doi:10.1017/S0003055410000043

Notes from the Editors

We first want to add our tribute to the chorus of encomia for Lee Sigelman, who died December 21 after a long battle with colon cancer. As members of the profession, we admire his scholarship, including six articles appearing in these pages between 1972 and 1999. As editors, we are in awe of his achievements as managing editor of the *American Political Science Review* from 2001 through 2007. Lee's editorship immediately preceded ours, and he could not have been more gracious or helpful in the transfer of editorial duties from George Washington University to UCLA. His advice both on manuscripts in process and on general points of policy was always swift and true. Although many more criticisms of us would have been justified, we can recall only one that he uttered, and which he hastened to say was predictable: He did not like the new cover design of the *Review*. We will very much miss his wise counsel. Both the *Review* and the discipline in general will be poorer for his passing.

Precisely because few mortals could equal Lee's breadth and efficiency in handling many hundreds of manuscripts annually, we have moved to the multi-editor—and, increasingly, a multi-campus—model. Assisted by the growing ease of videoconferencing, we have brought more colleagues from outside UCLA into the group of co-editors. In our view, the multi-campus model, which officers of APSA foresaw even as we took the helm, must be the future of *APSR*, not least in a time of financial stringency at universities and colleges both public and private. We are delighted to say that Greg Caldeira (Ohio State) and Jennifer Hochschild (Harvard) have both agreed to join our group, even as our UCLA colleague Karen Orren has, to our great regret, decided to rotate off. Both Greg and Jennifer of course already have distinguished records as editors of leading political science journals. Caldeira has already joined the group, and Hochschild will do so on July 1, when her sabbatical year ends. Thus, effective in July, the group of co-editors will comprise (in alphabetical order): Greg Caldeira (Ohio State), Gary Cox (Stanford), Jennifer Hochschild (Harvard), Jeffrey Lewis (UCLA), Kirstie McClure (UCLA), Ronald Rogowski (UCLA, Managing Editor), Arthur Stein (UCLA), Daniel Treisman (UCLA), and John Zaller (UCLA).

IN THIS ISSUE

Four articles deal with issues of ethnicity, migration, or both. In our lead article, "Are Coethnics More Effective Counterinsurgents? Evidence from the Second Chechen War," Jason Lyall exploits a matching strategy to establish that pro-Russian Chechen troops were far more effective than ethnically Russian soldiers at suppressing insurgent activities at the village level, probably because they could better identify insurgents and more credibly threaten civilians who failed to cooperate. This "coethnicity advantage" in counterinsurgency seems to contradict some previous experience—notably that of the United States in Vietnam—and raises both policy implications and questions for further research on ethnic solidarity (or lack thereof).

Ethnicity influences voting even more than violence. Why, then, in heterogeneous Mali, does ethnicity have so little political salience (no ethnically based parties, little effect on voting)? The answer, Thad Dunning and Lauren Harrison show by experimental evidence in "Cross-cutting Cleavages and Ethnic Voting: An Experimental Study of Cousinage in Mali," is that the Malian institution of "cousinage" cross-cuts and weakens ethnic identities. Because surnames in Mali give strong clues both to ethnicity and cousinage, Dunning and Harrison could present mock candidate statements in which only the surname was varied. Voting inclination of respondents varied strongly with coethnicity, but the effect was substantially diluted when the supposed candidate was not a coethnic but a "joking cousin." The effect is shown to be robust by qualitative fieldwork, in which greater trust is found to prevail among "cousins."

In the United States, a nation of immigrants, ethnic conflict often pits older arrivals against newer ones; especially during waves of high immigration or during economic downturns, sentiment congeals into restrictions on immigration. Although political scientists have focused on national policy, recent decades have seen a rise in *local* anti-immigrant policies affecting *inter alia* housing, employment, and criminal enforcement. In "Politicized Places: Explaining Where and When Immigrants Provoke Local Opposition," Daniel J. Hopkins explores these local variations, looking both at county and municipal ordinances and at regional surveys. The substantial regional variation, he finds, can be explained by an interaction of national rhetoric with local influx: Local sentiment and policy become anti-immigrant mostly when an area has experienced a major inflow of immigrants *and* national rhetoric against immigrants has heated up. The combination, Hopkins argues, can explain both individual attitudes and local policy outcomes.

But do "natives" oppose immigration as a matter of self-interest, be it from competition for jobs or the fear of the fiscal burdens that immigrants may impose? Neither, respond Jens Hainmueller and Michael J. Hiscox. In "Attitudes toward Highly Skilled and Low-skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment," Hainmueller and Hiscox use an original survey experiment to show that both high- and low-skill natives oppose low-skilled more than high-skilled immigration. This preference is unaffected by respondents' own levels of skill or wealth. These results, the authors conclude, impugn most attributions of anti-immigrant sentiment to self-interest and point us instead to explanations that emphasize ethnocentricity

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000043 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or how immigration affects the local economy as a whole.

Now that political scientists—after more than half a century of interest-based explanation—are seeking alternate or more nuanced routes, the study of personality and inheritance has come to the fore. Two articles in this issue do so, and with nicely complementary results.

In "Personality and Civic Engagement: An Integrative Framework for the Study of Trait Effects on Political Behavior," Jeffery J. Mondak and his coauthors[1] present new evidence that the so-called "Big Five" personality traits[2]—many of them likely inherited and intensively studied for two decades in psychology—significantly affect individual citizens' political behaviors. This includes their self-reported indicators of civic engagement (participating in campaigns, contacting elected representatives, etc.) even while controlling for more conventional predictors such as gender, education, and wealth. Although their main data are drawn from a 2006 U.S. national survey, the authors buttress their findings with relevant evidence from national surveys in Uruguay and Venezuela. The central point, they conclude, is not that personality determines political behavior, but that people with different personalities respond very differently to political situations and incentives.

In "Personality and Political Attitudes: Relationships across Issue Domains and Political Contexts," Alan S. Gerber and his colleagues[3] show in similar fashion that personal traits matter differently in different situations. For example, the Big Five trait of "agreeableness" is associated with more liberal attitudes on economic issues but more conservative attitudes on social issues. The trait of "conscientiousness" is associated with conservative self-identification among whites but not among blacks. In neither the Mondak et al. nor the Gerber et al. article do personality traits explain a large fraction of political behavior. In the latter, for example, the Big Five traits explain about 10% of variance in ideological attitudes, which is much less than is explained by two social attitudes—authoritarianism and racial resentment. Nonetheless, these two articles highlight both the importance of pre-political factors in channeling political behavior and the often indirect paths of their influence.

Such traits as extraversion and agreeableness, one might think, would be a natural province of political theorists. But, as Paul W. Ludwig observes in "Without Foundations: Plato's *Lysis* and Postmodern Friendship," modern political theory—think, perhaps foremost, of contract theory—begins by casting doubt on the naturalness of human sociability. Politics, in liberal theory at least, involves alliances of convenience among competitors, and friendship is consigned to a rigidly segregated private sphere. (Neither in Hobbes nor in Downs or even Rawls is there much room for personality or friendship.) By contrast, ancient theory saw civic friendship as fundamental to the polity. Surprisingly, Ludwig argues, Plato prefigured postmodern critiques by exploring what friendship might be like without ontological foundations or with only negative ones, such as power and enmity. Thus, the logic of competition, both in Plato's account and those of some postmodernists, can be extended to encompass private friendships. This, in turn, suggests Plato—or, more specifically, the Plato of the *Lysis*—as an unexpected resource for returning to ontological questions—not as a guide to the foundation of Being, but as an example of how such reflections might be oriented to particular problems.

Democratically elected representatives, in a different sense, try to be "friends" to their constituents by doing them favors. To what extent does such "particularistic" legislation (of which pork is only a part) dominate more general policy-making, and why does that extent vary over time and across regions? In "Broad Bills or Particularistic Policy? Historical Patterns in American State Legislatures," Gerald Gamm and Thad Kousser report the first definitive results of a hugely ambitious project that coded more than 160,000 bills from thirteen state legislatures over 120 years. Overall, bills that enact statewide policies dominate even in the later nineteenth century, and increasingly over time, but variation is large and often counterintuitive (e.g., more highly paid legislators actually introduce more particularistic bills). Most important, and substantiating one of V. O. Key's well-known hypotheses, strong two-party competition leads to broad bills, one-party dominance to particularistic ones.

A corresponding question in comparative politics is why some countries have nationally coordinated wage bargaining and encompassing unions, as opposed to the sector- or plant-level particularism that predominates elsewhere. In "Building Strategic Capacity: The Political Underpinnings of Coordinated Wage Bargaining," John S. Ahlquist[4] finds the secret of centralized and uniform bargaining in the equality of resources across member unions of national federations. More precisely, where unions' resources are unequal, they will hesitate to cede to national federations the crucial power of calling a strike, and coordinated wage bargaining tends to prevail only where strike powers are centralized. Where previous studies have focused on the consequences of centralized wage bargaining (e.g., for wage compression and equality), Ahlquist's study is one of the first to examine why coordinated bargaining arises and persists.

Finally in this issue, Andrew F. March returns us to the broad concerns of political theory with an analysis

[1] Matthew V. Hibbing, Damarys Canache, Mitchell A. Seligson, and Mary R. Anderson.

[2] Namely, openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and emotional stability.

[3] Gregory A. Huber, David Doherty, Conor M. Dowling, and Shang E. Ha.

[4] Because of Ahlquist's recent UCLA connection (he held a postdoctoral appointment at UCLA's Institute for Research on Labor and Employment in 2008–09), and in accordance with our standard procedures for avoiding any potential conflict of interest, the review and editing of this article were handled by a member of the *APSR* Editorial Board. In this particular case we gratefully acknowledge the expertise and contribution of Professor Cynthia Enloe.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000043 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of a thinker known in the West primarily as the "philosopher of Islamic terror." In "Taking People as They Are: Islam as a 'Realistic Utopia' in the Political Theory of Sayyid Qutb," March takes up the question of the specific place and status of politics in Qutb's influential contribution to "political Islam." By laying out the premises and argumentative structure of Qutb's political thought and also considering his account of the Salaf period (the generation immediately after the Prophet), March details Qutb's theoretical enterprise as one in which the moral demandingness of Islamic law speaks to the average capacities of human moral psychology. It is thus also one that accords considerable significance to politics as the non-idealistic management of the passions rather than a means for the creation of perfect justice.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

General Considerations

The *American Political Science Review (APSR)* strives to publish scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience of scholars and practitioners, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates a significant research problem or answers an important research question, of general interest in political science. For the same reason, authors must strive for a presentation that will be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

The *APSR* publishes original work. Therefore, authors should not submit articles containing tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that already have been published or are forthcoming in other places, or which are included in other manuscripts submitted for review to book publishers or periodicals (including online journals) or otherwise committed. In many such cases, subsequent publication of this material would violate the copyright of the other publisher.

The *APSR* also does not consider papers that are currently under review at other journals or that duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts submitted to other publishers (including publishers of both books and periodicals). Manuscripts substantially similar to those submitted or published elsewhere, or to part of a book or other larger work, should also not be submitted. If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your particular case, you should discuss any such publications related to a submission in a cover letter to the editors or as part of the author comments section of the online submission process. You should also notify the editors of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, that occur while a manuscript is under review at the *APSR* and which would fall within the scope of this policy. 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 carry out similar analyses on other data sets. For example, for surveys, at the least, sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings should be given; you should 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). This document is available on the Internet (http://www.aapor.org/standards.asp). For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, subject payments and debriefing procedures, and so on. Articles should be self-contained, so you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by capitalizing the first letter in the variable name and italicizing the entire variable name the first time each is mentioned in the text. You should also use the same names for variables in text, tables, and figures. Wherever possible, avoid the use of acronyms and computer abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables appearing in tables and figures should have been mentioned in the text and the reason for their inclusion discussed.

As part of the review process, you may be asked to submit additional documentation if procedures are not sufficiently clear; the review process works most efficiently if such information is given in the initial submission. If you advise readers that additional information is available, you should submit copies of that information with the manuscript as "attached materials" on our website. If the amount of this supplementary information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

Manuscripts that are largely or entirely critiques or commentaries on previously published articles 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 criticized. The original author(s) of the article being critiqued will be invited to comment to the editors and to submit a rejoinder, which also will be peer reviewed.

The *APSR* now accepts only electronic submissions. To submit a manuscript, please go to www.editorialmanager.com/apsr. This web site provides detailed information about the submission procedure and required manuscript formatting. Please direct any questions to the journal editorial offices at apsr@polisci.ucla.edu.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000043 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should not be longer than 45 pages including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices. This page size guideline is based on the U.S. standard 8.5 × 11 inch paper; if you are submitting a manuscript printed on longer paper, you must adjust accordingly. Font size must be at least 11 point for all parts of the paper, including notes and references. The entire paper, including references, must be double-spaced, with the sole exception being any tables for which double-spacing would require a second page that would otherwise not be needed. All pages should be numbered in one sequence, and text should be formatted using a normal single column no wider than 6-1/2 inches (rather than the double-column format of the published version of the *APSR*). Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. The *APSR* style of embedded citations should be used, and there must be a separate list of references at the end of the manuscript. Footnotes or endnotes may be included, but should not be used for simple citations.

These specifications are designed to make it easier for reviewers to read and evaluate papers and for potential copyediting and production needs, if accepted for publication. Papers not adhering to these guidelines are subject to being rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may place footnotes at the bottom of the pages instead of using endnotes, and you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text. However, manuscripts accepted for publication must be submitted with endnotes, and with tables and figures on separate pages at the back of the manuscript with standard indications of text placement, e.g., [Table 3 about here].

In deciding how to format your initial submission, please consider the necessity of making these changes if your paper is accepted. If accepted for publication, you may also be asked to submit high resolution digital source files or camera-ready copies 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. Instructions will be provided. For specific formatting style of citations and references, please refer to articles in the most recent issue of the *APSR*. And/or for unusual style or formatting issues, you may wish to consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (15th ed.; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2003).

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. Before submitting any manuscript to *APSR*, it is recommended that you download a PDF of the Transfer of Copyright Agreement from the Editorial Manager login page (http://www.editorialmanager.com/apsr/) and review its terms and requirements as well as the permissions granted to authors under its provisions. At any time after submitting, you may sign this and send it on ahead, by mail, to: *American Political Science Review*, c/o Dept. of Political Science, UCLA, 4289 Bunche Hall, Box 951472, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1472. In any case, a signed agreement will be required in order for your work to be published in this journal.
2. During the online submission process at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr you will be invited to submit a list of scholars who would be appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. Do not include on this list anyone who has already commented on your paper or an earlier version of it. Likewise, exclude any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends. You may also "oppose" potential reviewers by name but will be expected to provide specific reasons why they may be inappropriate. 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 paper; this file should not include any information that identifies the authors, or any other collaborators in the work (including anyone responsible for creating tables or figures, if they are also an author/collaborator); and, do not thank colleagues in notes or elsewhere in the body of the paper or mention institution names, web page addresses, or other potentially identifying information.; b) a separate title page that includes the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, e-mail address) for all credited authors in the order their names should appear, as well as each authors' academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgements or other author notes about the development of the paper (e.g., previous presentations of the research) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive correspondence. In addition, you may choose to include a cover letter.
4. Please review all pages to make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.
5. To insure anonymity throughout the review process, if it is important to the development of the paper that your previous publications be cited, please do this in a way that does not make the authorship of the submitted paper obvious. This is usually most easily accomplished by referring to yourself and any co-authors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited in 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 include redacted self-citations and references (i.e., do not delete

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000043 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the names of your manuscript's authors). If you are unsure as to the best use of these or any other procedures in rendering manuscripts anonymous, contact the editorial offices of *APSR* prior to submission.

Manuscripts that are judged to be lacking anonymity will be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.

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* 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 both the *APSR* 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), On-line 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

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* 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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055410000043 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/S0003055410000043 Published online by Cambridge University Press