Highlights of the *PS* Annual Report

Each year, *PS* editorial staff provides a report of activities to the APSA Publications Committee and the APSA Council, and usually we report on a few items in that report to our readers. Below we offer highlights and a summary of the results of the 2012 *PS* Reader Survey. In addition, because articles in *PS* are peer-reviewed, we take this opportunity to acknowledge the work of the reviewers who offered their time and service to *PS* and the profession. Their names and affiliations are listed at the end of this report.

MISSION AND EDITORIAL STATEMENT

PS: Political Science & Politics features timely, peer-reviewed articles on contemporary politics written for the informed, general reader, and commentary and debate on major issues in the political science profession. Incorporated into *PS* is "The Teacher," a dedicated forum for teaching providing resources for college faculty, high school teachers, and students. *PS*, founded in 1968, also serves as the association's journal of record.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Each year *PS* receives more than 100 manuscripts for consideration. To help authors and reviewers, we have refined the editorial guidelines to provide potential *PS* authors with better information regarding length. We now recommend articles not exceed 3,650 words, including references and notes, tables and figures rather than 15-page limit, and specific guidelines for submitting manuscripts through the Editorial Manager system. We hope these revised guidelines, shared with the *PS* Editorial Board and the APSA Publications Committee and Council, will result in a smoother submission process and appropriate, timely, well-written, concise articles for our readers, both those in the discipline and other general readers.

PR READER SURVEY

In October 2012 the *PS* editor reported to the APSA Council the results from the 2012 *PS* Reader Survey, completed in the summer of 2012. These results were also shared with the *PS* Editorial Board at is 2012 meeting (held in April 2013 due to cancellation of the board meeting in August 2012). Key findings include:

- Nearly two thirds (65%) of all respondents are satisfied (very, somewhat) with the journal.
- Most readers of *PS* read the journal in print only; readers with the greatest satisfaction with the journal read it in both print and electronic format. These results suggest that it would be premature to recast *PS* as an electronic only journal.
- Most readers do not share the journal (33%), and few forward their electronic copies of the journal to others (12%). Again, this latter finding suggests that electronic versions of the journal are not used in a way that we might expect.
- Many readers regularly read the several sections of *PS*, and most read them at least on occasion.
- Readers are satisfied with the quality of all the sections of *PS*. There is less in the professional sections of the journal to generate dissatisfaction, which is to be expected.
- As with professional journals generally, most readers are using the journal for professional development, but also for staying abreast of work in their area of research.
- Non-readers generally report having no opinion (48%) about *PS* or being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (22%) with the journal; fewer than 10% report being very dissatisfied with the journal.
- Only one-fifth (20%) of respondents reported having submitted a manuscript to *PS*.
- A majority of *PS* submissions come from faculty, despite encouraging students and postdoc submissions.
- The vast majority of submitters had a positive experience in submitting manuscripts.
- Most respondents report never being asked to be a reviewer for *PS*.
- Notably, readers of *PS* read the other APSA journals—*APSR* (63%) and *Perspectives on Politics* (46%)—more often than other political science journals. *AJPS* (36%) and *JOP* (31%) are also popular among *PS* readers.

PS is committed to covering contemporary politics, advancing professional development, contributing to political science pedagogy, and, as the journal of record, keeping members informed of APSA's programs and activities.

AUTHOR DEMOGRAPHICS

In the 2012–13 report, we reviewed the four most recent issues of *PS*: October 2012 (45.4), January 2013 (46.1), April 2013 (46.2), and July 2013 (46.3) to determine how well the 184 authors in *PS* reflect the rank, institutional, and gender demographics of APSA's membership. We reported that 32% of *PS* authors are full professors, 20% are associate professors, 21% are assistant professor, and 17% are students (mostly postdoctoral and other graduate, but a few, this year, were undergraduates who served as coauthors), and 10% are nonacademics. Regarding the distribution of *PS* authors by types of institutions 59% are based at public universities, 28% at private universities, 6% at colleges and nonacademic institutions (e.g., Congressional Research Service), and 1% are at other academic institutions.

There is a preponderance of *PS* authors from four-year PhD- and MA-granting institutions (87% public and private combined). This class of *PS* authors significantly exceeds their representation among APSA members (65.0%). Faculty members from four-year BA-granting institutions make up 18% of APSA members, but only 6% of *PS* authors. Although this type of faculty has historically been underrepresented in *PS*, this marks a decrease from 10% last year and certainly a decline from 2010 when they amounted to 14% of *PS* authors. We will continue to watch these percentages in the coming year.

The gender distribution of *PS* authors this year falls short of the gender distribution of APSA's total membership: 32.19% women and 66.46% are men (no code assigned to 1.34%) with 75% of the *PS* authors male and 25% female. The gender distribution in the past nearly mirrors the APSA gender distribution. Possible reason for this may be the underrepresentation of women in election forecasting, predominate in both the October and January issues. Of the 13 authors of the forecasts, only one author was female. It

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001406 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013

is not possible to determine if *PS* authors reflect the racial, ethnic, or sexual identities of the general membership.

SUBMISSION AND DECISION

Unsoliticited manuscripts in *PS* (in Features, The Profession, and The Teacher sections) have increased over the past several years (Tables 1 and 2). In both 2011 and 2012 *PS* witnessed an increase in the percentage of submissions in the teaching category, from 39% in 2011 to 45% in 2012. Table 3 reflects the growth in symposium/articles, and Table 4 reviews the acceptance rate of the journal.

MOST DOWNLOADED ARTICLES

The Cambridge Journals page provides monthly updates to the most downloaded article as well as most cited articles. Be sure to check out the Journal pages, via your MY APSA account, to view the most up to date information.

REVIEWERS

As noted in the *PS* Readers Survey, most of our readers have never been asked to review. We encourage you to contact us; at ps@apsanet.org , and we will help you update your information, alert the editor to your willingness to review, and involve you in this review process. If you have not reviewed before, read: "How To Be a Peer Reviewer: A Guide for Recent and Soon to be PhDs" by Beth Miller, John Pevehouse, Ron Rogowksi, Dustin Tingley, and Rick Wilson in *PS* 46 (1): 120–23. This article "includes why reviewing is important to the development of one's own scholarship but includes some nuts and bolts on reviewing." See also the Cambridge University Journal page for author and peer reviewers, alike, for responsibilities of both authors and reviewers. Visit http://journals.cambridge.org/action/stream?pageId=6728&level=2

PS REVIEWERS 2012

In 2012, *PS: Political Science and Politics* published articles covering a vast range of topics. The journal's commitment to publishing articles on pedagogy and the profession, as well as exemplary topical scholarship on a spectrum of issues, call for an equally broad stable of reviewers. *PS* cannot publish such diverse work without the outstanding work (and open-mindedness) of our peer reviewers. The peer-review process relies on the professionalism and generosity of those who contribute their time and knowledge to read and evaluate the work of others. The editors of *PS* thank the following scholars who completed reviews for *PS* between January 1, 2012, and December 31, 2012:

Jennifer Abbassi, *Randolph College*
Paul Abramson, *Michigan State University*
Viviana Abreu-Hernandez, *Research and Program Development*
Yasmeen Abu-Laban, *University of Alberta*
Martha Ackelsberg, *Smith College*
Brian Adams, *San Diego State University*
William Adams, *William Jewell College*
Christopher Adolph, *University of Washington*
Joseph Aistrup, *Kansas State University*
Ayhan Akman, *Sabanci University*
Julia Albarracin, *Western Illinois University*
Jilda Aliotta, *University of Hartford*
Mahalley Allen, *California State University, Chico*
J. Theodore Anagnoson, *California State University, Los Angeles*
Josephine Andrews, *University of California, Davis*
Mark Anner, *Pennsylvania State University*
Phillip Ardoin. *Appalachian State University*
Peri Arnold, *University of Notre Dame*
Victor Asal, *SUNY, University at Albany*
James Avery, *Richard Stockton College*
Valentina Bali, *Michigan State University*
Elsie Barnes, *Norfolk State University*
Scott Basinger, *University of Houston*
Staci Beavers, *California State University, San Marcos*
Ann Beck, *Murray State University*
Lauren Bell, *Randolph-Macon College*
Elizabeth Bennion, *Indiana University South Bend*
Jeffrey Bernstein, *Eastern Michigan University*
Merike Blofield, *University of Miami*
Paul Brewer, *University of Delaware*
Hannah Britton, *University of Kansas*
Russell Brooker, *Alverno College*
Michelle Brophy-Baermann, *Rhode Island College*

Table 1

New Submissions

	2012	2011	2010	2009
New Manuscripts Received	130	113	93	90

Table 2

Submissions by Category

	2012	2011	2010	2009
Features	42%	39%	55%	51%
The Profession	13%	22%	19%	17%
The Teacher	45%	39%	26%	32%

Table 3

Symposia Published. 2009–2012

	SYMPOSIA	NUMBER OF ARTICLES
2012	8	60
2011	6	41
2010	10	69
2009	6	49

Table 4

Acceptance Rates 2009–2012

OUTCOME	2012	2011	2010	2009
Accept	29.4%	30%	27%	24%
Revise and Resubmit	46.1%	31%	29%	24%
Reject	24.5%	39%	44%	52%

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001406 Published online by Cambridge University Press © American Political Science Association, 2013

Thomas Brunell, *University of Texas, Dallas*
Kevin Bruyneel, *Babson College*
Matthew Burbank, *University of Utah*
Miguel Centellas, *University of Mississippi*
Caleb Clark, *Auburn University*
Elizabeth Corley, *Arizona State University*
Michael Craw, *University of Arkansas, Little Rock*
Austin Crothers, *Illinios State University*
David Darmofal, *University of South Carolina*
Jeffrey Davis, *University of Maryland, Baltimore*
Janet Day, *SUNY, University at Oneonta*
Michelle Deardorff, *Jackson State University*
Mary Durfee, *Michigan Technological University*
Heather Evans, *Sam Houston State University*
Victoria Farrar-Myers, *University of Texas, Arlington*
Jasmine Farrier, *University of Louisville*
Kenneth Foster, *Concordia College*
Martial Foucault, *University of Montreal*
Brian Gaines, *University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign*
James Garand, *Louisiana State University*
J. Gillespie, *College of Charleston*
Johnny Goldfinger, *Marian University Indianapolis*
Jane Gordon, *Temple University*
Benjamin Gregg, *University of Texas, Austin*
Leon Halpert, *Siena College*
Charles Helm, *Western Illinois University*
Sunshine Hillygus, *Duke University*
Donna Hoffman, *University of Northern Iowa*
James Hutter, *Iowa State University*
John Ishiyama, *University of North Texas*
Stephen Jessee, *University of Texas, Austin*
Whitt Kilburn, *Grand Valley State University*
Brian Lai, *University of Iowa*
Edward Lascher, *California State University, Sacramento*
Howard Lehman, *University of Utah*
Tracy Lightcap, *LaGrange College*
Adam Luedtke, *Richard Stockton College*
Lindsey Lupo, *Point Loma Nazarene University*
Renee Marlin-Bennett, *Johns Hopkins University*
Seth Masket, *University of Denver*
Kenneth Mayer, *University of Wisconsin, Madison*
Allan McBride, *University of Southern Mississippi*
Kristine Mitchell, *Dickinson College*
Jack Nagel, *University of Pennsylvania*
Hans Noel, *Georgetown University*
Eric Novotny, *US Agency for International Development*
Manju Parikh, *College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University*
Thomas Pepinsky, *Cornell University*
Andrew Perrin, *University of North Carolina*
Delia Popescu, *LeMoyne College*
John Rausch, *West Texas A&M University*
Joachim Rennstich, *CJD Arnold-Dannenmann-Akademie*
Joseph Roberts, *Roger Williams University*
Michael Rocca, *University of New Mexico*
Amanda Rosen, *Webster University*
Mark Sachleben, *Shippensburg University*
Mikael Sandberg, *Halmstad University*
Todd Sechser, *University of Virginia*
Mack Shelley, *Iowa State University*
Gordon Shockley, *Arizona State University*
Mark Souva, *Florida State University*
Katina Stapleton,
Jerold Waltman, *Baylor University*
M. Stephen Weatherford, *University of California*
Joseph Wert, *Indiana University Southeast*
Irene Wu, *Federal Communications Commisssion* ■

APSA Task Force Report Released

The APSA Task Force on Electoral Rules and Democratic Governance has published its report, *Political Science, Electoral Rules, and Democratic Governance*, edited by Mala Htun and G. Bingham Powell, Jr.



In it, the authors discuss how electoral rules help to make democracy work. Small variations in them influence the type of democracy that develops. The field of political science has defined the study of why and how this happens. Political scientists have contributed to the world of electoral systems as scientists and as engineers. Taking stock of recent scientific research, this report shows that context modifies the effects of electoral rules on political outcomes in specific and systematic ways. It explores how electoral rules shape party systems, the inclusion of women and minorities, the depth and nature of political competition, and patterns of redistribution and regulation. It considers institutional innovations that could promote political equality. Finally, the report describes the diverse ways that political scientists are producing an impact on the world by sharing and applying their knowledge of the consequences of electoral rules and global trends in reform.

Members of the task force are Mala Htun, University of New Mexico, Chair; G. Bingham Powell, Jr., University of Rochester, APSA President, 2011–12; John Carey, Dartmouth College; Karen E. Ferree, University of California, San Diego; Simon Hix, London School of Economics; Mona Lena Krook, Rutgers University; Robert G. Moser, University of Texas, Austin; Shaheen Mozaffar, Bridgewater State University; Andrew Rehfeld, Washington University in St. Louis; Andrew Reynolds, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Ethan Scheiner, University of California, Davis; Melissa Schwartzberg, Columbia University; and Matthew S. Shugart, University of California, Davis.

The report is available at no charge at www.apsanet.org/taskforce/ElectoralRules. ■

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001406 Published online by Cambridge University Press
© American Political Science Association, 2013