

Additional information from NPVC Study

Prepared by Barbara Klein, NPV committee member May 10, 2009

Holistic approach

LWVUS has supplied the raw numbers and charts for each question of the study. Here we present a Holistic approach searching for the result (if there is one) of the question Do League Members support the NPV compact or not.

Procedure

Each response was looked at as a whole (including questions AND comments at the same time). Three general keys were used to indicate the leaning of the League by way of their question responses:

PRO Category: B – B – A - A/B – B – A

CON Category: A – A – B – C/D – A - B

N/C Category: C - C – C – E - C – C or unclear or apparently contradictory combinations

[Question 7 was ignored for this purpose as none of the answers (agree, disagree or no consensus) have any clear and obvious bearing on the support or opposition of the compact. Additionally, there were many complaints about the reason or meaning of that particular question.]

After the question responses were put into a pro/con/NC category the comments were immediately read to see if they agreed with the category. Clear comments took precedence.

Alert: there are Leagues / League Members who by their responses (to the first six questions) indicate either support/opposition or No Consensus but then clearly state something else in the comment section. Without looking at both their responses and comments AT THE SAME TIME it can be difficult to evaluate their real intent. This may have happened most with the N/C responses but was evident with the others as well. While perhaps more frequent with the 'CON' people, it was seen with 'PRO' as well. Meaning, that answers seemed to indicate N/C but when you read the comments they clearly said they 'do not support' the compact. This happened in both directions. A couple times the answers indicated (I thought clearly) one position and then the comments directly stated something else.

390 Leagues took part

The number of participants is not clear; it is **over 6,499**.

The number is not clear because the following Leagues did not list their number of participants. For exact numbers, these Leagues would have to be contacted:

FL009	MN457	NY605
MA260	OR310	SD105
NJ356	CA021	

These Leagues missing participant numbers fall under the following categories:

PRO	CON	No Consensus
4	3	1

Results of League /League Members when looking at holistic responses

League Results

PRO Leagues	CON Leagues	No Consensus Leagues
197	95	98

League Member Results

PRO Members	CON Members	No Consensus Members
3349	1253	1897

Please be alert to the fact of drastically varying League sizes. There were many Leagues with 4-8 participants (one with only ONE) and many others in the 40 -50 ranges. Some as large as 100 or 109 -- an interesting fact to **take into account** as we evaluate the systems of one-person, one-vote.

Question 6

Question #6 was tracked since it was the 'closest' to a question asking "do you oppose or do you support the NPV compact." Unfortunately, since that was NOT actually the question these figures cannot be extrapolated to clearly mean that. However, it is of interest to follow this question which MAY have something close to a consensus that is relevant to the issue.

Interestingly enough, comments indicate that some Leagues appear to answer No consensus to most or all questions out of protest over unclear questions, so we may have lost some real data there.

League Results for Question 6

PRO Leagues	CON Leagues	No Consensus Leagues	
242	61	87	62% in favor

League Member Results for Question 6

PRO Members	CON Members	No Consensus Members	
4111	771	1617	63.2 % in favor

Complaints

50% of the Leagues registered serious complaints about the consensus questions. Such a high ratio of dissatisfaction with the questions indicates a quality issue of this consensus process.

There ended up being so many complaints about the questions that some which I had originally listed (with a 'mild' designation behind them) I did not ultimately count.

I used the following four categories to chart the complaints:

1. they felt that the questions were biased FOR (in favor of) the compact
2. they felt that the questions were biased AGAINST (in opposition of) the compact
3. they had GENERAL complaints about the questions
4. they felt that the questions were BIASED (but not specified). They used the words biased, slanted, loaded etc. but did not explain on which side.

LEAGUES

Biased FOR	Biased AGAINST	GENERAL	BIASED	
8	28	137	27	195
				50% of all Leagues
8	28		27	63 – Leagues complained of <u>Bias</u>
12%	45%		43%	32% of the complaining Leagues spoke of bias

General complaints were NOT mild complaints but did not include any specific statement of bias.

LWV Members who were represented by the complaints of their Leagues

Members from groups that felt the questions were Biased FOR the NVPC	Members from groups that felt the questions were Biased AGAINST the NVPC
111	528

Compact vs. Amendment

Evidently consensus questions confused MANY people into thinking they had to make a choice during this study – either support the compact or choose to go the route of a constitutional amendment. While the option of both was available the questions evidently led many astray. That was clear in lots of the comments. Addressing this confusion, the following point should be noted:

83 Leagues made a written request to do 'both.' This represented 1650 members.

Additional

Several Leagues made comments that they either LIKE the Electoral College or feel that we should revisit, restudy it. They indicated that this was an active part of their discussion (despite being outside the scope of this study).

Surely typical, but sad, is that there were many erroneous statements and comments that indicated misunderstandings of the facts.

On the other hand, there were also many purely interesting debates.