

To the Editor:

Heinz Eulau produced a useful set of figures (*PS*, Summer 1972, p. 389) in testing the proposition that "the same crowd, year in, year out, dominated paper giving at the annual meeting"; but his figures lend themselves to more than one form of presentation. He has overlooked the distinction inherent in the well-known statistical fact that the proportion of all families with four or more children is quite different from the proportion of all children born in such families. To test the Eulau proposition for the years 1956 to 1969, we really need to know what proportion of the papers came from the multiple contributors. I have therefore extended the Eulau table by adding two more columns, as follows:

(Solo or Jointly) Number of Papers	Contributors		Papers	
	N	%	N	%
1	899	78	899	60
2	171	15	342	23
3	52	5	156	10
4+	20	2	100	7
	<u>1142</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>1497</u>	<u>100</u>

Not knowing how many papers were actually produced by those producing four or more, I have simply credited them with an average of five in extending the tabulation. Anyone who wishes to replicate this significant research project is naturally invited to be more precise about it.

What the figures seem to show is that the multiple contributors produced about 40 percent of the papers, although they were only 22 percent of the contributors. This seems to fall short of dominance, as Eulau contends, but it does indeed look a little conspicuous.

Paul T. David
Professor

To the Editor:

My mother always told me not to write letters to the Editor. For obvious reasons. But it was one of her failings not to teach me about "the distinction inherent in the well-known statistical fact that the proportion of all families with four or more children is quite different from the proportion of all children born in such families." After all, she was not much of a mathematician, though she knew the distinction between boiled, fried and scrambled eggs.

I am therefore most grateful to Professor David for his carrying on where mother left off. He is,

of course, one of those superproducers of convention papers known as the "four-plus" club whose exploits are reported in the *Cumulative Index to the Proceedings of the APSA* (still available, despite notorious misuse, from University Microfilm, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, at a reasonable \$18.95). In statistical fact, Professor David authored five papers between 1956 and 1969—four of them solo and one jointly. This certainly qualifies him as a multiplier. The only trouble is that he multiplies what cannot be multiplied. To make things simple, let us take the paper Professor David coauthored with R. Eisenberg. In my tabulation, this gentleman received proper credit in the first row as making a single appearance, and Professor David received credit for his five appearances. Following Professor David's procedure, the David-Eisenberg paper would be counted twice.

This example is the simple case. Take I. K. Feierabend. He authored one paper alone, two with R. L. Feierabend and B. A. Nesvold, and another one with R. L. Feierabend, B. A. Nesvold, V. M. Burkhardt, and R. M. Kelly. In my tabulation, I. K. Feierabend received credit for four appearances at meetings, R. L. Feierabend for three, B. A. Nesvold for three, and the other two collaborators for one each. By Professor David's unique method, this would yield 12 papers—but alas, in statistical fact, it's only four papers, no matter what operation is performed.

**Cross-Tabulation of Papers and Authors
Participating in APSA Meetings, 1956-1969**

Number of Authors	Number of Papers					Six
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	
One	780	175	31	9	0	2
Two	80	1	1	0	0	0
Three	11	2	0	0	0	0
Four	5	1	0	0	0	0
Five	1	0	0	0	0	0
Six	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seven	1	0	0	0	0	0

Note: do not take table at face value; at your own risk.

The trouble is, of course, that whatever Professor David had in mind cannot be done without disaggregation of the data I presented. If Professor David had picked up the telephone and given me a quick ring, I would have told him what my mother told me. Anyway, for the greater glory of our discipline, here is the disaggregated table on which appropriate multiplications are permissible. For the curious who want to know how many papers were delivered, I recommend the following procedure: (1) add columns; (2) multiply each

column total by 'number of papers'; and (3) add products of multiplications. You should come up with 1,380.

Heinz Eulau
Stanford University

**Communications
To the Editor:**

We've come a long way in the last few years. When the Women's Caucus for Political Science was formed at our Association's annual meeting in 1969, female participation in the program of the conventions was marginal.¹ So, too, was the attention to women in the political process. By 1972 our largest minority group had been discovered and was organized to prevent being relegated to the back of the bus. Female scholars were on the program to do their thing—and that thing was contributing to scholarship (not just being off in a corner raising their consciousnesses or special-pleading.)

Yet there's still a distance to travel before we can conclude that equality of treatment has come to the profession to stay.

While at this year's meeting I did a tabulation, based on the printed convention program, of the sex participation balance. The results, though better than in the past, still show subliminal biases. (There may be some slight corrections needed in my figures for 1970-72 because of last minute program changes as well as some ambiguous first names where I erred in determining the sex.) However here's what I found:

Eleven of the 12 section heads for 1972 (i.e., those who selected the panel chairpersons) were male. Three of the six chairwomen handled panels dealing with the role of women. (16 of the women who gave papers appeared in four panels concerned with sex differences; at these same four panels, six of the discussants were female.)

Women were virtually frozen out of the roundtables and symposia. It was rare in 1972 to find them participating on such topics as criminal justice and (surprisingly) presidential politics.

In addition the three evening plenary sessions featured three male chairmen and six male speakers. (In 1971 the three special evening programs were also "stag"—two male chairmen, five male speakers and three male discussants.)

I can imagine at this point that some readers may be thinking: "Picky, picky, picky! After all, women are only 7-10% of the profession.² How much more of a role do they expect?" But why are women underrepresented in the discipline? Shouldn't this be a source of concern?

At a time when other sections of our society are becoming aware of their blind spots with regard to recognition of the contributions of women and are taking affirmative corrective actions, in a period when female political activity in this country is attaining a level not seen since the twenties, a greater effort by our profession to provide equal opportunity irrespective of sex will contribute to an increase in the proportion of women in the discipline.

Martin Gruberg
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

	Total	Chairmen		Total	Paper Givers		Total	Discussants	
		Women	% Women		Women	% Women		Women	% Women
1968	82	3	3.7	188	9	4.8	111	9	8.1
1969	131	5	3.8	315	21	6.7	312	19	6.1
1970	132	10	6.6	466	24	5.2	253	8	3.2
1971	158	13	8.2	460	38	8.3	264	18	6.8
1972	104	6	5.7	413	48	11.4	174	21	12.1

1 In the annual meetings held over the 11 years to 1969, women averaged 1.9% of the chairmanship, 4.1% of the paper givers, and 3.2% of the discussants. Victoria Schuck, "Femina Studies rei Publicae: Notes on Professional Achievement," *PS*, Vol. III, No. 4 (Fall, 1970), p. 525. See also Donald D. Barry and James G. Boumer, "Participation in the APSA Annual Meetings, 1964-1969," in the same issue.

2 Earl M. Baker, "The Political Science Profession in 1970: Basic Characteristics," *PS*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (Winter 1971), p. 35.

To the Editor:

The Latin American nations appear to be at the threshold of constructing a regional sub-system of international politics (composed in turn of several component and at times conflicting sub-systems) which if successful, will profoundly affect inter-state politics within the area and United States foreign policy toward the region in the decade ahead.

I am now beginning a long-term research project which will have as its objective a systematic computer based analysis of the patterns and trends of Latin American inter-state and transnational interactions for the period 1960-to date. The focus will: (1) be *exclusively* on Latin America (both cooperative and conflictual) versus the traditional inter-American approach; (2) include both inter-state and transnational interactions (e.g., multinational corporations); (3) analyze both bilateral and regional interactions along economic, political, social and cultural dimensions in terms of level, nature, intensity, and direction.

Among questions to be asked and hopefully answered are : (1) have Latin American inter-state and transnational interactions increased in the last decade (quantity, nature, level, intensity, direction); (2) is a regional Latin American sub-system or series of sub-systems emerging; (3) are cooperative or conflictual interactions prevailing; (4) as a result of the above analysis, what are the implications in the next decade for Latin America.

I shall be chairing a luncheon round-table on "Latin American Inter-State Politics" as the 1973 Latin American Studies Association Convention May 3-5, 1973 in Madison, Wisconsin. This is to solicit your participation and exchange of data on a *quid-pro quo* basis. Please mail all correspondence to Weston H. Agor, Dept. of Political Science, Univ. of Florida, Peabody Hall, Gainesville, Fla. 32601.

Weston H. Agor
University of Florida

NOW AVAILABLE

WOMEN IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

REPORTS AND STUDIES OF THE APSA COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE PROFESSION, 1969-71

Copies may be obtained for \$2.00 a copy plus 15¢ postage from the American Political Science Association, 1527 New Hampshire Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. The document will also be on sale at the panel paper sales room at the 1971 Annual Meeting.