The 102nd APSA Annual Meeting

"Next Great City" to Host 2006 Annual Meeting


APSA is excited to invite its members to Philadelphia, PA, named the "Next Great City" by National Geographic *Traveler*. What better place to discuss "Power Reconsidered" than the birthplace of the American Republic? Hosted at the Philadelphia Marriott, the Loews Philadelphia, and the Pennsylvania Convention Center, the 2006 APSA Annual Meeting will be held from August 31 through September 3. Located in the heart of Philadelphia's Center City, both the Loews and the Marriott are within a short distance of the Convention Center, world-class dining, and major attractions.

A true testament to the city, the PSFS building, which houses the Loews Philadelphia, has been designated a National Historic Landmark, yet also offers modern accommodations. Once at the height of modernity as a financial institution, 70 years later the PSFS building has undergone a million-dollar makeover and now sets a new urban standard in luxury lodging.

Nestled beside the Loews is the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown, a grand hotel with luxurious accommodations and a convenient location. Spectacular views of the city are available in many guest rooms and beginning in 2005, Marriott began offering a luxurious new bedding package which will ensure a good night's rest before those early morning panels. Connected to the convention center via skybridge, the Philadelphia Marriott is the perfect convention hotel.

A rich history coupled with exciting modern-day attractions makes Philadelphia one of the most popular destinations in the United States. Want to see an actual piece of history? Visit the National Constitution Center museum and the Liberty Bell Center. Looking for modern art? With over 2,400 murals, the city itself is an art gallery. Eager to unwind with a night out on the town? Head down to South Street and visit one of over 60 eateries, cafes, and bars. There is so much to see and do, you may never want to leave!

Join us and discover why Philadelphia is designated as "the place that loves you back." And don't forget to have a Philly cheesesteak…..or two!





City Hall shares the skyline with One Liberty Place; Philadelphia is known for its cheesesteaks. (All photos: Edward Savaria, Jr.).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For more information about Philadelphia, visit the web sites below.



General

Philadelphia Convention and Visitors Bureau
www.pcvb.org

The City of Philadelphia
www.phila.gov

Center City District
www.centercityphila.org

Unofficial Philadelphia Blog
www.phillyist.com

Philadelphia Inquirer
www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/

Annual Meeting Hotels

The Loews Philadelphia
www.loewshotels.com/hotels/philadelphia/ default.asp

The Philadelphia Marriott
http://marriott.com/property/propertypage/ PHLDT

Attractions

Official Philadelphia Visitor Site
www.gophila.com

Philadelphia Culture Guide
http://phillyfunguide.com/

The National Constitution Center Museum
www.constitutioncenter.org

The Liberty Bell Center
www.nps.gov/inde/liberty-bell.html

The Franklin Institute Science Museum
www.fi.edu

Philadelphia Museum of Art
www.philamuseum.org/main.asp

Avenue of the Arts
www.avenueofthearts.org

Penn's Landing
www.pennslandingcorp.com

Philadelphia Phillies
www.philadelphia.phillies. mlb.com

Electric Factory (live music)
www.electricfactory.com/main.html

Theater Guide
http://theatrealliance.org/onstage/index.html

Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra
www.philorch.org/styles/poa02e/www/index2.html

The Kimmel Center (performing arts venue)
www.kimmelcenter.org/

Free Library of Philadelphia
www.library.phila.gov/

Kelly Writers House
www.writing.upenn.edu/~wh/

Transportation

Philadelphia International Airport
www.phl.org

Philadelphia Subway
www.septa.org

PHLASH Downtown Shuttle Service
www.gophila.com/phlash

Remember to check the upcoming April issue of PS *for housing, preregistration, travel, and more info on the exciting plans being developed for the 2006 Annual Meeting.*



One of the city's 2,500+ murals (top); the Philadelphia skyline at night (above).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Report of the Editor of the *American Political Science Review*, 2004–2005

Lee Sigelman, *George Washington University*

This completes my fourth year as editor of the *APSR*. The main theme of last year's annual report was continuity from the previous year in the flow, processing, and variety of the papers that we received and the articles that we published. That theme dominates this year's report as well, for only a glance at the tabular data reported below will be needed to establish the incremental character of the year-to-year changes that we experienced in the number and diversity of the papers that we received, the time it took to process them, and the outcomes of our review process. Having said that, I hasten to add that this year we have devoted extensive time and energy to an exciting new project, which I will discuss at the end of this report.

Before proceeding any further, I must extend a warm thanks to those who contributed to the operation of the *APSR* during the past year, including: Assistant Editor Elizabeth Cook; Editorial Assistants Jennifer Deets, Beth Franker, Lee Michael, and Jennie Schulze; the members of the *APSR* Editorial Board, bolstered during 2004–2005 by the additions of James Adams and Daniel Treisman; staff members too numerous to list at the APSA office, the George Washington University, and Cambridge University Press; the authors who submitted their papers; and the reviewers who donated their time, expertise, and good will to assessing these submissions (and who will be acknowledged by name in our November issue).

Submissions and Processing

The Number of Papers Submitted

During my first year as editor, 2001–2002, submissions skyrocketed, rising by 44% overall and by 56% for new manuscripts, compared to the preceding year.[1] The next year, they spurted by another 9% and 7%, respectively. Since then, they have reverted, more or less, to their first-year levels. To judge from the numbers shown in Table 1, the norm for the *APSR* appears to have settled in at 500 to 550 "new" submissions per year and more than 600 in all. Thus, the 2004–2005 numbers bear out my conclusion in last year's report that we had reached a new equilibrium in terms of submissions and that submissions would probably continue to hover around their current level.

Table 1
The Number of Papers Submitted

	Number of Submissions	
Year	Total	New
2004–2005	623	538
2003–2004	611	523
2002–2003	672	546
2001–2002	615	509
2000–2001	427	327
1999–2000	461	346
1998–1999	536	393
1997–1998	537	411
1996–1997	540	391
1995–1996	533	420
1994–1995	495	NA
1993–1994	480	NA
1992–1993	487	NA
1991–1992	479	NA
1990–1991	438	NA
1989–1990	428	NA
1988–1989	447	NA
1987–1988	391	NA
1986–1987	427	NA

Turnaround Times

One of my initial goals as editor was to speed up the review process. During my first two years as editor, even as the flow of submissions was rising dramatically, we compiled faster processing times than had been achieved in the past by the *APSR* or, for that matter, by other major political science journals. As explained in last year's report, during 2003–2004 we deliberately slowed down the review process in some instances, and our median turnaround time (the elapsed time between the day a paper arrive in our offices and the day I sign the decision letter) rose from 39 to 43 working days. During 2004–2005, our review process continued at the same pace as in 2003–2004 (See Table 2). We *could* go a little faster, but the effort that would be required to do so would strain our capacity and the steps that would be required (e.g., rejecting more papers without sending them out for review) would engender a loss of good will among authors. Some other journals are now touting turnaround times that are a bit faster than ours, but such claims warrant close scrutiny[2] and, in any event, the pace of our review process continues to be highly acceptable.

The Mix of Submitted Papers

Categorized according to primary analytical approach and disciplinary subfield, the distribution of submitted papers remained virtually identical in 2004–2005 to the pattern that has become familiar in recent years (See Table 3). Again in 2004–2005, most *APSR* submissions were quantitative and/or formal, and about one in four (predominantly but by no means exclusively normative theory) was classified broadly as "interpretive/conceptual." We continued to receive very few "small-N" papers. American politics-focused submissions continued to outpace submissions in other subfields, followed by comparative politics and, more distantly, international relations and normative

Table 2
Elapsed Time (Median Number of Workdays) in the Review Process

Phase of Review Process	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005
From receipt to reviewer assignment	1	1	1	0
From assignment to last review	39	40	43	43
From last review to decision	0	0	0	0
From receipt to decision	39	39	42	42

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3
Distribution of Papers Submitted (%)

	Approach					
Year	Formal	Quantitative	Formal and Quantitative	Small N	Interpretive/ Conceptual	Other
2004–2005	13	52	6	1	27	1
2003–2004	11	51	8	2	26	2
2002–2003	9	50	10	5	25	1
2001–2002	17	45	7	1	29	2
1995–2000	13	48	7	2	30	0
	Field					
Year	American Politics	Comparative Politics	International Relations	Normative Theory	Formal Theory	Methods
2004–2005	38	26	15	14	4	4
2003–2004	32	30	16	12	1	9
2002–2003	34	26	16	13	6	6
2001–2002	30	25	14	17	8	6
1995–2000	38	23	12	18	6	2
1991–1995	35	22	12	21	10	0
1985–1991	41	17	10	19	13	0

theory. I am reluctant to attribute much meaning to year-to-year fluctuations in these figures, and longer-term comparisons indicate changes of quite limited degree.

Outcomes

From the perspective of outcomes as well as submissions and processing, 2004–2005 amounted to more of the same, i.e., a continuation of trends documented in my prior annual reports. Once again, 88 of every 100 of my first-round decisions were rejections based on the recommendations of reviewers. Another 1% ("incorrect" submissions) occurred because the authorship of a paper had not been rendered sufficiently anonymous, the paper far exceeded our length limit, or its formatting was wildly at variance with our guidelines; in each such case, the author was invited to fix the problem and submit a corrected version of the paper. Another 4% of my decisions were to reject a paper without review because in my judgment it was so inappropriate for the *APSR* that no purpose would be served by sending it out for review; this was a higher proportion than in past years, reflecting encouragement from the editorial board to make selectively greater use of this expedient. Only 7% of my first-round decisions were "positive," in the sense of inviting an author to revise a paper for further consideration or accepting it subject to some final conditions; one paper was unconditionally accepted in the first round. (See Table 4.)

I also continued to make very sparing use of "revise and resubmit" invitations and to resist the temptation to pile one such invitation on top of another. The great majority—75–80%—of revised-and-resubmitted papers were ultimately accepted.

Of the papers that were accepted during 2004–2005 for publication in the *APSR*, 59% were classified as formal and/or quantitative, less than the proportion of such papers that we received during the year (71%). On the other hand, 38% of the acceptances were for interpretive/conceptual papers, which accounted for 27% of our submissions. Across fields, acceptances roughly mirrored submissions. As in past reports, I want to caution against overinterpreting differences implied by comparing the figures in Tables 2 and 5; Table 5 is based on a small number of acceptances, and the categorizations on which both tables are based are rough-and-ready at best.

The articles that appeared in the *APSR* during 2004–2005 represented a wide variety of theoretical, analytical, and methodological approaches and a rich array of subject matters; and although only time will tell whether it will emerge among the most important articles the *APSR* has ever published, one article in particular—Alford, Funk, and Hibbing's "Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?"—has set a new standard for political science in terms of the media attention and public discussion that its publication has provoked.

Special Centennial Issue

In November 2006, we will publish a special issue on "The Evolution of Political Science." The November 2006, issue will launch the 100th annual volume of the *APSR*, and a special centennial issue devoted to analyses of the evolution of the discipline over the years seems highly appropriate as a means of commemoration. I am co-editing the special issue with M. Elizabeth Sanders, a member of the *APSR* editorial board.

During the past year, we put out a call for submissions for the special issue. In doing so, we emphasized, among other things, that (1) papers must be brief (no more than 15–17 pages) so that we can accommodate as large and diverse an

Table 4
Outcome of the First Round of the Review Process (%)

Outcome	2004–2005
Reject, incorrect submission	1
Reject without review	4
Reject	88
Invite revise and resubmit	6
Conditional accept	1
Accept	0

Table 5
Distribution of Papers Accepted, 2004–2005 (%)

		Approach			
Formal	Quantitative	Formal and Quantitative	Small N	Interpretive/ Conceptual	Other
13	38	8	0	38	3
		Field			
American Politics	Comparative Politics	International Relations	Normative Theory	Formal	Methods
33	21	23	15	3	5

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

array of perspectives on the discipline as possible; (2) prospective authors should begin by submitting a brief prospectus; (3) all submitted papers will undergo a full peer-review process and we can offer no *a priori* assurance that a paper, once submitted, will be accepted for publication; and (4) the deadline for receipt of papers is January 2, 2006.

We undertook this project with a mixture of enthusiasm and trepidation. We had no idea of whether it would spark much interest. Nor did our normal procedures seem entirely appropriate in this instance; for example, in receiving paper proposals and providing authors with detailed feedback on them, we are functioning more in the mode of *Perspectives on Politics* than of the *APSR*.

Happily, the call for submissions has produced an outpouring of proposals far exceeding our most optimistic expectations. Building on preliminary contacts from more than 120 prospective authors, we have received roughly 75 full-blown proposals along with another 15 or so indications that proposals may be forthcoming. For each such contact, we have tried to provide constructive criticism and advice. Based on our feedback, some authors have decided not to proceed, but the great majority have expressed their intention to follow through by submitting a paper. I am not exactly certain *how* we will manage this paper flow in addition to our "regular" review process, but we *will* manage it. (A nightmare scenario is that a large van will back up to our building one day in early January and dump 75 centennial submissions on our doorstep.) Many procedural details remain to be worked out. In any event, the proposals that we have received promise to bring an extraordinary diversity of perspectives to bear, and based on what I have seen so far the publication of the centennial issue should greatly enhance our understanding of the history and evolution of our discipline and may even heighten our sense of intellectual community.

Notes

1. As in previous reports, for "total submissions" successive resubmissions of the "same" paper are counted separately. For example, a paper that was submitted, revised and resubmitted, and then finally resubmitted following its conditional acceptance pending final changes would count as three submissions, not one. In terms of assessing the workflow for our office, this counting rule is reasonable, for in the example just given, several separate review processes would have been conducted. For "new" or "original" submissions, by contrast, that sequence would be counted as a single submission, not three.

2. For example, I reject very few papers without review, and putting papers through a full-scale review process obviously takes longer than rejecting them out of hand. Moreover, many journals—but not the *APSR*—cease operations and "stop the clock" for a month during the summer. That is, they do not count days spent at the beach as "working days" for purposes of calculating turnaround times; thus, 43 working days at the *APSR* may well pass more quickly, in real time, than, say, 38 working days at another journal.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Report of the Editor of *Perspectives on Politics, 2004–2005*

Jennifer L. Hochschild, *Harvard University*

As of December 2005, *Perspectives on Politics* will have published three complete volumes of four issues each. As former editor of the journal (until June, 2005), I have published two previous reports (see *PS*, January 2004, 143–149; *PS*, January 2005, 141–144) this one covers the period from August 1, 2004 through July 31, 2005.

Previous reports have described the somewhat unusual editorial structure and review process of *Perspectives on Politics* compared with other political science journals; I will not repeat that description here, but readers should refer to it if need be to make sense of the tables below. Note that *Perspectives* does not categorize papers by approach, as does the *APSR*, for two reasons. Articles using technical methods or specialized vocabularies are not appropriate for *Perspectives* and, more importantly, we seek manuscripts that cut across conventionally defined subfields of the discipline, disciplinary lines, and methods. Note also that by the last few issues of this reporting period, roughly half of the articles submitted to *Perspectives* did indeed cut across conventional subfield boundaries in political science. We hope that proportion continues to rise. Thus the subfield categorizations below are more than usually inexact; in future reports, editors might consider dropping this rubric altogether since it may be more misleading than helpful.

Submissions

I start with the number of submissions, noted in Table 1.

Table 2 combines the subdivisions of Table 1, and reports the 331 submissions by subfield in political science (the first six columns) and by non-academics (the final column).

Processing

Table 3 shows how manuscripts fit into the different stages of *Perspectives'* process for review and decision-making. It includes the 331 new manuscripts of this report year, and an additional 88 that were first submitted prior to August 1, 2004 (for a total of 419 ms. handled this year).

We made decisions on over half of the submissions dealt with during this 12-month period; a large majority of those are rejections before review. (Remember that many pre-review rejections occur because the article is not appropriate for the distinctive mission of *Perspectives*, not because of any judgment about quality.) We sent detailed suggestions for revision to almost half of authors. At any one time, only a small fraction of submissions to the journal are under review or being revised for final consideration after review.

Table 4 shows the amount of time taken by these various stages. Note that the number of items in each row varies, and that the table includes only articles on which we have made decisions. We take special pride in the first row of Table 4. My letter proposing pre-review revisions followed an evaluation by at least two editors and two student assistants to the editor, as well as a discussion of each set of evaluations. So a great deal of careful work goes into that innocuous-sounding first stage.

This is an opportune moment to thank reviewers for responding to our requests for assistance; as the second row shows, with few exceptions their comments have been reasonably prompt. Even more importantly, reviews have almost always been clear, detailed, and extremely helpful.

Outcomes

Table 5 reports the overall outcomes for the report year.

Tables 6 provides more detail for interpreting Table 5. It shows acceptance rates for all submissions according to the subfields of political science (first six rows) or the non-academics (next row).

Our rejection rate was highest for the two subfields in which we had the largest number of submissions, which partly reflects *Perspectives'* commitment to publish widely across the discipline of political science. Our acceptance rate,

Table 1
Submissions, August 1, 2004–July 31, 2005, in percentages (Ns in parentheses)

Articles and Essays	Commentary	"Perspectives"	Contributions to Symposia	Proposals[1]	TOTAL submissions
66%	3	8	16	6	100%
(220)	(10)	(26)	(54)	(21)	(331)

Table 2
Submissions by Primary Subfield or Type of Author, August 1, 2004–July 31, 2005, in percentages (Ns in parentheses)

	American Politics	Comparative Politics	International Relations	Political Theory	Methods & Philosophy of Social Science	Public Law	Journalists & Public Actors
Submissions	34%	26	16	11	7	4	2
	(113)	(86)	(55)	(37)	(22)	(12)	(6)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3
Submissions at Various Stages of Decision-Making, August 1, 2004–July 31, 2005, in percentages (Ns in parentheses)

Decision Status of Submission	Percentage of All Submissions Handled This Year	
Author revising pre-review	45%	(188)
Manuscript currently out for review	3	(14)
Author revising post-review	2	(10)
Decision made and author notified	55	(231)
Total submissions handled	100	(419)

Table 4
Average Time for Each Stage of Review, August 1, 2004–July 31, 2005 (N in parentheses)

Stage of Review Process	Average Number of Days
From author submitting first draft to editor requesting pre-review revisions (N = 130)	19 (mean)
From editor sending manuscript out for review to editor requesting post-review revisions (N = 29)	47 (mean)
From author submitting post-review revisions to editor notifying author of decision (N = 35)	13 (mean)
Total days from author submitting first draft, to editor notifying author of decision, excluding days taken by authors to do revisions (N = 171)	18 (median) 28 (mean)

Table 5
Acceptance Rates for Submissions by Stage of Review, August 1, 2004–July 31, 2005, in Percentages (Ns in Parentheses)

	Accepted	Rejected	Pending	Withdrawn
Without review	37% (20)*	74 (93)	62 (41)	80 (4)
After review	63 (34)	26 (32)	38 (25)	20 (1)
Total	(54)	(125)	(66)	(5)

*These include introductions to symposia, commentaries on articles, the annual presidential address, and APSA task force reports.

however, is also slightly higher for the same two subfields, although it is more even across the major subfields than last year. Remember that all of these results are substantially an artifact of how we categorized articles that cut across two or more subfields, especially since these percentages are based on small numbers.

Table 7 summarizes the results of decisions made during this report year by the editors of *Perspectives*.

Note that the 78% of manuscripts that did not go to outside review reflects both manuscripts that we turned down before review, *and* manuscripts that authors chose not to send back after we sent suggestions for pre-review revisions.

Publication

Table 8 shows the published results of everything I have described up to this point. To maintain consistency with earlier reports, it covers volume 2, issue 4 (December 2004) of *Perspectives*, and volume 3, issues 1, 2, and 3 (March, June, and September 2005). It provides raw numbers, not percentages, since the totals are so low.

We see a reasonable distribution across the five subfields that one would expect to contribute most of the articles in *Perspectives*, except for the fact that American politics may be too predominant. But each article is excellent; we would have been sorry not to publish any of them.

Book Reviews

As Table 9 shows, from July 31, 2004 to August 1, 2005, the book review office (at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill until the end of June 2004), received over 1,200 books and planned to review close to 400 for an overall acceptance rate of 31%. The number of

Table 6
Acceptance Rates by Subfield or Type of Author for Submissions, August 1, 2004–July 31, 2005, in Percentages (Ns in Parentheses)

Subfield	Accepted	Pending	Rejected	Withdrawn	Total in Subfield
American politics	31% (17)	30% (20)	35% (44)	40% (2)	83
Comparative politics	27 (15)	30 (20)	25 (31)	20 (1)	67
International relations	19 (10)	14 (9)	14 (18)	20 (1)	38
Political theory	7 (4)	6 (4)	12 (15)	—	23
Methods & philosophy of social science	11 (6)	11 (7)	6 (8)	—	21
Public law	2 (1)	5 (3)	4 (5)	—	9
Journalists & public actors	2 (1)	5 (3)	3 (4)	20 (1)	9
Total by decision	100 (54)	100 (66)	100 (125)	100 (5)	250

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 7
Acceptance Rates, August 1, 2004–July 31, 2005, in Percentages (Ns in Parentheses)

For all submissions:	
To outside review	22% (92 of 419)
To publication, out of submissions sent for outside review	51% (47 of 92)
Overall acceptance rate	13% (54 of 419)
For articles only:	
To outside review	19% (51 of 271)
To publication, out of submissions sent for outside review	52% (27 of 51)
Overall acceptance rate	13% (32 of 271)

Table 8
Items Published in *Perspectives on Politics*, December 2004–September 2005

Subfield	Items Published, Counting Each Separately	Items Published, Counting Symposia, or Papers with Commentaries, as Single Items
American politics	15	12
Comparative politics	12	8
International relations	8	4
Political theory	2	1
Methods & philosophy of social science	6	4
Public law	1	1
Journalists & public actors	1	1

Table 9
Books Received and Book Reviews Commissioned, August 1, 2004–July 31, 2005, in Percentages (Ns in Parentheses)

Subfield	Books Received	Books Commissioned for Review	Acceptance Rate
American politics	26% (315)	22% (81)	26%
Comparative politics	32% (390)	35% (131)	34%
International relations	28% (346)	24% (92)	27%
Political theory	14% (178)	19% (72)	40%
Total	100% (1229)	100% (376)	31%

Table 10
Published Book Reviews, December 2004–September 2005, in Percentages (Ns in Parentheses)

Subfield	Percentage of All Book Reviews
American politics	30% (84)
Comparative politics	30 (83)
International relations	22 (61)
Political theory	17 (48)
Total	100% (276)

books received is somewhat lower than in recent years for the second year in a row (several years ago, the book review office received 1,600 to 1,800 books). It is not clear whether this marks a trend in submissions or simply an unusual few years. The decline in numbers does permit a higher proportion of the books received to be reviewed.

The subfield distribution of books sent to the review office fluctuates some from year to year; typically, although not this year, the field of American politics is one of the two largest, and international relations is closer to political theory in the number submitted.

The book review editors give first priority for review to singly- or co-authored works published by university presses. They also consider singly- or co-authored works by other presses, as well as edited volumes with a strong thematic focus. The overall acceptance rate of 31% is relatively high, compared with recent past years, for the book review section. The proportion of books reviewed is generally higher in the subfields of political theory and international relations because the books received are primarily singly- or co-authored scholarly works. (By contrast, in the subfield of American politics and, to some extent, in comparative politics, many of the books received are textbooks, non-scholarly works, or books from other disciplines.) However, in comparing these figures to previous years, the proportion of books accepted in political theory is unusually high.

Table 10 shows the number of book reviews per subfield published in *Perspectives on Politics* from Vol. 2, issue 4 (December 2004) through Vol. 3, Issue 3 (March, June, and September 2005).

For the second year in a row, the number of books in the subfields of American and comparative politics is slightly higher than has traditionally been the case, and the number in international relations and political theory is correspondingly lower. We aim to have the distribution of books relatively equal across the subfields, but are limited in any given year by the number and quality of books submitted in each subfield.

Conclusion

Completing this report is my last formal task as editor of *Perspectives on Politics*, and I want to end by thanking everyone involved for making it such a fascinating four years. In particular, I want to thank the associate editors, the APSA staff, the managing editors, and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the APSA officers and Council—as well, of course, as the authors and reviewers. Like everything else in *Perspectives on Politics*, the annual report remains a work in progress. The editors and staff welcome queries that were not answered above and suggestions for topics to include in future reports. We welcome even more your suggestions, proposals, and manuscripts for future publication in *Perspectives*.

Notes

1. This column includes only proposals for which we had not yet received full submissions by July 31, 2005.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

PS Political Science & Politics

April 2006

Here's a preview of some of the articles that will be published in the April issue of *PS: Political Science and Politics*:

Features

What You Use Matters: Coding Protest Data
Taehyun Nam

The Limits of Political Efficacy: Educating Citizens for a Democratic Society
Joseph Kahne and Joel Westheimer

Democracy, Dictatorship, and the Making of Modern Political Science: Huntington's Thesis and Pinochet's Chile
Jorge Heine

Vox Populi, Vox Dei, Vox Sagittae
Forrest Maltzman, Melissa Schwartzberg, and Lee Sigelman

The Profession

Reflections on the APSA Report on Graduate Education: International Students and Their Teaching Training
Masako Rachel Okura

Success in Graduate School and After: Survey Results from the Midwest Region
Vicki L. Hesli, Jacqueline DeLaat, Jeremy Youde, Jeanette Mendez, and Sang-shin Lee

How "International" Are Undergraduate Political Science Programs at Liberal Arts and Sciences Colleges and Universities in the Midwest?
John Ishiyama and Marijke Breuning

The Teacher

Why Bother? Because Peer-to-Peer Programs Can Mobilize Young Voters
Daniel M. Shea and Rebecca Harris

Teaching Politics Using *Antigone*
Kimberly Cowell-Meyers

Partial Online Instruction and Gender-based Differences in Learning: A Quasi-Experimental Study of American Government
Kerstin Hamann, Phillip H. Pollock, and Bruce M. Wilson

Washington Insider

HUD to Help Colleges Hurt By Storms

The colleges and universities that were damaged by hurricanes Katrina and Rita may be receiving aid from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. In addition to the extensive layoffs of faculty and staff at the affected schools there are also hundreds of millions of dollars in damage. HUD will award $5.6 million to help restore demolished buildings as well as provide general support to hurricane victims and their communities that may include child care, job training, health care, and assisting community development organizations and other colleges.

Humanities Grants Go to Hurricane Zone

The National Endowment for the Humanities announced the first recipients of grants to help cultural institutions, including college libraries and museums, that were damaged by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The NEH awarded 19 emergency grants totaling more than $500,000 to help preserve cultural artifacts and to help the institutions recover financially from the storms. Some of the universities that will receive grants from NEH are the Univerisity of New Orleans, Tulane University, the University of Southern Mississippi, and Xavier University of Louisiana.

New Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has Higher-Education Experience

Justice John Roberts has had considerable experience working on higher education cases. Prior to being appointed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, Roberts worked as a lawyer for Hogan & Hartson where Roberts represented colleges, faculty members, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. He has represented cases on issues involving privacy law, civil rights, and free speech, giving him experience uncharacteristic of Supreme Court Justices.

Senate Passes Bill—No Pell Grant Increase

Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA) proposed an amendment to a bill for education and health research that would increase the amount of the maximum Pell Grant b $200 in 2006. This amendment was defeated and the maximum Pell Grant award remains $4,050, the same amount it has been for the past three years. Had this amendment passed it would have cost an additional $836 million. Senators who opposed this increase did so because there were no proposed offsetting spending cuts to other programs.

Proposed Tax Changes Could Affect Colleges

A presidential panel proposed an overhaul of the federal tax system that could greatly affect collages nationwide. One proposal would allow taxpayers to write off only the portion of their charitable gifts that exceeds 1% of their income. This would greatly reduce the number of people eligible for the deduction, thereby removing the incentive for many donors and negatively affecting colleges that rely on small donations. The panel also proposed eliminating Clinton's Hope and Lifetime Learning Credit and replacing it with a Family Credit allowance.

Sources for this column include the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History's NCC Washington Update, *the* Chronicle of Higher Education, *and the Consortium of Social Science Associations'* Washington Update.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CenterPAGE

A Look at the Centennial Center for Political Science & Public Affairs

Center Space Available for Spring 2006!

The Centennial Center for Political Science and Public Affairs is quickly becoming an invaluable resource to political and social scientist. Since its opening in September 2003, the Center has housed more than 45 scholars. The Center, housed in the APSA headquarters near Dupont Circle, provides a great base of operations for scholars researching in the D.C. metro area. The Center offers Visiting Scholars furnished work space, telephone, fax, computers, Internet access, conference space, a reference library, and access to George Washington University's Gelman Library.

Visiting Scholar stays range from a few days to 12 months. Space is limited to APSA members and is available for faculty members, post-doctoral fellows, and advanced graduate students from the U.S. and abroad. Scholars are expected to cover their own expenses and a modest facilities fee for the use of the Center.

Prospective visiting scholars may apply at any time. Positions are awarded on the space-available basis. Full details on the Center and the Visiting Scholars Program, including application form, can be found online at www.apsanet.org/section_224.cfm. You may also contact Cathy Setzer at APSA: 202-483-2512; csetzer@apsanet.org.

Research Funding Available

The APSA sponsors a number of funds to help finance research. Many of these funds can support your stay at the Centennial Center or elsewhere.

The Presidency Research Fund
Provides supplemental support for examination of the presidency.

Special Study for the Study of Women and Politics
Provides supplemental support for the study of women and politics.

Warren E. Miller Fellowship for Electoral Politics
Provides supplemental support for research residencies in national and comparative electoral politics.

Ed Artinian Endowment for Advancing Publishing
Provides supplemental support to assist young scholars in publishing their research.

To see all available funding opportunities offered by APSA, please visit www.apsanet.org/content_3471.cfm

InTheNews

Ken Wald, a professor at the University of Florida, stayed at the Centennial Center from August–December 2005. His research focuses on Jewish political behavior and he presented his research at talks at Georgetown University, Harvard University, and the University of Maryland.

In the wake of Hurricane Katrina, the APSA Centennial Center for Political Science and Public Affairs opened its doors to displaced graduate students and faculty members of affected universities. The Center housed two graduate students and one professor from the New Orleans area.

InProfile

Brendan Doherty

A Ph.D. candidate at the University of California, Berkeley, Brendan Doherty's dissertation examines the relationships between electoral incentives and the ways that presidents behave throughout their term in office. It is widely accepted that the Electoral College structures the ways that presidential candidates campaign. How do these same incentives relate to the ways that presidents govern? How have these dynamics changed over time as the presidency has evolved?

Although scholars have noted the blurring of lines between campaigning and governing, the study of the presidency is often separated from the study of presidential campaigns. In an effort to help bridge this gap, Doherty hypothesizes that if, following the logic that David Mayhew applies to members of Congress, we assumed that presidents are single-minded seekers of reelection, then, at least during a president's first term, we would expect that strategic presidents as rational actors would act in ways that reflect the institutional incentives of the Electoral College in order to maximize their chances of reelection. His dissertation aims to assess to what extent this unrealistically simplistic assumption explains presidential actions.


Brendan Doherty

To test hypotheses about whether presidents favor key electoral states throughout their terms, Doherty employs both quantitative and qualitative approaches to analyze systematically the geographic distribution of presidential travel, fundraising, and mentions of the states in presidential documents during the latter portion of the 20th century.

In addition to shedding more light on the ways that presidents behave while in office, Doherty expects his study to provide valuable empirical evidence in the debate over efforts to maintain, reform, or abolish the Electoral College. More broadly, he seeks to assess the relationships between institutional incentives and political actions.

During his stay at the Centennial Center, Doherty is conducting archival research and interviews with presidential aides, as well as continuing work on the quantitative portions of his study.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Elites and Mandates in Post-Authoritarian Argentina and Chile

Jaime Baeza Freer, *Centennial Center Visiting Scholar and University of Essex*

The pacted nature of democratic transition seems to define the divergent path taken by Chilean elites in comparison with their Argentinean counterparts. However, using a Most Similar System Design (MSSD)[1], two new elements enhance opportunities for explaining the different outcomes. First, the content of a mandate that has the ability to co-opt people from outside the privileged class; and second, the capacity of the elite to generate a process of political systematization and economic monetarization that ensures stability with no apparent democratic setbacks.

Due to the characteristics of each particular democratic transition process, Argentina did not pursue any form of pact, while in Chile the intra-elite existing pact is known by its effects rather than the agreed clauses.[2] In this sense, the only way of grasping the boundaries of the accord is through the configuration of the elite, political discourse, and electoral outcomes. This is why Susan Stokes' definition of mandate remains crucial: "the expectations politicians create in campaign about the actions they will take if they win" (2001, 4).

Therefore, legitimating the agreement among the general population or presenting the true nature of their agenda results remains key in order to retain power for the elite. Stokes recognizes that holding government accountable is a complex business because of the leader temptation to violate the mandate. Therefore, it could be wise to state that campaigns are not predictors of future policy (Stokes 2001, 6). However, the post-war experience in the developed world is different. The author notes the results of Budge, Robertson, and Hearls' studies in 19 developed nations where there is consistency between party manifestos and what is delivered by those same political groups after assuming office.

Subsequently, it should be argued that the violation of the mandate is much more complex than politicians fearing a defeat or discredit from the population, but also a sign of lacking a basic cross-class institutional pact by which the leadership cannot deceive constituencies. It is completely understandable that a president switches policy because of extenuating circumstances, but not as a pre-meditated form of political activity.

Stokes presents two basic policy type manifestos: a security-oriented style with a mix of job creation, industrial policy, and gradualist approaches to inflation stabilization; and an efficiency-oriented style focused on reducing the size of the state, privatizing state-owned enterprises, and opening trade.

In this line of argument, Argentina's Menem and De la Rúa administrations represent particularly striking policy switches. Both ran campaigns promising security-oriented policy, but switched in the middle of their terms. These switches were also accompanied by vast cases of corruption and unpopular measures like massive privatizations with closed bids. The popular reaction generated mass mobilizations with the motto *¡Qué se vayan todos! (Let's fire all of them)* that ended the De la Rúa government in December of 2001. This moment represented a total lack of credibility in the government and a fracture between the political elite and the mainstream population.[3]

In comparison, the excessive importance given by the Chilean elite to the pact has assured stability, with candidates sticking to the system. In general, the system has brought economic improvement and made Chile an example of low corruption in the region. However, the price is a growing feeling of empty politics, with more people detached from the democratic process and less people registering to vote. It represents another symptom of a missing social institutional pact. Consequently, both countries are in real need of socio-political change. Nevertheless, Chilean political leaders can face reforms and modernization with more economic and institutional stability than Argentina's leaders.

This is the main difference between both political outcomes. In Argentina, the elite pursued instrumental alliances without attaching to any specific political group, changing loyalties in accordance to their short-term interests. In Chile, the economic elite has always been attached to only one specific sector of the political spectrum: the business elite representing the actions of the parties on the right. As one of Augusto Pinochet's former ministers portrays it, "they are supposed to work for them" (Barrett 2000, 11).

Furthermore, it leads to an explanation of the different nature of each country's political party, which is critically influenced by candidate selection, leadership, coalitional politics, and democratic stability. This means that the current political situation in these two countries is independent of both coming from bureaucratic authoritarian regimes, and above all, generating different conditions despite the missing pact. This includes the issues of corruption or electoral democracy. In Chile, the entrepreneurial and right-wing elite have attached its future to the existence of a rule of law that preserves its interests, even if they have to pay the price of electoral defeat for years to come. It is included in the transitional pact, while in Argentina their counterparts would only get involved in preserving the institutional framework if it benefits their particular political interest.

The content of the mandate also triggers another important differentiation. Since its existence and enforcement, Chile has ignited a double process of systematization in politics and monetarization of economics decisions. Both could be key explanatory factors in mandate stability. According to Cousiño and Valenzuela (1994), the first is produced when politics as an activity is independent, self-referred, and no longer measured from the lenses of economics (or any other system). The latter represents the independence of economic decisions from politics, being ruled by its own standards. In this sense, economics is no longer susceptible to interventions from the immediate political interests of a specific group.

My research questions whether the difference in stability in Chile is a result of a process of mandated systematization and monetarization that assures important degrees of predictability, while Argentinean politics continues to be understood from the lenses of economics. This characteristic is relevant for further explanations in the levels of political mobilization, social movement activity, and the entire political agenda. Furthermore, it illuminates the behavior of main actors and socio-economic barriers for better inclusion and participation.

References

Barrett, Patrick. 2000. "Chile's Transformed Party System and the Future of Democratic Stability." Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs 42 (autumn).

Cousiño, Carlos, and Eduardo Valenzuela. 1994. *Politización y Monetarización en América Latina.* Santiago: Cuadernos del Instituto de Sociología de la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.

Gervasoni, Carlos. 2003. "Debilidad Política y Crisis Financiera: Una explicación del fracaso de De la Rúa en Argentina." Presented at the Latin American Studies Association Congress, Dallas.

Godoy, Oscar. 1999. *La Transición Chilena a la Democracia Pactada Estudios Públicos.* Santiago: CEP Chile.

Fiorucci, Flavia, and Marcus Klein, eds. 2004. *The Argentine Crisis at the Turn of the Millennium: Cause, Consequences and Explanations.* Cedla: Latin America Studies.

Landman, Todd. 2004. *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction.* London: Taylor and Francis Group.

Stokes, Susan. 2001. *Mandates and Democracy: Neoliberalism by Surprise in Latin America.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tsebelis, George. 1990. *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Notes

1. MSSD "seeks to identify the key features that are different among similar countries and which account for the observed political outcome . . . especially suited for area studies" (Landman 2004, 29–30).

2. Godoy (1999) presents a classification between the explicit and implicit clauses of the transition pact.

3. Argentina's 2001crisis is well documented in journalistic circles. For more academic perspectives see, Gervasoni (2003) and especially Fiorucci et al. (2004).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Trolling the Partisan Waters of Congress: The 2005–2006 Class of Congressional Fellows

Jeff Biggs, *APSA, Congressional Fellowship Program*

No year is like any other for the successive classes of APSA Congressional Fellows. Over the last few years Fellows have encountered the impeachment of a president, the repercussions of the terrorist bombings of New York City's Twin Towers and the Pentagon, the invasion of Iraq, and the devastation of New Orleans and the Gulf Coast following Hurricane Katrina. One of this year's 2004–2005 Fellows, Amy Steigerwalt, is still waiting for the University of New Orleans to open so she can resume her teaching position.

This year, the 2005–2006 Fellows will encounter an off-year election and a highly partisan Congress in which the Republican leadership and majorities in both the chambers are displaying fissures, uncertainties, and even power vacuums for the first time since 2000. If anything characterizes the new atmosphere it is flux and new and relatively unfamiliar personalities exerting a surprising level of political muscle.

As the Fellows complete their three-week intensive orientation and begin searching for the "right fit" in a congressional assignment in this political party-dominated atmosphere, they are faced with far more uncertainties than their predecessors were some 40 years ago when the "players," beginning with the committee chairs, were far more recognizable. In the 1960s a freshman member of the House and a Congressional Fellow would probably have been equally impressed by unchallenged wielders of power. In 1964, newly-elected Representative Thomas S. Foley (D-WA) described being a new member of the Agriculture Committee chaired by Harold Cooley (D-NC).

> He strode out, took his chair at the head of the dais, rapped the gavel several times, and announced that he wanted to say a few words to the new members. 'I hate and detest, hate and detest, hearing senior members of this committee, of either party, interrupted by junior members of this committee, of either party,' he said. 'You new members in particular will find that you will require some time, some of you months, others of you regrettably probably years, before you develop sufficient knowledge and experience to contribute constructively to our work.
>
> In the meantime, silence and attention,' rapping the gavel for emphasis, 'silence and attention is the rule for new members of this committee.'

The situation became bleaker when one freshman Member, who had over-stepped the chairman's injunction, was declared dead.

> You can come and sit in your chair. You can attend the meetings, but I'm not going to recognize you to speak. And you won't be able to amend any bills in the committee. On the floor you won't be given any time to speak in general debate, and I'll oppose any amendment you offer. And you won't be allowed to travel anywhere. And nothing you want to do for your district will come out of this committee. Soon as I find out it's you who wants it, it will be stopped. Let me give you some advice. Get off the committee. You're a zombie on this committee. You're a walking, living, dead man. (*Honor in the House: Speaker Tom Foley*, Washington State Press, 1999)

Although the Member was later revived, with suitable apologies, those years were nothing like what new Fellows encounter today, where new Members play a far more active role. The choices for assignment are far broader with few of the old guideposts for direction. The 2005–2006 Fellows have come face-to-face with what political scientists have viewed as the transition from the committee to party-controlled Congress. For many, such as the journalists, and even many political scientists, who have become accustomed to viewing politics from the position of an independent, they are now encountering an institution where there are few, if any, independents among the staff.

While much of the new environment is familiar to the political scientist Fellows, the journalists, Federal fellows, Robert Wood Johnson health policy, and international fellows are having to come to grips with concepts such as the permanent campaign and the inside game and the outside game. For this environment, the goals of the November orientation are particularly important—to introduce Fellows to the legislative process and policy concerns likely to see action in the 2nd session of the 109th Congress; to give them a sense of the distinct working environment on the Hill; to start them on the important exercise of networking new contacts; and to acquaint the Fellows with alumni who can help them maximize the value of being a Fellow.

Alumni have always been the bedrock of the 85-plus speakers in the orientation. Looking at political scientist alumni alone, this year the roster included: Norm Ornstein (1969–1970), Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and Chair of the fellowship's Advisory Committee; Tom Mann (1969–1970), W. Averill Harriman Chair, The Bookings Institution; David Auerswald (1998–1999), National War College; Paul Herrnson (Steiger Fellow, 1989–1990), Director, Center for American Politics and Citizenship, University of Maryland; Frances Lee (Steiger Fellow, 2002–2003), Department of Government and Politics, University of Maryland; Forrest Maltzman (1994–1995), Department of Political Science, George Washington University; James Thurber (1973–1974), Director, Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies, American University; Christopher Deering (1984–1985), Chair, Department of Political Science, George Washington University; Arthur Burris (YEARS?), Deputy Minority Staff Director, House Budget Committee; Bill Koetzle (1997–1998), Assistant to the Speaker of the House for Policy; and John Haskell (1997–1998), Governmental Affairs Institute, Georgetown University.

Each year we draw on recent Fellows to staff a series of panels discussing how best to maximize the fellowship experience, and how best to approach the interview process to insure that Fellows can find the right office assignment. The composition of these panels reflects the increasing eclectic composition of an average class of 30–35 Fellows. This year the panelists included: Kel Britvec (1999–2000), Chief, Pentagon Support Division, Joint Intelligence Task Force for Combating Terrorism, Defense Intelligence Agency; Peter Gadzinski 2002–2003), Senior Adviser, Director for Business Practices, Office of eDiplomacy, Department of State, and formerly Director, Department of State Congressional Liaison Office; Brian E. Harvey (YEARS?), Director, Office of Gastroenterology Products, CDER, Food and Drug Administration,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Department of Health and Human Services; Nancy Schoenberg 2002–2003), Program Policy Officer, Office of Disability Programs, Social Security Administration; Aimee Curl (2004–2005), *Federal Times*; Willa Green (2004–2005), Department of Labor; Richard Litsey (2004–2005), Social Security Administration; and Christopher McShane (2004–2005), State Department.

To ease the Fellows' anxieties about trying to find the right fit between their own long-term goals and the specific office needs, the fellowship sends out an announcement about the current year's class to the chiefs-of-staff for every Senate and House personal office and the majority and minority staff directors for every committee—750-plus messages—asking if they want a Fellow and to submit a contact name and issues they want covered. This year we received more than 60 requests and many from new offices in which this past year's Fellows broke new ground: Senators Susan Collins (R-ME), Olympia Snowe (R-ME), Kent Conrad (D-ND), Michael Enzi (R-WY), The Senate Finance Committee (Max Baucus, D-MT), and the House Republican Policy Committee.

Part of this new congressional response to the fellowship stems from the Fellows interviewing far more widely than in the past as they recognize the exercise as part of the educational process—even interviewing in offices in which they have no real political compatibility but about which they are curious. Even before the end of this year's orientation, one journalist Fellow has interviewed in 15 offices.

The final installment in this year's orientation is the Congressional Research Office's Advanced Legislative Process Institute. This two-day session presents an awesome amount of detail: "Raising and Considering Measures on the House Floor" by Walter Oleszek; "The Amending Process in the House" with Elizabeth Rybicki; "Special Rules and the Rules Committee in the House" with Mike Koempel; "Committee Hearings, Markups, and Reports" with Chris Davis; "The Tactical Use of House Floor Procedure: A Case Study from the Congressional Record" with Judy Schneider; "Raising and Considering Measures in the Senate" with Tom Carr; "Unanimous Consent Agreements" with Rick Beth; "The Amending Process in the Senate" with Jim Saturno; "The Tactical Use of Senate Floor Procedure: A Case Study from the Congressional Record" with Betsy Palmer; and "Resolving Legislative Differences—Conference Committees" with Elizabeth Rybicki. While it sounds a bit daunting, this past year the session proved its utilitarian value as a surprising number of Congressional Fellows became actively involved in drafting legislation from controlling the illegal sale of methamphetamines to expanding U.S. free trade zones.

As the 53rd Congressional Fellowship class prepares to embark upon their hands-on congressional experience, their most immediate benchmark tends to be the class that preceded them and whose evaluations they read for guidance. Without any mathematical regressions to prove the point, we fall back on anecdotal evidence and offer two examples among many.



Front row (L to R): Liping Zhang, Leona Cuttler, Kathy Hebert, Veronica Jones, Amy Jasperson, Sharon Rapport, Kelly Trimble; **Second row (L to R):** Caroline-Lucie Ulbrich, Michelle L. Stefanick, Sarah England, Robin Hemphill, Fresia Rodriguez Cadavid, Jeffrey Biggs,Sharon Elizabeth Hudson-Dean; **Third row (L to R):** Samer Mustafa abu Libdeh, Michael Crespin, Neil Simon, Colleen Shogan, Martina Bebin; **Fourth row (L to R):** Sebastian Soto, Alfred Pheley, Richard Driscoll, Laura King Kellams, Stephen Ceccoli, Francis Bires, Kenneth Vogel; **Fifth row (L to R):** Jerry Hibbitts, Andrew Barrett, Roger, Johns, Sebastian Schwark, James Roberts, III

Political scientist Jennifer Nicholl Victor (2004–2005) returned to her position at the University of Pittsburgh from where she wrote:

> I'm teaching two Congress classes this term (one undergrad-level and one Ph.D.-level). I find myself drawing on my fellowship experience a LOT! As expected, the fellowship has provided great insight and nice teaching tools for me. I like showing off to my students with off-hand statements like, "'I met John Roberts, and. . . .' I'm also trying to get a book project going. I'm off to a bit of a slow start, but my fellowship experience is helping me out there too.

And, from a different part of the world, German Marshall Fund Fellow Hans Michael Kloth returned to cover politics for *Der Spiegel*. A true networking aficionado, he sent his fellowship colleagues a recent interview he had with U.S. political scientist Robert Kagan, known by many for his "America is from Mars, Europe is from Venus" theory focusing on developments in the trans-Atlantic relationship.

These two examples also reflect the eclectic character of contemporary classes of APSA Congressional Fellows. The senior Fulbright Fellows give a good sense of how international the fellowship has become. This year's Fellows include Jordanian Samer Mustafa abu Libdeh, who directs the Interaction Forum in Amman which seeks to find common ground between Palestinians and Israelis, Moroccan Mustapha Khalfi, who is head of the political division of leading Rabat daily *Attajdid*, Chilean Jose Sebastian Soto Velasco, who serves as a senior legislative researcher for the Santiago think tank *Libertad y Desarrollo* (Liberty and Development), and Chinese Liping Zhang, who is an Associate Fellow at the Institute of American Studies at Beijing's Chinese Academy of Social Sciences.

The staff at APSA continues to receive updates from former Fellows who are interested in staying in touch with their colleagues and expanding their network with former Fellows. You can update your profile on the web site, www.cfpnet.org. Alternately, you can send your name, fellowship year, work and home addresses, phone numbers, email addresses, and office assignments to either cfp@apsanet.org or to APSA Congressional Fellowship Program, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036. We are also happy to accept updates on the whereabouts of alumni, which we will soon begin posting on our web site.

The Congressional Fellowship Program continues to benefit from the generosity of MCI, Congressional Quarterly, Inc., the William E. Steiger trust, and the annual contributions of program alumni.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

APSA Journals' Most Downloaded Articles, 2003–2005

The following tables display the 10 most frequently downloaded APSA journal articles from the Cambridge University Press web site from January 2003 to present.

American Political Science Review

Volume & Issue	Title	Author(s)	Abstract Views	Full Text Views
97:3	The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism	Robert A. Pape	3,952	5,204
97:1	Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War	James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin	3,532	5,146
97:4	The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory	Sebastian Rosato	1,084	2,377
98:2	What is a Case Study and What Is It Good for?	John Gerring	1,234	2,222
95:1	Governance in a Partially Gloabalized World	Robert O. Keohane	792	2,036
96:4	Ideas, Institutions, and Political Order: Explaining Political Change	Robert C. Lieberman	1,336	1,930
97:2	Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance	Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks	1,344	1,848
98:1	The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy	Beth A. Simmons and Zachary Elkins	1,466	1,808
96:4	Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science	Lisa Wedeen	1,028	1,688
95:1	Toward a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816–1992	Håvard Hegre	760	1,632

Perspectives on Politics

Volume & Issue	Title	Author(s)	Abstract Views	Full Text Views
1:1	Just War Theory and the U.S. Counterterror War	Neta C. Crawford	900	1,517
1:3	Is American Multilateralism in Decline?	G. John Ikenberry	566	1,043
1:1	Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict, and Rationality	Ashutosh Varshney	836	946
1:3	The Ontology of "Political Violence": Action and Identity in Civil Wars	Stathis N. Kalyvas	518	932
1:3	Still Standing By: Why America and the International Community Fail to Prevent	Benjamin A. Valentino	428	707
1:1	Exploring the Bargaining Model of War	Dan Reiter	354	706
1:3	Genocide and Mass Killing National Identity and Self-Esteem	Jeff Spinner-Halev and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse	452	618
1:2	Islamism, Revolution, and Civil Society	Sheri Berman	370	588
1:1	Social Capital and Racial Inequality in America	Rodney E. Hero	410	569
1:1	Linking Knowledge and Action: Political Science and Campaign Finance Reform	Thomas E. Mann	406	567

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Volume & Issue	Title	Author(s)	Abstract Views	Full Text Views
36:1	Anatomy of a Rally Effect: George W. Bush and the War on Terrorism	Marc J. Hetherington and Michael Nelson	992	995
36:2	Journals in the Discipline: A Report on a New Survey of American Political Scientists	James C. Garand and Micheal W. Giles	330	990
35:3	How Americans Responded: A Study of Public Reactions to 9/11/01	Michael Traugott, Ted Brader, Deborah Coral, Richard Curtin, David Featherman, Robert Groves, Martha Hill, James Jackson, Thomas Juster, Robert Kahn, Courtney Kennedy, Donald Kinder, Beth-Ellen Pennell, Matthew Shapiro, Mark Tessler, David Weir, and Robert Willis	798	703
35:3	Will 9/11 and the War on Terror Revitalize American Civic Democracy?	Theda Skocpol	690	695
35:4	Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews	Beth L. Leech	228	583
36:1	The Seven Sins of American Foreign Policy	Loch K. Johnson and Kiki Caruson	484	581
35:3	American New Consumption during Times of National Crisis	Scott L. Althaus	650	577
35:4	Interview Methods in Political Science in America	Beth L. Leech	214	546
36:2	Marbury v. Madison: How John Marshall Changed History by Misquoting the Constitution	Winfield H. Rose	532	539
35:3	Political Knowledge after September 11	Markus Prior	168	512

News and Notes

Special Thanks

The APSA would like to thank representatives of the Association who attended the inauguration of their university presidents: Jack Fleer of Wake Forest University represented APSA at the inauguration of Nathan Hatch and Caroline Heldman of Whittier College represented the Association by attending the inauguration of Sharon Herzberger. To each of the distinguished representatives, we at the APSA wish to express our appreciation—thank you.

Call for Papers

The *American Politics Research* announces a call-for-papers for a special issue on Courts and Judicial Process to be published in early-to-mid 2007. The manuscripts must be between 25 and 45 pages in length and follow the submission instructions which may be found at www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/apr. All submissions are due by July 1, 2006.

Berlin Seminar

Bradley University's annual Berlin Seminar will be held from May 28 through July 3, 2006. This program is intended for academics interested in the history and contemporary culture, society, economy, and politics of Germany and Europe. The seminar is centered at the European Academy in Berlin-Grunewald and will provide professional translators. Applications are due by January 30, 2005. For more information please visit www.bradley.edu/academics/las/his/Berlin.

Ella T. Grasso Collection

The Mount Holyoke College Archives and Special Collections will be housing Ella T. Grasso's papers in February 2006. Grasso was the first woman governor of Connecticut and the first woman governor elected in her own right. The papers deal with issues such as the Vietnam War, the energy crisis, and *Roe v. Wade*. Details can be found at www.mtholyoke.edu/offices/comm./news/grasso.shtml.

National Archives Offers Summer Institute for Educators

For the first time, *Primarily Teaching: Original Documents and Classroom Strategies* will be held in Washington D.C., California, and Kansas. *Primarily Teaching* is designed to provide access to the rich resources of the National Archives for educators at all levels. Participants will learn how to research the records and create classroom materials based on the resources provided. Space is limited. Applications are available at www.archives.gov/education/primarily-teaching.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Saluting Our Fifty-Year Members

50 years in 2006

William W. Adams Jr+
Martin Albaum*
Lyle C. Brown+
John H. Bunzel*
Bancroft Henderson*
Gordon G. Henderson*
Peter H. Juviler*
Stanley Kelley, Jr.*
Lu-Yu Kiang*
Allen B. Lee*
John D. Sprague*
Rex J. Swartz+
Duane E. Wilder+
James Q. Wilson*
Stephen B. Wood*

More than 50 years in 2006

Henry J. Abraham*
Herbert E. Alexander*
David E. Apter*
John A. Armstrong, Jr.*
Henry Bain*
Richard D. Baker*
Willard F. Barber
Lucius J. Barker*
Twiley W. Barker, Jr.*
Samuel H. Barnes*
Eliot S. Berkley*
Walter Berns*
William T. Bluhm*
Robert L. Bock*
Henry L. Bretton*
Frederic S. Burin, II*
James MacGregor Burns+
Eleanore Bushnell*
Douglas Carlisle+
Karl H. Cerny*
Carl Q. Christol*
Charles L. Clapp*
Bernard C. Cohen*
Robert A. Dahl+
Alfred Diamant*
Marion E. Doro*
Alex N. Dragnich*
David Easton*
Leon D. Epstein*
William O. Farber
Richard F. Fenno Jr.*
Robert S. Friedman*
Robert T. Golembiewski*
Samuel K. Gove*
Doris A. Graber
William A. Glaser+
Daniel R. Grant*
Werner F. Grunbaum
Gibson Gray*
Milton Greenberg*
Fred I. Greenstein*
Harold Guetzkow*
Lewis Gulick+
Dagmar Gunther-Stirn*
Harry H. Hall+
Paul Y. Hammond+
Jerzy Hauptmann*
Ferrel Heady*
Lawrence J.R. Herson*
Charles M. Hersh
Jack E. Holmes
Samuel P. Huntington+
Malcolm E. Jewell*
T. Page Johnson*
Scott D. Johnston*
Charles O. Jones+
Elijah B.-Z. Kaminsky*
Max M. Kampelman*
Morton A. Kaplan*
Jules A. Karlin*
William J. Keefe*
Francis J. Keenan*
David Kettler*
Frank L. Klingberg*
David C. Knapp*
Charles A. Koehler+
Louis W. Koenig*
Norman Kogan*
Edward M. Kresky*
Samuel Krislov*
Raoul Kulberg+
Robert E. Lane*
Jean A. Laponce*
John W. Lederle*
Louis E. Leopold*
David M. Levitan*
Earl W. Lindveit*
George T. Little*
Gerhard Loewenberg*
Duncan MacRae, Jr.*
Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr.
James G. March+
Lee C. McDonald*
Theodore H. McNelly*
Robert O. McWilliams*
Walter F. Murphy*
Dalmas H. Nelson*
Chester A. Newland
Charles R. Nixon*
Harding C. Noblitt*
Grady H. Nunn*
Maurice E. Odonnell*
Morris Samuel Ogul*
Roy Olton*
Felix E. Oppenheim*
A S. Osorio+
Vincent Ostrom
Gen. Curtis H. O'Sullivan+
Samuel C. Patterson+
Julius Paul*
Jack W. Peltason*
Claude S. Phillips*
Paul J. Piccard+
Nelson W. Polsby+
Mojmir Povolny*
Jewel L. Prestage*
Lucian W. Pye*
David E. RePass*
Benjamin Rivlin*
J. Austin Ranney+
Elston E. Roady*
James S. Roberts*
John H. Romani+
William J. Ronan*
Victor G. Rosenblum+
Ernest E. Rossi*
Raymond K. Rossiter*
James N. Rosenau
John W. Ryan*
Robert H. Salisbury*
Joseph A. Schlesinger+
Ralph W. Schuhart*
H. P. Secher*
Roberta S. Sigel*
Albert Somit*
Frank J. Sorauf*
Herbert John Spiro*
Vincent E. Starzinger*
Murray S. Stedman, Jr.*
Vladimir Steffel+
William P. Stein*
Robert H. Stern*
Thor Swanson+
Richard N. Swift+
Morton J. Tenzer*
George O. Totten, III*
Daniel W. Tuttle*
S. Sidney Ulmer*
Paul P. Van Riper*
Herbert Waltzer*
Robert E. Ward*
Richard A. Ware*
Maurice Waters*
Raymond E. Wolfinger
Peter Woll*
Lloyd W. Woodruff+
Deil S. Wright*
Raphael Zariski*
Aristide R. Zolberg
Norman L. Zucker

* indicates retired member
\+ indicates life member

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rowman and Littlefield Award for Innovative Teaching in Political Science

2005 Recipients Announced

The 2005 recipients of the Rowman & Littlefield Award for Innovative Teaching in Political Science are Barbara Allen and Greg Marfleet of Carleton College. The award, which carries a cash stipend, was presented at the 2005 Awards Reception at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting in Washington, DC.

The innovative teaching award recognizes political scientists who have developed effective new approaches to teaching in the discipline. The award seeks to honor a wide range of new directions in teaching, not one particular new direction. The winners were chosen from among a large number of deserving nominees whose teaching techniques in various ways have moved our pedagogy forward. The only limits on this award are the creativity and imagination of those teaching political science.

The 2005 winners were chosen by a committee that was chaired by L. Sandy Maisel of Colby College and that included the 2004 award winner, Kay L. Scholzman of Boston College.



(L to R) L. Sandy Maisel, chair, Rowman and Littlefield Award Committee; Margaret Levi, former APSA president; and 2005 Award Recipients Barbara Allen and Greg Marfleet.

Call for Nominations


Rowman & Littlefield Publishers proudly announces the 10th year of the Rowman & Littlefield Award for Innovative Teaching in Political Science. The award, which carries a $500 cash stipend, will be presented at the 2006 Honors Reception at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting in Philadelphia.

The Innovative Teaching Award recognizes political scientists who have developed effective new approaches to teaching in the discipline. The award seeks to honor a wide range of new directions in teaching, not a particular new direction. Thus, in one year a professor might be chosen because of an innovative course syllabus; in another year a multimedia approach to reaching students might be chosen; in yet another the creator of a simulation or an educational data set might be recognized; and in yet another, the author of a text or monograph that changes the way in which a subject is taught might be tapped. The only limits on what will be recognized are the imagination and creativity of those teaching political science.

The recipients of the award will be chosen by a five-person committee, chaired by L. Sandy Maisel, the William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor of Government and director of the Goldfarb Center for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement at Colby College. Additional Committee Members will include the APSA director of education and professional development and three members of the association selected by APSA President Ira Katznelson.

Northeast Political Science Association Annual Meeting

The Northeastern Political Science Association (NPSA) held its annual meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in November 2005. More than 600 participants attended more than 150 panels. Richard Cohen of the *National Journal* spoke as the Pi Sigma Alpha speaker on "What's Wrong with Washington?" APSA President Ira Katznelson spoke at the Association's annual dinner. Pictured at right are Katznelson, APSA Executive Director Michael Brintnall, NPSA Program Chair Joseph Melusky, NPSA President Azzedine Layachi, NPSA International Relations Section Chair Francine D'Amico, and past Chair and President of the Policy Studies Association (UK) Wyn Grant.



https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pi Sigma Alpha Announces 2005 Grant Winners

Pi Sigma Alpha, the National Political Science Honor Society, is proud to announce the winners of its 2005 Chapter Activity Grants Competition. Now in its 24th year, the Chapter Activity Grants program is the biggest and most important of the honor society's roster of awards because of the size of its budget and the large number of students it affects. In this annual program Pi Sigma Alpha chapters submit proposals for activities they would not be able to carry out without funding. The maximum grant to any chapter is $2,000. The proposed activities may be in areas such as chapter and student development, social service, and the like. A grants committee* reviews the proposals competitively and makes awards based on the quality and feasibility of the activity proposed, the completeness and appropriateness of the budget, and other factors. Some proposals receive full funding, some receive partial funding with instructions on how to scale back the activity, and some are rejected. This year the committee funded 88 chapter projects for a total of nearly $56,000.

SCHOOL	ACTIVITY	AMOUNT
University of Akron	Initiation banquet	$375.00
University of Alaska, Fairbanks	"Ethics of Education" forum	975.00
Allegheny College	Initiation banquet with speaker	525.00
American University	Awards banquet with speaker	900.00
Arizona State University	"Nerd Fest" with speaker	900.00
University of Arizona	Essay contest and awards banquet	875.00
University of Arkansas	Student attendance at Midwest convention	1,068.00
Auburn University	Awards banquet and speaker	775.00
Austin College	Campus-wide speaker	798.00
Baldwin-Wallace College	Panel on Economic Development	130.00
Barton College	Student essay contest	225.00
Benedictine University	Christmas stockings for Katrina victims	1,150.00
Boise State University	Awards breakfast	350.00
California State University, Chico	Initiation banquet with speaker	638.00
California State University, San Bernardino	Initiation banquet with speaker	525.00
Capital University	Essay contest and banquet	475.00
Cedarville University	Banquet and roundtable on biology & politics	560.00
Centenary College of Louisiana	Induction ceremony	400.00
University of Central Oklahoma	Awards banquet	750.00
Christopher Newport University	Banquet with speaker	625.00
Clemson University	Banquet and forum on ethics	500.00
University of Colorado, Colorado Springs	Essay contest on globalization films	435.00
Creighton University	Student journal	425.00
DeSales University	Speaker	328.00
Dickinson College	Initiation banquet with speaker	650.00
East Central University (OK)	"Week of Work" and essay contest	1,225.00
Eastern Michigan University	Panel discussion with speakers on "9/11"	600.00
Fayetteville State University	Model UN Conference	1,800.00
University of Florida	Initiation banquet	1,000.00
Florida International University	Initiation ceremony	795.00
Georgetown University	Initiation ceremony	500.00
Gettysburg College	Symposium	1,000.00
Hillsdale College	James Madison Lecture and dinner	813.00
College of Holy Cross	Speaker on pop culture & politics	650.00
University of Illinois, Springfield	Awards banquet	750.00
Illinois State University	Political Science Student Conference	600.00
Jackson State University	Mock Senate for high school students	638.00
Lamar University	Relief for Katrina animal victims	700.00
Lincoln University	Reception and essay contest	475.00
Louisiana State University, Shreveport	James Madison Conference (2006)	600.00
Loyola College in Maryland	Student trip to Washington, D.C.	600.00
Marist College	Essay contest	175.00
University of Mary Washington	Political science career day	965.00
University of Maryland	Katrina victim benefit event	1,053.00
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	Essay contest and awards banquet	813.00
Mercer University	Leadership and Service night; banquet	475.00
Mercyhurst College	Initiation banquet with speaker	925.00
Midwestern State University (TX)	Essay contest and awards banquet	555.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Minnesota State University	Student conference and awards banquet	1,750.00
Mississippi Valley State University	Easter baskets for nursing home residents	250.00
Monmouth University	Banquet with speaker	900.00
University of Montana	Essay contest, awards banquet, speaker	875.00
Morgan State University	Essay contest, awards luncheon	600.00
Murray State University	Panel on emergency preparedness, luncheon	570.00
New Mexico State University	Initiation banquet	500.00
SUNY, Albany	Luncheon with speakers	875.00
University at Buffalo, SUNY	Initiation banquet, speaker	1,055.00
SUNY, New Paltz	Essay contest, luncheon	435.00
North Carolina A&T State University	Ethics panel and banquet	1,400.00
University of North Carolina, Charlotte	Initiation banquet	600.00
University of North Carolina, Greensboro	Student trip to Washington, D.C.	1,400.00
Ohio University	Peer mentoring program	300.00
Ohio Northern University	Student attendance at Midwest Convention	1,811.00
University of Pennsylvania	Dinner & Discourse series	600.00
Providence College	Essay contest and awards banquet with speaker	1,125.00
Purdue University	Student colloquium and best paper awards	225.00
Purdue University, Calumet	Essay contest and awards banquet	600.00
University of Richmond	Awards banquet	400.00
St. Joseph's University	Research awards and banquet with speaker	875.00
St. Olaf College	Roundtable on environmental ethics	1,800.00
University of St. Thomas	Panel discussion, initiation banquet	463.00
San Jose State University	Departmental convocation reception	250.00
Seton Hall University	Pi Sigma Alpha alumni reception	525.00
Sewanee, University of the South	Essay contest, reception	455.00
University of South Florida	Student observers at Florida state party conventions	1,980.00
Sul Ross State University	Host multi-honor society initiation ceremony	438.00
Temple University	Initiation banquet and speaker	1,988.00
Tennessee State University	Initiation banquet and speaker	722.00
University of Texas, El Paso	Programs for induction ceremony	61.00
Union College	Essay contest, awards banquet	850.00
Utah State University	Essay contest, awards banquet with speaker	1,375.00
Wake Forest University	Initiation banquet	750.00
University of Washington	Panel discussion on film, "Hotel Rwanda"	600.00
Wheaton College	Initiation banquet, speaker	550.00
Wilkes University	Panel on Supreme Court, multi-campus	674.00
Winthrop University	Essay contest on Social justice, banquet, speaker	1,600.00
University of Wisconsin, Madison	Student journal	716.00
University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point	Student journal	420.00

The 2005 Chapter Activity Grants Selection Committee members were James I. Lengle and Diana Owen of Georgetown University, and Stephen J. Farnsworth of the University of Mary Washington.

For more information about Pi Sigma Alpha, visit www.pisigmaalpha.org.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ralph Bunche Institute Deadline Approaches

Designed to introduce 20 students to the world of graduate study and encourage applications to Ph.D. programs in political science, the heart of the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute (RBSI) is two transferable credit courses, one in quantitative analysis and one in race and American politics. The courses introduce students to the intellectual demands of graduate school and political science research methods. As a final project for both courses, students prepare original, empirical research papers and top students are given the opportunity to present their research at APSA's Annual Meeting, with all expenses paid by the Association. Exact dates for the 2006 Summer Institute will be announced in spring 2006.

Classes are held on the Duke University campus, where students have access to a fully equipped computer laboratory, library collections, and other university facilities. Educational activities range from formal classroom settings to informal dinners and lunches with prominent political scientists and Duke University faculty. A strong ethics component is included with readings, cases, debates, and lectures on issues within an academic setting. RBSI Director Paula McClain, professor of political science and law at Duke University, teaches classes along with other colleagues from major universities. Bunche students have uniformly praised the exceptional mentoring that they receive from Dr. McClain and other Bunche faculty.

Since good performance on the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) is key to admission to and funding for graduate school, Graduate Record Exam test-taking strategies are provided by Princeton Review.

At the end of the Institute, representatives from a number of leading Ph.D.-granting institutions come from across the country to participate in a recruitment fair. They visit with Bunche students, provide information about their doctoral programs, and discuss admissions concerns with the students.

The Institute provides full support of tuition, transportation, room and board, books, and instructional materials. Participants will also receive a stipend of $200 a week.



The 2005 Class of RBSI Scholars (L TO R): Bottom Row: Erica Childs, Dianna Vazquez, Jessica Sims, Melissa Swaby, Chloe D. Caraballo, Erica Williams, Monique Lyle, Camila Rivera; **Second Row:** Seth Jolly, Candis Watts, Erin Melton, Karen Ellis, Jatia Ruggles, Quinae McCommons, Dr. Shayla Nunnally, Gerald DiGiusto; **Third Row:** Gerald Lackey, Shalai Coakley, Aza Gray, Victoria DeFrancesco, Niambi Carter, Efren Perez, Michael Brady; **Fourth Row:** Doris C. Cross, Dr. Paula McClain, DeReall Moore, Randall Coleman, William Reese, Shaun Williams-Wyche, Amir Ayers; **Top Row:** Jonathan Patterson, Reymundo Zambrano, Ruben Sanchez, and Robert Walsh.

The Bunche Program Goals

- Enhancing the writing research and analytical skills of the participants, making them more competitive applicants for graduate school admissions and financial assistance
- Improving students use of computers for statistical analysis of research data used in the study of political science
- Exposing participants to leading issues and problems in the discipline and profession of political science
- Introducing participants to leading scholars in the discipline
- Informing students of career opportunities for political scientists

Who is Eligible?

African American, Latino/a, and Native American students who are:

- United States citizens
- Completing their junior year of undergraduate study
- Majoring in Political Science or a related discipline
- Have an interest in attending graduate school in political science

Application Process

Participants in the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute are drawn from a competitive national applicant pool. **All applicants should submit the following in one packet:**

- An RBSI application form (available at www.apsanet.org/imgtest/RBSIapp.pdf)
- Academic transcripts (including fall semester)
- Three letters of recommendation—one from department chair, and two more from other people who are familiar with the applicants academic qualifications
- A statement, not to exceed two double-spaced typed pages, stating the reasons for wanting to participate in the institute.

Application Deadline is February 15, 2006!

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Prestage/Fenno Fellows Present at 2005 Annual Meeting

Two Ralph Bunche Summer Institute Scholars, Candis Watts, Duke University, and DeReal R. Moore, Texas Christian University, presented research funded in part by the Jewel L. Prestage and Richard F. Fenno, Jr. Endowment for Minority Opportunities. The Prestage-Fenno Fund promotes and supports expanded opportunities for minority students contemplating advanced training in political science through such programs as, though not limited to, the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute.





Prestage/Fenno Recipients for the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute (Watts, left; Moore above), presenting research at the 2005 APSA Annual Meeting poster sessions.

The Fund honors two political scientists who were instrumental in developing the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute: Jewel Prestage, who served as its first director, and Richard Fenno, who advanced the idea during his term as APSA president.

Your support of this fund allows APSA to continue its efforts in the recruitment and retention of outstanding young minority scholars.

Political Communication Section Offers One-Day Pre-APSA Conference

The Political Communication Section and its chair, Christina Holtz-Bacha, are organizing a one-day pre-APSA conference, to be held at the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania, 10.00–7.00 on Wednesday August 30th, 2006.The conference will include a plenary session, panels, lunch, and a closing reception.

Recent dramatic events in the news headlines—the tsunami in South-East Asia, the hurricane and its aftermath in Louisiana, 9/11 in New York, the Bali bombing, the potential risks of a bird flu pandemic, and the bombing of the London tube—all highlight issues of crisis communications. Similar catastrophes occur in all countries and at different levels of society. At the macro level, wars, terrorist attacks, man-made emergencies, and natural disasters impact societies and states. At the meso level, institutional crises strike companies. And at the micro level, individual crises appear, demanding the involvement of specific actors such as politicians and managers. Dealing with communications during any crisis poses major challenges for journalists, broadcasters, public officials, political leaders, and the public. Since these events mostly occur unexpectedly, only limited contingency plans for communications can only be prepared in advance. Technical breakdowns and the speed of unfolding events can easily disrupt these plans, thus putting communication professionals to a severe test.

Recent years have provided multiple cases that can be studied from different angles and levels of society. How do journalists and broadcasters mobilize to cover an unfolding story which disrupts regular coverage and news routines? In the confusing situation of the immediate aftermath, when the provision of accurate information by the news media may be critical for saving lives and rescuing victims, do journalists and broadcasters maintain high standards of reporting, impartiality, and balance? How do officials and political leaders respond to public concerns, when attempting to strike a suitable balance between judicious warnings and alarmist panic? How far do those in authority who are attempting to coordinate and manage the official response to emergencies rely upon direct or mediated channels of information? How does the public respond to coverage, when learning about the scale of the crisis, and how far do they turn to the Internet, radio, or television for reliable information? After the immediate crisis subsides, how far do the news media continue to investigate the structural causes and the broader lessons learnt from these events? The workshop will consider these and related issues.

Graduate students are especially welcome to participate and a limited number of $100 travel grants will be available for ABD graduates. General queries should be sent to christina.holtz-bacha@wiso.uni-erlangen.de and more details are at www.apsanet.org/~polcomm/

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506280338 Published online by Cambridge University Press