doi:10.1017/S0003055412000366

Notes from the Editors

The next issue, that of November 2012, will be the last for the "UCLA" team—which now includes Harvard, Ohio State, and Stanford—as (now former) co-editors of *APSR*. The new University of North Texas (UNT) editors are already receiving all papers submitted after June 30, 2012 (at the rate of almost twenty per week, John Ishiyama tells us) while we are handling the "conditional accepts" and "revise and resubmits" that were in the pipeline and have invited referees for the submissions that arrived through June 30. So far, all seems to be running smoothly at both ends, for which we express our gratitude to Aries (which runs Editorial Manager), to the North Texas editorial team, and especially to the professionals who make the whole enterprise run—Joseph Riser, who has served as a superb senior editor at UCLA—and his successor at UNT, Meagan Williams.

The occasion of our penultimate issue has inclined us to muse about the lessons we have learned. First, and most encouraging, there is a future for a general-interest journal in political science; or, in other words, the discipline is not so Balkanized as many had feared. Three years ago, the *Review* regained—and has since sustained—its place as the most-cited journal in the field; and, anecdotally, we think that we are being read (sometimes for the first time in years) by a wide array of political scientists of different tastes, institutional affiliations, and nationalities. More importantly, people seem to be reading not merely articles in their own subfield, but ones from corners of political science into which they had rarely peeked, or of whose existence they had been unaware.

Methodologists are (sometimes, anyway) reading theorists, comparativists are reading Americanists, articles on the judiciary are being read by modelers and theorists. Relatedly, and as we have noted in these columns previously, the *Review* is becoming international: read and refereed by, and contributed to, scholars from outside the United States, Canada, and Western Europe. We have also been gratified to see how many of our authors have been graduate students, including again (as in this issue's lead article) non-Americans. And breaking down a barrier that had come to seem insuperable, qualitative submissions and articles have begun to return to the *Review*. In sum, we think the journal has done its part to reinvigorate and broaden the conversation among political scientists, or indeed among social scientists who study politics more generally—or, perhaps, only to capture a conversation that was already becoming more general and more stimulating.

Conversation is difficult without a common language, and we have also worked hard to expunge jargon from the *Review,* to make its articles as understandable as possible to a broader scholarly audience, and even (the biggest challenge) to insist on better and more concise writing. An editorial collective makes these tasks far easier. If the co-editors sitting around the table cannot all understand (or, worse, some of them misunderstand) a paper, then it probably needs greater clarity of exposition. As we have told countless authors, clearer and more accessible argument, and better writing, is in their interest at least as much as ours: Their articles will find a larger readership and greater influence.

We have also seen a rise in "forum" submissions, almost all of them involving worthwhile controversies and clarifications. That increase, in turn, arises from more provocative articles we have published, on such issues as the proportional representation's historical origins, categories and meanings of representation, the resource curse, the European Court of Justice, audience costs, and the genetic bases of politics. We owe a special debt of gratitude to the scholars who have refereed, and in some cases are still reviewing, forum submissions, since they must evaluate not only the critique but also the earlier article(s). Those referees have assisted us greatly in maintaining a civil tone (not always originally present) in forum exchanges. The referees have also made sure, as peer review is supposed to do, that these critiques and rebuttals have scholarly merit and importance comparable to that of the original articles.

On the negative side, we have two main observations. First, although the discipline as a whole is less fragmented than we had feared (noted earlier), some subfields—and you know who you are—continue to be riven by ideological or methodological conflict. Too often, a paper in one of those fields draws recommendations of "reject," "minor revision," and "accept" from three equally esteemed referees. When reviewers diverge so greatly, the editorial team's judgmental burden increases significantly, compelling editors to discount some expert advice (if possible, without antagonizing reviewers) in order to provide coherent advice to authors. We have no answer to this puzzle, but simply note a pattern accurately described by one co-editor: increasing engagement across sub-disciplines, sustained fratricide within some.

Second, we have become painfully aware of how badly (or how little) some of our colleagues read. Articles are too often cited, by authors and by referees, as making the exact opposite of the argument they actually advanced. Long books are noted, with a wave of the rhetorical hand but without the mundane encumbrance of specific page or even chapter references; and highly relevant literatures, even in leading political science journals, are frequently ignored. We may have fallen victim to an occupational disease of editors, but we have often found ourselves moaning, "Doesn't anybody *read* anymore?" It is cold comfort that this sloppiness extends well beyond political science. A recent study has shown that, even in "gold standard" medical research, articles that clearly refute earlier findings are frequently ignored, or even

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000366 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cited subsequently as supporting the conclusion they demolished.[1]

So we advise our successors to maintain, and even expand, vigilance against jargon and murkiness; and we advise authors, referees, and readers generally to further and broaden the conversation, not least by reading seriously what has been, and is being, written.

IN THIS ISSUE

Many of this issue's articles deal with the broad subject of inequality: political, social, gender, or urban-rural. The first two continue debates initiated by the seminal work of Daron Acemoglu, Simon Johnson, and James Robinson (AJR) on two related questions: Do today's economically backward and autocratic societies result from predatory institutions originally imposed by colonialists; and does democracy emerge as a "commitment device" in distributive struggles between the poor and the rich?

In our lead article, "The Autocratic Legacy of Early Statehood," Jacob Gerner Hariri offers a corrective to the first AJR thesis, a "reversal of fortunes," according to which colonialists imposed predatory institutions on originally prosperous societies. Rather, Hariri argues, autocracy lingers today in societies where states developed earliest and were already strong enough to fend off colonial control; or, at worst, to allow existing elites to work with colonialists in imposing "indirect rule." In either case, autocratic rule persisted. Only where pre-colonial states were weak, absent, or of recent origin—according to Hariri—did colonialism lead to transplantation of institutions, and often of settlers, that carried with them some tradition of self-government. Hariri's account offers the startling and counter-intuitive insight that European colonialism may have fostered "good" institutions precisely where it was most successful, and even under colonialists (e.g., the Spanish and Portuguese) usually regarded as the most exploitative.

Relatedly, Stephan Haggard and Robert R. Kaufman ask, in "Inequality and Regime Change: Democratic Transitions and the Stability of Democratic Rule," whether transitions to and from autocracy are linked to economic inequality and to distributional struggles. Acemoglu and Robinson, as many will recall, posit a U-shaped relationship between inequality and autocracy: Where inequality is low, autocratic elites will rarely be challenged; in the most unequal societies, elites rationally concede little and invest heavily in repression. Hence the major regime conflicts, and the major transitions to and from autocracy, should occur in societies of "moderate" inequality. Moreover, since an expansion of the franchise is chiefly a way for elites to commit credibly to future redistribution, conflicts over form of regime will almost always be, at root, distributional. By way of contrast and in the tradition of Tocqueville, Boix finds a monotonic link between inequality and autocracy: At least where capital is immobile, a transition to democracy becomes likelier with increasing economic equality; a transition to autocracy likelier with increasing economic inequality.

Neither hypothesis, Haggard and Kaufman argue, stands up to close empirical inspection of the transitions that occurred around the globe between 1980 and 2000. Employing a new qualitative dataset that they have constructed, Haggard and Kaufman find—on the most generous coding—distributional conflict in only about half of the transitions to democracy, and in less than a third of the reversions to authoritarian rule. They show that many of the transitions both to and from democracy result from conflict within elites or between ethnic groups—rather than between rich and poor—and a significant share of democratizations occur in highly unequal societies, something unexpected in either Boix's or Acemoglu and Robinson's theory. Based on their qualitative analysis, Haggard and Kaufman suggest alternative causes both of transitions and of instability.

In "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective," Katherine Cramer Walsh employs quite a different methodology to address a very different kind of inequality—that between urban and rural Americans. Having conducted intensive participant observation of recurring informal groups in 27 rural Wisconsin communities, Walsh found—after overcoming respondents' initial distrust and reticence—powerful sentiments of solidarity and resentment.[2] Her rural interlocutors increasingly revealed their perceptions of rural deprivation, urban condescension and bias, and—above all—a strongly separate and distinct rural identity. Convinced that government, even at the state level, is tilted against rural interests, these respondents emphatically advocate lower spending and a "small state."[3] Students of public opinion err, Walsh concludes, to the extent that they privilege issues of class, values, or economic interest over ones of "place" and community. Methodologically, she urges that structured interviews and focus groups be supplemented by longer-term observation and simple "listening."

Do women participate equally with men in the kind of discussions that Walsh observes, or in deliberation generally? Does the share of women in the group and, where voting is involved, the decision-rule, affect

[1] John P.A. Ioannidis (2005), "Contradicted and Initially Stronger Effects in Highly Cited Clinical Research," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 294 (2): 218–28. DOI:10.1001/jama.294.2.218. Cf. David H. Freedman (2010), "Lies, Damned Lies, and Medical Science," *The Atlantic*, November. http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2010/11/lies-damned-lies-and-medical-science/8269/

[2] None of this is new, at least to those of us who grew up on farms and inherited Populist rhetoric. Cf. William Jennings Bryan (1896), "Tear down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country."

[3] Walsh, we should probably emphasize, conducted her research well before the recent controversies over public-sector unions in Wisconsin. It may however shed light on those controversies, and on the ensuing electoral struggles.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000366 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whether men and women participate equally and have equal odds of affecting the outcome? On a larger scale, does increasing the share of women in, e.g., parliaments, promote gender equality? In "Gender Equality in Deliberative Participation," Christopher F. Karpowitz, Tali Mendelberg, and Lee Shaker seek answers in a controlled experiment. Varying both the share of women and the decision-rule (majority or unanimity) in small groups of subjects, they find a conditional effect: Women participate and drive outcomes equally when (a) there are few women but unanimity is required and (b) under majority rule, when there are many women. Otherwise, men participate more than women and achieve outcomes closer to their own preferences. Perhaps the most surprising result is that men dominate discussion and outcomes when they are relatively few in the group but unanimity is required. Their results, Karpowitz, Mendelberg, and Shaker argue, can inform the design of deliberative bodies in a variety of contexts.

Does equality of representation, or even of participation, affect perhaps the most fundamental of women's rights—freedom from male violence against women? Less than we might think, or than experiments might lead us to believe, answer Mala Htun and S. Laurel Weldon in "The Civic Origins of Progressive Policy Change: Combatting Violence against Women in Global Perspective, 1975–2005." Using an original data set that—among other things—traces the adoption of comprehensive policies to combat such violence, Htun and Weldon find little effect of women in government, women in parliament, the strength of leftist (usually pro-feminist) parties, or even per capita GDP. By far the strongest effect, they find, comes from the development of autonomous women's movements in civil society, also traced in their dataset. Moreover, the rise of such movements domestically seems to lead to (and not to be precipitated by) feminist international norms, including most prominently a norm that censures violence against women. Their finding likely generalizes, they argue: To explain social change, scholars must examine not only the "usual suspects" such as wealth and descriptive representation, but rather "civil society in general, and social movements in particular."

We often assume that victims of violence—regardless of gender—will be made unequal, so intimidated by their experience that they will be less inclined to participate in the larger society, in deliberation, and in voting. Surprisingly, recent articles in this *Review* have countered that belief, showing that those who have been harmed or threatened by civil war, genocide, or even experience as child soldiers, are actually *more* inclined to participate. In "Crime Victimization and Political Participation," Regina Bateson asks whether this counter-intuitive finding extends to victims of "ordinary" crime—mugging, burglary, carjacking, etc.—in less conflictual societies. She not only finds that it does (in surveys across five continents) but indeed that crime victimization is among the most powerful predictors of political participation, even when the crime is non-violent (e.g., fraud). In most societies, Bateson demonstrates, becoming the victim of a crime raises political participation by about the same amount as an additional five to ten years of education. While in some cases this newly aroused participation has the predictable goal of tougher anti-crime policies, or even of support for authoritarian rule, in most cases victimization simply makes citizens likelier to speak out, join groups, and vote—on many issues. As Bateson acknowledges, the policy implication of her finding is puzzling: Do successful efforts to reduce crime have the side effect of depressing political participation?

The conventional wisdom about clientelism resembles our intuitions about crime: Patron–client relations inhibit participation, and in particular constrain what might otherwise be the kind of self-provision of collective goods whose study the late Nobel Laureate Elinor Ostrom so luminously pioneered. We have plenty of instances in which powerful patrons block the provision of public goods, but also cases in which patrons help their clients to gain access to such public goods as education and clean water. The crucial difference, Mahvish Shami argues in "Collective Action, Clientelism, and Connectivity," is whether the community is isolated. Exploiting a natural experiment in rural Punjab, India—where the construction of a new highway gave some peasants in clientelistic settings access to the wider world, while neighboring clientelistic communities remained isolated—Shami finds that patrons continued to block community based projects only where their clients remained isolated. In the newly connected villages, patrons often came to assist peasants' collective action, presumably because only such a transformation could preserve the patron's usefulness to his clients. In thus unraveling one of the mysteries that Lin Ostrom left us, Shami pays homage to the research trail she blazed.

Political equality is conventionally taken as a defining feature of democracy, but its relationship to liberty is by no means self-evident. In "Competing for Liberty: The Republican Critique of Democracy," Nadia Urbinati offers a "friendly rejoinder" to contemporary neo-republican theories that supplement the weaknesses of a liberal conception of liberty as "noninterference" through a concept of liberty as "nondomination." Attending to the polemical character of conceptions of liberty, Urbinati reconstructs the ongoing historical contestations between two models of political liberty: the Athenian (with its twin values of *isonomia* and *isegoria*, i.e., equality in the making of laws and equal right of free speech) and the Roman (with its emphasis on *aequa libertas* as the equality of different status groups before the law and security from domination). The latter, she shows, was rooted in a misrepresentation of democracy as populism, and its subsequent elaboration as a tradition harbored a persistent suspicion of democratic participation. Modern neo-republicanism is strongly supportive of democratic constitutionalism, yet Urbinati discerns traces of that Roman model, along with its construal of democracy as populism, in the republican view that there is no "definitional connection" between liberty as

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000366 Published online by Cambridge University Press

non-domination and "democratic control."[4] As an internal correction, then, to the neo-republican treatment of equal participation as a means to further liberty rather than an essential principle, Urbinati's broader argument defends political equality, understood as taking part in *imperium,* as an essential part of the "liberty side" of democratic citizenship.

Democracy is compatible with hierarchy, for in every democracy some bodies may overrule others: A state legislature may overrule a local ordinance, and national legislation often supersedes (pre-empts) state or local law.[5] In practice, however, lower bodies—most notably in the United States, lower courts—make most of the rules, doing so with an eye to whether higher instances (e.g., the U.S. Supreme Court) will overrule them. Every such situation produces a complicated strategic interaction, one that Clifford J. Carrubba and Tom S. Clark analyze formally in "Rule Creation in a Political Hierarchy." Their model suggests that many of our cherished intuitions are wrong. In equilibrium, a higher court is least likely to overrule a lower one not only when its preferences agree most with those of the lower court, but when the preferences of the two courts diverge most—for, in the latter case, the lower court will normally craft a rule that is just "close enough" to the higher court's ideal point not to trigger the effort that would be involved in hearing the case and overruling the judgment.[6] Higher courts overrule lower ones most frequently when the two courts' ideal preferences diverge only moderately, leaving room for error in this strategic interaction. In the U.S. system, Carrubba and Clark show, this is exactly what happens; and they conclude by suggesting much broader implications of their analysis for hierarchical, or principal–agent, relationships more generally.

Almost two decades ago (1994), Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba undertook an endeavor—by no means the first, but arguably the most influential—to set out common methods of inquiry for quantitative and qualitative social science. In "Socratic Method and Political Science," Christopher Meckstroth renews that effort, albeit from the very different starting point of ancient Greek theory. As Meckstroth shows from a far-ranging survey of Platonic texts, Plato's Socrates proposed a well-developed and sophisticated method of scientific inquiry: "*elenchus*," rendered roughly as "cross-examination." While akin to what Karl Popper argued, namely that we gain confidence in a proposition to the extent that it withstands efforts to disconfirm it, Socrates advocated repeated questioning of both the logic and the implications of any theory, normative or positive. Applied to modern-day political inquiry, *elenchus* requires us always to consider alternative explanations and to search out possible contradictions in the one(s) we entertain. While the position that Socrates adopts anticipates much of current thinking about causation (e.g., issues of potential endogeneity) in quantitative research, it equally provides standards for qualitative inquiry; and it provides a way to develop question-specific standards of objectivity.

Ancient Athenians seemed confident that democratic citizens could correctly understand causation, and hence in politics could rightly attribute blame or praise. Modern students of democracy have lost much of this confidence: If, as Achen and Bartels found, voters punish politicians for "drought, flu, and shark attacks,"[7] analyzing who actually deserves credit or blame for economic trends—consistently seeming to influence voters' decisions most profoundly—seems well beyond their ability. Even more problematic, as illustrated by the current U.S. presidential campaign, is assessing how much of a country's own economic performance results from events or decisions outside its borders: Does the Euro crisis, or the slowing of Chinese economic growth, hobble the U.S. economy; and, if so, could we really expect the average voter to calibrate her judgments accordingly?

Surprisingly, the evidence suggests that voters are indeed this sophisticated, both at the aggregate and the individual levels. As Mark Andreas Kayser and Michael Peress argue in "Benchmarking across Borders: Electoral Accountability and the Necessity of Comparison,"[8] voters in OECD democracies not only gauge their own country's recent economic performance (measured by growth in real GDP and by unemployment) against the "yardstick" of average OECD results, they also hold leaders accountable far more for the *domestic* than the *international* component of economic growth or contraction. More precisely, once one decomposes the given country's recent economic performance—ia fairly sophisticated econometrics—into its international and domestic components, the latter affects voters' assessments almost twice as much as the former. While voters likely manage this feat of decomposition only indirectly, i.e., by shrewd interpretation of media reports on the economy, the Kayser-Peress results indicate: (a) that we too easily underestimate voters' sophistication, at least in the aggregate and (b) that students of voting and public opinion err by treating the national economy as if it were autarkic. Once again, scholars turn out to be not quite as shrewd as the voters to whom they so readily condescend. Evidently, these results, if sustained in further research, have large implications for the growing literatures on the effects of natural disasters, import- or offshoring-related layoffs, and governmental quality. If one country responds markedly better (or worse) to an

[4] Philip Pettit (1999), *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 30.

[5] As the German Basic Law puts it succinctly, *"Bundesrecht bricht Landesrecht."*

[6] Indeed, the lower court in such cases may craft a disposition of the case that fits the higher court's ideology, but a rule that diverges from it (relatedly, recall *Marbury v. Madison*). If the higher court reviews such a case, it will usually be to affirm the result but state a different rule.

[7] Christopher H. Achen and Larry M. Bartels (2004), "Blind Retrospection: Electoral Responses to Drought, Flu, and Shark Attacks," Working Paper # 199; June.

[8] Kayser is a former student and co-author of *APSR* Lead Co-editor Ronald Rogowski. Accordingly, Rogowski recused himself from all consideration and discussion of this article.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000366 Published online by Cambridge University Press

earthquake, a hurricane, or a set of plant closures; or if one manages to provide good health care or schools at low cost—while a neighboring land levies high taxes but achieves poor outcomes—will voters (a) be aware of those facts and (b) reward or punish politicians accordingly? The question, curiously, has rarely been asked, and then only in a local context (e.g., municipalities). Certainly there is a lot of room for more "benchmarking" research in political science.

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 strive to be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

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 you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your case, you should address the issues in a cover letter to the editors or as part of the author comments section during online submission. You should also notify the editors of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, during the pendency of your 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. You should follow the guidelines for preparing an anonymous submission in the "Specific Procedures" section that follows.

If your manuscript contains quantitative evidence and analysis, you should describe your procedures in sufficient detail to permit reviewers to understand and evaluate what has been done and—in the event the article is accepted for publication—to permit other scholars to replicate your results and to carry out similar analyses on other data sets. With surveys, for example, provide sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings; calculate response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys (Lenexa, KS: AAPOR, 2006).[9] For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, payments to subjects, debriefing procedures, and so on. In any case involving human subjects, the editors may require certification of appropriate institutional review and/or conformity with generally accepted norms.[10]

The strength of evidence necessary for publication of quantitative empirical findings cannot be captured by any single criterion, such as the conventional .05 level of statistical significance. The journal's coeditors—following the evolving disciplinary standard among reviewers—will evaluate the strength of findings on a range of criteria beyond statistical significance, including substantive significance, theoretical aptness, the importance of the problem under study, and the feasibility of obtaining additional evidence.

In addition, authors of quantitative or experimental articles are expected to address the issue of data availability. You must normally indicate both where (online) you will deposit the information that is necessary to reproduce the numerical results and when that information will be posted (such as "on publication" or "by [definite date]"). You should be prepared, when posting, to provide not only the data used in the analysis but also the syntax files, specialized software, and any other information necessary to reproduce the numerical results in the manuscript. Where an exception is claimed, you should clearly explain why the data or other critical materials used in the manuscript cannot be shared, or why they must be embargoed for a limited period beyond publication.

Similarly, authors of qualitative, observational, or textual articles, or of articles that combine such methods with quantitative analysis, should indicate their sources fully and clearly enough to permit ready verification by other scholars—including precise page references to any published material cited and clear specification (e.g., file number) of any archival sources. Wherever possible, use of interactive citations is encouraged. Where field or observational research is involved, anonymity of participants will always be respected; but the texts of interviews, group discussions, observers' notes, etc., should be made available on the same basis (and subject to the same exceptions) as with quantitative data.

For articles that include candidate gene or candidate gene-by-environment studies, *APSR* uses the same policy as the journal *Behavior Genetics*.[11] 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:

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

[10] 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

[11] *Behavior Genetics* 42 (2012): 1–2, DOI 10.1007/s10519–011-9504-z

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000366 Published online by Cambridge University Press

- 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.

Articles should be self-contained; you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

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. However, tables and figures should also 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.

You may be asked to submit additional documentation if procedures are not sufficiently clear. If you advise readers that additional information is available on request, you should submit equally anonymous copies of that information with your manuscript as "supplemental materials." If this additional information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

Manuscripts that, in the judgment of the co-editors, are largely or entirely critiques of, or commentaries on, articles previously published in the *Review* will be reviewed for possible inclusion in a forum section, using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts. Well before any publication, however, such manuscripts will also be sent to the scholar(s) whose work is being addressed. The author(s) of the previously published article will be invited 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 regarding new submissions to the journal's editorial offices at apsr@unt.edu

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 50 pages (8.5 ×11 inch paper) or 45 pages (DIN A4), including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices intended for publication. Font size must be at least 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. 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.

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). If you have any doubts about how to format the required in-text citations and/or bibliographic reference sections, please consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (15th ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003) and review recent issues of the *APSR*.

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000366 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 acknowledgements 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. Please make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.
5. 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 which may not be generally accessible to others). Manuscripts with potentially compromised anonymity may be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.

Further questions

Do not hesitate, in any cases of doubt, to consult the *APSR* Editorial Offices with more specific questions by telephone (940-891-6803) or by sending an e-mail to: apsr@unt.edu

ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE *APSR*

Back issues of the *APSR* are available in several electronic formats and through several vendors. Except for the last three years (as an annually "moving wall"), back issues of the *APSR* beginning with Volume 1, Number 1 (November 1906), are available on-line through JSTOR (http://www.jstor.org/). At present, JSTOR's complete journal collection is available only via institutional subscription, e.g., through many college and university libraries. For APSA members who do not have access to an institutional subscription to JSTOR, individual subscriptions to its *APSR* content are available. Please contact Member Services at APSA for further information, including annual subscription fees.

Individual members of the American Political Science Association can access recent issues of the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* through the APSA website (*www.apsanet.org*) with their username and password. Individual nonmember access to the online edition will also be available, but only through institutions that hold either a print-plus-electronic subscription or an electronic-only subscription, provided the institution has registered and activated its online subscription.

Full text access to current issues of the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* is also available on-line by library subscription from a number of database vendors. Currently, these include University Microfilms Inc. (UMI) (via its CD-ROMs General Periodicals Online and Social Science Index and the on-line database ProQuest Direct), Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) (through its on-line database First Search as well as on CD-ROMs and magnetic tape), and the Information Access Company (IAC) (through its products Expanded Academic Index, InfoTrac, and several on-line services [see below]). Others may be added from time to time.

The *APSR* is also available on databases through six online services: Datastar (Datastar), Business Library (Dow Jones), Cognito (IAC), Encarta Online Library (IAC), IAC Business (Dialog), and Newsearch (Dialog).

The editorial office of the *APSR* is not involved in the subscription process to either JSTOR for back issues or the other vendors for current issues. Please contact APSA, your reference librarian, or the database vendor for further information about availability.

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

The American Political Science Association's address, telephone, and fax are 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 483-2512 (voice), and (202) 483-2657 (fax). E-mail: apsa@apsanet.org. Please direct correspondence as follows.

Information, including news and notes, for *PS*:

Dr. Robert J-P. Hauck, Editor, *PS*
E-mail: rhauck@apsanet.org

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000366 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Circulation and subscription correspondence (domestic claims for nonreceipt of issues must be made within four months of the month of publication; overseas claims, within eight months):

Sean Twombly,
Director of Member Services
E-mail: membership@apsanet.org
Reprint permissions:
E-mail: Rights@cambridge.org

Advertising information and rates:
Advertising Coordinator,
Cambridge University Press
E-mail: journals_advertising@cambridge.org

EXPEDITING REQUESTS FOR COPYING *APSR*, *PERSPECTIVES*, AND *PS* ARTICLES FOR CLASS USE AND OTHER PURPOSES

Class Use

The Comprehensive Publisher Photocopy Agreement between APSA and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) permits bookstores and copy centers to receive expedited clearance to copy articles from the *APSR* and *PS* in compliance with the Association's policies and applicable fees. The general fee for articles is 75 cents per copy. However, current Association policy levies no fee for the first 10 copies of a printed artide, whether in course packs or on reserve. Smaller classes that rely heavily on articles (i.e., upper-level undergraduate and graduate classes) can take advantage of this provision, and faculty ordering 10 or fewer course packs should bring it to the attention of course pack providers. APSA policy also permits free use of the electronic library reserve, with no limit on the number of students who can access the electronic reserve. Both large and small classes that rely on these articles can take advantage of this provision. The CCC's address, telephone, and fax are 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400 (voice), and (978) 750-4474 (fax). This agreement pertains only to the reproduction and distribution of APSA materials as hard copies (e.g., photocopies, microfilm, and microfiche).

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) has created a standardized form for college faculty to submit to a copy center or bookstore to request copyrighted material for course packs. The form is available through the CCC, which will handle copyright permissions.

APSA also has a separate agreement pertaining to CCC's Academic E-Reserve Service. This agreement allows electronic access for students and instructors of a designated class at a designated institution for a specified article or set of articles in electronic format. Access is by password for the duration of a class.

Please contact your librarian, the CCC, or the APSA Reprints Department for further information.

APSR Authors

If you are the author of an *APSR* article, you may use your article in course packs or other printed materials without payment of royalty fees and you may post it at personal or institutional web sites as long as the APSA copyright notice is included.

Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials

For any further copyright issues, please contact the APSA Reprints Department.

INDEXING

Articles appearing in the *APSR* before June 1953 were indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Current issues are indexed in *ABC Pol Sci*; *America, History and Life 1954–*; Book Review Index; Current Contents: Social and Behavioral Sciences; EconLit; *Energy Information Abstracts*; Environmental Abstracts; Historical Abstracts; Index of Economic Articles; Information Service Bulletin; International Bibliography of Book Reviews of Scholarly Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Bibliography of Periodical Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Index; International Political Science Abstracts; the *Journal of Economic Literature*; Periodical Abstracts; Public Affairs; Public Affairs Information Service International Recently Published Articles; Reference Sources; Social Sciences and Humanities Index; Social Sciences Index; Social Work Research and Abstracts; and Writings on American History. Some of these sources may be available in electronic form through local public or educational libraries. Microfilm of the *APSR*, beginning with Volume 1, and the index of the *APSR* through 1969 are available through University Microfilms Inc., 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (www.umi.com). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969–95, is available through the APSA.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000366 Published online by Cambridge University Press