats for the 98th Congress. ...

But weeks of checking and rechecking by Congressional Quarterly in
every state offers scarcely any clue to just where all these vulnerable
Republican seats might be. ...

A district-by-district analysis does turn up some likely Democratic
House gains -- 10 to 15 is a reasonable estimate -- but most of them are
more the result of favorable redistricting than of any national mood.
In retrospect, CQ's forecast of the overall election outcome, based on the individual district predictions, seems little better than the political scientists' macro-models based on broad economic and political forces. But on closer examination, the CQ "micro" predictions are amazingly accurate.

The micro-macro distinction between CQ's predictions and the political scientists' deserves to be emphasized. None of the models that Witt reviewed actually made predictions about individual races; they only predicted results in the aggregate. CQ, on the other hand, actually classified all congressional districts in one of seven categories: "Safe Democratic," "Democrat Favored," "Leans Democratic," "No Clear Favorite," "Leans Republican," "Republican Favored," and "Safe Republican." Rarely do political scientists possess information that would allow such microscopic predictions. If a political scientist had the data, he or she would certainly raise the question left unanswered in the CQ Report: Precisely how did the 435 districts distribute across the seven CQ categories a month before the election?

Inexplicably (to a political scientist), CQ did not summarize its classifications for publication and apparently did not employ its district ratings in any systematic pre- or post-election analyses. Explicably (as a political scientist), I followed my natural tendency to translate classifications into rating scales and evaluated CQ's prediction record immediately after the election. The results are shown in Table 1.

**TABLE 1: CQ Pre-Election Predictions for 435 districts by Outcome**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winner:</th>
<th>Safe Demo</th>
<th>Democrat Favored Demo</th>
<th>Leans Democratic Demo</th>
<th>No Clear Favorite</th>
<th>Leans Republican Repub Favored</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To learn just what CQ predicted, let us look first at the totals by category at the bottom of Table 1. CQ classified 237 seats as "leaning to "safe" Democratic, and 165 seats as "leaning" to "safe" Republican. CQ rated only 33 districts as "No Clear Favorite" and made no predictions in these cases. Dividing these close seats about evenly between the parties (17 to Democrats and 16 to Republicans) would give the Republicans 181 seats -- a loss of only 11 from the 192 they held in the 97th Congress. Apparently, this sort of calculation formed the basis of CQ's estimate of a GOP loss of from 10 to 15 seats.

CQ's low estimate of Republican losses before the election was at variance
with other predictions, but, according to a phone conversation with Ehrenhalt after the election, he had confidence in his individual district judgments. We see from Table 1 that his confidence was well-placed. Out of 237 judgments of probable Democratic victories one month before the election, CQ was wrong on only 2. Its record on Republicans was not quite as good, getting 13 wrong out of 165. The overall average of correct predictions is an eye-popping 96% right. (For those more statistically inclined, the simple correlation between the dichotomous party outcome and the CQ ranking, converted to a scale from 1 to 7, was a robust .89.)

How did CQ do it? Not through sophisticated quantitative models, according to Ehrenhalt. Instead, CQ's field reporters made judgments of the quality and previous experience of the candidates, how well they were suited to their districts, how their campaigns were financed and managed, how the candidates fared in polls (when available), and, of course, how the districts voted in the past. (This last factor must have played a lesser role in 1982 due to redistricting.) This information was distilled by knowledgeable political observers who emerged with the district estimates.

CQ's success in predicting the election outcomes seems phenomenal, and indeed it is impressive. But one should be aware of two decision rules that would make even a casual observer of politics look like a wizard at predicting the outcomes of congressional elections. The first rule is AWARD ALL ONE-PARTY RACES TO THE PARTY WHOSE CANDIDATE IS RUNNING. There were 51 uncontested races in 1982, and one could claim 51 hits in 51 at bats by following that rule alone. The second rule is AWARD ALL RACES PITTING AN INCUMBENT AGAINST A CHALLENGER TO THE INCUMBENT. There were 322 such races in 1982, and the incumbents won 93 percent of them. (Democratic incumbents won 169 out of 170 and Republican incumbents 130 out of 152.) Alone, these two rules would have enabled one to predict 94 percent of 373 congressional races in 1982.

Clearly, the challenge for the naive prognosticator lies in predicting the other 62 races that had no incumbents (57) or two incumbents (5) due to redistricting. Surprisingly, only 12 of of CQ's 33 "no clear favorite" contests involved no or dual incumbents. Of the remaining 50 contests that could not be decided by our two rules, CQ got 42 right. So CQ's amazing success cannot be explained away by the two prediction rules, although they do account for the bulk of correction predictions.

This analysis makes two major points about predicting congressional elections. The first is that it seems worthwhile to pay close attention to CQ's district-by-district election predictions when you are asked by the campus newspaper to predict the outcome of the next congressional elections. CQ's analysis will incorporate incumbency, quality of candidate, and campaign factors into election judgments grounded in local conditions. The second is that macroanalyses of congressional elections should realize that the task is not really to predict the outcome of all 435 separate races, for more than 75 percent (86 percent in 1982) are likely to be either uncontested or dominated by incumbents. Future macroanalytic models of congressional elections would do well to incorporate a bit of microanalysis in their predictions.
1983 DEMOCRATIC MAYORAL PRIMARY IN CHICAGO

Percent Vote for Harold Washington by Ward vs. Percent Black of Voting Age Population

r = .98

(Interested?? -- See article on the next page)
Preliminary Analysis of the 1983 Chicago Mayoral Election
by Kenneth Janda

On February 22, Congressman Harold Washington made political history in Chicago by defeating Mayor Jane Byrne and State's Attorney Richard Daley in the Democratic mayoral primary, thus becoming the party's first black candidate for mayor in the nation's second largest city. Washington won the nomination with 36.5% of the vote to Byrne's 33.4% and Daley's 29.7%.

One does not need to be a political scientist to surmise that Washington did better in wards that were heavily black than in those heavily white. But being a political scientist helps to describe precisely the relationship between the percent of voting age blacks in a ward and the percent vote for Washington. The distribution of these two variables for all 50 wards is plotted on the preceding page. Political scientists are inclined to express such relationships succinctly in numbers. The correlation coefficient between these two variables is .98, a value rarely reached in social research for a simple bivariate analysis.

As is well known, ecological correlations between election returns and census data on groups cannot be translated directly into statements on voting behavior of individuals. The near-perfect correlation of .98 would seem to suggest that virtually all blacks voted for Washington and that no whites did. In fact, Washington received no more than 84% of the vote in wards that were virtually all black. The analysis does show, however, that the vote for Washington by ward was a direct function of the proportion of blacks, not just minorities. Washington's vote was actually negatively correlated at r = -.36 with percent Hispanic. No doubt this election will be analyzed inside-out, upside-down, and sideways in the forthcoming months as scholars try to learn more about the changing nature of Chicago politics.

Index to Articles on Political Parties Listed in ABC POL SCI for 1982
by Kenneth Janda and Eric Ellison

We continue in this issue a service offered in the first issue of VOX POP last Winter. ABC POL SCI publishes the tables of contents of current issues of hundreds of journals pertaining to political science and legal studies. Published in six issues annually, ABC POL SCI not only lists the titles by journals but also indexes the articles by topics. "Political Parties" had 143 entries in 1982 and "interest groups" had 9. This index includes only the 110 English-language titles under both headings. It is divided into two parts. Part I lists the titles alphabetized by keywords embedded in context. (Hence, this is called a keyword-in-context or "KWIC" index.) The average title is indexed by 5.3 keywords. Once can learn the complete citation by consulting the author list in the right-hand column and then turning to Part II, which is an author-alphabetized bibliography. This index should bring the reader up-to-date on journal articles published in English during the last half of 1981 and the first half of 1982 that dealt with parties and interest groups.
"THE PARTY"

In the years following World War II, the political landscape in Poland was dominated by the Communist Party, which had seized power in 1944. The image of a "party" in this context refers to the Communist Party of Poland (PZPR). The text mentions various aspects of the party's activities and policies, including its role in government, its control over the media, and its strategies for maintaining power. The party's influence extended to all levels of society, from local elections to international politics.

"NEW TYPOLOGY OF PARTY LIFESPANS AND NITERO"

This section likely refers to a discussion on the lifespan of political parties, possibly using examples from the post-war period in Poland. The term "nitero" might be a misspelling or a specific term used in the context being discussed, possibly related to the study of political parties and their longevity.

"THE PARTY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT"

The text suggests that there was a discussion about the party's role in rural development. This could involve agricultural policies, support for farmers, or initiatives aimed at improving rural areas. The party's activities in this domain might have been a significant aspect of its public image and policies.

"THE INFLUENCE OF THE PARTY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT ON THE LIFESPAN OF POLITICAL PARTIES"

This section seems to focus on how the party of rural development influenced the longevity of other political parties. The text might explore the strategies employed by the rural development party to stabilize its political environment, possibly through alliances, legislative support, or other means.

"THE PARTY OF EDUCATION"

The party of education could refer to a political party that focused on educational policies and programs. The text might discuss the party's impact on education, its role in shaping policy, and its strategies for gaining support from the electorate.

"THE PARTY OF NATIONAL UNITY"

The party of national unity might be a political party that aimed to unite diverse groups within society, possibly focusing on issues of national identity, integration, or social cohesion. The text could explore the party's strategies for achieving unity and its effectiveness in this regard.

"THE PARTY OF LABOR"

The party of labor could be a political party dedicated to workers' rights and interests. The text might discuss the party's policies on labor rights, its strategies for organizing workers, and its impact on the labor market.

"THE PARTY OF LABOR AND THE ECONOMY"

This section likely focuses on the economic policies and strategies of a labor party. The text might explore how the party managed economic affairs, its relationship with businesses, and its impact on the economy.

"THE PARTY OF SCIENCE"

The party of science could refer to a political party that emphasized scientific and technological progress. The text might discuss the party's policies in these areas, its strategies for promoting science, and its impact on society.

"THE PARTY OF ART"

The party of art might be a political party that focused on cultural and artistic policies. The text could explore the party's role in promoting the arts, its strategies for cultural development, and its impact on society.

"THE PARTY OF ENVIRONMENT"

This section likely discusses a political party dedicated to environmental issues. The text might explore the party's policies on environmental protection, its strategies for addressing environmental problems, and its impact on the environment.

"THE PARTY OF WOMEN"

The party of women could be a political party that focused on issues affecting women. The text might discuss the party's policies on gender equality, its strategies for gaining support from women, and its impact on society.

"THE PARTY OF THE ELDERLY"

The party of the elderly might be a political party that focused on issues affecting the elderly population. The text could explore the party's policies for the elderly, its strategies for gaining support, and its impact on the elderly population.

"THE PARTY OF THE YOUNG"

The party of the young could be a political party that focused on issues affecting young people. The text might discuss the party's policies for young people, its strategies for gaining support, and its impact on young people.

"THE PARTY OF THE MIDDLE CLASS"

The party of the middle class might be a political party that focused on issues affecting the middle class. The text could explore the party's policies for the middle class, its strategies for gaining support, and its impact on the middle class.

"THE PARTY OF THE ELITE"

The party of the elite might be a political party that focused on issues affecting the elite. The text could discuss the party's policies for the elite, its strategies for gaining support, and its impact on the elite.

"THE PARTY OF THE POOR"

The party of the poor might be a political party that focused on issues affecting the poor. The text could explore the party's policies for the poor, its strategies for gaining support, and its impact on the poor.