doi:10.1017/S0003055408080222

Notes from the Editors

This issue continues the gradual transition from the editorship of Lee Sigelman at George Washington University to the new team of co-editors at UCLA. We publish here the first two articles adjudicated from start to finish at UCLA—one by James Fowler, Laura Baker, and Christopher Dawes, and one by Michael Ting—which identify, respectively, a genetic predisposition to vote and a social cost of giving legal protections to whistleblowers. Keeping these two provocative and well-argued pieces company are five other full length articles on a variety of subjects that began the long journey into print under Sigelman's stewardship. We end with a forum, also edited mostly before our term, on the study of suicide terrorism.

IN THIS ISSUE

In the lead article, "Authoritarian Reversals and Democratic Consolidation," Milan Svolik offers a new approach to the question of democratic survival. There is, he argues, an important distinction to be made between transitional and consolidated democracies—that is, between democracies that are at risk of an authoritarian reversal and those that are not. The problem, of course, is that we cannot observe whether a given democracy is consolidated. Medical researchers face a similar problem when they must assess the causes of a disease, knowing that part of the population has immunity but not knowing which part. Svolik follows their lead in using a split population research design. Different factors turn out to affect the likelihood of democratic consolidation and the likelihood of authoritarian reversal. While the nature of institutions, the level of economic development, and the nature of past authoritarian regimes affect the first, only economic recession clearly affects the second. The results suggest we need to develop separate theories about what causes authoritarian reversals in transitional democracies and what causes democratic consolidation.

Aspects of democratic stability and political organization, respectively, are the foci of the next two articles. We generally think of stability in parliamentary governments in terms of the duration of cabinets and the number and identity of parties they contain. In "Replacing Cabinet Ministers: Patterns of Ministerial Stability in Parliamentary Democracies," John D. Huber and Cecilia Martinez-Gallardo shift the focus from parties to the individual occupants of cabinet posts. Analyzing ministerial turnover in 19 countries over roughly 50 years, the authors show that the factors that promote stable cabinets do not necessarily reduce the turnover of individual ministers. Single-party governments, for example, last longer than coalition governments, but individual ministers are replaced more often. Ministerial turnover is high when parties are able to replace ministers whose behavior or competence proves disappointing. Conversely, ministerial stability sometimes reflects the weakness of the parties, whose leaders are unable to remove even poorly performing ministers. This suggests both empirical and normative insights. Empirically, ministerial instability is by no means necessary for cabinet instability. Normatively, ministerial stability is not always desirable.

Another dimension of stability has to do with how new interest groups enter the political arena and how they interact with governments. A wealth of recent research has sought to categorize the divergent patterns of interaction between economic classes and the state, identifying corporatist and pluralist varieties of capitalism. Some have drawn links between the electoral rules, the party system, the organization of the state, and the mode of policymaking on economic matters. In "The Political Origins of Coordinated Capitalism: Business Organizations, Party Systems, and State Structure in the Age of Innocence," Cathie Jo Martin and Duane Swank take the argument a step further. Electoral rules, the party system, and federal structure, they argue, even shape the way that interest groups—specifically, business—organize. Using data from 16 countries over the period from 1900 to 1930, supplemented by detailed case studies of the US and Denmark, the authors show that different state and party structures resulted in either centralized, corporatist business organizations, or looser, pluralist ones. The finding has implications not just for the historical question of how class relations and welfare states developed in the advanced democracies, but also for how patterns of social coordination may or may not change in the post-industrial economies of the present century.

"Economy," we might recall, was once spelled "oeconomy," in which form its sense of "household management" retained traces of its Greek stems in *oikos* and *nomos*. In "Mill, Political Economy, and Women's Work," Nancy J. Hirschmann recovers a significant if little noted gender dimension of the younger Mill's economic writings. John Stuart Mill would not spring immediately to mind as an authority on the subject of women's work in the household, as his views on gender seem to be informed more by moral concerns than by economics. Hirschmann, however, argues that his unusual idea of production, which includes "mediate" as well as end products, can be extended to household labor, even though Mill himself declined to do so. This insight, she contends, resolves certain ambiguities in Mill's own thought, while at the same time, and more provocatively, it offers contemporary scholars conceptual resources for rethinking the relationship between productive and reproductive labor, the requirements of gender equality, and the accepted categories of political economy.

Resources for rethinking conventional wisdom can come from many directions, some of them unexpected. In "The Strength of Issues: Using Multiple Measures to Gauge Preference Stability, Ideological Constraint, and Issue Voting," Stephen Ansolabehere, Jonathan

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080222 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rodden, and James M. Snyder, Jr. suggest that many of the conclusions that we take for granted—about American voters' inconsistent attitudes, incoherent preferences, and low levels of ideological consistency—may actually be based on measurement error in the American National Election Study Panels. To take just one of their examples, over successive waves of the survey, the percentages of respondents picking particular answers to a complicated question about abortion have varied considerably. Is this because Americans' opinions about abortion are in flux? Ansolabehere, Rodden, and Snyder suggest the variation is attributable to measurement error. When scores from several questions on abortion—including general attitudes on abortion, stem cell research, and "partial birth abortion"—are averaged, the resulting measure is much more stable over time. Simply averaging results from multiple questions is one way to deal with measurement error. The authors construct issue scales on economic issues and moral issues, with each scale based on responses to as many as 34 questions, and find that these scales are quite stable over time. They approach the stability of party identification. These issue scales, they argue, also do nearly as good a job as party identification at predicting voting behavior. In contrast to much previous work on mass public opinion, the article suggests that when looked at correctly, the commonly used opinion polls suggest a great deal of coherence in individuals' attitudes and voting. There is "substantial policy content to individual voters' preferences and behaviors."

The next article is also concerned with voting, but shifts the focus to a less conventional understanding of its determinants. In "Genetic Variation in Political Participation," James H. Fowler, Laura A. Baker, and Christopher T. Dawes ask what proportion of the variation in electoral participation can be attributed to genetic effects. The authors first look at monozygotic (identical) and dizygotic (non-identical) twins in the Southern California Twin Registry. Then they consider the publicly available voter histories for these twins to see in which of eight elections through 2000–2005 they voted. Their data, summarized in their Figure 1, show that identical twins are more likely to have similar rates of participation than non-identical twins. Based on this, the authors argue that the greater genetic similarity of monozygotic twins explains some of the variation in voting participation. They use a variety of statistical methods to separate this genetic component from the influence of environmental and other factors, and show a similar finding in another data set, the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health.

In the last full article, aptly if simply titled "Whistleblowing," Michael M. Ting models the effect of whistleblowing on organizational performance, especially as this might apply to large public agencies like the FBI and the Food and Drug Administration. He finds the effect mixed. When the law protects workers who go public against management, politicians are able to discover and replace managers who perform poorly. However, whistleblowing protection may also tempt workers to resist legitimate management directives because, by going public, they can shift blame for poor agency performance to their bosses. To avoid such false accusations, managers may choose to divert resources to keeping workers in line. Thus, whistle blowing makes it easier for politicians to detect poor agency performance after it occurs, but also more likely that agencies will perform sub-optimally in the first place. Where popular accounts emphasize the positive benefits of whistleblowing, Ting finds that negative effects can balance or even outweigh the good. In concluding, he suggests guidelines for how politicians can sensibly respond to this dilemma.

Closing out the issue, the Forum section features a critical exchange over the study of terrorism. In a 2003 APSR article, "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism," Robert A. Pape analyzed a new dataset on suicide terrorism and concluded that such attacks are not a product of extreme religious beliefs and that they are aimed at foreign democracies who occupy territory the terrorists view as their homeland. In "Design, Inference, and the Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism," Scott Ashworth, Joshua D. Clinton, Adam Meirowitz, and Kristopher W. Ramsay take issue with those conclusions by challenging the ability to draw any such inferences from Pape's data. In their view, Pape's research design of analyzing only cases of suicide attacks is equivalent to selecting observations on the basis of the dependent variable and without any variance in it. Such a design renders it impossible to draw any inferences about the correlates of suicide terrorism.

In his reply, "Methods and Findings in the Study of Suicide Terrorism," Pape defends the approach in his original article and also discusses his subsequent book, *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism* (2005). He notes that his article was based on a compilation of the universe of cases of suicide terrorism and even absent variance in the dependent variable could assess necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for suicide attacks. In addition, Pape draws extensively from his book to reiterate and expand his argument about the factors that underlie the adoption of suicide terrorist campaigns.

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.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080222 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 using the same general procedures as other manuscripts, with one exception. In addition to the usual number of reviewers, such manuscripts will also be sent to the scholar(s) whose work is being criticized, in the same anonymous form as they are sent to reviewers. Comments from the original author(s) to the Editors will be invited as a supplement to the advice of reviewers. This notice to the original author(s) is intended: (1) to encourage review of the details of analyses or research procedures that might escape the notice of disinterested reviewers; (2) to enable prompt publication of critiques by supplying criticized authors with early notice of their existence and, therefore, more adequate time to reply; (3) as a courtesy to criticized authors.

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.

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.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080222 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 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

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080222 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 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*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055408080222 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/S0003055408080222 Published online by Cambridge University Press