doi:10.1017/S0003055416000046
© American Political Science Association 2016

Notes from the Editors

As we wind down as editors of the *Review* (we are responsible for the remainder of this issue year, but hand off submissions to our successor in the Summer of 2016), we are very pleased to offer, in this issue, a number of articles that we believe will have an important impact on our field. In this issue of the *Review*, as with previous issues, we present articles that ask important questions for both scholars and practitioners, such as, How do authoritarian leaders develop strategies of repression? Why do individuals join ethnic insurgencies? What role can civic organizations play in promoting political participation? Are there more efficient and replicable ways to code "expert" data? What does "representation" really mean?

As always, we seek to publish work that speaks to a broad audience of scholars, and on topics that also may have important implications for policy makers and practitioners as well. Further, in keeping with our vision of the *Review* as the leading journal in our discipline, we seek (and will continue to seek) to publish the most innovative work in the field.

In This Issue

Our lead article for this issue, Kurt Weyland's **"Crafting Counterrevolution: How Reactionaries Learned to Combat Change in 1848,"** offers a historical case study that is highly relevant to our contemporary international environment. The author notes that in revolutionary waves, one country after another experiences a revolution, as happened during the Arab Spring. However, counterrevolutionary movements tend to follow on the heels of such revolutionary waves, but they unfold slowly and deliberately. Using historical sources, Weyland shows that after their initial panic, reactionary leaders methodically work to tighten their grip on power. The result is that the longer term gains of revolutionary waves are often limited.

In **"Forbearance,"** Alisha C. Holland makes the argument that states in the developing world do not always fail to enforce laws because they are unable to do so. She suggests that we need to distinguish the purposeful nonenforcement of law from that which results from the weakness of state institutions. Holland provides a typology for identifying instances of intentional and revocable nonenforcement of law, or forbearance, from other nonenforcement of law. She then applies this to street vending and squatting in urban Latin America, and shows that forbearance better explains variation in enforcement than a focus on institutional capacity or societal compliance.

Güneş Murat Tezcür in **"Ordinary People, Extraordinary Risks: Participation in an Ethnic Rebellion"** asks the question, Why do ordinary people take extraordinary risks and join an ethnic armed rebellion? Building on social identity economics, Tezcür argues that individuals who lack security and economic opportunities, and who develop polarized ethnic identities because of state repression and threat perceptions, are most likely to join an insurgency. The paper employs a very unique and comprehensive data set on insurgent recruitment (containing biographical information about 8,217 Kurdish militants) bolstered by extensive fieldwork involving interviews with relatives of militants. The findings provide strong support for the theoretical propositions and highlight the key role played by nonviolent ethnic mobilization in inducing individuals to fight for their ethnic group.

Amid the current revival of interest in Hannah Arendt's political philosophy, relatively little attention has been paid to the question of her methodology. A work like *The Origins of Totalitarianism* is thought to be methodologically loose, if not lacking in coherent methodology altogether. Arendt wrote to a friend that the book does employ a method, though one that might have been explained more clearly. Hans-Jörg Sigwart seeks, in **"Political Characterology: On the Method of Theorizing in Hannah Arendt's *Origins of Totalitarianism*,"** to explain this method by extrapolating from the text itself. The method he calls "characterology." Characterology employs characters (individual persons or types of persons) to illuminate the structure of a given historical age or historical process. Going beyond Arendt, Sigwart proposes that characterology is a method that contemporary political theorists should consider using in their own work.

Kenneth Benoit, Drew Conway, Benjamin E. Lauderdale, Michael Laver, and Slava Mikhaylov in **"Crowd-sourced Text Analysis: Reproducible and Agile Production of Political Data"** offer a new, innovative way to code data. Empirical social science often relies on data that are coded into quantitative variables by expert researchers who base their codes on qualitative raw sources. These authors suggest that using crowd-sourcing to distribute text coding to massive numbers of nonexperts generates results comparable to those from expert coding, but far more quickly and flexibly. The data collected are furthermore reproducible, transparent, and economically affordable. Thus this allows researchers to focus on specifying reliable and replicable methods for collecting the data, an important consideration in this era of data transparency. The authors provide examples illustrating the application of this method.

What role can civic organizations play in promoting political participation? In **"The Organizational Roots of Political Activism: Field Experiments on Creating a Relational Context,"** Hahrie Han seeks to answer this question. In doing so, he develops an organizationally based rational model of political activism. Utilizing data from three field experiments, he demonstrates that organizations can have a powerful impact on increasing participation, beyond voting, through the dynamic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000046 Published online by Cambridge University Press

social relationship between the person representing the organization and the person targeted to participate. His findings challenge popular theories of political participation that focus on more static individual characteristics or contextual factors.

In **"Systemic Representation: Democracy, Deliberation, and Nonelectoral Representatives,"** Jonathan W. Kuyper argues that representation may best be understood if we combine two recent advances in political theory. The first is from the theory of representation, the second from deliberative theory. From representative theory, Kuyper takes the notion of self-appointed representatives, who gain their position not by formal appointment/election, but by claiming to speak for a given constituency (and having that claim validated in some way). From deliberative theory, he takes the notion of a "system" of deliberation, a complex of institutions and relationships whose deliberative capacity is to be determined holistically. Combining these two, Kuyper argues, allows us to make normative judgments on various representative claims. Claimants to representation, he concludes, are to be evaluated in part according to what type of representative "space" they occupy ("public" space vs. more informal roles). Occupants of public space are to be judged more stringently. The theory is illustrated with a transnational case study that nicely highlights the nuances of the theory. Kuyper's argument will be of great interest to theorists of representation, and of democracy more widely.

Scholars have long held that prior to the emergence of the modern U.S. presidency in the twentieth century, presidential power was greatly limited due to congressional dominance. Presidents serving before the modern era are characterized as working for rather than with the Congress. In **"Presidential Influence in an Era of Congressional Dominance,"** Jon C. Rogowski challenges this thinking and argues that, as the head of the Executive branch, pre–twentieth century presidents were able to wield more policy influence over Congress than previously thought. To test this argument he uses an original data set to quantitatively assess the relative influence of presidents and congressional majority parties in the expansion of the national post office system in the late nineteenth century. He finds strong evidence of presidential power over congressional power, and his results are robust across a wide range of model specifications.

Inequality is a perennial issue in contemporary democracies. Adam Smith, the apostle of the free market, is stereotypically seen as a defender of inequality. Building on recent scholarship that sees Smith as more attuned to the negative effects of inequality, Dennis C. Rasmussen seeks in **"Adam Smith on What Is Wrong with Economic Inequality"** to bring together the diverse strands of Smith's thought to produce an account of just what is wrong with inequality. While a degree of inequality is healthy, extremes of inequality are not. The reason, according to Rasmussen, is not simply that it creates poverty. It is rather that inordinate inequality has a distorting effect on the moral landscape of a society. Making use of Smith's theory of moral sentiments, Rasmussen argues that extreme inequality leads people to identify and sympathize more with the rich. The moral sentiments are in effect siphoned off in the direction of the superrich, rather than being spread across society. Rasmussen's work will be of interest to any who are concerned about the problem of great inequality in society today.

In **"Left Behind? Citizen Responsiveness to Government Performance Information,"** John Holbein empirically tests the widely held belief that informed citizens are more likely to hold government officials accountable. To do this he utilizes three "big data" sources to explore citizens' reactions to school performance information provided as part of the accountability system established under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. He finds that when school failure occurs and the citizens are made aware of this failure they typically express their displeasure by turning out at higher rates in school board elections. The competiveness of the elections also increases. However, those who are more sophisticated, more informed, and more politically active (high propensity/status) are significantly more likely than others less sophisticated, less informed, and less active (low propensity/status) to react by removing their children from the public schools. Thus the provision of performance information may have some of the desired positive effect but it also has the unintended negative effect of promoting existing inequalities between high-status and low-status populations. Policy makers could greatly benefit from having this information.

The scope of religious free exercise, and particularly whether free exercise claims under the U.S. Constitution can justify exemptions from applicable laws, is a perennial theme in modern American politics and jurisprudence. Vincent Phillip Muñoz, in **"Two Concepts of Religious Liberty: The Natural Rights and Moral Autonomy Approaches to the Free Exercise of Religion,"** returns to the thought of the Framers to begin sorting out this issue. He finds that their understanding, contrary to some modern interpretations, did not countenance "exemptionism," the idea that religious belief had a *right* to be exempted from laws. Relying partly on a reconstruction of the philosophical reasoning that would have led the Framers to their view of free exercise, Muñoz finds that government could not in their view interfere with religious freedom, but exemptions from standing law were not to be allowed as of right. Exemptionism, he argues, is a much more expansive doctrine whose roots are in mid–twentieth century jurisprudence, rooted in turn in notions of autonomy foreign to the Founders. Muñoz's article will not only inform our understanding of the American Founding, but help us think through the problem of religious liberty today.

Recent theories of representation have steadily expanded the scope of what we regard as "representation," in the broadly political sense. Howard Schweber wonders whether this expansion has reached its natural limit, or perhaps gone beyond it. In **"The Limits of Political Representation,"** he undertakes to gauge the limits of what we can properly call political

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000046 Published online by Cambridge University Press

representation. These limits include the restriction of what can reasonably be called a political constituency, and the recognition that not all stakeholders or shareholders can or should be represented. Representation, Schweber argues, always "represents" some traits in the represented and not others: no one is fully represented in all aspects of his or her persona. Exactly what should be represented, and what counts as a representative, is variable across political systems. It is subject to continual renegotiation. Once a society has produced a cognitive "map" outlining these things, Schweber maintains, it is normative for that society. All maps, moreover, must embody certain limits to representation. This paper should kindle a robust debate among theorists of representation.

Tobias Böhmelt, Lawrence Ezrow, Roni Lehrer, and Hugh Ward in **"Party Policy Diffusion"** ask whether parties seek to emulate successful parties in other political systems. They find, using spatial-econometric analyses of parties' election platforms from several established democracies, that political parties respond to left-right policy positions of foreign political parties that have recently governed. This paper contributes greatly to the diffusion literature by showing that parties respond to these foreign incumbent parties, and not just parties in their own political system. Further, the authors demonstrate that parties play a major role in policy emulation that crosses borders.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

The *American Political Science Review* (*APSR*) publishes scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. A significant advance in understanding of politics—whether empirical, interpretive, or theoretical—is the criterion for publication in the *Review*. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates or answers an important research question of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must make their work understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

While committed to publishing research that is useful and accessible to the whole discipline, the *APSR* makes every effort to ensure that each submission is reviewed by scholars who are familiar with its substance and methodology. Editorial decisions grounded on those assessments are unlikely to be based on just one empirical benchmark. For example, the strength of quantitative empirical findings cannot be captured by any single criterion, such as the conventional .05 level of statistical significance. Similarly, the validity of an argument advanced in a process tracing case study is unlikely to be judged solely on the grounds that it passed a "smoking gun test." The journal's editors will evaluate manuscripts on a range of criteria, including substantive significance, theoretical aptness, the importance of the problem under study, methodological rigor, and the feasibility of obtaining additional evidence.

Articles should be self-contained. Authors should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of their basic research procedures (of course, reference to widely used databases, such as the American National Election Study or Polity IV or others, is acceptable and does not require exhaustive description).

The *APSR* fully expects authors to conform to generally accepted norms concerning the protection of human subjects, and the editors may require certification of appropriate institutional review.[1]

The *APSR* publishes original work. Submissions should not include tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that already have been published or are forthcoming in other places. In many cases, republication of such material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. Neither does the *APSR* consider submissions that are currently under review at other journals or that duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts submitted to other publishers (whether of books, printed periodicals, or online journals). If scholars have any questions about whether these policies apply to their submission, they should address the issues in a cover letter to the editors or as part of the author comments section during online submission. Authors should also notify the editors of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, during the pendency of the submission's review at the *APSR*—regardless of whether they have yet been accepted. The editors may request copies of related publications.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. Authors should follow the guidelines for preparing an anonymous submission in the "Specific Procedures" section that follows.

Manuscripts that, in the judgment of the co-editors, are largely or entirely critiques of, or commentaries on, articles previously published in the *Review* may be reviewed for possible inclusion in a forum section (subject to the discretion of the editors), using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts. Well before any publication, however, the *Review*'s editors will send such manuscripts to the scholar(s) whose work is being addressed, inviting them to comment to the editors and to submit a rejoinder, which also will be peer-reviewed. We do not publish rejoinders to rejoinders.

The *APSR* accepts only electronic submissions (at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr). The web site provides detailed information about how to submit, what formatting is required, and what type of digital files may be uploaded. Please direct any questions to the journal's editorial offices at apsr@unt.edu

[1] One widely accepted guide to such norms is given by the American Anthropological Association's Code of Ethics, particularly Section III. http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/upload/AAA-Ethics-Code-2009.pdf

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000046 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Data Access, Production Transparency, and Analytic Transparency

The *APSR* expects authors to comply with the access and transparency obligations described on pp. 8–10 of APSA's *A Guide to Professional Ethics in Political Science* (2012). Researchers have an ethical responsibility to facilitate the evaluation of their evidence-based knowledge claims so that their work can be fully evaluated, including through replication when appropriate, or by providing sufficient evidence to permit others to develop their own interpretation from the materials. This involves providing access to the data or evidence underlying their analysis, and achieving production and analytic transparency. All relevant materials should be made available in a trusted digital repository (such as a partner in the Data Preservation Alliance for the Social Sciences (Data-PASS)) or through the *APSR*'s online appendices (housed with Cambridge University Press).[2] More specifically:

- *Data access*: Authors making evidence-based knowledge claims should provide clear and complete citations to the evidence that support those claims in the reference section of the article; citations should include a "persistent identifier" (e.g., a "digital object identifier" or DOI). Authors should also provide comprehensive documentation that describes the data or evidence in full (see below for more specific guidance on references). Authors are expected to make these data available if they themselves generated or collected them. However, if the protection of human subjects requires nondisclosure, if confidentiality agreements prohibit disclosure, if data are under legal constraint (i.e., they are classified, proprietary, or copyrighted), and/or if the logistical burden of sharing relevant data would be particularly high, the author will inform the editor at the time of submission. The editors can grant an exception with or without conditions, and may require an explanation of the restriction(s) prior to publication of the piece.
- *Production transparency*: Researchers providing access to evidence they themselves collected and/or generated are expected to offer a full account of the context in which the data were collected and/or generated and the procedures used to collect and/or generate them. They should also make available any research instruments they used (e.g., interview protocols, coding protocols, procedures for identifying appropriate informants). Researchers whose claims are based on analysis of a dataset they created themselves should clearly describe how they assembled the dataset.
- *Analytic transparency*: Researchers making evidence-based knowledge claims should clearly map the path from the evidence to the claims. In addition to information provided in the article's main text and footnotes, this path should be mapped in ways that correspond with the methodology employed. For example, researchers may wish to provide software code and associated supplemental material or a methodological appendix; or they can attach a transparency appendix (TRAX, see note [4] below). Generally, it is expected that researchers should make available materials sufficient to allow others to fully understand and, *where relevant and applicable*, reproduce their results.

These guidelines apply to all research in political science that combines evidence and analysis to reach conclusions. The *APSR* recognizes, however, that the general principles will be put into practice differently in different research traditions: different types of materials and information can be provided in different ways.[3]

- For example, for survey research, along with providing the parts of the dataset that they analyzed, authors might provide sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings; and a calculation of response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Standard: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys (Lenexa, KS: AAPOR, 2006).[4] For observational data, authors should list the dataset in the reference section of their article, and provide the parts of the dataset that they analyzed.
- For example, for articles that analyze a *qualitative dataset* in aggregate (e.g., if using QCA/fs), authors should list the dataset in the reference section of their article, and provide the parts of the dataset that they analyzed. Where authors draw on *individual data sources* (e.g., books, interviews, newspaper articles, videos) as distinct inputs to the analysis, each source must be cited, and then listed in the reference section of their article. Whenever possible (within the confines of human subject protections and other exceptions mentioned in the section *Data Access*), authors should share the relevant fragment of sources that support contested or central empirical claims and make the original sources available to other researchers. If the evidence used to create the dataset or the individual

[2] See http://www.data-pass.org/. Current Data-PASS members include the Institute for Quantitative Social Science at Harvard University, the Howard W. Odum Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill, the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan, the Electronic and Special Media Records Service Division, National Archives and Records Administration, the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut, the Social Science Data Archive at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), the Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research (CISER) at Cornell University, and the Qualitative Data Repository at Syracuse University.

[3] This parallels the position taken by APSA. See, for example, Guidelines for Data Access and Research Transparency for Qualitative Research in Political Science, and Guidelines for Data Access and Research Transparency for Quantitative Research in Political Science.

[4] See http://www.aapor.org/standards.asp

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000046 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sources were collected and/or generated by the author, she should provide a methodological appendix or section in the paper (that explains how the evidence was collected and/or generated and selected for citation), and all relevant evidence-collection instruments. These and analytical transparency requirements can be satisfied for qualitative research using individual sources by preparing a transparency appendix (TRAX) if the author chooses to do so.[5]
- For example, to achieve transparency in experimental research, authors can provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, payments to subjects, debriefing procedures, and so on.

Similarly, analytical transparency should be provided in ways that are relevant for the type of research that was undertaken, and the inferential and interpretive steps the author took to reach a conclusion.

At the time a manuscript is submitted to the *APSR* for review, authors must provide the main text, notes, bibliographic references, and any tables and diagrams. If they so choose (but this is not required), authors may also provide the underlying evidence, and information needed to achieve production and analytic transparency, as supplemental materials. These supplemental materials may be submitted as a file accompanying the manuscript submission or authors may provide a hyperlink to a trustworthy digital repository where the materials reside. Although not a requirement for submission, data access and production and analytical transparency materials may make the manuscript more understandable and more compelling for reviewers.

By the time the manuscript is published in the journal, the underlying data and materials necessary to meet APSA's data access, production transparency, and analytic transparency standards must be available in a trusted digital repository (such as a partner in the Data Preservation Alliance for the Social Sciences (Data-PASS)) or through the *APSR*'s online appendices (housed with Cambridge University Press), which are made accessible when the article is published.

For articles that include candidate gene or candidate gene-by-environment studies, the *APSR* uses the same policy as the journal *Behavior Genetics*[6]. In relevant part, that policy states that an article will normally be considered for publication only if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- It was an exploratory study or test of a novel hypothesis, but with an adequately powered, direct replication study *reported in the same paper*.
- It was an exploratory analysis or test of a novel hypothesis in the context of an adequately powered study, and the finding meets the statistical criteria for genome-wide significance—taking into account all sources of multiple testing (e.g., phenotypes, genotypes, environments, covariates, subgroups).
- It is a rigorously conducted, adequately powered, direct replication study of a previously reported result.

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 12,000 words, including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices intended for publication. Font size must be 12 point for all parts of the submission, including notes and references, and all body text (including references) should be double-spaced. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. Explanatory footnotes may be included but should not be used for simple citations; but do not use endnotes. Observe all of the further formatting instructions given on our web site. Doing so lightens the burden on reviewers, copyeditors, and compositors. Submissions that violate our guidelines on formatting or length will be rejected without review.

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by italicizing the entire name of the variable—the first time it is mentioned in the text—and by capitalizing its first letter in all uses. You should also use the same names for variables in text, tables, and figures. Do not use acronyms or computational abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables that appear in tables or figures should have been mentioned in the text, standard summary statistics (*n*, mean, median, standard deviation, range, etc.) provided, and the reason for their inclusion discussed.

For submission and review purposes, you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text, but with an in-text locator for each, in any case, e.g., [Table 3 about here].

If your submission is accepted for publication, you may also be asked to submit high-resolution digital source files of graphs, charts, or other types of figures. Following acceptance, all elements within any tables submitted (text, numerals, symbols, etc.) should be accessible for editing and reformatting to meet the journal's print specifications, e.g., they should not be included as single images not subject to reformatting.

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

[5] A TRAX consists of two elements: (1) a brief overview outlining the data-collection and data-generation processes employed and (2) activated (digitally enhanced) citations. Activated citations follow the format of traditional footnotes or endnotes, but are digitally augmented to include, for each source: (a) a precise and complete reference such that scholars can locate the source and find the relevant information within it; (b) a redaction of/excerpt from the source; (c) if needed, an annotation that explains how the source supports the textual claim with which it is associated; and (d) the source itself (if available and shareable) or a hyperlink thereto. For more details, see http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/A_Guide_to_Active_Citation/

[6] http://www.springer.com/psychology/journal/10519?detailsPage=pltci_624152

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000046 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1. Before submitting any manuscript to the *APSR*, download a PDF of the Transfer of Copyright Agreement from the Editorial Manager login page at http://www.editorialmanager.com/apsr and be sure its terms and requirements, as well as the permissions granted to authors under its provisions, are acceptable to you. A signed agreement will be required for all work published in this journal.
2. When you submit (at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr), you will be invited to provide a short list of appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. Do not include on this list anyone who has already commented on the research included in your submission. Likewise, exclude any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends. You may also "oppose" potential reviewers by name, as potentially biased or otherwise inappropriate, but you will be expected to provide specific reasons. The editors will refer to these lists in selecting reviewers, though there can be no guarantee that this will influence final reviewer selections.
3. You will also be required to upload a minimum of two separate files:

    a) An "anonymous" digital file of your submission, which should not include any information that identifies the authors. Also excluded should be the names of any other collaborators in the work (including research assistants or creators of tables or figures). Likewise do not provide in-text links to any online databases used that are stored on any personal web sites or at institutions with which any of the co-authors are affiliated. Do not otherwise thank colleagues or include institution names, web addresses, or other potentially identifying information.
    b) A separate title page should include the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, and e-mail address) for all credited authors, in the order their names should appear, as well as each author's academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgments or other author notes about the development of the research (e.g., previous presentations of it) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive all correspondence from the *APSR*. You may also choose to include a cover letter.

4. If your previous publications are cited, please do so in a way that does not make the authorship of the work being submitted to the *APSR* obvious. This is usually best accomplished by referring to yourself and any co-authors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited within the list of references. Your prior publications should be included in the reference section in their normal alphabetical location. Assuming that in-text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should not redact self-citations and references (possible exceptions being any work that is "forthcoming" in publication, and that may not be generally accessible to others). Manuscripts with potentially compromised anonymity may be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.
5. Please make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.

Tables and Figures

Tables and figures should be comprehensible without reference to the text, e.g., in any figures, axes should be clearly labeled. Please bear in mind also that neither the published or online versions of the *Review* normally can provide figures in color; be sure that a grayscale version will be comprehensible to referees and readers.

Appendices

Appendices should be lettered to distinguish them from numbered tables and figures. Include a descriptive title for each appendix (e.g., "Appendix A: Data Transformation and Estimation").

References

References should be listed in a separate section headed "REFERENCES." All listed references must be cited in the text, and vice versa. Publication information for each reference must be complete and correct.

References should be listed in alphabetical order by authors' last names; include first names and middle initials for all authors when available. For works with more than one author, only the name of the first author is inverted (e.g., "King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba"). List all authors; using "et al." in the reference list is not acceptable.

When the cited material is not yet published but has been accepted for publication, use "Forthcoming" in place of the date and give the journal name or publishing house.

List two or more entries by the same author(s) in the order of the year of publication, and substitute three m-dashes for the author's last name in the second and subsequent entries. If two or more cited works are by the same author(s) within the same year, list them in alphabetical order by title and distinguish them by adding the letters a, b, c, etc., to the year (or to "Forthcoming").

For dissertations and unpublished papers, cite the date and place the paper was presented and/or where it is available. If no date is available, use "n.d." in place of the date.

References for datasets should include a persistent identifier, such as a Digital Object Identifier (DOI).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000046 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Persistent identifiers ensure future access to unique published digital objects, such as a text or dataset. Persistent identifiers are assigned to datasets by digital archives, such as institutional repositories and partners in the Data Preservation Alliance for the Social Sciences (Data-PASS).

The following list is intended to be illustrative of more common reference types, not exhaustive. For additional reference guidance please see *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th edition.

Books

Ahlquist, John S., and Margaret Levi. 2013. *In the Interest of Others: Leaders, Governance, and Political Activism in Membership Organizations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mansbridge, Jane J. 1986. *Why We Lost the ERA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

U.S. Department of State, 1979. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1951. Vol. II: United Nations; Western Hemisphere*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Periodicals

Gerring, John. 2005a. "Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 17:2 (April):163–98.

Gerring, John. 2005b. "Minor Parties in Plurality Electoral Systems." *Party Politics* 11:1 (January): 79–107.

Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 96:4 (December): 713–28.

Chapter in Edited Collection

Brady, Henry E., and Cynthia S. Kaplan. 2011. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Ethnic Identity." In *Measuring Identity: A Guide for Social Scientists*, eds. Rawi Abdelal, Yoshiko M. Herrera, Alastair Iain Johnston, and Rose McDermott. New York: Cambridge University Press, 33–71.

Edited Collections

Boix, Carles, and Susan C. Stokes, eds. 2007. *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dissertations

Boas, Taylor. 2009. "Varieties of Electioneering: Presidential Campaigns in Latin America." PhD dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

Web sites

American Political Science Association. 2013. "About the APSA Africa Workshops." Washington, DC: American Political Science Association. Retrieved October 10, 2013 (http://www.apsanet.org/~africaworkshops/content_58417.cfm).

Data Sets

Levy, Jack S., and T. Clifton Morgan. *Great Power Wars, 1495–1815*. [Computer file]. ICPSR09955.v1. 1989. Ann Arbor, MI: Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1994. doi: 10.3886/ICPSR09955.v1

Further questions

A list of frequently asked questions and their responses are available at the APSA website at: http://www.apsanet.org/apsr

Do not hesitate, in any cases of doubt, to consult the *APSR* Editorial Offices with more specific questions by sending an e-mail to: apsr@unt.edu

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000046 Published online by Cambridge University Press