

## Notes from the Editor

### ANNOUNCEMENT

The inaugural issue of the *American Political Science Review* was published in November of 1906. To mark the centennial of the *APSR*, the November 2006 issue will feature a special section devoted to considerations of *the evolution of political science*. This special section will be an extra feature, above and beyond the regular complement of research articles.

The *APSR* is actively soliciting submissions on the broad theme of the special section.

If you are interested in submitting a paper, please contact the editor of the *APSR* at [apsr@gwu.edu](mailto:apsr@gwu.edu) to express your interest and to provide a brief description of the paper you would like to submit. Also, please bring this solicitation to the attention of others who may be interested and encourage them to contact the editor.

Like all other papers submitted to the *APSR*, submissions received in response to this solicitation will undergo peer review. Overseeing this process will be the editor of the *APSR*, Lee Sigelman, and a member of the *APSR*'s editorial board, M. Elizabeth Sanders of Cornell University.

To be considered for publication, a paper must be no more than 15–17 pages in length, conventionally formatted (e.g., double-spaced throughout, including notes and references, with margins of at least one inch on all sides and set up in at least an 11-point font size).

In light of the length constraints, authors are advised to address a specific theme rather than aiming at a broader, synoptic disciplinary overview. Pertinent examples would include: an analysis of a particular turning point in the evolution of the discipline or of the role played by a particular individual; a treatment of the evolution of some influential school of thought; a comparison of the evolution of two subfields of political science, or of political science in the U.S. and another area, or of political science and another discipline; or a consideration of how a certain type of scholarship has influenced and/or been influenced by public policy, or the relationship between political science and the state. (These are offered only as examples, rather than as a definitive set of topics to be addressed.)

To be considered for publication, submissions must reach the *APSR* office by no later than January 2, 2006, but earlier submission is encouraged.

### In this Issue<sup>1</sup>

The human genome is a biological *magnum opus* three billion letters long, a tiny portion of which adorns the cover of this issue. As an information storage device, DNA dwarfs human-made libraries and microchips. This remarkable code contains the instructions for producing living things from aardvarks to zebras and determines traits from sex to allergen sensitivity. Yet DNA does not determine many aspects of our lives, from the career paths we choose to the types of music we prefer. Thus assessments of the relative and joint effects of “nature” and “nurture” go on in a vast array of contexts, presenting new and ever-changing answers to the questions of who we are and why we are what we are—biologically and even, as the lead article in this issue suggests, politically. The genetic code on our cover, which is tinted green in honor of the month of May, could well have been shaded in the reds and blues of a map of presidential election results in honor of that article.

One often hears about long-separated twins who, upon meeting, discover that both like the same foods and drive the same make of car. But how about twins who vote for the same party and care about the same

issues? Genetics meets political science in “Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted?” by John R. Alford, Carolyn L. Funk and John R. Hibbing. Drawing on databases compiled in Virginia and Australia, Hibbing, Alford, and Funk conclude that biology shapes ideological outlooks, even more than parental socialization does. Here, then, is intriguing evidence that genetic predispositions play a more prominent role than political scientists have recognized.

If our genes predispose us to take different positions on political issues, then electoral calculations may work rather differently than previously thought. Scott Basinger and Howard Lavine’s “Ambivalence, Information and Electoral Choice” contributes to a rapidly developing subfield of electoral research that questions conventional wisdom about the determinants of vote choice. Voters use various cues to evaluate political candidates—party, ideology, economics, and specific issues, among others. Do they weight these factors equally? Basinger and Lavine suggest that they do not. By creatively synthesizing insights from research on information processing, congressional elections, and public opinion, Basinger and Lavine develop an ambivalence-centered model that depicts those who hold ambivalent partisan attitudes as distinctive in the cues they use to select their favorite candidate.

<sup>1</sup> Drafted by *APSR* editorial assistant Lee Michael.

Identifying these cues and examining how voters use them to home in on their preferred candidates are Basinger and Lavine's primary contributions in an analysis that advances our understanding of electoral decisionmaking.

Voters must not only consider the relative salience of different cues, but also devise voting strategies that make sense given the institutional context in which they find themselves. Of course, the ideas that voters act strategically and are influenced by policy outcomes are well established, but Orit Kedar ("When Moderate Voters Prefer Extreme Parties: Policy Balancing in Parliamentary Elections") imparts some new twists to these ideas by probing the interplay of institutions and individual behavior. Using survey data from Norway, the Netherlands, Britain, and Canada, Kedar argues that voters in proportional representation systems often engage in "compensatory voting" and favor more extreme parties where there is considerable power-sharing among parties; by contrast, plurality-based systems are likely to motivate more ideologically sincere voting patterns. Kedar's analysis should interest a wide readership ranging from American scholars who study strategic voting and electoral systems to comparativists who are concerned with "bringing the state back in."

Whether conducted in a New England town hall or a European-style proportional representation system, voting is the quintessential collective action activity—a modestly time-consuming task for most citizens, but not usually a dangerous one. Engaging in other forms of collective action, however, can occasion greater risk, from bearing the financial costs of an endeavor alone to being punished or even executed for challenging the status quo. Thus, in politics, fools may rush in where angels fear to tread only when they have company. Jacob K. Goeree and Charles A. Holt apply the concept of quantal response equilibrium to several important categories of political activity in "An Explanation of Anomalous Behavior in Models of Political Participation." Their insights help account for failures of equilibrium-based models to explain what actually happens in real-world situations. For insights about situations ranging from the dynamics of anti-government demonstrations in Lebanon to the jockeying that goes on when incumbent senators announce their retirement, Goeree and Holt's analysis merits attention from a wide range of readers, including those who might ordinarily shy away from an article based on formal modeling.

Another ingredient in the collective action recipe is social capital. The creation of social capital through civic engagement is often cited as an important factor in "making democracy work," but disagreement persists what form these civic engagements should take. In "Civic Engagement and Mass-Elite Policy Agenda Agreement in American Communities," Kim Quaille Hill and Tetsuya Matsubayashi test whether bridging or bonding associations produce greater leader responsiveness. In addition to the novel findings they report of no connection between bridging associations and leader responsiveness and of a negative association between bonding associations and such responsiveness,

Hill and Matsubayashi introduce innovative measures of policy concurrence and member participation. This article seems likely to excite both Americanists in the behavioral tradition and comparativists interested in democratization.

In the United States, policy outcomes are of course shaped by the provisions of the Constitution. Generations of American schoolchildren have been taught that the Father Of The Constitution was James Madison, who dominated the Constitutional Convention with his Virginia Plan and then pushed for ratification in the *Federalist Papers*. David B. Robertson challenges the textbook version of history in "Madison's Opponents and Constitutional Design." Robertson argues that Madison's Virginia plan was successfully challenged on many fronts by a coherent and influential opposition led by Connecticut delegate Roger Sherman. Many of the prominent constitutional features we see today were the result of path-dependent compromises balancing state and national power. Madison lost important fights on issues such as federalism and states' rights, intra- and interstate commerce, separation of powers, and the composition, powers, and selection of the national legislature and executive. Madison may have been the Constitution's father, but he lost many a custody battle in its drafting stages. For an audience ranging from senior scholars down through beginning undergraduates, Robertson's analysis teaches some valuable lessons about American politics and the Constitution's origins.

A major component of American government not detailed in the Constitution is the bureaucracy—an administrative amalgam of executive, legislative, and even judicial functions and features that handles most citizen-government interactions. Just as the Founders were concerned about the ethics of elected officials, Sanford C. Gordon and Catherine Hafer ("Flexing Muscle: Corporate Political Expenditures as Signals to the Bureaucracy") wonder whether private firms can buy favorable bureaucratic decisions. Gordon and Hafer focus on the influence of regulated industries, especially nuclear power companies, on enforcement decisions of agencies that are charged with regulating them. At the heart of corporate influence, Gordon and Hafer argue, are the political contributions that firms use to signal their willingness and ability to challenge unfavorable agency actions. In contrast to previous research, Gordon and Hafer see the motivation underlying political contributions as one of influencing the decisions of regulatory agencies rather than congressional enactments. The provocative findings of this analysis seem certain to add fuel to the already heated debate over the extent to which and the manner in which political contributions influence policy outcomes.

Like Gordon and Hafer, who obtain thought-provoking data from corporate lobbies, Michael Laver ("Policy and the Dynamics of Political Competition") argues that political scientists can improve their theory by studying the "real world" of politics. Laver insists that political scientists must start treating parties as partisans do: as maelstroms of activity and change, not inert institutional fossils, especially when it comes

to modeling multi-party competition. Political parties have access to much more information (such as opinion polls) than is generally recognized, and it is up to political scientists to begin to represent these policy environments more accurately in their models of politics. Laver develops different algorithms to allow for party adaptation in multi-party systems and applies his findings to the Irish party system in this insightful study.

In the September 2000 issue, the *APSR* published “The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment,” by Alan S. Gerber and Donald P. Green. Gerber and Green contended that face-to-face visits during the election campaigns they studied increased voter turnout substantially, that direct mail did so modestly, and that brief telephone calls were ineffective. In the “Forum” section of this issue, Kosuke Imai (“Do Get-Out-The-Vote Calls Reduce Turnout? The Importance of Statistical Methods for Field Experiments”) challenges the data, methodology, and substantive results of the Gerber-Green study. In response (“Correction to Gerber and Green, Replication of Disputed Findings, and Reply to Imai”), Gerber and Green concede and correct some data problems but vigorously dispute Imai’s challenges to their methodology and substantive results. This exchange highlights the relationship between methods and results, and demonstrates how spirited debate can contribute to our understanding of political phenomena.

## INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

### General Considerations

The *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 have already been published or are forthcoming in other places, or that have been included in other manuscripts submitted for review to book publishers or periodicals (including on-line journals). 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 by other journals or duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts that have been submitted to other publishers (including publishers of both books and periodicals). Submission of manuscripts substantially similar to those submitted or published elsewhere, or

as part of a book or other larger work, is also strongly discouraged. 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 Editor. You should also notify the Editor of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, that occur while a manuscript is under review by the *APSR* and which would fall within the scope of this policy. The Editor may request copies of related publications.

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 that 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* (Ann Arbor, MI: AAPOR, 2000). This document is available on the Internet at <[http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey\\_methods/standards\\_and\\_best\\_practices/standard\\_definitions](http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey_methods/standards_and_best_practices/standard_definitions)>. 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 and tables and, wherever possible, should avoid the use of acronyms and computer abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables appearing in tables 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 printed copies of that information with the manuscript. If the amount of this supplementary information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. You should follow the guidelines for preparing anonymous copies in the Specific Procedures section below.

Manuscripts that are largely or entirely critiques or commentaries on previously published *APSR* articles will be reviewed using the same general procedures as for 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 that they are sent

to reviewers. Comments from the original author(s) to the Editor 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; and (3) as a courtesy to criticized authors. If you submit such a manuscript, you should therefore send as many additional copies of their manuscripts as will be required for this purpose.

Manuscripts being submitted for publication should be sent to Lee Sigelman, Editor, *American Political Science Review*, Department of Political Science, The George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052. Correspondence concerning manuscripts under review may be sent to the same address or e-mailed to [apsr@gwu.edu](mailto:apsr@gwu.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. The font size must be at least 11 points for all parts of the paper, including notes and references. The entire paper, including notes and references, must be double-spaced, with the sole exception of tables for which double-spacing would require a second page otherwise not needed. All pages should be numbered in one sequence, and text should be formatted using a normal single column no wider than 6.5 inches, as is typical for manuscripts (rather than the double-column format of the published version of the *APSR*), and printed on one side of the page only. 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. Do not use notes for simple citations. These specifications are designed to make it easier for reviewers to read and evaluate papers. 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 your paper is accepted for publication, you will also be required to submit camera-ready copy of graphs or other types of figures. Instructions will be provided.

For specific formatting style of citations and references, please refer to articles in the most recent issue of the *APSR*. For unusual style or formatting issues, you should consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. For review purposes, citations and references need not be in specific *APSR* format, although some generally accepted format should be used, and all citation and reference information should be provided.

### Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. You are invited to submit a list of scholars who would be appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. The Editor will refer to this list in selecting reviewers, though there obviously can be no guarantee that those you suggest will actually be chosen. Do not list anyone who has already commented on your paper or an earlier version of it, or any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends.
2. Submit five copies of manuscripts *and* a diskette or CD containing a pdf file of the anonymous version of the manuscript. If you cannot save the manuscript as a pdf, just send in the diskette or CD with the word-processed version. Please ensure that the paper and diskette or CD versions you submit are identical; the diskette or CD version should be of the **anonymous** copy (see below). Please review all pages of all copies to make sure that all copies contain all tables, figures, appendices, and bibliography mentioned in the manuscript and that all pages are legible. Label the diskette or CD clearly with the (first) author's name and the title of the manuscript (in abridged form if need be), and identify the word processing program and operating system. If you are unable to create a diskette or CD, please note this in your submission, and you will be asked to e-mail the appropriate file.
3. To comply with the *APSR*'s procedure of double-blind peer reviews, only one of the five copies submitted should be fully identified as to authorship and four should be in anonymous format.
4. For anonymous copies, 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 in the third person and including normal references to the work cited in the list of references. In no circumstances should your prior publications be included in the bibliography in their normal alphabetical location but with your name deleted. Assuming that text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should include

full citations as usual in the bibliography. Please discuss the use of other procedures to render manuscripts anonymous with the Editor prior to submission. You should 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. *All acknowledgments must appear on the title page of the identified copy only.* Manuscripts that are judged not anonymous will not be reviewed.

5. The first page of the four anonymous copies should contain only the title and an abstract of no more than 150 words. The first page of the identified copy should contain (a) the name, academic rank, institutional affiliation, and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, e-mail address) for all authors; (b) in the case of multiple authors, an indication of the author who will receive correspondence; (c) any relevant citations to your previous work that have been omitted from the anonymous copies; and (d) acknowledgments, including the names of anyone who has provided comments on the manuscript. If the identified copy contains any unique references or is worded differently in any way, please mark this copy with "Contains author citations" at the top of the first page.

No copies of submitted manuscripts can be returned.

### 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](http://www.apsanet.org)) with their username and password. Individual non-member 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), 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.

### BOOK REVIEWS

The *APSR* no longer contains book reviews. As of 2003, book reviews have moved to *Perspectives on Politics*. All books for review should be sent directly to the *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors, Susan Bickford and Greg McAvoy. The address is Susan Bickford and Gregory McAvoy, *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors, Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, CB No. 3265, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265. E-mail: [bookreviews@unc.edu](mailto:bookreviews@unc.edu).

If you are the author of a book you wish to be considered for review, please ask your publisher to send a copy to the *Perspectives on Politics* Book Review Editors per the mailing instructions above. If you are interested in reviewing books for *Perspectives on Politics*, please send your vita to the Book Review Editors; you should not ask to review a specific book.

### 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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:membership@apsanet.org)

Reprint permissions:  
E-mail: [Rights@cambridge.org](mailto:Rights@cambridge.org)

Advertising information and rates:

Advertising Coordinator,  
Cambridge University Press  
E-mail: advertising@apsanet.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 article, 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 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](http://www.umi.com)). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969-95, is available through the APSA.