

To the Editor:

The plans announced by Professor Marvick for the 1972 program of the APSA convention (P.S. Fall, 1971) include a drastic reduction in the number of paper-givers and discussants over preceding years. This strikes me as a basically sound decision. In the past the more participants were allowed for, the larger the number of colleagues who could obtain travel funds to attend the convention. It need no longer be a major consideration as universities across the country have reduced if not eliminated such funds. I only hope that a tighter market for panel slots will mean that a quantitative loss will produce a qualitative gain in contributions.

I would like to suggest that a reduction in the size of the program should lead to a consideration of a shorter convention. Unlike other professional associations, we have extended the length of our meetings and hereby made it more costly to stay from start to finish. Moreover, changes in the calendar of an increasing number of colleges and universities have moved the beginning of the academic year to the first week of September. For various reasons another meeting time may not be feasible. But conflicts between institutional responsibilities and associational activities might to some extent be reduced if the annual meeting were to be limited to the last three days in the first week of September.

Lewis J. Edinger
Columbia University

To the Editor:

Professor Adamany's article on undergraduate evaluation procedures raises issues of particular concern to political scientists, whose discipline is especially concerned with controversial topics and matters of fundamental personal belief. Non-calibrated grading methods, such as Pass-Fail, have the potential for depreciating the value of courses graded in such fashion, either by introducing extraneous factors in the process (e.g. judgments about the "worth" or "moral value" of a student's beliefs), or by eliminating any meaningful distinctions between the accomplishment levels of students.

Inability to make a sufficiently significant distinction between numbers of students can be a most trying problem in experimental programs not

using traditional teaching methods. For the past semester I have sponsored a number of independent field work projects under the auspices of the newly established Center for Experimental Studies at Holy Cross. This program allows students to pursue full time internships and other work study projects in government offices, public service organizations, and businesses, for regular academic credit. Performance is checked by a faculty sponsor, and grade components include research papers, on-the-job reports, as well as evaluations by field supervisors.

One problem of evaluating such work is the nature of the supervisory evaluations, which tend to be uniformly favorable. Lacking a calibrated measure for performance, and recognizing the uniqueness of each project, supervisors might very well be hesitant to evaluate students in a manner to give clearly defined and measurable distinctions. This experience coincides with what Professor Adamany refers to as the "banality" of most written evaluations, a situation which the Educational Testing Service has also commented upon: "faculty ratings and recommendations have often been shown to have relatively low reliabilities." *Guide to the Use of GRE Scores, 1970-71, p. 16.*

The enthusiasm of business schools for ungraded evaluation systems is no great recommendation for such methods. Percentile scores for the 22 advanced GRE tests given in the base periods May 1965 to April 1968 show the 99th percentile in the business exam to be 720. Political Science has a 99th percentile of 740. Only six of the 22 fields produced 99th percentiles at or below 740 (business, education, music, geography, speech, physical education) in addition to political science (*Handbook for the Interpretation of GRE Scores, 1968-69, p. 11*).

The political science mean score during that period was 535; subsequent reinterpretation of this score produced means of 526 and 514, according to recalculation of means in terms of "rolling norms," i.e. base periods of previous three year test periods; the base periods for the latter scores are 1966-69 and 1967-70 (*Guide to the Use of GRE Scores, p. 13*). Granted a general reduction in overall means for most fields (physics increased in its mean by 2 points), these figures show that the students who are tested for admission to graduate programs in political science fall into the lowest third of all students tested for the fields examined in the GRE.

Without wishing to disparage business school admissions officers or business school students, there is strong suggestive evidence that neither business schools nor graduate political science programs are attracting applicants of the quality of the "hard" sciences; anthropology, mathematics, chemistry, physics and philosophy all have 99th percentiles above 900 (*Guide*, p. 12). It is unlikely that these examinations are any less stringent than those given to political science, business, or education majors.

To make general use of Pass-Fail or other subjective evaluation methods would be to perilously ignore the implications of the GRE findings. Political scientists should be hesitant to emulate the willingness of business schools to accept ungraded evaluations. Such enthusiasm ill befits a field which, in light of the GRE findings, does not seem able to attract a high caliber of student, not to mention what such scores imply for the quality of undergraduate business education; the business GRE exam during the 1965-68 period produced a 1st percentile of 260, political science 1st was 320, and only 9 of the 22 exams produced such low 1st percentiles (*Handbook*, p. 11).

Although I do not agree with Professor Adamany's judgment of standardized tests as arbitrary, I agree that the use of imprecise student grading methods will disadvantage students in their attempts at graduate admissions.

Roland E. Dufault
College of the Holy Cross

To the Editor:

For the last two years *PS* has been conscientious in examining the status of women in the profession of political science. Victoria Schuck, "Women in Political Science" (Fall 1969, p. 642), pointed out that in 1968 women comprised 11.4% of political scientists. In a subsequent article she wrote, "Femina Students rei Publicae" (Fall 1970, p. 622), that women publish 3.1% of journal articles, give 4.1% of the papers at conferences, and make up 7.3% of the membership of the American Political Science Association. Philip E. Converse and Jean M. Converse, "The Status of Women as Students and Professionals in Political Science" (Summer 1971, p. 328), described discrimination in graduate schools and in the job market. Finally, Jane Jaquette, "The Status of Women in the Profession:

Tokenism" (Fall 1971, p. 530), gave the results of a survey showing that during 1960-1968 women were 14.7% of Ph.D. candidates and 8.7% of Ph.D. recipients.

Should women believe that this recent sharp focus of attention on their status will assist in amelioration of the situation? Some indication is given in the annual listing of "Doctoral Dissertations in Political Science, 1971," (Fall, 1971, p. 607), which gives both dissertations in preparation and those recently completed. An analysis of these by sex gives little encouragement to the notion that the female proportion of the profession is on the rise.

If the list is viewed in totality, we find 1,695 names of which 81% (1,381) are male, 13% (210) are female, and 6% (104) are not readily identifiable by name. If the list is broken down by dissertations "in preparation" as opposed to those "completed," there is little change: 80% (769) of those in "preparation" and 80% (612) of those "completed" are by males; 12% (120) of those "in preparation" and 12% (90) of those "completed" are by females, and the percentage of unknown is 6% (50) and 7% (54).

However the proportion of women does increase if the list is viewed by selected subject areas.

Subject	Male %	Female %	Unknown %	Total No.
Philosophy, Theory & Methodology	85	12	3	220
U.S. Government & Politics	80.6	13.4	.98	201
U.S. Constitutional & Admin. Law	89	10	—	87
Public Administration	78	11	11	106
Foreign & Comparative Govt. & Pol.	77	10	10	563
International Organization Politics and Law	80	8	9	277

The percentage of females varies from a low of 8% to a high of 13.4%. According to these figures, the field most favorable to females is U.S. Government and Politics, while that least favorable is International Organization Politics and Law. But the difference in percentage is so small as not to change perceptibly the whole picture. Even if all the unknown names should turn out to be female, the proportion of women would still not go over 22%, and it is far more likely that less than half of them are.

The writer does not presume to draw any weighty conclusions from this rough survey of these figures, only to point out that within our chosen field the most recent indicators show that women still have a great distance to go before they achieve some semblance of parity with the male members of the profession.

Patricia S. Florestano
University of Maryland

To the Editor:

On page 591 of the Fall 1971 issue of PS, an official journal of the American Political Science Association, appears a letter by John P. East of East Carolina College that includes the title of a paper delivered at the 67th Annual Meeting. The paper was by Sanford V. Levinson and was entitled "Fucking vs. Making Love: The Problem of Political Education."

"I find this kind of language wholly indefensible at a scholarly convention which would hopefully pride itself on the pursuit of excellence, civility, and the life of the mind," the letter states. He goes on to call it "at best . . . crude and callow" and asks for an "official explanation from our officers" before concluding with a comparison of the treatment received by the Conference for Democratic Politics and "other groups" (unnamed but presumably including the Caucus "such as Levinson might represent") from the Association leadership.

Aside from being shocked by the use of such language (albeit attributed to another) by a self-appointed champion of civility, I wonder whether this is a proper subject for discussion in this forum. Surely the readers of this magazine are not looking to its pages for their kicks; presumably they are not likely to be shocked by simple four-letter Anglo-Saxon words. I take the import of the title quoted to be the added element beyond mere description of behavior conveyed by the choice of terms employed (I stand ready to accept a correction from Mr. Levinson if he so wishes). As such, such a topic is clearly important to students of politics, in these days when air bombardments are called protective reaction strikes and military officers are quoted as saying "it was necessary to destroy the village in order to save it." To focus attention on the terms used in the title of the paper merely emphasizes the importance accorded those

symbols we call words, perhaps to the point of neglecting the import of the behavior involved.

I would also take issue with Mr. East's emphases for the profession with "excellence, civility, and the life of the mind" as the enunciated values. A concern for truth should head the list, and Mr. East's candidates — while virtuous — mean little in the absence of a dedication to pursue truth. In the pursuit of that elusive objective, excessive concern with the trappings of civility might be a hindrance.

Finally, I claim foul when a letter that uses alleged obscenity in the convention program as a come-on ends with yet another sally in the endless battle to put the Association on the proper ideological path. I suspect the letter would not have been published if it had been solely devoted to the concern of the last paragraph; I suspect the author knows that as well as I do.

Paul Lutzker
Swarthmore College

To the Editor:

In the last issue of PS there appeared a letter by John P. East protesting the APSA program listing of a paper by Sanford Levinson entitled "F - - - ing v. Making Love: The Problem of Political Education." Mr. East said he found such language to be "indefensible," "anti-intellectual" and in violation of "the pursuit of excellence, civility and the life of the mind." Several comments are in order before we join Mr. East in his crusade.

(1) It is not entirely clear which words Mr. East finds offensive. Is it the "f - - - ing" or is it the "making love"? Many people are upset by references to either activity, and some individuals do not even make a distinction between the two.

(2) Mr. East should have made it perfectly clear that Prof. Levinson engaged in no acts during his panel presentation — at least none that could be detected from the audience. Prof. Levinson's concern with "f - - - ing" and "m - - - ing l - - e" remained firmly in the realm of ideas. And I think that was to his credit.

(3) There persists the more important question of whether Prof. Levinson, while confining himself to the life of the mind, was nevertheless forcefully

teaching and advocating certain acts (Dennis v. U.S.), or was merely engaging in a philosophical and theoretical inquiry (Yates v. U.S.). Mr. East has not informed us as to how clear and present was the danger posed by Prof. Levinson (Schenck v. U.S.).

(4) I would give my unequivocal support to Mr. East were I not astonished to discover that in his very own letter, he used the word "f - - ing" in its full spelling. Rather than making deletions, as I thoughtfully have done, he saw fit to insert the "u" and the "c" and even the "k" in their respective but uncalled for places, very much as had Prof. Levinson in the original paper — all of which leads me to conclude that Mr. East is becoming no better than the thing he says he opposes. One can only recall Pascal's immortal comment: "He who would act the angel, acts the brute."

Really, Mr. East, if certain words are offensive in the APSA convention program, what makes you think they are any less offensive in *PS*? If Prof. Levinson has abused *your* sense of civility and decency, just think what you have done to *mine*. Or don't you give a d - - n? It will not do, sir, to offer excuses about context, function and motive. (That is probably the very kind of argument that Prof. Levinson would fall back on.) Words are words — as nanny taught us — and regardless of the enticement, a gentleman should never become too familiar with certain of them.

Michael Parenti
University of Vermont

To the Editor:

We would like to tell the members of the American Political Science Association who are published or prospective authors that they may be eligible for membership in The Authors Guild. The Guild is a voluntary association of 3,500 writers. Its principal activities — along with those of its parent organization, The Authors League of America, to which Authors Guild members belong automatically — are: to promote and protect the professional interests of authors in the basic areas of freedom of expression, copyright protection, book contracts, taxation, pertinent legislation.

Writers of textbooks and contributors to professional journals and library publications are of great concern to the oldest and largest

organization of authors in the country. A number of professionals in the academic community already belong to The Authors Guild in order that they may speak with the collective power of book writers in general and may keep informed of book and magazine markets and practices. We have discovered in the last few years that textbooks and supplementary book authors — especially those with links to the colleges and universities — have not always been armed with the knowledge and representation that results in stronger contracts and copyright protection.

Over the years The Authors Guild has worked hard to improve the terms that all writers, including scholars and authors of textbooks, receive from their publishers. In this context, The Authors Guild is now preparing a guide for authors in the textbook and college fields that will bring up to date one of our basic member publications, *YOUR BOOK CONTRACT*. We believe strongly that good book contracts and freedom of expression are as important to those who write textbooks as to trade book authors.

The Authors League obtained a change in the 1969 Tax Reform Act giving authors the benefit of the 50% maximum rate; it is responsible for changes in the Social Security Act protecting authors over 65 from loss of benefits; it has secured legislation qualifying authors' contributions to retirement funds as tax deductible; it has enabled authors to enjoy tax averaging of windfall income. We are working for revision of the term of copyright to life-plus-50 years, and for other forms of protection — crucial in an age of computer libraries, microfilm and microfiche, photocopying and cassettes — against the use of copyrighted works without compensation. The Authors League and the Guild are frequent participants in free expression and free writing appeals before the courts, and stand by to help writers against censorship of their works.

Any of you who have recently published books or are about to publish them, with a university press, textbook house, or regular trade book publisher, would be eligible for membership. We would be pleased to have our Membership Committee consider your application and answer any of your questions addressed to our national headquarters: The Authors Guild, Inc., 234 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036.

Herbert Mitgang
President, The Authors Guild

To the Editor:

In my teaching experience at four different schools, I have been struck by the failure of political scientists to bring politicians into the classroom to talk with the students. Each semester I contact half a dozen politicians and government employees, to ask them whether they would be interested in visiting my classes in American politics. Almost without exception, they are not only willing but are delighted to be asked. Visitors to my classes have included congressmen, party organization leaders, top ranking state and local political and career executives, representatives of interest groups, legislators, gubernatorial staff, and reporters. If the instructor has done his job in preparing the class to ask relevant questions, these guest sessions can be extremely valuable. I have found that the best format is usually to let the visitor speak about 10 minutes on his background, and then to open himself up to questions from the floor. Of course, this appeals to the typical harried politician, who is glad to forego the task of preparing some kind of formal speech.

Another attractive feature of these visits is that it is almost never necessary to provide any financial inducement to visitors who live nearby, so that the only costs involved are those of lunch. I am sure that no such inducements are necessary, because the visitors both enjoy talking with students, and view an invitation from the University as an honorific one, not to be refused. Many professionals in government, in addition, view it as part of their public service duty. (In some cases, in fact, guests have adamantly refused to accept any kind of honorarium.)

Inviting this kind of guest to a college classroom can enhance any political science course dealing with American government. It is my impression that political scientists are not adequately availing themselves of this resource, and I urge them to seriously consider doing so.

Douglas M. Fox
University of Connecticut

To the Editor:

I would like to bring to the attention of the membership some of my views on the current market situation and employment practices for political scientists.

It is my contention that while there may be some current shrinkage in enrollments as a result of the general economic recession, and some falling off in the *growth* rate of projected future enrollments, a significant factor in hiring policies and load factors (teacher-student ratios and teacher class hours) has been a result of a combination of budget cutting and inflation (i.e. — less dollars to deal with higher costs and static or increasing public demands for services). Since 40-60%+ of most educational institution budgets goes into faculty salaries, that is where many institutions begin cutting costs. One way to do this relatively unobtrusively all the while keeping most of a faculty pacified is to use the part-time instructor or extra-class gambit. The part-time instructor is hired to teach one or two classes at part-time pay scales, not at a percentage of equivalent rank and training full-time scales. In the same manner the full-time faculty member is "given the opportunity" (and often, first choice) to teach an "extra class" at part-time pay scale.

The result is that two or three extra classes are taught by part-time faculty or by moonlighting full-time staff for literally one-half to one-third of what a full-time professor would cost.

The "consumer," the student, is likely to be short changed in the quality of education available to him and, it is hardly necessary to note, a concomitant effect is a heavier burden on the proportionately dwindling full-time faculty for counseling, faculty-administration advisory committees, student activity sponsorship, library purchase recommendations, for service on faculty senates — in short, for all those "normal" duties for which the shadowy part-time staff is, not surprisingly, not available. All the while the school catalog of course offerings looks good and the budget "adjustments" largely come at the expense of the present and future faculty members, and even hapless grad students who succumb to the economic pressures and thus perpetuate a vicious cycle.

For example, we now have one faculty member (grad student in history, University of Washington) teaching two courses at Seattle Central Community College, and one at Shoreline Community College amounting to a 15 hour load for part-time pay scales at both institutions!

These patterns that I see developing in Seattle Central Community College and others in this

state and elsewhere are significant to the political science profession because Community Colleges are the fastest growing segment of higher education in the United States and thus can have a significant impact on the job market. It is my conviction that APSA can and should conduct a survey to establish the exact dimensions of the practice. Statistics thus developed should be publicized with clear reference to their implications for placement now and in the future. Further, an "education" campaign should be mounted by APSA to stimulate affirmative action by each department. The problem should also be approached from the other direction by urging the college and university Accreditation Boards to develop standards that include an acceptable ratio of part-time to full-time staff, perhaps based on a percentage of the total number of course sections offered per quarter or even per academic year.

I will grant you that jobless graduate students, many desperate for money and experience, women with degrees but personal commitments that prevent accepting full-time positions even if available, nepotism rules that allow emergency use of faculty wives, full-time professors who moonlight for the extras in life, and those who face compulsory retirement at sixty-five but want to keep a hand in, are a formidable group to educate to their professional responsibilities and in the long run their professional self-interest.

However, a unified campaign in the profession for *commensurate pay*, credit towards advancement in rank, and fringe-benefits (retirement, insurance programs, etc.) for less than full-time teaching duties coupled with accreditation requirements of a percentage limit on the number of classes taught by part-time employees could work for constructive change in providing more full-time teaching positions, and proper compensation for all of those who need flexibility.

Standing up to the public and proclaiming that we will no longer be tromped upon is never easy, nor is it pleasant. But the stakes are rather irrepresive. Even one full-time staff position in political science on each community college, college, and university campus in the United States salvaged from the policy of the use of multiple part-timers could make a significant difference in the now bleak outlook for those graduate students who have invested a horrendous total of time, money, and effort in preparing themselves to teach, to say nothing of preserving the need for existing

graduate faculties to train them! I believe this is a matter of appropriate concern to APSA's Human Resources Committee chaired by Professor James March.

Marie Barovic Rosenberg

Seattle Central Community College and
Executive Council, Pacific
Northwest Political Science Association

To the Editor:

It was with great satisfaction that I read the report of the APSA Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education. The commitment of the Association to improving the products of the American high school is gratifying, if long overdue. We are all indebted to the Committee members and the PSEP staff for their untiring labors. My own sincere appreciation of the Committee's work must be tempered, unfortunately, by some rather emphatic criticisms. To no small degree the shortcomings of the endeavor grew out of the first problem stated in the report — mutual isolation. I find it very difficult to see how any committee which included only one member (as far as I can determine) with any experience in high school teaching could really comprehend the magnitude of the problem. The extent of isolation is often reflected in the language of the report, much of which would not be understood by many high school teachers. One would hope for greater communication between the discipline and public school teachers, but we in academe will be compelled to talk their language.

While much of the report does bear on real shortcomings of pre-collegiate education, it appears to exclude the most important ones. The textbooks are ridiculous; however, there are new teaching materials available. Many of these are well-designed units with a problem-solving orientation even if they do tend to denigrate politics as an entity. Of course it must be remembered that texts are usually chosen by administrators, so availability would not guarantee acceptance. Moreover, availability doesn't insure use by the student under expert guidance.

The Committee essentially avoided a far more significant issue — the teaching environment in the public high school classroom. Like it or not, the problem in the classroom is largely one of discipline, and teachers just pray that some of that

conformity which the Committee saw imposed at the elementary level might carry over. Even if he had no such problems, the conscientious teacher who might wish to innovate and to improve his teaching is restricted considerably by a class load of 165, a teaching load of 25 hours, and 5 hours of hall duty or other weird assignments.

The problem in pre-collegiate education which overshadows everything is teacher preparation. The Committee cavalierly suggests that a government teacher in high school should have "competencies in political science roughly equivalent to those of undergraduate political science majors." Most political science majors will have had 30 college hours or more in the field; however, in most states one can be certified to teach government with no more than 18 hours, with 12 in many states, and possibly even fewer. The evil of teacher certification lies in what is laughingly called the "social studies concentration." A student can easily spread himself among subjects so that his 42 or so hours include 12 in American history, and 6 in European history, sociology, economics, geography, and political science. He can, in most states, teach any of those courses even though he will have had only 6 hours beyond the freshman survey level. When this is projected to the elementary school level, it can be safely said that most teachers there have had no more than 6 hours in political science totally.

If the insanity of teacher certification were not enough (especially in the face of a catastrophic teacher surplus), the misplacement of teachers defies belief. The fact is that very few schools offer enough sections of American government and allied classes to utilize a full time — and qualified — political science graduate, so he must be "certified" in other subjects in order to get a job. Even if he is qualified in government, he very likely will not be adequate in his economics and sociology courses. This ridiculous situation has been exacerbated historically by the almost universal notion that "anybody can teach social studies." So one finds football coaches teaching American government even when qualified political science majors are available.

This rather unpleasant but realistic criticism of the Committee's work would not be at all fair unless some positive alternatives were to follow. I would make several modest proposals.

(1) Let the excellent beginning toward curriculum reform go forward. (One can foresee grants, workshops, and sophisticated publications resulting. And we desperately need more publications!)

(2) Let the Association put its energies into a drive for a national teacher certification law that demands adequate training in courses to be taught.

(3) Let the regional associations exert their pressure on state departments of education which certify teachers.

(4) Let college and university faculties encourage schools of education to eliminate "social studies majors," and perhaps to offer "Government for Teachers" courses — taught by political scientists.

(5) Let every member bring all possible pressure on local school administrators to reallocate teachers according to academic training.

(6) Finally, and most important, during the decade or so necessary to implement these objectives, let us get on with the task of teaching the products of the schools as we find them and of educating future teachers. If freshmen are expected to take two semesters of American history because they obviously failed to learn it in three tries in the public schools, let us not expect the same students to know anything about politics when he may have had only one semester of civics in the ninth grade under a driver-ed teacher! Let us accept the challenge of starting from scratch; perhaps insist that all freshmen take the introductory American government course; make it two semesters, if necessary; and then start teaching. By this I mean to get away from huge classes and lecturing and computerized testing of memorized facts. Rather let us restructure the role of the teacher — to one who manages the learning process and motivates students to learn the most exciting and the only surely relevant subject matter he will find in college — POLITICS.

John Ramsey
Old Dominion University