Scholars have highlighted the great disparity between polling projections and actual voter behavior in the 2016 presidential election, attributing much of this difference to the secret ballot. Many Trump supporters, for example, did not reveal their true preferences to human pollsters but did support Trump in the private voting booth. While some pundits applauded this as precisely what the secret ballot is for, others voiced disgust that the ballot had freed voters to act “irresponsibly.” The 2016 election thus raised an older normative problem regarding the role of the secret ballot in modern democracies. This article seeks to better understand normative arguments for and against the secret ballot by comparing the writings of D. W. Winnicott—one of its most thoughtful defenders—and J. S. Mill—one of its most provocative critics. Winnicott and Mill both support mass democracy but share an understanding of it as inherently pathological and, oftentimes, irrational. But where Winnicott embraces the secret ballot in representative democracy as a healthy and minimally destructive means of purging citizens’ irrational drives, Mill argues that an open voting system more effectively persuades, if not compels, citizens to act reasonably and virtuously when making public decisions.

Given recent initiatives to make the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) more inclusive and diverse, thus upholding the title of “The People’s Department,” this study explores the evolving development of actor coalitions and policymaking brokers that impact a common public issue considered by many as a potentially harmful threat affecting our food supply. Politically and publicly acknowledged because the issues involve an impending crisis in the production of food crops resulting from pollinator collapse, the context of this crisis relates to the reported population decline of pollinators as reflected in
honeybee winter hive loss of 30 percent per year since 2006 to Colony Collapse Disease (CCD). Without pollinators, one-third of the overall US total food supply is at risk of being lost. Using the analytical tool advocacy coalition framework (ACF), the results of this study present the representative diversity of policymakers and the subsequent coalition formation that influences and directs policy development, implementation, regulation, and oversight of this multidisciplinary policy domain. Also, primary actor relationships are identified and evaluated using network analysis. The study finds evolving and conflicting policy positions of the USDA, the 2015–16 Obama Administration/EPA, and congressional action articulated in the Agricultural Act of 2014. The policy directions from the policy actors/brokers are found to have been more politically motivated than directed by CCD scientific research.

Coming to America for Higher Education:
An Analysis of the Predictors of International Student Enrollment at Colleges and Universities in the Southeast

David Starling, Valdosta State University
James LaPlant, Valdosta State University

International students enrich the educational and cultural environment on college campuses as well as contribute to the economic health of institutions of higher education and their surrounding communities. International student recruitment has never been easy at non-doctoral institutions, but it has become even more challenging in the age of Trump. Our study begins with a description of the enrollment trends of international students at US colleges and universities, with special attention given to the impact of President Trump. We explore the factors that influence the decision of an international student to study in the United States, focusing particularly on the role of cost (tuition and fees) for regional universities and baccalaureate institutions. The heart of our study examines the percentage of international students enrolled at almost 200 institutions of higher education in the Southeast. We investigate the impact of institutional diversity, academic classification, cost, and public vs. private status on the percentage of international students enrolled for 2015–16. We find significantly higher rates of enrollment at doctoral institutions when compared to those which offer only master’s, bachelor’s, and associate degrees. Significant differences also emerge by the type of research classification for doctoral institutions with those universities designated as highest research activity reporting an international student enrollment more than three times
greater than moderate research activity universities. Furthermore, the average percentage of international students enrolled in private institutions is more than double that of enrollees in public institutions. In a multivariate regression model, percentage white and percentage female are negative predictors of the percentage of international students, while the cost of tuition and fees is a positive predictor. In a truncated model of just public master’s universities, the cost of out-of-state tuition is a negative predictor of the percentage of international students, but it does not attain statistical significance. We conclude with policy recommendations for college and university campuses as well as for policymakers at the state level.