

science as especially concerned with the sharing of contributions publicly and the capacity to predict on the basis of well-defined procedures. But political science runs the danger of becoming "more scientific but not more relevant" if attempts are made to treat human behavior as similar to that of rats.

According to MacRae, three factors limit the political scientist's ability to predict: first, lack of rigor in defining key terms; second, change in the subject matter over time; and, third, the presence of conflict and strategy. Utilizing the critical elections studies, MacRae discussed how failure precisely to define concepts like "critical election" and "party alignment" had muddied scholarly endeavors and made it more difficult to ask, "What are the intervals for critical elections?"

Difficulties in predicting are also engendered by change. What happens when the social bases underlying critical elections are transformed? Our findings do not necessarily transcend particular time periods or institutions. Propositions valid in one period are not in another. Or, as MacRae, quoting Morris Fiorina, put it, "yesterday's truth is today's fiction."

Some situations are more difficult to predict than others, particularly those involving conflict and strategy. MacRae noted the "shifting sands of the political world": how participants in the political process seek change in ways difficult to anticipate and how some strategies, like those of presidential candidates, are unknown to political scientists.

On the other hand, some circumstances facilitate prediction, such as when the focus is on the behavior of a large number of individuals (rather than on elites), when people are not reinterpreting their world—that is, stable rather than revolutionary times—and when there is no substantial conflict marked by changing strategies. MacRae linked these conditions to political scientists' success in predicting voting behavior and coalition formation.

In order to enhance our capacity to predict, MacRae argued that scholars should direct their attention toward the "non-scientific aspects" of political science, the values that guide behavior. He con-

cluded with the following toast to political science, "May it never be merely a science." □

Plenary Panelists Analyze Gender Differences in Politics

Carol Nechemias

Pennsylvania State University,
Capitol Campus

Do women see the world in a different way than men? At the 1983 annual meeting, the plenary session on "Gender Politics in the 80's" addressed this issue as well as others related to women's changing relationship with the political world. A distinguished panel, chaired by Barbara Sinclair (University of California, Riverside) included political scientists Jean Elstain (University of Massachusetts), Virginia Sapiro (University of Wisconsin, Madison), and Ruth Mandel (Rutgers University), social work professor Grace Holt (University of Illinois,



Chair of the plenary session, Gender Politics in the 80's, Barbara Sinclair of the University of California at Riverside, responds to questions.



Panelist Grace Holt, professor of social work at the University of Illinois, Chicago, listens to a question from the audience at the plenary session on gender politics.

Chicago), and Judge Abner Mikva (U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit). The panelists offered a variety of interpretations concerning the implications of the gender gap for scholarship and for American politics.

Although most studies of the gender gap focus on women, Elshtain maintained that a full understanding of the gender gap demands evaluation of men's as well as women's behavior. The 1980 presidential election was the first to elicit significant differences in voting preferences along gender lines, but it was women who followed party line and men who defected to the Republican party. In a sense women's political behavior has been more stable than men's. As Elshtain put it, analysts need to ask "why men behaved so strangely in the 1980 election."

The gender gap not only has persisted since 1980 but has reached a new high during the summer of 1983. A recent CBS/NYT poll showed that only 34 percent of women approve of the way President Reagan is doing his job, compared to a figure of 51 percent for men. According to Elshtain, the key ingredient in this gap involves issues concerning war and peace. Women prefer a less aggressive

foreign policy and fear that Reagan will lead the United States into war. Indeed, the intensity of attitudes toward Reagan is such that survey questions including his name elicit a more negative response from women than other questions. For Elshtain women's concerns about the use of force far outweigh other factors such as economic and environmental issues in accounting for the gender gap.

In order to understand better how women evaluate politics, Elshtain recommended that political scientists build linkages between the work of psychologists like Carol Gilligan¹ and the field of political behavior. Gilligan's work is based on moral development theory. She argues that moral reasoning differs along gender lines. Utilizing this approach, the gender gap can be viewed as the politicization of women's formerly insular values and standards. This development poses in stark terms an issue which has long troubled and divided feminists: does equal opportunity and freedom from traditional sex roles mean embracing male values and standards?

Women prefer a less aggressive foreign policy and fear that Reagan will lead the United States into war.

In contrast to Elshtain's emphasis on "war and peace" issues, Sapiro noted that the gender gap has been at least 10-12 percentage points wide on a variety of issues related to attitudes toward President Reagan, his party, and his policies. These include: approval of Reagan's performance as president, whether his economic policies have helped the country or have helped the respondent personally, and support for Reagan's defense and social welfare positions. Contrary to conventional wisdom, the data indicate that men are

¹Gilligan is the author of *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982).

more conservative than women. Men are less supportive of social welfare measures, more hawkish on foreign policy, and more in favor of the death penalty. Overall, Sapiro concluded that women are "less likely to believe that the Horatio Alger story is a reality in America today."

Like Elshtain, Sapiro called for a new wave of research characterized by the application of psychology to the field of political behavior. She particularly emphasized that the insights gained from psychological research can help political scientists rid their own work of gender-biased methods of observation; this development would enhance our understanding of how women think about politics, leaders, and issues, and why their behavior might differ from that of men.

She offered several examples of how psychology contributes to a revision and expansion of political behavior literature. Consider the conclusion by many scholars that women are not power-oriented because they do not use male strategies. These studies fail to point out that power-oriented behavior may render women ineffective and that women utilize other, gender-based strategies. Similarly, research has held that women, compared with men, are more passive and conforming, more concerned with appearances; yet this is true only in public rather than private situations (the reverse is true for men), and women who behave in a non-conformist (independent) fashion in public suffer a loss of influence. A final illustration involves "don't know" responses in survey questionnaires, which have led scholars to conclude that women are less knowledgeable and interested in politics than men. An alternate explanation does exist: Women are apt to underestimate their ability, while men overestimate theirs. Psychological research thus increases our ability to sort out and avoid misleading interpretations.

Arguing that women now are "acting in behalf of themselves in the political world," Mandel concentrated on women's interest in expanding their participation in public life. This interest is reflected in a now commonplace practice of government officials: the citing of statistics regarding the appointment of

women to government offices or agencies. Despite the pressure to expand women's presence in public life, only 10 percent of elected officials are women, and that figure is under 5 percent at the highest levels. Nonetheless, Mandel noted that progress has occurred, with women doubling their numbers in elected office in the past six years.

According to Mandel women in public office are demonstrating greater solidarity. They are forming networks fostering a growing sense of community that has spawned caucuses of women state legislators and, in many states, organizations dedicated to bringing more women into public office. Women officeholders increasingly share a sense of common struggle and openly seek political power.

Different groups of women may have different agendas.

Mandel also pointed to "a gender consciousness in office" and to women's different priorities and interests. Surveys conducted by the Center for the American Woman and Politics at Rutgers University indicate that the Equal Rights Amendment enjoyed much stronger support among women state legislators than among their male colleagues, with the gap especially large in unratified states. Women in Congress likewise exhibit a special concern for women's lives, Title 9 of the Education Amendments, the rights of military wives, and so on. Thus, the presence of women officeholders has implications for policy outcomes.

Finally, Mandel stressed that women must employ the gender gap in favor of women candidates. Women's unique strength lies in women helping women; indeed, that is one of the few political resources available to women seeking parity in the political world. While acknowledging that "we don't register in droves to support a woman as blacks did in Chicago to support Harold Washington," Mandel nonetheless asserted that women have become interested in themselves and, as a result, politicians got interested in them. Witness the recent Na-

tional Women's Political Caucus meeting with its parade of Democratic presidential contenders.

Holt took another tack, warning that the gender gap obscures other important distinctions dividing one group from another. Noting that black men and women overwhelmingly oppose Ronald Reagan (although there is a gender gap of 11 percentage points between black men and women), she argued that analysis must take into account racial gender differences and class gender differences.

Different groups of women may have different agendas. Forced sterilization, for example, has at times been an issue for minority women. The Chicago mayoralty election exemplified the divisions that occur among women, where black women formed a network to elect Harold Washington and oust a woman mayor they had deemed "destructive to women." Holt cautioned against support for women regardless of their records.

She advocated a strategy that emphasized voting, raising money, electing candidates who support minority and feminist issues, socializing young people, and delivering the following message to political candidates: that women provide the margin of victory.

Mikva took the position that the "big news" in the gender gap involves women's alliance with the Democratic party. He compared current developments with the alignment of blacks with the Democrats during the New Deal, and

argued that if this trend continues, we will have to throw out our old score cards about how various socioeconomic groups and regions vote. Women, according to Mikva, have begun to think of themselves as political have-nots, a situation hard on incumbents, especially Republican incumbents.

The former Congressman expects to see more women candidates in the future since women's vote, in contrast to that of blacks', cannot be gerrymandered. He suggested that rewards for women's political support will have to be more substantial than blacks have typically been able to secure.

Mikva predicted that women's legal and legislative issues will become more contentious. He cited several areas of probable controversy: (1) "front pay" or reparations for previous discrimination which kept women from getting jobs they would have secured in the absence of discrimination; (2) quotas, especially competition among groups of have-nots; (3) maternity leave and the problem of career development; and (4) the draft. In Mikva's view the absence of the ERA, which would provide a clear signpost for the direction in which the nation should tilt, clouds these issues.

Following these presentations, a lively discussion between the panelists and audience ensued. Several areas of contention emerged. Criticism was expressed about the American focus of the analyses, since the gender gap apparent-

1984 DISSERTATION AWARDS

Department chairs are invited to nominate outstanding dissertations that have been completed and accepted during the 1982 or 1983 calendar years. The award categories and a list of the 1983 winners are listed in this issue of *PS*. In addition, the first Harold D. Lasswell award will be presented in 1984 for the best dissertation in the field of policy studies. Departments may nominate only *one* person for each award. An engraved certificate and a cash award of \$250 will be presented to the winners at the 1984 Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. Dissertations will be returned to the department following the Meeting.

Nomination letters from the department chair and a copy of the dissertation should be sent by **JANUARY 15, 1984** to: Dissertation Awards, American Political Science Association, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

ly is occurring in several European countries as well as the United States. Questions were raised about the "ethnicity of women's vote," whether women had demonstrated any political clout in the voting booth. Other concerns focused on whether there must be a difference between men's and women's opinion in order for a "gender gap" to exist. Although men and women support the ERA in roughly equal proportions, might not women be more likely than men to vote on the basis of the ERA? Is this not part of the gender gap? The issue of dif-

ferences in agendas among groups of women also was discussed, with the suggestion that the ERA and the nuclear freeze matter most for Republican women, economic survival for black women, and the safety net for all women. Finally, attention was directed toward whether the gender gap will disappear in the future, perhaps because men will increasingly agree with women's positions, and whether its disappearance would be detrimental to the women's movement. □

Five New APSA Sections Approved

Five subfield groups successfully petitioned the Council at its August 31 meeting to become official sections within the Association. Guidelines approved by the Council last fall (reprinted in the box below) provide the means for groups of APSA members who share an interest in a particular subfield of the discipline to organize meetings and coordinate communications under Association auspices and to receive logistical support from the national office in collecting dues and maintaining membership lists.

Association members may become section members by checking the appropriate box and paying the specified dues on their regular dues renewal forms.

The six APSA sections, and their present officers and dues levels, are as follows:

Name of Section	Contact or Officers	Annual Meeting Program Contact	Dues
*Public Administration, Organizations and Executives	Chair: H. Brinton Milward Graduate Center for Public Administration University of Kentucky Lexington, KY 40506-0034 (606) 258-8640	Program Chair: Larry N. Hill Department of Political Science University of Oklahoma Norman, OK 73019 (405) 325-6058	\$3.00
Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations	Chair of Ad Hoc Committee: Stephen Schechter Department of Government Russell Sage College Troy, NY 12180 (518) 456-0157 Nomination of officers will be in the spring of 1984 and elections will be at the 1984 Annual Meeting	Stephen Schechter	\$3.00
Law, Courts and Judicial Process	Chair: Charles Johnson Department of Political Science Texas A&M University College Station, TX 77843 (409) 845-2141 or 2511	Charles Johnson	\$5.00